

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 2 July 2014

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

Parliamentary Committees

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY 2014-15

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (11:01): I move:

That the 85th report of the committee, entitled Emergency Services Levy 2014-15, be noted.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (11:02): I am happy to speak on the Economic and Finance Committee report into the emergency services levy. The emergency services levy is something I have had some interest in for 16 or so years, and I guess the real issue this time is the way the government has shabbily treated the committee in relation to the remissions issue and the way that they have changed the reporting to the committee in relation to the remissions issue.

For those new members of the house who are not familiar with it, the emergency services levy was introduced around 1997-98 when the fire service levy was taken off all insurance—

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I was the minister for it, and I am glad I introduced it. The reality is that there was a fire service levy on insurance. Only those people who paid insurance paid the fire service levy, and when we did an examination of it we found that about a third were properly insured, about a third were underinsured and about a third had no insurance at all.

You had the bizarre situation where an insured pensioner would pay the fire service levy and a company that insured overseas would pay nothing, and so you would have the insured pensioner subsidising the fire service for those companies. To even the load, the emergency services levy was brought in and not only covered the fire services such as CFS and MFS but also covered the other emergency service agencies—Surf Life Saving, Royal Life Saving, the State Emergency Service and some emergency services of the police—so it was a broader issue.

What has always been the case is that, in setting up the emergency services levy, the levy was sent to the parliament's Economic and Finance Committee so that it could be put under some scrutiny. That is the process here now: the Economic and Finance Committee then reports to the parliament about the emergency services levy and how it is going to be spent. What changed this year, and for the first time in about 16 or 17 years, is that the government decided not to tell the Economic and Finance Committee if the budget proper (that is, the government's budget) was going to make a contribution to the remissions.

Essentially what used to happen was that the levy used to collect around \$140 million or \$150 million a year. That was the amount required by the levy. The government thought that was too high a figure to collect from the taxpayer, so they would make a contribution of about half. Around \$70 million out of the budget proper would go into the emergency services levy and that would mean there needed to be about \$70 million to \$75 million actually collected from the taxpayers out there. The levy is charged on property and it is charged on vehicles.

In the report to the Economic and Finance Committee there has always been a line that says the government's budget is going to pay a certain dollar figure of remissions and so it was crystal clear to the committee how much the taxpayer was going to contribute and how much the government was going to contribute. Roll forward to Treasurer Koutsantonis and what do we find? We find a sleight of hand in reporting to the committee.

The SPEAKER: That would be the Treasurer or the member for West Torrens.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I apologise. Didn't I say Treasurer Koutsantonis? I meant to if I didn't.

The SPEAKER: It is best to keep our first and surnames out of it.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The Treasurer. Roll forward to this new Treasurer and what we find is a change of practice. What comes before the Economic and Finance Committee is not the whole story. There is a deception given to the Economic and Finance Committee which is quite simple. All it says is the remissions will be subject to reporting in the budget proper, and the budget proper was brought down a couple of weeks after the Economic and Finance Committee got to examine the report.

We did not pursue this issue during the Economic and Finance Committee for one very simple reason. The government had already made its decision. Nothing we asked at the Economic and Finance Committee was going to change it. It was clear to me that they were going to, in all likelihood, reduce the remissions—not abolish them altogether, but certainly reduce the remissions—otherwise why change the procedure?

What is surprising is that the government has gone down the path of hiding from the committee this issue of the remissions. Why change the procedure after 16 or 17 years? Of course, we now know why they have done it. They have cancelled all the remissions and what that means is that the average taxpayer out there is going to be paying essentially double in approximate numbers. Most householders, most businesses and most vehicle owners are going to be hit with approximately double the cost of the levy.

There was no mandate for this at the election. This government did not go out and say they were going to get rid of the remissions of the emergency services levy. In fact, if you read their rhetoric during the election, it was quite the opposite. This was the government that was going to actually maintain the concessions for a whole range of taxpayers out there and a whole range of services. But what they have done here, of course, is essentially misled the public. They have given the indication that these things were secure, that the levy would roll along in the normal procedure. What we find now, of course, is that they have not done that. They have hidden the change to remissions in the documents they have sent the Economic and Finance Committee and then announced it in the budget proper.

Had we gone down the path of asking a whole range of questions at the Economic and Finance Committee, we all know what the answer would have been. The answer would have been, 'You'll have to wait for the budget.' We know that would have been the answer. I know that the Chair of the committee is nodding over there in agreement, which I appreciate. The reality is that we have asked a series of budget questions in this chamber during question time and every single answer has been, 'Just wait for the budget; just wait for the budget.'

I know there has been some media reporting on this particular issue. The reality is that there was nothing that the opposition could have asked or changed at the Economic and Finance Committee that would have changed anything to do with this particular issue, because the government have the numbers on the Economic and Finance Committee and can vote it through any way they wish. What is sad—

Mr Odenwalder: So why turn up?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: What is sad—sorry?

Mr Odenwalder: Why turn up at all?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Why turn up at all? I am obligated to turn up. Yes, that's right. The reality is—

The SPEAKER: The member for Little Para is called to order.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The reality and what is sad is that under this Treasurer we now know that there has been this sleight of hand to the committee. A treatment of disdain to the committee by this government has gone on, not just under this treasurer but under a number of treasurers. There is another committee, a subcommittee of the Economic and Finance Committee, called the Industries Development Committee, which is meant to look at a whole range of industry assistance—like the Holden package and the Mitsubishi package, etc.—over the years. From memory, I do not think that has met since 2004. It was set up in the 1940s by the Playford government to be bipartisan in its approach about industry assistance and economic development in the state, but this government has been keen on making sure that committee does not meet, so that the Economic and Finance Committee does not get access to the information.

Roll forward to this Treasurer, and what does he do? For the first time in 16 or 17 years he changed the procedure just so that the Economic and Finance Committee did not have access to the information. I think it is sad that the lack of transparency on the government's behalf, on this particular issue, has resulted in what it has resulted in. The truth is that the public out there is going to pay for the Labor Party's mismanagement.

As I understand it from an answer yesterday, what they have essentially said is this: that the \$70 million they were going to spend in remissions to the emergency services levy they are now going to spend on health. That is what they are saying, of course, but they are cutting a billion dollars out of health already; they have already announced \$1 billion cuts out of health. There was an article in the paper the other day that there was \$80 million a year in efficiencies in health.

So, rather than actually deal with the management of the health system, what they are going to do now is charge people an extra tax, through the abolition of the remissions, simply to pay for their inefficiency in the health system. Essentially, they are using the emergency services levy as a way of funding to correct a budget problem not that they have in emergency services, but a budget problem they have actually got in health—and they have had the problem well before the Abbott government was elected.

This was a government that went out and said in the Mid-Year Budget Review that they were going to cut \$1,000 million dollars out of health over the next four years, a \$250 million cut from education over the next four years, and a \$150 million cut to police over, I think, a three-year period. This was a government that had said they were in trouble and was going to cut their budget.

What we are finding now is that the reason they have cut the remissions out of the emergency services levy is not that there is a problem with emergency services but that there is actually a problem on the other side of the budget, the health side of the budget, and to try to prop up their inefficiency in the health system everyone who owns a house, everyone who owns a car, everyone who owns piece of property is going to be paying twice the emergency services levy than they did last year. It is just a pity that the government was so dishonest that they did not tell the public before the election that that was what they were going to do.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (11:12): I also rise to speak on the 85th report of the Economic and Finance Committee which, of course, references the emergency services levy policy of this government. What a disappointing policy this is for the people of South Australia. As the member for Davenport has just made very clear, there was no discussion on the removal, the abolition, of the remissions prior to the election. No-one went to the ballot box thinking that the government would have such a massive increase—

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I am sorry, leader, can I just interrupt you briefly. I want to welcome to parliament students from the Cummins Area School, who are guests of the member for Flinders.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr MARSHALL: And I am sure it is no reflection on the calibre of my speech that they all upped and left as I rose to my feet. However, we certainly do welcome the Cummins Area School coming to Adelaide to visit the parliament. It is an outstanding and very productive part of our state and we are always very proud to host a visit here to the parliament. Thank you very much for visiting.

The SPEAKER: And they have had outstanding rainfall and look forward to a good season.

Parliamentary Committees

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY 2014-15

Debate resumed.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (11:15): As I said, we are very disappointed, on this side of the house, that the government concealed their plans to remove the remission provided to households in South Australia for the emergency services levy. This concealment amounts, essentially, to nothing more than the imposition of a new land tax on the family home.

Let us be quite serious about this: removing that remission puts a land tax on every single household in South Australia, on the primary place of residence and, of course, most importantly—and the part that I would like to highlight today—on primary production properties here in South Australia which have enjoyed no land tax in the past. This is a sneaky new land tax which has been put in place and it will have widespread ramifications right across South Australia.

I only met this morning with a dairy farmer who has done the analysis on his property. This is the situation that exists right across regional South Australia, and it is a pity that the member for Frome, the Minister for Regional Development, does not seem to be here and listening to what I have to say, making eye contact as I speak at the moment.

I make this point: many people in regional South Australia are asset rich and for this they are going to pay a very heavy penalty with the changes that the government has made to the emergency services levy. This particular farmer said to me this morning that his property was valued at \$3 million, so he will be paying \$802.10 for the emergency services levy as of this year. That is a massive increase—it is an increase of 173 per cent in a single year.

He is lucky in a way, because he has multiple titles. If that property value were all on the single title there would be an increase of 541 per cent in a single year—a 541 per cent increase. I ask you, Mr Speaker, in what jurisdiction is that increase in an emergency services levy fair on people in South Australia? They did not ask for it, and the government did not come clean with it. They did not tell people what they were going to be voting for before the election but, importantly, they had considered this before the election. In fact, immediately after the Henry tax review came out it was reported in *The Advertiser*—and this is four treasurers ago, because they mix them up a bit here in South Australia—that the then treasurer, Kevin Foley, said:

A broad-based land tax bid on commercial or industrial will be levying taxes on people who have not previously paid them and we don't think that that's the right way to go.

He also said, as reported in *The Australian* on 4 May:

A broad-based land tax would be a punitive tax on families and households and won't be supported by this government.

Interestingly, after those comments were made by that treasurer we had a new treasurer in South Australia and we know for a fact that the member for Playford, the treasurer before the last treasurer, went to some length to have his treasury model up the likely impact of a new land tax on the family home. Importantly, he made it very clear that this would be something that he would do after a 'conversation' with the people of South Australia. In fact, he said that this would be something that he would take to an election.

Let me tell you, sir, there was no conversation with the people of South Australia. There was no clear indication of what the government was going to do before the election—no clear indication whatsoever. The first indication that was received by members of this parliament was when the Economic and Finance Committee brought down their report which basically said they were looking at removing that remission. I say this is something that should have been made abundantly clear to the people of South Australia before the election because it amounts to a very significant increase in cost and is going to be particularly and unequally felt in regional South Australia. They have not had a land tax on their primary production facilities or properties in the past, and that is exactly and precisely what they are going to have going forward.

As the member for Davenport said, one would not mind if this money was going to go to increased services in terms of provision of money for emergency services in South Australia, but let us look at the facts. There will be \$384 million worth of additional revenue introduced to the South Australian budget as part of this measure. How much of this \$384 million in new revenue will be spent on projects associated with emergency services in South Australia? I will tell you. There is a miserly \$8 million worth of new emergency services programs identified in this budget. So out of \$384 million worth of new revenue, only \$8 million will be allocated to new projects in this emergency services levy. It is an absolute shame that this is the case. Make no mistake about it: this government is running the books extraordinarily poorly here in South Australia.

We learnt from the budget that was handed down just two weeks ago that there has been \$311 million worth of unbudgeted expenditure last financial year—\$311 million worth of unbudgeted expenditure last financial year, and guess who will make up the difference. It is the taxpayers of

South Australia, the people who are struggling, households, small business and, in particular, our primary producers here in South Australia. Yes, they are asset rich, but as one person pointed out to me very recently they do not have two bob to rub together, and this is a real problem. They will be hit with this tax, a massive increase in their costs as a business, and they will be struggling.

The government immediately after the election said, 'Well, we need to listen. We need to listen to the small business sector, we need to listen to regional South Australia'. They need to be judged on their performance since they made that announcement. They said they would be focusing on small business and regional communities right across this state. How appalling is it then that the first opportunity to reset the cost basis in South Australia that they did not do one single solitary thing for those communities whatsoever? In fact, what we saw were new taxes, new fees, new charges and, quite frankly, a budget that was heading in the wrong direction for both those groups.

The government needs to go back to the drawing board and needs to understand that much of our growth, much of our wealth and much of our prosperity in the future will come from regional South Australia. It is great they have made a trip to the Riverland. It is great they got up there; people were very pleased to see them, but you cannot just make one visit and con the people in the regions that this is a government that cares. The increase in the emergency services levy will disproportionately hit the people in regional South Australia. The Minister for Regional Development should have something to say about it. I hope he makes a contribution to this debate this morning.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:22): I rise also to talk about the tabling of the emergency services levy report 2014-15. It is an absolute disgrace what is happening here. This is a land tax, an absolute land tax, on our primary producers and I am standing here as a proud primary producer, but having had my land leased out for about 10 years now for the interests of the parliament. This is just a backdoor tax on our primary producers who are already struggling. I asked in the house yesterday what a \$1.5 million property near Murray Bridge would pay in land tax, the emergency services levy. It would be \$420. That would be a farm that would be barely viable.

We just had the leader, the member for Dunstan, talking about a property worth about \$4 million, and their tax has increased to over \$800. It is just crazy stuff. As with farming, the saying is that people have to get big or get out. This is because of cost pressures on the industry and the efficiencies of having larger properties, so that means there will be many family operations (and some of these family operations have become family semi-corporate farming operations) will be paying thousands extra for this emergency services levy.

What will they get back for it? Next to nothing. Yes, some of this funding goes into paying for emergency services vehicles, but many of our farming friends are those same volunteers who man those vehicles and valiantly give their time to fight fires and pick up and look after the road accidents that happen on our highways and lesser known roads. There are some horror stories. One particular friend of mine has been with the Coonalpyn CFS for many years but is having a year off because he is sick of seeing the trauma and death resulting from high-speed accidents that happen on the Dukes Highway. He is just having a bit of time out for 12 months to get his head together—that is how this affects people.

The issue here is this is a backdoor tax. It will make farmers that little bit more unviable. We have a budget that has been stripped down to \$59.8 million for PIRSA. We have a government that supposedly wants to ride on agriculture's back, yet every year they take more and more money out of the Primary Industries' budget, and now we see another tax on our great primary producers.

Especially in regard to where the emergency services levy goes, I have been quite disheartened over recent years to learn that a lot of our fire trucks are not even manufactured locally. They have been manufactured in Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria, and the latest lot were made in New Zealand by Fraser's. They bring the Isuzu trucks out from Japan. They do some import/export arrangement where I think they even unload the trucks here in Australia then put them straight back on and take them to New Zealand to put the fire truck bodies on—in New Zealand.

This is a government that does not even support our local industries with this emergency services levy, and it is shameful—it is absolutely shameful. I have a great manufacturing company, Moore Engineering, in my electorate in Murray Bridge, who manufacture fire trucks. They work for All Fire Services. They have some contracts with the CFS, but they pale into insignificance compared to what Fraser Engineering are building in New Zealand.

There are many, many hundreds of thousands of dollars—in fact, it would run into millions of dollars over time—that are not being spent in this state and that could be spent in my electorate on building quality fire trucks. What I have seen happen over time with some of these trucks that have come in from interstate and overseas is that, as soon as there is a problem, the trucks shake apart, they need—

Dr McFetridge: Plastic fantastics.

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, that's it. They need some maintenance. Well, hello? Where is the maintenance done? Moore Engineering. They come in to fix some of the problems that have occurred with these trucks. I have seen two brand-new trucks—one from Ceduna, that was detailed to Ceduna, and one that went to Meningie—that were basically falling apart on their first runs and had to come to Murray Bridge for a refit.

We are stabbing our primary producers, many of whom are our CFS volunteers out there in the field, with a huge impost with the massive rise in the emergency services levy, which will just be another thorn in the farmers' sides, making them wonder why they are doing it, especially when they look at the lower amount that PIRSA gets in the budget lines. We see budget cuts to research and development and budget cuts to biosecurity. It just goes on and on, and it smacks our primary producers in the face.

I find it so unacceptable that not only are they paying this backdoor tax—this land tax—but then this emergency services levy is being used to fund vehicles and trucks that are put together in New Zealand. This is a government that supposedly supports this state. I cannot see how that is supporting our state. All members on the government side should be ashamed of that, and the Minister for Regional Development, the Minister for Trade, and others, need to have a good, hard look at what is going on when ordering vehicles and equipment for this state's use. Why are we not supporting our local industries?

We hear all the carry-on and outrage about the support or non-support for Holden, depending on who you talk to in this place, but Holden's always were going to go. They made that decision in Detroit. They said, 'You could have thrown as much money as you like but we are out the door. We are going.' We have people who could be building equipment in this state yet they are overlooked by this government, who only look at what I believe is the bottom line but then they get an inferior product and it costs a lot more in the end to maintain.

Not only are we getting vehicles that I do not believe are up to scratch but also people are paying a lot more in the emergency services levy, which just makes it harder for their way of life in the bush. When people finally realise, when the accounts arrive in the mail, I can just imagine the amount of anger coming from throughout our rural electorates to us in this place when they voice their concerns. I think it is an absolute disgrace. It is a backdoor tax and a real impost on our great farmers and primary producers.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:31): I too rise to comment on the 85th report of the Economic and Finance Committee, entitled Emergency Services Levy 2014-15. I would like to make it very clear that I have recently been appointed to the Economic and Finance Committee. I have not attended a meeting yet because there has not been one since my appointment. I was disappointed to shift away from the Natural Resources Committee, but that is just how things go. I do look forward to my involvement with this committee. I was not a member of the committee when this report was tabled but I do take a very serious interest in this matter not only as a new member of this committee but also as, until very recently, shadow minister for emergency services.

My main purpose in my contribution today is to debunk the rubbish said by the Treasurer in question time yesterday and also by commentators in the media about the opposition's response to this levy increase—that somehow we should have known exactly what was coming and the phrase 'hidden in plain sight', which is completely inappropriate. To be really clear, so that everybody understands, let me read directly from a section of the report that came out in mid-June. I am reading from section 4, Legislative Overview:

...the levy proposal consists of a charge to owners of both fixed and mobile property. The charge is determined in accordance with a formula using prescribed rates as declared by the Governor.

Once these prescribed rates are established, remissions to the levy may be granted. When remissions are granted the government declares effective rates of the levy which are used in the calculations of levy bills.

The remissions are paid into the Community Emergency Services Fund established under the Act, directly from Treasury's consolidated revenue account. Remissions paid to the account represent the difference between the declared rate and the effective rate of the levy.

As per the minister's statement, details of the remissions provided by the Government on fixed-property ESL and mobile property liabilities for 2014-15 will be provided on 19 June 2014 as part of the 2014-15 budget.

It would not have mattered what question any member from the opposition or anyone else asked. The answer would have been, 'Not going to tell you a thing until the budget is released.' To say that questions went begging is absolutely ridiculous. We all know, because they are the answers we got to every other question about things that might be coming in the budget. Essentially, the report said there might be some changes in the budget. We had no choice but to wait until the budget was released to know what those changes were, and any suggestion to the opposite is clearly false and misleading.

Now what we got, of course, was a new tax. Let me be very clear about this: the increase in the emergency services levy is going to net the state government an additional \$384 million in extra revenue. The state government in the budget gives the emergency services sector an extra \$8 million. Let's be very clear about that. This is not about increasing the emergency services levy so that the emergency services sector can have all of this extra money. This is an extra tax and all of it except for \$8 million will go to another sector. If you take the \$8 million off the \$384 million, you get \$376 million—that is \$376 million of extra tax being charged under the guise of the emergency services levy that is going to go to a completely different sector.

As it turns out, it is going to the health sector which had already, previously to the budget, announced that the government was going to cut \$932 million out of the health sector. So the government made a decision to cut nearly \$1 billion out of health—and, by the way, it is trying to blame all of that on the federal government which again is completely inappropriate—but is now going to take \$376 million out of the emergency services levy and put it into health. This tax which is on households, properties, mobile properties is a tax which affects every component of our society which is linked to those properties. Every household pays it and every tenant in a rented property is going to pay it because eventually the landlord will pass it through in the rent at the next rent review opportunity.

Every small business is paying this extra tax. It is a tax on business which makes it even harder for businesses to employ people, which should be the key focus of any government and any opposition. One of its highest priorities must be to try to increase employment. Any business that works out of owned premises will pay this tax, any business that works out of rented premises will pay this tax. Guess what? They will pay it immediately because they will get it from their landlord under outgoing which is the normal way in a commercial tenancy.

Residential properties will have to wait a little bit until the next rent review and the landlord decides to pass it on. However, immediately, a business that works in a rented property, as soon as the landlord gets the extra charge on the ESL, the landlord as part of the outgoing will pass it straight on to their small business tenant. So it is a tax on business; that is what we actually have here.

Another dreadfully concerning thing here is the negative impact that this will have on the public perception of our emergency services workers because, as I said, of \$384 million being taxed here only \$8 million is going to the emergency services sector, but every household that gets the extra bill is quite likely to think that it is going to the emergency services but they are not going to get any extra service from the emergency services sector, whether they be professionals or volunteers. They are not going to get any additional service because of this levy. They are going to get a levy—an extra charge, an extra tax, extra money out of their household—but the emergency services sector will not be able to provide them with any better service than they already do, so it is harming the reputation of the hardworking volunteers and professionals in our emergency services sector as well.

Another extremely concerning issue here is the fact that the government is trying to bypass the very important parliamentary scrutiny of issues through parliamentary committees. I think every member here would have to accept that the work that parliamentary committees do in interrogating some of the decisions that the government makes is valuable and important and is usually done in a bipartisan way.

The government here is bypassing the Economic and Finance Committee's opportunity to interrogate this decision by just including in the report before the budget that it is likely to make

changes in this area but, for the first time ever, not actually say what the changes will be so that the committee's Liberal and Labor members do not have the opportunity to scrutinise that decision. It would be akin to the Public Works Committee getting a report for a significant piece of public infrastructure but we are not going to tell you what it costs. We want you to interrogate every single thing about this project but we are not going to tell you what it costs and, by the way, we want you to tell us whether you approve it or not and, by the way, the committee is dominated by government members. We will tell you everything about it, except the price tag.

It would be akin to the Natural Resources Committee having natural resources management board levy increases hidden from it. The boards would come to the committee, and they would say, 'Here's all of the work we want to do, these are the challenges we have, these are the goals we have set ourselves, and this is what we would like to do on behalf of the committee. We are seriously considering increasing our levies—we may or may not—and it will come out in the budget, but we're not going to tell you what it is. Can you tell us, please, Natural Resources Committee, will you approve this report?' Well, of course that would be ludicrous. It would be ludicrous for the Natural Resources Committee to be asked to accept a report from the boards that work around the state and to say that their work and their levy increases were okay without their being told what the increases would be.

It would be ludicrous for the Public Works Committee to be asked to approve a government-planned piece of public infrastructure and to tell the parliament that they support the development of this infrastructure, with a significant price tag, but not know what it costs, and that is exactly what we have here. The Economic and Finance Committee was asked to approve this report and, with a majority of government members on it approved it, but the committee itself had no idea what the change in the remission rate would be, yet it had to support it anyway.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11:41): This report by the Economic and Finance Committee is an interesting report that is done every year under legislation. I have read this report. I think that I have a reasonable level of intelligence. Having three science degrees and having done veterinary science, you do tend to learn to comprehend quite complex situations. Having read this report and then for the Treasurer to say that the removal of the remissions rebate was there hidden in plain sight is just ridiculous.

As the member for Stuart, who should be a minister in a Liberal government, said, there is no way that, had we asked questions about this report, we would have had any more information than we had for other answers: it would have been, 'You will have to wait for budget day.' I have told people in this place many times that they should read these reports, because a lot of us sort of gloss over them or might read a bit about them and some of the recommendations from them. I tell people in this place that they should read the whole report and see whether they can be enlightened as to where this is hidden in plain sight because it is not. Unless you are familiar with reports in the past, you may have no indication that there is a change in the remission rates and, as I have said, if we had asked questions, it would not have happened anyway.

I have to give the government one thing, though: they were fast off the gun. As soon as the gun went on the budget, they were out of the blocks. If you go to the RevenueSA website, there it is: taxes, duties, emergency services levy, remissions and concessions, and the first question is: 'Why is my ESL liability significantly higher compared to last year's liability?' The answer states:

As part of the State Government's Budget handed down on 19 June 2014, it was announced that the Government's contribution to the Community Emergency Services Fund would cease for certain levy payers.

It goes on to state:

In prior years, the State Government contributed approximately 50% of the funding required...

We have heard several times in this place that this extra money raised by the ESL is going into health. My understanding is that you cannot do that; it cannot happen. The money that is raised in the ESL has to be dedicated—hypothecated I think is the correct term—for use in emergency services. The emergency services levy never ever raised as much as was spent on emergency services, and I will talk about spending on fire services in this state in a moment. You cannot take this extra money out of ESL.

What the government is doing, I suppose, is that the money they used for remissions they are now not providing those remissions, so that money is going to then be available to be put across

into the health budget or whatever budget or area they have which is out of control and needs propping up. Taxpayers in South Australia are going to be hit with this tax, whether you call it a land tax or a toll on transport because that is what it is: it is not driving on a new road, but you have to pay it before you drive your car and you have to pay it on any property you own. This is going to be a serious impost on people who are struggling in this state, where the highest tax regimes exist in the history of the state.

Everybody should go to the RevenueSA website and inform themselves about the way the emergency services levy is calculated, subject to revision and examination of who actually gets these remissions because, let me tell you, some of the people who are not getting these remissions are a huge proportion of South Australians who hold a state Seniors Card. On page 7 of 16 of the Frequently Asked Questions on the RevenueSA website, the question is asked:

I am a State Senior Card Holder, why have I lost the General Remission?

It says there:

Essentially, holding a State Senior Card does not qualify a levy payer to the General Remission. Rather, a levy payer must hold a Commonwealth Senior Health Card—

If you have a state Seniors Card, bad luck: you are going to pay the money on the whole lot. And if you have been wise and you have invested in this state and invested in properties as part of your superannuation or part of good management in looking after yourselves and building for your retirement, the general remission has been restricted to a levy payer's principal place of residence only, so there will be a hit for all those people with investment properties and, certainly, businesses out there will be paying a lot more than they are now.

So, for Business SA to say that there has been no impact on business from this budget is clearly wrong. We have seen the massive increases in screening fees for employees through the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion and now we are seeing Treasury with its hand in the pocket of the thousands and thousands of small businesses and medium-size businesses in South Australia to get more money out of them through this land tax—this emergency services levy.

The way the emergency services levy is calculated exemplifies this even more. There is a reasonably complex way of calculating this but, to give RevenueSA their due, they actually have an online calculator and you can go and punch in the numbers. If you can work out which regional area you are in, which is not too hard, you can actually work out what your levy is going to be. I know that on some of my properties it was doubling—or more than doubling, in some cases—and that is something that everybody is going to have to face but, in particular, businesses. There is a land-use factor that you calculate. I will just read it for everybody:

The Emergency Services Levy on your property is determined by the following formula:

Effective Fixed Charge + (Capital Value x Effective Area Factor x Effective Land Use Factor x Effective Levy Rate) - Concessions.

There are four regional areas which are numbered 1, 2, 3 and 4 as you would expect. Some of them are the rural and regional areas, including Mount Gambier, Murray Bridge, Port Lincoln, Port Pirie, Renmark, Victor Harbor, which are in regional area 1. Others are parts of the state outside regional areas 1 and 4 and but still within a council area. Region 3 is those parts of the state not within a council area and region 4 is land within all metropolitan areas.

The area factor that you factor in for regional area 4—in other words, metropolitan people—is 1, so there are no concessions there. In regional area 2, which is the Adelaide Hills and those areas, there is some reduction there of 0.5. But then when you come to the land-use factor—and this is the bit that Business SA wants to have a look at—for residential, there is a multiplier factor of 0.4, so it brings the final levy back down again; for commercial, it is 1.044, so it is a multiplier to increase the levy; for industrial, it is 1.815, so you are not quite doubling the multiplier effect there on industrial land.

For commercial and industrial land in South Australia, you are paying an additional multiplier effect on calculating the levy. Rural and vacant land is 0.3, so there is some hope that the farmers will not be paying the massive amounts that the commercial and industrial properties are, but when you multiply that all out and add it all up and you work out what the South Australian taxpayers are going to be paying, it is a massive increase.

As for spending on emergency services, let's just refer to the Report on Government Services 2014. Table 9.1 on page 9.4 lists real revenue of fire service organisations in 2012 dollars, and every state, including the ACT and Northern Territory—so, every state and territory—has increased their fire service funding other than South Australia. Every one of them. So, where is the money going from the emergency services levy?

It is not going into front-line fire service organisations. In 2008-09, South Australian fire services revenue was, in 2012 terms, \$193.4 million. What is it in 2012-13—\$178.5 million. Of all the states and territories, we are the only jurisdiction where fire service funding has been reduced. What do we see in this budget? Virtually no improvement at all, and virtually no increases at all. The efficiencies are being demanded. We are seeing nothing keeping up with CPI. We are seeing the volunteers again having to struggle.

I was talking to some volunteers the other day about training for advanced first aid. They still have to run chook raffles to run those advanced first-aid courses. That is a disgrace in 2014, where we have this massive ESL increase, the money is coming in, and you still have CFS volunteers having to run chook raffles to do advanced training courses so that they can go and do their job and save lives. What have they saved South Australia? What have they saved this government by providing those volunteer services? Millions and millions, and what do we get?

Certainly, they are not being valued by this government, and this emergency services levy shows that this government is so out of touch with the real position out there. They should go out—they went up to the Riverland but they told people up there, 'Give us your ideas.' I think they offered a \$50,000 reward or bonus if you gave them some good ideas, so I have been told. They are bereft of ideas, they are bereft of any good policies and what do we see? They are gouging volunteers, they are gouging emergency services, they are gouging the whole of the taxpayer base in South Australia to prop up a dud budget and this is just another example of it.

Time expired.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:51): I will make a few remarks on this report. I actually feel sorry for the member for Lee that he had to bring such a report into the parliament given the—

Dr McFetridge: Little Para.

Mr PENGILLY: Little Para, I beg your pardon, sorry—given the treachery he had perpetrated on him and on the people of South Australia by the Treasurer's budget. Regarding the emergency services levy—and I go back a fair way actually, I was on the CFS board when it was introduced; it took over from various other funding mechanisms such as fire levies and whatnot which were put to bed—it was seen as a progressive way forward.

Since that time in 2005 or 2006, I think from memory, it has proven to be successful in funding much of the emergency services requirements, but I would point out that it is not funding all of those requirements by a long stretch of the imagination. Something that comes to mind immediately in my electorate is the fire station at Delamere, which has been on the backburner for some time and has been duckshoved and pushed around. Meanwhile, the good people who man the volunteer Country Fire Service at Delamere/Rapid Bay are still surviving in a shed that is seriously out of date, and that seriously does not cater for the needs of that area, which seems to have an increasing number of fires.

Likewise, over on the island there has been a plan for some years to put in a substantial station adjacent to the Western Districts oval. I think that is finally coming into fruition. I know that I have had approaches from CFS volunteer personnel on the island about the hiccup. I have written to the minister about it, and I have had responses from him to which I have written back because one of the most stupid things that the bureaucrats wrote was that it was waiting on a native title decision. There is no native title on Kangaroo Island, which I pointed out to the minister. He would not know that. I would not expect him to know that. I think this was through the auspices of the Kangaroo Island Futures Authority, which has been around for two or three years and should know these things but clearly does not.

Hopefully that will have a happy ending but, more to the point, I listened with interest to the leader this morning and his remarks on this report. He talked about the impact of this emergency services levy increase, this disgrace that has been inflicted on the people of South Australia, this return to a land tax on the family home abolished by the Tonkin government (1979-82), which I spoke

about yesterday, and the complete fabrication of putting this levy up to the extent where it will not go into emergency services, which the emergency services act was designed to do.

This will be raised again in the Economic and Finance Committee, I am sure, by Liberal members in that committee, but it is outrageous. It is now a tax on families and a tax on primary producers. The leader this morning talked about the impact on a dairy farmer, who happens to be from my electorate, and other farmers from that community in the electorate of Finnis have raised this issue with me. They are outraged by it and so they should be, as should every home owner in South Australia, at how this government has got itself into such an appalling mess through its own ineptitude and by spending money it did not have. The rivers of gold from the GST revenue has been spoken about in the last couple of days. The government has just spent and spent and the bank has run out of money.

I find it has the authority to raise the emergency services levy through being the government of the day but, in my view, it has dismally failed the people of South Australia morally in inflicting a land tax back on the family home and on property owners which is to the great detriment of many South Australians. It is no wonder that young people are leaving the state in droves. Why would they want to hang around? With those few words, I express my extreme annoyance at the action of the government over what it has done in the budget with the emergency services levy and put it on the record.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON A REVIEW OF THE RETIREMENT VILLAGES ACT 1987

Adjourned debate on motion of Dr McFetridge:

That the report of the committee be noted.

(Continued from 18 June 2014.)

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:58): I rise today to talk about the retirement villages select committee report because it is something that is quite important to my electorate. To give you a bit of background on that, when seeking to understand one's electorate over the course of becoming a politician one of the first sources of information I turned to was ABS Census QuickStats, which is a great way to get a broad overview of where your electorate is at.

This confirmed what I knew anecdotally, that the age profile of my electorate was older than the average. I will not go through the brackets but the age brackets over 60 in my electorate mean that Schubert is about 25 per cent over-represented in those categories, so from 60 to 64, 65 to 69 and 70 to 74 Schubert is 25 per cent over-represented with older Australians. This has implications for health services, local amenities and access, and for aged care.

This is an important sector in my community and I have made it a priority to get involved and understand the issues. I have great aged-care facilities in Schubert and I have visited almost all of them.

Barossa Village CEO Phil Schmaal is a man I have met on a number of occasions and visited only a couple of months ago. Barossa Village has 165 independent living units, 55 high-care and 23 low-care beds. Barossa Village is a fantastic organisation that responds very closely to the needs of its residents. Keith Adams is the CEO of the Tanunda Lutheran Home, which is the other large-scale retirement facility in the Barossa. I had a beautiful pancake brunch with him in the new refurbished facility which has 88 independent living units and 97 high-care and 20 low-care beds.

Abbeyfield in Williamstown, which had a beautiful Strawberry Fete earlier this year, is a facility that is working with Maggie Beer to look at putting more fresh—

The SPEAKER: Could the member seek leave to continue?

Mr KNOLL: I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Bills***APPROPRIATION BILL 2014***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 July 2014.)

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (12:01): In rising to speak on the state budget I just want to go back basically over 20 years and look at what has been done to the budget and what strategy South Australia is using in its budgets to try to develop the state.

In 1992 I decided to run for state politics, primarily on the back of the State Bank disaster under the then Bannon government. That was interesting because the state debt at that time was rising to around \$11 billion and the budget deficit at that time was around \$300 million a year. Since that time, this is what the state has done: it has leased its electricity assets, it has leased its ports assets, it sold the TAB; it sold the State Government Insurance Commission, and it sold the good bits of the State Bank and offloaded the bad bits. I think it was last year, 20 years after the collapse of the State Bank, it finally got rid of the last bad asset from the State Bank.

The government has also outsourced a significant section of SA Water's management; it has outsourced the public transport buses; it sold the South Australian Pipeline Authority; there have been a lot of properties sold, the more famous of them 333 Collins Street; it has outsourced Fleet SA's management; it has outsourced some of the prison management; it has sold the South Australian Casino, it has sold the South Australian forestry licences for 100 years; it has sold SA Lotteries; and, in this budget, it is privatising the Motor Accident Commission.

Having done all of that to fix the budget, where are we? Under this budget, the state debt is not less than \$11 billion, not less than it was 20 years ago, it is actually at \$14.3 billion. The budget deficit the government is talking about is not \$300 million a year but in this year it is \$1,200 million. What South Australia has been doing, particularly this government, is selling off and offloading income-producing assets but not fixing the recurrent side of the budget.

History shows that in the last term of government this government offloaded or sold the forestry assets in the South-East, the timber harvesting rights for 100 years, and it sold SA Lotteries. The money received from selling the forestry rights and from selling SA Lotteries is less than the budget deficit the government is running this year, which is \$1.2 billion.

What we have is a government that says, 'We are going to sell income-producing assets, to the tune of forestry and the lotteries, to try to reduce debt,' and then on the recurrent side of the budget they are running net operating balance deficits to the tune of a larger sum than the sale of those two assets produced. So, they are selling assets, in effect, and the poor performance on the recurrent side of the budget is actually wiping out any real gain in debt reduction.

I come to what is probably one of the biggest broken promises in this budget, and that is the decision to privatise the Motor Accident Commission, and they are basically privatising it. Currently, compulsory third-party insurance is offered by a government agency, and from a certain date (1 July in a couple of years' time) they are going to allow the private sector in. They are going to stop issuing government compulsory third-party policies and it will be the private sector running the third-party property system. So, they are effectively privatising that particular activity.

Before the election, of course, this was a government that ran around and said, 'Don't worry, we're not going to privatise any significant assets.' You could not get a more significant asset than the Motor Accident Commission. It has significant funds tucked away on behalf of injured motorists, for which the scheme was established many decades ago. Why are they doing this? Why are they breaking their election promise?

They are breaking their election promise because their budget is shot. The budget is in trouble, so exactly what they did last time they are doing this time. Last time, the budget was in trouble. The debt was budgeted to be about \$14 billion. They had budget deficits of over a billion dollars. So, 'What will we do? I know what we'll do: we will sell the forests in the South-East, we will sell the Lotteries Commission and that will fix the budget.'

The reality is that it did not fix the budget. They kept on spending in an inefficient way and now they come to this term of government and the first thing they do after the election is break their promise on privatisation. They are going to privatise the Motor Accident Commission, and the reason they are doing it is that they want to get their hands on whatever surplus cash assets are available from within the Motor Accident Commission.

The media reporting is that it is around \$500 million. I think it is fair to say that industry sources—and the Treasurer might have hinted at this himself at one point—suggest that it could be up to a billion dollars of excess cash within the Motor Accident Commission. If they are bringing that into the budget, you would have to ask: what impact does that have on the net operating balance? This is the real question that the Treasurer will ultimately have to answer at some point: is the government going to use a one-off, or maybe over two grabs—grab a lot of money out of the Motor Accident Commission (somewhere between \$500 million and a billion dollars), and will that actually have a positive impact on the net operating balance? Will they actually achieve a surplus on the back of receiving the Motor Accident Commission money?

If they do that, of course—if that is the method they use to do it—then that becomes a falsehood because they have not fixed the recurrent side of the budget. The recurrent side of the budget would not be producing a surplus, it is just a one-off grant, essentially, from the Motor Accident Commission that will be producing the surplus.

The only time this government has produced a surplus in the last five or six years was at the 2010 election, and how did they produce a surplus at the 2010 election? The way they produced a surplus at the 2010 election was to receive somewhere between \$1 billion and \$2 billion extra in grants from the Rudd/Gillard government as part of their Building the Education Revolution money and a whole range of stimulus packages that flowed into the state budget.

Even though they were capital expenditure, they used the accounting practice of bringing them into the budget as an income, but when they spend it they bring them in as a grant, which reduces the net operating balance. So, it produced a surplus in that case; if it were not for those grants, it would have been in deficit. What they do is, when they spend them, they spend them out of the capital side of the budget, so these grants artificially inflate the true position of the surplus.

Even though they have produced six deficits in seven years, the truth is they have actually been running a deficit for seven years, because these one-off grants are not sustainable. As we can see, they have been cut the very next year. The question becomes: what are they then going to do with the Motor Accident Commission money? They say are going to do is spend it on roads. That will go out as a capital expenditure, it will come in as a grant from the Motor Accident Commission, and that will more than likely inflate the net operating balance to a more positive figure than it would normally be. Then, they will spend it out on the capital side of the agenda.

The reason I raise this is very simple. For 20 years, this state has been offloading assets to try to fix its recurrent budget problems. The reality is that the former Liberal government also got rid of assets to fix the budget. Indeed, we did reduce the debt from something like \$11 billion down to \$3 billion, and then the recurrent side of the budget was close enough to in balance the year we left. What has happened since is there has been an extraordinary lack of financial discipline, especially in the latter half of this particular government.

What we are finding now is there is no financial discipline at all on the budget matters. You only have to look at this particular budget to see what was promised before the election and what has been delivered after the election. Just look at the broken promises from this government about what it was going to build and construct, and what it was not going to do with taxation or privatisation.

They said there would be no privatisation of significant assets; I have touched on that broken promise in relation to the Motor Accident Commission. They promised a nearly \$28 million upgrade of Modbury Hospital; that has been cancelled. They promised a \$100 million upgrade to the Flinders Medical Centre; that has been cancelled. They promised a \$125 million upgrade to The Queen Elizabeth Hospital; that has been cancelled. They promised a \$31 million upgrade to the Noarlunga Hospital; that has been cancelled. They promised to deliver the Gawler rail electrification; that has been cancelled. There is just a litany of broken promises within this particular budget.

Then we have the promise of no new taxes and no tax increases. You only have to look at the emergency services levy and what they have done there, which is basically double it for everyone

in the state, to realise that is also a broken promise. Why are they breaking their promises? This is not a new government. This is not a government of one colour taking over from a government of another colour and saying, 'Look at that. What they told us before the election is simply untrue. We have to reconfigure things.' This is actually a government of the same colour.

This is exactly the same government, with the same Premier and the same personalities, sitting around the cabinet table. They went to the election promising certain things, and since then there has been an absolute litany of broken promises within this budget. It really comes down to their own lack of financial discipline and lack of discipline at the cabinet level, and I point that directly back to the Premier and his commitment to get rid of the AAA credit rating.

Former treasurer Kevin Foley once said that if you got rid of the AAA credit rating the state would go into an abyss of debt. The reason he said that was very simple: trying to maintain a AAA credit rating maintains some financial discipline at the cabinet table, and as soon as you get rid of the financial discipline at the cabinet table, it becomes a spendathon. Look at what this government is doing.

This government has got rid of the forests, got rid of the Lotteries Commission, it is getting rid of the Motor Accident Commission, and the debt is still around the \$14 billion mark, assuming that they can produce these magical surpluses within two years without the Motor Accident Commission money. Can they produce the surplus without the Motor Accident Commission money? Because if they cannot produce a surplus without the Motor Accident Commission money, then essentially what you have got is a budget that is perpetually in deficit, and that is what we are looking at in South Australia.

They really have mismanaged the expenditure and control of their financial discipline in this particular budget—seven deficits in seven years. Just have a look at the swings of their predictions. Why is this side of the house so suspicious about these promised surpluses in two years' time? That is pretty easy: in every budget they have promised surpluses in two or three years' time and, of course, they have never delivered them. They have promised surpluses, I think, for six or seven years straight and they have delivered six deficits in seven years.

Look at the difference in the predictions: the reality is that they have promised things like a \$480 million surplus but produced a \$1.2 billion deficit. That is a \$1.7 billion error in their budget forecasting. They are looking at an \$840 million surplus now. They are predicting a \$479 million deficit. In that year, that is a \$1.3 billion error. There was another year where they predicted a \$304 million surplus and they delivered a \$948 million deficit. That itself is a \$1.2 billion error. So, you have got \$1.2 billion, \$1.7 billion and \$1.3 billion errors in their budget forecasting. How can they get it so wrong and so consistently wrong?

The sad part about this budget, I think, is that there is no real jobs plan. If you had to ask the government what is its job plan outlined in the budget, it would be struggling to articulate where it is going to get the jobs to meet its 100,000 job creation target by 2016. Since making that promise in February 2010, the number of jobs has actually declined by about 800. To meet that target, they would have to create something like 4,800 jobs a month between now and when that target is meant to be reached. That is an equivalent of about a 6 per cent employment growth rate, and that is clearly not going to happen.

The whole budget has numbers on it that simply cannot be believed. I think the shadow treasurer, Rob Lucas, in another place has already been out on the artificially high level of expected revenue growth. The significant increase in revenue—something like the stamp duties, the payroll taxes, those sort of things—they are talking about significant increases well above the other states, and there is no indication that the South Australian stamp duty base or its payroll tax base is going to grow at 4 and 5 per cent.

The reality is that, if you look at our economic growth forecasts, even in the budget they have overstated where most independent commentators put South Australia's likely economic growth. So why has the government constructed a budget based on artificially high revenue figures? Well, if they construct the budget on artificially high revenue figures, it makes their deficits look smaller and their surpluses look bigger. That is what it does. It artificially inflates stamp duty revenue income and payroll tax income, and so what it means is it has an artificial income stream higher than we expect and that makes their deficit look smaller and their surpluses look bigger.

The reality is that the real story about the budget is the lack of jobs and the lack of cost of living relief for average families out there. The reality is that under this budget, if you look at the series of decisions over 12 months from this government, they will add about over \$1,000 of extra costs every year to the average household. So, the reason that people are finding it hard to make ends meet and the reason that business confidence has slumped to the lowest in Australia is that there is no spare cash, so the retailing community is finding it hard and the restaurant and catering areas are finding it difficult. All of those discretionary spends are being taken up with extra government impost and charges.

The emergency services levy is a classic: it is another \$150 to \$200 per year for a family. That is simple. They pay the emergency services levy. They do not necessarily go to the theatre, they do not go and spend it on retail, and they do not spend it in areas that might be job creating for the economy.

The story of this budget is that it is really just a litany of broken promises. It shows that the government were dishonest with the people of South Australia before the election. They have broken a series of promises, not just on the privatisation but on capital works promises and on tax increase promises. There is a whole range of promises that this particular government have broken. They are really snubbing their noses arrogantly at the punters out there, the taxpayers out there, thinking that they will not remember or they simply do not care.

Hopefully, by the time the next election comes around, the public will realise that the government simply cannot be trusted and they have really lost control of the budget. At what point will South Australia develop a different model? At what point will South Australia start dealing with the recurrent side of its budget and not just keep off-loading income producing assets? There are only so many income producing assets you can off-load, and we are nearly at the end of the line there.

The reality is that this government has a responsibility to the state to stop being so inefficient in its administration of government and start putting in place a model that makes the recurrent side of the budget sustainable. If they do not do that, you will not be looking at six deficits in seven years, you will be looking at seven deficits in eight years and eight deficits in nine years. The reality is that without the federal assistance there would actually have been a deficit every year for some time.

The chickens are coming home to roost. It is time for South Australia to have a different model. If you look at all the income producing assets we have off-loaded as a state over the last 20 years and then look at the position of the budget, you can only draw the conclusion that it has been gross mismanagement by this government, particularly the last half of this government, that has got South Australia into the difficult financial position that it now is in, and it is the average taxpayer who is going to pay, through higher cost of living and higher employment as a result.

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (12:22): I rise to make my contribution regarding the 2014-15 budget. As a state, we are currently looking at a deficit in the 2013-14 year of \$1.2 billion, the largest in the state's history. In the 2014-15 year, the deficit is predicted to be \$479 million. That will make six deficits in seven years, after originally budgeting for seven surpluses.

The Labor government promised \$2.6 billion in surpluses and instead has delivered \$3 billion in deficits. How can we trust any figures this government comes up with? Even prior to the federal budget, this government had budgeted for the largest debt and deficit in the state's history. Labor had already budgeted for debt increases of \$4 million a day for eight years and had already budgeted a \$1 million a year interest bill, which is larger than the police budget. This is wasted money on interest due to the incompetence of this Labor government and its inability to live within its means.

They already had the highest taxes in the nation and were already implementing a new car parking tax. Prior to the federal budget, South Australia already had the worst credit rating in the nation and was already borrowing to pay wages. This would be known as trading insolvent if the state was a business, and the liquidators would be on the way. Debt is rising to \$14.3 billion in 2016. To quote from this week's *CityMag*, issue 5:

The 1991 financial implosion of the State Bank left the city \$3.15 billion in debt, and had devastating effects not only on Adelaide, but also on the very psychology of Adelaideans. In order to repay the debt, successive state governments were forced into practicing extreme budgetary austerity.

We are now facing debt levels at four times this amount. With a \$311 million expenditure blowout expected in 2013-14, this takes the total budget blowouts to close to \$4 billion since Labor came to government. This is not for infrastructure or income producing assets; this is purely having more expenses than revenue, a cardinal sin of accounting, totally unsustainable, yet something Labor governments around the country have perfected to a fine art, building up debt and living beyond their means, relying on Liberal governments to come in and clean up their mess. To take from the leader of the Liberal Party's speech earlier this week, the only thing Labor is building, building, building is debt.

Premier Weatherill and Labor deliberately set out to lose the AAA credit rating, apparently choosing jobs over the credit rating. To quote Premier Weatherill from 14 September 2012, 'We've made those choices deliberately...that's led to the loss of the AAA credit rating.' Where are the 100,000 jobs that Labor promised in 2010 to be achieved by 2016? South Australia has actually lost 800 jobs since this promise was made at the 2010 election. Labor would have to create 4,800 jobs per month to meet its 100,000 new jobs promise.

We are in the midst of a jobs crisis, recording the highest unemployment rate on the mainland; 6,000 manufacturing jobs were lost in the three months to May and 16,000 were lost in 12 years of Labor, 4,000 South Australian construction jobs were lost in the three months to May, and northern Adelaide ranked the second highest in youth unemployment out of 79 regions that were measured. That is 45 per cent of youth unemployed. There is no plan to create jobs or grow the economy. Losing the AAA credit rating to save jobs clearly did nothing but cost the state an estimated extra \$20 million in higher interest payments. Imagine what we could do for the community with an extra \$20 million per year.

I was almost starting to believe the rhetoric of this government about how hard it has been with the global financial crisis, the high Australian dollar, how they were affected by the federal budget, whine, whine, whine. Then I read the budget speeches of the Liberal treasurers around Australia, who were also affected by the same global financial crisis, the same high Australian dollar, the same federal budget. These treasurers did not open their speeches whingeing about how hard things are, making excuses for their incompetency, like our Treasurer did. They spoke about their achievements, their plans for the future. They are all kicking goals while we languish, falling behind in nearly every economic indicator there is.

Reading the other states' budget speeches made me angry, even furious, about the incompetency of this illegitimate government that has bought its way to power with deals from the members for Frome and Waite, estimated to cost the state \$16 million over the forward estimates. I call on the members for Frome and Waite to read the budget speeches around Australia and ask themselves 'Have I done the right thing?' I believe their decisions are pushing our state further and further behind, destroying businesses, destroying lives—all on their heads. The right thing to do is to call elections in their seats and give South Australians the chance to choose their government.

Let me give you some idea. From New South Wales on 17 June:

New South Wales is back in the game. Our budget is powerfully positioned. Net debt is down, expenses are under control, the triple-A credit rating is maintained...housing approvals are at the highest levels in over a decade...114,000 [jobs have been] created since 2011...In three years of hard work, the New South Wales government has done the repair job...When we came to office...We were lagging on jobs growth, productivity, housing approvals and business confidence. We were facing years of deficits and high net debt courtesy of the legacy left by those opposite—

being Labor, of course.

From the Queensland budget speech, in 2012 Queensland launched an economic blueprint. In two years a Liberal government has achieved a budget surplus for 2014-15, expenses growth no longer exceeds growth in revenue, major projects are now all subject to the cost benefit analysis. Think of how much money we would have saved if Labor had done a cost benefit analysis before doubling the desalination plant.

Water prices have more than tripled under Labor to 236 per cent, while CPI for the same period increased only 40 per cent. Adelaide has the highest capital city water charges in the nation, with the average household paying \$600 per year more than when Labor came to power. Doubling the desalination plant cost \$2.2 billion; this is now planned for mothballing, which will only reduce the cost by \$6 per household. Labor's decision to use renewable energy for the desalination plant also

added \$37 million over three years, along with Labor's carbon tax adding a further \$14.6 million over three years. What was Labor thinking? How could this ever be considered a good deal for our state? The list of broken promises is extensive under this Labor government. It includes:

- the \$1.7 billion new RAH has already blown out to \$2.8 billion, let alone any further delays or costs that might be incurred;
- the \$450 million Adelaide Oval—not a penny more—as we know, blew out to almost \$600 million;
- the \$61 million O-Bahn extension was scrapped and then re-promised and is now up around \$160 million, just to save four minutes;
- the \$304 million water interconnector, which was required due to the desalination plant, has already blown out to \$403 million;
- the promise of no increase in taxes, charges and no new taxes was also scrapped—another broken promise—with a new car park tax being introduced, a new River Murray levy, gambling taxes up, mining royalties are up, the emergency services levy has a huge increase, and now we have a fun tax on public transport for major events;
- the no increase in water rates has also been a broken promise, with water bills more than trebling under Labor;
- payroll tax exemptions for trainees and apprentices was also scrapped;
- the promise of 100,000 new jobs in six years has led to 800 fewer jobs in four years;
- the no privatisations promise has also been broken with the sale of the forests, the Lotteries Commission, and now the Motor Accident Commission being privatised; and
- the electrification of the Gawler line was promised three times and scrapped twice, and is again delayed.

In 2012-13, there were 5.5 million less boardings on public transport compared to the 2009-10 financial year. Increasing the cost of tickets, as this budget suggests, will not encourage more boardings. It is far more likely to have the opposite effect. Labor's attempt to save money by choosing the cheapest bus service provider led to a huge drop in the number of bus users and the highest ever recorded number of complaints for months on end. To try to compensate, the government reprinted the bus timetables, allowing more time for the runs that past bus companies managed to keep for years. They threw money into new bus lanes throughout the city which have caused congestion and frustration to many drivers and businesses.

To get workers back using public transport we need a system that is reliable, affordable, safe, clean and efficient—not a car parking tax. A car parking tax will not encourage people to use public transport. What it is more likely to do is to push shoppers and users of services such as dentists, lawyers, banks, etc., into the suburbs where they can park for free. The very people the city relies on for vibrancy are those who have the choice to go elsewhere. The high cost of parking is already the number one issue cited by many people as to why they will not shop in Rundle Mall. I feel this car park tax would be absolutely devastating for the City of Adelaide.

It is illogical for a government to be claiming that it is trying to revitalise the CBD and at the same time making it more expensive to participate in the life of the city. Mr Weatherill's toxic car park tax will hurt businesses and jobs, discourage people from entering the city and damage CBD vibrancy. The car park tax has been criticised by numerous industry experts, including the Property Council of South Australia, the Adelaide City Council, Business SA and the Rundle Mall Management Authority. The Property Council has said that it will add up to \$6 per day to the average cost of a car park.

Most importantly, this tax will hurt residents who have been encouraged into the city on the back of the government's vibrancy agenda. Mr Weatherill's toxic car park tax is nothing more than a desperate cash grab by a broke Labor government after 12 years of financial mismanagement. Now the government plans to tax companies for hosting major events: any commercial event hosting over 5,000 people will now have to pay a levy or tax imposed—the amount is yet to be determined. How

can you calculate ticket pricing or the event viability when the government can come along at any time and make up a new tax and cannot even tell you exactly how much it is?

In the budget, there is \$46.5 million for the Festival Centre car park and the plaza. Whilst I welcome the upgrade to the car park (which we all know has concrete cancer), I do not welcome the idea of an office building on the plaza site. This site should be enjoyed by all South Australians and an office building would not improve city vibrancy. I call on the Labor government to release what the plan is for this area as soon as possible.

The emergency services levy is going up by an extraordinary amount, with the average household with a home of \$400,000 paying an extra \$150 per year for the emergency services levy and, as has been mentioned by my colleagues, you would not mind so much if the whole levy actually was going to the emergency services, but a lot of this is going to prop up the government's failed ability to balance its budget. So, how is this not a punitive tax on households and families? For a home of \$750,000, they will now be paying \$408 a year, a \$280 increase, which is extraordinary.

According to the ABS figures for March 2014, the state budgets, we have had a CPI increase of 40 per cent during the 12 years of Labor, house rents have gone up by 54 per cent, property charges by 87 per cent, state taxes have risen by 92 per cent, gas bills by 136 per cent, electricity bills by 160 per cent and water bills by a massive 227 per cent. This all hurts the everyday Australian, and now volunteers will also be hit with screening and background checks, with application charges soaring by 33 per cent from \$41.25 to \$55 for most volunteers. The tax hike on volunteers will raise \$3.2 million in the next year.

While many employers, including schools, aged-care and disability services, as well as non-government organisations, sporting services and service groups, require screening and background checks to comply with government regulations, every volunteer, virtually every sporting and service organisation and many businesses are adversely affected by this tax. The Weatherill Labor government's tax grab from volunteers runs the risks of discouraging people from providing their time and expertise in schools, sporting clubs, Meals on Wheels and many other organisations.

I encourage the Weatherill Labor government to look at a simpler, more streamlined system that reduces bureaucratic red tape and the associated costs to applicants. WorkCover is another cost to business and is an absolute shambles, as stated by our Deputy Premier. I welcome reforms to WorkCover and hope it will actually lead to a reduction in levies and lessen the cost to business. The South Australian WorkCover scheme has the highest levy in the country, has unfunded liability of \$1.23 billion, has the worst return-to-work rate in the country, has the highest number of disputes in the country, takes the longest to resolve disputes and spends three times the proportional cost on rehabilitation than any other scheme in the country.

Ms Redmond: To no avail.

Ms SANDERSON: To no avail. As far as businesses go, taxes on businesses in South Australia are completely out of control. The increase in payroll tax, after deducting CPI, since Labor came into government is 39 per cent. Conveyancing duties have risen by 55 per cent over CPI, land tax by 195 per cent, property taxes by 79 per cent, taxes on gambling surprisingly have reduced by 8 per cent compared to CPI, taxes on insurance are up 41 per cent and motor vehicle taxes are up 31 per cent. So, no wonder businesses are struggling under such a high tax regime in this state.

This Labor budget will deliver more pain and increase cost of living pressures for families. After 12 long years South Australians are paying the high price for Jay Weatherill's budget of broken promises. This is a disastrous budget for all South Australians who are already struggling with soaring electricity, gas and water prices. The worst part about this budget is what it does not do. There is no plan to create jobs or grow the economy. At a time when South Australians are struggling to pay their bills, to find work and to keep their businesses open, the Weatherill government has delivered a state budget of broken promises and no plan to help with jobs or the economy.

Do not be fooled by the Treasurer blaming the federal budget for his cuts and broken promises. This budget is a culmination of 12 long years of Labor's economic chaos and mismanagement. South Australians deserve better. Premier Weatherill has embarked on a deceitful strategy of making ordinary South Australians pay for his government's years of financial mismanagement and ineptitude.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I acknowledge the next speaker, I welcome the Hon. Stephen Baker to the chamber, a former eminent member of the House of Assembly, who I hope has not found the changes here too significant or shocking this morning. The member for Port Adelaide.

*Bills***APPROPRIATION BILL 2014***Second Reading*

Debate resumed.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (12:39): I rise today to provide my contribution to the budget debate. This government is determined to deliver on its election commitments. The promises we took to the election to build South Australia are being delivered in this budget, and I commend the Treasurer for framing this budget during very difficult times.

The federal government, through both its attack on the most vulnerable in its first budget and its determination to shut down the automotive industry in this country, has created a very challenging environment for South Australia. This makes it more important than ever that this state Labor government take a principled stand to deliver a budget that ensures that trust is not lost forever from the political landscape—trust that develops when, once elected, a government does exactly what it says it will do and honours its commitments to the electorate.

This is a budget that delivers for the pensioners, the workers and the families hit hard by the mean-spirited federal budget. Within my electorate of Port Adelaide reside many pensioners and concession cardholders who would have been hit hard by the commonwealth's attack on senior citizens. This budget protects pensioners and low-income earners by maintaining their concessions for the next year.

Unlike the Abbott government that dishonoured its pledge not to cut pensions, we are making good on our election commitments. This budget contains \$41.7 million to provide a \$50 increase to the annual heating and cooling concessions paid to eligible recipients, and it provides \$32 million to protect pensioners from the commonwealth Liberal government cuts in 2014-15.

The people of Port Adelaide, like many in this state, are also concerned about law and order; that is why I am pleased that this budget maintains the government's election commitment of recruiting an additional 300 police officers who will be trained at Fort Largs in the electorate of Port Adelaide. This budget also provides \$2 million to reinvigorate the role of Neighbourhood Watch—a crime prevention program that is well supported in my community—and it also provides grants to local councils to improve neighbourhood safety through the installation of CCTV cameras, improved lighting and other technologies.

This budget also supports parents who want their children to be active and have fun by taking part in organised sport. The \$50 vouchers for the parents of primary school children taking part in organised sport and attending recreation clubs throughout the state make good on our election commitment and are funded through a \$7.7 million allocation over four years. Many South Australian families are working hard to manage their bills, so these \$50 vouchers will be welcome to help cover the costs of their children's sporting commitments.

This is a budget that recognises the importance of retaining and creating jobs. This is a budget that accepts that our economy faces enormous challenges and tackles them head on. This is a budget that will assist our automotive industry, the suppliers and the workers in the massive transformation they face in the three years before Holden closes its doors at Elizabeth. As a government, we have said that doing nothing is not an option.

As Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, and Minister for Automotive Transformation, I have my own role to play in delivering the benefits of this budget to South Australian families. I will be assisted in this role from next month when the highly credentialled Don Russell returns to his home state to lead the new Department of State Development. A former principal adviser to the great

reformist prime minister Paul Keating and a former ambassador to the United States, Dr Russell will bring national and international experience to the role of heading a department tasked with the job of growing our economy and creating jobs. South Australia has a positive future, but we need to work now to secure the rapid transition required to lock in that prosperity.

The 2014-15 state budget includes \$60.1 million over the next five years to implement the government's comprehensive jobs plan. This funding will support a nimble and responsive task force chaired by the very experienced and highly regarded Greg Combet, which has the job of implementing this plan. Mr Combet is a highly respected former industry minister and ACTU official who has high-level contacts throughout the automotive and other industries with vast experience in achieving structural change within the Australian economy. The state government, through this new task force embedded in the new Department of State Development, will work with businesses so that, whenever a job in the industry can be saved, it will be saved.

The funding from this budget will support the task force to carry out a number of important roles. These include managing the design and delivery of programs and services to businesses and workers in the automotive supply chain and at GM Holden. The task force will also liaise with the commonwealth and Victorian governments in the final design and rollout of the \$155 million growth fund. It will also work with GM Holden to help determine the future of the Elizabeth site—an important piece of employment land well placed near Edinburgh Park. The task force will also participate in government-wide strategies to attract investment and jobs to the state, and it will provide a central point of coordination and communication for the rollout of the Our Jobs Plan.

Across the supply chain, GM Holden's activities in South Australia are estimated to generate spending of more than \$1.2 billion and that, in turn, supports 13,000 jobs across the state. For the northern suburbs, this is a huge employer and generator of economic activity. We have three years at most to ensure that once that winds down there are alternatives in place to support our economy. Having a task force to drive the implementation of the \$60.1 million Our Jobs Plan will ensure that there is sufficient and targeted support for all of those affected workers—support to find new work, support so that businesses in the automotive supply chain can diversify and find new markets, and support to generate activity across the economy that creates alternative jobs for displaced workers.

Not only will there be direct support for workers and suppliers, but this government is continuing to invest in infrastructure that creates jobs and a more efficient and productive economy. Our \$10.1 billion spend on infrastructure across the forward estimates will support 4,700 jobs a year at a crucial time when 13,000 jobs are under threat in the automotive sector.

Funding for the electrification of the Gawler line to Salisbury will improve rail services for members of my electorate living in Mawson Lakes and Parafield Gardens. Again, it is a great pity that the commonwealth has shirked its responsibilities by refusing to co-fund public transport projects, even in the aftermath of the Holden announcement.

This budget also supports the mineral resources and energy sector and regional development areas of the South Australian economy that will be crucial to jobs growth. Employment growth in South Australia is expected to be 1 per cent in 2014-15, accelerating to 1.25 per cent in 2015-16. To put that in context, this budget aims to support a pickup in the pace of annual jobs growth at a time when the automotive sector faces a huge task of transition and manufacturers remain under pressure from the high Australian dollar.

The closure of Holden is a devastating blow for the workers and families that rely on the automotive industry for their livelihoods, but there is no reason why this blow cannot be softened by a policy framework, supported by this budget, that helps workers to find new opportunities that draw on their specialist skills garnered from years of working in advanced manufacturing. We want those automotive component suppliers that relied on Holden, Ford and Toyota for their businesses to diversify and survive.

South Australia has a long history of innovation, and finding commercial opportunities for our innovators will also be key to our economy's continued strength. Our state's economy has a huge reliance on small business as drivers for growth and job creation. Many of those small and medium enterprises have grown from home-grown ideas and local talent. The strength of our economy lies in its diversity. This budget provides a support for that continued diversity through innovation. This state budget delivers on our election commitment to support entrepreneurs to transform great ideas into iconic products.

As already announced by the Premier, we are investing \$2.5 million over three years to establish the Lance Hill Design Centre and Hills D-Shop as nation leaders in innovative support. This investment will be matched dollar for dollar by Hills Holdings, the company that has grown from the innovation of Lance Hill, inventor of the rotary hoist. These two centres will be looking to support the new generations of Lance Hills so that the desktop research and development taking place in our institutions, in our garden sheds and across our kitchen tables can be recognised and nurtured.

This budget also includes \$400,000 over four years for training and mentoring programs delivered by Majoran Distillery to develop skills and provide industry contacts. Majoran is Adelaide's co-working community for the tech and creative freelancer communities and start-ups, and encourages people to share its space at its Grenfell Street base. A further \$588,000 will fund a grant program for entrepreneurs to establish city premises, including activating vacant buildings, enabling them to pursue exciting new concepts and ventures.

Before the election, Labor said we would support local innovators and entrepreneurs. This state budget delivers on those commitments. That is because Labor knows that our home-grown entrepreneurs can create jobs for the small business sector and grow our economy if we can assist them at the crucial point of turning ideas into commercial products. Innovation and the ability to commercialise ideas will be key to our state's future success and speed our transition to an advanced manufacturing economy.

This budget also continues the government's support for improving the efficiency and international competitiveness of our local manufacturers. Our Manufacturing Works strategy aims to drive and encourage research and development, investment and innovation, and developing our capabilities to find new markets. The strategy dovetails not only with our jobs plan for the automotive industry but also our targeted trade policies that seek to open new markets in India and China.

In the third year of the manufacturing strategy, this government will be looking to build on the work of the past two years where we have supported more than 90 manufacturers to increase their knowledge and capacity to innovate. We will look to continue to build on the successful early stages of the Tonsley Park development that is already attracting firms to set up businesses in this attractive research and development training precinct.

Our Industry Participation Program will continue to assist local companies to bid for major projects and assist firms to build their capability and capacity to successfully bid for contracts. Through the Industry Capability Network this government has helped local companies win \$103 million worth of contracts. This budget allows us to continue that work, especially where manufacturers can meet the needs of the expanding mineral resources, oil and gas sector.

Our ability as a government to deliver on the commitments contained in this budget requires a focused and engaged public sector. This budget supports the implementation of the policy outline in 'A Modern Public Service'. This document, launched before the election, not kept secret from the electorate, allows voters to see our policy that harnesses the expertise and professionalism of our public servants. We have already begun to implement projects that are providing greater opportunities for young people in disadvantaged areas to gain employment in the Public Service.

I rise to support this budget because its priorities are the right priorities for the times. Yes, the budget puts South Australia on a pathway to surplus, but it does so with compassion and with an expectation that South Australians want a government that stands with them, not against them. This is a budget built on support for those who need it. This is not a budget that puts the burden on the most vulnerable but rather ensures a safe and secure future all South Australians can share.

Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (12:52): Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, and I do note that you are presiding over the first ever occasion on which this house has been peopled entirely by the female gender.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Ms REDMOND: I would like to say that I am pleased to rise to support the Appropriation Bill but that is hardly the right wording. I thought about starting with, 'Once upon a time,' but then when I heard the opening remarks of the member for Port Adelaide talking about trust and being part of a government that, according to her, does exactly what it says it will do, I cannot resist pointing out that this government over many years promised no new taxes, no privatisations. It promised surpluses,

jobs, lower electricity prices, and indeed the member for Port Adelaide's very own predecessor as the member for Port Adelaide who was then the treasurer said famously:

You do not have the moral fibre to go back on your promise. I have...

Thus we come to my comments on this budget which is just appalling. I thought that rather than starting where I have started on every other budget speech that I can remember in this place, and that has been 12 years of them, I would start with talking about what the effect is on ordinary people, particularly those least able to afford it, those on low and fixed incomes and self-funded retirees.

I note the member for Port Adelaide's remarks were about being a compassionate government that cares about people, but in fact in my electorate—and it is generally looked at as a relatively wealthy electorate—there are a lot of people who have lived there for a very long time, often generations, and they happen to have houses which now are relatively valuable but that does not make them wealthy by any means. Therefore, they are asset rich and often income poor, and many of them are in this situation of being on fixed, low incomes or being dependent as self-funded retirees on very low interest rates which are paying them very scarce amounts of money.

Of course, we have already heard this morning, during private members' time, about the biggest impact, I think, that is going to come out of this budget, and that is the so-called emergency services levy. As has been pointed out by a number of earlier speakers, the fact is that the emergency services levy that is now going to be recovered by this government in excessive amounts is, in fact, not being applied towards emergency services at all—I will not say 'at all'; it is already partly providing funding for emergency services. I think it was the member for Morphett who pointed out that there has been very little increase and nothing in this budget to show an improvement in funding for emergency services. Indeed, he mentioned that there were people in CFS groups he is close to who have had to do chook raffles to pay for their first-aid training.

So, it is clear that the government is not planning to collect all of this money and apply it to emergency services. What the government is planning to apply it to is simply its budget shortcomings, and those shortcomings have been obvious for quite a number of years. In fact, the original speech this morning by a former minister, the member for Davenport, about the introduction of the emergency services levy was absolutely on point, and that is that this levy was introduced not to fund the government's poor budgeting but to provide an equitable mechanism whereby everyone in the state contributed an appropriate amount towards the provision of fire services.

Paying a fire levy on your insurance policy had been the previous situation, which led to people who did not take out insurance still having the fire brigade come to their house to rescue them. Instead of people insuring with a company that was either interstate or overseas, where the fire levy was not paid in this state, everyone had to pay their fair share, and we have all been doing that for some considerable time.

That is not what is happening here. Although it is called an emergency services levy, it is clearly a land tax. This government, quite dishonestly, went to the election never mentioning to the people of South Australia that it was about to impose a land tax on every premises within the state and on every vehicle and I think even every boat within the state.

The average house, they say, is \$150 a year. So, even if you have an average house, it is \$150, plus for a car another \$8. Indeed, if you have a \$400,000 house, and I would think that would be a reasonable average around Adelaide at least, it would be \$241 per annum. If you happen to have a \$750,000 house, which would not be out of the realms of possibility for many people who are just living in ordinary suburban homes but the value of the house has gone up, that goes up to \$408 and, if they happen to have a couple of cars, there is another \$16 on top of it.

So, that is an extraordinary increase. In fact, after allowing for inflation, since this government came in, the amount that is being paid has gone up something like 195 per cent; it is just an extraordinary amount. What is more, even stamp duty is going up. This government, which is talking about trying to get the economy going, is still going to increase things such as stamp duty. Stamp duty, by the way, has gone up 55 per cent after inflation since this government came in.

Water prices are up by 236 per cent under this government. Where CPI went up only 40 per cent, our water prices have gone up 236 per cent. We pay the highest cost for water of any capital city in Australia, and that is just ridiculous. We are now almost \$600 per annum more for the average water bill than we were in 2002. Part of that cost is because of the desalination plant. Some

of the newer members may not recall, but what happened with that desalination plant is that it was originally proposed by the Liberal Party. We did a lot of investigation. I was one of the people who went to Perth. We talked to the people over there, and we said, 'How much would it cost us to build a desalination plant just like this one you're building if we signed the contract today?' They said, '\$450 million.'

We came back and we had this policy: \$450 million for a desalination plant, 50 gigalitres. What the government did was to say, 'No, we don't need a desalination plant.' For two years, they said, 'We don't need a desalination plant.' After two years, having delayed that long, they decided not only that we needed a desalination plant but that we needed one that was double the size, that was 100 gigalitres.

The Productivity Commissioner and other people have since done their examinations of it and have said that there is absolutely no justification for a 100 gigalitre desalination plant; nevertheless, that is what this government decided to do. Of course, over the two years, plus the doubling, that meant that the cost had blown out from a \$450 million plant that we could have signed on the dotted line when we proposed it, it cost us instead \$2.2 billion. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:01 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:02): I give notice that on Thursday 7 August 2014 I will move that this house condemns Prime Minister Abbott's government for undermining our national healthcare system that has been carefully constructed over decades by successive governments both Labor and Liberal—

Members interjecting:

Ms DIGANCE: —that the house note the tearing-up of the national healthcare reform agreement, shifting costs into the states; the proposed introduction of a GP co-payment, effectively a tax on visits to the local doctor; the proposed introduction of an increased gap on tests and investigations, effectively a tax on those taking responsibility for their own health; and the repudiation of the federal government's responsibilities in primary and preventative health care.

Members interjecting:

Ms DIGANCE: I urge the house to call on the federal government to honour the national agreement and reverse the dramatic cuts and also abandon the proposed increases and new charges imposed by the federal budget.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Heysen, I call to order the deputy leader, the member for Chaffey, the member for Kavel and the member for Hartley. It is highly disorderly to interject while a member just reads out a notice of motion, even though it contains some argumentation. The member for Heysen.

Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (14:03): I give notice that on Thursday 24 July 2014 I will move that regulations entitled Housing and Urban Development (Administrative Arrangements) (Riverbank Authority) Regulations 2014 be disallowed.

The SPEAKER: Are there any more notices of motion?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the Treasurer to order.

ANSWERS TABLED

The SPEAKER: The Opposition Whip and the leader will be very pleased to hear me say that I direct that the written answers to questions as detailed in the schedule I now table be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

Mr Marshall: What year are these questions from?

The SPEAKER: The year of our Lord 2014.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:05): I bring up the fourth report of the committee, concerning subordinate legislation.

Report received and read.

Mr ODENWALDER: I bring up the fifth report of the committee, concerning subordinate legislation.

Report received.

Question Time

COMMISSIONER FOR PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08): My question is to the Minister for the Public Sector. Can the minister advise the house if the position of Commissioner for Public Sector Employment was publicly advertised?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:08): I think we canvassed this fairly extensively yesterday. No, it was not.

COMMISSIONER FOR PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08): Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

Mr MARSHALL: Can the minister explain why one of the most senior positions in the government, the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment, was not publicly advertised?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:09): It might help those opposite if I explain the process that we have been going through in the public sector. Before the election, we not only released a policy document, called 'A modern government', but also made a commitment to bring together three areas within the public sector to merge them into one.

We then won the election and formed government and undertook a review of that process of how the merger would work and how the savings would be achieved. Once we had determined that the merger would definitely occur, one of the people who ran one of the three areas was appointed to run the combined office—and that was Ms Ranieri. Obviously a period of time then elapsed between that and the replacement of Mr Warren McCann as previous commissioner and during that time a process was undertaken.

There was no requirement to undergo a process; however, it was my decision both to seek advice and to follow that advice on the best way to ensure that the appointment was made with merit in recommending to the Governor, and so that is what we did.

COMMISSIONER FOR PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): I have a further supplementary. Was the Committee of Senior Management Council established to recommend a new commissioner for public sector employment, as the minister referred to in her answer, only established after the opposition first asked questions on 6 May this year?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:10): I think the house is very clear on the timing.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: What the question implies is that there is a causal relationship. I wish to remove that implication. Things can happen in a sequence of time that does not necessarily

imply that one thing caused another—so as long as we all accept that as a basic fact. Once it became clear that the commissioner would not be continuing with his role I sought advice, and that occurred—

Ms Redmond: What date?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I can certainly bring back the exact dates to the house. But I sought advice and followed it.

Mr MARSHALL: Can the minister clarify—

The SPEAKER: Yes, third supplementary.

COMMISSIONER FOR PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): Can the minister clarify whether that was established before or after 6 May?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:11): It was after 6 May because on 6 May I indicated that I had not turned my mind to the process that would be employed to provide that advice to the Governor. I then did seek advice, as I indicated to the house: I sought advice and then I followed it.

The SPEAKER: A further question from the leader.

COMMISSIONER FOR PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): Yes, my question is to the Minister for the Public Sector. Can the minister guarantee that she did not first take a submission to cabinet prior to 6 May which indicated that she would propose at a future cabinet submission that Ms Erma Ranieri be appointed as commissioner for public sector employment?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:12): I think the process that I have outlined has been extremely clear. As I said yesterday, I will not be canvassing the proceedings within cabinet. I will not be discussing matters; however, I have given a very clear process from election commitment through to action.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader has a supplementary.

COMMISSIONER FOR PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): Supplementary: on what date did the minister first take a submission to cabinet proposing that Ms Erma Ranieri be appointed as the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:13): I feel that I have been answering this question multiple times, so it is the *Groundhog Day* effect, but I will not be discussing the proceedings of cabinet.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Before a further supplementary is asked, the deputy leader will refrain from interjecting and she is warned for the first time. She got away with murder yesterday. The member for MacKillop I call to order also.

COMMISSIONER FOR PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): This question is to the Minister for the Public Sector. Why did Ms Ranieri tell staff of the Office of Public Employment and Review, and the Public Sector Workforce Relations Agency, prior to the convening of the Senior Management Council Selection Panel that she would be taking over as Commissioner for Public Sector Employment from 1 July 2014?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:14): I have

absolutely no evidence that that occurred. If you have some evidence I would appreciate it if you could provide it to me.

Mr Gardner: Ask her.

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta will not encourage the leader openly—

Mr Gardner: I was encouraging the minister.

The SPEAKER: —nor the minister—and is called to order. The leader.

COMMISSIONER FOR PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): A question to the Minister for the Public Sector: can the minister confirm that, after questions were asked in parliament on 6 May about the appointment process for the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment, the minister's cabinet submission of 7 April, which indicated that she would propose in a future cabinet submission that Ms Erma Ranieri be appointed as Commissioner for Public Sector Employment, was removed from the eCabinet system ECO?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:15): I will not be discussing the proceedings of cabinet.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: Further supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is warned for the first time. The leader.

COMMISSIONER FOR PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): Was the minister or her office involved in any way in removing her cabinet submission 102, dated 7 April 2014, from the eCabinet system ECO and, if so, what were the reasons for removing her submission from ECO?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:15): I just find it very interesting that questions can keep being asked when the answer is very clear: I am bound by cabinet confidentiality. I will not be discussing what goes to cabinet, when it goes and how it goes.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the leader to order. Third supplementary?

COMMISSIONER FOR PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16): Can the minister confirm that the eCabinet system ECO still indicates that the minister's cabinet submission of 7 April, which indicated that she would propose in a future cabinet submission that Ms Erma Ranieri be appointed as Commissioner for Public Sector Employment, was approved by cabinet?

Mr Pengilly: Get ready, Lisa.

The SPEAKER: The member for Finniss is called to order.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:16): One of the difficulties I have in sitting in this place is understanding what supplementaries constitute. I understood that they were coming from the answer but, given that I can't see how that could have possibly come out of my previous two or three answers to the same supplementaries—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I won't be discussing cabinet matters. You don't get access to cabinet documents by asking questions here.

Mr MARSHALL: Final supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: No, just another question.

Mr MARSHALL: Another question.

The SPEAKER: Just a plain old question.

COMMISSIONER FOR PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): Did the minister, prior to the cabinet submission of 7 April, discuss with the Premier the proposed appointment of Ms Ranieri as Commissioner for Public Sector Employment?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:17): I can't see how that isn't all still tied up with this question about cabinet proceedings and I feel that, given cabinet confidentiality, I am unable to discuss any matters that are associated with cabinet proceedings. What I can do, though, is remind you that I have made two ministerial statements about the process of appointing a public sector commissioner, a woman who is eminently well qualified and has been appointed by the Governor and will do an excellent job for our public sector.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Stuart to order and I warn the deputy leader for the second and final time. It would be a pity for the member for Bragg to leave us so early in question time.

The Hon. P. Caica: Fifty-one minutes without interrupting—that's impossible. Wait and see.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Yes, I am afraid I must call to order the member for Colton, though he speaks the truth. The leader.

COMMISSIONER FOR PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): This is a supplementary, because clearly the part that was offending in my question was related to the cabinet meeting, so I will ask a supplementary following on from the minister's answer. Did the minister, prior to 7 April, discuss with the Premier the proposed appointment of Ms Ranieri as Commissioner for Public Sector Employment?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:19): I am very happy to answer this question. Can I say that I don't quite understand which part of a vacant office with two people being involved in running those arrangements—Ms Ranieri and the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment, Mr McCann. One of them ceases to actually be in that role, you amalgamate those two agencies. If you can't understand that Ms Ranieri wasn't a frontrunner for that position then I can't help you. The fact that she is an eminently suitable candidate for this position, the fact that she is a first-class public servant that you are seeking to cast doubt about her suitability or otherwise for that role, or indeed the process associated with it—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the leader to order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —is just fairly standard form for those opposite. It is a pretty simple matter: we said before the election that we would pull together these three agencies. We actually have Ms Ranieri running these three agencies; there is a vacancy. She continues in her role.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Obviously, she was going to be a frontrunner for the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment. Obviously, the minister undertook a process to make sure that she was the suitable candidate for that role. She got that advice, then the Governor was provided with the relevant recommendation, and the appointment has been made. It is completely appropriate, the steps that have been taken—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —and I strongly support her appointment.

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary, sir?

The SPEAKER: Before the supplementary, would the leader be seated. The member for Morialta is warned for the first time; his benefit of clergy is over. The member for Chaffey is warned for the first time, and I call to order the members for Heysen, Schubert and Mount Gambier. Leader.

COMMISSIONER FOR PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): My supplementary is a simple one, sir: was it a yes or a no? Did the minister, prior to 17 April, discuss with the Premier the proposed appointment of Ms Ranieri as the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:21): As I have indicated and I have said in answers to questions in this house, she was an obvious frontrunner for this position. Of course, I have had conversations with the Minister for the Public Sector—

Mr Marshall: Before 17 April?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, before the election we realised that we were bringing together these agencies. There was a natural sense in which Ms Ranieri was a suitable leader for these roles in the amalgamated body—an absolutely obvious choice. Remember, we are bringing together a series of agencies. One of the persons that leads those agencies continues; another of those people ceases to continue. It is fairly obvious that the person that continues in the role will be a frontrunner for the role for commissioner for public employment.

All we had to do was satisfy ourselves, as the minister did, quite appropriately, through the process that she ran, that Ms Ranieri was a suitable pick for commissioner for public employment, as she manifestly is, and we then recommended that way to the Governor. It is utterly inappropriate for those opposite to be casting doubt on the process associated with the appointment of Ms Ranieri—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It is utterly inappropriate for those opposite to be casting doubt about the process for the appointment of Ms Ranieri because it is a very important position in the South Australian public sector.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: She is a first-class applicant for that position, and we are very proud to have recommended her appointment.

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is warned for the second and final time. The leader is warned for the first time, and I call the members for Morphett, Unley and, I regret to say, the member for Goyder, to order. The member for Torrens.

FEDERAL BUDGET

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:23): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house about efforts by the South Australian government to address cuts announced in the recent federal budget?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:23): I thank the honourable member for her question. As promised in the lead-up to the state election, we will continue the fight against the federal government budget cuts that have such a dramatic effect on South Australia.

I am pleased to advise the house that today I met with key industry and community leaders to discuss the establishment of the Federal Budget Response Taskforce. It is a new group which draws on a cross-section of those affected by cuts to funding in South Australia, and the Leader of the Opposition may be interested in this particular point because it would benefit from him also adding his voice to the efforts of all South Australians in attempting to resist the federal budget cuts.

I know that those opposite support the federal budget and are one of the few states and territories that stand on their own in support of the federal budget, but we are trying to unite the rest of the South Australian community against these cuts—cuts in the order of \$5.5 billion in relation to health and education alone. This group will lead a campaign against the federal cuts which have

been inflicted on South Australia in the recent federal budget and amount to, effectively, the Americanisation of our health and education systems.

When people pay federal government taxes, they expect the money to be spent on core services like health, education and supporting vulnerable people in their communities, but the federal government has decided to cut funding in a bid to force this sector down some American-style pay-as-you-go system that benefits those that can afford to pay. In doing so, they are also adopting that same philosophy for the universities, as they seek to take that system down that path. Sir, I—

The SPEAKER: You certainly haven't had four minutes yet, Premier. Owing to the failure of the system, I will bring in the Crvena Zvezda stopwatch.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The old ways are often the best, sir. The purpose of the task force is to take up the fight to Canberra and to campaign against these cuts. We have to make them real to South Australians because, sadly, there are so many horrors in this federal budget that many of the deepest and most threatening elements are not well understood by our community.

The truth is that these \$5.5 billion cuts are not well understood. The \$7 co-payment cuts, the cuts to the university system, the cuts to welfare and the cuts to our pensions are better understood than those very significant cuts to our health and education systems: 3,000 teachers, 3,000 nurses, the very significant effect that will have on people who are sick and trying to go to public hospitals, and young people seeking to learn and having their unique needs met in our public schooling system.

It is a very substantial threat to the way in which our federation is organised. We hear this nonsense about governments being sovereign in their own spheres. What that is code for is the commonwealth retreating to responsibilities that it suggests it had historically in 1901 and that, somehow, they are an appropriate distribution of responsibilities as between the state and federal governments.

Well, it's transparent nonsense. Obviously, the world has changed since 1901. The integration of commonwealth and state responsibility is profound, and for one government to retreat and simply say, 'Well, it's over to you for your bit,' doesn't make—

The SPEAKER: Point of order from the member for Stuart.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The Premier has run out of time.

The SPEAKER: No, it's a completely bogus point of order.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: No, sir, I started timing when he spoke because I saw—

Members interjecting:

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I noticed that the Clerk was otherwise engaged, and I thought I would give you some help. Someone's got to take charge.

The SPEAKER: I have not appointed the member for Stuart official timekeeper. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Perhaps I will conclude on this basis: there is only one institution and organisation in the South Australian community that seems to be speaking up in support of the federal budget. I must say, that is not entirely fair; Bob Day seems to be there as well, but it seems to be the local Liberal opposition.

The SPEAKER: The Premier's time has expired. During that entertainment, I warn for the first time the members for Heysen, Schubert and Mount Gambier. I call the member for Mitchell to order and, as a bonus, I warn the member for Schubert for the second time and also the member for Mount Gambier for the second time, and did I mention a second warning for the member for Chaffey—he knew it was coming. The leader.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier confirm that, more than six weeks ago, the Environment Protection Authority identified a significantly increased risk to residents in Clovelly Park and Mitchell Park as a result of groundwater and soil contamination?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:29): It is true that some preliminary advice has been provided to the government about a significant issue in relation to environmental protection. I do not want to add any further remark in relation to that today because we also have advise to say that there is a very extensive communication strategy which is being prepared, and—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, I would ask those opposite, and obviously those seeking to report on those matters, to wait until all of the material can be properly provided to the community in a way which is both extensive and full, and provides all the relevant information, so as not to provide unnecessary concerns. That is the advice that we have, and we will be making some announcements about those matters soon.

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary, sir—

The SPEAKER: Before a supplementary, I regret to call the member for Flinders to order, I warn the member for Kavel for the first time, and the member for Heysen for the second time. Leader.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): Thank you, sir. When did the EPA begin investigating this issue?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:30): I will take that question on notice. I am not fully aware of when the EPA began investigating this particular issue. I am aware, from my own knowledge some years ago, there were some concerns about some contamination risk associated with former industrial properties in that general vicinity of South Australia.

Frankly, all of the former industrial areas which are in the peri-urban area of South Australia really fit into that category, so a very significant issue for many our suburbs is the contamination from past legacy industrial uses. But, what is important is that when we communicate, the information is clear, it is cogent, and people are given proper information about what steps they should take. I understand the agency is putting themselves in a position to do that very soon.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary?

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): Have residents been informed, and will they be asked to vacate their properties?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:32): I do not think it is appropriate to answer those questions at this time, except to say that a full communication strategy—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It is imminent. It is imminent, and those opposite should accept their responsibilities—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —by not inappropriately—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Alright, play your games. On this side of the house, we will accept our responsibilities to follow our advice about the appropriate steps to inform people about what steps should be taken in a timely and appropriate fashion.

The SPEAKER: The members for Unley, Goyder and Morphett are all warned for the first time.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): Considering the EPA advises on their website that in relation to site contamination, 'Residents can expect urgent information to be communicated face to face and with follow up letters' from the EPA, has this occurred, given that the government has known about this problem for the past six weeks?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:33): As I said, there will be an imminent communication, and if the member was interested in eliciting information rather than seeking to sensationalise and alarm people, he would have taken the opportunity—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —to communicate with me before coming into this place, and he would have been able to get a very simple answer—

Ms REDMOND: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Is the point of order about the subjunctive?

Ms REDMOND: No, it is about the imputing improper motive to the leader, suggesting that he was trying to alarm people—

The SPEAKER: The Premier will be seated. Does the leader claim to have been misrepresented?

Mr MARSHALL: Absolutely; I've got a genuine interest in this area, and suggesting—

The SPEAKER: Is the leader seeking a withdrawal?

Mr MARSHALL: Absolutely, sir.

The SPEAKER: The leader seeks a withdrawal from the Premier of the imputation that he does not have a genuine interest in this matter.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Sir, my point is this: after having—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, I don't. Sir, I don't withdraw, because what I say is this: if the Leader of the Opposition, after my initial answer—which was that a communication would be imminent about this matter—notwithstanding that, continues to proceed with questions to elicit information about a sensitive matter which could cause alarm and concern if the information comes out in an untimely and uncontrolled fashion, then having pressed ahead with his questions on that matter, I retain my point.

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Well, you have had three supplementaries, so we'll come back to you, leader, and we will go to the member for Taylor.

PASTORAL LANDS VISIT

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:34): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Can the minister inform the house about his recent trip to the pastoral regions of South Australia?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:35): I thank the member for Taylor for her question. Last week, former premier Rob Kerin, who is now the head of Primary Producers SA, the member for Hammond and I travelled with PIRSA staff up to the outback of South Australia. There are about 15 properties up there that have had very poor rain in the past few years and are in need of assistance because on one of the properties in particular that we went out to see, Sharon Oldfield's property, Cowarie Station, they have not had decent rains for over two years. It looked much like a moonscape out there as we travelled around her property for a few hours.

As I said, there are about 15 properties up there. We flew into Leigh Creek and had a meeting at the Lyndhurst pub. We had about 40 people there, including the Fargher families and the Bells and many others who turned up and we had a really good discussion about what they see as the priorities. They say that they have never seen the dogs so bad out that way, so they want to see some controls put in place and maybe some baiting.

Some of the stories were from one family who have never locked their back door but the dogs are coming right up to the back door. They have a three-year-old son. The dog was up on the

trampoline a few weeks ago. It is really quite a serious situation. So we have put \$100,000 into a fund that Livestock SA will run and that will look after some dog-baiting and other programs. We have \$175,000 that we have put into that same fund for some water infrastructure because that was another area where people around that part of the outback thought they could do with some help.

Later on, we went up to Oodnadatta and the member for Stuart joined us there. Again, it was a very good, productive meeting. We had Andrew and Donagh and many other local station owners and managers who joined us and we talked about the immediate problems but also what we need to do in the medium term and in the longer term as well, and we had some really good discussions around perhaps getting some solar panelled bores up there as well to reduce the use of diesel which obviously increases the sustainability of these properties but also reduces the annual cost of diesel to these people. All those sorts of things are pretty good ideas.

We then went down to Coober Pedy and met up with a lot of the tourism operators there and had a tourism forum. The following day we went down to Glendambo where we caught up with the NRM Board and the Pastoral Board which were having a joint meeting at Glendambo. It was a pretty good use of the amount of time that we had to get to speak to as many people as we could and to get some really good views.

What we kept explaining to everyone was that no-one is here to play politics with this issue. There are people there who are in serious trouble and we all want to work together. The member for Hammond and I have worked closely on the grain handling committee in recent years, we have travelled widely around the state and to Western Australia, and it was terrific to have him there, feeding in his ideas and listening so that we all heard the same stories at the same time. The member for Stuart was also there to hear those stories.

I must commend Rob Kerin. I think he is doing a great job with Primary Producers SA. He brought together a lot of different primary industry groups to come together and he has been a great advocate for them and it was a real bonus for us to have him along on the trip.

On Friday, I had a ministerial meeting with the state and territory ministers, and Barnaby Joyce was there. I told him about our \$275,000 commitment and he said that he would be willing to match that money. Again, not just both sides of politics are working together but both levels are working together as well. We do not have that signed off. We have to send over some paperwork but I know the people in the outback we met with will be very pleased with that news as we try to assist them through these tough times. We do not want to leave anyone behind.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:39): My question is to the Premier. Has the Emergency Management Committee been convened to discuss the issue of groundwater and soil contamination in Clovelly Park and Mitchell Park?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:39): I won't be commenting on cabinet processes.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Health. When was the Public Health Division of SA Health advised of groundwater and soil contamination in Clovelly Park and Mitchell Park and what is their assessment of the risk?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:39): I cannot add anything to what the Premier has already said.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:39): Supplementary: given that a contamination was identified in 2009 in this area and residents were advised by SA Health at the time, what ongoing testing and ongoing communication with residents has occurred since 2009?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:40): I will have to get a report back to the house.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:40): Has the local member, the member for Elder, been advised of this contamination?

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: Well, the health minister will be fine.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:40): I will report back to the house.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Local Government. Has local government been notified of this contamination?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:40): I think the Premier has adequately answered that question.

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned for the second and final time.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT FUND

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Can the minister inform the house about the number of expressions of interest received for two programs under the enhanced Regional Development Fund and further opportunities that will follow?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:41): I thank the member for Giles for his question and acknowledge his—like mine—great passion for the regions. As part of my agreement with the Premier, the government has committed to a range of initiatives, including a \$13.4 million increase to the Regional Development Fund, bringing it to a total of \$15 million per annum.

The Regional Development Fund will deliver greater support for projects that provide better infrastructure, that drive economic growth, that create jobs and that leverage increased investment in regional South Australia.

Expressions of interest for funding from two of the RDF programs—the Regional Food Initiatives Program and the Small Grants Program—opened in early June 2014 and closed last Friday. Under the Regional Foods Initiatives Program, \$300,000 is available this year to support regionally-based food organisations to build a stronger regional food presence in our state.

I am advised that the response to the call for funding has been very enthusiastic, with in excess of 30 expressions of interest having been received, which will have a total project value of approximately \$3.7 million. Under the RDF's Small Grants Program, \$3 million is available this year to support new regional employment and investment opportunities linked with state government priorities. I am advised that this program too has generated enthusiasm in our regions, with more than 100 expressions of interest having been received, with a total project value of approximately \$57 million.

Yesterday I opened the RDF's Major Projects Program (\$8.55 million), which supports major economic projects designed to strengthen regional industries and support local economies and opportunities through investment in strategic projects, and also the Community Infrastructure Program (\$3 million per annum) that will encourage investment in regional communities to develop economic infrastructure and grow their capabilities as a foundation for future jobs and economic growth. The expressions of interest for these programs close on 18 July and 1 August 2014 respectively.

Like the first two Regional Development Fund programs, I expect the government will get an extremely positive response from our regions, which is in accord with the optimistic and innovative

outlook that I have observed during my extensive regional visits as the Minister for Regional Development.

Expressions of interest have already been received under the additional two programs that I announced yesterday. I look forward to seeing the benefits of the government's enhanced Regional Development Fund beginning to flow to our regions to create employment opportunities.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT FUND

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (14:44): Further to the Minister for Regional Development's answer, in regard to the major projects component, which is \$8.55 million, as you have stated, why is it that you have only given community, business and industry groups 17 days to lodge an application for this program?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:44): I thank the member for Goyder for the question. My advice, through my department, is that there are quite a few projects already shovel-ready out there and that they will be very eager to apply for that. This will be analysed as we go along, bearing in mind that we have another three years of these programs to go.

The SPEAKER: A further supplementary, the member for Goyder.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT FUND

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (14:45): Minister, I am wondering then in regard to that same major projects fund whether you can actually detail from your point of view the number of jobs you expect to be either retained or created each year from that fund?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:45): To the member for Goyder, I thank him for the question. The expressions of interest have not come in at this particular point. There will be as many—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: Sorry, I have not seen the expressions of interest. However, once they have been analysed, each one will be dealt with on its merits and when the number of jobs that could be created from that is known, I am very happy to announce that in this house.

The SPEAKER: Third and final supplementary.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT FUND

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (14:45): Minister, as you were part of the group that developed the guidelines for the major projects fund, I am just asking a question about the detail, then. In assessing those applications, do you actually attach the highest significance to cost-benefit analysis, cost-effectiveness analysis, an economic impact analysis or a social return on investment?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:46): It is a very important question. In actual fact, it will be a combination of everything. We are looking for opportunities to increase employment opportunities for our regional areas.

TRADE FIGURES

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Investment and Trade. Can the minister inform the house of the latest update on South Australia's trade performance?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:46): I thank the member for Kaurna for his question. I am pleased to inform the house that South Australia has once again reached a record export high of \$12.4 billion in the 12 months to May. The latest—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: I'll just let them go. Right, beautiful.

Mr Griffiths interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Goyder, whose interjections often shade off into talking to himself, is warned for the second and final time.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. It is much appreciated.

Mr Whetstone: You need it.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: No, I don't. The Australian Bureau of Statistics—

Mr Whetstone: Yes, you do.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: I don't think anyone needs any defending from anything that might come from opposite, but we will get back to that. The latest Australian Bureau of Statistics trade figures show overseas goods exported from South Australia for the year to March 2014 grew by 14 per cent year on year outpacing the nation. The ABS figures published today show national exports grew 11 per cent in the same 12-month period, with all the states lagging behind South Australia's performance. South Australian exporters had exceeded the \$12 billion mark for a 12-month survey for the fourth consecutive month. Despite a challenging exchange rate and lower commodity prices, South Australian exports continue strong performances compared with the other states, so it is not all doom and gloom.

South Australia's 18 per cent growth in the 12 months to May compares more than favourably to 13 per cent for Western Australia and the Northern Territory, and up 11 per cent for Victoria and up 1 per cent in Queensland. Who would want to live in Queensland with those figures? Both New South Wales, where exports were down by 8.4 per cent, and Tasmania, down by 10 per cent, recorded declines in the same 12-month period. Our key growth sectors in today's figures include metal ores and metal scrap up \$643 million, or 31 per cent, meat and meat preparations up \$253 million, or 37 per cent, copper up \$221 million, or 24 per cent, and wheat up \$186 million, or 15 per cent.

Exports are booming under this government. We have seen crucial growth in our targeted destinations supported by this government's engagement strategies, and I will tell the house more about that. Building on the support of our Indian and China engagement strategies, the government has embarked on a consultation process to develop a similar approach to South-East Asia.

Exports over the previous 12 months to China have increased by \$1.16 billion, or 53 per cent; exports to India have increased by \$87 million, or 13 per cent, and up \$151 million, or 8.4 per cent, to ASEAN partners. Other important growth destinations include the USA \$373 million, or 38 per cent, and New Zealand—let's not forget New Zealand—\$93 million, or 24 per cent. It is a tremendous result for the state, and a tremendous result for businesses here at home, both agribusinesses and manufacturers. We want our exporters to export even more and we have a plan to help them do just that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned for the first time, though not for that approbation of the Minister for Investment and Trade's answer.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: No, you may not. The member for Heysen is warned for the second and final time as is the member for Hartley. The member for Mitchell is warned for the first time and I call the member for Newland to order. Leader.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation. Has Monroe, the automotive products business, been advised of the contamination in the Clovelly Park and Mitchell Park area?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:51): I am unaware and I will find out for you.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Social Housing. Have non-government organisations who have undertaken social housing works in the Clovelly Park and Mitchell Park area, their workers and their unions, been notified of the contamination?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:52): The Premier has covered these matters and I will not be commenting any further at this time.

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:52): Back to the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation: when did Monroe provide the EPA with the, and I quote, 'additional monitoring report that was due in early 2014', and what action did the EPA take upon receiving this report?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:52): I will stand up as the person representing the Minister for the Environment rather than manufacturing and innovation and I will happily take all of that on notice.

REMOTE AIRSTRIP UPGRADE PROGRAM

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister inform the house how federal government cuts for remote airport upgrades will impact remote communities across South Australia?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:53): I thank the member for Colton for this question and his keen interest in this area. Since 2007, the South Australian government has been a cooperative partner with the Australian government in the current Remote Airstrip Upgrade Program. The program provides funding to improve the safety of airstrips in remote communities in Australia and for services which are not commercially viable but essential for the social and economic wellbeing of the communities they serve.

Currently, the state government has cooperated on 49 projects to improve vital access to remote communities. Largely on a 50:50 basis, with small contributions from remote councils, these partnership agreements have invested close to \$17.5 million in South Australian remote airstrips. However, the Abbott government will axe funding for remote airport upgrades, putting future remote airport upgrade works beyond the reach of the communities they would serve. It will also mean remote communities across South Australia are at risk of being cut off from vital services and emergency medical care.

In the recent Senate estimates it was confirmed that the federal Coalition government has axed the Remote Airstrip Upgrade—the (RAU) program it says here—component of the Regional Aviation Access Program (RAAP) from 2015-16. A key objective of the program is to provide accessible health care to these remote areas and to facilitate the delivery of essential goods and services. The commonwealth government's own portfolio budget statements describe the program as 'vital for the provision of access to essential air services such as the Royal Flying Doctor Service'.

The former federal Labor government provided funding for 181 remote airport upgrades nationally under this program, investing more than \$260 million to build and upgrade regional and remote airports across Australia. Cutting funding to remote airports could put communities at risk and will certainly impact on the wellbeing of people living in remote communities across South Australia. The nature of these airstrips means that unless alternative funding is found these airstrips may become unusable.

As I know the Minister for Health is keenly aware, the Royal Flying Doctor Service is very reliant on airstrips being maintained to an appropriate standard. This ensures their aircraft can operate in and out of these airstrips safely day or night and in all types of weather to deliver the emergency services our remote communities may require. Cuts to remote airport upgrade funding

come as unwelcome news for our regional areas that rely on air services for emergency medical care.

I can advise the house that I have written to the Deputy Prime Minister calling on the Abbott government to reverse its decision to cut funding to this important program. The Federal Budget Response Taskforce, announced today by the Premier, will also campaign against these cuts inflicted upon regional South Australia. This decision by the Abbott government will have a disastrous effect for those living in regional communities, and we will continue to stand up to these cuts.

CARR COMPONENTS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Automotive Transformation. Will the minister confirm that automotive parts manufacturer, Carr Components, established in 1928, has today advised that 70 staff will be made redundant from their Netley operations?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:56): Thank you for that question. I am not aware, but that sounds very serious and I will be looking into it immediately. If it is the case, we will of course be supporting the workers in their retraining and their bids to find future employment. I will take that matter very seriously and look into it, thank you.

CARR COMPONENTS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:56): I have a supplementary question. What support will the government provide to this business and the staff who are going to be made redundant?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:56): I am sorry, sir, but I can't resist this. The idea that those opposite should be asking what we're doing about protecting a car component manufacturer that has hit the deck—

Mr Marshall: You're so out of touch. You have no idea.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Car component manufacturers—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned for the second and final time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Because you did not have the internal fortitude to stand up to your federal party in the lead-up to the last election, you weren't prepared to add your voice to stand up for South Australia. Absolutely—

The SPEAKER: The Premier will be seated. He will not refer to the leader in the second person. Is the Premier finished?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Mr Speaker, we have been campaigning on behalf of the car component sector and Holden workers and their families who rely upon this state government to stand up and advocate on their behalf. We ran a campaign. We stood out the front of Parliament House—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —you pulled on the T-shirt, pretended to be with us, and then you walked over to the cameras and actually sold us out by selling out \$500 million of support that this industry needed. You sold out these workers and their families—every single one of them. You should be ashamed of your lack of courage to stand up for these workers and their families, and every single one of them will be reminded that you are the guilty party.

Members interjecting:

An honourable member: Atko is not guilty of anything.

The SPEAKER: Indeed, Atko is not guilty of anything, but the deputy leader—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: No, but you may well have been chucked for the sins of others, as you were left interjecting when they stopped.

OBESITY PREVENTION AND LIFESTYLE PROGRAM

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Health. What is the current status of the Obesity Prevention and Lifestyle program following the federal government's decision to cancel the National Partnership Agreement on Preventive Health?

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Health will speak with authority on this matter.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:59): Sir, it is not often a member has to make a personal explanation in response to a comment from the Speaker, but you will keep.

The federal budget handed down in May did not only cut funding to our state's doctors and nurses but it also tore up important national partnership agreements. Unfortunately, one of the most sudden cuts in the budget was the immediate termination of the National Partnership Agreement on Preventive Health, meaning that South Australia will no longer receive \$15.6 million from the commonwealth to fund important preventative health initiatives from this week.

Obesity Prevention and Lifestyle (OPAL) has been the largest investment in childhood obesity prevention of its kind in South Australian history. This groundbreaking program supports children, through their families and communities, to be healthy now and stay healthy for life. OPAL is currently operating in 20 sites across South Australia. Since it started in 2009, OPAL has strengthened the efforts of many councils to improve the health and wellbeing of children and their families. Importantly, OPAL targets high-risk groups, that is, those most at risk of ending up in our hospitals in years to come.

Despite the program's success and important aims, its future was in grave danger following the federal budget. However, I am pleased to say, unlike Joe Hockey and Tony Abbott, the South Australian government will not walk away from the fight against childhood obesity. Instead, the government will fulfil our commitment of \$6.3 million over the next three years of the program.

Preventative health is a major factor in keeping people out of hospitals in the first place. Governments on all levels need to invest in programs keeping people healthy and out of hospital. In the long run, they cannot afford not to. We will now work closely with local councils to determine how we can continue to operate OPAL on a reduced budget after the federal funding is withdrawn. This may mean that some aspects of the program will have to be modified, but our goal of encouraging South Australians to live healthy and active lives will remain the same.

The future of OPAL was just one of the many difficult choices this government was faced with in the wake of the federal Liberal Party's budget cuts. Around the country, Liberal Party premiers and health ministers are voicing strong opposition to the federal government abandoning their fair share of health funding. It would be nice to see something like that coming from members opposite.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Health. In relation to the remediation of the new RAH site, have all the claims and notifications been settled, how many were there, and what was the total cost to government?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:02): I will double-check, but I don't think any have been settled. There is one formal claim that is going through the process that is provided for in the contract with SAHP. That claim is for approximately \$1 million and, to date there are no other claims. I will double-check, but that is the information I have to date. I will update the house if any other formal claims are made, if and when that is the case.

FEDERAL BUDGET

Mr GEE (Napier) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion. Can the minister update the house on how the budget is protecting pensioners and low-income earners from cuts made by the commonwealth in the federal budget?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (15:03): I thank the member for Napier for that question because I know that he, like many members of this house, has heard from people in his local community who are concerned about the impact of the federal budget in helping make ends meet. One of the cuts made by Tony Abbott and the federal government which will hit people who can afford it least is the cancelling of the National Partnership Agreement on Certain Concessions from 1 July this year.

This means that South Australia will lose around \$30 million in funding each year for the next four years, totalling around \$120 million. Scrapping the National Partnership Agreement on Certain Concessions is equal to cutting out to \$200 for each eligible recipient who receives concession payments in South Australia.

Funding provided under the National Partnership Agreement on Certain Concessions provided assistance to pensioners and low-income earners by offering free public transport, and water, energy and sewerage concessions. We know that this would have had a devastating impact on some of our most vulnerable members in our community and people who can afford it least.

That is why I am pleased that the Treasurer announced, as part of the state budget, that Labor will guarantee the \$30 million in funding ripped out of South Australia by Tony Abbott and the federal government for the next 12 months. This means that pensioners and low-income earners will continue to access the same level of concessions as beforehand, and will be protected from Tony Abbott's twisted priorities. I hope that all members of this house will join with us in working with advocacy groups to take the fight to the federal government to make it reverse this cruel cut.

In addition, I am pleased to inform the house that our government is delivering on our election commitment to increase the energy concession and the medical heating and cooling rebate by \$50 from 1 July. This increases the amount to \$215 each for eligible recipients. That is because our government understands that pensioners and low-income earners are struggling to make ends meet.

I understand that in the electorate of Napier there are around 4,735 people who will benefit from this increase in payment, and I am sure the member for Napier will welcome this additional funding for pensioners and low-income earners in his local community. Our commitment means that people will receive assistance to pay their energy bills and help balance the household budget. Our government will ensure that no South Australian is left behind and will continue to help those in our community who need it most.

MAJOR PROJECTS FUND

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:06): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Minister, given the importance of investing in regional South Australia, why did it take 100 days to announce the guidelines for the major projects fund and invite applications?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:06): I thank the member for Goyder for his question. The projects of all the different funds—

Mr Griffiths interjecting:

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: Are we right?

Mr Griffiths: Absolutely.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I just want to make it quite clear that, while we may have taken a while, we wanted to make certain that the criteria for all the funds were correct. We want to make certain we get the best opportunity to get the money out there—money for creating job opportunities. Therefore, if the members on the other side have any suggestions of how we may be able to improve, I am only too happy to take those on board before we look at the programs for next year.

STATE DRILL CORE REFERENCE LIBRARY

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (15:07): My question is to the Treasurer. What developments have occurred regarding the new State Drill Core Reference Library?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small

Business) (15:07): I thank the member for Newland for his interest in the State Drill Core Library, because he has a keen interest in resources, as do all members on this side of the house. We want to grow our economy, unlike some of the protectionists opposite who don't want to see our natural resources exploited.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is not responsible for the opposition.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, thankfully, sir. The government is committed to growing our resources sector and developing world-class, pre-competitive data is a key element to supporting such growth. Since 1978, the Glenside Drill Core Storage Facility has stored millions of metres of drill cores and helped unlock some of the state's biggest resource developments. It is recognised by the minerals and petroleum industries as one of the best purpose-built drill core reference libraries in the world. We are committed to ensuring our state has a world-class facility today and into the future.

Following extensions in 1982 and 2005, the current core library is now at capacity. That is why the government is committed to building a \$32.2 million new State Drill Core Reference Library at Tonsley. We are committed to this new core library because delivering world-class pre-competitive data will attract and sustain international investment in mineral petroleum and geothermal exploration in South Australia.

The State Drill Core Reference Library will be the cornerstone of investment for a resources hub at Tonsley. It will work in tandem with the world-renowned PACE program and the Mining and Petroleum Services Centre of Excellence, projects such as the ICT Roadmap and, of course, the Onshore Petroleum Centre of Excellence to drive synergies for mining supply and services.

This investment in our resources sector will advance our pathway to a 20-year period to generate an estimated \$6.5 billion in royalties. This is because world-class resource information and data leads to new discoveries. It leads to new mining and energy developments which can create thousands of jobs and grow our economy. To help fund this development—and I am looking directly at the member for Mount Gambier—DMITRE and Renewal SA have progressed towards undertaking—

The SPEAKER: Point of order from the member for Finniss.

Mr PENGILLY: Sir, this matter is readily available. It's been printed, it's been in the parliament through a report from Public Works, and I ask for your direction on where the minister is going with this.

The SPEAKER: Can the minister assure me that this information is not readily available in a parliamentary paper, and can he be very careful that his answer is correct?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, I would never mislead this house but, given my experience with the member for Unley not reading his Economic and Finance papers—

The SPEAKER: That—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —I doubt very much if members opposite have read any of the Public Works reports.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned for the second and final time. Has the Treasurer thrown in the towel?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Never, sir—not until the last dog dies. I will say this: there is much available on the progression of the drill core library, but I think it's important that the executive detail to the house its importance to our future prosperity.

The SPEAKER: Of course, if it has done that through the Public Works Committee, that wouldn't be in order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, we will talk about it in the first 100 days and in the first 1,000 days, and we will keep on talking about it until our job is done. The government's objectives are consistent with the state's strategic objectives for the site of the sale.

We intend that use of the land for sale be consistent with the state's previous and future intended use of the land, being for mines and energy, and preserves the heritage of the Z ward through adaptive re-use in accordance with the state heritage requirements and the objectives of this site. It is an exciting step forward in the development of our resources sector as it will help cement our place as one of the world's leading mining jurisdictions.

There being a disturbance in the strangers' gallery:

The SPEAKER: The stranger should be removed from the gallery forthwith; it's out of order. Has the Treasurer finished the answer? The motion before the house is that the house note grievances.

Mr WILLIAMS: Before we move to that, sir, I want to bring a matter to your attention that occurred in question time today.

The SPEAKER: Is it a personal explanation or a point of privilege?

Mr WILLIAMS: I will seek your guidance, sir, but it's not a personal explanation, and I do wish to bring this matter to your attention. Today, in question time, the Premier was answering a question. I think it was the member for Heysen who brought to your attention that he had impugned improper motive—

The SPEAKER: Imputed improper motives.

Mr WILLIAMS: —imputed improper motive on the part of—

The SPEAKER: He didn't impugn anyone.

Mr WILLIAMS: —on the part of the Leader of the Opposition. Of course, standing order 127 says that a member may not impute improper motives on any other member or make personal reflections on any other member. Erskine May—I refer to the 24th edition of Erskine May at page 396, 'Rules governing the form and subject matter of motions'—says that:

Certain matters cannot be debated except on a substantive motion which allows a distinct decision of the House. These include the conduct of—

and then it names a class of people starting with the Sovereign and going through members of the house. It goes on and says:

Such matters cannot, therefore, be raised by way of amendment, or an adjournment motion. For the same reason, no charge of a personal character in respect of these categories of person can be raised except on a direct and substantive motion. No statement of that kind can be incorporated in a broader motion nor, for example, included in a reply to a question—

which is exactly, sir, what the Premier did.

The SPEAKER: So, it is a point of order?

Mr WILLIAMS: I believe, sir, you asked the Premier to withdraw, and he then went on to justify his statement earlier in the reply to the question. Sir, I put to you that if we were going to continue to allow such behaviour the house may well descend into some form of anarchy. The standing orders are there for very good reason. Erskine May has developed over many hundreds of years and has come up with a set of rules which keep this place very orderly. Yes, sir, I do ask that you reflect on what did occur in question time today because it is far too often that ministers, in my opinion, do resort to this sort of behaviour.

The SPEAKER: It is a fair point of order. I am going to read it now—*The Practice of the House of Assembly* by Blackmore, which lists all those things that this volume thinks is unparliamentary. I took it to be a point that the member took offence. The member for Heysen was taking offence to the words used by the Premier on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition, and that is why I asked the Leader of the Opposition if he took offence, and then I invited the Premier to withdraw, but he did not.

That is the proper procedure for members taking offence; however, the member for Mackillop is now raising a slightly different point—that it is altogether unparliamentary to impute improper motives to a member, and I am sure he is right. Whether it is to impute improper motives to say that the member is not really interested in the question he is asking is, I think, conjectural.

Mr WILLIAMS: Sir, if my memory serves me correctly, I think the Premier didn't suggest that he wasn't interested. I think he suggested that the reason the question was brought to the house was to try to incite fear in the community. I think the Leader of the Opposition was offended by that when he brought this matter—

The SPEAKER: But is it unparliamentary? Are you saying those words are unparliamentary by dint of imputing improper motives?

Mr WILLIAMS: Absolutely, sir.

The SPEAKER: Alright, well, I will read *Hansard*—

Mr WILLIAMS: Thank you, sir.

The SPEAKER: —and get back to the house about it.

Grievance Debate

RIDE FOR HOPE

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:17): I rise today to speak about the Ride for Hope, which was hosted by Edge Church International. They do a marvellous job at Edge Church. I am not going to talk about their services or the spectaculars they put on either at Reynella or in the city, but I believe they are a great sight. Having witnessed a few of them, their spectaculars are very much worthwhile visiting and viewing; they make *The Voice* TV show look like a kindergarten production.

What I want to talk about today, though, is the Ride for Hope. This was a great event held on Saturday 24 May earlier this year, when Edge Church International, in partnership with Edge International Foundation, hosted a fundraising event, as I said, called Ride for Hope. This event was specifically designed to raise much-needed funds for children in Zimbabwe, through World Vision; in Cambodia, through Transform Cambodia; and, locally, the Childhood Cancer Association.

The participants in these events were mostly from Edge Church and the surrounding communities, and they got very actively involved in four activities: cycling, running or walking, driving, and motorcycling. They sought sponsorship from family and friends to raise money for those charities I just mentioned. It was great to see so many active people in the community out and about and engaging, seeing families come together to help a really worthwhile cause, and seeing young people extend themselves and push themselves.

One young lad, who was riding with his dad, worked very hard to get through the course and to complete it. Whilst he was working his way through a tough situation, when he got to the finish line he was very happy with himself, and so were all those around him. A marvellous job was done by all the families and the people in the community who got involved.

The day was a great success; they had over 427 participants, and it all finished in Bonython Park, where they had a celebratory lunch. A lot of the Edge Church volunteers helped put on the lunch, and it was an absolutely outstanding day. Donations are still coming in, but the total amount raised at this point stands at almost \$60,000, which I think is an outstanding achievement by a wonderful community group. All these funds raised go directly to the children in these three organisations, so again they are great funds going to a worthwhile cause.

Out of the success of this event held here in Adelaide run by the two arms of Edge Church, from Reynella and the city, they have decided that it will be run annually and that next year it will be run nationally and internationally with Edge Church in Melbourne, Bristol in the UK, and the New York campuses also getting involved. It is a great idea, founded here in Adelaide, South Australia, and now expanding right around the world to raise money for a worthwhile cause.

It is also my pleasure to note that all the money raised will officially be handed over at a special evening planned for Friday 11 July at 7.30pm at the south campus on Old South Road, Reynella. I must point out that this is in the heartland of the Mitchell electorate. These are great people in the community doing wonderful things for South Australia and beyond. They will be joined by the CEOs of all three of the charities, which I mentioned earlier which they have been raising funds for, as well as Tim Costello from World Vision, and I am sure he will be gratefully receiving the cheques they hand over on Friday night.

Edge Church is looking forward very much to an ongoing partnership with these groups and the work Edge Church does in the community is outstanding. Some other events they have done over time include great community work with the Service to Youth Council, renovating seven units. Each year, they have a Christmas fair for the Childhood Cancer Association. They have also transformed four units managed for Childhood Cancer Association in Prospect, doing big renovations and fixing them up. I know that the Childhood Cancer Association was blown away with the work they did in Prospect and they are forever grateful.

Along with a number of other groups, they helped build a playground, landscaping and tree planting at Fulham Gardens Primary School. Again, they are putting back into a primary school in that area. They have done a couple of jobs and helped out at the Women's and Children's Hospital with renovations in the paediatric outpatient area and also in the accommodation unit. Morphett Vale High School was one of the first projects they entered into, where they revamped and did a marvellous job in the gardens and areas around high school—another community project that is very impressive.

The thing that really struck me and sat with me after this wonderful day when they gave so much and did so much for the community at large was when Pastor Jonathan Fontanarosa pulled me aside at the end and wanted to have a chat. I thought he might be coming to me to ask for something, for some help or for something I might be able to do for him, but amazingly he came to me and asked, 'What more can we do for our community? What more can we do for the people of Mitchell? What more can we do for South Australia?' For me, that just sums up what a wonderful community group this is and the great service they are giving back to South Australia.

ROYAL SOCIETY FOR THE BLIND

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:22): This morning, it was my pleasure to co-host with the member for Morphett a morning tea for the Royal Society for the Blind (RSB), and I thank Andrew Daly for his invitation to visit the Black Road facilities of the Royal Society which led me to this invitation. I would also like to thank all the MPs and MLCs who attended to meet the dogs in training and the RSB personnel: David Matthews was handling Lily, a male German Shepherd (I do not know why he is called Lily; maybe it means female, who knows?) who is 22 months of age; Daisy Holt handled Iden, a male labrador golden retriever cross who is two years old; and Chris Muldoon handled Xion, a male golden retriever who is 12 weeks of age. I would also like to thank Diana Swanson and her team.

The Royal Society for the Blind is responsible for many great services for the vision impaired, and I had the experience of walking an obstacle course with a trained guide dog recently, and their value, if ever I had doubted it, was totally reinforced. A guide dog costs about \$25,000 to train, and they are in much demand because of the independence they give their owners. The Royal Society is to be congratulated on the wide range of help they provide, and I call on all members to get behind their fundraising activities.

One of the groups that uses the Black Road facilities is the Blind Bowlers Association. It has been my honour to be the patron of the South Australian Blind Bowling Association for many years. We will be hosting the national championships in 2015 at the Salisbury Bowling Club, and I put on record my thanks to the Salisbury Bowling Club for their assistance over many years. It will be a great event, so I urge all here to get behind blind bowling in South Australia. Just as walking blindfolded with a dog is a valuable insight to a life with vision impairment, so too is watching blind bowlers in action. The South Australian Parliamentary Bowlers might be interested in getting involved and perhaps even supporting blind bowlers financially.

Our South Australian team did very well in this year's nationals in Perth. Brian Cameron and Kath Murrell won gold in the B2 mixed pairs. Neil Cundey and Marilyn Koch won silver in the B2 mixed pairs. Neil Cundey and Brian Cameron won bronze in the B2 men's pairs. Mary Nichols won bronze in the B3 ladies single. Martyn Lovejoy and Graham McLean, who was from Western Australia, won bronze in the B4 men's pairs.

So well done to everybody mentioned and all other competitors who were not able to win awards during the tournament. Thanks also to Doreen Smith, the team manager, and all the directors who make bowling and other sports possible for the vision impaired. It cannot be done without someone who is sighted to give them a hand.

I would also like to report on an event I attended for the Minister for Sport and Recreation on 14 June. The Eye 2 Eye Gala Ball at the Stamford Grand, Glenelg, is the Blind Sporting Council's main fundraiser. President Bradley Jansen and his hardworking board are assisted by many sponsors, the major sponsors on the night being Workskil, the Stamford Grand, Foodland Pasadena and Munno Para, and the wonderful Fox Creek winery. Entertainment was provided by the Borderers, great musicians and contributors to the South Australian community. The wines of the evening were introduced by Paul Rogers from Fox Creek, and their involvement in community activities is legendary in South Australia.

Presentations on the night—the Workskil Australia Perpetual Trophy for 2014 was presented by Nicole Dwyer, CEO of Workskil, and I had the pleasure to award the 2014 Hall of Fame trophy to winner, Dennis Lorenzo, so congratulations to him.

The major auction on the night, and there was a silent auction as well, was carried out by Victor Velgush, principal of the Refined Real Estate group. I would also like to give a special thanks to Rajini Vasan, the CEO of the Blind Sporting Council, and her staff and volunteers. They did a marvellous job and they are very enthusiastic and dedicated.

The Blind Sporting Council exists to finance recreation, sport and associated projects to ensure blind and vision-impaired people of all ages have opportunities to fulfil their dreams. Their charity partners are the Royal Society for the Blind, Guide Dogs South Australia and Northern Territory, the Epilepsy Centre, Euride Cycling Excellence, Youthinc and BSA.

It is marvellous to be able to support blind sporting people. As I said earlier, until you try to put yourself in their shoes, you do not realise the difficulties that they have and the extra costs that they incur to take part in sport. It is through events such as the Eye 2 Eye Ball, run by the Blind Sporting Council, that those funds can be raised. It is not possible just with raffles and going to the same community people all the time to fund the necessary expenditure to enable blind and vision-impaired people to travel interstate to give them the wide sporting experiences that they deserve. I commend everybody involved in the Blind Sporting Council and blind sports groups in South Australia and urge members to get behind them.

MEMBER FOR REYNELL

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:27): I rise to speak about an issue that is as breathtaking in its audacity as it is mind-boggling in its stupidity. The current member for Reynell, a former boss of the ASU, or the Australian Services Union, spent a brief few months before the state election telling everybody that she was the CEO of a new community organisation called Together SA. I have to admit that that sounds impressive.

While I would have to question how committed she was to this organisation when just a few months earlier she had been preselected for a safe Labor seat, the title of CEO of a community organisation sounds more appealing than 'union boss' on anyone's CV. No doubt that was part of the plan. Perhaps it might be wise at this point to reflect on what the public perception of a CEO is.

A chief executive officer would be expected to be the leader of an organisation, responsible to a board and focused on managing the operations of the entity by which they are employed. CEOs of government departments are typically employed on five-year contracts. Their role is advertised and usually the employment process is robust and competitive. CEOs are full-time positions that require complete dedication.

One would have thought that a new organisation with the goals of Together SA would need its very first CEO to be 100 per cent focused on the establishment of the organisation, with a commitment to its long-term success. A quick look at the member for Reynell's Facebook page makes it pretty clear that she was campaigning extensively in Reynell instead of doing whatever taxpayers were paying her to do as the CEO of Together SA.

It seems surprising to me that an inaugural CEO would be employed to establish a new community initiative when that person was expecting to enter the parliament within a few months. We will never know what calibre of person could have been employed as the very first CEO of Together SA. As far as I am aware, the position was not advertised and no job specification was referred to on the website or in the annual report of Community Centres SA.

Put simply, the evidence suggests that taxpayer funds purported to support a worthwhile community initiative were in fact used to provide an income for a Labor candidate waiting to enter the parliament. It has been put to me that the government set this up to fund the member for Reynell's campaign to save the Labor Party or the unions picking up the bill; that is, taxpayers have funded this campaign and not the Labor Party or the unions.

In June 2013, the Minister for Social Inclusion announced that the Labor government would provide Together SA with \$80,000 over two years. According to the annual report of Community Centres SA, which was used by Labor to channel this money, the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion handed over \$97,500 for this program in just one year. From \$80,000 over two years to \$97,500 in one year is an incredible funding blowout even by Labor standards, and we do not yet know how much money was handed over from 1 July last year. The question is: just how much of this money ended up in the member for Reynell's pocket? We do not know that yet, but we will find out.

I should make it clear that there are many people in the community who are committed to the ideals behind Together SA. I just do not believe that the member for Reynell is one of them; in fact, she has betrayed them. Is there any limit to a union boss's sense of entitlement when it comes to other people's money? There is no doubt that the spirit of Craig Thomson is alive and well in this parliament.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Dear, oh dear! The member for Taylor.

HOA HAO BUDDHIST FESTIVAL

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:31): Hardly surprising, from the person opposite. I would like to speak this afternoon on the 75th anniversary of the foundation of the Hoa Hao Buddhist faith when I recently attended an event in Virginia with the community there. The Hoa Hao community is a Buddhist religion that was founded in Vietnam in 1939, sited near the original Hoa Hao village in Chau Doc province, which I visited in October.

Their founder, Huynh Phu So, was born in 1919 and, after a life of weakness and infirmity, he was miraculously healed and began to proclaim his doctrines of Buddhist reform through his national area. Hoa Hao Buddhism is part of the reform area of Theravada Buddhism and stresses a simplifying doctrine and practice that is based around the western area of the Mekong Delta. There are no grand buildings or massive monuments in evidence. People honour their parents, love their country, respect Buddhism and its teaching, and love their fellow man. Their earth-coloured robes reflect their agricultural connection to the land. Many of them are farmers.

The religion came to be here in South Australia around 28 years ago in 1986. In the electorate of Taylor, there are around 40 families (around 100 people) who are followers of Hoahaoism. The majority of the Hoa Hao followers live in Virginia and make their living as farmers and market gardeners and contribute greatly to the economic development of the northern suburbs. There is a strong faith, and followers have been using a shed in Virginia to honour their founder, Huynh Phu So, for many years. This year's festival was indeed particularly special as it was a national congregation gathering.

The annual festival occurs in the fifth month of the lunar calendar or June/July. The festival attracts many guests, community leaders and local residents. On 21 June this year, the followers of the congregation marked this 75th anniversary by inviting Lieutenant-Governor Hieu Van Le (our incoming Governor), legislative councillors Tung Ngo and Kelly Vincent and me to celebrate with them. Even though the numbers of Hoa Hao followers are small compared with other religious areas in this state, they play an important role in the Vietnamese community, and in the South Australian community as a whole, through their generosity. For 75 years, their Buddhism has helped guide and support them through many troubled times of profound change in Vietnam, particularly those who arrived in Australia as refugees.

The triumph of this faith and its celebration of 75 years is a significant one. Having visited the Hoa Hao temples in Chau Doc in October last year, I understand firsthand the challenges and difficulties these people have faced in practising their religion due to the efforts of the Vietnamese government to control and restrict their religious activities. I pay my respect to these brave individuals who have fought for the freedom of their religion and their nation. Freedom of religion is a vital part

of a multicultural society and, here in Australia, they are welcome to practise their faith freely, and I welcome them to our community.

STUART ELECTORATE

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:34): I rise today to again share my concerns with this house about the constantly rising cost of living the people of the electorate of Stuart are facing. Over 12 years of state Labor government, inflation (the Consumer Price Index) has risen 40 per cent and yet, very unfortunately, property charges have gone up 87 per cent, state taxes have gone up 92 per cent, gas bills have gone up 136 per cent, electricity bills have gone up 160 per cent, and water bills have gone up 227 per cent in total.

I am sure that these rises affect all electorates in the state not just the one I represent, but of course Stuart is my primary concern. I am very sad to learn that, on top of the 160 per cent increase in electricity prices I have just mentioned over the last 12 years, effective yesterday there has been another 4.4 per cent increase in the cost of electricity for South Australians—that in the face of a prediction only a few months ago by the Minister for Resources and Energy that electricity prices would actually decrease nearly 1 per cent every year for the next three years; instead, they are actually going up 4.4 per cent in just one year.

I am also very concerned specifically about water prices—something that of course no household and no business can avoid—going up 227 per cent in 12 years, compared to inflation of 40 per cent. At the same time, the government is claiming hundreds of millions of dollars (I think it is nearly \$300 million each year) from SA Water. Essentially, a government monopoly making money from a resource that is absolutely mandatory, necessary, and its use cannot be avoided, and then taking those proceeds back into Treasury seems completely inappropriate to me.

I certainly understand the need for SA Water to invest in its network, and I understand the value in having a government-owned water provider, but when the operation of SA Water is returning hundreds of millions of dollars to the government and at the same time increasing water costs to people across our state by nearly 200,000 above inflation that clearly is not acceptable.

I think particularly about my constituents who live out on the Barrier Highway, from Terowie out to Cockburn; some of those people are paying nearly \$14 a kilolitre for water you cannot actually drink. They are paying a price three or four times what Adelaide metropolitan people pay for their water, but the Adelaide metropolitan people get potable water; those people get unpotable water. It hurts families, it hurts homes and it hurts businesses out that way.

I think particularly about the Yunta Hotel (not that they are in isolation) trying to encourage people to come and stay in their hotel, an important local business, and their guests refuse to shower there because of the quality of the water. It is a disgraceful situation, and yet they are paying nearly \$14 a kilolitre for that water. That concerns me enormously.

In addition to thinking about comments from ESCOSA and comments from SACOSS in regard to people accessing services and support, an indication of the impact of the cost of living on the public of South Australia which is probably not often commented on but which is quite interesting is this. In the financial year before last (and because the last one has just finished, I do not have the stats) approximately 156,000 police expiation notices were sent out, but the number of expiation notices that did not receive payment within 14 days of a reminder notice being sent out was 66,000; that is, 42 per cent of expiation notices sent out by police were not paid on time. I can tell you that 7,700 of them went to court, so that leaves approximately 58,000 that did not.

I think that is a very interesting indicator of people's cost of living because, quite understandably, expiation notices would come after water, electricity, gas, food and clothes for the kids.

Time expired.

NAYDA, MR KWEMENTYAYE (LES)

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:39): Today, I rise to pay tribute to Aboriginal activist, Kwementyaye (Les) Nayda OAM, who died in Alice Springs in May at the age of 70. It is fitting that the contribution he made to our state and to understanding the vital nature of true reconciliation be acknowledged in this place.

A proud Eastern Arrernte elder, sadly he, like his mother and grandmother, was a member of the stolen generations and he lived as a young boy at the Gap Cottages outside Alice Springs. It was from here that Kwementyaye Nayda was taken away from his mother in 1954 at the age of 10, an experience which his family says shaped everything he did—it is tragic that he never saw her again.

He was sent from Alice Springs to St Francis Boys' Home in Semaphore which also housed many family members and other names now synonymous with Aboriginal activism (and, as it turns out, soccer), including Charles Perkins, Gordon Briscoe and John Moriarty. Kwementyaye also lived for almost 40 years in my electorate of Torrens in the suburb of Greenacres and was involved with the nearby Gaza Football Club where he and his wife Ann shared some enjoyable times.

Kwementyaye Nayda was the first Aboriginal person to serve on the South Australian Parole Board. He also served as chair on the Aboriginal Housing Board, the Aboriginal Advancement Committee and the Special Community and Aboriginal Projects Board. In 1995 he was made a member of the Order of Australia. He held a number of senior positions across government agencies and was chief advisor on Aboriginal Affairs to the South Australian government.

When he retired after 30 years of service in 2004 he was acknowledged as the longest serving Aboriginal public servant in Australia. He is admired for his efforts across a wide range of areas, from education and employment to law and order, housing and land rights. While his cousin Charlie Perkins looked to the big picture of Aboriginal affairs working in the sphere of federal politics, his son Shane Nayda says his dad was more community focused and he wanted to help clean up his own backyard first.

Kwementyaye Nayda was involved with creating the Family Wellbeing program in the 1990s with a focus on the empowerment and personal development of Indigenous people through the sharing of their stories, discussing relationships and identifying goals for the future. He was also viewed as a key figure in the development of the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act of 1981.

Kwementyaye Nayda returned to Alice Springs in 2005 and tragically, less than a year later, he suffered a stroke from which he never recovered. A memorial service will be held this Friday, 4 July at 10.30am at the Glanville Function Centre, which was formerly the St Francis Boys' Home.

For his whole working life, Kwementyaye (Les) Nayda strived to make a difference for Aboriginal people and to ending the suffering he had both witnessed and experienced firsthand. His family believes it is appropriate to remember and reflect on his life at the place he was sent as a child in such traumatic circumstances.

He is survived by his longtime partner, Annie Ernst; children, Shane and Sharon; and grandchildren, Elliot and Christopher.

Motions

GRESTE, MR PETER

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:43): I move:

That this house—

- (a) condemns the conviction and sentence given to the Australian journalist Peter Greste and his colleagues from the Al Jazeera network; and
- (b) supports the commonwealth government in its diplomatic efforts to bring about a positive outcome for Mr Greste and his family.

I indicate that I will speak briefly about this matter and after my remarks I understand the matter is to be adjourned to give members the opportunity to speak on a further occasion. However, I thought it was timely that we add our voice to those who are seeking to support justice for Mr Peter Greste.

The ruling by an Egyptian court that Peter Greste and his Al Jazeera colleagues are guilty of spreading false news in supporting the Muslim brotherhood has been the subject of obviously very substantial criticism and, on the face of it, their arguments that they were denied natural justice appear to be cogent. That they could then be sentenced to terms of imprisonment of seven to 10 years really was a shock. This result is even more alarming, given claims by the Egyptian government that the country is on a transition to democracy.

I would like to offer my support for the efforts by the commonwealth government and I think it is appropriate that this house resolves also to provide that support. The international community is obviously outraged about this decision and, for the sake of the Greste family, Mr Greste himself, of course, his colleagues who have also been gaoled, the freedom of the international press and the evolution of Egypt as a country that seeks to become a modern democracy, we call upon Egypt to find a way of remedying this patent injustice which has been perpetrated on Mr Greste.

It is even more poignant when, for many of us, Mr Greste was a familiar face on our television screens. His reputation as being a first-class professional journalist is well accepted, and that only adds to the shock of those who have witnessed the events in Egypt. I commend the motion to the house.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:46): I rise to speak on the motion and indicate that I will be supporting the Premier's motion, and I thank him for his contribution on this matter. I place on the record that I am the mother of Alex Hart, who is a Channel 7 journalist who has been three times to Egypt to cover this trial and who has obviously had the professional and personal responsibility there on behalf of his particular employer, but representing a myriad of journalists around the world to cover this trial.

The circumstances that have befallen Mr Greste and two others who are charged are to be roundly condemned, and it has been internationally. I place on the record a statement that my son Alex wrote in respect of this, and I make this point: I think that it behoves all of us to recognise the personal risk that journalists place themselves in to follow these matters, and in this particular case because it was the action of the government in Egypt and the judicial system—or lack thereof—which has culminated in this tragic outcome obviously for Peter Greste but also for the rule of law, the independence of the judiciary, the enforcement of equitable and fair application of the law, just as another demonstration of how disgracefully this has played out in Egypt.

If it turns out down the track that there has been some action, or failure to act on behalf of the new government in Egypt, that attracts further criticism then so be it. I do say, however, as a new government that has formed in Egypt, it is important that we give the foreign minister, the Hon. Julie Bishop, an opportunity to confer with her equivalents in Egypt, and for the Prime Minister to continue to confer with the new President of Egypt to try to bring this matter to a sensible, fair, humane and just outcome.

These were the words of Alex after three trips to Egypt. As a journalist, from my point of view, my advice, quite frankly, was: 'You've got the judgement now, get the hell out of there,' because it is a dangerous position to be placed in. He said:

I leave Egypt with a horrible taste in my mouth. Everyone angers me, even those who are being friendly...the woman at the hotel reception, the waiter serving me lunch, the driver silently chauffeuring me around.

I can't stand this country. I want to #boycottegypt as so many are encouraging on social media. Yet, here I sit with a beer in the airport departure lounge about to leave. I am lucky.

Across town in Tora Prison, Peter Greste sits in a tiny jail cell. He isn't going anywhere.

Twenty-four hours after being sentenced to seven years jail for doing his job, the incredibly harsh reality must be sinking in. His brothers, Andrew and Mike, would have just visited him. Imagine the embrace they shared...the emotion.

Andrew and Mike have alternated monthly being in Cairo to support their brother during this trial. Andrew only arrived a few hours before Monday's verdict. He wanted to be here to take his brother home. Neither of them expected the outcome that has shocked not just them, but the world.

I didn't know what to say to them outside the court. I was sorry. I put my arm around their shoulder, told them I was here if they needed anything. It was awful. Many of the journalists left the court in tears.

Having covered several hearings during this trial, I have often wondered what it would be like to be in Peter's shoes. As a journalist in these parts of the world, it is always a possibility. But in truth, I always thought he would get out...that it was only a matter of time before he was released on bail and acquitted. How wrong I was. How wrong we all were.

When I returned to my hotel room from the court on Monday, it hit me in the lift. The adrenalin of reporting the devastating events as they unfolded had worn off. I thought of my loved ones...my beautiful girlfriend, my incredible mother, my dear brother and his gorgeous girls. What would they be going through if it was me in that cell?

They'd be going through exactly what Peter's parents, brothers and the rest of his family are going through. Complete and utter devastation...their world turned upside down. Juris and Lois Greste, his parents, are not young. They do not deserve this in their lives. They are rightly proud of their son and his work. It is work that should be celebrated, not condemning him to seven years behind bars.

Now, Peter, his family, consular staff and the Australian Government are grappling with how to overcome this situation. An appeal is being discussed. The Prime Minister is preparing to lobby Egypt's new leader for a Presidential pardon. Both options seem like extreme long shots.

Why would a court system that convicted the journalist and his Al Jazeera colleagues without any incriminating evidence overturn its decision? Why would a new President grant clemency knowing it would make him look weak in the eyes of his people?

I can't help but feel pessimistic. A large part of me is resigned to the fact that this is the way it is...Peter Greste has been dealt a cruel injustice and will have to serve his time...there is nothing I can do.

But if I give up hope, who is next? Other journalists? The Government? Peter's family? Peter himself? None of us can afford to give up on Peter Greste. There is so much more than the next seven years of his life at stake.

I commend the motion and the support of the house for this motion.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.R. Kenyon.

Bills

CRIMINAL LAW (FORENSIC PROCEDURES) (BLOOD TESTING FOR DISEASES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:53): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) Act 2007. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:53): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Day in, day out, police officers perform a vital service to the people of South Australia. All too often, however, officers are placed at risk through the criminal actions and recklessness of others. Approximately 700 police officers are assaulted in the line of duty each year. Many of these assaults—between 250 and 350 a year, according to SAPOL figures—result in one or more officers being spat on, or even bitten.

It is an unfortunate fact of life that many of those who seek to do harm to our police in these circumstances are at high risk of having an infectious disease. Currently, SAPOL offers blood testing to any officer who has had contact with an offender's bodily fluids and is therefore at risk of having been exposed to, or contracted, a communicable disease. There is currently, however, no obligation on an offender to be tested.

At the last state election, the government committed to introduce legislation to require an offender who bites or spits at a police officer to undertake a blood test for infectious disease. This bill—the Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) (Blood Testing for Diseases) Amendment Bill 2014—delivers on this commitment. I seek leave to insert the remainder of the second reading explanation in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The Bill builds on the existing framework in the *Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) Act 2008* for suspect forensic procedures.

The Bill provides that any offender who is reasonably suspected of having assaulted a police officer or having committed other specified offences of violence can be compelled to undertake a blood test to test for the presence of infectious diseases where the police officer was exposed to the offender's bodily fluids and there is a risk that the police officer, in being so exposed, could have been exposed to or contracted an infectious disease.

The specified offences are assault or resisting a police officer, assault and assault causing harm, causing harm, causing serious harm, doing acts likely to cause harm, serious harm or endanger life, riot, affray and violent disorder. The amendments allow other specified offences to be added by Regulation.

Consistent with existing procedures for forensic procedures in the *Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) Act*, the Bill provides that an offender can only be required to undertake a blood test upon the authorisation (to be recorded in writing) of a 'senior police officer', being an officer of or above the rank of Inspector.

The Bill also amends section 58 of the *Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) Act* to make it clear that regulations made under the Act can regulate how such tests are to be carried out and to whom the results may be released to.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) Act 2007*

4—Amendment of long title

This clause makes an amendment to the long title of the Act consequent upon the measure.

5—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause substitutes the definition of suspects procedure in section 3 of the principal Act.

6—Insertion of Part 2 Division 4

This clause inserts a new Division 4 into Part 2 of the principal Act as follows:

Division 4—Blood testing of certain persons for communicable diseases

20A—Interpretation

New section 20A defines key terms used in the new Division 4.

20B—Senior police officer may require certain persons to provide blood sample

New section 20B allows a senior police officer to authorise the taking of blood from a suspect in the circumstances set out in subsection (1), and makes related procedural provisions.

7—Amendment of section 31—Use of force

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

8—Insertion of section 34A

This clause inserts new section 34A into the principal Act, which prevents forensic material obtained under new Part 2 Division 4 from being used for purposes other than testing the material for communicable diseases.

9—Insertion of section 39A

This clause inserts new section 39A into the principal Act, which requires the destruction of forensic material obtained under new Part 2 Division 4 as soon as is reasonably practicable after the material has been tested for communicable diseases in accordance with new section 34A.

10—Insertion of section 48A

This clause inserts new section 48A into the principal Act, which renders inadmissible specified results, admissions and statements relating to operation of new Part 2 Division 4, and prevents the reliance on those things to ground the obtaining or use of search warrants or powers.

11—Amendment of section 58—Regulations

This clause amends section 59(2) of the principal Act to enable regulations to be made under the Act in relation to the operation of new Part 2 Division 4.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

APPROPRIATION BILL 2014

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (15:56): I will see how much time I have on the clock, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think you are up to about 12 minutes.

Ms REDMOND: Twelve, was it?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think that is a bit generous, but you can go for 12.

Ms REDMOND: When I sought leave to continue my remarks, I had been explaining how it was that our water bills had gone up so extravagantly, by some 236 per cent in the time that this government has been in office. I had got as far as explaining that, instead of agreeing to a \$450 million desalination plant, this government had resisted it for two years and then doubled the size of it unnecessarily, resulting in a \$2.2 billion desalination plant.

In addition to that, they did a couple of other things, of course. They insisted that the power to supply this desalination plant be paid at a premium, which is costing us an extra \$37 million over three years, and then, of course, this government is very much in favour of keeping the carbon tax, which will cost us another \$14.6 million over three years. In addition to all of that, as if the cost of that plant alone and all those added cost burdens imposed by the plant were not enough, the government insists every year on taking not only a dividend from SA Water but a tax equivalent payment from SA Water of hundreds of thousands of dollars. So, it is for those reasons that the people of this state face these extraordinarily high bills that come in for our water charges.

Similarly, our electricity bills have gone up, and they will be going up in the average household yet again this year by another \$85, and that is certainly well beyond inflation. As if all of that was not bad enough, this government has decided to withdraw the concessions. When I moved to this state many years ago, the concessions on local council rates which, of course, although they are on your local council notice are actually paid by the state government, amounted to a fair percentage of your council rates.

Over the years, they just have not been increased. This government has not increased them in my memory, so for a long time the council rate concession has stayed at \$190. As if that was not bad enough, however, what the government has decided to do now is withdraw the council rate concession altogether. Indeed, I think they are also withdrawing the Seniors Card concession, which amounts to about \$100.

It is pretty clear that this government, through its own mismanagement, has got into this dreadful economic situation. It has never yet met its target in terms of coming in on budget or creating a surplus—heaven forbid! In fact, I think that for six out of the last seven years they have promised a surplus and, on all but one occasion when they did manage a tiny surplus, they have actually come in with a deficit, and this year of course is no exception.

As I said at the outset, I want to concentrate my comments at this stage on the fact that this budget in particular is going to impact not just on the debt and the deficit for the state but on the ordinary consumers in this state—the mums and dads in all the suburbs who all of us in this house are charged to represent. Even when you get past all those high costs, you then face other increases.

Your licensing costs are going up. Heaven forbid you get a driving fine. I get an enormous number of complaints in my electorate office from people who have been driving for sometimes 40 or 50 years with never an infringement but, because of the regime of this government, they suddenly find that they have been driving down the street they have been driving down for 40 or 50 years and exceeded the 50 km/h speed limit that has been imposed without them being aware, and they cop an extraordinary fine, and even those fines are going up.

In addition to that, even if they wanted to do something in the community—and of course, this state famously has an enormous culture for volunteering. Indeed, I remember years ago looking at the statistics on volunteering in this state, and the amount of money contributed by volunteers in our community was the equivalent of something in the order of one-third of the amount of money that our state budget comprises; so, they were very significant volunteers.

We have a very high rate of volunteering. What does this government do? It increases the fee to get your clearance to go work as a volunteer. I must say, I find the whole idea of having to get a clearance quite offensive. I have been a volunteer all my life—I must confess, I took a back step

from my Rotary Club while I was leader, and I have not actually gone back to the club as an active member, but I am still an honorary member.

I am a bit hesitant to do so, simply because I have a fundamental objection to having to pay to get a clearance in order to volunteer my services in the community, particularly when those services are not going to actually have any direct contact with children and when I do not believe that, in any event, the people that we need to protect our children from are in fact stopped from having contact with children via that clearance. Even volunteering is going to be more expensive for the community members.

This government talks about creating a vibrant city and wanting to encourage people to come into the city, and in this budget there are two extraordinary measures aimed, I think, at precisely the opposite. The first is that they are going to impose a car park tax. This is the one city where we actually do not have congestion, but between the state government and the Adelaide City Council, they are doing everything they can to make this city as congested as possible, when in fact 85 per cent of the journeys are never going to be on public transport.

But we are going to have a car park tax on every car park in the city, at \$750 a year, and of course that is going to be passed on. Not only that, but I have spoken to at least one owner of a high-rise car park development who has said he will simply go out of business. He will not be able to afford to pay the amount of money required by the government in this tax and still run a profitable business because he won't be able to simply pass all of that onto the users.

To make matters even more complicated in terms of trying to encourage people to use public transport, the government has said, 'Yes, if you use public transport to all these events it is going to be free,' but then they are going to turn around and impose a charge on all the people who attend. So, even if the people attend by walking, or if they attend by driving their own car and paying the excess for their car park, they are going to be confronted with yet another payment because they have attended the event, and the event itself is going to attract the tax known as the 'cost recovery for public transport to events'.

In spite of the minister going on radio and trying to dodge the fact that it was not going to be \$2 per ticket, that was clearly the amount that had been indicated by those who attended the briefing at the budget lockup. I was somewhat surprised to find that the Minister for Transport, in his radio interview on 891, did not even appear to know what a not-for-profit organisation was. It does not surprise me.

I know that on this side of the house we have many, many people who have been involved as volunteers for a long, long time, and they fully understand that a not-for-profit organisation does not mean that the organisation never makes any money and has to absolutely break even every year. What a not-for-profit organisation is about is simply that the profits do not get shared among shareholders; the profits get ploughed back into whatever good community purpose it might be.

For instance, I spent 29 years on the local hospital board in Stirling, and it made a significant profit every year, which was used to improve the facilities and all the things that were available at that hospital to improve patient care at that hospital. There was never a profit distributed among the board members, who were all volunteers for absolutely no pay, and that is the distinction. But it does not really surprise me that people on the other side do not actually understand that distinction.

Having provided that disincentive, the government has then announced this extraordinary step that they are going to close down the Motor Accident Commission, after promising no more privatisations. Of course, they will argue that they are not really privatising, but the reality is that the effect of it is that people in this state, rather than going to the Motor Accident Commission to get their third-party personal insurance, will now be faced with having to go out into the open market.

Of course, the government had already raided that. It is one of the few things that had been working well, probably because the government did not have its hands on the till and, compared to WorkCover which has made extraordinary losses and run up vast amounts of unfunded liability over successive years going to a worse position, the Motor Accident Commission actually ran quite effectively and, indeed, had money in the bank.

So what did the government do? In the last budget they came along and said, 'We'll take \$100 million from there and put it into our general revenue,' and now they have decided that they are not just going to do that, they are actually going to close the thing down and leave the people who

are driving vehicles at the mercy of the marketplace. If you know anything about the insurance marketplace, you will know for a start that there are only about five underwriters around the world and they are overseas and that it is very hard in some areas to get insurance at all.

For instance, in the area of housing indemnity where I had thought until recently there was housing indemnity insurance that you took out if you were going to go with a builder and build yourself a new home, take out your insurance and you are covered for the builder going belly up or for the building not being completed or for problems with warranty of the building once constructed. In fact, there are significant problems with providing that indemnity insurance in that industry.

I have no doubt that when it comes to motor vehicle industry insurance it is going to be the same thing, that people will struggle to get insurance. Of course, the government had already largely dismantled the provision of a lot of the damages for people who were injured in significant ways and they have certainly made improvements in the level of damages available for catastrophic injury but they have significantly removed the damages payable for a range of other injuries which are not classified as catastrophic.

This government seems intent upon removing all sorts of protections which have previously been in place. Indeed, Mr Acting Speaker, I refer you to the Travel Agents Fund—and you may have some familiarity with it, considering we discussed it this morning. The Travel Agents Fund up until last week, in fact up until Monday, provided protection in the Travel Compensation Fund for every person going through a travel agent in this state, but as a result of the government's move to dismantle that legislation as of today we do not have any such protection. I believe that the same thing is going to come to pass with the Motor Accident Commission.

I will not have time to go through the other things about the debt and the deficit. However, I will mention that although the jobs promise is being cited as the government promise to create 100,000 jobs by the year 2016, my recollection is that originally when then premier Mike Rann made the announcement it was going to be 100,000 jobs in the next four years coming from the 2010 election to 2014. A loss of 19,500 jobs and growing is an absolute disgrace. This government should be condemned for this budget.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (16:08): I have listened to all the contributions of the members opposite and, if a week is a long time in politics, then the past 24 hours were a very long day for me. I believe those speeches from the other side confirm several old sayings, especially the one that describes the first casualty as always being the truth, then there is the one about how statistics can be made to tell any sort of story, and my personal favourite is the 'we were robbed' one. They have all been trotted out in one way or another in nearly every single speech.

South Australians did not vote for the overwhelming change they on the other side anticipated, and the electoral system is not rigged. Voting patterns are not and should not be easy to predict and so, no matter the results of the work of the committee set up to examine electoral reform, it will be hard to redistribute boundaries in a way satisfactory to all because of that very unpredictability.

There are a couple quotes that I hope will be inspiring for all of us here as we work to make South Australia the best place it can be. One is from John Fitzgerald Kennedy on the occasion of his inauguration in 1961 when he said, 'So ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country.' Another from Noam Chomsky is, 'If you assume there's no hope, you guarantee there will be no hope. If you assume there are opportunities to change things, there is a chance you may contribute to making a better world. That's your choice.'

These are important notions and they demonstrate the level of commitment needed as this state faces up to the world in the aftermath of the GFC and the impact of the high dollar and the fall in commodity prices that led to the disappointment of the stalling of the Olympic Dam project.

No matter what anyone says, no-one expected a federal budget that would change the Australian way of life so significantly. Why would we? We were told not to expect any surprises. Talk about broken promises and the pot calling the kettle black. The result had to be a major rewrite of the South Australian budget and, as the member for Waite said in his contribution last evening, this government has had to make bold changes while still doing its best to fulfil election commitments.

We are building and reforming as well as transforming. These are the visions we took to the election and these are the qualities that see us all well placed to lead in a time of transformation in

this state. This government is committed to structural change. We shed the title 'rust-bucket state' and we will turn around the current adverse circumstances and negative perceptions those on the other side are now peddling. If I were a Tasmanian, I would be reminding you all that not all states start from the same position and, like Tasmania, South Australia faces significantly different circumstances to the Eastern States and Western Australia.

The sudden and total abandonment of the car industry by the federal government means that the transition phase for manufacturers and workers will be so much harder. This did not have to be the case. Federal changes to health care and education will be massive, and we do not even know yet if this is the last of the changes the federal Liberal government will inflict on us. The cuts will hurt the most vulnerable, and this state government will keep concessions until at least next year when we will see what lies in store from the next Abbott budget.

This is the time, at all levels of government, when elected members must strive to win back the confidence and trust of the electorate. If we are honest with the people, the people will accept the measures being taken. There has been a lot of talk about perceptions and about there being no plan behind the measures being taken in this budget. When we talk about perceptions we cannot have it both ways. The sole act of the election of a Liberal government is thankfully not the only catalyst for positive change. In other states held up as examples for success assets have been sold, so this is not something uniquely South Australian.

In fact, I remember in my early days in this place watching the now shadow treasurer Lucas in another place hanging on every word and almost dragging the now late Hon. Trevor Crothers across the floor to enable the sale of ETSA, thus privatising electricity supply in this state. This was the change we were told we had to have. Other changes interstate have not all been positive. People have been left behind, something this government is working hard to avoid. Trickle down at breakneck speed is not the only way to return to surplus and, as we have heard, some level of debt is acceptable in any budget.

If the Liberals had won last March they would have started from the exact same place in planning this state's future. To claim the election of a reformist government is the only catalyst for improvement is not borne out by the results in other jurisdictions. Engendering a perception of 'all things will get better' while making bold changes is an example of how talking things up can have a positive effect. Confidence is an important ingredient in success, and we need only look to the inspiring example of Nick Kyrgios—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Kyrgios.

Ms BEDFORD: Anyway, he looks like you from the back—at Wimbledon last night to observe the power of positive thought.

Locally, Florey residents rely on Modbury Hospital, and I have spent my entire public life working to support this great facility and the wonderful staff who make it such an integral part of our community. We now have a state-of-the-art accident and emergency department, featuring paediatrics that dovetail into the remarkable facilities at the Lyell McEwin health service for the sickest adults and children. We have a fantastic hospice service and the rehab ward is due to open soon. Sure, we have had to postpone the new build that was promised, but as each community contributes to the measures to contain health expectations it is a share we must accept as we take our share of the changes needed for the greater good.

There seem to have always been good times and bad times in this capitalist cycle. Australia has been lucky enough to emerge from downtrends to again enjoy better times as the rest of the world catches up. Closure of the hospital is not an option, and our community will not accept this. The continual rumours, fanned by party-political advantage-seeking individuals is appalling. I ask you all to refrain from scaring people and causing anxiety when it is not necessary and in some cases is very harmful.

This is another example of a case where confidence is vital. This persistent niggling away is particularly galling from the very people whose failed privatisation experiment caused such terrible calamity. I have lived that experience and will not stand by for anything similar, ever. We have local experience of the importance of investment in public transport, reliability being the key factor in deciding people to make the change. Now, with a great secure park-and-ride, commuters enjoy a

seamless experience. It has quickly become a tradition for the fixtures at the wonderful Adelaide Oval and for arts events in the city.

The Heights School will become a defence school hub, readying our students for careers in defence and the defence industries. This is the school my now adult children attended and they have gone on to do degrees and secure employment in their chosen fields here in South Australia as have most of their friends. While some of our children move further afield for experience, this should be seen as a good thing, for many return and contribute again while enjoying the universally-celebrated lifestyle that is uniquely ours and to raise their own families.

We know the task ahead of us. This government took a manifesto to the election that has had to change in keeping with the harsh measures that have been enforced on us—measures that will change the very fabric of the Australian way of life. Access to good health care when you need it and good education for all are the basics of our society. Understanding a need to contain health spending is vastly different to tearing up national health agreements and imposing mammoth changes to universal health care. Tearing up national education agreements and completely rewriting education commitments (cunningly, not in the short term, but into the future) and changing the face of university education—changes that will not serve us well—are things that we are all awake to.

One thing the federal budget did do was to unite state and territory leaders in the universal condemnation of what was forced on them—all this while removing safety nets for the most vulnerable, removing the commissioner for disability and almost single-handedly killing off the euphoria of the NDIS, and not addressing child care, irrespective of a paid parental leave scheme almost as unpopular as the changes to Medicare.

All of this feeds into the main issue, and that is the creation of jobs. It may seem like a chicken and egg argument, but I have always felt everything is important, as we never want working poor in Australia. Without federal support rather than withdrawal of services, our efforts here will be hamstrung. Business has acknowledged this government's emphasis and support in the budget measures to stimulate their sector—spending will only occur in a climate of confidence.

I will continue to do everything I can to support our Public Service and public servants. They provide the advice to whoever is in government and deliver the services on which we all rely. Instead of complaining, let us all put our efforts into making things work. The areas that need change have been identified: the only difference now is the emphasis and the speed with which the change is delivered.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (16:17): Interesting—I did not realise I would be following the member for Florey, and she has encouraged me to make a couple of comments I had not intended to make.

Ms Bedford interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: No, maybe I don't; maybe the member is right, but let me say that anybody who stands up in this place and says that this government has a mandate for this program does not understand the fundamentals of democracy. Anybody who suggests that this government was returned with the confidence of the people of South Australia is kidding themselves. The reality is that 92,000 South Australians wanted a change of government—more than those who wanted to continue in the same vein. And not only did they vote for that change as recently as 15 March, indeed they voted for a similar change four years ago.

The people of South Australia are getting somewhat frustrated with an electoral system that does not allow democracy to occur in South Australia. They are getting frustrated that it takes something like, I would suggest, 54½ per cent of the two-party popular vote to create a change of government in South Australia.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: No, that's not true.

Mr WILLIAMS: Well, the minister interjects that that's not true—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: And it's not right to respond to interjections, so I will bring you back to the debate.

Mr WILLIAMS: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. The reality is that it takes about 54.6 per cent, on the current electoral boundaries, for there to be a change of government in South

Australia. That is the fundamental reality. For those members who have not read it, I refer them to the 2012 Report of the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission and, with a recast of the vote—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: A recast.

Mr WILLIAMS: This is part of the process that they go through, Tom. With a recast of the votes, cast—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is out of order to interject, it is out of order to respond to interjections, and you must refer to the member by his name.

Mr WILLIAMS: Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker. If you read the 2012 report of the boundaries commission, when they reapplied the votes from the 2010 election to the new boundaries, notwithstanding that the Liberal Party received 51.6 per cent of the two-party preferred vote, their calculations showed that the Labor Party would have still won 25 seats.

On the votes cast at the 2010 election, on the boundaries that we currently have, the Labor Party would win 25 seats, notwithstanding section 83(1) of the Constitution Act that says that the boundaries commission should draw boundaries such that the group that receives 50 per cent of the vote plus one should have an even chance of forming government. I will leave it there but those who are saying otherwise are kidding themselves, just like this government is kidding itself in its blame game.

Let me turn to Budget Paper 3, page 42, Table 3.1, Revenue cuts imposed by the commonwealth government. It has a whole list of supposed revenue cuts that the state will be suffering, and down the bottom it has the total under the column 2014-15—minus \$101.1 million. I did another little exercise. I picked up Budget Paper 3 from last year's budget and had a look to see how much the state expected to get from the commonwealth. In last year's budget, the budget paper showed that the state expected to get \$8.235 billion for 2014-15. Lo and behold, in this year's budget it shows that the state will get \$8.269 billion. It is a fair while ago since I studied arithmetic but by my calculation that is an increase of \$34 million.

In Budget Paper 3, I draw members' attention to table 3.1 on page 42 and table 3.13 on page 55, and I draw their attention to the exact same tables with the same numbers (on different page numbers possibly) in last year's budget, and they can review what I am saying for themselves. Notwithstanding that the minister, the Treasurer and the Premier are claiming that all their budgetary problems are because of changes to the federal revenue stream, the reality is that that revenue stream for the state this financial year, according to the Treasurer's budget papers, will be \$34 million more in the financial year that we have just entered than what we were expecting 12 months ago.

Let me say that one of the big problems in managing anything is that if you deny reality you will never ever make the correct decisions, and that is what this government has now been doing for 12 years—it has been denying reality. The reality is that this government has been fiscally inept, to put it mildly. In the early days of this government the revenue streams increased dramatically above expectations.

The Labor government in the early 2000s did not have the wit to understand that that was an aberration. They did not have the wit to understand that that was not going to go on forever and ever, so they spent and spent and spent every cent that came in. Yes, we did have the global financial crisis which changed the way the world operated in 2008. It did all of a sudden put the brakes on the revenue stream flowing into the Treasury coffers. Former treasurer Foley had some little understanding, I believe, of what he was facing.

It was Daniel Wills in *The Advertiser* on the Saturday following the release of the current budget, I think (or it might have even been the Saturday before), who pointed out that in 2010 treasurer Foley had budgeted to cut the public sector by 4,000 full-time equivalents. He said, 'We have to do this. We have to put some restraints on our expenditure. We have to get the budget back to a sustainable level.'

Of course, treasurer Foley has disappeared, those decisions were overturned, those cuts were never fulfilled and, indeed, in the meantime the public sector has continued to grow. In the interim, it has gone up by about another 1,400 full-time equivalents, if Daniel Wills from *The Advertiser* has his numbers right. There is a turnaround of 5,400 full-time equivalents between treasurer Foley's 2010 budget and where we find ourselves going into the 2014-15 financial year.

Just those two decisions—one not to go ahead with those announced cuts of former treasurer Foley and the other one to continue to grow the public sector—I argue would be having more impact on the state's budgetary position than anything the commonwealth government has done, bearing in mind, as I have just pointed out, the commonwealth government's decisions have not had any impact on the position of the state budget for 2014-15, according to the Treasurer's budget papers, and I quoted the source a moment ago.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: I quoted the source a moment ago: Budget Paper 3, table 3.13. The Treasurer might have a look at that. I want to spend the next little time talking about some of the impacts on South Australia and the way South Australians live because of the budgetary decisions this government has made over the last 12 years, the foolish way that it has spent money and its inability to have reserves to do sensible things.

For a while now, the Treasurer has been the Minister for Mineral Resources, and he is great at talking up the minerals industry. I had the shadow portfolio for a reasonable time over the last 10 years, and I think there is considerable potential for a significant resources industry in South Australia. One of the things I have argued for many years now is that we need a deep-sea port. Has this government done anything to support that? Apart from talk, it has done absolutely nothing. Proposals have sat on ministers' desks for years and not been actioned. The private sector has wanted to move, but it has been frustrated and thwarted.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Who? Name one.

Mr WILLIAMS: Flinders Ports.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I just remind you both that it is—

Mr WILLIAMS: When they have come up with the proposal—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are unparliamentary, and it is not parliamentary to respond to interjections.

Mr WILLIAMS: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. There was a proposal put to government a number of years ago, and the then minister for infrastructure told the proponents, 'We're not going to give you a concession to build a deep-sea port at Point Bonython or in that vicinity. We're not going to give you a concession to build a port there unless we go to a public tender.' So they went through a public tender process, and the proposal sat and sat and sat. I think it was well over 12 months that that process held that project up—in fact, I suspect it was a couple of years. When the original proponents got the nod and said—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Oh, they did get the nod.

Mr WILLIAMS: They did get the nod after a couple of years.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I just want to remind the house that the Speaker has taken his question time scoresheet with him, but I am sure he will be listening to me asking him to return the question time scoresheet so that we can just make sure that anything that is interjected or carried on from here can be added to the lunchtime score. Member for MacKillop.

Mr WILLIAMS: The reality is that there was a solid movement some years ago to get on with that job and nothing has happened. The result of that is that the Cairn Hill project has now closed down, with a loss of jobs. Why did it close down? Because there is a lack of facilities in South Australia to support a minerals industry and they had to cart their product in 40-foot shipping containers, individually loaded out the other side of Coober Pedy, by train to Outer Harbor, accumulate them until they had a shipload, then wait for a ship to come in, lift them up one at a time and unload them into the ship.

Third World country infrastructure, Third World country processes—that is why IMX Resources is not operating and those people are not employed today. Anybody who has an understanding of the minerals sector knows that that is just one of many projects which would be underway if we had a government that over the last 12 years had moved on getting a deep-sea port constructed here in South Australia.

The member for Heysen spoke just a little while ago and talked about the Motor Accident Commission. This is, I think, one of the most disingenuous things this government has done. They went to an election only a few months ago saying, 'There will be no significant privatisations,' or, 'No privatisations of any significant government enterprises or businesses in South Australia.' That is what they said.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: That's right.

Mr WILLIAMS: Well, the MAC is not insignificant. Only a couple of months after the election, after the government had set it up 12 months ago (I have no doubt that the government has been working on this project for well over a year and probably a couple of years), the government has come out and announced that it is going to wind up the Motor Accident Commission, put out the work to the private sector and, lo and behold, there will be about \$500 million in cash that we can put into our pocket, back into the Treasury coffers, and that is going to shore up our bottom line.

I suspect that at the end of the day it will be a lot more than that: it could be close to double that, and I suspect that it will be somewhere between \$800 million and a billion dollars. The people of South Australia certainly were not informed of the government's clear intent, and that is another reason I say that this government does not have a mandate for the sorts of things it is doing.

We have had this debate on the car park tax for a long time, but the Premier gets up on almost a daily basis and talks about a vibrant city and that we are encouraging people to come into the city. What does he do? He puts on a car park tax. To me, that is counterintuitive. You want to build something in the city and you want people to come into it, but then you tax them for the privilege of bringing their car into the city.

We want to encourage them to use public transport. Okay, so the people will come into the city on public transport for their entertainment. What do you do then? We tax their tickets to the entertainment venues. The poor people of South Australia will be wondering what the hell they can do to stop themselves being taxed by this Treasurer and this government. It is a nonsense for the Premier to say that he wants to see a vibrant city, yet on the other hand he will tax anybody, in any way he can, who wants to come into the city. It is an absolute nonsense.

In the few minutes I have left I want to talk about a couple of things in my electorate; one is the forestry sector. It has come to my attention recently that now whole log from forests which were previously controlled by the state are being exported from the South-East, through the port of Portland, at such a rate that the port of Portland cannot cope with them, and whole log, which used to be sawn, milled and processed in the South-East, is now being carted and shipped out of Port Adelaide because the port of Portland cannot keep up.

It cannot accommodate the quantity of whole log, unprocessed raw material, which is now being shipped off into Asia to be processed. That in itself is a crime. When I go around the southern part of my electorate and the electorate of Mount Gambier next door and see the number of jobs that have been lost in that timber industry in the last few years, it is a crime.

One other matter I wish to raise in the minute or two I have left relates to the drainage network in the South-East, because this government announced a few years ago that it wanted to impose another tax. Again, I read from the Treasurer's Budget Paper 3, page 84, under the heading 'Management of assets and liabilities':

Each agency establishes, implements and maintains its own asset management plan to ensure assets are deployed efficiently and effectively in the delivery of programs.

There is a drainage system in the South-East of the state. It was conceived well over 100 years ago, in the first instance to aid transport across a very wet area, and particularly to link in an efficient way the growing community of Mount Gambier with the community here in Adelaide. In the meantime, it has assisted in the building of transport corridors right across that region and opened up a lot of country for agricultural pursuit.

I am told that the value of that drainage system is about \$250 million. A large part of the value is bridges and other structures in the system, and the government has ripped \$5.4 million a year out the funding for that particular drainage network. Indeed, the government handed over the management and operation of the upper South-East scheme of which I think about \$3 million a year was going into the Department of Environment when it was managing it. It has now handed the

management of that over to the drainage board in the South-East with not one additional dollar, and expecting that very important system to continue to operate.

This government has once again highlighted that it has the wrong priorities, that it cannot manage the economy of South Australia, and it continues to make poor decisions. Every South Australian will be the worse off, unfortunately for another four years. I come back to where I started: hopefully, we can do something about the electoral system to allow the people of South Australia to have their way.

Time expired.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (16:37): I rise to speak in support of the Appropriation Bill 2014. The state Labor government is determined to deliver on its election commitments. For anyone who says there is little difference between the Labor and Liberal parties, they need to look no further than the differences between the Abbott Liberal government's federal budget and the Weatherill Labor government's state budget. The contrast is stark.

The federal budget is based on the shredding of agreements and the ripping up of commitments in health and education and the tearing down of protection for our most vulnerable citizens. The measures in this mean-spirited budget are so divisive to our social fabric that ironically, since it was handed down, they have been uniting people from a wide range of backgrounds across Australia to protest against it.

People have been coming together around Australia to protest its cuts and their impact, and in Adelaide, at 11.30am this Sunday, concerned members of our community will meet in Victoria Square to have their voices heard. This should be of no surprise as Mr Abbott's and Mr Hockey's gifts to the nation include:

- \$7 extra to visit the doctor;
- \$5 more to buy prescriptions medicines;
- many young unemployed under the age of 30 to be without income support for six months a year;
- a tax on the age and disability support pensions;
- university fees rising;
- super increases frozen at 9.5 per cent;
- work until you are 70;
- billions cut from state education budgets; and
- billions cut from state health budgets.

On the other hand, the South Australian state budget introduces measures to shield our pensioners and low-income earners from these cruel cuts—those in our society in our communities that are the most vulnerable. It builds on investments in health and education, infrastructure and skills.

The Weatherill government is delivering on our commitment to our schoolchildren and our families through the Gonski funding, despite Prime Minister Tony Abbott's, and the member for Sturt, Christopher Pyne's, trashing of the historic deal that they committed to honour in the lead-up to the federal election. We are increasing our investment in health care, building a new and much needed neonatal unit at the Flinders Medical Centre and continuing to construct our new state-of-the-art Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Our government is going ahead with the rollout of the National Disability Insurance Scheme which, just yesterday, reached an important milestone with the start of a new age group, with children six years old entering the trial. Meanwhile, the Abbott/Hockey budget slashes a whopping \$898 million from health and hospitals, schools and skills, and concession funding in South Australia over the next four years. Mr Abbott and the Liberals have ripped more than \$120 million over that time from concession payments to South Australians. It is of great concern that the real effect of the federal budget takes us down the path of the American pay-as-you-go health and education systems.

Funding under the national partnership on certain concessions helps pensioners and low-income earners with free public transport and water, energy and sewerage concessions. In a further act of thumbing their noses at South Australians, the Liberals have withdrawn from this partnership. They do not care. In real terms, this means that, as of yesterday, pensioners and low-income earners would have received around \$200 less in concession payments per year. In my electorate of Torrens, there are many pensioners and low-income earners who would be affected by a loss or reduction in concessions. I know it is a cut they can ill afford.

Fortunately, the Weatherill Labor government will step in and guarantee this funding for the next 12 months to ensure these pensioners and low-income earners will continue to access the same level of concessions as before. Those opposite need to convince their federal colleagues that their slash and burn approach is the wrong way to go when it impacts so heavily on those in our communities who are so vulnerable.

Labor has also made an election commitment to raise the energy concession and the medical and heating cooling rebate by \$50 from 1 July, and will honour that commitment. This move will increase to \$215 the amount available each year for eligible recipients. We will join with advocacy groups to fight the federal Liberals' heartless cuts into the future. Labor's move to shore up concessions means that those who rely on energy use for medical purposes will be able to do so without falling into further debt.

The 2014 state budget also includes a previously agreed Gonski funding commitment of an extra \$72.3 million over the forward estimates for South Australian schools. This increases to an extra \$229.9 million over the full six years of the agreement. Meanwhile, in Canberra, Prime Minister Tony Abbott, with the member for Sturt Christopher Pyne's support, is ripping an estimated \$335 million out of our schoolchildren's hands over the six full years of the agreement. This equates to around 3,900 student support officers or nearly 3,000 additional teachers—student support officers and teachers that we will not have. The cuts to years five and six equate to an average of \$1,280 per student.

As a former teacher and as a member of this parliament, I am appalled that the federal Coalition government could toy with our children's futures in this way, reducing them to nothing more than a budget line. Those opposite should be taking their federal colleagues to task over this.

This government wants our children to have a real opportunity to succeed. Gonski reforms are about addressing the needs of every school-aged student, and that is why we want to see the federal funding cuts reversed. We will continue to campaign against the Abbott government's brutal cuts which have impacted on our state government.

The Weatherill Labor government has proved its willingness to reach across the political divide in the interest of the betterment of our state. This government has held its nerve in the face of the federal government's 'trash and torch' mentality and will continue to invest in a brighter future for South Australia. I should acknowledge that yesterday the Leader of the Opposition did share one idea with us in this place—that we become more like Queensland. The member for Dunstan said:

I had a great opportunity to meet with Campbell Newman over the weekend and look at what he has done. When we look at what he promised and what he has delivered, they are two completely different numbers, but they are not in the wrong direction: they are actually underpromising and overdelivering.

That is what the Leader of the Opposition said. Overdelivering? Really? Tell that to the tens of thousands of workers who have lost their jobs under the watch of the Queensland Liberal National Party. Unemployment is up since the LNP won government in Queensland. In their 2012 budget, the government sacked an estimated 20,000 workers, once cuts in government-owned businesses and job losses for non-government organisations are taken into account. This was despite their Premier telling government workers before the 2012 election that they had nothing to fear.

In the previous two budgets in Queensland, they have had cuts to health and education funding, nurses and teachers losing their jobs, cuts to front-line health services delivered by community groups, cuts to funding for 500 not-for-profit groups in the community services sector, more than 400 positions abolished in the TAFE system, cuts totalling \$3 billion over four years in the health system, 4,000 jobs cut in hospitals and other parts of the health system, a tax on public housing tenants, and the scrapping of tenant advisory services. That is only a small example of what has happened in Queensland.

Household spending, business investment and private investment are all weaker in Queensland under the LNP, and the Leader of the Opposition put them up yesterday as a good example. State final demand or domestic spending in the economy is expected to contract over the coming year in Queensland, with business investment falling by 20 per cent.

Back to the South Australian budget, Business SA says there is good news for business from this state budget, including that there are no increased or new direct taxes. Chief executive officer Nigel McBride said:

The government has honoured its commitment in last year's budget by maintaining the payroll concessions for small business, the stamp duty concessions on off-the-plan apartments and the First Home Owners Grant.

An additional concession is a housing grant for people aged over 60 years of age who want to purchase a new home to live in.

These concession should assist the housing industry in particular.

Mr McBride also said:

Other positives are the commitment to infrastructure spending on projects such as the north-south corridor.

From the South Australian Council of Social Services (SACOSS) came the following response to the South Australia government's budget:

Given the economic challenges around the closure of Holden, and recent federal budget cuts—

I reiterate, the recent federal budget cuts—

the Weatherill government appears to have cushioned vulnerable and disadvantaged South Australians from the harshest parts of its budget.

Key initiatives that seek to protect low-income households include the retention of concessions for the emergency services levy, the maintaining of council rate concessions despite federal government cuts, and guaranteeing no water price increases as a result of the debt transfer to SA Water.

The Weatherill government has worked hard to get the balance right between investments and saving, between fostering growth and providing a shield and showing compassion for our most disadvantaged. We went to the election with a series of commitments to build a stronger South Australia, and that is what we intend to do.

Among other things, the 2014-15 state budget includes the construction of a second high school in the city, to be built on the current Royal Adelaide Hospital site, with a capacity for 1,000 students. The budget also provides for a new ambulance station in my electorate, in the Northfield area, which will service the growing surrounding suburbs, better support neighbouring crews, and improve emergency response times.

The state Labor government is investing in employment through Our Jobs Plan, an initiative which provides \$60.1 million over five years for a range of measures to revitalise and rebuild the state economy following the decision by GM Holden to close its vehicle manufacturing operations in Australia by 2017. The government is investing in child development, with the expansion of services and more allied health services to address the needs of parents and their children through our children's centre network, including at the Gilles Plains Children's Centre in my own electorate.

At James Nash House at Oakden our government is honouring another election commitment with \$400,000 per annum indexed for the creation of a specialist unit for patients with an intellectual disability. This will provide more appropriate treatment and care for forensic patients with an intellectual disability and a better opportunity for them to return to the community. The government will also extend the O-Bahn and electrify the train line to Salisbury as part of the revitalisation of our public transport system.

I have highlighted just some of the government's initiatives in the 2014 state budget, and there are many more positives. I commend this bill to the house.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (16:50): I take this opportunity to speak about some areas I am responsible for as shadow education, employment and skills minister. I am looking forward to seeing members opposite protesting in the streets about the extension to the efficiency dividends that were announced in the education budget by the Treasurer.

If you recall last year's budget, \$223 million in efficiency savings were announced in the forward estimates, and this was well before there was even a change of government in Canberra. These cuts were spelt out in the Budget and Finance Committee by Julieann Riedstra, who is the person responsible for managing the books, if you like, in the education department. She listed a number of budget savings initiatives or targets, if you like, from 2012-13 right through until 2016-17. They totalled \$223 million, which just happens to be the exact same amount over a four-year period that the government has said is their funding, their share, of the so-called Gonski or Better Schools funding model, but they are delivering that over six years.

What we learnt from the Budget and Finance Committee was that what the government takes with one hand it gives with the other, but in the meantime it is giving it over a longer period. So \$223 million has been taken over four years from the education budget. This year, we learnt that efficiency dividends are being brought forward by 12 months to begin from 2015-16, next year that is \$8.5 million in that year alone, so that is a total of \$28.5 million over the forward estimates on top of the figures that were given to the Budget and Finance Committee on 18 November last year. Those figures were confirmed by Mr Harrison, the CEO of the Department for Education and Child Development, on commercial breakfast radio just a few weeks later when he was asked about those budget savings.

What is extraordinary about those budget savings is that on numerous occasions now I have asked the education minister if she could explain where those savings are coming from because the savings in the first year, for example, are \$8.7 million and are so-called specified savings, so I think I and certainly teachers and parents are entitled to know where those specified savings are coming from, but \$21.483 million are unspecified savings. Even though that financial year is now complete, we are still none the wiser as to where those unspecified savings have come from. Every year, as we move forward in the forward estimates those savings are larger.

The specified savings grow by a smaller amount but the unspecified savings grow by a much larger amount. For example, in 2014-15 we have specified savings of \$10.5 million moving up to unspecified savings of \$39.6 million, and that gives us a total savings target of \$50.1 million. The following year, the total savings target is \$65 million; \$53.5 million are unspecified, so in other words we still do not know where they are coming from. It is interesting that the education minister can run around the state telling everybody what they are not going to get, but she cannot tell any of us in this chamber what these unspecified cuts to her own budget are. It is an extraordinary situation.

I think I also need to remind the house that it is not the federal government that allocates funding to individual schools. That is what the education department or the minister does and, from the reports I have been getting from principals, that job is being done and being countersigned by the Australian Education Union here in South Australia. That additional funding is coming in from Canberra, an increase of 37 per cent over the forward estimates, and where that money is going is determined by the minister and the Australian Education Union. That is what I have been advised in relation to that process.

The savings cuts that were announced at the last budget were for FTE savings of 387.7 full-time equivalents. So how is it that the government is telling us that they are spending more money on education, that they are honouring their commitment in relation to the so-called Gonski funding, but there will be 400 fewer teachers in the education system here in South Australia by 2016-17?

I can remember seeing the advertisements on television. I can remember seeing the newsreels of Correna Haythorpe saying, 'We need those extra teachers for numeracy and literacy for our kids in schools.' The first question that I asked myself as the shadow education minister was: what on earth are teachers teaching if they are not teaching numeracy and literacy in primary schools now? Why do we need numeracy and literacy specialists in primary schools?

As a parent. I expected my kids to learn numeracy and literacy with their primary school teacher, and they did. They did learn numeracy and literacy. They had a great education at Unley Primary School. So it is just extraordinary that we hear this excuse from the left in particular that more money will fix it. The fact is that education funding has doubled in the last 15-odd years, and here in South Australia in particular we have seen a deterioration of academic results, whether they be NAPLAN results or international PISA results.

Another point I want to make is about the smoke and mirrors around the funding for the new city high school. This is in the budget papers—\$85 million has been allocated or announced, yet

there is only \$51 million in the budget. If you read the budget papers, you will see that of that total \$85 million for the new school, \$54.26 million was taken from other projects. I wonder whether the minister will run around telling those schools that they were going to get a new recreation block, that they were going to get new classrooms, that it was in the plan, but 'for political expediency, we are going to deliver what the people of Adelaide don't want, and that is a high school on the Royal Adelaide Hospital site'.

Remember, this was a big battle in the seat of Adelaide. I can remember the Attorney-General on election night—when they took the results of one booth thinking that they had won the seat of Adelaide—saying, 'This election in Adelaide was all about the school. This proves that our decision to build the school on the Royal Adelaide Hospital site is what the people of Adelaide wanted. That's what they voted for.' But guess what? Some more booths came in and they lost.

As a matter of fact, they only managed to take 1 per cent of the massive 15 per cent swing that the member for Adelaide got in 2010 on the same issue: on a second city campus for Adelaide High School. They only managed to take 1 per cent from the very hardworking member for Adelaide. It is extraordinary that they are now insisting that that is what the people of Adelaide wanted when their very own Attorney-General on election night in his commentary on what was happening in the seat of Adelaide said that it was all about the school and that is why they won.

Of course, they did not win the seat of Adelaide. So why on earth are they imposing this school on the people of Adelaide when they were voting for a second campus of Adelaide High School on West Terrace, just like they voted for a second campus of Adelaide High School when the Bowden site was available, which was our policy in 2010.

What did Labor do to counter that policy? In the last three or four days before the election in 2010, they announced an expansion of Adelaide High School by 250. They said that 250 students will attend Adelaide High School from 2013. Guess what? There is not a single extra student in that school in 2014—not a single extra student. Next year, when the expansion is going to be finished they are only taking 50 year 8 students.

The zone was supposed to be expanded into the City of Prospect. There are 150 or 180 grade 7s who leave the primary schools in the City of Prospect every year, but they are only taking 50 students. What a con job on the people of Adelaide. They were smart enough to realise back in 2010 that that was nothing more than a reactive response to a good policy for a second city campus at Adelaide High School, and they were proved right because, here they are, 18 months after this government told them that their children would be attending Adelaide High School, and there is still not an extra student in that high school and people in Prospect are still not in the zone.

That is exactly what is going to happen with the second city campus. We have already heard from the building unions who are building the new site that they believe the new site is 12 months behind schedule—and do not forget they have to move the hospital out before they can do any work on building a school, yet we have been told that this school will be open by 2019. The fact is that the only significant thing that is going to happen in 2019 is that that is the year that all 250 extra students will be at Adelaide High School—not 2013, as was promised by Labor at the last election. It will be 2019 before those extra 250 students who were promised nine years earlier that they would have access to that school will be there.

I want to touch on the area of TAFE, and I am looking forward to hearing what the member for Torrens, who was so critical of the 400 job losses in TAFE in Queensland, is going to say about the 380 job losses there have been at TAFE since the corporatisation of TAFE in 2012 and the 400 job losses earmarked for TAFE in the budget. I would love to see her set up that process; I would love to be there.

This is the hypocrisy of the Labor Party: 'You spend your money, we won't spend ours.' The Labor Party is very good at spending other people's money. It is an extraordinary situation. You promise the world to get yourself elected and then come up with all sorts of excuses. You blame a nine-month-old government in Canberra for your 12 years of fiscal mismanagement and poor management here in South Australia.

Of course, there were more criticisms of the federal government about the changes to the funding arrangements for university students. One of the things that was announced by the federal government was that HECS fees would be available to non-university students. We are opening it

up to any student who is doing tertiary education. What a great idea—criticised, of course, by the left, but guess what? It is going to be taken up by TAFE.

TAFE in South Australia are already expecting less Skills for All funding, but they are not worried about it because kids will be able to take out student loans under this new expanded HECS scheme. So, there they are, banking on the fact that students will take out loans so they can go to TAFE while this government has cut \$90 million in one year out of the skills training budget. I refer members opposite to the budget papers and to read that information for themselves and then I will join them when they are on the steps of Parliament House protesting about training cuts and TAFE cuts in the South Australian budget.

It is an extraordinary situation, the extraordinary hypocrisy we have from the Labor Party. They came to office in Canberra seven years ago with a \$20 billion surplus and \$50 billion in the bank, and they leave with \$600 billion for other people to pay, yet it is all Abbott's fault. It is an extraordinary situation. All care and no responsibility—that is the Labor Party and that is the trade union movement, which is the basis, of course, of the Labor Party.

An interesting statistic for those of you who are listening is that in the days of the Whitlam government, when about 75 per cent of the workforce was unionised, 17 per cent of the Whitlam cabinet was from a union background. Now, of course, in the general workforce, 17 per cent of the workforce is unionised if you combine the private sector and the public sector; 75 per cent of the Gillard/Rudd government were from a union background. They are a really balanced group of people over there, and there is no difference here.

An honourable member: Your brother.

Mr PISONI: My brother, yes, of course, but he did not get elected. When you do pick a good one, you put him in an unwinnable seat. Extraordinary situation. So, just one senator elected and, boy, is Don Farrell pissed off about that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me, did I hear you say something that—

Mr PISONI: 'Tissed off,' I said, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Oh, right. You had your back to me; that's why I didn't hear it—but, anyway.

An honourable member: That's not even a word; you will probably have to withdraw that for not being a word.

Mr PISONI: Or find something it relates to. I have a few more minutes and I think it is important that I speak about the academic results in South Australia. We used to be a leader of education here in South Australia. I visited Blackfriars Priory School a couple of years ago and they were good enough to put a morning tea on when I arrived. I was speaking to the teachers and one of them came up to me and said, 'David, I want you to know, my husband and I are both teachers. We came to South Australia 15 years ago because we wanted to be at the cutting edge of education.'

That is why they came to South Australia, and it is a long way from that now. She felt she had to tell me that, she was so disappointed in what has happened in recent years. What has happened in that period of time? With the PISA results—which is international testing predominantly in science and maths achievement and so forth—in South Australia in 2000 we were the best performing state in the country, yet last year's PISA results came in and we were the worst performing mainland state in the country.

How on earth can that happen? How can it be that in the first year of NAPLAN results in 2008 we met the national average in five out of 20 categories, and last year we met the national average in one out of 20 categories, and that is on the back of not meeting the national average in any category in the previous year, and in the year before that. So, in 2012 and in 2011 we did not meet the national average in a single category.

What did Queensland do in 2008 when they got a shock from their NAPLAN results? They completely changed the way they did business in 2008. That was a Labor government and you have to give credit where credit is due, member for Mount Gambier. They took immediate action. They were shocked that on a national comparison their students were bouncing on the bottom.

Well, guess what? Queensland is improving, Western Australia is improving, South Australia is going backwards. We are getting worse results now in the fifth year of NAPLAN testing than we got in the first year of NAPLAN testing. And what do they do? Every time there is a NAPLAN result, a new literacy program is announced, run by bureaucrats out of central office. They do not tell us how the last one went. Well, I suppose the NAPLAN tests tell us how they went. It is an extraordinary situation. They keep doing things the same and expecting a different result.

So, this is a disappointing budget for South Australians. It is a disappointing budget for education and employment in particular—20,000 jobs have left South Australia since the last budget. It is a sad day and, for someone who is the father of young adults, it is very tough getting a job out there; I can tell you that right now. It is extremely tough. The only way that we are going to improve that situation is to get confidence in the business sector, and give them the confidence to make that investment to employ somebody.

Getting the first job is the hardest. It took me 100 job applications when I was 16 to get that first job. It is a bloody hard thing to do. But, of course, once you get there, the world is your oyster, once you can say you have that experience. Unfortunately under this government our young people are not getting those opportunities, and it is a crying shame when you consider what this state has to offer, and it is simply because of the poor management we have, the people who are running this place, that we are not reaching our full potential.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (17:09): It is a pleasure to also contribute to the debate. I have not deliberately waited until the end but I do like to have the opportunity to listen to the contributions from both sides and to put some objective assessment to it and try to find some ground there. It is not always easy to do.

There are two very philosophical differences here, I think, as well. I have listened to the contribution from the member for Torrens. As a person who, when living in Adelaide, resides in the electorate of the member for Torrens, I wanted to listen to her first contribution to the budget. It is a total focus upon federal actions without me hearing an acceptance of decisions and actions of state responsibility also in past years which have created the necessity for actions to be occurring now and into the future years, too.

For example, there have been a lot of actions taken and decisions made by government ministers in recent years where I am aware of some very disappointing decisions about withdrawing dollars from NGOs for mental health providers in my own electorate. They are small in dollars but they make an enormous difference to people. That is disappointing. We all have examples where we can quote frustrations that exist.

Is government perfect? Far from it, absolutely, no matter who is elected. I do not believe any government is perfect because there will never be the level of resources required to provide what society expects now. So, with that, I recognise that the Treasurer has had some challenges as a first term, can I say, Treasurer, after somewhat of a succession of treasurers in recent years. He has been faced with some enormous challenges for the future years and across the forward estimates which have required some hard decisions.

It is fair to say, though, that I do not accept the contribution from the member for Waite last evening. He is a person I have known for some time and I listened to him intently. I declare my hand that I was not in the chamber at the time listening to him firsthand but I listened to him in my office. He seemed to me a very different man from the one I have heard speak quite often in the last eight years, and he is someone for whom I had a lot of respect.

I want to put some of his direct quotes which frustrated the life out of me. He talked about a very brave budget and about not putting the dollars on the credit card. However, with the level of debt that we have—and he spoke about debt, and there is a reasonable level of debt for all governments to assume—this is an enormous responsibility upon future generations to pay it back. It will take a concerted effort and a period of outstanding economic growth in the economy to be able to afford to pay what we owe now. It will be very difficult.

A radio commentary yesterday morning noted that yesterday marked 100 days since the new government was elected. That was the reason I asked the member for Frome the question today about the major projects fund within the regional development funding program and why there was a delay in the announcement of it. I, like the member for Frome, agree absolutely totally that there is

a need for investment to occur. Government has to be a prime driver of it; the budget has to be a prime driver of investment and policy and hope for the future for the community.

Why, in such a key area, where there is \$8.55 million available—and the frustration there is that we have only known the split of this \$15 million fund for the last month; what the different components of it are—has it taken 100 days since presumably the agreement was reached between the member for Frome and the Premier, for the announcement to be made on where the dollars are to be spent and for the guidelines for the last two areas to be released so the money can be put out there?

That is where I think I have the frustration. That is a deliberate action. To me the level of urgency that should have been attached to this area has not been displayed—I am not quite so sure but it has to occur. We have to make sure that the money is out there; the guidelines are in place; yes, the KPIs that we measure against it are there; and that there are strong results from it. I want to know what the job outcomes from it will be, because it is people on the ground that need the dollars to be available. Industry, private enterprise and community groups need to be able to actually seek these dollars and raise their own capital to go towards it, and make sure the outcomes are positive ones.

I looked through the numbers that are contained in the budget and looked at what the cost of living pressures will be. There was a press release from the Liberal Party earlier this week that talked about a \$1,100 increase per household, and there are a lot of components that make that up.

On Wednesday of last week I had a visit into the electorate office from a couple who live in Kadina. They came to see me about electricity increases. That is symptomatic of probably all members in this chamber who are contacted quite regularly about cost of living pressures. It is for the average South Australian and the average household—yes, we look at sums and we consider whether the sums are acceptable, are they too large, are they manageable or is it going to be a challenge, but it comes out of people's pockets. That is what Treasurers and ministers have to understand and accept the responsibility attached to it.

The fiscal responsibility that comes in delivering what budget papers say—the commitments that are actually in place—has to translate into the actions necessary to make those visions become a reality. It is extremely difficult out there. The member for Torrens—and rightly so—referred to her electorate, the community and the challenges that they face. I can assure the member for Torrens that that is replicated in all 47 electorates. No matter where you are, how close you may be to the CBD area, what distance is involved, what financial circumstances you are under, it changes seemingly on a month by month basis because of pressures that are created through cost of living pressures, and it is becoming exceptionally hard.

In a state that has one of the older populations in the nation, there will be increasing pressure upon us that the parliament, I hope in a bipartisan way, looks to solve, to come up with a solution and put in a place a plan where you do not have such significant increases. Off the top of my head, I think water costs in the last 12 years have gone from \$280 per average home to \$790—that is a threefold increase. Incomes have not risen by the same level, which creates a pressure on people, no matter what their earning opportunity is, to meet their commitments.

I think we are very lucky as a society that interest rates are relatively low. Historically, when we look at it, it is a low rate. There would be a lot more people out there under significant mortgage pressure if interest rates were to increase, and I am pleased that the Reserve Bank has kept the official cash rate at 2.5 per cent, which is relatively low. However, a lot of people will feel the pinch when, no doubt, there will be an improvement in worldwide and national economies and there will be pressure to increase it, which will create challenges for us. We have to be ready to respond to that. That is where policies have to exist within government and capacities have to exist within budgets to ensure that we can get people the support that they need.

I am an optimist by nature. I am a believer in there being a wonderful future for us. I am a believer that hard work is rewarded. I am a believer that our young people will be outstanding and will be great community leaders. If I did not believe in that, it would be rather challenging psychologically to even get up every day, and especially to come into this place. The parliament has to provide a fulcrum for it.

As much as people steer away from politics, they have to respect that politics impacts on their lives every day in some way. The parliament is a rather unique place in South Australia to actually ensure that it can be good, bad or indifferent. That is why we have to have the debates, philosophical differences sometimes and quite strong opinions that will be opposing to each other, but there is an opportunity to find middle ground that will result in outcomes for people.

When I look at the figures, they are really interesting and there are lots and lots of volumes attached to it, and I seem to remember a lot of it, but it is the impact on people that I look at the most. For example, I am pleased that, when it comes to the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme (PATS), there are additional dollars there. I commend the Minister for Health in ensuring that the dollars are there.

For those of us who live in regional areas, for a lot of our community there is some level of health problems which require visits outside of our locality. Most of that is provided in Adelaide, and I understand why, but it means transport when quite often it is not easy for them to transport themselves or, even if it is, they need some level of financial support. The PAT Scheme exists to provide good for people.

The Minister for Health has done the right thing. When he had the review, he committed to extra dollars. My recollection is that there is no limit on spend; it all depends on applications that are lodged. For the life of me, I hope the money continues to be there and that the review of the conditions and guidelines for PATS allows more people to get some level of financial support, particularly for those who might need some level of care attached to them or who might have to stay overnight. I think the compensation for overnight accommodation was very low, and I hope that has been reviewed, too, and the per kilometre return rate. That is a good thing.

The great shame and disappointment for me is the level of unemployment. The member for Frome and I share a boundary, and we have a commitment to the regional communities we serve. It must be really disappointing for the member for Frome, as it is for me, that unemployment in our part of regional South Australia is, I think, 9.4 per cent.

I would hope that those people would want to have a future and a chance. In short, they have to be provided with an opportunity for that chance to exist. That is why it has been really important to me that the member for Frome, with his agreement with the Premier, roll that money out, and I am pleased that some has come out. There is still the Job Accelerator Fund of \$10 million, which is for the 2014-15 year; we are two days into it already, yet we have still not seen the criteria and the guidelines attached to it.

Similarly, when it comes to a portfolio responsibility for Regional Development Australia dollars, I am a very strong believer in the network. Indeed, I was quite pleased that the minister spoke on a motion in this chamber in the last sitting week, and I was pleased that he put his position on the record. It is absolutely key to me that it is sorted out. There are small dollar costs to the government, but it is a great opportunity for a lot more investment to occur in the region by using the skills and the knowledge those people have. They need the surety of the core funding agreement—it has to be there.

I do not want to talk about the member for Waite much more, as I referred to him and some of his commentary at the start. It is fair to say that quite often circumstances that exist around us put governments in very difficult situations, and some rather challenging priorities need to be determined.

In recent years, there have been announcements of cuts across all budgets. I know that in health it is getting towards \$1 billion across the forward estimates that needs to be created. I quote the member for Torrens, being one of the more recent contributions, about the level of withdrawal of funding from the federal government. On the figures I have seen, yes, there has been a change in agreements—I absolutely understand that. The figures I have seen show an increase in the federal government contribution towards grants funding that comes into South Australia increasing (and some may choose to correct me), from a \$7.8 billion figure this current year up to \$9.8 billion at the end of the forward estimates.

It is a fraction over a 25 per cent increase in that four-year time frame of money that is coming in from the federal government. That reflects some changes to agreements and some slight reductions in what was previously agreed with a different federal government on financial support to come into South Australia, but it shows in pure dollar terms a 25 per cent increase in a four-year

period to support the provision of services in South Australia. That is a stated fact and it has to be acknowledged.

There are a lot of different issues that are pulled out of budget papers, but I am disappointed when I look at the cost of screening for our volunteers; some may consider it to be a relatively small amount, but my understanding is that it has gone up from \$37.50 to \$41.25, or thereabouts. I think it is a 10 per cent increase in the cost of screening for volunteers. The minister might—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison: It has gone up to \$55.

Mr GRIFFITHS: From \$50. For some, it depends if they work; for some, if they are pure volunteers; and for some, if they are associated with children. There is a different fee structure in place, but my understanding is that across the board there has been a 10 per cent increase. I know the minister in parliament just yesterday referred to the 112,000 requests for review that were lodged in the last calendar year, the 66 per cent increase and the additional resources provided to that.

One of the frustrations I have had as a representative of the people is the number of times I have had to write to the Minister for Volunteers about a community group that has approached me rather frustrated about the need for the multiples that have been required for the different services. I put on the record that I appreciated the contact made with me by the minister and the opportunity for a briefing this morning with her and her officers, and I understood the circumstances surrounding that.

I do believe that the minister is going to give it her all, and I hope, indeed, that the relationship that exists with the shadow minister will allow some benefits to flow through to all so that we can work in a bipartisan way because it is absolutely one of the more challenging issues—that the screening has to be there to ensure that services are provided by those who make sure we have a safe society. I absolutely understand that, but we have to make sure that there is a practical reality attached to all these things and that we do not make it so difficult for people to actually be involved. The difficult balance with budgets when it comes to pure dollar figures is finding that area in between.

As to the Goyder electorate, I looked expectantly at the budget in the hope there were some investments. Firstly, I looked at the area of schools; I could not find any dollar announcements for projects, but I recognise that 2½ years ago a lot of effort went into what is now a combined primary and high school at Kadina, and it is a great school. I looked for our roads being directly targeted, but I could not find that either. However, I recognise that minister Mullighan is going to be in the area towards the end of July and has agreed to spend a little bit of time with me in the car, driving around and looking at some of the roads, so that will be an interesting time.

It is hard for a member of parliament from an area that is seen as voting one way all the time, even though the numbers change every year and the community's expectations are increasing all the time, because I want to deliver, like all of you do. I want to make sure that my time in parliament, with the honour provided to me, actually translates into investment occurring in the community—we all want that.

I understand that in the broad picture there are significant budgets in so many different areas that deliver services across all 47 electorates, but we all need to ensure that the lasting legacy of our time in this place is that some real commitments have been made. Across the political divide, and within political parties, we quite often have this debate about where dollars and resources should be allocated; for me, it comes down to priority and the need of the community. Sometimes that does not stack up in the hurly-burly of the debates that occur relatively close to election time, but it has to be absolutely key.

I just want to finish off with a few comments about the numbers. The probability of an increase in the emergency services levy and the take from the community via property they own over the forward estimates of \$357 million is significant. The Treasurer has talked about the fact that those additional dollars, which are not paid out via the concession or rebate to the ESL anymore, will be put into health.

We know that over \$340 million worth of health investment is still up in the air. It has been previously stated that it would happen, but it is up in the air now and all linked with what the ESL increase will be, but again it is a cost upon people. That is why we have to ensure that the budget actually presents a strong priority to grow the economy. It has to be based around that, and that is where I think there is a significant difference between the Liberal and Labor parties.

We campaigned very strongly in the election only 3½ months ago on the basis of growth of the economy and return for hard work because from that come job opportunities. We have to ensure that job growth is not just the 1 per cent that the budget estimates for the next 12-month period, that it is never allowed to return to the 1.25 per cent loss it experienced over the last 12 months and that it is built upon growth upon growth because from that comes a capacity for the community to benefit. That is what we are here for—to actually ensure that the people we serve, the ones who vote for us, the ones who come and speak to us seemingly every day, and often a lot of repeat conversations occur, are delivered the services in the way in which they need them to be.

I look at the fact that the gross state product is estimated to be across the forward estimates between 2¼ per cent and 2½ per cent. I would love it to be more than that, but at the end of the day I would love it to just be that estimated figure. I know there are probably a lot of others who might make contributions related to the accuracy of estimates that are included in budget figures. There is no doubt that it must be an enormous challenge to get those estimates right, but provision of accurate information is so vital.

For anybody who has worked with numbers before, the numbers are only as good as the basis of the information that allowed you to form those numbers and the quality of the people who do that work. I do not disparage anybody who is involved in the preparation of it, but accuracy is absolutely vital because information empowers the Treasurer, it empowers individual ministers and it ensures that, when a figure is put in a budget, it is achievable and realistic.

Finally, I just want to finish off on the fact that the budget now sets a lot of priorities for individual ministers to adhere to. It will be a challenge for them; I have not seen the challenge met enough in past years. Each one of them individually needs to ensure that they meet their targets on delivery of services, on cost restraint and on revenue opportunities but, overwhelmingly, they need to ensure that the people of South Australia benefit.

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (17:29): I feel somewhat unworthy following the member for Goyder's contribution, in that he gives a very considered analysis of the figures, which I might not be able to do quite such a good job. But, I hope to be able to still give some of my thoughts on the Appropriation Bill which is before us tonight.

I think we are coming to the end of quite a lot of speeches on this bill, and we have heard a lot of the analysis around the specific figures over and over again. It does not make a great story to tell. I do not want to delve into them in too much detail but, by way of introduction, just a few of those figures: the skyrocketing deficit which we are facing in this state and the substantial debt that we are carrying as well; and then, of course, the forward projections—the estimates of what those figures will be into the future.

It is very hard, I suppose, for me in my first budget speech in this place to know accurately how things are going to go in the future. These are always just estimates, but if we look back on what the government's efforts have been historically at making predictions of what is going to come in the future we cannot really rely on those figures. I believe in 2012-13 there was a forecast that we would reach a surplus of \$304 million. It was something that was obviously never attained, and we have been in deficit ever since, and rising deficit.

When we look at those forward estimates and see that in just a few months we are going to be back into a half a billion dollar surplus in 2015-16, it is difficult, given past evidence—and all we have to go on is the past evidence of what this government has served up for us—to believe that we could reach that position of \$512 million in surplus in 2015-16.

However, ever the optimist, we will keep talking up the sort of state that South Australia is and hope that we can get there, because while, in opposition, we do want to hold the government to account over what we see is a woeful economic record, we still do want this state to be in a good economic position in the future, because that means better lives for all of us, but, particularly, better lives for the most vulnerable in society.

That is what I believe the government is here for: to provide a safety net for the most vulnerable in society and to get out of the way of others' daily business and let them get on with their lives. A solid economic performance enables us to provide that very thing: a solid safety net for the most vulnerable in South Australia.

I want to go through some of the things in the budget which I think particularly impact the electorate of Bright and the communities that make up that electorate down in Adelaide's south-west coast. Firstly, I wanted to discuss another topic on which much debate and much discussion has been had during the Appropriation Bill, and that is the emergency services levy and the government's decision to substantially increase that levy.

It has been said time and time again—and I agree with this—that this is tantamount to a land tax being placed on the principal place of residence, and it is designed wholly and solely to fill the black hole created by the state government's historic financial ineptitude. While it is admirable to hear that the additional money gathered through the emergency services levy will be directed towards plugging the black hole in the health budget—and that is where we do want money to be spent—I believe the reason we are in this place in the first place is not because of a reduction in future increases in federal government funding but is actually because of economic mismanagement over the long term by the state Labor government.

As I said, I believe this is a land tax on every single household in South Australia; over 650,000 households will be affected. The member for Dunstan spoke this morning of the impact of this new tax on people who are asset rich but often cash poor. People in regional communities who have land holdings, small businesses that own their premises will be particularly affected, and also many people from my own electorate.

There are many people who are asset-rich in the electorate of Bright, having properties on the face of it in affluent coastal communities but many of these people have purchased houses in these communities quite some time ago and, over the last 15 years or so, have seen rapid increases in the value of those properties and have not necessarily seen that passed on in terms of their own discretionary income.

I think the emergency services levy increase will hit many people who are not rich simply because they own a house in a suburb which results in it being of relatively high value. I think of people in the suburb of North Brighton. North Brighton is a suburb with a very homogenous community because many people have bought into that community to get their children into the zone for the excellent Brighton Secondary School. Many people there have above median house price values and are really doing it tough to be able to get into that school zone, and those are the sort of people who will be particularly hit with the substantial increase in the emergency services levy.

I also want to touch briefly on the loss of concessions on council rates. The electorate of Bright is one of the most elderly in the state in terms of its demographic. Some of the suburbs in Bright have more than a third of their population who are seniors, the suburb of Hove being one of them. The suburb of Brighton has a quarter of its population as seniors, and this is a series of communities which will be very hard hit with the loss of concessions on council rates. I will speak more on council rates later. Some of my concerns come from being someone who has spent time in local government prior to being elected to this place. I may spend some time in a grievance later this evening musing on the state of local government in South Australia and some of the challenges that local government faces.

What we have seen in recent years is that councils year on year increase their council rates by an average of 5 per cent or more, and 5 per cent, 5 per cent, 5 per cent—it is well above inflation—and that is one of the reasons why I was so supportive of the Liberal Party's somewhat controversial policy leading into the state election to put a cap on council rates. I think that is a discussion we need to continue to have because I think council rates are something that really do eat into people's discretionary spending.

When you are eating into people's discretionary spending again and again, you are taking away the dollars they might have to spend on the luxuries which keep our economy going—the holidays they take, the visits they make to the local coffee shop, those extras that they buy, the things that are above the day in day out expenditure on groceries and things like that. When you eat into the discretionary spending, you discourage people from going to the movies, you discourage them from going out for dinner, you discourage them from having a weekend away in the Barossa or the Fleurieu, and those are the very industries, the hospitality and tourism industries and the small businesses, that really suffer when the discretionary dollar is eaten away by ongoing government fees, charges and taxes.

Another issue which I have spoken on in this place and I do not want to bore members with, but it does obviously amuse some people the way it occurred, was the issue of Brighton Rugby Union Football Club. I have talked about the betrayal my community feels with the government's cynical decision to withdraw \$1 million funding promised for that rugby club despite former minister Fox, a minister of the crown, promising in writing—and I keep that letter in my drawer here just to remind me to be good to my local residents and to treat them with the respect that they deserve.

They were promised in writing the day before the election that they would receive funding should a Labor government be elected, and unfortunately, from my point of view, a Labor government was elected—a good thing from the point of view of the Brighton Rugby Union Football Club, or so they thought. But, no, the budget does not honour that \$1 million commitment made in writing just prior to the election.

This is a prime example of why people are so sick and cynical of politics and politicians in this state: the idea that a politician or candidate will say anything to get elected and will pluck a dollar figure from thin air and create a false promise in the hope of being re-elected. I was down at the rugby club last Thursday night where they presented me with a rugby club polo shirt. I think it was the only small polo shirt they had; actually, they might have had it specially manufactured for me.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

Mr SPEIRS: Very friendly—and no interjections. So I was down at the rugby club enjoying my chicken schnitty and chips with the club president, Roger Lassen, and the club treasurer, Ken Daly, and I had an opportunity to speak to club members and let them know that I would continue to fight for that broken promise.

I have written to the Minister for Recreation and Sport inviting him to come down and visit the club. Perhaps they will present him with a polo shirt as well; they probably will not need to get a small one manufactured. Perhaps he can enjoy a chicken schnitty down at the Brighton rugby club as well and explain to those members why the government chose not to honour that promise and perhaps in a spirit of bipartisanship work with me during this term to try—

Mr Gardner: Share a schnitty.

Mr SPEIRS: Yes, over a schnitty. We can work towards getting that club the funding it needs. I would love the minister to accept that invitation (which I made in writing) to come down so that he can understand what the club's priorities are.

Another issue I would like to discuss is the extent of the cuts to the environment department. This is something that I have a real personal interest in and it is one of the reasons that I stood for local government: to look at the protection of coastal environments along the Hallett Cove and Marino part of my electorate, which fell into the council area that I represented for three years. I have a long-term interest in environmental protection and have been very disconcerted with the savage cuts which are unfolding and have unfolded over several years in the environment department.

Just yesterday, listeners of 891 radio would have heard the Department of Environment chief executive, Mr Allan Holmes, musing the impending fate of his department. It was quite an unusual interview in many ways. We get these unusual interviews from time to time when a jaded chief executive is heard on radio often doing what you would expect the minister to be doing: half defending and half grieving the huge environmental department cuts that that department is facing and the fate of that department.

You almost had the idea that the chief executive of that department was just soul searching and working out what he was there for. You had almost a feeling that he was giving up the fight because the staff reductions in that agency, from 2,236 FTEs in the 2008-09 financial year to 1,709 FTEs in the current financial year, and projections to drop even further in the coming financial years, are a huge cut. We understand that there are difficulties in the budget, but particularly the loss of front-line and environmental officers, people working out in the field, is very hard to swallow in a state where we acknowledge that we have a fragile environment. We know that there are a lot of environmental challenges here and to lose so many outdoor staff from the environment department is truly a tragedy.

One figure that really puts this into perspective is the loss of rangers working in South Australia's parks. They have, I think, borne the real brunt of cuts with the number of rangers falling

from 300 in 2002 to only 88 today. We do not have any fewer parks now: in fact we have more, and those 88 rangers are responsible for taking care of 29 per cent of the state's land mass. I think that is the figure. To have those levels of cuts is quite dramatic and, really, they know it; I have spoken to rangers who have admitted that they cannot do their jobs the way they should.

You have rangers who are looking after parks in Tea Tree Gully and also on the Fleurieu Peninsula and trying to form connections with the communities and the various friends groups that are supporting and looking after those parks and it really does not work when you drop from 300 to 88 over 12 years. The situation with rangers in South Australia is facing crisis point and I don't think there is any point sugar-coating that. What has happened here is a travesty. We had David Paton, a very well-regarded ecologist and administrator at Adelaide University on the radio yesterday—I think that was also on 891—lamenting this. He said:

It is quite clear governments are losing interest, both state and federal in the environment and we do have a duty of care to look after our native species—the government's...just investing in those things which they can see, both things which they believe that people actually want but ultimately we have a duty of care to pass on the environment to the next generation which is as good as it is for us, if not better.

He went on to share that you can judge that the government is losing interest simply by the reduced quantity of money for the environment department and those cuts to front-line staff as well.

Combined with the cuts to front-line staff and the environment department is the loss of support to volunteers in terms of grants to support volunteers in the environmental space. The NRM and its boards and committees have come up for a fair bit of criticism from this side of politics over the years, but there is no doubt that the NRM grant programs have been able to build capacity within some communities and inspire communities to come together and often do the work that rangers would have been doing.

The irony is that the loss of grants and seed funding for community groups to get involved in environmental action is even more of a tragedy because, if you were to keep that sort of seed funding in place—pardon the pun—you could actually perhaps justify over the longer term some of the cuts to front-line on-the-ground staff in the environment department, but with the loss of both the seed funding and support to volunteers and at the same time massive cuts to on-the-ground staff, you really do think that the environment department is losing its *raison d'être* and is not going to be able to fulfil its core business—if, in fact, it knows what its core business is—into the future.

In the electorate of Bright, I have two conservation parks—Hallett Cove Conservation Park and Marino Conservation Park. They are both really unique examples of coastal environments which have been protected, preserved and revitalised in recent years and in recent decades. A huge amount of effort has gone into supporting environmental groups to get off the ground and get grants and get those environments restored. I think it is a real shame that not only will they lose the opportunity for grants but they also lose the support of rangers as those services are cut back, and that is something that I might dwell on some more when I discuss other things in this house.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (17:49): It gives me great pleasure to rise and speak on another appropriation of money to the government to spend on behalf of the South Australian community. I am sure that some of the things they will spend it on will be excellent and some of the things will leave us scratching our heads a little bit.

My particular duty as the member for Morialta is to be concerned, of course, about my local patch in the area of Morialta and so—if not in my 20 minute speech perhaps in the 10 minute grievé; we will see how we go—I hope to talk a little about some of the issues that are of concern to people in Morialta. I also have the great privilege, thanks to the leader for asking me very recently as a result of the recent reshuffle, to have responsibility for the opposition for the areas of police, Correctional Services and justice.

I might start by making a few comments particularly about those areas and, in the time allowed, make some broader comments about the budget, and then some particular comments in relation to the electorate of Morialta.

In the police budget, I note that we have the estimates hearings in about two weeks' time, so perhaps I might just raise a couple of the things that no doubt I will have the opportunity to raise in estimates as well. Maybe the minister's advisers or the public servants who prepare papers for

estimates can take a couple of these things on board now and it will be easy to get answers very quickly from the estimates and we will not have to take everything on notice, as sometimes occurs.

As a new shadow minister just a week old at the time when the budget was handed down, I of course approached the budget papers with eagerness and delight and anticipation of what would be found therein. There were some positive moves in the police area, but there are some things that tickled my interest.

I am really enjoying so far, three weeks into the police shadow portfolio, the opportunities that it presents. I joined the member for Little Para last week at Fort Largs and we shared in being able to see a wonderful graduation of new recruits. Some of them were very impressive and it was nice to be able to talk to some of the people there. The recruiting target that the government has set we know has been—I think 'rephased' is the politically correct term—delayed, pushed back—

Mr Odenwalder: Recalibrated.

Mr GARDNER: 'Recalibrated' is a suggestion. At any rate, it is not what it used to be and now, rather than 400 by last year, it is 300 in a couple of years' time, and we will look forward to seeing how that goes. No doubt the minister will have an opportunity to inform us how that recruitment target is going in the estimates process, and I look forward to hearing about it, but, certainly, I was impressed by the calibre of people who are putting themselves forward as police officers, and it was a pleasure to be able to share that opportunity.

Attrition rates in the police force obviously need to be met and surpassed to meet those recruitment targets because, as is natural, people—what is the verb of attrition, they 'attract'—they retire, they resign.

Along with the minister, I was pleased on Friday night to be able to attend the annual Police Association dinner to honour retiring members. I think there were some 70 or 80 retiring members on Friday night. Those members who have had the privilege of being able to attend that Police Association dinner would understand the credit that it does the association, and the way in which they are able to honour those people who have served our community in this way.

Each of them has their career acknowledged, the service they have done, and they are presented with a plaque or a watch, as is their choice. That was a privilege and one of which I am very happy to say that if any member gets an invitation to one of those functions it is really worth going along. I felt privileged to be able to share in their honour.

I think the attrition rate last year was about 130, so they have to be replaced, and I look forward to getting the detailed numbers that we are up to for this year to come. I am particularly interested in the capital being spent in this area, and I note that for each of the five listed capital projects under Budget Paper 5 there seems to have been some rephasing, recalibration, delay.

Closed-circuit television for custody management is the first one that is listed. It is listed as being completed by the June quarter 2015 at a total cost of \$8.066 million. A number of these rephasings or delays may well be because there have been improvements, or it may well be because there have been redesigns of the work that improve it to such a point that we are going to be absolutely thrilled that they have made the decision to have a later delivery of the program.

That may well be the case, and I look forward to hearing from the minister either way. However, I note that this item, or at least one named exactly the same, first appeared in the budget papers in 2008-09 with a completion date of June 2010. If this is in fact a different program that has been completed five years later, then I stand to be informed, and I look forward to that information.

The second item on the list is the domestic violence legislation system support, an information technology system to process early intervention orders. This is listed as \$310,000 to be spent by this year, a \$1 million project all-up to be completed by the June quarter 2015. This is a very important area. Members have heard me speak before about the importance of getting domestic violence (I think we now call it domestic and family violence) assessed and tackled in the best possible way. In fact, I commend those members opposite and members on this side who have this as a priority area because it is incredibly important.

It concerns me and I am interested in finding out why a similar budget line of exactly the same total spend (so I assume it is the same system) originally appeared in the 2010-11 budget

papers, originally intended to be finished in that year for \$1.003 million, finished in the June quarter 2011. We now, of course, have it finished in the June quarter 2015.

The third item on the capital list is high-tech crime-fighting equipment. Again, we originally had that appear in the 2010-11 budget as well, immediately below the domestic violence legislation system support, and initially due to be completed in the June quarter 2012 but now due to be completed in the June quarter 2015.

Finally (and those who have been in the police area for a while will be aware of this), the police records management system is listed now in two sections: stage 1 to be completed by June 2015 and stages 2 to 4 to be completed by June 2020, long after the forward estimates are complete. This originally appeared as due to be finished by the June quarter 2013 at a total cost of \$9.4 million. I think stage 1 could now be described as having blown out by two years, to be finished in the June quarter 2015 at a similar cost of \$9.7 million, with stage 4 now in the budget paper to be completed by June 2020 at a total cost of \$29.4 million.

This is really important because the cops I know are regularly concerned about having not just to double enter or triple enter things, but some items have to be entered five times into different systems. Police records management, filing systems and IT are critically important, and it is critically important that they be improved. If that is going to cost a bit of money up-front, I am sure it will save money in the long term. However, I am not sure that the government have provided suitable money up-front, and I look forward to hearing back from them and to hearing what their commitment is.

It appears to somebody looking at the budget papers for the first time that there is a significant blowout of about seven years, from the time of the originally promised delivery to the now promised delivery. I would suggest that this government's record would not make one hold one's breath. I seek leave to resume my remarks and look forward to talking about other things after the break.

Sitting suspended from 17:59 to 19:30.

Mr GARDNER: Prior to the brief adjournment we have just enjoyed I was making some comments in relation to matters in the police budget, which I am sure we will tease out further in estimates. I am happy to inform the wonderful Hansard reporters who had a chat to me on the way up that I am happy to speak a little bit slower than I did before the adjournment.

In the corrections area, also looking at the budget papers, as I said before, as a new shadow minister for the area one looks at the budget papers to see what one finds. I am pleased that I have had the opportunity to talk to a number of stakeholders in the corrections area in the last couple of weeks, and I look forward to the opportunity to talk to a number more in the next few weeks.

In estimates in particular, I think we are going to have to get into issues in relation to the prisoner population as opposed to the infrastructure we have to house the said prisoner population in our state. Let me put this into context: the daily average prisoner population has risen from 2,177, in the 2012-13 financial year, to 2,418, in this financial year, and it is expected to rise to 2,494 by the end of the next financial year. That is a rise of more than 300 prisoners per year. This is in Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, page 149 for those following at home.

This is compared with an approved capacity (how much infrastructure we have to look after these prisoners), which has increased from 2,262, in the 2012-13 year, to 2,448, in the 2013-14 estimate, to a projection of 2,500 at the end of the next financial year, the one we have just entered. The gap between our prison infrastructure capacity and our average prisoner numbers has narrowed from 85 to six.

This presents significant challenges that I am not sure the government has any real answers for. There is, as I have identified, an increase in the infrastructure. There are a number of new beds being put in at Port Lincoln and at a couple of the other facilities, but they do not go anywhere near the increase that is expected in prisoners that is being allocated for and that the government is expecting, partly because of the laws they are changing.

The point I am making is that infrastructure is increasing slightly but that prison numbers are increasing significantly. What we have as of today, as of 2 July, is a brief gap between capacity and average daily numbers, but that is not every day. On a number of days, there is a surge and there is

overcrowding, by the government's own numbers, and that is only going to get worse by the government's own numbers.

According to the figures presented in this budget, the gap between the average daily population and the total approved capacity is going to be six prisoners, in a prison population estimated to be 2,494 and 2,500 prison beds. The average is 2,494. There are days when it is below that and there are days when it is above that, and the beds are not there—the beds are not there and the government's plan to slightly increase the number of beds does not go anywhere near reaching the amount they need. This goes back years. Deputy Speaker, you would remember the cancelled prison program of several years ago (before I entered the house).

This is a significant challenge for the government and I look forward to hearing the minister describe what his answers are. At the very time when prisoner numbers are going up and the capacity over and above the prisoner numbers is reducing, the government is doing what? Yes, they are cutting prison staff. We understand from negotiations between the department and the Public Service Association that they are cutting prison staff by about 50. So, fewer prison officers, moving people from the kitchens altogether; I look forward to seeing exactly where these negotiations are going to end up.

I hope the minister is paying close attention and is going to actually get involved and help fix the negotiations, unless they miraculously resolve in the coming weeks. By reducing prison officer numbers and extending shift times they are not catering for the expected numbers that are going to be there. It is a significant problem. There are job cuts in the budget and that loss of 19.4 full-time equivalents, and that is just from last year until this year, it remains to be seen exactly where they are going to fall as a result of the negotiations currently underway.

There are a couple of changes to capital programs and I look forward to an explanation of these: the Mobilong Prison security upgrade. There was \$9.9 million budgeted in 2013-14 but only \$600,000 of that was spent, so there is now \$9 million budgeted for this financial year. It was due to finish at the June quarter 2014, which finished two days ago; now it is due to finish at the June quarter of next year.

The Northfield infrastructure upgrade was a \$45.8 million upgrade overall, due to be completed at June 2015. It appears that only \$9.5 million was spent in the 2013-14 year of the \$15.5 million that was budgeted to go in the last financial year, so it appears that \$6 million worth of work has been delayed until this financial year. I look forward to the minister's confirmation of whether or not that puts the June 2015 completion date in doubt.

I am pleased to have responsibility for the more general field of justice, some matters of which I share with the shadow attorney, the deputy leader, in the Attorney-General's area and some of which is, in particular, the youth justice area for which the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion has responsibility. I indicate that I am very pleased to be able to look after this area for the opposition again.

It is an area that I appreciated having the opportunity to do so in before when I was shadow minister for families and communities. There is some significant important work in this area. If we can turn around the life of a young person who is going off the rails and get them rehabilitated into a productive life ahead, then there is an enormous human benefit to the individual, a social benefit to our community and a financial benefit to our budget. A life saved in that manner is so important.

Our juvenile justice system is a critical moment in the lives of many of these young people. Some of them have, in fact, committed heinous crimes and their rehabilitation is a significant challenge. A number, of course, (some as young as 10) perhaps have a slightly easier road ahead, but getting this right is important. I look forward to the minister explaining the—I want to say savings but I cannot; it is a cut—youth justice down from \$39.1 million to \$36.6 million in the year ahead and full-time equivalent staff down by several as well.

The Jonal Drive Youth Training Centre—it is sometimes confusing between the new and old Cavan centres, so we will talk about them by the name of the road that they are on—security upgrade had \$4.15 million budgeted to be spent in 2013-14 but only \$37,000 of that was spent, and there has been a blowout to this year and, again, at least a one-year rephasing, restructuring, redesign, whatever the government wants to call it, of the budget, so it is now due to be completed in June

2015. I look forward to the Minister for Communities explaining exactly how that is going to work, and I am sure we will have some opportunity to go into those matters further.

I will identify some matters in relation to my local electorate when I have the opportunity to grieve at some point, but I just want to touch briefly, in these last couple of minutes I have, on the budget as a whole. Having been elected in March 2010 to the parliament, I have sometimes been disappointed and sometimes appalled at the way the government has handled the state's budget matters and economy.

In that election in 2010, there was an archetypal moment which I am sure you personally, Deputy Speaker, as a candidate and the Labor member for Florey at the time, benefited from, as a number of other members elected in 2010 on the Labor side did. Mike Rann's promise to create a 100,000 new jobs was a key moment in that campaign.

There were flyers in Morialta. I will not speak for the Deputy Speaker. You often put out your own flyers, but the flyers that went out in Morialta and in a range of Labor marginal seats were very much focused on this promise of 100,000 new jobs. Lindsay Simmons had a number of good attributes; nevertheless, these 100,000 new jobs featured very highly above whatever other attributes she had in much of her advertising material.

Let us just say that this promise that the Labor government would provide 100,000 new jobs is going badly—this promise that, by February 2016, the government would have created 100,000 new jobs. This budget provides us with the latest figures on that matter. We are two-thirds of the way through, so you would hope that they would be 60,000 jobs in; there are now fewer employed people in South Australia than there were at the time the promise was made.

So, for 100,000 new jobs, there would now need to be about 101,000 new jobs in the next two years if the government is going to meet this significant election promise. They are not on track, they are not going to make it, this budget says they are going to fall tens of thousands short, and it is just another indictment on the way in which they have failed to manage our economy over the last 10 years.

Bill read a second time.

Estimates Committees

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (19:43): I move:

That this bill be referred to estimates committees.

Motion carried.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (19:43): I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills (Hon. G.E. Gago) and the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation (Hon. I.K. Hunter), members of the Legislative Council, be permitted to attend and give evidence before the estimates committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill.

Motion carried.

Appropriation Grievances

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (19:43): I move:

That the house note grievances.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (19:43): This year's budget announcement of the government, disclosed in a document titled Capital Investment Statement—Budget Paper 5, contains an interesting array of projects to be undertaken by SA Water. We know that SA Water is the corporatised entity that is responsible for the provision of water in South Australia. They contract all water and other entities to provide some services in relation to that but, essentially, they are responsible for the provision of water—a safe, clean, reliable water supply for public consumption and for industry and others.

It was interesting to read this year that their primary projects under consideration are further upgrades of wastewater networks, including some pipeline supply upgrades. The elephant in the room for them, in the sense of a financial burden, is the continuing payment of \$21,439,000 per year to provide for the retention payments for the Adelaide desal plant. Remember that, through its warranty period, and indeed probably forever, we are going to be paying for this piece of infrastructure big time.

What this tells me this year is that SA Water's priority under the direction of the government—because, of course, they are subject to ministerial direction, including making sure that they maximise profits for the government which urgently needs the money—is that they are preparing for sale a number of wastewater treatment plants. If I am wrong, I will be happy to apologise, but let's watch that space in the next couple of years and see whether we are left with any major wastewater projects in South Australia. They were getting a fair bit of attention last year and this year, and I suspect there will be the big 'For sale' signs on them before we advance into the 2015 and 2016 budget years.

What is most disappointing about this budget is that there is no provision for work specifically for the residents of Skye. There is provision for network growth to increase capacity of existing water and wastewater systems, in response to customer growth, of a proposed \$11.206 million this year, for network extensions of some \$30.6 million, and for pipe network renewal of \$47.232 million, so there is some money there, but there is no provision for the residents of Skye.

A month ago, on 4 June I brought to the attention of the house the plight of some 120 residents of Skye who live in my electorate and within 10 kilometres of the GPO but do not have access to mains water supply or wastewater services. The short brief historical reason for this is that at the time of development approval in what is our Hills Face Zone area, people were allowed to proceed with the development of their homes on the clear understanding that they would not have then E&WS supplied water to them and that they would have their own arrangements.

What they have done is build up provision through five water supply entities for the residents, one of which has recently given notice that as of 28 August it will no longer be providing water from its bore and network system and that the residents will be on their own. This has been known to the government for months—in fact, years. When I had responsibility for this area back in 2008, it was an issue then. There was not wholesale support amongst those residents to proceed to have SA Water come in and provide the supply to this area at a cost to households.

I think I reported to parliament at that stage that SA Water estimated the cost of providing these services at around about \$26,000 per household. There was not an appetite for it to progress, as each still had, perhaps somewhat inadequately in some areas, access to water supply. It was not enough to deal with major bushfire issues. It was not enough, I suggest, to ensure that they would always have a clean water supply. Certainly, they did not have a supply that provided them with potable water, but largely they relied on their own rainwater reserves.

What has happened since? What happened immediately prior to that is that on 14 May I called a public meeting. The community came together, and about 25 of them were facing having their taps turned off and we needed to deal with the issue both on an interim basis and also long term. In about mid-June, I had a meeting with SA Water because they had not turned up and the minister deigned to decide not to come to the public meeting. We had a meeting with them and they said, 'Well, look, Burnside council are going to deal with this. We have had discussions with them, and they are going to be dealing with an interim arrangement, either one of two options, to provide a pipeline from main service into the system and that will deal with the matter.'

So, I rang Burnside council, and they said, 'As we said at the public meeting, we're not in the water business, we don't want to be in the water business, we have no intention of being in the water business, and you can take it from us, as confirmed by our council and the passing of resolutions, we're not getting into the water business.' SA Water is essentially the monopoly provider of water in South Australia, and I hasten to qualify that by saying that I accept that there are third-party access rights but, for 100-odd households, I can tell you that is not going to happen. The reality is that SA Water is responsible within their charter for providing a network of service, and in the metropolitan area they are entitled to have it.

They said that the Burnside council were going to deal with it. Burnside council said, 'It's not on our patch. We are happy to help development applications to ensure that people can put in extra rainwater tanks in the meantime, and we're happy to try to help with council and assist SA Water in

making sure they know what hazards are out there and what things have to be done to be taken into account in helping them to do the structure.'

I got them together, and this morning they came in and we had a meeting. I am pleased to report to the parliament that SA Water acknowledge that in fact Burnside council have not and are not intending to get into the water business and that they have now done some preliminary work to look at the cost of providing this to that community. They are looking for full cost recovery, and I understand that. I also know that ministers have the power to direct for works to be done, where appropriate, and that they can make provision for this in a subsidised way if they see fit. They have done it before, and I will traverse that on another occasion.

Nevertheless, it is perfectly appropriate for SA Water to say, 'Okay, we will attend to at least look at the viability of doing this. We will try to meet with the five water companies.' Clearly, I have already been told, as I think some of them have already been told (and it was in the local paper this week, which they have read) that the other water companies are saying, 'We can't take the load of the other 25 because we've got limited infrastructure and it's sometimes in a fairly poor or at least fragile state, and we cannot accommodate them.' So, we are moving in a new direction.

Frankly, I would like the minister covering SA Water (minister Hunter) to take his head out of the sand and understand that this is an important issue. These people are taxpayers, they live in metropolitan Adelaide, and they are entitled to have access to water to ensure that they are protected in a bushfire and that they have safe, consumable water, as their current water supply is degraded and in some cases will not be available after 28 November. He does need to understand that he does have responsibility to deal with this.

I am pleased that the representatives came this morning; four of them came from SA Water—I felt very privileged—another three came from Burnside council and a couple from the minister's office. I had so many people turn up to deal with my 25 people who are facing this precarious situation in Burnside that I started to wonder what was happening with the running of the state, but I am pleased to have had the meeting. Let's hope that we can advance some resolution for these people.

I also want SA Water to be absolutely clear when making statements to the media that they do not cause alarm in the community. Statements that were reported in the local *Eastern Courier* this week suggest that SA Water are not interested in dealing with anything relating to the provision of services of the residents to the main system. That is inconsistent with what I heard today, and I think it is incumbent on them to make sure that they communicate with those electors promptly, give them that reassurance, and provide them with the service that we are asking for.

Time expired.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (19:53): Deputy Speaker, can I note first of all that I will adhere very strictly to your ruling about being referred to in the neutral term of Deputy Speaker and acquiesce to your request on that. Tonight, I certainly do wish to grieve about this budget, and I would like to take a bit of time to reflect on some of the contributions from members opposite, those of you who got up to talk about the budget, because the members opposite have tried very hard to deflect on that score.

Those who have indeed talked about the budget that is actually at hand include the members for Port Adelaide and Waite, and I would like to congratulate them on at least talking about this budget in their budget reply speeches and attempting to justify it. I would like to think that was due to my contribution yesterday calling on somebody to actually stand up and take responsibility for selling the budget of this government; indeed, I did call upon the member for Newland yesterday but, alas, he missed his opportunity. Deputy Speaker, you as the member for Florey discussed the election result and electoral reform, and the member for Torrens did speak about every other government's budget and every other government's performance except for her own.

What I would like to do in my 10 minutes tonight is debunk some of the messages that members opposite have put up in relation to their budget reply speeches and out in the public space. The first message that I would like to debunk is the fact that the federal government is cutting money in absolute terms to the state government. I will acknowledge that, budget to budget, there are cuts, and there are cuts where we do not agree with the federal government, especially when it comes to supplementary roads funding (the \$18 million there) and we do not agree with the GP co-payment.

I have heard from the member for Playford, though, in response to a question, a sotto voce contribution that he gave when we were discussing it. Well, if you are talking about the federal budget

to budget cuts to the state government, what about the state government's own cuts? He did say that there would be a \$500 million real increase in health spending over the forward estimates. Do not quote me on that, except to say that that is the contribution he gave across the chamber during the hurly-burly of question time.

I would like to say that you cannot have it both ways. You cannot talk about budget to budget cuts when it comes from the federal government and then talk about real net increases when you are talking about the state budget's contribution. You have to look at these things on equal terms, and I find it very disingenuous by members opposite to suggest that things are anything other than that.

Indeed, there is an honest voice within the government and it is a gentleman by the name of Brett Rowse. When speaking to the Budget and Finance Committee, he was forced to admit that the federal government was increasing funding. I will quote from something that the Hon. Rob Lucas said:

So that over the forward estimates there's an increase of \$2.02 billion coming into South Australia from commonwealth grants, whether it be current grant revenue or capital grant revenue?

Brett Rowse in response said, 'Yes, that's correct.' So finally we have on the record the fact that somebody has been able to stand up and say that the federal government is indeed increasing funding to the state government, because you would be forgiven for thinking that it is anything other than that.

The second thing in debunking this myth is by having a very general and cursory look at some of the early budget papers. It is page 55 of Chapter 3—Revenue in the budget statement. I implore members opposite to have a quick look at this because, when comparing the 2014-15 budget to the 2013-14 estimates, it does show a 6.2 per cent increase in commonwealth grants to the state government. The next year, the 2015-16 year, it grows again by 6.2 per cent. The year after that, 2016-17, it grows by 8.1 per cent and in 2017-18 it grows by a measly 3 per cent. All of these figures seem well above inflation, they seem well above population growth, and they seem well above any objective measure that this is a solid increase from the federal government to the state government, but all of the rhetoric that we have heard over recent days and weeks has been very much the opposite.

The second thing I would like to debunk is the fact that South Australia is a competitive place to do business. We heard in question time today that the Liberal Party misleads and misrepresents using its own figures, but again, page 54 of Chapter 3—Revenue in the state budget talks about tax effort ratios by jurisdiction. This is a measure that the Commonwealth Grants Commission puts out every year in relation to relative tax efforts for states and territories. On this measure, which is an objective, long-term measure, South Australia is the highest ranked state when it comes to tax effort ratios. In fact, our total tax effort has increased from 9.1 per cent above average to 9.7 per cent above average.

That is not us saying it; that is the Commonwealth Grants Commission saying it, and that is an objective measure showing that South Australia's tax regime is too high. It is the highest of the states and indeed South Australia is not, as members opposite talk about, a great place to do business. I would also say that I think a lot of the results when it comes to business confidence and employment growth do indeed bear out the fact that South Australia is not a great place to do business. We do have the highest WorkCover rates in the country, some of the highest electricity prices in the country, and we certainly, according to the Commonwealth Grants Commission, are the highest taxing state in the country.

The third point I would like to debunk tonight is that this budget is all about federal budget cuts and that federal cuts are the main driver behind the numbers in this state budget. That is absolutely not the case. We have heard members opposite talking about health cuts and we have heard them talking about education cuts, but the truth is that the state government's cuts are far more serious than any federal government contribution to this state budget.

In the 2013-14 year, the state health cuts were \$116 million compared to the federal health cuts of zero. In 2014-15, it is \$217 million versus \$69 million. In 2015-16 it is \$322 million versus \$125 million and in 2016-17 it is \$379 million versus \$186 million. In total, the state health budget is being cut three times more by state cuts than it is by federal cuts, and I think that is something that

needs to be said here and needs to be borne out because the rhetoric from members opposite has been anything other than that.

On the education front in this 2013-14 year there were \$30 million worth of state education cuts versus federal cuts of nothing; in 2014-15, \$50 million versus \$2 million; in 2015-16, \$65 million versus \$2 million; and in 2016-17, \$78 million versus \$2 million. On those figures again it bears out very clearly that it is the state government's responsibility, it is the state government sitting in a mess of its own making and it has less to do with the federal budget and their cuts than it does with 12 years of inept management by the Labor government.

If we are to be consistent, then I expect to see the government not only talking budget to budget or talking absolute relative increase when it comes to comparing figures of federal versus state, but I also expect to see the frenzy being whipped up in the same way over federal budget cuts as state budget cuts. This morning we heard about the federal budget response task force, and I genuinely believe that members opposite do not want to sell this budget.

They do not want to justify it to the people of South Australia; they want to abrogate and they want to deflect, and what they genuinely need is for the South Australian public to keep believing that it is the federal government's fault that the state government cannot run its finances. In the next chapter of that we are seeing that in the clearest form and they need to maintain that deflection lest some of the blame gets pointed at themselves, lest the state government of South Australia takes responsibility for the state budget of South Australia.

Lastly, there has been a discussion about the fact that we on this side of the house have not been constructive and we have no ideas. Well, as a candidate in the 2014 state election, I fought very hard for a set of policies that are very dear to me, policies that exist across a wide range of areas. If members opposite are looking for some ideas, maybe some hope of reform for the future of South Australia, they need only look at the raft of policy ideas that the Liberal Party took to the last election. The prime job of opposition is to hold government to account, and that at the moment is what we are doing.

This is what we are doing and at least we are willing to debate the issue at hand, we are willing to debate the state budget as opposed to deflecting the blame to the federal government or talking about the Queensland budget or anything else that members opposite want to talk about. We are here in a David and Goliath battle between the collective resources of government and the miserly resources of the opposition. We can only do our own job. We do not have the resources to do yours as well.

In light of that, I would like to discuss for the last few seconds the ability of ministers to control their own budgets. The figures that I am going to talk about are not of our concoction, they are the Labor government's own figures. The fact is that over the past year they have had a \$311 million budget overspend. Very quickly, I would like to highlight a couple of ministers who have high percentage overspends. Interestingly, minister Koutsantonis (member for West Torrens) in the Treasury and Finance portfolio is 14 per cent over budget versus last year. The Hon. Gail Gago in the other place is 10 per cent over budget on the further education portfolio. Minister Hunter in the other place in the environment, water and natural resources portfolios is 14 per cent over budget.

Time expired.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (20:03): I want to talk briefly about circumstances that prevailed today during question time that I thought were a little bit less than useful, and it has nothing to do with Vickie's contribution regarding her son's letter which was an outstanding contribution to the house, and Alex is a very—

An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: He meant the member for Bragg.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Was somebody about to take a point of order, were they? He is an outstanding boy. Look, what happened today in question time was that some questions were directed, I think, at a variety of ministers across the front bench in relation to Clovelly Park. I think what occurred today, through what I think was a very unprincipled action by the opposition, has heightened the level of awareness—fear, more importantly than awareness—of the people who live in that particular area.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I worried that you had moved to your position to say something. Yes?

Ms CHAPMAN: Well, I am sure you will be welcoming it, Deputy Speaker. My point of order is that the member is making a reflection on the management of the house by the Speaker during question time. Questions were asked by the opposition, in fact by a number of members of the house. The Speaker determines the management of that, whether the questions are in order or not, and of course challenges can be made to those during the course of that by other members of the house.

The management of the house is now being reflected upon by the member in those questions being asked. He may have an issue and he may wish to reflect to the house about his view on a certain matter, which he is entitled to put, but to present this as being out of order in some way, that it is unacceptable in the issue being dealt with during question time, is a reflection—and a very poor reflection—on the management of the house by the Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the member is going to get to the point of what he is trying to say.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I will try my hardest, Deputy Speaker. It was in no way a reflection on the Speaker with respect to the way he managed the question time this afternoon; it is more a reflection on the opposition who posed the questions. That is my point.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: I am allowed to have a view as to whether things are—and I am not suggesting in any way that what was asked today was out of order, but there's a difference between something being out of order and being, in my view, inappropriate. That is what I was getting to.

I very much respect the member for Bragg—Bragg for the defence or Bragg for the prosecution, whatever you like to say about her legal expertise—but there is a difference between being out of order and being inappropriate. The reason I say the questions today were inappropriate is because we have protocols in place.

This matter about Clovelly Park and that area particularly goes back a very long way. In fact, truth be known, I think there was a member for Elder, a long time ago, called Mr Wade, I think it was. Mr Wade, if I remember, had some grave concerns about the way in which the Liberal government of the day was managing the communication process in relation to legacy issues as they relate to groundwater contamination in that particular area. I am sure the member for Bragg is aware of those particular matters at that time.

Mr Whetstone: It was six weeks.

The Hon. P. CAICA: We're talking 17 years ago.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: As you know, interjections are out of order and it is out of order to respond to interjections. The member is entitled to be heard in silence.

The Hon. P. CAICA: If I recall both the media reporting of the day and the other issues associated with it, all these 17 or 18 years ago, from Mr Wade and the then minister for the environment—somebody might help me here—it was an issue between the minister for the environment, cabinet and the member for Wade.

Ms Chapman: I remember when you were the minister for the environment.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I distinctly remember it too. It is not that long ago.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! What is in the water in this chamber tonight that everyone is so chirpy?

Mr Pisoni: I hope it's not contaminated!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I'll have the water vetted, please, chamber attendants. Water down the water.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I don't mind inane interjections. They can keep doing them for as long as they want. The point that I am making is that we have legacy issues that relate to the way that custom and practice years ago have resulted in contamination in groundwater, in the soils, in a whole variety of areas—customs and practices that were accepted all those years ago. They have a legacy effect here and now. In fact, they did when Mr Wade was the member for Elder.

The point I am making is that Mr Wade's concerns back in those days were the lack of communication and the lack of information that was provided to him as a local member, and it is well documented that in turn it was a lack of information that was being transmitted to and communicated with the local community.

As the member for Bragg said, 'When you were the minister,' and when I was the minister for the environment, protocols were put in place. Protocols were put in place that the first people who should be aware of a situation like this are those people who are the local residents. Otherwise, the inappropriate, but not disorderly, contribution of the opposition today, has heightened the fears of those people living in that area before there was the ability to communicate to those people. Let me also say this: the matter of Clovelly Park—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must advise members that I am reaching for the Speaker's score sheet from question time and remind the deputy leader she's on her first warning, and it's the lips moving thing again shortly. Members on the other side, if you want me to go through the score sheet, I will. The member is entitled to be heard in silence.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Without reflecting on the chair, of course—

Ms Chapman: Point of order, Madam Chair—

The Hon. P. CAICA: You're on two warnings, that's right.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of order, and I hope it will be a reasonable point of order.

Ms CHAPMAN: I want to make a confession: I am actually on a second warning.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am prepared to overlook that if you just—

Ms CHAPMAN: Excellent, a remission.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next time your lips move it will be a second warning.

The Hon. P. CAICA: This is an effort by the opposition to gag me, to not allow me to talk.

Mr Whetstone: Are you going to send this out to the people of Elder?

The Hon. P. CAICA: Not at all.

Mr Whetstone: Rubbish.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is actually on his second warning.

The Hon. P. CAICA: The member for Chaffey lacks a little bit up top, so I will just ignore what—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Okay, well, he should not interject, Madam Deputy Speaker. Anyway, getting back to the point that I am trying to make, without the interruptions, and that would be good—far be it from me to be a dibber dobber Cindy but the member for Morialta was interjecting out of his chair. However, I am sure you picked up on that, Deputy Speaker.

Mr Gardner: Sorry, I was trying to give the Deputy Speaker some information.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I am sure it will be excellent information. The simple fact is that what occurred today is something that now needs some remedial action, remedial action on the basis that the best plans are in place to make sure that information, when it does get to residents, is information that is accurate and not communicated in scientific gobbledygook but something they will understand that either reassures them that things are alright or makes it clear that there is certain action that needs to be taken.

What has occurred today through the opposition's inappropriate but not disorderly behaviour will actually create a greater scare within that area. I have not seen the media tonight because I do not watch the television, but I am pretty sure it would have made the news—and I am sure that the member for Bragg would have looked at it because I am sure she watches TV and hopes to see herself on it from time to time. I am pretty sure of that, but who knows. However, I think today's behaviour was, as I said, inappropriate.

These are the circumstances. A protocol was put in place when I was the minister. That protocol was that information would be gathered, unlike what occurred when Mr Wade was the member for Elder, unlike what even occurred under certain circumstances when Mr Conlon was the member for Elder. What we have today is a situation where the EPA will continuously monitor those areas where legacy issues exist as a result of custom and practice in the past. That information will be collated and communicated in the most timely fashion when that information is accurate.

Today, from my point of view, was nothing more than a bit of a political exercise to try to gain some points at the expense of the poor people living within that area. It occurs not only in Clovelly, there are situations on Lefevre Peninsula, in Port Pirie, in Kilburn, and elsewhere. It is a legacy issue in the industrialised world. What we need to do is make sure that we are actually able to communicate information in an accurate and timely way, not heighten fears, not undertake a scare campaign, not try to score political points through what was an inappropriate approach to the questions that were asked and directed at ministers today.

I thought those questions were answered in a quite orderly manner by the ministers in an appropriate way, but what it has done is circumvent what has been a process that has proven to be effective in the past and, to that extent, whilst not disorderly, the opposition should hang their heads in shame for their actions here today.

I have two minutes left and I might just use those two minutes. Why not? Another issue I want to speak about relates to marine parks. I remember the Nuremberg rally that the member for Bragg attended with the then leader of the opposition where, depending on—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Well, today it was reported that we are over 2,000, but who knows? However, I note that over a period of time when the member for Bragg tried to organise recreational fishers before, she had like 25 down at West Beach—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Bragg is reminded—

The Hon. P. CAICA: —and that might be an exaggeration.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will have to write it down. My hands are tied.

The Hon. P. CAICA: What we have seen is a rear-guard action from the opposition to try to undo the good work that has been done with respect to marine parks here in South Australia. I do not believe their view will eventually prevail. What we have done is the right thing. Indeed, there is little difference between what is now going to be put in place by the government and what was being proposed by the member for Davenport when he was—

Ms Chapman: Don't mislead the house.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I'm not—the member for Davenport—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Bragg is warned for the second time.

The Hon. P. CAICA: It really should be the third time, Deputy Speaker, but I accept your comments earlier. The member for Davenport and the then premier put forward to the people of South Australia about the marine parks that they were going to put in place, and the member for Bragg knows that. There is no misleading in what I am saying. There is nothing we have done today that is different from what they were proposing back in 2001. Check the records and go back and have a look. The only difference today is that the position of the opposition has changed significantly

from what it was at that time. For that, they should also hang their heads in shame. I have very much appreciated being able to make a contribution in this grievance debate.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (20:15): I do not think a lot of that diatribe can go unanswered, quite frankly. The member for Colton is quite right: what has taken place at Clovelly Park is a legacy of the past; none of us is responsible for what happened industrially or whatever 20, 30, 40 or 50 years ago. I and probably others in this place can tell you that when I first started work I used to get covered in DDT. I was covered in Lindane; I was covered in Luci-Jet, literally covered in it. I also handled tonnes and tonnes of asbestos sheeting, but that is the way it was.

The issue the member for Colton has picked up on here is not about what is in the water or whatever, it is the fact that this government tried to hide it.

The Hon. P. Caica: Rubbish!

Mr PENGILLY: For six or seven weeks—

The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: I seek the protection of the Chair from this vicious attack. The fact is that this government has hidden it, and it is only because it was leaked from within government circles to the opposition that it was raised today. If they had got off their collective backsides and come out and addressed the issue properly in the public arena, it would have made a big difference. It is fine for the member for Colton to talk about the opposition doing it in an improper way, but I happen to remember, member for Colton, what your mob did to Carolyn Habib in the seat of Elder in the election, when they launched a vicious racial attack on her—and you know it. So do not come in here being high and mighty and self-righteous.

The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: Don't come in here giving us—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am on my feet: that means everyone sits down. I am prepared to put up with a little bit of extra frivolity in the evening session, but it is a waste of the house's time. I call all members to order and ask for their goodwill in progressing the debate this evening. I will return to the member for Finniss and ask for him to be heard in silence.

Mr PENGILLY: Thank you, ma'am. So, it is a bit rich to come in here and preach to us, after what they did to Carolyn Habib—the shoppies union, the Malinauskases, the Koutsantonises. That is what they did to Carolyn Habib—that is what they did. That is what I am told; that is what I am informed from people on that side, so do not come here preaching to us about that sort of thing. I thought what happened to Carolyn Habib was an absolute disgrace and a sad moment in the history of South Australian politics.

Let's get to the marine parks issue. I sat in the other place this afternoon and listened to quite a bit of the debate, and I have never heard such orchestrated nonsense, a litany of absolute mistruths and everything else that came out of the mouth of Mr Maher there—written, printed and authorised, I suggest, by Allan Holmes and Chris Thomas. It was an absolute disgrace and it was just categorical nonsense. I happened to be sitting next to a fisherman from Port Wakefield, Mr Bart Butson, and he could not believe the nonsense that was coming out of Mr Maher's mouth. It was absolutely ridiculous; it was so far away from the truth that it was not funny.

Talking about consultation, that bill went through the upper house, and it will come down here. The challenge is for the member for Frome and member for Waite to stand on their collective credibility and support this bill when it comes to the lower house. I can tell you that it will do irreparable harm to the fishing industry in my electorate and in the electorates of the members of Flinders and Goyder. It was nonsense. It was absolute claptrap they were talking up there. I am glad it got through and I commend that it got through.

Decent, honest fishing people, both recreational and professional, were here in the Balcony Room a couple of weeks ago talking about the impact on their lives. It is simply inappropriate for the government to be putting out this spin line which is a nonsense. I sat in meetings around the place when Chris Thomas who ran the program was there, and he sat there sniggering and sneering.

The Hon. P. Caica: Rubbish.

Mr PENGILLY: He did! Don't you give that to me, member for Colton.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PENGILLY: I sat there and I'll bring you hundreds of people if you like.

The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Colton is called to order.

Mr PENGILLY: Thank you. When this bill gets down here, it is going to be a fairly interesting debate. We have plenty of evidence. Why would you go to the fishing industry and say, 'Where do you fish?' and then say, 'That's what we want to know,' and then block those up in sanctuary zones? It is just ludicrous, and there will be a fair bit more said about that in this place.

Three in every 10 South Australians live in a regional community, and they are sick of being screwed over by 12 years of Labor government. They are sick of it, absolutely fed up to the back teeth with it, I can tell you. No wonder they voted for a change of government in the bush. They voted for one in the city as well. Regional South Australia—

The Hon. P. Caica: They never voted any differently.

Mr PENGILLY: You've had your go, mate.

The Hon. P. Caica: They never voted any differently. What are you talking about? More whingeing about the election. Get over it. You lost.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It is unparliamentary to interject. It is out of order to respond to interjections. The member is entitled to be heard in silence.

The Hon. P. Caica: And so was I.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Colton.

Mr PENGILLY: Regional South Australia contributes more than \$20 million to the South Australian economy and produces over 50 per cent of South Australia's exports. They do not want much in the way of assistance. They just want to get on with their business and what they do properly, whether that be farming, vineyards, honey, fishing, it does not matter. They just want to get on and do what they have always done and what in many cases they have done for generations and generations.

Instead, what has happened now is that this government has brought in another land tax scenario on the family farm, on the family home, across South Australia, so it is impinging once again and putting financial strain on families right across this state. I think it is despicable and cowardly and should be condemned for what it is. I can tell you that this side of the house will take it up to the government every day up until the next election. Every day, they will be reminded, and the member for Waite and the member for Frome want to think about that because it ain't going to go away.

The Liberal Party had a stand at Mitcham Shopping Centre last Saturday. Every minute, someone from that electorate was coming up and signing a petition calling for a by-election in Waite. They have had an absolute gutful of the member for Waite and what he did to them, screwing them over. He has to live with his conscience; I do not have to. I have a clear conscience on this. I thought it was disgraceful, but it is interesting, and it will go on and on as well every Saturday now until the next election. We will see what comes out of that.

In my electorate, we make a major contribution to the state's economy through primary industry, agriculture, fishing, dairying, and also tourism. I have huge numbers of visitors—two million visitors a year go down to the South Coast and the Fleurieu Peninsula. Many of those are repeat visitors from the metropolitan area who come down there for weekends, extended holidays or over the summer period. Some 190,000 go over to Kangaroo Island, and a high proportion of those are internationals. We make a major contribution to the state, and we have had a gutful. We have had an absolute gutful, I can tell you.

There were 1,400 jobs lost and 4,000 more unemployed and an increased unemployment rate from 6 to 8 per cent in regional South Australia in May this year alone. Where is that going to end? The challenge for the Minister for Regional Development is to try to do something about that. I will help him to try to do something about it, but every time the poor beggar gets up to open his mouth

or answer a question he is done over by someone else. He is not allowed to answer the questions. It is ridiculous. He is going to have a go.

I do not think they have the confidence in him to answer the questions, and it is obvious to blind Freddy what is going on. We can sit here and watch it. When the minister for regional affairs is given a question, he gets tugged by someone alongside him and told to sit down and then someone else will shoot up like a jack-in-the-box. It is crazy stuff. If he wants to come and work with me, I will work with him as closely as possible to achieve good things for my electorate and the rest of regional South Australia. I wish him luck with this appalling mob that is in government at the moment, I can tell you.

I am seriously concerned about where this state is going. The state government's budget of a couple of weeks ago has done nothing for this state, except build on debt enormously and slug the poor old South Australian taxpayer over and over again. Day after day, we hear the acolytes on the other side talk about the federal government and the impact of their budget. Well, get over it, guys, you are in government here.

The Hon. P. Caica: Get over the election, mate.

Mr PENGILLY: Here it goes again, the singing rooster. The fact of the matter is that—

The Hon. P. Caica: Get over it, get over it.

Mr PENGILLY: I was over it a long time ago. The fact is that this state government has responded to its own ineptitude, its own debt and its own budget disaster.

Time expired.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have a speaking list, and the member for Wright is next on my list.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (20:25): Thank you, Deputy Speaker, and thank you for the opportunity to speak on the Appropriation Bill. I will very quickly outline some of the highlights in this current budget for education. The budget will overall deliver \$3.27 billion in 2014 for the Department for Education and Child Development, and there is \$96.7 million in capital works in the budget. I point out that the per student funding now is double that of the 2002 levels. We are investing in a new secondary school in the city, and we are delivering on our commitment to Gonski funding (\$72.3 million of additional funding over four years), and we are honouring the full six years of that agreement.

Also, there are 20 new outdoor learning areas, with \$6 million going into that and, importantly, \$14.2 million to ensure that every government school student has access to a school counsellor. There is another \$13.7 million for a children's centre here in South Australia and, importantly, \$3.2 million to establish a Strong Start program in Adelaide's southern suburbs which supports parents and infant children. To ensure that we have better communication with parents, a \$1.8 million parent portal will be established.

There are many other initiatives which I could talk about, but there are some issues which I think I do need to address also; they are claims that have been made in this house by the members for Stuart, Chaffey and Unley in relation to education. The member for Stuart prides himself on his economic credential and knowing his way around budget papers. Sadly, our public schools are actually getting \$100 million less in 2017-18 than the member for Stuart claimed in this place.

I would refer the member for Stuart to the federal Budget Overview, page 7, on health and education funding, where it states that 'measures will achieve cumulative savings of over \$80 billion by 2024-25'. That is \$80 billion not going into health and education. You can call them savings or you can call them cuts; it is funding which was promised which will not be provided.

Every other Liberal government gets it. Mike Baird gets it, Denis Napthine gets it, even Campbell Newman gets it, and they are all standing up to the Abbott government to campaign against these brutal cuts to our hospitals and to our schools. Sadly for South Australia, it seems that the South Australian Liberals are the only ones doggedly going into bat for Mr Abbott's budget: they keep denying that they are cuts. Reneging on promised funding increases is cutting funding.

In South Australia, this will hit our students, our teachers, our nurses, our doctors, the sick and the poor to the tune of \$5.5 billion over the decade. In the last two years of the signed Gonski

agreement, \$335 million of agreed funding will not be made available for our three education systems. This equates to \$1,280 per student over 2018-19. In 2018, students in year 8 will be the first to feel the reduction in this funding. Mr Abbott's cuts will hurt, and they will hurt regional communities hard.

On a per capita basis the electorate of Stuart stands to lose \$5.5 million in funding resources and support in two years; the electorate of Chaffey, \$6.97 million; and the electorate of Unley, \$4.2 million. The members for Unley and Stuart claim that the federal government plays no role in allocating funding to local schools. It is all up to us how we spend our money. But, make no mistake, it is this federal Liberal government that is determining that funding will not be made available—\$335 million less to share.

As the member said last week, I was in the electorate of Stuart, as well as a number of other regional electorates, but what the member failed to mention was why I was there. I was there to open a wonderful new purpose-built Jamestown Community Children's Centre that represents a \$2.4 million investment in the member's electorate, and I can tell the house that the local community is very pleased to have this wonderful new facility.

It is one of 41 children's centres across the state that have been developed by this government and represents a small portion of the massive infrastructure program this government has underway. Because this government believes in education. That is why, unlike the federal Coalition government, we are fulfilling our promise to South Australian children and their families by committing to the full six years of the Gonski agreement, that will see an additional \$229.9 million over the life of the agreement.

I will turn my attention to some of the amazingly outrageous claims made by the member for Unley. Quite frankly, he has been farcical in his claims, but we know the member for Unley has been prone. He describes them as tongue-in-cheek comments. They are hardly tongue-in-cheek when you write them in a press release but I would prefer to describe them as foot-in-mouth. Indeed, someone said to me he needs to go to the dentist when he wants his toenails trimmed.

He does not let credibility get in the way of a press release. In only the last couple of weeks alone, he has variously claimed that the education department is recruiting for the SDA, and he rehashed an Adelaide High School media release and thought the media would not join the dots, and claimed increased school fees are funding Gonski.

Mr Pisoni: What press release is that, Jennifer?

The SPEAKER: In interjections, the member for Unley will refer to the minister as the Minister for Education or the member for Wright. Some of these metaphors are a bit stale.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: He claimed increased school fees are funding Gonski. Regarding the removal of the emergency services levy remission, he obviously completely slept through that meeting or he supports the removal of that remission, but I bet he did not tell his leader about that. Credibility counts. It is a really important issue.

When it comes to savings there is a clear difference between members on this side and those opposite. We will not be cutting 25,000 public servants, 888 out of education. The member for Unley let that cat out of the bag. No wonder the opposition tried the small-target strategy. One would have thought they would have learnt, but it did lead to their downfall. Pleasingly, my grandchildren do not have to wait until they are old to see their grandmother in government.

We are investing more than \$1 billion extra in education and child development over the next four years. The member for Unley spoke about the big battle for the electorate of Adelaide. I think he is trying to wipe the memory of the battle for Ashford from his memory. He directed and ran that campaign and failed. The member for Ashford picked up 1.3 per cent of the vote to win her seat, despite a redistribution reducing her margin to 0.6 of a per cent. The seat was practically wrapped in a bow and delivered with a singing telegram, but thanks to the inspired leadership of the member for Unley they could not figure out how to open that box.

The member for Unley had the monumental achievement of a swing against him of 2.2 per cent, an amazing achievement when you are an opposition running against a government seeking a fourth term. The member for Unley also suggested that Prospect had somehow been let down. This is somewhat rich coming from the party whose second campus for Adelaide High School

document proposed the creation of a mega-edu-sausage factory that left out Thorngate, Collinswood, Medindie, Medindie Gardens and Nailsworth, whereas our new CBD school will allow the secondary school zones in Adelaide's inner suburbs to be redrawn.

As well as allowing students from the suburbs of Ovingham, Prospect, Fitzroy and Thorngate to enrol in year 8 in 2015 at Adelaide High School, we will be honouring our policy to include Bowden, Brompton, Hindmarsh, Hilton, Kurralta Park, Glandore, Black Forest, Nailsworth, Medindie Gardens, Medindie, Gilberton, Walkerville and Collinswood into an expanded city zone in 2019.

As stated in our policy, the eastern parts of Torrensville, Mile End, Richmond and Marleston will also be included and, as a result of the advocacy of the member for Ashford, sections of Clarence Park zoned to Black Forest Primary School will also be rezoned.

Government schools in the member for Unley's electorate are set to lose a total of \$4.2 million, as follows:

- Glen Osmond Primary School—\$456,000
- Glenunga International High School—\$1.95 million
- Highgate School—\$769,000
- Parkside Primary School—\$429,000

What we want to see is Liberal members opposite standing up and supporting their schools in their electorates.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (20:36): I rise to give a grievance to the Appropriation Bill. That was a very interesting speech we have just heard. Members on this side do stand up for their electorates, and the minister would be well aware in communication we have had over several months now—since November last year—of the school where I spent most of my education, Coomandook Area School. It is no accident that, out of an enrolment of about 160, 12 left after last year because of the debacle of funding in bush education. It is just an absolute debacle.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: You had your go and I kept quiet. It is an absolute disgrace when a local area school—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the Minister for Education to order.

Mr PEDERICK: It is an absolute disgrace when a country area school cannot even hold their in-house sports carnival on their own oval and they have to travel 50 kilometres to Meningie to do it because there is not the money in the budget to water that oval. They have a swimming pool that has been out of action for 12 months, yet the education department hired the failed contractor that did the job last time.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: They hired a failed—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: You had your go. Mr Speaker, I seek your protection.

The SPEAKER: I did not have a go, actually.

Mr PEDERICK: I was speaking to the member for Wright, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Point of order, sir: he is standing there shouting at me and pointing his finger at me, and he has the gall to ask for your protection.

The SPEAKER: That is an entirely bogus point of order, and I—

Members interjecting:

Mr Pisoni: She's a bogus minister.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley has been called to order and is on two warnings. The Minister for Education is warned for taking a bogus point of order. Member for Hammond.

Mr PEDERICK: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your protection. I am a quiet, unassuming member. Mr Speaker, for the Minister for Education to make the comments that she did in this house tonight, when I see the school that I love, the school I went to, being torn down through lack of funding and lack of appropriate maintenance, is an absolute disgrace. For the minister to come into this place and make out they are doing such a good job for education when 12 of those children have left that education facility to go elsewhere, is an absolute disgrace and really hits at the heart of regional communities.

What I would also like to refer to is the funding cuts to agriculture spending in this budget. We have a government trying to ride on the back of agriculture in this state because the Olympic Dam expansion has not happened, sadly. Suddenly, we see the Premier decide that agriculture is going to be the saviour. As I mentioned in my earlier speech in regard to the Appropriation Bill, we are down to the lowest budget spend in agriculture for over a decade at \$59.8 million. It is an absolute disgrace.

I refer now to the Australian Centre for Plant Functional Genomics. It is having a severe cutback and the Chief Executive Officer Michael Gilbert outlined these cuts. In 2013, the South Australian government advised that it was reducing its annual investment to \$260,000, down from \$1.8 million. The GRDC has now advised that due to this drop in equity funding it will from 2015 withdraw core equity investment and only fund the Australian Centre for Plant Functional Genomics on a project basis. This means that the ACPFG will lose the financial base to protect and generate value from the intellectual property it has developed over the past 11 years. We are also in danger of losing key scientific staff and the essence which has made ACPFG unusually successful.

Without this funding it will lose the protection of its IP, lose the capacity to grow the international research contracts, lose the capacity for further business development from its IP and lose world-class capacity to grow the future local grains industry. These budget cuts will result in significant research capacity being lost from an industry that will be central to South Australia's economic future.

Agriculture is a vital component of our state's economy. There needs to be more support for our farmers and regional towns. Our farmers are one of the biggest earners in the state and need to be supported to assist growth. There needs to be more significant investment in growing our exports as this industry has the ability to significantly grow our state's economy.

I will now state a few facts around what has been happening: food exports from South Australia have only grown by an average of 1 per cent annually in the past decade—what an abysmal performance that reflects the lack of state government assistance; livestock exports have decreased by 10 per cent; dairy exports have decreased by 10 per cent; and seafood exports have decreased by 5 per cent. Even with all these cuts, the food industry is still the main driver of the state's economy and employs nearly 20 per cent of the workforce.

There is a lack of any strategic long-term plan for agriculture in this state. Agriculture has been asking for a long-term plan for years but the Labor Party continues to ignore them. The Liberals promised a plan at the last state election which was well received by industry. Regional South Australia, I believe, will be the future gateway for the state's prosperity and growth but the Labor Party continues to abuse it.

River Murray funding has been cut once again. The government will spend \$4.3 million less on the River Murray, the Lower Lakes and the Coorong environmental programs. A lot of these programs involved community engagement with community volunteers doing their bit to shore up acidic shorelines and doing what they could to make sure that there was some environmental health in the lower reaches of the Murray.

Natural resources management has been stripped right across the board of \$1 million in annual funding across the state. What we will see is that these NRM cuts will most likely be transferred to farmers who will be hit with more levies and more costs. With regard to the regions, we need the Minister for Regional Development to stand up for our farmers in the regions.

I will just make a point about job losses in this state. In May 2014 there were 2,500 South Australian jobs lost in Adelaide but 1,400 jobs were lost in regional South Australia and there were

4,000 more unemployed in regional South Australia in May 2014. The regional unemployment rate increased from 6.1 per cent to 8 per cent in May 2014. It is the worst jobless rate of all the regions in the nation. It is an absolute shame. The unemployment rate for the Mid North of South Australia, where the Minister for Regional Development resides, is now at 9.3 per cent. That is in Geoff Brock's own electorate.

I want to close my remarks by talking about marine parks. What a flawed policy; what a disgraceful policy coming into play on 1 October this year. We will see a massive impact not just on fishermen but on whole communities, especially seaside communities. It is a whole service community to fishermen: people who service boats, holidaymakers, caravan parks—there is a whole range of impacts that will be felt right downstream from where the fish are caught offshore. Sadly, what we see is an environment department with some misguided view of the world; they want to take over the fishing industry from the primary industries department. We have the Fisheries Management Act, which is world recognised as being some of the best—if not the best—legislative framework to manage our fisheries, yet, no, the green zealots in the Labor Party think there is a better way.

Because there is about only one person on that side now who has ever run any sort of business, they have no idea what impact this is having. I know that the Ferguson family on Kangaroo Island is already shifting out one-third of their boats; they are gone. They have made that decision, those boats are going. All that regional input is lost to this state because of this flawed policy. It is going to hurt communities all the way from the Far West Coast right down to the South-East of this state, the impacts of these no take zones. They have not been planned at all; they have just been put in by zealots where they think it is a good spot to have no-take zone, when it has been perfectly well managed under the Fisheries Management Act.

I note that in the last couple of days the head of the environment department, Allan Holmes, when asked on radio about how this will be policed—because the environment budget has been cut by millions—said 'Oh, it will be self-policed.' Well, good luck with that. It is a very sad budget, and it is a very sad budget with regard to agriculture and regional South Australia. Let us hope this government is not here for too much longer.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (20:47): It is my pleasure to rise to make a further contribution to the budget bill currently before the house, and it is a great privilege to follow the member for Hammond, who has been such a passionate advocate for all things regional for such an extended period of time. He, like everyone in the Liberal Party, recognises that the regions have such a great opportunity to turn our economy here in South Australia around. The regions provide enormous opportunity; they have been neglected for an extended period of time but we, on this side of the house at least, know their potential. That is why we took a very large offering to the people of South Australia to this election. Unfortunately we did not form government.

I must say that in the days after the election we were somewhat heartened by the fact that the word 'regional' passed the lips of the Premier. He started talking about the regions—in fact, the government even recently made a visit to a region—so we were excited by the prospect of a budget that would have some focus on creating jobs in regional South Australia and enable the regions to participate in the economic resurgence of South Australia. Of course, we were very, very dismayed when finally the budget was handed down and a golden opportunity to provide the regions with an opportunity to help our economic recovery in South Australia was completely and utterly lost.

This is a grave problem for South Australia. When we look at the employment statistics for this state, they are abysmal. We know that this government has presided over an economy in which we have lost 19,600 jobs in this state between the last two budgets. We look around the rest of the country and we see economies that are growing. We see Victoria, which has created 18,000 jobs; we take a look at the Queensland economy, and they have created 60,000 jobs; Tasmania has been creating jobs. What have we been doing here in South Australia? I will tell you what we have been doing: we have been sitting on our hands. We have had the wrong economic settings in place; a high-tax, high-regulation government putting further burden on the productive component of our economy, unlike the other Liberal reformist governments which sit in every other state of Australia.

They are implementing a reformist agenda to take the burden off the productive component of the economy and, guess what, they are creating jobs. This is not rocket science: you take the burden away from the productive component of the economy and that component of the economy

wants to create jobs and increase investment. We are in exactly the opposite situation here in South Australia.

Let me tell you that the situation for regional South Australia under this government is going from bad to worse. I would like to share with the house this evening some of those statistics which were alluded to by the member for Hammond in his earlier excellent contribution to this debate. On 19 June this year, the Australian Bureau of Statistics released their regional labour market brief, and what a sorry tale it is for South Australia. Not only at the macro level have we lost 19,600 jobs in this state over the last 12 months but, when we take a look at regional South Australia, it is a very perilous situation.

I would like to refer specifically to the statistics for the area in which the Minister for Regional Development actually lives and represents, and that is the regions of the Barossa, Yorke and Mid North. Let's take a look at what these statistics show us. They show us that the unemployment rate in this area a year ago was 5.8 per cent, so let's take a look at what it says now, a year later, a year after these miserable settings that this government has had in place. What have they delivered for the people in that region? A massive unemployment rate there now skyrocketing to a dangerous 9.3 per cent. You have to go back a long time in South Australia's history to see unemployment rates with a '9' before them. They are heading in the wrong direction—9.3 per cent.

There is a youth unemployment rate in that district of 16.9 per cent, and it gets even worse if you go to outback South Australia, and I know many people in this place are very concerned about employment opportunities in outback South Australia. Let me tell you that 5.8 per cent a year ago and 10.1 per cent in May this year are the statistics that have just been published in the SA regional labour market brief, published on 19 June by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, and there is a staggering 18.4 per cent youth unemployment rate in outback South Australia.

That is exactly and precisely why we need to be very careful as a parliament when we consider the Marine Parks (Sanctuary Zones) Amendment Bill, which was passed in the other place today. This is an extremely important bill because it will enable a continuation of the very important commercial fishing sector here in South Australia. I am a great advocate for our marine parks in South Australia. Make no mistake about this: I am a great advocate for our marine parks in South Australia, and I wholeheartedly support the establishment of these marine parks and for South Australia to fulfil its obligations under the various UN protocols that relate to marine biodiversity and also the protection of our marine environment.

However, I do not support the current sanctuary zones that have been suggested by this government to be put into place on 1 October this year. I will tell you why I do not support these particular sanctuary zones, or what the industry calls 'no-take zones': because they are not in any way based on a threats-based determination, and this is the problem. What we have from this government is a representative sample of our marine waters in South Australia locked up in a conservation framework.

When we asked the question of this government, 'What is the point of excluding fishing? What damage is the fishing sector doing in these areas?' the answer came back, 'Well, fishing is not doing any damage.' So, we legitimately say, 'If fishing is not doing any damage, then why are we excluding it?' 'Well, we want to have a conservation framework. We want to lock up these waters in a conservation framework and we want to preclude commercial fishing from taking place in this environment.'

Quite frankly, that is just not good enough. This government needs to take a look at the regional labour market brief which has been provided to the house; it needs to understand that we want growing regions in South Australia. We do not want to be diminishing jobs in this important sector.

The commercial fishing sector in South Australia directly employs over 6,000 people and most of those jobs are in regional South Australia. Hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars of exports come from the commercial fishing sector. This is a very important sector to our economy, but it is also a very responsible sector. It is an extraordinarily responsible sector. Nobody in the commercial fishing sector would like to see any harm come to the commercial fishing waters in South Australia; they want to protect them. They want to protect these waters. They are not going to let any harm come to these waters whatsoever.

What we need to do is have a system in place where any protections are based upon threats to the marine environment. We already have the Fisheries Management Act 2007. The Fisheries Management Act provides for aquatic reserves to be proclaimed to exclude fishing. If there is any danger to the marine environment the people within PIRSA (the fisheries department) can proclaim these aquatic reserves and make sure that no harm can come to these waters or the marine environment, but this government has chosen to ignore a threats-based determination for exclusion and base it upon this conservation framework. Sir, I put it to you that this is completely and utterly unacceptable.

South Australia's employment situation is worsening—19,600 jobs lost in this state in the last 12 months. The last thing we can afford at the moment is further job losses, particularly in regional South Australia. The Premier said after the election that he was going to pay greater regard to the regions of South Australia and the small business sector in South Australia. Well, here is the first test. We would like to see those members opposite pass the Marine Parks (Sanctuary Zones) Amendment Bill when it is introduced into this house. This will be a great test for the government to see whether it is actually fair dinkum about creating, preserving and growing regional jobs in South Australia. How much does it specifically and genuinely care about the regions in South Australia?

We will be watching the member for Frome. We will be watching the member for Waite. We will be watching every single member opposite and we will see how they vote on that bill when it comes before the house. I know that many opposite will enjoy that debate. Some of them already look excited about the prospect of us—

The Hon. S.W. Key: I'm excited.

Mr MARSHALL: The member for Ashford says she really cannot wait; she is looking forward to it. I will certainly be looking forward to her contribution. We have very little time because these new sanctuary zones will be proclaimed on 1 October. Mark my words: if these go ahead we will see further job losses in regional South Australia, we will see a decrease in exports out of South Australia and we will see this state get further and further behind the Liberal reformist governments which exist in every other state in Australia.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (20:58): I rise tonight to beseech the government and call on its support for funding for a significant project in the seat of Hartley, namely, the Felixstow Reserve master plan. Anyone who knows the area and knows the Felixstow master plan would know that for many years, unfortunately, this part of the world, this patch of grass, has been significantly under-utilised by the community. It is through the great efforts of the Eastern Region Alliance—an alliance of seven councils in metropolitan Adelaide, including: the City of Burnside, the City of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters, the Corporation of the Town of Walkerville, the Campbelltown City Council and the City of Tea Tree Gully—and a significant project called Waterproofing Eastern Adelaide whereby an opportunity has arisen for these councils to work together to better utilise the scarce resources we have, and the most scarce resource is water.

What I would like to do is explain a little bit about what the project entails, some of the features and benefits of it, talk a little bit about the consultation and then, finally, call on the government to support the project, to put its hand in its pockets and to support funding for this great project. Felixstow Reserve has been underutilised for many years now. In fact, as a young man, I used to actually use Felixstow Reserve on Saturday mornings to play Auskick but, for many years now, it has been significantly underused. If this project does go ahead, it will certainly lead to much greater use.

There are many social issues involved and improvements in social use should this go ahead, as well as cultural issues and the obvious environmental issues. I would like to talk a little bit about the sorts of benefits that can be expected if the Felixstow Reserve master plan does go ahead. Obviously, open space is extremely important; however, once this site is developed, you will see certain amenities improved, and I will explain what they are.

Firstly, you will see a U-shaped wetland located along the River Torrens Linear Park and at the reserve, which will be several hectares in size. There will still be a large open-space area for passive recreational use, and this is obviously very important because we want to make sure that families in the area still have ample opportunity to walk their dogs on weekends and play with their children. Large open space is extremely important and will still exist under this proposal.

There will also be a network of pathways and walkways. As you know, sir, being a keen cyclist, there are a number of cyclists who use the Linear Park and surrounding area, so it will be extremely important that these sorts of pathways and walkways are installed here to enhance the various features of the reserve and the surrounding amenity.

I am pleased to say that, under the proposal, there will also be natural play equipment in the lower reserve located in Linear Park. That is obviously important because we want to put out to the community that exercising is important. We want to emphasise the need for safer, stronger and healthier communities as well. There will also be fitness equipment located strategically throughout the reserve and viewing platforms for the wetland. It is hoped that significant flora and fauna would also be in the area and on the site.

As you can see, there are a number of positive features and a number of positive benefits involved with this project. The total ERE project is estimated to be about \$28 million worth, \$9.5 million of which was actually funded by federal government funding, while \$2 million has been provided by the Adelaide & Mount Lofty Ranges Natural Resources Management Board. The remaining money will mostly be funded through the proposed regional subsidiary, with the councils acting as guarantors. I would also ask the state government to put its hand in its pockets and support this project.

Apart from mentioning the features and benefits, I note that this plan has actually gone to consultation. To the local council's credit—the Payneham, Norwood and St Peters council—several days of consultation have been held. I know of two recent days of consultation, both of which I attended. I applaud the council and the local volunteers who assisted in holding these consultation days.

I note that, on one consultation day, 92 written submissions had been received, whereby 94 per cent of respondents were supportive of a wetland being developed at Felixstow Reserve, so there is a clear positive majority here. The local community understands that this is an underutilised resource. They understand that the sky is the limit for this resource. If you can improve the amenity of a public resource, why not? At the same time, there are obvious advantages in doing so—advantages for the social implications of the area, the cultural implications of the area and, most importantly, the environmental implications. If a local council area is able to better capture the stormwater that it is able to, why not?

I would ask the state government in its future budgets to consider supporting the Felixstow master plan concept. It has been released for public consultation, as I mentioned. It has enormous positive impacts on the community and I would certainly be disappointed if I saw in the next budget that the state government was not supporting this project.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (21:05): I want to continue my comments from where I left off yesterday afternoon in my speech on the Appropriation Bill. I was illustrating the fact that the Treasurer has his projections completely wrong in relation to the forecast surplus that he is making in two years' time of over \$400 million. There was comparison made with seance yesterday in the house.

The Hon. S.W. Key: Are you into the black arts?

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I am definitely not and I do not know much about it, as I said yesterday, but I understand there is a glass and a board or something. The Treasurer has his hand on the glass pushing it as hard as he can towards the surplus side of things, but really the forces of reality are pushing it even harder to the deficit side of things. We know that the forces of reality are correct and why do we say that? Because, as I pointed out yesterday, none of the government's budget forecasts has ever been realised.

Through the whole 12 years of them being in government none of the budgets has ever been realised. They have never met their budget figures and I gave as illustration some examples of how they have exceeded their expenditure, massively blown out their expenditure, year on year. Also they massively underestimated those rivers of gold flowing in from the GST in the early years of their government.

Why are we saying that? Because it is the track record of this government that they can never get it right in relation to their budget predictions, and for the Treasurer to forecast it was going to be a surplus of \$400 million plus in a couple of years is all wrong. Another reason is that a highly

respected academic, Professor Dick Blandy, has publicly raised some significant doubts and given some reasons as to why he does not believe that that surplus figure will result.

Another reason is the estimated growth figures that the government is projecting; they are way outside the realms of reality. For a long time the state has not achieved those growth figures and the government is projecting way above what has been achieved previously to achieve this budget surplus. It is seance economics, it is voodoo economics, as was described yesterday in the house, but really strongly supported by the government's past record and some quite serious sensible analysis from a highly respected academic.

I want to turn my comments to some local issues, particularly in relation to infrastructure in my electorate. For a long time—for about the past 10 or so years—I have stood up in this place and lobbied strongly for a second freeway interchange to be built at Mount Barker.

To the credit of the local federal member (Hon. Jamie Briggs), at the time of the 2010 federal election he had an amount of money committed from the federal government—I think, from memory, it was \$20 million then—and he was able to maintain that commitment. At last year's federal election, it was reduced to \$16 million. They are in seriously tough economic times with the state of things in Canberra, so it is understandable that the commitment from the feds was reduced in a minor manner.

We were able to drag the government, kicking and screaming, at the very last minute to commit to that project in the election campaign. It was part of our policy platform, and I was very pleased that my party committed \$8 million and made that commitment to see that project realised. The District Council of Mount Barker is contributing \$3 million, so it is a \$27 million project, and it is a necessary piece of infrastructure.

I am not going to say that I am pleased that the government has made that commitment, because the community is satisfied that the government has committed those funds, but it is necessary infrastructure. The focus was sharpened on the requirement for that specific piece of infrastructure when the government unilaterally made the decision back in December 2010 to rezone all that land (1,310 hectares) in and around Mount Barker, against all the advice.

The council did not want it, the community did not want it, and we on this side of the house certainly did not want it. We opposed that policy, but the then minister for planning and urban development (Hon. Paul Holloway) made a unilateral decision and rubberstamped it. Basically, he rubberstamped the development plan amendment to rezone that land without any consideration of the concerns of the community, the council or this side of the parliament.

We have seen a big mess left as a consequence of that decision, and the District Council of Mount Barker was left with a huge task, without any assistance from the government, in preparing what we call a structure plan; that is, all the requirements of where the local roads and associated infrastructure have to go, as well as the schools and the parks—you name it. The council had to pick up all the tatty loose ends that the government left as a consequence of that very poor decision. We on this side of the house, working through the Legislative Council, were able to have the matter referred to the Ombudsman, and the Ombudsman brought down a report that was less than complimentary and less than satisfactory in relation to how the government dealt with that.

It left an enormous level of uncertainty at the local level. Back then, SA Water could not make a decision on how they were going to deal with all the wastewater generated from the proposed development. They were thinking about a combined plant out at Monarto to deal with the expansion going on at Murray Bridge and Mount Barker. They prevaricated over that and were wringing their hands, so eventually that was off the drawing board.

We then had a private company proposing to build a stand-alone wastewater treatment plant at Callington, and that was extremely problematic. I really think it was a bad idea to pump greywater and blackwater from Mount Barker out to the back of the Hills and onto the Murray Plains in the Bremer Valley to treat wastewater, blackwater and greywater from the township of Mount Barker.

To its absolute credit, the Mount Barker council have come up with their own plan and they are building their own wastewater treatment plant. For the latest information, I hear they are still considering the tenders from their call for that part of the process. So, really, the government made that unilateral decision and then they handballed the rest of the responsibility back to the council and the community.

It was interesting during the course of the election campaign that the then transport minister tried to muddy the waters in relation to the funding that was available for freeway work at Mount Barker. The member for Mayo, the federal Minister for Infrastructure, categorically said there was only \$16 million from federal government going towards that project, and we have seen that is the amount of money, with \$8 million from the government and \$3 million from the council. The project, I understand, is going ahead in the latter part of this year.

Time expired.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (21:16): It is with great pleasure that I rise tonight to give my grievance speech in response to the budget. We have heard many a story here tonight about the mismanaged budgets over time by this government and how this is hurting this state. The deficits backed up after deficits: six of the last seven budgets all promised to be in surplus and returned in deficit. The last two, of course, were record numbers of deficit with almost \$1 billion in both years. In fact, the most recent year was \$1.2 billion in deficit. That sort of budget is really damaging South Australia, damaging business confidence in South Australia and creating an uncertain future for so many here in this state, and more particularly for our young people.

I would like to draw a few transport issues to the attention of the house, if I may. I know a lot was talked about in the lead-up to the budget—a lot of promises about the Gawler electrification, and this one still has me shaking my head: \$152 million is the figure at the moment that is allocated to complete that project. It has been on again, off again, on again, off again, and they are claiming it is on again. I notice in the forward estimates that in the last year there is \$60 million set aside. They hope that it is there in that budget, and they are still \$92 million short of getting the project done.

I do not know how the people in the north feel about that, but to me they have been shunted around, pushed around and shoved around. Will this project get done or not under this government? It is quite amazing, because they promise it and put it on the table, take it off the table, put it on the table and take it off the table. It is just quite astounding. I say that with reference, too, to my own electorate of Mitchell where a similar thing has happened over the journey.

It was back in 2008 that I think \$6.8 million was spent on upgrading the Oaklands train station there, a piece of infrastructure that has been long overdue to have a look at getting a project fix. This government, as I said, spent that \$6.8 million on overhauling the train station and then a little bit later they promised \$12.6 million to upgrade the congestion that is that intersection of Diagonal Road, Prunus Street and Morphett Road, but in the 2011 budget, again, it was off the table. It was scrapped and the \$12.6 million was taken off the table, and instead they went with a \$2 million study, which I thought was quite fascinating and quite an expensive study.

From that, we got some more pretty pictures and they are quite commonplace. We got some wonderful, pretty pictures of an overpass, and I quote from the transport minister of the time (in fact, I think it was from one of his staff members) who said that 'the costing of this'—this is after a \$2 million study—'is somewhere beyond \$100 million'. So, you spend \$2 million on a study and the figure that comes back is somewhere beyond \$100 million—where beyond \$100 million we are not really sure. But that is all we saw from that \$2 million study. The people of the electorate were shown those pretty pictures over a very long period of time and they talked about this wonderful study and this wonderful overpass and in fact that has not happened.

Most notably, too, with that and the recent electrification of the Seaford line and the concrete sleepers going down, I heard with interest the Premier saying yesterday that the whole Seaford line has had the concrete sleepers put down, and he referred to the old wooden sleepers as being toothpicks or matchsticks or twigs, or something like that.

Members interjecting:

Mr WINGARD: Splinters, thank you very much. I was at the intersection the other day and they have left some splinters behind, so with the whole project they are doing, the money they have spent, there are still splinters, as he described them, on the bend of the Oaklands crossing. Whether that plan is to tease people and have them think that the overpass is coming, I really do not know. I talk about the people of Gawler with their electrification, teased by this government and not delivered in the budget. It has happened in the electorate of Mitchell as well. Maybe they know that there just is not money in the budget to be doing these projects.

With that, I look at the O-Bahn extension and the people of Mitchell have come to me in the last couple of weeks and they have spoken to me about what is proposed: is it \$60 million, \$160 million, 500 metres, 700 metres, will it save 10 minutes in travel time, will it save four minutes in travel time? These are rubbery figures we are hearing and seeing again. The people of Mitchell have come to me again saying, 'Our project was on the table, off the table, this project is on the table. What is going on? Why are these people getting preferential treatment?' I can tell you that the state is confused. They should not be because if you look back over the finances of this state for a long time you can see this government has lost control of where the finances are going, how they are being spent.

I note with interest the pretty pictures I speak of, the integrated transport plan that came out before the last election, \$30 million over 30 years. It was a wonderful glossy document, great pictures again. The pictures were outstanding, but where is the funding for all this going forward? That is what does not seem to come when these plans are put in place. They go in place, they are promised, funding does not come and then they are just shelved. The Gawler train line again—I am staggered at that, and how the people of Gawler and all along the route are not up in arms about it is beyond me.

I said the people of Oaklands Park are in a similar boat and they really cannot understand how and/or why their project has been on the table, off the table, and on the table again. It is quite fascinating. In the time I have spent at the Oaklands train station and spoken to the commuters and when I catch the train myself, I talk to people. There was a recent survey that talked about 50 per cent of people on the train being dissatisfied with the reliability of this service and that, to me, is another great concern.

When you are spending money on a service like this, and quite a considerable amount of money was spent on the electrification of the Seaford line, commuters then come away after that massive investment and say, 'We are not happy.' In fact, there are three million fewer boardings on public transport since the Premier came into office and that just says to me that people have no confidence in the system, and that is what I hear on the ground when I travel on public transport, when I talk to people at the train stations and the bus stations around the city. That is the gist of what I am getting and it is not good enough. We are spending that amount of money and we are spending millions of dollars on the transport system and people just cannot rely on it. It is very disturbing.

The catch here is the number of people who are using public transport. They have got off public transport—and I hear it time and again—because it is not reliable, and then we hear lines and buses are being shut down because they are not being used. People have got off these services because they are not being used. That is something I think is a great concern. The system is not supporting itself, it is not helping itself, it is not bringing in more customers, and I think that is something that really must be addressed and I am not convinced it was addressed in this budget.

One of the most amazing things that I have picked up on again in speaking to people in the electorate and around Adelaide is about bus and train interchanges. This is one that really had me quite fascinated. I spoke to a constituent who said, 'I used to catch the train and I used to catch the bus to the train and vice-versa.' He said, 'Every time the bus pulled up at the train, the train would be pulling out of the station and, every time the train would pull up, the bus would be leaving the station.' So he said, 'Never could they get these two things in cahoots. It would cost an extra 20 minutes each way on his travel every day.' You would think that if you could line them up and get them working efficiently you would have a much better system and people would want to use that system. He gave up, hopped back in his car and he said it is just working so much better and it is saving him time. That is not what we want out of our public transport system. Again, I stress there is no confidence in this system.

The other issue that truly amazed me when I was speaking to people again was the local high school. Its catchment area is determined by the education department. I was speaking to this high school and they said, 'We can't get our kids on buses that come to our school. The bus does not come anywhere near our school.' In fact, it goes quite a distance away, and it makes it harder for these students to get to school. It adds substantial travel time.

In fact, there are schools that are a similar distance away and they can get buses to those schools, but the school they are zoned to does not have a bus that comes to that school. It just does not make sense again. It is a system that is not working and not as efficient as it should be, and that

is what is causing problems. You can spend millions and millions of dollars, but if you cannot get the system to actually work it is incredibly frustrating.

The other thing I have some reservations about as I look at the budget is the Motor Accident Commission. We know that \$100 million was taken out last year and \$500 million this year, and we think the government might be looking for another \$500 million to keep propping up the poor budgets they have been producing and to cover some of the overspend and the uncontrollable mismanaged spending over the past seven to 10 years.

I am worried that taking the money out of the Motor Accident Commission is going to impact on road safety and road safety campaigns because the Motor Accident Commission has funded those road safety campaigns for a long time. I am worried about where the money is going to come from in the future. I am sure this government will find another tax, another way to bring in money from people's pockets so they can fund the Motor Accident Commission. I look forward to hearing how that is going to happen in the future so that we keep our roads safe.

Personal Explanation

MINISTER'S REMARKS

Mr PISONI (Unley) (21:26): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr PISONI: During the minister's contribution to the grievance debate, she made the claim that I had released a press release making certain comments about the shoppies union and schools. I would like you to understand, sir, that there was no such press release. No press release was written or distributed by me on that matter.

The SPEAKER: That is clear.

Mr PISONI: Thank you, sir.

The SPEAKER: Now you are beginning your contribution to this debate?

Mr PISONI: Thank you, sir.

The SPEAKER: Splendid.

Bills

APPROPRIATION BILL 2014

Appropriation Grievances

Debate resumed.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (21:27): I listened with interest when the education minister was talking about what she described as some of the achievements of the Labor government and some elements in the budget, but I did not hear her mention or expand on the promise that was made prior to the state election about the new education precinct at Magill, with the Magill University of South Australia campus. If you recall, during the election there was a promise of Norwood Morialta High School moving to that precinct. There was a promise of a primary school also co-locating with that precinct so that we would have reception to year 12 students working with the university.

We get the budget papers and all we see is a \$250,000 feasibility study for 2014-15 and nothing for the next three years, so I think we can guess from those budget papers that we are going to have an expensive talkfest. There will be some lovely colour flyers, perhaps. Perhaps there will be a booklet that we will see the Premier walk around with, but there will be no school at Magill. It is no wonder that the minister did not touch on that during her speech.

I want to also pick up on some of the comments the minister made yesterday when she was referring to the independent public school concept. The minister yesterday in parliament referred to money from the commonwealth for the independent public school initiative, and she said she was considering participating in that initiative. The minister has been travelling round the state talking about the cuts to the education budget, the difference between years 5 and 6, that were signed or promised by the former Liberal government and what is in the budget.

She has been telling schools how much money they will be missing out on in that comparison but then she is also telling us that she is not necessarily going to take the extra \$5.7 million offered from Canberra for participating in the independent public school system. She says that we do not need it here because we have school autonomy. At the same time she said that it was a terrible idea, that it delivers a two-tiered system.

Minister, you have told us that we have autonomy here and that we have the concept here but we do not have the name. You are going to condemn the process and you are considering not taking the money. It is a very strange political argument that we hear from the minister. You simply cannot have it both ways. The minister is completely wrong to assert that the IPS concept will initiate an unfair two-tiered system in our public school system. She has claimed that introducing independent public schools will give us a two-tiered system.

If we were to accept that on face value, is the minister saying that the IPS systems is a better system and that because all schools cannot immediately move into the IPS system it will generate a two-tiered system? We have some schools that are performing better than others. Is the minister's solution to that that we cannot have any schools perform better than they are performing now unless all schools perform better than they are performing now? I think it illustrates just how long they have had that relationship with the Australian Education Union, where the lowest common denominator is where everybody is comfortable in the union. That is the management style that we have seen here in South Australia.

If the minister went over to Western Australia she would see that 264 of Western Australia's 800 public schools, which house around half of public school students, are already fully within the program, and another 231 schools are to join the scheme. They are lining up. The reason it takes a while, of course, is that it involves the training of principals, the training of governing councils. Where we have seen the best outcomes of school participation with parents, increases in academic achievements and increases in engagement in schools are in some of the toughest areas in Perth, some of the areas where they have been struggling for years to get good school leaders and good teachers.

What has been happening in Western Australia is that the whole community has become involved in their school community. What we see in my electorate is a very strong cohort on the governing council simply from parents—you see doctors, lawyers, accountants, business people, high-ranking public servants, so there is plenty of expertise on the governing council.

Of course, if you go into some of the lower socioeconomic areas in the northern suburbs, for example, you are unlikely to find the same pool of parents to participate in the process. So, consequently, what they have done in Western Australia is open up the school community to include local businesses, whether that be a small business, a large employer in the area, people from council and people from community organisations to come on board and be members of that school board. Consequently, the expertise that is available to that school board is now available from a broader range of people.

If we look at what has happened in South Australia over the last 12 years, we see a massive drift from the public sector to the private sector. We have seen about 9,000 students leave the public sector and about 15,000 students join the private sector. Unfortunately, the growth in that area has been in low-fee schools in our lower socioeconomic areas.

Consequently we are not getting the demographic mix in our schools. Public schools in those difficult areas are becoming more dysfunctional because supportive families, families that bring skills and a degree of aspiration, if you like—that might not necessarily be there with every family—to those schools and sharing it with others are going to the private system because the public system is not delivering what those parents want. It is not delivering them a voice at the governing council; it is not delivering them access to their teachers; it is not delivering them a say in the curriculum. All these decisions are being made in Flinders Street.

Then we have this bizarre industrial relations system where you are not rewarded or paid based on your ability as a teacher, what you are able to achieve or on your skill level, but your pay level is based on how long you have been serving as a teacher.

Consequently, the longer you are in the system the more likely you are to get a job closer to where you live. Where do most teachers live? They live in electorates like mine, Unley, and in the

electorate of the member for Dunstan, our leader. They live in the leafy green suburbs, so they want to work in a leafy green suburb.

So, effectively, what happens with the industrial relations system is that we end up with our most experienced teachers and school leaders in our least disadvantaged primary schools and high schools that have enormous resource in their parent cohort, and we send our least experienced teachers and school leaders to our most difficult schools, those very schools that need the experience, that need quality teaching because, let's face it, many of those families are struggling to understand the concept and value of education.

We are seeing second and third generation unemployed people in those suburbs, and we are seeing a lot fewer job opportunities. As with the chicken and the egg argument, you could argue whether we have a situation where the job opportunities are not there because the education system has failed or whether the education system has failed because the job opportunities are not there? In both cases it is a big fail after 12 years of Labor. Remember, this state used to be a leader in educational development. People used to come from all over the country to learn what was happening in education in South Australia. We used to lead in international PISA scores and in national testing. After 12 years of Labor we have fallen well behind.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (21:37): It was you, Madam Deputy Speaker, in your contribution earlier today, in your place as the member for Florey, who talked about matters electoral.

Ms Sanderson: Muriel!

Mr WILLIAMS: Not Muriel Matters. I made a few comments in my earlier contribution on the bill and now in this grievance I decided to come back to this matter. The Leader of the Opposition in his contribution yesterday signalled his intent to move a private member's bill tomorrow to instigate an independent judicial inquiry into matters electoral here in South Australia.

We have seen a number of people since the 15 March election try to make the case that we have a wonderful electoral system in South Australia and that there is nothing that needs fixing. I want to go back and redress that. Not just your comments today, but I noted in *The Advertiser* this morning that a government spokesman, I think the Deputy Premier, said that the government would not be supporting this matter, that they wanted to set up a standing committee. My understanding is that the standing committee was directed more at things like the Electoral Act rather than the Constitution Act, where I believe the problem lies.

I picked up today in *InDaily* that David Washington wrote an article, entitled 'The myth of the undemocratic South Australian election'. I want to address his article today, because it shows how wrong you can get it when you write about something you do not know anything about.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Ha, ha, ha—chortles from over the way.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I shall give the rulings on laughter, audible, infectious or whatever.

Mr WILLIAMS: Or forced, Madam.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, all sorts of laughter have been ruled on in parliaments, but you're going to remain on track, aren't you, member for MacKillop?

Mr WILLIAMS: I certainly am, Madam Deputy Speaker, because I have some important matters to canvass.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Absolutely. He is quoting the leader, I think, in his contribution yesterday, saying:

For over a decade, the SA election system has delivered the opposite result to what the majority of voters want.

David Washington took him to task because he points out that in 2006 there was a landslide election victory to Labor. Well, there we go: there was one Labor win result. Between 1989 and 2014, there have been seven elections in South Australia, and six of them have been won by the Liberal Party

on a two-party preferred basis. Out of those seven elections, notwithstanding the Liberal Party won six of them, only twice was the Liberal Party able to form government.

So, the Labor Party has won only one of those elections, that 2006 election, but it was able to form government no fewer than five times. The people of South Australia would be scratching their head, like I am, at the problem they face in trying to get rid of a government they do not want, because that is what they have been trying to do.

David Washington goes on to make the case that, if you took the seats of Frome and Fisher and they were Liberal seats, the Liberal Party won the last election. He is saying that we would have won 24 seats if both the seat of Fisher and the seat of Frome were held by the Liberal Party. He was saying that is the case, that they should be Liberal seats, and that it is our fault that they are held by Independents. That may well be the case. He goes on to argue that when you look at the number of seats, including those two seats on the Liberal side, and the vote that we got, we would have had something like 51.06 per cent of the seats if we had held those two seats, which is pretty close to 53 per cent of the vote.

This is the problem when you have someone making those sorts of statements and writing these sort of articles who does not know what they are talking about, because in single member electorate systems, there is not a linear relationship between the two party preferred vote and the number of seats won by any particular team, and people who study these matters have understood this for well over 100 years.

It was in the late 1800s when the relationship, known as the 'cube rule', was discovered, where the relationship between the number of seats held is relative to the cube of the votes cast for the various parties. When you get right at the middle in a system where it is totally unbiased, if there is a 50 per cent vote, you will win 50 per cent of the seats. But if you get 52 per cent of the vote, you should win a lot more than 52 per cent of the seats; in fact, you would win about 56, 57, 58 or 60 per cent of the seats. It is a non-linear relationship.

David Washington, I can only assume, is totally unaware of that fact because that is what it is. It is not a myth, as he would have the readers of his article believe; it is a fact. If he did any reading of those who study electoral matters and write academic papers on it, he would come across that very soon. He goes on to quote other luminaries in this area. He quotes some musings of Clem Macintyre, one of the other academics around South Australia; he comments on elections and politics and various matters. I will quote what Clem Macintyre apparently said to him, as follows:

'I have said this to the Liberals and they grind their teeth and acknowledge it's right—316 votes in Newland would have given the Liberals the seat and Brock would have gone with the Liberals,' Macintyre said.

Well, I agree with him. If we had won another 316 votes in Newland, we would find ourselves in government. I come back to the point I have been making for a long time, and that is that 316 votes in Newland is another 1.426 per cent of the vote. For us to get another 316 votes in Newland, we would have to get a further swing of 1.426 per cent. It is most unusual that we would get that just in Newland—most unusual—but if you got that swing right across the state we would have won 54.426 per cent of the vote.

I go back to the 2012 Report of the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission because that is exactly the conclusion they came to; that the Liberal Party would have to win 54.6 per cent of the two-party preferred vote to win the election on the boundaries that they drew up, on which the most recent election was held.

As I said earlier today, when you recast the votes from the 2010 election where the Liberal Party won 51.6 per cent of the vote into the boundaries that were drawn for the most recent election, and were the subject of the report of the boundaries commission in 2012, notwithstanding 51.6 per cent of the statewide two-party preferred vote was won by the Liberal Party, the Labor Party still won 25 seats, a two-seat majority. Not a bare minimum majority that Clem McIntyre would have us achieve if we won 54.4 per cent of the vote, not just that bare minimum of 24 seats, but 25 seats.

The reality is that we have an electoral system that is biased. It is heavily biased against the Liberal Party. Earlier, I urged members to go back and read the 1991 Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission report, and if they read that report they would understand that that commission identified that there was a significant bias against the Liberal Party. Following that we had the fairness clause introduced and you know what, things have gotten worse.

Mr Picton: Do you want to get rid of the clause? Do you want to get rid of it?

Mr WILLIAMS: I don't want to get rid of it, I want it to damn well work. I want to get it to work. The member for Kaurua asks do I want to get rid of it? I do not want to get rid of it; I want the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission to make it work and then we would all be happy.

Time expired.

Sitting extended beyond 22:00 on motion of Hon. S.C. Mullighan.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (21:47): Great words, Minister for Transport. It is important that we spend time in here. I want to spend a bit of time talking about national parks. With the budget there was a real kick in the bum for the people of Yorke Peninsula with the announcement that Innes National Park—which many of you in this chamber might have visited and which has 130,000 visitors per year—through some financial restrictions that are in place in the Minister for Environment's portfolio, will face some fairly significant changes.

As a Yorke Peninsula person that is extremely disappointing to me. Family members of mine have a property right next to Marion Bay, Stenhouse Bay and Innes National Park and I visit it quite often, and for the thousands of people who go there, it is a level of disappointment.

I am not sure how to say it better than what I read in the local newspaper today. In the editorial, Amy Price, the editor of the *Yorke Peninsula Country Times*—and I might put this on the public record—starts off by saying that at the Yorke Peninsula Tourism Awards dinner last week, one of the major awards was won by the national park staff at Innes National Park. I was lucky enough to attend that dinner, the Hon. David Ridgway was also in attendance, and there were 178 people there.

On that very same day I had been told by the local newspaper about this budget issue which is creating staffing changes and a completely different system of management, referring to a sort of voluntary system that will be in place. I must say that the two national park staff who went up and accepted the award were very professional about it. They were upset, I think it is fair to say, about some announcements that had occurred within their staff but they went up and spoke about the positive aspects of the wonderful area of South Australia that they look after. I want to put on the record some things that were in the local newspaper. It stated:

At last Wednesday night's Yorke Peninsula Tourism Awards, Innes National Park deservedly received the accolade for best tourism attraction. The park has long been considered a hidden jewel, frequented by locals and visitors for camping, surfing, fishing, bushwalking and generally just escaping the rat race of life.

But it seems, like its location on the toe of the peninsula, the state government has tucked away Innes to the back of its mind. To save money, the relevant authorities have decided it would be better to remove the friendly faces behind the Innes National Park Visitor Centre counter and introduce a new, faceless online system.

One of the main purposes of the centre is to collect entrance fees—\$10 per vehicle per night. Now, the government is trusting all those who enter the park will honestly book online or pay via automatic machines. Will the fees collected decrease with no staff to oversee the system?

Besides collecting money, the staff also offered friendly advice to tourists about the best places to camp, where to go for spectacular views—

and it is truly inspiring when you drive through Innes National Park. There are some wonderful views when you first go over the crest from Stenhouse Bay heading further down towards the park area—

and landmark sites of interest. For locals and regular visitors, they would give information about surf breaks which had been pumping, where swells were expected and any shark sightings. Back in the day, there were potentially up to five rangers who lived within the park or at Marion Bay—

and, certainly, I can attest to the fact that they all contributed to the community as volunteers in so many different ways. The article continues:

Now there seems to be a mishmash of employees who come and go from the park. The department has said there are 11 staff who service the region but it would be interesting to know what exactly their roles are, if they are full-time and how often they visit the park.

Yorke Peninsula always seems to be the poorer cousin when it comes to the state government promoting tourism. But, rather than taking away funding, the government should be investing more in our hidden gems.

They are absolutely the truest words I have heard for a long time, and they express the frustration I have that one of the icons of tourism visitation in the state is having a change of management brought

about by the need to create efficiencies because of budget controls that I feel will have a serious impact on the visitor numbers to not just that area but to all of Yorke Peninsula. It is exceptionally disappointing and I trust that, in estimates, there will be some questions posed on it.

I asked the minister, via a letter I emailed to his office on Wednesday last week, for an urgent briefing on it and had no response at all—absolutely no response. Here we are, five business days since that was sent off, and there has been no response to a member of parliament from the responsible minister. A call would be nice or an email of acknowledgment would have been nice—some level of contact to explain the situation to me so I can stand up here coming from an informed position, not an alarmed position, about what might be the case. Instead, I am still guessing. I cannot talk to the staff—rightly so, because they are in a difficult situation and they are probably not authorised to speak about it—and it is disappointing to me that the information flow does not occur.

I also want to talk briefly about marine parks. There has been a lot of toing and froing across the chamber about that this evening. The vote in the Legislative Council is an exciting one for me, particularly in regard to marine parks 11, 12, 13 and 14 in my area. It is an issue that has been causing a lot of emotion for the last three years. The bill the Hon. Michelle Lensink has introduced into the parliament via the Legislative Council which seeks the removal of 12 of the 84 sanctuary zones is seen as the last-ditch legislative effort available to us to ensure that the debate continues.

I am pleased that, as a result of the Hon. Ms Lensink's bill, she and I met with the member for Frome and the member for Waite yesterday to talk to them about the bill and its intent. The member for Frome has spoken to a lot of different community groups, not just in his own area but across the state, about their concerns regarding marine parks. The member for Waite, I think it is fair to say, probably has not talked to as many people about it. He does have some relationship with some people in different areas about it, but he appeared to be rather interested in it.

I hope he also sees the wisdom of what this bill proposes, which is not the removal of the process of sanctuary zones but just ensuring, in its simplest form, that we legislate to remove these 12 but we do not close the door. The Liberal Party does not close the door to sanctuary zones. It supports the introduction of marine parks and recognises that sanctuary zones need to exist, but it is all about the scope of them.

We looked very closely at what in some key areas are where these 12 sanctuary zones are and what the local advisory groups direction was to the minister and the government about the scope and the size of them, which was completely disregarded. There was a meeting in April 2012 where the months and months of work done by all these people who had volunteered their time and had spoken to people across the community about the scope of creating a preserved area where fishing could not occur was seemingly totally forgotten about.

The bill from the Hon. Michelle Lensink addresses that. It tries to put some balance in it; legislatively, that is all we can do. I hope the discussions we have in this chamber at a later time, particularly as it addresses the member for Waite and the member for Frome, will look at trying to find some balance and some opportunity for a review to occur. If they come back to us with that I would love to have that discussion as well. We move it from the basis of its impact upon regional communities. Those who understand what the impact of marine parks will be—yes, they want it to be, but environmental vision has to be tempered by economic reality.

If you just allow it to occur in its current form the great fear for those of us who live in these areas, who rely so significantly upon recreational fishing and professional fishing and the benefit that it brings to a region, is that it is going to be another kick in the guts—a bit like what I talked about within this national park. That is going to challenge the future of these communities. It has to be addressed. It has to be worthy of a full debate in this chamber to ensure that we get an outcome that people can live with.

People who have expressed concerns are not against marine parks—not at all. They have worked quite stridently to create a future opportunity for the discussion to be held and a system put in place that is rational and can be supported. They have taken some personal risks.

They have been prepared to stand up and make decisions sometimes on behalf of others, but that opportunity was taken away from them by this meeting in April 2012 that suddenly decided that, in these 12 areas—and some others, too, I must admit—that we are looking at, where the scope of the sanctuary zones would just be so much larger, it was just going to, from our perspective and

from the perspective put to us by people who live in those communities, have such a significant impact that it cannot be allowed to occur. I look forward to that debate.

Motion carried.

Estimates Committees

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (21:57): I move:

That the proposed expenditures for the departments and services contained in the Appropriation Bill be referred to Estimates Committees A and B for examination and report by Wednesday 24 July, in accordance with the following timetables:

APPROPRIATION BILL 2014
TIMETABLE FOR ESTIMATES COMMITTEES
ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A
THURSDAY 17 JULY AT 9.00 AM

Premier

Attorney-General

Minister for Justice Reform

Minister for Planning

Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning

Minister for Housing and Urban Development

Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development

Minister for Industrial Relations

Legislative Council

House of Assembly

Joint Parliamentary Services

State Governor's Establishment

Auditor-General's Department

Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)

Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)

Courts Administration Authority

Attorney-General's Department (part)

Administered Items for the Attorney-General's Department (part)

Electoral Commission SA

Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)

Administered Items for the Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)

Department of Treasury and Finance (part)

Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)

Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (part)

Administered Items for the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (part)

FRIDAY 18 JULY AT 10.30 AM

Minister for Health

Minister for Health Industries

Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse

Minister for Arts

Department for Health and Ageing (part)

Department of State Development (part)

Administered Items for the Department of State Development (part)

MONDAY 21 JULY AT 10.30 AM

Minister for Disabilities

Minister for Police

Minister for Correctional Services

Minister for Road Safety

Minister for Emergency Services

Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (part)

Administered Items for the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (part)

South Australia Police

Administered Items for South Australia Police

Department for Correctional Services

Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)

Administered Items for the Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)

Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)

TUESDAY 22 JULY AT 9.00 AM

Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries

Minister for Forests

Minister for Tourism

Minister for Recreation and Sport

Minister for Racing

Minister for Investment and Trade

Minister for Defence Industries

Minister for Veteran's Affairs

Department of Primary Industries and Regions (part)

Administered Items for the Department of Primary Industries and Regions (part)

South Australian Tourism Commission

Minister for Tourism

Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)

Administered Items for the Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)

Department of State Development (part)

Administered Items for the Department of State Development (part)

Defence SA

Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (part)

Administered Items for the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (part)

WEDNESDAY 23 JULY AT 10.00 AM

Minister for Regional Development

Minister for Local Government

Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion

Minister for Social Housing

Minister for Multicultural Affairs

Minister for Ageing

Minister for Youth

Minister for Volunteers

Department of Primary Industries and Regions

Administered Items for the Department of Primary Industries and Regions

Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)

Administered Items for the Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)

Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (part)

Administered Items for the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (part)

Department for Health and Ageing (part)

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

THURSDAY 17 JULY AT 9.00 AM

Treasurer

Minister for Finance

Minister for State Development

Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy

Minister for Small Business

Department of Treasury and Finance (part)

Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)

Department of State Development (part)

Administered Items for the Department of State Development (part)

FRIDAY 18 JULY AT 10.30 AM

Minister for Education and Childhood Development

Department of Education and Child Development

Administered Items for the Department of Education and Child Development

MONDAY 21 JULY AT 10.30 AM

Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation

Minister for Water and the River Murray

Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation

Department for Environment, Water and Natural Resources

Administered Items for the Department for Environment, Water and Natural Resources

Department of State Development (part)

Administered Items for the Department of State Development (part)

TUESDAY 22 JULY AT 10.00 AM

Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills

Minister for Science and Information Economy

Minister for Status of Women

Minister for Business Services and Consumers

Department of State Development (part)

Administered Items for the Department of State Development (part)

Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (part)

Administered Items for the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (part)

Attorney-General's Department (part)

Administered Items for the Attorney-General's Department (part)
Independent Gambling Authority

WEDNESDAY 23 JULY AT 9.30 AM

Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation
Minister for Automotive Transformation
Minister for Public Sector
Minister for Transport and Infrastructure
Department of State Development (part)
Administered Items for the Department of State Development (part)
Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)
Administered Items for the Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)

Motion carried.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (21:57): I move:

That the Estimates Committee A be appointed consisting of the Hon. F.E. Bedford, Ms Chapman, Ms Digance, Mr Gardner, Mr Hughes, the Hon. S.W. Key and Mr Marshall.

Motion carried.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (21:58): I move:

That Estimates Committee B be appointed consisting of Mr Odenwalder, the Hon. P. Caica, the Hon. I.F. Evans, Mr Gee, Mr Griffiths, Ms Hildyard and Mr van Holst Pellekaan.

Motion carried.

At 21:58 the house adjourned until Thursday 3 July 2014 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***HOUSING SA WAITING LIST**

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (6 May 2014).

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I have been advised:

As at 30 April 2014, there were 2,911 people on the Category 1 priority waiting list for Housing SA properties. This figure comprises only new applications (i.e. excludes Category 1 transfers).

COMMUNITY HOUSING

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (7 May 2014).

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I have been advised:

The successful tenderers will be responsible for the payment of council rates. Contracts between Housing SA and the providers will include a clause that prevents them from seeking Council Rate Remissions under the Local Government Act 1999.

FAMILIES SA ADVERSE EVENTS REVIEW COMMITTEE

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (8 May 2014).

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development): I have been advised:

In 2004, Families SA consolidated and formalised its system for undertaking reviews of the deaths and serious injuries of children who have been involved with Families SA. This resulted in the establishment of the Adverse Events program and the Adverse Events Committee.

What has remained consistent since 2004 is the strong focus on practice reforms. The Adverse Events process aims to provide staff with practice knowledge and tools that enable Families SA to provide the best possible service to vulnerable children, young people and their families.

An important part of the committee's influence on Families SA practice environment is its capacity to make recommendations to Families SA Executive for change at an agency level. The committee is formally a subcommittee of Families SA Executive which emphasises this direct link with Families SA decision-making and practice implementation.

The Adverse Events program has established vital working relationships with external review bodies such as the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee (CDSIRC) and the Coroner. Findings and recommendations from such bodies are considered and progressed by the Adverse Events Committee, noting quite often the similarity of themes that subsequently influence Families SA practice and policy implementations.

Since the establishment of the Adverse Events Committee in 2004, almost 70 Adverse Event Reviews have been conducted with respect to 93 children/young people. Each review report is considered by Adverse Events Committee and contains recommendations and/or findings that relate to the case and wider practice issues, where appropriate. Such findings and recommendations recognise both exemplary practices by Families SA and essential learning's with respect to continuous improvement.

Families SA Executive generally accepts and progresses implementation of recommendations. Examples of recommendations that have contributed to the implementation of practice changes include:

- the infant safe sleeping guidelines;
- establishment of high risk infant policy and procedural guidance;

- establishment of key principles for working with culturally and linguistically diverse families;
- establishment of the Senior Practitioner review to consider the mentoring and quality assurance role of social workers to positively influence practice and family assessments;
- the establishment of the protocol for the conduct of interviews with interpreters; and
- the establishment of the interagency memorandum of understanding relating to chronic school non-attendance.

In 2014 and 2015 the Adverse Events program will continue to focus on learning and development to capitalise on the recommendations and learnings from internal and external review processes to promote continuous improvement mechanisms.