

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 30 June 2015

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 11:01 and read prayers.

The SPEAKER: Honourable members, I respectfully acknowledge the traditional owners of this land upon which this parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2015

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

APPROPRIATION BILL 2015

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 June 2016.)

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11:03): This is my 14th budget in this place, and each year I am intrigued by the way the budget papers are presented. The permutations and combinations of presentations just seem to have no end. While I have seen four treasurers (treasurer Foley, the Premier, the Minister for Health and the current Treasurer in this place), I have also seen the state of the state continue to deteriorate.

Can I just remind people what treasurer Foley said back in his first budget in 2002. Remember, we had just been through an amazing piece of work by the Liberal government trying to restore the damage that was done prior to the State Bank debacle, and, thanks to the hard work of that Liberal government under premiers Brown and Olsen, the state was actually starting to track in a very positive way. The GST was increasing dramatically, things were looking good, we had some significant mining prospects on the go at that stage, but sadly as we have seen, those mining prospects have not borne the fruit we all had hoped back then.

Let us just remind ourselves of what 'Budget Paper 1: Budget at a Glance 2002-03' said on page 4, and it is talking about the inherited financial position of South Australia. It has got a graph—and this is more like a comic book; there are lots of pictures and lots of little snippets which should be in balloons, I think. Page 4 says, 'This graph illustrates the unsustainable financial position (black column) that South Australia was faced with before the Government introduced the disciplined fiscal measures contained in the 2002-03 Budget.'

Mr Bell: Is it a comedy?

Dr McFETRIDGE: This is a comedy. This is just a comedy of errors, unfortunately, what we have seen since 2002-03. For people to believe that sort of rhetoric and spin is just a tragedy for South Australia. On page 6 of that same budget document, 'Budget Paper 1: Budget at a Glance 2002-03', it says, and this is treasurer Foley speaking on behalf of the government here in this particular budget paper:

As part of implementing its policy of 'Honesty and Accountability in Government', the Government has set about establishing a new Fiscal Responsibility Framework to ensure that this and future governments manage South Australia's finances with transparency and accountability.

The new Fiscal Responsibility Framework requires existing legislation to be amended. State governments will then be required to prepare and table a Charter of Budget Honesty.

I just wish that budgets were an open, honest and transparent document as we were promised back in 2002-03, because every budget document that I have seen has been more convoluted, more

complicated, has different volumes altered—this year we do not have a capital investment statement—and we have a number of presentations that just require more and more investigation trying to delve in and find out who is responsible for what, who is spending what and where the money is going.

Let us not forget that we did have the rivers of gold. There were millions and millions, if not billions, of dollars in extra funding being put into South Australia from the federal government. As well as that, the economy then was on the real up, and so state revenue and particularly some of the state taxes (land tax, stamp duties, those sorts of things) were on the way up as well. There was a lot of money. We had high hope that South Australia could become a state where everybody was bouncing from prospect to prospect, from opportunity to opportunity, but what we have seen is the rivers of gold have dried up to a large extent, and I will talk about that a little more in a moment.

The 100,000 jobs we were promised—where have they gone? The promises of new and better lives really have disappeared and, as I said, the El Dorado of the mining boom has, if not died, certainly subsided in a dramatic way. Remember, we are dealing with our constituents' lives: their families and their everyday lives when they get up in the morning and are having to face paying the mortgage, buying petrol for the car and all those daily routines—the price of food, power and water.

I do not think that even the most diehard Labor supporter would think that the way this state is going is something we can be proud of. Certainly the prospects that were held up by the Labor government in its early days have disappeared. They are not even a mirage in the desert anymore. What we have is a state where debt and deficit have just gone out of control and the government is in a state of denial: we do really have a budget crisis.

Greg Combet, who was brought into this place to try to help the automotive industry, is talking about thousands more job losses and we already have the highest unemployment rate in the nation, including Tasmania. We used to say 'the mainland' but now, including Tasmania, we are the worst of the lot. It is a dire state. I plead with this government to face reality, have some ministerial accountability, take the responsibility that is required and lead this state in the direction that we all deserve and all want for our constituents.

To remind the house, and for those who may be reading these speeches, the economic growth in South Australia is 1.3 per cent which, when compared with the national average of 2.5 per cent, is just over half. We have seen ministers in this place blame it on SARS, bird flu and everything else—they always try to blame the global financial crisis—but, when you compare South Australia with other states, the other states seem to be going ahead but South Australia is, unfortunately, not achieving what we think it should.

We get told off in this place by members of the government for talking down the state. It is not about talking down the state: it is a matter of exposing the realities. If you do not face the realities of the situation before you, you are not going to address it. First, define the problem. With any issue, first define the problem and then work out how you are going to challenge it, but this government does not seem to want to look at the problems. Their crisis management 101 is deny, deny, deny and deflect, deflect, deflect, whether it is bikies, time zones or the uranium industry. They will do anything they can to try to distract, deflect and deny the reality we are facing.

Inflation in South Australia is 1.1 per cent. That has gone down significantly, but that is a national trend and we are lucky that South Australia is not having to face such high inflation rates as we are seeing in other countries overseas. Labor promised 100,000 extra jobs in February 2010 but what have we got since Labor came to power? There have been 6,651 jobs created since 2010.

In relation to unemployment in South Australia, as I have said, the trend is 7.2 per cent and, seasonally adjusted, it is 7.6 per cent. You can play with statistics but, no matter what, this is a terrible position to be in. If you are one of the many thousands who are unemployed and looking for a job, and have been for a long time, your prospects, unfortunately, are not really good. I just hope this government is able to work towards finding more opportunities for us in South Australia.

The other sad fact is that our power and water charges have gone up significantly. The government here talks about the privatisation of ETSA all those years ago. Let us not forget it was the Keating federal Labor government that brought in the national electricity marketing scheme. It was the networking around Australia and the open competition that decided power prices, with some

regulation. The competition decided what happened with power prices and, if we had not leased ETSA, the Auditor-General said we would have been in an absolutely dire state. While not being complimentary, he remarked on the fact that the Liberal government's leasing out of ETSA certainly saved South Australia from an even worse financial position than what Labor left it in in 1993.

South Australians have been promised a lot by this government but, unfortunately, what we have seen in the budget is no jobs plan, more debt and increased charges. We are paying much more, and the ESL is a classic example of that, but we are getting less. People are getting less. Financial mismanagement is being exhibited by this government. I am not an economist but I have run a business and made money out of that business and I have done particularly well, I must say, without boasting, and I am very comfortable.

Having said that, my family and I lived in a tin shed for quite a while. I drove a third-hand Morris Mini for quite a while. I have done it tough. I have been looking for 20¢ down the back of the seat so I could go and buy some lunch when I was at uni. I do not ever forget that and I do not want anybody in this place to forget that. I lived at 85 Hogarth Road, Elizabeth South in a Housing Trust house with my parents. I saw how hard they worked. South Australians will deliver and will try hard if they are given the opportunity. I never forget that and I hope nobody in this place ever forgets where they have come from, because there are people out there doing it tough, as we speak, right now.

The failure by this government to deliver what they promised in 2002-03 hangs heavily around their head. After 14 years in this place, I am just amazed at the lack of ministerial accountability. There are ministers who seem to be oblivious to the fact that the buck stops with them. I always remember John Hill, the former minister for health, saying in this place that people expect a decent public health service to be delivered by the Labor government or any government and he said that the buck stopped with him. Every minister in this place should remember that—that the buck stops with them and that they are responsible for the outcomes, not their CEOs, their staffers, their minders or their spin doctors. These people are the ones who were elected.

The need to make sure that we deliver has never been more crucial. But what have we seen? We have seen a failure to deliver on jobs, a failure to deliver real taxation reductions, a failure to reduce the cost of living in South Australia and a failure to plan for any downturns in the state's economy. We have seen failure after failure, and I cannot stand in this place and watch this without speaking very strongly about the opportunities lost and the ministerial accountability we are not seeing.

The bottom line is that in South Australia we have the highest deficit we have ever seen, and I do not see any way in the short term or even in the long term, unfortunately for my children and my grandchildren, that this is going to be managed in a much better and much more responsible way as we were promised in 2002-03. The increased taxation that has been levied on our constituents is becoming more and more of a burden.

If people here think that it is because of the federal government, then I challenge the Premier and the Treasurer to go and ask Bill Shorten—if through some miracle he is elected into federal parliament and becomes Prime Minister—whether he will replace that funny money, the budget allocations that were never really there but this government claims were there for health and education in those out years? Will he do that? No, he will not do that.

He knows the money was never there. This government knows the money was never there. It was Monopoly money. It was fantasy land, and anyone who believes that money was there, and there have been budget cuts, is dreaming. Go and ask Bill Shorten if he will put back that money if he becomes Prime Minister. He will not. I guarantee he will not because he knows that it was completely unsustainable and is completely unsustainable.

That said, though, look at the revenue this government is getting from the federal government: it has never been higher. We are getting hundreds of millions of dollars more than we ever expected and was ever budgeted for, and thank goodness for that because, if it were not for that, South Australia would be in a far more parlous state than it is now.

I am honoured to be not only the member for Morphett but also on the front bench of the Liberal Party in this state and to have the portfolio of emergency services. I look at the budget allocations for those emergency services and my heart goes out to these people, particularly the volunteers, who are doing more and more with less and less. I have said before that every man and woman in our emergency services, whether they are paid or volunteers, are the ones going in to do the job during an emergency as people are running away. They are saving lives, saving properties and saving this state hundreds of millions of dollars. What is their reward? They get a very minor increase in some areas of spending, but the reality is they are being asked to do more and more with less and less.

We see almost token gestures being made by this government about strategic reserves and extra protective equipment for volunteers, but I will have a lot more to say about that in estimates. I have never looked forward to estimates as much as I do this year. I am really looking forward to finding out from the minister, when they have all of their minds there and cannot escape the scrutiny, how this can happen. There will be some ministerial accountability and it will be a torrid time in this place. I just hope that the ministers are ready for it because they cannot escape that accountability.

I want to just talk about the estimates committees in the little bit of time that I have left but, first, I will go back to some of my other portfolios and very quickly mention disabilities. I have tried to work in a bipartisan way there. Of course, the NDIS is coming in. We have a lot of issues with the numbers. The estimated number of participants has been underestimated by this government, so some argy-bargy is going on with the feds. I think that this government needs to take a hard look at what it has been trying to do in terms of a cross shift to the feds. There are massive issues with the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion, not only with the cost of screening but also with the amount of money that is going out now in the Community Benefit fund.

With respect to Aboriginal affairs, again I have tried to work in a very bipartisan way. Aboriginal Affairs has been downgraded in my time in this place, from a ministry to a department, and now it is not even a department: it is just a division under the Department of State Development. We have a lot more to see and do with Aboriginal affairs in South Australia, and I am happy to work with the government on that.

As to veterans' affairs, I am more than happy to work with the minister, and I am very pleased to see that the federal government was also happy to work with us in South Australia on the memorial pathway that is being constructed next to the War Memorial. Also, I was very delighted to have received a letter from Senator the Hon. Michael Ronaldson, in which he states that the federal government has decided not to go ahead with the changes to pension indexation for veterans and that pensions will continue to be indexed with a reference to CPI and the Pensioner and Beneficiary Living Cost Index, which is a good thing to happen.

I will just quickly go back to the estimates committees because this year estimates is even more and more compressed and squeezed. It has been wrung out and spat out by this government to the point where, with respect to the Health estimates on Friday 24 July, we have four hours and 45 minutes for a total expenditure of \$5.256 billion, which works out to about \$18 million a minute.

What happened to the days when we sat here till 10 o'clock at night, hour after hour going through these budgets and the ministers being quite happy to answer question after question? What we see now are long opening statements and Dorothy Dixers—any devious device that they can think of to try to limit the amount of scrutiny they are being put through in estimates committees.

Well, the time may have been reduced but, ministers, the time is up. You have to answer, and I challenge this government not to have Dorothy Dixers but to give us the full time we need to ask these questions about it. As I said, \$18 million a minute for Health and \$37,000 a minute for Veterans' Affairs. Veterans' Affairs is a very important portfolio, but I would guarantee that the veterans out the front of this place protesting about the Repat would rather have their time handed back to Health so that we can talk about the real issues in this Transforming Health.

The Department for Communities and Social Inclusion is working out at millions of dollars a minute, and so is emergency services—\$3.9 million a minute in emergency services. That is the time we are seeing this government trying to say that it is being honest and accountable, as in 2003.

Where is the budget honesty? We are not seeing it. We are seeing a government hiding and compressing the estimates down. We are seeing the budget hiding behind convolutions, permutations and combinations of presentations in the budget papers. We are seeing a state that is not even a shadow of what was promised in 2002-03.

I just hope that this government does accept the fact that there is a budget emergency, and I hope that we see some ministerial accountability on that side and see some real answers in the estimates process and some real prospects for an upward trend to our economy in South Australia.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:23): Can I say that it is a pleasure to be back in the chamber to have an opportunity to speak about the budget. As a person who has made many decisions in his life based around numbers, I actually appreciate the fact that there is a significant amount of numbers there that collectively bring forward a picture of how it is envisaged that things will operate in the next 12 months and what the scope is for the future of our state. It is therefore important that we do talk about it and give a lengthy expression of opinion on it.

I do get excited and frustrated by it, though, it is fair to say. There are good stories in it, there are frustrating examples in it, and there are, I think, rather challenging decisions in it, but collectively it comes into a melting pot, and the Minister for Health (having previously been the treasurer) would be one of the unique people who would have sat down and examined all the budget bids, tried to determine priorities, listened to the advocacy put by ministers and staff on the importance of what they propose, did the best to determine priorities, looked at what the needs of the state are and looked at what political realities exist to then come up with a form of words and numbers that actually equate to what the vision will be for the next 12 months.

I put on the record, and I will be positive in the first sense on this, my appreciation of the fact that there are two projects within the Goyder electorate that are mentioned in the Treasurer's speech; that is, roads infrastructure. One is the Copper Coast Highway and an area, as I understand it, of 17 kilometres between Kadina and Paskeville which has been the subject of many representations made to me in the nine years that I have been in this place. So, I am extremely pleased with that and I thank the Minister for Transport (after the budget speech was presented) for that investment.

I also note that the next line (I think it is) refers to a future project on the Yorke Highway, without detailing what is proposed for that, but it does mention that is occurring (presumably) over the next four years in the forward estimates. I have written to the Minister for Transport on both of those projects asking him for information, so that I can make the community at large aware of what is proposed to occur there. So, they are welcomed, as indeed many other projects will be welcomed across the state.

I have also written to the Minister for Water, the Hon. Ian Hunter, about a reflection in the budget papers of \$8.5 million occurring on the Port Wakefield to Pine Point water pipeline, just to find out if that is associated with the Rex Minerals mine proposal near Pine Point and close to the Ardrossan area, which as I understand it is \$25.5 million that I thought the company was paying for. I am intrigued to see whether that is a government contribution or an SA Water contribution based on future consumable water and the revenue that comes from that or, indeed, if it is being paid for by the company as part of their proposal. So, that will be an interesting one to clarify, too.

It is obvious to me that budgets are about lots of things, but they are about actions and visions. What can we do to improve things? What is the future for us? Where can we spend the money? What results can we get? What priorities exist? How do we meet those and the community's expectations? Any person who aspires to become a member of parliament, in talking to people understands very quickly that their position is quite strong on what they expect. Most people are rather polite, there is no doubt about that, but they have high expectations when it comes to consideration of whom they vote for and they want to see outcomes.

The political process provides that opportunity to one side, as it currently exists. I think opportunities for change will occur in the future (I hope it is in 2018), but the challenge is there for all politicians to ensure that they get outcomes from it. I have had some small exposure for a nine-month period, as the shadow treasurer before the 2010 election, to look at the numbers in detail (extreme detail) and to try to take a collective picture of it. It is a very pressurised time, I have no doubt about that, and the Treasurer, in determining what to do as part of his future vision for South Australia and

that of the government, will face a lot of very challenging questions as to what the answer on that should be.

The base premise (for me) comes down to what the economic future will be because via that comes the ability to provide the community with services and infrastructure, but also, what the future will be for job outcomes. I am extremely saddened when I see a budget paper that proposes an employment growth rate of only 1 per cent. For those of us who have seen the fact that in the month of May alone, as I understand it, over 8,000 people lost their job, to see a 1 per cent growth rate, which equates to about 8,400 people, so to see a 12-month period planned for a job increase equal to what the job loss was for one month of a full 12-month period is, I think, a very sad situation.

It reflects the fact that we have a statewide unemployment situation of 7.6 per cent, but you have to look more than beyond the numbers because each number, in this case, actually relates to a person, as part of a family or as an individual, who has obligations and wants to have a more prosperous future (I have no doubt about that) and that is where the total focus has to come to, or the benefits from this that will go into creating job opportunities.

In the Goyder electorate alone, across the wider region, it is about 7.6 per cent (so the state average). In the neighbouring electorate of Frome, for example, the unemployment rate for the Port Pirie township is above 13 per cent. I am sure the member for Frome is saddened by that. I know he is a person who wants to get outcomes for the community, but he must be saddened by that. I intend to put on the record some unemployment rates as they exist—based on some federal figures that are provided on a quarterly basis—across regional South Australia.

The community impact of this is that it makes it very hard. We have unemployment in high rates in pockets in metropolitan and suburban Adelaide, no doubt about that. A high focus is placed on the challenges to the manufacturing industry and the need to transition to the next opportunity that exists in South Australia, and to ensure that every opportunity is taken up and becomes an outcome and a reality, but regional South Australia suffers from it also.

Alinta, in its decision probably only about four weeks ago, is an example of that. That company has made a decision, based on the fact that they have lost about \$100 million over the last few years on electricity production, to stop that production. That is a devastating impact on Port Augusta, and absolute devastation upon Leigh Creek. I am so pleased when I hear Mr Sam Johnson, the Mayor of Port Augusta, talk about the fact that Port Augusta has faced challenges in the past. Anybody who has read and reviewed part of what they have dealt with as the rail industry understands the challenges they have suffered in the past, but they will overcome it, and that is the strong message he delivered.

He also said to me, which I find interesting, that the economic modelling they have had done highlights I believe in the range of \$137 million per year being based around the production of electricity within that township. So the loss of that revenue, and the number of times it circulates and the value-adding that occurs across all business areas and the community at large, will be significant, but the community will rally and do their absolute best.

There are some figures I want to put on the record that relate to unemployment across parts of regional South Australia. This is based on March 2015 figures, which I think are important, because they deliver some challenging messages: in the APY lands 25.5 per cent, in the Barmera community 7.6 per cent, the Barossa/Angaston area 3.9 per cent, Berri 12.7 per cent, Ceduna 7.1 per cent, Clare 4 per cent, Cooper Pedy 10.9 per cent, the Eyre Peninsula region 3 per cent, the Flinders Ranges 4.8 per cent, the Gilbert Valley area 4.2 per cent, Goolwa and the Port Elliot communities 8.1 per cent, the Goyder council area 7.3 per cent, the Grant council area 4 per cent, the Jamestown community 4.6 per cent, the Kadina community (part of the Goyder electorate) 8.7 per cent, Kangaroo Island 5.3 per cent, the Karoonda/Lameroo area 4.9 per cent, Kimba, Cleve and Franklin Harbour 2.2 per cent, the Kingston/Robe area 3.8 per cent, the LeHunte/Elliston area 2.1 per cent, the Light area 4.5 per cent, the Loxton area 6.1 per cent, the Loxton region 5.1 per cent, and Lyndoch 3.2 per cent

Mallala has 5.6 per cent, Mannum 7.7 per cent, Millicent 8.1 per cent, Moonta 9.2 per cent, Mount Gambier 7.4 per cent, Murray Bridge 10.8 per cent, Murray Bridge region 7.1 per cent, Naracoorte 4.7 per cent, Naracoorte region 1.5 per cent, the Nuriootpa area 4.2 per cent, the Outback

3.3 per cent, Penola 4.7 per cent, Peterborough/Mount Remarkable 7.6 per cent, Port Augusta 8.5 per cent (down from 10.5 per cent previously), Port Lincoln 6.4 per cent, Port Pirie 14.4 per cent (greatly concerning to the minister), Port Pirie region 7.3 per cent, Renmark 12.2 per cent, Renmark region 5.1 per cent, Roxby Downs 0.8 per cent (they have some challenges too), Strathalbyn 5.4 per cent, Strathalbyn region, 4.5 per cent, Tanunda 2.5 per cent, Tatiara 2.4 per cent, the Coorong 6.9 per cent, Victor Harbor 9 per cent, Waikerie 6.4 per cent, Wakefield/Barunga West 6.4 per cent, Wallaroo 13.3 per cent, Wattle Range 4.6 per cent, the West Coast 5.6 per cent, Whyalla 8.3 per cent (the member for Giles, I am sure, is interested in that), Yankalilla 7.2 per cent, the Yorke Peninsula North area 7.3 per cent, and, the Yorke Peninsula South area 7.3 per cent.

I put those figures on the record not to criticise the community, not to have a go at them, but to make public the challenges they face, and by association make public the challenges governments face, current and future of all persuasions, to ensure that the budget they present, the vision they hold, ensures that job outcomes come from it, because it has to be.

A modern society demands basic things such as housing, education, police, health treatments, water, electricity, infrastructure and services—and that is from all governments. In the last 25 years, the perception of people has changed: where they once understood what different government levels did in the past, now they just want governments (no matter what level they are) to provide; they do not necessarily completely appreciate the differences between the three levels. The most basic thing is the employment rate, and that is why I want to put that on the record because without that you cannot get opportunities for growth.

There are challenges when it comes to the level of stability in employment rate that occurs, but working gives people a belief in their ability to be able to provide; it gives them the belief, indeed, that they will have a future; it gives them the opportunity to plan for that future and to expend money. There is no doubt that Treasury, which brings in the revenue and provides it via decisions made by the Treasurer and others to government departments to expend approximately \$16 billion, relies upon transactions to occur. Without the transactions you do not get the revenue, without the revenue you cannot provide the services, and if you continue to borrow for it, then it faces challenges in the future when it comes to repayments and what future generations are left with. It is important that we create a climate at the moment that ensures that transactions will be vibrant, undertaken with some confidence, and are not continuously based upon financial liabilities that result in increased debt, but ensure we get the revenue we need.

South Australia's 7.6 per cent unemployment rate—the highest in the nation—is the reason, with great sadness, that we on this side continue to talk about it. We do not want to continually highlight the challenges we face, but it is the big one; it has to be the driver for the decisions that are made. I know that, when the Leader of the Opposition speaks, he will highlight this and what he feels are the outcomes that need to occur very soon to ensure we get through those challenges so that we create a vibrant future.

I was pleased with one figure in the budget which I had not noticed in the past, and that was the reflection of the number of full-time equivalent public servants who work and live in regional communities—that figure is 21 per cent, or 17,720 people. I thought that was a good number, so I was pleased to see that being reflected. It is part of the change that continually occurs in budget papers to make it a bit more challenging to read and digest everything, but that is something that is good. I am a believer in the fact that the concentration of Public Service numbers should not be within the CBD and metropolitan and suburban areas. I reflect the fact that most of those people live in those areas, but regional communities—by virtue of their distance, their concentrations and what they bring to the state—deserve to be respected and supported. I found that 21 per cent figure to be a good one. I would like to see it improve a little bit more, but it was far better than what my perception had been in the past.

I want to point out a couple of things in the remaining minutes I have. The Treasurer's speech highlighted expenditure in the range of \$1.3 billion in capital works for the 2015-16 year. In reviewing the expenditure over the last relatively short period of five years, as I understand it, that equates to an average expenditure of \$1.95 billion. So, we are down by a third. The Treasurer is trumpeting the \$1.3 billion—significant dollars, no doubt—but it is a reduction on what the expenditure has been in

the past. The message that goes out sometimes becomes confused by the reality of the facts behind it.

I am frustrated from a regional point of view that from a cursory glance of the budget papers—and I will talk about this when it comes to estimates later on, and also with the member for Frome—there are unexpended funds from the dollars provided to the Minister for Regional Development in the 2014-15 financial year. I hoped that the member for Frome, in becoming minister, would have been absolutely focused on ensuring that the expenditure actually occurred, that the project guidelines were published very early, that the applications were requested from groups in regard to how funds could be used and what growth could occur as a result, and that the outcome by now would have been job growth.

In reading some of those unemployment figures for regional communities, it is obvious that has not occurred. It is even more obvious to me that it has not occurred when you look at what the budget figures highlight as unexpended funds and the fact that forever they are lost as an expenditure opportunity in the 2014-15 year. They are carried forward and, one would hope, unless the same delays continue to occur in 2015-16, they will be available to expend in the next financial year, but why for goodness sake was it not done in the 2014-15 year? It is desperately needed now. It is needed in the future—yes—but it has already been required, so it should have been an absolute priority for it to occur.

One example of that is a commitment given for a regional port. Planning was meant to have occurred on it in the 2014-15 financial year, and has not occurred yet. I was part of a presentation today by Mr Mark Rodda about Free Eyre and the proposal that they have for a PIF fund to be established for investment by farmers on the Eyre Peninsula into a fund to help create infrastructure development, to drive down the handling costs for their wheat, barley and grains.

These port projects, which primarily they talk about, was an obvious policy from the government last financial year that has not been delivered upon. That is the great frustration I have. Within my portfolios I have local government, regional development and planning. One thing that hit me from the budget papers is the \$1 million of revenue intended to come in in 2015-16 from a royalty on rubble raised by local government. This has not previously been in place, but it will come into effect from 2015-16 after councils have already set their budgets.

In talking to an association that deals in this area, they tell me that there are some varying estimates on the amount in tonnes of the rubble that is raised each year—between one million and nine million tonnes. Now if you extrapolate it out at 55¢ per tonne (as I understand the royalty is intended to be) potentially it could be \$4½ million. That is a cost that local government has had no warning of. It is a cost that local government—68 councils but predominantly it is going to impact the 49 or so that exist in regional communities—will suddenly have to bear.

There are some varying estimates out there already. The mayor of the Yorke Peninsula council last week told me that the estimate provided to him from staff within that council is \$150,000; and Ceduna is \$38,000. There are a variety of figures out there, completely unfunded, that will impact upon the ability of local government—much smaller budgets, much smaller level of operations—to actually continue to provide their services. So will that equate to a lesser output when it comes to road services? I hope not, but it is an example where I think there is a lack of respect from the second level of government (state government) to the third level of government (local government) in relaying actions and future costs, and therefore making people pay for them, and I think that is a great frustration.

The budget papers highlight amongst many things, in looking at collective incomes, that taxation revenue in the 2015-16 financial year is going to go up. South Australians, as I understand it, are going to be paying about another \$143 million out of their pockets in the coming financial year to support government infrastructure and services. The challenges of cost-of-living pressures are ones that are with all of us. We all get people who talk to us about the challenges they have when it comes to paying the bills. They worry about the budgeting restrictions that they have to put in place. Their quality of life is reducing as result of it. There are pressures, no matter what you do, where you live and what level of debt you have, to keep paying the bills.

South Australians are good people. They want to be accountable for their costs. They want to contribute to our society but they are frustrated, upset, angry and anxious about it, and they want governments to do something about it. So it is important that governments and oppositions project to the people that they are not here for themselves, they are not here to just talk about it, but they are here to get outcomes from it that make for a better quality of life for people.

That is why I sought to be elected to parliament; I know it is why my colleagues sought to be elected to parliament; and I am sure it is why the government sought to be elected to parliament. We cannot afford to fail the people of South Australia. Budgets are the message on how it is delivered. Budgets have to be right and budgets have to benefit the people.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (11:43): I support the words from the member for Goyder. In particular, I would like to start with what I was expecting to see out of the state budget. I thought there would be some correlation between the Governor Hieu Van Le's speech and the vision that was put forward—some money set aside for driverless cars or education reforms, some bold vision for South Australia that would get people excited, and that that would mirror back to the opening of parliament, where we were not that long ago. Unfortunately, I did not see that in this year's budget. Somebody once told me, 'When you're in a hole, the first thing you need to do is stop digging,' and that is the advice I would like to give to the government. We are in a bit of a hole. We have mounting debt and deficits.

For those who want to have a look into the future, you need only look at the South Australian regional labour force data to work out what is going to happen to the city of Adelaide, because it is already happening in regional areas across South Australia. In fact, I think there is a time lag between what has been occurring in regional South Australia and what will inevitably occur in the city of Adelaide. You will see kids leave home and leave the state because there are no jobs, which is exactly what we are seeing in regional areas at the moment. You will see house prices fail to keep up with the national average, and that is what we are seeing in regional South Australia at the moment.

You will see confidence decline. Businesses will stop opening or the rate of openings will decline, and that is exactly what is happening in regional South Australia at the moment. Of course, once that decline starts it becomes increasingly hard to reverse it. That is where you need bold visions and where you need to take a bit of a risk. In actual fact, you need to stop doing what you have been doing, because the last 13 years have not provided such great uplift in the South Australian economy.

I will go through a few statistics. I thought I would grab the regional labour force data and compare it over the last 12 months, just to see how my region, the South-East of South Australia, has been faring. In May 2014, the unemployment rate was about 5.4 per cent. So this time last year the unemployment rate in the South-East of South Australia was about 5.4 per cent. If you fast forward 12 months, it is now 8.1 per cent. The last budget certainly did not do much for the South-East of South Australia in terms of the unemployment rate.

What is quite scary is the youth unemployment rate, which is ages 15 to 24. If you want to be technical about it, it really should be ages 17 to 24, because it is mandated under law that you are meant to be in school up until that age. There are not too many 15 or 16 year olds who are technically unemployed, because they are engaged in education. Twelve months ago, the youth unemployment rate in the South-East of South Australia was 9.3 per cent. On anybody's measure, that is quite unacceptable but, again, fast forward 12 months and it has doubled to 18.8 per cent.

I started out by asking, 'What is going to occur in the city of Adelaide?' There will be an increase in youth unemployment, an increase in overall unemployment, and you will see people starting to leave this state in search of a brighter future. Of course, in terms of the property market, house prices will stagnate, investors will stop investing, builders will start going broke—and I think we are starting to see early signs of that. Builders will start looking at other states where they can deploy their services.

I was in the Sunshine Coast about four weeks ago and the amount of infrastructure build going on in the area of the Sunshine Coast in Queensland is quite staggering. There is a hospital that rivals the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, major roadworks, major sewerage infrastructure and, of

course, the subdivision of many acres of land. That is an area of Australia that is growing at quite a rapid rate and they are putting the infrastructure in to catch up with that. If you compare that with what is going on in South Australia—and I will get on to infrastructure spend in a minute—you will see that we have an opposing point of view.

This budget was meant to be a jobs budget; it was meant to be about growing jobs. This government and the Premier in particular is very good at using words and not backing them up with any action. This year's jobs budget is all about jobs, so what lofty projections have we had put in front of us for this year, what are we aiming to achieve? Is it a 2 per cent growth in jobs? No; we're going to aim for 1 per cent. Keep in mind that last year the budget predicted a jobs growth of 1.25 per cent but, in fact, delivered only 0.5 of 1 cent. So it is quite scary, if you think about it, that we are now predicting a lower jobs target; if we achieve only 0.4 or 0.3 of a 1 per cent growth, we are going to see the unemployment rate rise from 7.6 per cent to a much higher number. Again, that is frightening. If you have kids or if you are unemployed, South Australia is the worst performing state and you are less likely to be employed in this state. Therefore, what do you do? You look to move to provide other opportunities for yourself.

Labor claims that jobs will be created because they have budgeted to spend between \$1.3 billion and \$1.45 billion per year over the forward estimates on capital works—exactly what I was talking about in Queensland and, in particular, the Sunshine Coast. The reality is that budget documents for the last five years show that they have actually budgeted average capital works spending of \$1.9 billion for the general government sector. So here we go: this is a jobs budget, but we are actually going to predict lower target rates for the number of jobs and we are going to spend less on infrastructure. It is a quite staggering realisation.

For the 2015-16 year, the government is estimating a \$43 million surplus, with surpluses in the forward estimate years forecast to increase to \$961 million by 2018-19. You will have to excuse me, Deputy Speaker, but I will believe that when I see it. The reason I say that is because the deficit for the financial year 2014-15 is \$279 million, which is actually an increased deficit of about \$100 million on the December 2014 Mid-Year Budget Review. Six months, and it is \$100 million out of whack already on what was predicted. They make these numbers up; they are the ones who make the prediction, yet they cannot even get the made-up numbers right. A hundred million dollars is not chickenfeed, it is serious money; they cannot get the estimates right. We should not forget that this \$279 million deficit is on the back of getting a \$459 million injection from the Motor Accident Commission, yet they still cannot balance the budget.

This comes at a time when there is more money flowing into this state from GST revenue than we have ever seen before. In fact, the government's GST revenue over the forward estimates is \$892 million more than last year's budget estimates. This \$892 million was unbudgeted and was, therefore, a bonus, and that GST revenue will blow out to \$1.66 billion more in GST revenue in 2018-19. So the money is coming in. They have set their benchmarks very low; let us hope they can achieve them, because even if they do achieve them it will not drive our economy to the place it needs to go.

In terms of stamp duty, there is a little bit of relief in there and I do need to give some credit for that. One of the bonuses for an industry in my area is stamp duty transfers on fishing licences, which go from one generation to another. That has been an impediment down in my region.

Of course, there is no real relief for households in this budget. Again, a beautiful sleight of hand will save you \$40 on the River Murray levy because the government will abolish that, but it will charge you \$205 for the ESL increases. So, the government will praise up getting rid of the River Murray levy but, of course, it will whack you across the back of the head with the ESL. As people are now starting to realise—they are coming into my office—the levy also applies to motor vehicle registrations. They are going to go up by about \$7 as well.

In 2014-16, the government has overspent its budget by \$201 million and the total of unbudgeted spending since it was elected is now \$4.1 billion, and think about the things the government has flogged off that were actually generating money for this state. I cannot stand up here and not talk about the forests down in my region. Forests were bringing in a net profit of \$40 million a year and employing hundreds of people, but of course that was not good enough—'We'll flog it off, give it to the cheapest price,' and we have lost that income. The government has flogged off the TAB,

it is flogging off the MAC and, don't forget, it has shifted a hell of a lot of debt onto SA Water so that it makes the bottom line look a bit better.

There is no doubt that the economy in South Australia has flatlined and we are paying more, yet getting less. The one group that can turn this around is small business, yet there are very few incentives to encourage businesses to employ more people and invest in South Australia. In *The Advertiser* today Nigel McBride said:

Jobs growth will increasingly come from small entrepreneurial businesses, not just large corporations.

And you sit back and ask: what is the government doing to support small businesses? Of course, there is not a lot. Nigel McBride talks about introducing entrepreneurship into the school curriculum, which I totally agree with. However, if you read further, it talks about schools being the places that are most likely to deter terrorists in the future. If you go into a school, which I often do, and spend time talking to the principal and to the teachers, entrepreneurship is the last thing they are talking about. Why? Schools are so risk averse now; they are so scared of the CEO, a minister, or somebody coming down and hauling them to court because something has happened in their site.

If you want a culture where you overload principals with paperwork, bureaucratic processes and everything else you can think of, instead of actually teaching and guiding the education of students, you could just take the South Australian education system right now and you would have exactly that scenario. In fact, if schools are so important and vital to our entrepreneurial future, why does the state budget show that there are going to be 308 job losses in the education department—308 job losses in terms of full-time equivalents in one of our key areas?

Unfortunately, South Australia is going backwards in the NAPLAN. I think we went backwards in nine out of the 12 categories, which is absolutely appalling. These job cuts come after a national survey showed that not one single South Australian government primary school had been ranked in the top 100 schools in the nation based on NAPLAN results. That is an absolute shame. Indeed, only one South Australian government school made the top 100 secondary schools. So, none of the primary schools and only one secondary school, and that was Glenunga International High School.

This government needs to look at that and ask, 'What are we doing about it?' The first thing you need to do about it is let principals govern their schools. We are talking about school autonomy. Let teachers teach instead of filling out paperwork. Equally, we need to have a serious conversation, I would love to have a bipartisan conversation, about getting year 7s into secondary school or into high schools.

We have Nigel McBride and many others saying that small business is the way we are going to turn this state around, so I went and did a bit of research on how many small business start-ups we have had in South Australia in the preceding 2013-14 year because that is all I could get. Believe it or not, we did not have any. In fact, overall—

Mr Whetstone: Not one?

Mr BELL: Not one. It gets worse than that. We actually lost 14 businesses in terms of an overall statistic. So, some start up and some go broke or close down but, overall, we lost 14 businesses. How does that compare with some other states around Australia? Surely we cannot be the worst in every statistic on any database. We looked at New South Wales. New South Wales gained 8,522 new business start-ups.

Mr Whetstone: Say that again?

Mr BELL: There were 8,522. So, we lost 14, and they are getting over 8,500. Victoria, which is very close to my seat and which is where more and more residents of Mount Gambier are starting to do business, had 7,160 business start-ups.

Mr Pengilly: How many?

Mr BELL: There were 7,160. If businesses and small businesses are the road to recovery in South Australia, we have a long way to go. In fact, some would say the road is closed because somebody is filling out a bit of paperwork to see if you can actually drive on the road. Of course, the

other way the government wants to get this state going is with its new investment attraction strategy. It is going to give Martin Hamilton-Smith \$15 million to do a fighting fund to—

Ms Redmond: Member for Waite.

Mr BELL: —yes, member for Waite, thank you—to scour the globe for partnership opportunities.

Ms Redmond: Or 'the quisling'.

Mr BELL: Okay. It is quite interesting to look at OZ Minerals. That is a \$10 million deal to get them in, so one company took out two-thirds of the entire fund. It is going to be interesting to see how many other small businesses or businesses in general are destined for that type of fund. With that, I was going to talk a little bit about electoral reform and the fact that this government does not have a mandate to deliver this budget, but I will leave that for another time.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker, I would like to acknowledge the attendance in the gallery of a group from the Riverside retirement village, who are guests of the member for Hammond. We hope they enjoy their time with us this morning. They will also be back at question time, so we look forward to seeing you then. Leader, you are the lead speaker.

Bills

APPROPRIATION BILL 2015

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (12:03): Thank you, Deputy Speaker. South Australia is in trouble. We are in the midst of a dangerous jobs crisis. We have the highest unemployment rate in the entire nation. Our population growth is half the national average. Our economy has ground to a halt after 13 years of Labor mismanagement. Our exports are going backwards, and the culmination of all of this is that we have an exodus of young people and capital across our borders into jurisdictions which provide a better environment for the future.

This is a shameful situation and so, on 18 June, when the Treasurer brought down his budget, we were hoping for a bold plan to address the crisis that we have here in South Australia. We were hoping for an emergency response to the crisis which is enveloping South Australia but, unfortunately, we had nothing like that from the Treasurer opposite.

In fact, the government has been deluding themselves now for an extended period of time. They have been out there telling people that we are doing quite well. In fact, only in October last year, the Premier and the Treasurer stood side by side at their press conference promising the people of South Australia 5,000 new jobs in the mining, oil and gas exploration sector in South Australia.

Let us have a look at where we are. Less than 12 months later, we have lost 5,000 jobs. We are now 10,000 jobs away from the hollow promise that was made by this government. They have continued to blame anybody else but themselves: 'It's Tony Abbott's fault; it's a problem of our currency in South Australia; it's big business; it's the global financial crisis.'

There is always something that has delivered the problems in South Australia. More than ever, what we need in South Australia is a government that will take responsibility, a government that will develop a plan to create jobs and opportunity in South Australia, and that is what we need right here in this parliament today. What is the role of the opposition in this? We are unequivocally a constructive opposition.

Time and time again, we have been putting forward positive plans to this government for their consideration to advance the cause of South Australia. I know that we have worked constructively with them to augment the SACAT legislation to provide opportunity for business in South Australia. I know that we have worked very hard, hand in glove, with this government on their

return-to-work legislation to address the situation where South Australia had unequivocally the worst workers compensation scheme in the entire nation.

We are continuing to work with them on planning reform in South Australia. In fact, the opposition is pushing the government in terms of planning reform in South Australia. They have not done nearly enough. We supported their royal commission into the nuclear fuel cycle. We are a responsible opposition and, again, we come into the parliament today with our positive plan to create jobs and opportunity for our next generation.

The focus of this plan must be, unequivocally and unashamedly, on creating jobs for our next generation. We on this side of the house do not accept that we should have the highest unemployment rate in the nation. We on this side of the house do not accept that 8,700 full-time jobs were lost in this state only last month. This is completely and utterly unacceptable and we need to take action straightaway.

The government has put forward its agenda and we received that in the house on 18 June. The centre point of this, quite rightly, was on tax reform, but let us take a look at what they actually offered. The centre point of their tax reform agenda in South Australia is to offer stamp duty relief that does not come into full effect until 2018-19, but we are in the midst of a dangerous jobs crisis now. We need an emergency response right now, right here—bring it forward!

If the government genuinely believes that offering stamp duty relief in two, three and four years' time will create the jobs we need in this state to keep our next generation here, then they should bring that forward. Bring forward that tax relief to this very year when we are in the midst of this dangerous jobs crisis.

More than that, when we look closely at the detail of the plan that was put forward by the Treasurer on 18 June, the government chose not a decrease in payroll tax, as we would argue for on this side of the house, but in fact an increase in payroll tax to come into effect on 1 July next year. That is an important date, because 1 July next year is the date on which the South Australian Liberal Party would have implemented its third successive increase in the threshold at which small business pays payroll tax in South Australia, but rather than offer this relief to the small business sector, on 1 July next year, the government will rip away the concession on payroll tax that has been in place.

They want to increase taxes to create jobs. It is completely and utterly dysfunctional. It will not work and I tell the government today that the Liberal Party, those people on this side of the house, will fight every single day between now and the next budget so that the government does not increase payroll tax and starts to implement decreases in our payroll tax threshold in South Australia.

More than that, as we know, in last year's budget, the government actually ripped \$90 million away from households in South Australia when this Treasurer implemented what was essentially a land tax on the family home. This is something that previous treasurers have said they would not do without going to the people of South Australia, but that is exactly and precisely what this Treasurer did last year. He ripped \$90 million from households, and the reason he gave was quite interesting. He said it was due to federal government cuts in funding to South Australia.

I thought I would take a look; I thought I would check to see if the Treasurer was speaking the truth. To do that, I took a look at the last budget that was handed down by Wayne Swan. Wayne Swan was the federal Labor treasurer and he handed down his budget in May 2013. Over the forward estimates, it provided federal government funding under the Labor administration to South Australia through to the end of 2016-17.

I compared that with the budget that was handed down by Mr Hockey in May this year. It is fair to say that I was a little bit surprised with the results because, as we know, the government has spent millions of dollars of taxpayer dollars in South Australia on their spurious campaign telling the people of South Australia about these terrible cuts.

Let's have a look at what happened—there we go. If we look at the difference this current financial year between what was promised under Wayne Swan and the Labor Party and what was promised by Joe Hockey and the Coalition, there is a \$273 million increase in funding from the federal government. Let's take a look at next year: a \$671 million increase in funding from the federal government, to be followed up the year after by a \$1.256 billion increase in federal government

funding from the Coalition, over and above what Wayne Swan had promised from the Labor administration.

That brings us to a total of \$2.2 billion worth of additional money, additional money that the Treasurer said was not coming to South Australia. In fact, he said that there were cuts; he ran very expensive television advertising telling the lie that South Australia's funding from the federal government was cut—it was increased. It was increased this year; it is increasing next year and the year after. So is the Treasurer a man of his word? He said repeatedly that, if there were not these cuts from the federal government, there would be no need for this \$90 million ESL removal of the remission. There is no need, Treasurer. Restore the remissions and give that money back to the households.

More than just tax relief to the people of South Australia, we need a wholesale focus on deregulation in South Australia. Our businesses have been bound up in increasing red tape after 13 years of Labor administration in this state. You do not have to go very far to hear about the appalling state of business confidence in South Australia. You just have to switch on the television at night, or open the paper, to hear about more business failure in South Australia, businesses downscaling or businesses going out of business.

Red tape is killing our businesses in South Australia. The government routinely talks about trimming red tape here and trimming red tape there. Well, the time has passed for trimming red tape. We need wholesale deregulation in South Australia and we are proposing that the government moves away from its long-held position with the Economic Development Board as its sole independent advice on managing our economy and moves to establish the first state-based productivity commission in South Australia.

I have no quarrel with the EDB, or the members of the Economic Development Board in South Australia. Individually, they are outstanding contributors. They are leaders, business leaders, community leaders and highly credentialed achievers in their own right, but collectively, either they have not been providing the advice to this government or the government has not been listening to the advice of this board. Whichever it is, South Australia is not performing well. Our economy has ground to a halt, and we need a different mechanism to get our economy moving in the right direction.

The Productivity Commission methodology has been in place for decades and decades. It has operated at the federal level. It has been supported by both Labor and Liberal administrations over that time and it has driven a productivity improvement in Australia. We are the 53rd most populous nation in the world; we have the 12th largest economy. A lot of that drive has come from the independent advice of the Productivity Commission, but we have fallen behind in South Australia. That is why we on this side of the house are advocating the first state-based productivity commission to remove barriers to creating employment in South Australia and to drive and direct our productivity improvement as a state.

Another great source of productivity is through enabling infrastructure and, again, this is an area where this government has dropped the ball. In fact, when the Treasurer made his speech to this house only a few weeks ago, he said that we were going to have a massive \$1.3 billion infrastructure expenditure next year. Well, that is his budget. Let me tell you what he did not tell you: if you look at the average over the last five years, it has been closer to \$2 billion. In other words, the Treasurer is presiding over a massive slashing of the capital budget in South Australia. There is not one single major announcement in terms of infrastructure in their budget, and that is not good enough.

Infrastructure creates jobs, but it also creates that enabling productivity improvement to have sustainable jobs going forward, and that is what we need in South Australia. That is why we say on this side of the house, 'Get on with the Northern Connector.' The government has been talking about the Northern Connector for an extended period of time but get on with it, bring it forward, deliver it for the people of South Australia. Create the jobs and create the productivity improvement, but do not just stop there. We know that the Prime Minister of Australia, the Hon. Tony Abbott, made an announcement in 2013 committing to a continuously flowing north-south corridor in South Australia to be delivered within 10 years. We are calling upon the government to bring forward future stages of the north-south corridor upgrade in South Australia to create jobs and to improve our productivity in South Australia.

Our focus on productive infrastructure should not be limited to metropolitan Adelaide. Our regions have been starved after 13 years of Labor government in South Australia, and that is why we have said that we would like to establish Infrastructure SA, an independent statutory authority looking at developing a long-range productive infrastructure plan for the people of South Australia. This government has focused on pet projects around marginal seats in electoral cycles for too long and they have not delivered the productive infrastructure that we need to support our exporters to create jobs and to grow our economy. That is what Infrastructure SA would do.

Our first referral would be for an immediate cost benefit analysis on the Strzelecki Track upgrade. This is an important piece of infrastructure. Again, the government want to talk about it—endlessly talk about it—but when are they actually going to do something about it and deliver it? We want a long-range plan in South Australia for roads, rail, ports, water augmentation, electricity augmentation. Where is our ports plan? This government has been talking about another deep-sea port for South Australia for a decade. They have no detail whatsoever and that is why they cannot be trusted to do the job and Infrastructure SA needs to be developed to oversee this important area for the people of South Australia.

Water is a critical part of our infrastructure and, again, this is an area where this government has not performed. Let's be serious about this. We have the highest water prices in the country and this is again holding back our ability to grow our economy. That is why we say we need an immediate independent inquiry into water pricing in South Australia. We have called upon the government for this; they have ignored it. What have they got to hide? We need to have a look at the way that we are pricing our water in South Australia so that we are not dealing ourselves out of the game because of our extraordinary high prices in South Australia.

More than that, we need to have a plan for water augmentation in South Australia so that we can open up the productive capacity of the Northern Adelaide Plains, the Clare region and, in fact, right across regional South Australia. We can get into further intensive horticulture. We talked about this a great deal in the lead up to the state election and we implore the government to take a very good look at this. Most importantly, we need to look urgently now at opening up third-party access to SA Water infrastructure so that we can drive down prices and improve our productive capacity as a state.

We are not travelling well in terms of our export performance in South Australia and, again, this is something that is holding South Australia back. We know that for every million dollars exported we create a huge number of jobs in South Australia—10 jobs, the economists tell us—and that is why we need to have a major focus on creating these opportunities for South Australia. How have we gone in this area? The figures were published only a few weeks ago for the year to the end of April. We have had a 7 per cent decrease in exports. For years, those opposite have told us that the reason for the decrease in the exports is because of the high valuation of the Australian dollar. Guess what? It is massively devalued, and what has happened to our exports? They have fallen back, ratcheted back yet again.

When this government came to power, we represented almost 8 per cent of the nation's exports. Today, we are little over 4 per cent, and we do not have a focus on this area. We have had vanity projects and jetting overseas, but the outcome has not delivered jobs for South Australia. In fact, if we go back to the 2012-13 budget, the government was budgeting to spend \$30 million a year to support our exporters; this year, it is \$13 million.

So, there was a lot of talk. We have had the jumbo and it has gone overseas. The 85 public servants have all been over and they have actually got the stamp on their passports. But, unfortunately, when we look at the budget, there is less money going in to supporting our trade-related exports out of South Australia, and that is absolutely shameful.

Deputy Speaker, as you would be aware, last year I travelled to New Zealand and met with the Prime Minister, the Hon. John Key. Let me tell you that the New Zealand economy, under solid, centre-right administration led by John Key and the National Party, has seen an incredible turnaround since 2008. When John Key became the Prime Minister of New Zealand, 3,000 New Zealanders net were leaving New Zealand every single month. Proportionally, it sounds a little bit like South Australia—3,000 every single month.

Fast forward to 2015, they now have a net repatriation of people going back to New Zealand, because they have a quality government which is delivering economic growth for the people of New Zealand. What a powerhouse that economy has been. If we look at the last four years, there has been a 7.9 per cent increase or growth in the size of their economy. South Australia has been languishing, bumping along the bottom, at 3.7 per cent.

Last week, I had the good fortune of meeting with the Hon. Bill English, who is the finance minister and Deputy Prime Minister of New Zealand. Fundamental to New Zealand's turnaround have been two things: firstly, a major focus on growing the size of the economy through exports; and, secondly, improving the productivity of the public services in that country. How do you actually grow the output? How do you actually deliver better services to the people of New Zealand in a constrained fiscal environment?

Bill English gave a great speech in Melbourne last week which focused upon not just pouring more and more money into public services but looking at reforming them, understanding the cost drivers and focusing on the output. How many times, when we have asked questions in this parliament about how the government's performance and their outputs are going in an area, have the government responded, 'We put more money in'?

What we are calling on the government to do is to work with the Public Service to develop and improve productivity with a greater focus on outputs. In business, we have been doing this for years. We have understood the great asset, which is the people who work in our organisations. Yet, in the Public Service in South Australia, we have a government which treats them as a cost centre, not a great source of ideas, and not a great source of reform or productivity improvement or to improve output, but a cost. We have seen this time and time again, and it is about time the government changed their stance. This has got to be a major focus for them going forward.

It was a disappointing budget. It did not deliver the emergency response we desperately needed here in South Australia. Our party, the Liberal Party of Australia, was formed 71 years ago by Robert Gordon Menzies. Robert Gordon Menzies founded this party based upon the rights and responsibilities of the individual. He wanted the individual to be the best that they possibly could be; he wanted the individual to achieve their optimum, unencumbered by government. He talked about the forgotten people: he talked about the farmers, the shopkeepers, the tradesmen—the people who put their capital on the line to create opportunities for our nation and for our state. Sir Robert Menzies understood about these forgotten people, and he addressed it.

At a time in South Australia when we have the highest unemployment rate in the nation, when we have a state growth which has essentially ground to a halt, when we have population growth half the national average, when we have more and more of our young people leaving our state, when we have exports going backwards, there has never been a more important time for our state to recommit to the forgotten people, to recommit to those people who have the capacity to create jobs, to create enterprise and to advance our state.

That is why today, in this parliament, we call upon this government to focus on the forgotten people, for this government to accelerate their tax reforms, to bring forward their capital investment, to deregulate and to focus on exports.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (12:25): It is a pleasure to follow such a fine speech by the Leader of the Opposition. He has done an absolutely outstanding job, as he does day in day out, leading us and holding the government to account, but it is my turn to respond to this year's budget on behalf of the people of Stuart. Let me just say that of course no budget is all good or all bad, but there is a lot more disappointment in this budget than we were led to believe would be the case. Let me touch on a couple of positives to begin with, and then I will probably use the remaining 19 minutes of my time to talk on the other aspects of the budget.

The additional funding for tourism is a positive aspect of this budget. It will help metropolitan South Australia, it will help regional South Australia, and I welcome that. I hope the money is spent very wisely. There are a lot of very capable people working within SATC and we need to get that money out. We need to make it as effective as possible and get it out so that it actually contributes to effective marketing and to growing the efficiency of our existing businesses. To me, one of the

most important aspects of growing tourism is improving tourism product and developing the product that is out there.

Of course, we welcome the tax relief. Any tax relief is welcomed by households or businesses, or employees for that matter, because employees are part of households and businesses, so they benefit as well. The extension of one year of the increased threshold for payroll tax is certainly welcome, but I cannot see why this government just wants to extend it for one year and one year and one year, unless, of course, it is because they do not want the full liability of that decision to be throughout the forward estimates. They only want the liability to be in the next year and so they hide the true picture.

The reduction in stamp duty is very positive, but why is the government having the vast bulk of that relief in the fourth year of the forward estimates after the next election? I can only imagine, again, that they are holding off on providing the benefits to our state, but they are also holding off on attributing the genuine cost to the budget. They are trying to make themselves look better than they actually are. Yes, of course we welcome the tax relief, but they have not gone nearly far enough.

We need to pursue employment, and greater employment needs to be the highest goal of this government and the budget. We need to do that by supporting business to employ people, not so that we have wealthy business operators—that is a lovely by-product, and good luck to them and their families—but so that they can have productive businesses and can employ people, and employ more people, and so that the people they employ can have secure employment. That is the reason to support businesses: so that they can provide secure, ongoing employment to their staff so that those people then can improve their lives with some security, so that they can go to the bank and get a mortgage, so that they can be sure that they can look after their kids and their families as they grow up, so that they can get a car loan and so that they can pay off their mortgage and have security. That is the reason to support businesses but, unfortunately, this budget is not doing that.

The Treasurer does talk about it but, unfortunately, it is just not happening to nearly the extent it should. I have given a couple of examples of where they are talking about benefits that do not actually accrue for a very long time and, if they were genuine about trying to support those businesses so that they could provide secure employment, they would bring forward those benefits.

The most recent figure we have for unemployment across our state is 7.6 per cent. It is the highest unemployment in the nation. It is an absolutely disgraceful position to be in. Guess what, Deputy Speaker: this budget provides us with the lowest jobs growth target of any state in the nation. Those two things just do not go together. If you are in a dreadful situation with regard to unemployment, you should have a very hardworking, ambitious budget that unlocks the productive capacity of our state and provides an employment growth target of much greater than 1 per cent and certainly not be targeting, again, to be the lowest in the nation.

We have seen unemployment grow and grow and we have had a lot of very unfortunate shocks. In the mining industry, in November 2014 (seven or eight months ago), the government announced boldly that it was going to create 5,000 new jobs for our state. That is a fantastic target. But, guess what? We have lost that many in less than a year. In the eight months since that target was announced, we have lost as many jobs as the government said they were going to create.

Do you know what is the most disappointing thing about that, apart from the obvious loss of jobs? I heard the Premier stand up at a South Australian Chamber of Mines and Energy awards night a few months ago and say to everybody assembled—hundreds of people from the industry were there—'We have set an ambitious target in government and now it's up to all of you to deliver.' That is exactly what the Premier said, that the government had set an ambitious target but it was up to the industry to deliver on that target. Isn't that a disgraceful way to support industry—to have big banner headlines, that are not even being achieved, and eight months later we have lost as many jobs as were going to be achieved in the industry, and at the same time to shamelessly say that it is up to somebody else to deliver that target? That is where we are at at the moment, and that is completely unacceptable.

Another great disappointment for me in this budget has been a complete lack of support for families and households and any relief whatsoever from cost of living burdens. We have high electricity prices, high water prices and high taxes across the board. The government brags about

removing the River Murray levy which will save a household on average \$40 each, but they are actually increasing the emergency services levy at the same time and that will cost the average household \$205 each. There is no relief for households. In fact, they are pushing up the cost of living for households.

To get back to the employment issue, the emergency services levy is not only a burden on households but also a burden on employment. The emergency services levy is a tax on employment because it is a tax on property. Every single business, whether a self-employed business or a business that employs other people as well, works, in one way or another, in a situation where they have to pay that increase. If they work in owned premises, they pay the increase. If they work in rented commercial premises, they pay the increase through outgoings which the landlord will pass on directly to the business as the tenant. If they work from home, they pay the increase in the emergency services levy. While this government makes big claims about trying to look after business, employment and families, it is doing exactly the opposite.

With regard to infrastructure, infrastructure is incredibly important. The government talks about infrastructure, and has done for a very long time, but it is again not following up with action. We have two key infrastructure projects that need to be pursued at the moment. They are two key regional pieces of infrastructure, and I mention them specifically as a regional member of parliament.

The upgrading of the Strzelecki Track is very important. Sealing that 470-kilometre piece of road will improve the transport and other efficiency of our state enormously. There are three key industries—they are not the only ones—that work in the north-east of our state: oil and gas, particularly in the Cooper Basin; tourism; and the cattle industry, and they will all benefit by having that road upgraded.

Another very important piece of infrastructure is a deep-sea, multi-user export port and, again, the government has talked about this for a very long time. A year ago the government committed to within a year from that point of time—so by now—producing for the public a plan for a new export, deep sea, multi-user port that would support our existing resources and agriculture industries and help them both grow, exporting typically iron ore, grain and other products. We need to have that. A year ago they promised to have a plan. They did not promise to have the port; they promised to have a plan. You cannot build the port if you do not have the plan and we are still waiting for the plan. The government has recommitted and recommitted to providing this plan, but they have not yet developed it. We need to see it.

I do not say that the government needs to fund all the money required to develop a brand-new port. Certainly, they do not need to do that, but they do need to show leadership so that financing will be attracted to this very much needed project. Infrastructure, in general, is incredibly important because jobs are created while the project is developed, but that is actually the second tier priority. That is a big help and we all welcome in regional South Australia or in metropolitan areas when infrastructure is developed, but the key issue is the ongoing jobs (the additional capacity that is created) and the additional efficiency that is created. They are the two things that are very important that come out of infrastructure and if they do not provide those into the future then they are not productive, efficient, worthwhile infrastructure. So, yes, there are jobs while they are being built, but they need to improve our economy and those two projects, the port and the Strzelecki Track, would both do those things.

The employment situation in our state is dreadfully concerning for all of us here, and I am sure government members are very concerned about that as well, but somehow the message is not getting through to cabinet and the senior decision-makers about what needs to be done. We are losing jobs at Holden faster than was predicted. There are now only 1,260 employees left at Holden and, let me tell you, they are doing an outstanding job. The employees working at that Holden factory are doing an enormous job. They are surprisingly winning awards within the entire worldwide GM group for their productivity improvements and their innovation. They are doing everything they possibly can. The workers and management have taken it upon themselves, every man and every woman, to be as good at their job as they possibly can be right until the very last day that that factory is building cars, and I commend them for that.

Unfortunately, they are losing employees faster than was predicted and yet the government is supporting them slower than they said that they would. We are losing employees quicker than was

predicted and yet the money in the budget that the government has set aside specifically for programs to help the Holden workers in the north of Adelaide and all of the other people affected by this very unfortunate automotive transformation at the moment is not being expended as quickly as the government said they would.

I do not want the government to waste the money. I am not saying just pump it out there, spend it on any old projects and who cares whether it is efficient or not. That is definitely not the case but, goodness gracious, by now they should have some effective, productive, useful programs in place that will help. Holden is getting on with the job. They are spending the \$15 million that they have put into South Australia and Victoria to support their people in transition. They have an excellent program working there. They are getting on and doing the job, but the state government saved \$2 million out of their program from the financial year that is just finishing today. Of all of the places to try to save money, that is not the place to target. These people need help and they need it faster than we expected they would.

Not saving but overspending by this government has been its nemesis for as long as this government has been in office. It has perpetually overspent and this year is no different. We have a situation where, over the forward estimates, the state government is going to receive from the federal government \$892 million of additional federal government income, yet it keeps overspending and overspending. There is a history of this government receiving unbudgeted additional income, yet unbudgeted spending is outstripping that income, and that is a habit that just has not changed.

To its credit, the government is still forecasting a \$43 million surplus next financial year—the financial year that starts tomorrow. Let us hope that it achieves it—history tells us that it will not. It has just handed down a deficit well in excess of the deficit that was forecast for the financial year just finishing. I am not at all optimistic that it will reach the surplus it is predicting for the new financial year. However, let me tell members, if it does it will be thanks to the federal government; if it does it will be because the federal government has given it more unexpected additional income than its most likely overspending which is about to commence. So, if it is able to have a surplus do that it will be thanks to the federal government but, unfortunately, it is highly unlikely.

Overspending has been the downfall of this government. We have a situation where hundreds of thousands of dollars is being spent on redundancies for public servants at the same time as the number of public servants in the state is growing. That is just one example of dreadfully inefficient use of money. We have a situation where \$176 million, I think it is, needs to be spent unbudgeted—so, an overspend of \$176 million—to transfer patients and equipment from the old Royal Adelaide Hospital to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital.

It is impossible to imagine that not one of these people—not one person within government, not one person within the health department, not one person analysing the PPP that put all the financials together, from an orderly doing important work in the hallways of hospitals all the way through to the chief executive of SA Health, or any of the financial people who scrutinise this—thought, 'Gee, we're going to need some money to transfer the patients and the equipment and all of the things that have to go from the old hospital to the new hospital.' I do not believe that they did not think of it. I do believe the government thought about leaving it out of the budget to make the budget a few years ago look a little bit better, and that is the sort of thing that catches the government out.

There are two aspects to its overspending: one fact is that it just spends and spends more than it expects that it will; but the other aspect is that it hides necessary expenses out of budgets to make the budgets look better, and that is exactly what I was getting at with the things I discussed earlier with regard to, for example, extending the payroll tax by one year so that years 2, 3 and 4 do not actually have to show the cost to the budget of forgoing that payroll tax income.

It is not an accident: it is the government's way of making things look better, but, unfortunately, it is not making them look good enough. We could talk about the budget for as long as we like and we can all share our different opinions and agree or disagree, but the most important thing going on in our state at the moment from a budgetary and an economic perspective is our incredibly high unemployment rate—7.6 per cent at last count and we know how many thousands of jobs have been lost across the state since then.

In the last minute I have left, let me just tell you how dreadfully disappointed I am that the government did not put any relief in this budget for the Alinta workers, their families and other employees affected in the communities of Port Augusta and Leigh Creek and surrounding districts. The announcement that those jobs were going to be lost was made a week before the budget. I understand the last minute issues about printing, but I also understand that there would be money made available.

An announcement could easily have been made that there was support for those people and those communities in this budget. It could easily have been explained: 'Look, we haven't got a page, we haven't got a line item, we haven't got something in the budget paper books that have already been prepared, but here is an allocation of money,' because there have been other announcements since the budget was handed down for other things they thought were a priority. I am terribly disappointed that they did not consider the Alinta workers and the other people who will lose their jobs because of Alinta's decision, and affected communities, a high enough priority.

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (12:45): This budget is a failure. It is a failure on infrastructure, it is a failure for business and it is a failure for job seekers. The Labor government has no plan for job creation, debt reduction, there are no new infrastructure projects nor assistance for local exporters and no plan for South Australia's future in this year's budget. We need solutions. Right now South Australia's economy faces some serious challenges. The South Australian economy has been on the decline for the last 10 to 12 years and ongoing struggles are becoming terminal. Our challenges are not new. They have not crept up on us. They have been presenting themselves for some time now.

Successive Labor governments have failed the people of South Australia. They have failed to put the brake on our state's decline, they have failed to diversify our economy and they have certainly failed to create a positive jobs growth agenda: jobs that would attract people to our state; jobs that would keep our young people here. We continue to suffer from a mass exodus of our best and brightest, who are leaving South Australia in search of greater opportunities. They are moving interstate and overseas for opportunities that do not exist in their own backyard.

South Australia is now in the unenviable position of having the highest unemployment rate in the nation at 7.6 per cent. In the period since the Premier was re-elected unemployment has dropped in Queensland, Victoria, New South Wales and it has even fallen in Tasmania, but in South Australia we have bucked that trend. In the last year alone our unemployment rate has jumped from 6.2 per cent to 7.6 per cent and there are grave fears that the worst is yet to come. Jobs at the Port Augusta power plant, Holden and BHP are still to be shed and the full impact of those announcements will not be realised in the jobs stats for another year or so. Add to this the demise of Leigh Creek and our ongoing manufacturing decline, and South Australia is in real trouble.

ABS figures released in June of this year revealed that more than 5,000 mining jobs have disappeared from South Australia; 5,000 jobs lost since the Premier promised to create 5,000 new mining jobs—5,000 jobs lost. This government is not very good at keeping its promises. The Treasurer promised that this state budget would offer some answers, that this budget would be a jobs budget, but his supposed jobs budget is nothing short of a failure.

This year's budget prediction of 1 per cent employment growth for 2015-16 is less than last year's predicted employment growth of 1.25 per cent for the same period. Labor has proven time and time again that it does not have any answers. This Labor government has proven that it cannot keep its promises, promises that included creating 100,000 new jobs by 2016. In reality, just 6,651 jobs have been created since Labor promised 100,000 extra jobs in February 2010.

This government has broken its commitment to create jobs and instead of working to deliver on its promises it has taken a saw to our vocational training centre by axing jobs training programs and announcing funding cuts for non-government training providers. These are cuts that will drive many private training organisations to cease offering courses and reduce the range of vocational training available to South Australians.

Data released by the National Centre for Vocational Education Research in May of this year shows the drastic decline in the number of South Australians in jobs training in 2014, falling from 165,000 to 129,000. The number of students in vocational training has fallen by more than

21 per cent. At a time of soaring unemployment and daily announcements of further job cuts across South Australia, cuts to vocational training could not have come at a worse time for job seekers, job seekers who need training to have a chance of success in this highly competitive jobs market.

This state is at a critical juncture. The decisions we make, the steps we take, will determine whether we look back at this moment as one of lost opportunity or the turning point that delivered enduring prosperity. South Australia can turn around its fortunes; we can reverse the trend of our soaring unemployment, but we need a budget and a government that lowers business costs and lowers them now, a budget that provides incentives for investment in our state. Health, biotech and medical research are industries that could help drive future economic growth. International education, tourism, food and wine are other areas of great potential for South Australia.

I believe in South Australia and its people. South Australia has the foundations to rebuild our economy. We have the ability to transition our state to a new, modern economy. But transitioning the economy is a complex and delicate task. It requires a careful mix of the right short-term and long-term solutions. We need to confront the issues we face today, and also put in place the economic framework that will stand the test of time. But, to achieve success, to turn around our fortunes, we need a bold vision, we need bold decisions and we need bold actions.

Labor has not been bold: Labor has played it safe; Labor has delivered a budget that has no plan for job creation, a budget that has no plan for turning around our failing economy. The state budget again proves that Labor is not up to the challenge. It proves that the Premier and Treasurer cannot, will not, make the tough decisions. Our economy has flatlined. South Australians are paying more and getting less. They are paying more taxes, more for water, more for electricity and further increases to the emergency services levy this year, after a massive hit last year.

This budget fails to deliver for South Australians, it fails to provide any real cost of living relief to households, and it fails to deliver a plan for our future. Small business is the heartbeat of this state's economy, but our small business sector is struggling. It is struggling because of bureaucratic red tape and government apathy.

The South Australian business sector needs a budget that drives competitiveness, lowers costs and incentivises investment, and they need that now. The changes to stamp duty announced in this budget will be welcome relief when they are eventually phased in, but they fail to deliver the urgent impact our small business sector is craving, and they fail to deliver the significant impact the small business sector desperately needs.

The fiscal impact of the stamp duty changes will not be delivered for up to three years, and it is worth reminding members that these same changes were promised by the Labor government in the 2005-06 budget, changes promised by former Labor treasurer, Kevin Foley, until he changed his mind. The small business sector in South Australia needs a government that is pro small business. It needs a government that makes it easy to do business in this state by removing red tape, a government that gets out of the way of business so that business can thrive.

Payroll tax is a huge impediment on growth. It is a tax on jobs, jobs that this state desperately needs. It is a tax on jobs at a time when we have Australia's worst unemployment record, and a record that is sadly trending upwards. Removing payroll tax across the board would have an absolute and immediate positive impact on business. It would free up capital for investment to expand their workforce, capital to invest in their business.

But simplifying taxes is not enough. We must also work with the business sector to help it grow. We need to help South Australian businesses, exporters and producers to find new markets and new opportunities. We need to attract more business, offering incentives and making it easy for businesses to set up shop in our state. We need to increase the number of new businesses, new industries and people moving into South Australia, and we need to do more to help start-ups. There are some amazing entrepreneurial spirits in South Australia, and we must help them unlock their full potential.

Programs such as the South Australian Young Entrepreneur Scheme can play an important role in fostering entrepreneurship and helping enterprising business people, but suitable and sufficient support is crucial for this to occur. I am concerned because support for programs aimed at

helping the business sector have fallen in recent times. Since the 2011-12 state budget, funding for the main state government program aimed at boosting exports has been cut by this government from \$30 million to \$19 million, at a time when unemployment is rising and at a time when export and investment are crucial to this state and its future.

The Labor government has slashed funding to the main state government program aimed at boosting exports. Support for this program has fallen, despite the fact that the current government is nowhere near its target of \$18 billion in annual exports by 2017. In fact, during the last 12 months South Australian exports have dropped and merchandise exports have plummeted from 7.1 per cent to \$14 billion per annum.

Small states do not become prosperous by selling their produce to themselves. Instead of entering or expanding further into international markets, Labor's lack of adequate assistance means that many businesses have had to turn their focus to survival—not export growth. Attracting inward investment is equally important to promoting exports. The government's \$15 million budget commitment to fund and secure new investment in South Australia is a welcome step, but it does not go far enough to address our needs. The Treasurer is picking winners through the provision of targeted assistance rather than providing a vehicle to attract sustainable new business.

It is time to think outside the box. To be bold, we should look at new programs and new initiatives to help kickstart our lagging economy—programs such as the Immigrant Investor Program in the United States, also known as EB-5. The US Congress created that program to attract investors and entrepreneurs from around the globe to attract investment that will create jobs in America. EB-5 makes a limited number of visas available annually to immigrant investors who invest in commercial enterprises and there must be an enterprise that creates at least 10 US jobs in a high unemployment or rural area.

The concept of an EB-5-style program should be explored here in South Australia with potential benefits for many. It provides an alternative to the Treasurer's 'picking winners' strategy. The challenges confronting South Australia are not unique to our state. There are many cities that have also experienced the sharp decline of our key sectors of the economy, surging unemployment, increasing costs and population decline. We can look to these places for ideas—ideas of what has worked and warnings of what has not worked as they transition to a new, modern economy.

The revival of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, has lessons for all of us. The City of Bridges—as it is known—has built a bridge from its steel past to become a diverse 21st century economy. Pittsburgh long symbolised the industrial era in the US. When the US steel industry collapsed in the 1980s under foreign competition, Pittsburgh unemployment surged to 17 per cent and its population declined. Yet Pittsburgh found a way forward. The manufacturing sector diversified into advanced manufacturing, health care and education picked up the slack, and entrepreneurs turned the city into a centre for robotics.

It took a coordinated effort by the city's political, economic and non-profit leaders to link education and innovation, nurture new business and turn Pittsburgh into one of America's most liveable cities. In 2009, the city was selected to host the annual G20 Summit and was hailed by the group as 'a model for economic, environmental and quality-of-life transformation'. That transformation did not happen overnight, and it did not happen on the back of safe, unimaginative political leaders.

The city's transformation took vision, it required bold decisions and involved good, long-term planning. Most importantly, it was driven by government coinvestment. The waterfront, once lined with factories, was given over to parks; the city fostered its green technology sector; and the G20 Summit was hosted in the world's first and largest LEED-certified convention centre. Government involvement has been in the right places and to the right extent in Pennsylvania. Entrepreneurship has been fostered, innovational work and a state-aided seed fund has played a vital role in Pittsburgh's technology economy. It provides capital investment, business and technical expertise and access to a network of innovative expert resources. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:58 to 14:00.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (BOARDS AND COMMITTEES - ABOLITION AND REFORM) BILL*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

SUPPLY BILL 2015*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Petitions***KANGAROO ISLAND COUNCIL**

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): Presented a petition signed by 235 residents of Kangaroo Island and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to institute a parliamentary inquiry into the administration of the Kangaroo Island Council including its financial management.

*Parliamentary Procedure***PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Auditor-General—Health ICT systems and the Camden Park distribution centre
Supplementary Report June 2015 [Ordered to be published]

By the Acting Premier (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Fees Regulation—
Fees Variation
Incidental SAAS Services—Fees Variation

By the Attorney-General (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Associations Incorporation—Fees Variation
Bills of Sale—Fees Variation
Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration—Fees Variation
Burial and Cremation—Fees Variation
Community Titles—Fees Variation No. 2
Coroners—Fees Variation
Criminal Law (Clamping, Impounding and Forfeiture of Vehicles)—Fees Variation
Criminal Law (Sentencing)—Fees Variation
District Court—Fees Variation
Electoral—Insertion of Regulation 18 to 24
Environment, Resources and Development Court—Fees Variation
Evidence—Fees Variation
Expiation of Offences—
Fees Variation
Fees Variation No.2
Magistrates Court—Fees Variation
Partnership—Fees Variation
Public Trustee—Fees Variation
Real Property—Fees Variation No. 2
Registration of Deeds—Fees Variation No. 2
Security and Investigation Industry—Fees Variation
Sexual Reassignment—Fees Variation

Sheriff's—Fees Variation
State Records—Fees Variation
Strata Titles—Fees Variation No. 2
Supreme Court—Fees Variation
Worker's Liens—Fees Variation
Youth Court—Fees Variation
Rules made under the following Acts—
South Australian Employment Tribunal—Rules
Supreme Court—
 Probate Rules 2015
 Supplementary Probate Rules 2015

By the Minister for Planning (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Development—
 Fees Variation
 Miscellaneous Variation
Liquor Licensing—Fees Variation
Private Parking Areas—Fees Variation

By the Minister for Housing and Urban Development (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Housing Improvement—Fees Variation

By the Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Dangerous Substances—
 Dangerous Goods Transport—Fees Variation
 Fees Variation
 Variation of Regulation 4
Employment Agents Registration—Fees Variation
Explosives—
 Fees Variation
 Fireworks—Fees Variation
 Security Sensitive Substances—Fees Variation
 Variation of Regulation 5
Fair Work—Fees Variation
Return to Work—
 Miscellaneous Variation
 Transitional Arrangements—Variation of Regulation 5
South Australian Employment Tribunal—Regulations
Work Health and Safety—Fees Variation

By the Minister for Health (Hon. J.J. Snelling)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
South Australian Public Health—
 Fees Variation
 Legionella—Fees Variation
 Wastewater Fees—Fees Variation
 Wastewater Variation

By the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse (Hon. J.J. Snelling)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Controlled Substances—Fees Variation
Tobacco Products Regulation—Fees Variation

By the Treasurer (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Emergency Services Funding—Variation of Regulation 3
Land Tax—Fees Variation
Public Corporations—
Adelaide Convention Centre Corporation—Dissolution and Revocation
Adelaide Entertainments Corporation—Variation Regulations

By the Minister for Finance (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Petroleum Products Regulation—Fees Variation

By the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Mines and Works Inspection—Fees Variation
Mining—Fees Variation
Opal Mining—Fees Variation
Petroleum and Geothermal Energy—Fees Variation

By the Minister for Disabilities (Hon. A. Piccolo)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Authorised Betting Operations—Fees Variation
Building Work Contractors—Fees Variation
Casino—Voluntary—Pre-commitment Code Variation
Conveyancers—Fees Variation
Disability Services—Fees Variation
Gaming Machines—Fees Variation
Land Agents—Fees Variation
Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing)—Fees Variation
Lottery and Gaming—Fees Variation
Plumbers, Gas Fitters and Electricians—Fees Variation
Second-hand Vehicle Dealers—Fees Variation

By the Minister for Police (Hon. A. Piccolo)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Firearms—Fees Variation
Hydroponics Industry Control—Fees Variation
Police—Fees Variation
Summary Offences—Weapons—Fees Variation

By the Minister for Emergency Services (Hon. A. Piccolo)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Fire and Emergency Services—Fees Variation

By the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Brands—Fees Variation
Fisheries Management—Fees Variation No. 2
Livestock—Fees Variation

Primary Produce (Food Safety Schemes)—
Citrus Industry—Fees Variation
Egg—Fees Variation
Meat Industry—Fees Variation
Plant Products—Fees Variation
Seafood—Fees Variation

By the Minister for Local Government (Hon. G.G. Brock)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Local Government—
Fees Variation
Variation of Regulation 11

By the Minister for Ageing (Hon. Z.L. Bettison)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Retirement Villages—Fees Variation

By the Minister for Education and Child Development (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Adoption—Fees Variation
Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium—Fees Variation
Children's Protection—Fees Variation
Crown Land Management—Fees Variation
Environment Protection—Fees Variation
Heritage Places—Fees Variation
Historic Shipwrecks—Fees Variation
Marine Parks—Fees Variation
National Parks and Wildlife—
Hunting—Fees Variation
Protected Animals—Marine Mammals—Fees Variation
Wildlife—Fees Variation
Native Vegetation—Fees Variation
Natural Resources Management—
Fees Variation
Financial Provisions—Fees Variation
Pastoral Land Management and Conservation—Fees Variation
Radiation Protection and Control—Fees Variation
Water Industry—Fees Variation

By the Minister for the Public Sector (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Freedom of Information—Fees Variation
Public Sector—Variation of Regulation 9

By the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure (Hon. S.C. Mullighan)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia)—
Expiation Fees Variation
Fees Variation
Motor Vehicles—
Accident Towing Roster Scheme—Fees Variation
Expiation Fees Variation
Miscellaneous Fees Variation

Miscellaneous Variation
Passenger Transport—Fees Variation
Rail Safety National Law (South Australia)—
Fees Variation
Variation of Regulations 56 and 57
Road Traffic—
Expiation Fees Variation
Miscellaneous Fees Variation
Roads (Opening and Closing)—Fees Variation
Valuation of Land—Fees Variation

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today residents of the Riverside retirement village, who are guests of the member for Hammond, and also pupils from Ridgehaven Primary School, who are guests of the member for Newland.

Ministerial Statement

GILLMAN LAND SALE

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (14:08): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide identifies Gillman as a key industry area. Located close to key existing infrastructure, but constrained by zoning, infrastructure and environmental issues on the site itself, the land has outstanding potential to create jobs for South Australians. In spite of interest in developing the site through the past 30 years, the land has remained largely vacant and significantly underutilised.

Part of the reason for the lack of progress in developing the land has been that past proposals have relied on the state government funding significant infrastructure upgrades where the cost and risk have been prohibitive. The Adelaide Capital Partners proposal was significant in that it proposed to develop up to around 407 hectares of the Gillman land to support economic development and jobs growth, including an oil and gas servicing hub, without the need for the government to first spend money to remediate the land.

The government is working with ACP and will continue to do so to ensure that settlement on stage 1 of the land is completed as expeditiously as possible. The government will do all it reasonably can to progress the necessary investigations to consider rezoning the land at Gillman to support development. As I have previously advised the house, settlement on stage 1 of the land cannot occur until certain preconditions are met. Such preconditions include:

1. The completion of the development plan amendment process affecting the land;
2. The satisfaction of ACP that all required planning, environmental and other regulatory requirements have been obtained; and
3. ACP having procured the deposit of a plan of land division over stage 1 of the land.

Public consultation on the ministerial development plan amendment process to consider rezoning the Gillman employment lands commenced on 27 March 2015 and closed on 25 May 2015, with nine submissions received. I am advised that the independent Development Policy Advisory Committee (DPAC) has recently concluded its review of this DPA last week and is expected to finalise its advice today. I understand that the independent advice of DPAC will be provided in due course to the Minister for Police, who has delegated authority to consider this DPA. I expect the DPA will be considered in line with the usual process.

With the conclusion of this DPA process, ACP will complete the work necessary to meet its preconditions to settlement, which it is obliged to do expeditiously under the deed. This is expected to lead to settlement on stage 1 of the land. The government will seek to settle the transaction for the land as swiftly as possible so that the significant economic development potential from this sale is realised as soon as possible.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order not just for interjecting but for blaspheming.

BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY SECURITY OF PAYMENT ACT REVIEW

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:13): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Building and Construction Industry Security of Payment Act 2009 has been in operation for over three years. Under section 36 of the act, I as minister am required to review the act and determine whether the policy objectives remain valid and whether the terms of the act remain appropriate for securing those objectives. The review has been completed and I have tabled copies to the house.

Former youth and District Court judge, Mr Alan Moss, was engaged by the Office of the Small Business Commissioner to assist me in the review. Submissions were sought from key stakeholder groups and advertisements advising of the review were placed in *The Advertiser* in December 2014 and January 2015. In addition, information of the review was placed on the Small Business Commissioner's website. A total of 24 submissions were received, and Mr Moss and the Small Business Commissioner also met with a number of parties.

There remains considerable concern within sections of the industry about the imbalance of power between subcontractors and head contractors, and Mr Moss was presented with evidence of behaviours of some parties which show the industry is a long way from best practice when it comes to a smooth payment process. Any future changes to the way the building and construction industry operates must be taken with great caution to ensure that the industry is not burdened by excessive red tape.

The Moss review made significant recommendations and the review has been distributed to key stakeholders for comment. The Small Business Commissioner is currently reviewing relevant legislation in other jurisdictions relating to subcontractor payments. I will provide the house with further updates on the Building and Construction Industry Security of Payment Act 2009 as they become available.

Mr Speaker, on a related issue, I would also like to place on the record that the failure of Tagara is of great concern to the state government. The Small Business Commissioner spoke to Tagara liquidators, Clifton Hall, on Monday, 29 June, who advised that a meeting of creditors was scheduled to be held on 14 July 2015. Contact will continue with liquidators to establish the cause of Tagara's collapse, and I will report back to the house with an update on this matter when appropriate to do so.

Parliamentary Committees

CRIME AND PUBLIC INTEGRITY POLICY COMMITTEE

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (14:19): I bring up the first report of the committee, entitled Public Integrity and the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Annual Review.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call to order the Leader of the Opposition.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:20): I bring up the 101st report of the committee, entitled Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges Natural Resources Management Board Levy Proposal 2015-16.

Report received and ordered to be published.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I bring up the 102nd report of the committee, entitled Eyre Peninsula Natural Resources Management Board Levy Proposal 2015-16.

Report received and ordered to be published.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I bring up the 103rd report of the committee, entitled Kangaroo Island Natural Resources Management Board Levy Proposal 2015-16.

Report received and ordered to be published.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I bring up the 104th report of the committee, entitled Northern and Yorke Natural Resources Management Board Levy Proposal 2015-16.

Report received and ordered to be published.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I bring up the 105th report of the committee, entitled South East Natural Resources Management Board Levy Proposal 2015-16.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The SPEAKER: I welcome also to parliament today the former member for Kaurna, who is here in her second political incarnation as the Mayor of the City of Onkaparinga, together with her deputy, I am told.

*Question Time***JOBS GROWTH FORECAST**

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): My question is to the Treasurer. Given the Treasurer and Premier have claimed to have delivered a 'jobs budget', why do the budget papers show only a 1 per cent employment growth forecast for next year?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:24): We are being conservative. I found instructive the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition today. In his question just now, he presupposes that the budget is not a jobs budget yet calls on me to bring forward the measures in the budget to create jobs.

Either this budget creates jobs or it does not. So, what the Leader of the Opposition is putting to the people of South Australia is: this budget is so bad, bring the measures in the budget forward; this budget is so bad bring it forward. That is what he is putting to the people of South Australia. I mean, really, Mr Speaker.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Leader of the Opposition is lost—he is lost. He never put these types of tax package to the people.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I uphold the point of order.

Mr Pederick: Chuck him out!

The SPEAKER: What, without even having warned him first? Of course, I may be an optimist here but I think that the Treasurer would be less inclined to debate if he was not confronted with a wall of noise. Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I just want to distribute the facts, sir, and the facts are these: by the time this budget's measures are completed we will be the lowest-taxing jurisdiction of all the states. We have delivered tax reform that the opposition could never have even imagined—cuts to the mining sector, to the property sector.

There are many people who have said wonderful things about the budget, but the one that stands out the most is Mr Daniel Gannon. Mr Gannon has had lots to say, but he says this:

The peak body for Australia's \$680 billion property industry has welcomed the abolition of commercial conveyance stamp duties labelling it 'a bright green light for investment'.

He says, I quote:

The removal of this dead weight business tax is a green light for investment and a positive platform for investment hunting and will also accelerate transaction activity across the state.

These tax cuts were never proposed by the opposition. If we had followed the model of the opposition there would be cuts to land tax (a very efficient tax), there would be cuts to payroll tax. Only 10 per cent of South Australian businesses pay payroll tax—130,000 businesses would have received absolutely nothing. Our tax changes touch every single business in this state.

The Liberal opposition has more in common with the Greens than they do with their past, with Sir Thomas Playford looking disapprovingly—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr GARDNER: The minister is debating the topic, sir.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, there is a political party that does not support unconventional gas. There is a political party that does not support a crackdown on bikies; it is more interested in civil liberties. It is not the Greens: it is the Liberal Party.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer will not canvass a bill before parliament, the serious and organised crime legislation: he will address the question of employment growth. If the Treasurer has finished, I call to order the members for Hartley, Chaffey, Adelaide, Morialta, Mount Gambier, Schubert, Stuart and Hammond. I warn for the first time the leader, the member for Morialta, the member for Hartley and the member for Chaffey, and I warn for the second and final time the member for Morialta. Leader.

JOBS GROWTH FORECAST

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): Supplementary to the Treasurer: how can the Treasurer claim that the jobs growth forecast is in fact conservative when this government has provided to the house several separate forecasts for the next financial year, ranging in value from 1.75 per cent down to the latest growth rate at 1 per cent? How can the Treasurer say that his modelling and his forecasts are indeed conservative when he had to revise down his own jobs forecast for this current financial year twice during that year when it was in progress?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:29): The reality is that if the Leader of the Opposition does not want to believe me about our conservatism, if he does not want to believe the Department of Treasury and Finance or the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, perhaps he will believe Kate Carnell, the Chief Executive of the Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

Cutting stamp duty will boost growth and jobs at a time when South Australia's economy is going through a period of transition...This significant step may have a short-term impact on the budget bottom line but will have long-term benefits for South Australians. We applaud the government for having the foresight to take this bold initiative to invest in growth.

Kate Carnell, former Liberal minister, and now Chief Executive of the Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry—hardly a hotbed of socialist activity. She went on to say that today's budget, speaking of last Thursday:

...will help the state get back on its feet. Other states should consider following South Australia's lead and free up their own economies from the constraints of stamp duty, which increases transaction costs and lowers transaction volumes...The South Australian Government should be commended for listening to these arguments and taking action.

The CPA of Australia, the Managing Chief Executive, Mr Alex Malley, said the South Australian government is to be congratulated:

...for getting on with the job of reforming the state's economy and reducing impediments to business restructuring.

None of these tax changes were ever proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, not once. Not once has the Leader of the Opposition ever come into this place and said, 'Get rid of transactional taxes.' Not once.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer should bear in mind that there are now children in high school who have never experienced a state Liberal government and, therefore, it is irrelevant to the question for the Treasurer to canvass the merits or otherwise of former governments, and I asked him not to do so. Does the Treasurer have anything further to say?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There are so many more endorsements, sir. The Shopping Centre Council of Australia said:

The tax reform plan announced in the budget has the real potential to boost confidence and attract new investment and new jobs to South Australia.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: They don't believe us, Mr Speaker. There you go. There is the interjection. They do not believe us, they don't believe the reforms work, and yet they ask us to bring the reforms forward. Which one is it?

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr GARDNER: Both debate and also defying your other rulings.

The SPEAKER: Well, I don't uphold it because the member for Mount Gambier, as he acknowledges, taunted the Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He congratulated us on playing an important role and understanding the important role that commercial property plays as a job creator and an economic stimulator. The South Australian Chamber of Mines and Energy, Mr Jason Kuchel, the Chief Executive, went on to say:

The combined effect of the stamp duty and payroll tax concessions, and investment to unlock our copper wealth, will lift the cash burden for many companies operating in the mining and energy industry and increase investor confidence that South Australia is open for business and supportive of resources development.

The Australian Industry Group's Director Stephen Myatt said:

The state government is to be congratulated for placing business and industry at the centre of its budget announcements...Many of our members in manufacturing and related industries are doing it tough and the stamp duty concessions and one year payroll tax rebate extension for some small companies will be welcome and helpful...In particular with the restructuring of the automotive industry supply chain—

Now, why is that occurring? Do you remember why that is occurring? Because the commonwealth government are not investing.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That's right. This is the same Liberal leader who agrees. The commonwealth government has no role in running the country. He is just the Prime Minister. What would he know about South Australia? He went on to say:

In particular with the restructure of the automotive industry supply chain, the Government's announcements in relation to stamp duty—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the minister has run out of time, thank God.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the member for MacKillop's point of order and, before we move to the next question, I call to order the member for Newland. I warn for the first time the members for Stuart and Mount Gambier, I warn for the second and final time the leader and the member for Hartley. Leader?

JOBS GROWTH FORECAST

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): A supplementary: why has the government ignored calls from the South Australian Chamber of Mines and Energy to invest in infrastructure projects, such as sealing the Strzelecki Track, to improve the feasibility of resources projects in South Australia in order to create jobs?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:34): These infrastructure programs are generally funded on an 80:20 basis with the commonwealth, and we are in negotiations with the commonwealth government; my colleague, the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, is involved in negotiations with the commonwealth government. The Leader of the Opposition is calling on me to bring forward tax cuts, abolish the emergency services levy, provide a budget surplus, and build the Strzelecki Track. What programs does he want me to cut to pay for it, or do we not want the commonwealth government to be a funding partner?

I have to say again that this is a political party that opposes the privatisation of the Motor Accident Commission, opposes unconventional gas—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order. The minister is again debating. He is not responsible for opposition policy.

The SPEAKER: I'm sorry?

Mr GARDNER: The minister is again debating, sir. He continues to defy your ruling.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer's breach of standing orders has become so serious that I call him to order. While I do so, I also warn for the first time the member for Unley.

MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:35): My question is to the Treasurer. Given that there are now almost 5,300 fewer South Australians employed in the mining sector than at the time he promised to create an extra 5,000 mining jobs, will the Treasurer now concede that his promise to create these additional 5,000 jobs by 2017 was unrealistic and irresponsible over-spruiking?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:36): No, sir. We aim high, we are an ambitious government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I find it interesting that a political party that does everything it can to stop the expansion of our oil and gas sector now complains that the government has not done enough. They do everything they can to try to stop the expansion of the oil and gas sector, so much so that they voted with the Greens to establish a parliamentary inquiry into this very industry and the largest company in South Australia, the top ASX-listed company in South Australia, has condemned the Liberal Party.

Of course, these Greens policies pumped out by the Liberal Party will not change the fact that copper prices are down internationally, iron ore prices are down internationally. Any state government, any politician, that gets up and tells you they can change the international commodity price of copper, of uranium, of oil, of gas would not be being honest with the people of this state. Members opposite, who do not like these industries anyway and who attack them, now complain that the government is not doing enough.

We are the most investment-friendly state government in the country. The Fraser Institute, an independent research institute, says that this state government has the best regulatory approach for the investment of mining anywhere in Australia. We are held in high regard by the Western Australians, by the Queenslanders, by the Victorians, by the Northern Territory government—conservative governments. They say that the South Australian approach to the mining sector is the one we should be adopting. They are the ones who are saying it.

I was recently in Western Australia, and the Western Australian mining minister got up and praised the South Australian government for our move on taxation and for the way we deal with PACE. I have to say that it is a bit rich that after a bit of karaoke with the Greens the Leader of the Opposition turns up and says, 'You're not doing enough for the resources sector,' after he does everything he can behind the scenes to try to stop it.

MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:38): A supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Before we go to the supplementary I call to order, and warn for the first time, the member for Kavel; I call to order the members for MacKillop, Davenport and Mitchell; and I warn for the first time the member for Adelaide and the deputy leader and, if I have not already warned him, the member for Unley. Leader.

Mr MARSHALL: Thank you, sir. Does the Treasurer and the government stand by their commitment to the people of South Australia, their promise to the people of South Australia, to increase the value of our mineral and energy resources production to \$10 billion and to create an additional 5,000 jobs by the end of next year?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:39): We will do all we can to encourage—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I give the leader a lot of scope to bellow at the government, but I am—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Something like that, yes.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We aspire to see a larger investment in the resources sector in South Australia. Through our unconventional oil and gas sectors, we want to make sure that the Otway Basin is fully explored, we want to make sure that people in the Cooper Basin get the investment that they need, we want to make sure that Arrium can export more iron ore, we want to see Iron Road grow its deposits, we want to see Olympic Dam expanded, we want to see Carrapateena develop. We want to see South Australia take its rightful place amongst the titans of mining and we will do all we can to do that.

What we will not do is vote to establish parliamentary inquiries that stifle investment. What we will not do is attack the resources sector, and what we also will not do is behind closed doors do everything we can with the Greens to try to stop access to farmland, to explore resources, a right to farm—the guilty party, the party that wants to stop mining, the party that has more in common with the Greens than it has with Sir Thomas Playford. No wonder he looks down at them all so disapprovingly.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Was that a point of order or just an exclamation?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Standing order 98, sir: the minister is debating the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I think you are right. I uphold the point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We aspire to become a mining state. We aspire to grow our mining sector—

An honourable member: How's that going?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: How's that going? I will tell you what we are not doing. We are not out there trying to stop investment. I will tell you what else we did. We took a mining policy to the last state election. We took a resources policy to the last state election. Even the Greens had a resources policy at the last election. They want to stop it. We know that one was drafted. We know that one was ready, but who did not want to take it to the election? Who did not want to announce that resources policy at the last election?

Any politician who tells you they can control commodity prices is not being honest. We are giving every opportunity for our resources sector to grow. We are giving them every opportunity to invest. We are lowering taxes. We give them long-term security with indentures. We use regulatory processes. We have very little red tape for the mining industry. We are held in high regard by the industry, nationally and internationally, and they are all worried about one thing: the Leader of the Opposition ever becoming premier of this state, because they know what those karaoke weekends with the Greens mean. They know what all their karaoke with the Greens means, all that whispering in his ear about the dangers of fracking, the dangers of uranium. When we talked about the royal commission, who were the two people who opposed it? Christopher Pyne and the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Pengilly: You are a fool.

The SPEAKER: The member for Finniss will withdraw and apologise.

Mr PENGILLY: I withdraw and apologise, sir.

Mr Griffiths interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Goyder is called to order. The member for Mitchell.

TRAIN AND TRAM DRIVERS DISPUTE

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Can the minister confirm that the current EBA for train and tram drivers expired 12 months ago?

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) (14:43): I have a few points to make. First, there are separate enterprise agreements for these different workforces, so there is not one single one. In fact, it expired more than 12 months ago, and the reason for that is that negotiations were put on hold at the mutual desire of both the union and the government so that we could progress, on the union's behalf, a work value assessment.

TRAIN AND TRAM DRIVERS DISPUTE

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (14:43): Supplementary question: why has the minister waited more than 12 months to resume negotiations, leaving them until industrial action was taken, especially at a time when uni students are sitting exams?

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) (14:44): Perhaps the member for Mitchell was just sticking to the pre-written script that somebody gave him before question time. I just addressed the substance of that question in my previous answer.

TRAIN AND TRAM DRIVERS DISPUTE

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (14:44): Supplementary: how much longer then is the minister going to wait until he gets this resolved? If he has waited a couple of months and stretched it out to 12 months, how much longer will he wait?

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

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) (14:44): We are working very hard with the union to resolve this dispute to make sure, primarily, that commuters aren't further inconvenienced. What we're not doing is we're not shopping a false story around to the media about the government being intent on outsourcing these services.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: I would like to hear more than a sentence and a half before I decided whether it was out of order, if that's okay by the member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: I submit that he is imputing improper motive, so I invite you to reflect on that as he continues to do so.

Mr Marshall: 'False stories', 'shopping around'.

The SPEAKER: Shopping is not unlawful or to be condemned. Minister for Transport.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. As I said, what we're not doing is shopping around false stories to the media claiming that the government is looking to immediately privatise or outsource these services in an effort to press the bruise of all public transport groups, who are very sensitive about what was done nearly 20 years ago by the former Liberal government in privatising these services.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order. The minister now having identified the motive and made the accusation—

The SPEAKER: Yes, I uphold the point of order. Does the minister wish to add anything?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, Mr Speaker. I find it interesting that the member for Morialta would jump up and take a point of order. I didn't say who was shopping it around, but if the level of guilt on that side is so high that they feel the need to defend themselves, Mr Speaker, then that's fine. I think we all know what's been going on.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir. The standing orders define clearly the opportunities available to the Speaker when a minister defies his rulings.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully to what the minister has to say. I beseech him not to go down that line further.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Unlike those seeking to prolong the dispute and interrupt services to be provided to commuters, we're actively working towards getting it resolved. We've made it clear that the parameters within which the government will negotiate are that we will be removing the no forced redundancy clause. I should note that it was interesting today that, where previously there has been bipartisanship on this matter—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Sorry, I missed that from the leader.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Oh, he was just embarrassed—okay. Where previously both parties had taken a particular policy to the last election to remove the no forced redundancy clause, the member for Mitchell this morning said he was happy to take his party's position to the next

election. What news that is! Let's see how we go at the next election when asked to confirm whether that would be—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —the Liberal Party's position at the next state election.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I know it's very embarrassing for you both. I know it's very embarrassing.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland is warned for the first time, and the deputy leader is warned for the second and final time. The member for Mitchell.

TRAIN AND TRAM DRIVERS DISPUTE

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (14:47): Given that the Under Treasurer has suggested that scoping had been done in the past on the sale of sections of the public transport system, can the minister confirm or deny whether he has been involved in any of those scopings or had any discussions, or does he, in fact, back what the Under Treasurer said?

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) (14:48): I've made it clear both in this chamber and publicly that we are not pursuing, progressing or in receipt of reports of it.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: If the member for Mitchell has some evidence that he could furnish to the house, then please do.

HEALTH BUDGET

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:48): My question is for the Minister for Health. Given that the budgeted funding for the Department for Health and Ageing in the 2015-16 financial year is less than the estimated expenditure for 2014-15, why did the government breach its commitment to continue to increase health funding year on year?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:49): The way health is funded, a large proportion of our funding is on an activity basis. The more presentations we have, the more we get funded, because we need to open up more beds and we need to staff those beds with doctors and nurses.

Last year was a very bad year. We had a lot of presentations with the worst flu season on record, and we had to significantly flex up the capacity of our hospitals and that meant we needed to employ more doctors and more nurses and open more hospital beds to deal with the enormous number of presentations we had.

Now Treasury and the budget make forecasts every year about what we expect, and we do not expect and we hope and pray that we do not get another bad flu season as we did last year. But what there can be no doubt of is that, if we do have as bad a year as last year, then we will receive the funding to enable us to staff our hospitals accordingly to open up the hospital beds we need. This is essentially a forecast based upon what we expect activity levels are going to be. We do not expect activity levels to be as high as last year because we don't expect that we would get two years in a row the worst flu seasons on record.

I should also point out that part of the reductions, particularly with regard to FTE numbers in the department, are because of either expiring and not being renewed or national partnership agreements with the commonwealth or, indeed, national partnership agreements which have just been defunded from 1 July. There are about 200 FTEs in the Department of Health whose

employment will cease because the commonwealth has ceased to provide funding for those positions.

As well as that, the chief executive has previously announced some significant reductions to head office staff so there will be some reductions of, from memory, 100 to 200 FTEs in head office that will go from the Department of Health.

HEALTH BUDGET

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): A further question to the Minister for Health. Can the minister guarantee that as at 30 June 2016, there will be no fewer nurse FTEs employed than as at 30 June 2015?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:51): All I can guarantee is that under the enterprise agreement we have with the Nurses Federation, we have to staff our hospital beds with a certain number of nurses, so for every hospital bed there is a certain number of nursing staff that we have to have. I do hope that we don't have activity levels at the same levels that we did last year because I do hope that we don't have as terrible a flu season this year as we had last year. If activity levels are down, we won't need as many beds, and we won't need as many staff in those beds, but as long as those beds are open we will make sure that they are staffed accordingly.

HEALTH BUDGET

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:52): Supplementary: given that the minister has stated that he is actually pursuing a reduction in bed numbers, will the government—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: He doesn't need help from you, Tom. Will the government be reducing the number of nurses, either altering the nurse to bed ratio or renegotiating that industrial agreement with the nurses' union?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:52): I've made no secret of the fact that we have the highest number of hospital beds for our population size anywhere in Australia, perhaps anywhere else in the world, and I would like to see us reduce the number of acute beds. We do need to increase the number of subacute beds.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Well, our ratio is 2.6 and the Australian average is about, I think from memory, 2.1. So we have significantly more hospital beds for our population size—acute hospital beds—than other states and, in fact, any other Australian state or, indeed, territory. I make no secret of the fact that I would like to see that brought down to closer to what the national average is.

Having said that, we have fewer subacute beds, we need more rehabilitation beds, we need beds that actually get people better and get them out of hospital, and we do need to change the bed mix. Of course, as we change those, we need to change the roles some nurses do. We won't need as many—I would anticipate, if we are able to achieve such a reduction—nurses working on wards, but what we do need and where I do want to use nursing staff much more is out in the community. We need more community nurses doing the work that keeps people out of hospital. We need more nurse practitioners taking on an expanded scope of practice and doing things like, and being involved in discharging of patients from hospital and all that other expanded scope of practice that we can have.

We also need more allied health staff. We need to recruit more positions such as physiotherapists, nutritionists, speech pathologists, because they are the health professionals who get people out of hospital and keep them out of hospital. So there is no secret. I have been quite clear about this throughout the whole Transforming Health process. We do need to change—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned a first time.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: We do need to change the mix in our workforce and I certainly want more nurses with higher qualifications and with an expanded scope of practice. I want more allied health as well and I would hope that in time we would be able to reduce our acute bed numbers down to closer to what the national average is than what it is at the present.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, the leader.

HEALTH BUDGET

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:54): Can the minister outline to the house what the total number of bed reductions will be—this is acute beds—if he achieves his goal to reduce our bed numbers down to the national average?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:54): I have not sat down and done it, but the current figure, from memory, is 2.6 per thousand population. The national average is 2.1, so I would like to see it. Of course, we will always probably need to have somewhat more acute beds than interstate because we have an older population, so I would not expect that we would get down to having the lowest number of any Australian state, but I would like to see it closer to the national average.

What I will always do is make sure that we have an adequate number of beds for the activity that we are getting. We will never reduce the beds and hope and expect the system to simply adapt, but I am confident, with the changes in Transforming Health, that as the system becomes more efficient, as we get better at discharging patients over the weekends so that we do not have these lengths of stay where the day of the week you present to the hospital can be a large determining factor in how long you stay in hospital, where we have rehabilitation better integrated into our big hospitals, we can get patients out of hospital far quicker. With all of these things I would certainly be confident that we would be able to get some reduction. I do not have a figure in mind, but I would like to see it a lot closer to the national average than it currently is.

HEALTH BUDGET

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:56): Supplementary: can the minister clarify to the house that he is talking about somewhere between 600 and 800 fewer acute beds in South Australia when Transforming Health is fully implemented?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:56): I do not have a figure in mind. I have simply stated facts, and the facts are that currently we have 2.6 per thousand. I would like to see that closer to the average. I am not nominating a particular target because it will depend upon any number of factors. What I—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Colton is—

The Hon. P. Caica: Frustrated.

The SPEAKER: You may be frustrated, but you are also called to order for the first time, and the member for Stuart is warned for the second and final time. The minister.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I am not going to nominate a number because I do not have a target as such, other than to say I would like to see it closer to the national average than it currently is. I have been saying this for the last nine months. There is nothing new. It is nice to—

Ms Chapman: Tell the truth, Jack.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is very close to departing.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —know that the Leader of the Opposition suddenly has an interest in health policy in this state, but there is nothing I have said today which I have not already

said before, and that is simply the fact that I would like to see the number of beds we have closer to the national average. There is no reason we cannot get ourselves down to something close to the national average. Having said that, I should also point out, as I have said previously, that we do clearly need more subacute beds. We have more acute beds, but we certainly need far more subacute beds. We need to change the bed mix that we have in South Australia, and I do not think there is any commentator in regard to health policy in this country who would deny that.

HEALTH BUDGET

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): Supplementary: when will the government be in a position—

The SPEAKER: That would be the fourth supplementary—

Mr MARSHALL: Very important issue, sir.

The SPEAKER: —on the same line.

Mr MARSHALL: There could be nothing more important I don't think.

The SPEAKER: Let's just make it a fresh question.

Mr MARSHALL: Okay. When will the government be in a position to tell the parliament how many fewer beds we will have in South Australia as part of the Transforming Health program?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:58): The bed numbers we have is a fluid number. We flex up the number of beds and we flex down the number of beds. It is not a static number that is set in concrete and never changes. Our hospitals increase the number of beds that they need and reduce the number of beds we need. The important thing is that what determines our bed numbers is not me. I do not make a decision, 'This is how many bed numbers we are going to have.' What—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader and the deputy leader—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It's those death rattles again.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader and the deputy leader, if they move their lips again in the next 25 minutes outside standing orders, will both depart under the dreaded sessional order. The Minister for Health.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: So, the simple fact is that bed numbers are determined by activity. If we get more people presenting at our emergency departments we open up enough beds to make sure we are able to deal with those presentations, and we recruit nursing staff accordingly, because we have to. The bed numbers are not a static thing; they are not set in stone, never, ever to change. Our bed numbers will always be determined by the amount of activity that we have and the number of presentations we get to our emergency departments, and they will continue to happen.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (15:00): My question is to the Attorney-General. Attorney, what was the outcome of last week's advertised public phone-in to ministers about criminal justice?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (15:00): I thank the honourable member for her question. This is actually a very important initiative. Members of the government have been engaging in a thing called GOVchat. On 23 June, we in the criminal justice area decided that we would participate in GOVchat. This is part of the Transforming Criminal Justice reform agenda—

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: Good name.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It's a good name. GOVchat gives the public direct access to various important people involved in the criminal justice sector. Can I just give some tiny taste of what this was like. It was an absolutely terrific evening. My ministerial colleague the Minister for Police and I were both there, ready at the phones. The Commissioner of Police, Deputy Commissioner of Police and Minister for Youth were there, and there was the Director of Public Prosecutions and several heads of government departments. It was a virtual panoply of senior government people in the criminal justice area.

Ms Chapman: How many rang?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It's funny—the member for Bragg wants to know how many rang. Actually, it was an overwhelming success, because even though my colleague the Minister for Transport did get more phone calls than we did—in fact, he got over 500 when the Minister for Transport did it—at least 300 were sent by the member for Bright, using some elaborate high-technology thing with his telephone. Luckily for us, the member for Bright was not interested in criminal justice on that particular evening.

So, with that very important caveat, we received 285 calls (none of which were organised by the member for Bright) which totalled some 35.5 hours of fantastic conversation. There were phones everywhere, as my ministerial colleagues would tell you. There were phones everywhere, and people answering the phones. The important thing is—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The important thing is each one of these calls, Mr Speaker, was the subject of careful noting and there will be action on all of these calls. I know my ministerial colleagues were taking notes, just as I was. We have certainly, in my office, got a whole bunch of jobs to do. We have got a number of things to take up. The interesting thing is the number of people who phone in and want to have a chat and are absolutely delighted to find that they have got somebody like my ministerial colleagues or the Director of Public Prosecutions, or somebody like that, where they can speak directly to those people about these important issues.

As I said, we count it as having been an excellent evening; all of us very much enjoyed being involved. As I said, initially I felt a little bit crestfallen that we had not achieved the great numbers achieved by minister Mullighan (the Minister for Transport) but as it turns out—

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier will not use a minister's surname.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I apologise. I was initially a bit upset that we had not been able to achieve the same high achievement as the Minister for Transport, but then I discovered the role of the member for Bright and I felt somewhat heartened.

The SPEAKER: Minister, GOVchat does sound a bit Orwellian to me.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I didn't pick the name, Mr Speaker; I just get with the program.

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright.

BATTERY STORAGE INITIATIVE

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (15:04): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Can the minister update the house on the battery storage developments in the state?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:04): Yes, I can. Start your computers. Last week, the government released an expression of interest for a \$1.1 million battery storage demonstration in government buildings. Following on from what has already been detailed in the media, I can inform the house that this exciting initiative will demonstrate how integrating battery storage with PV solar can deliver multiple benefits of greenhouse gas reduction.

Within the City of Adelaide, the government owns around 150 buildings, with a number of these having solar PV installed. Of these, the North Terrace arts precinct sites offer a good combination of public exposure for showcasing emerging technologies, and this precinct will support the government's goal to make Adelaide the world's first carbon-neutral city. The government is committed to renewable energy, and our production continues to rise with the total renewable energy levels sitting at 39.3 per cent of the state's total generation.

We are well positioned to be a strong, early market for battery storage systems as we have a high uptake of renewables in the state with over 172,000 rooftop solar systems currently connected to the grid. This expression of interest strengthens our commitment to renewable energy and is good news for battery storage technology. I am advised that interested parties can access expressions of interest documents at www.tenders.sa.gov.au.

I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the City of Adelaide's—the council, that is—great work in promoting renewable energy, including a \$5,000 offer to ratepayers who install battery storage devices. I look forward to this exciting battery storage demonstration and to providing the house with further updates in future.

ADELAIDE CABARET FESTIVAL

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:06): My question is to the Minister for the Arts. Minister, what were the outcomes of the 2015 Cabaret Festival?

Mr Marshall: Another Liberal initiative, sir.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:06): Yes, in a day when the Liberal Party had ideas, Mr Speaker, they indeed did come up with the Cabaret Festival. I pay credit to a former minister, I think it was arts minister Laidlaw of blessed memory, in a day when the Liberal Party in this state actually had something positive to say, something constructive to say, something we don't see out of them under the current Leader of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for the Arts will return to his text.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I shall. Our internationally renowned Adelaide Cabaret Festival is over for another year. We have been absolutely privileged to have had Barry Humphries grace us as the artistic director. He promised us brilliance and he delivered, with more than 350 artists in 152 performances. There were 50 international artists and around 192 local South Australian performers starring across 18 world premieres, six Australian premieres and six Adelaide exclusives.

Barry's program took us on a rollercoaster of genres from the incredible Teddy Tahu Rhodes and Greta Bradman taking to the stage in *Peter and Jack* to the risqué Clover Club featuring Adelaide's very own Miss Burlesque, Sapphire Snow. We were even honoured by the presence of the cultural attaché to the Court of St James, Sir Les Patterson, who so many decades later still manages to entertain and shock the audience, and the international gigastar herself, Dame Edna Everage.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: Did you say gigastar?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Gigastar. She is a gigastar—moved beyond megastar to gigastar. The Cabaret Festival is not only a wonderful event for our local community, it also has a national and international reputation. A concerted advertising campaign in the Eastern States, featuring Barry, saw an increase in tickets sold outside South Australia.

On behalf of the government, I would like to extend my utmost thanks to Barry Humphries and the entire Adelaide Cabaret Festival team for all of their work in making this year's festival such a roaring success. Too often, we hear the terms 'world's largest' or 'biggest' ring hollow but, for this event, there is no doubt of its excellence, and I congratulate Frank Ford and the former minister for the arts, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, who inspired this initiative.

As with many of our other festivals, our Cabaret Festival is now being copied interstate. They are nowhere near as good but they are trying. It's important that, while we bask in the brilliance that was 2015, we also look to how this wonderful institution can become bigger and better. To that end

I would like to put on my record a warm welcome and congratulations to new Festival co-directors Ali McGregor and Eddie Perfect. Following on from Barry Humphries is no easy task, but, having seen both these incredibly talented artists perform, I have no doubt that they will put on spectacular events as they direct the 2016 and 2017 festivals.

I would also like to place on my record my thanks to the team at the Adelaide Festival Centre, in particular John Glenn who hosts and produces this great festival every year. All South Australians should be proud of their festivals; they are an important part of our cultural identity and create a vibrant and artistic community all year round.

APY LANDS ROAD UPGRADE PROJECT

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:10): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Minister, what is the progress on the upgrade to the Pukatja airstrip access road?

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) (15:10): Can I thank the member for Giles for his question and, of course, his interest in this area. I know that the member has been a strong advocate for improved infrastructure in the APY lands for many years, and I have appreciated his strong support for the road upgrades in the APY lands.

I am pleased to advise the house that works have started to upgrade the Pukatja airstrip access road. This project is the first minor construction works contracted to the APY lands' Main Access Road Upgrade Project. As members would be aware, access to airstrips in the APY lands is crucial for the local community; in particular, there is a heavy reliance on air transport for goods and services, especially the Royal Flying Doctor Service.

The upgrade works mean that there will be all-weather access to the airstrip throughout the year. Construction is expected to commence in June, and it is expected to be complete by October this year, weather permitting. I am advised by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI) that traffic control measures will be in place to ensure the safety of road workers and the travelling public. Possible delays may occur during construction periods.

I am also pleased to advise the house that South Australian company Remote Contracting Specialists has been awarded the tender for this project. Importantly, the contractor submitted extensive plans for local Anangu employment for the upgrade of the road. In addition, other communities where roads to local airstrips and community access roads will be upgraded include Umuwa, Mimili and Indulkana.

Tender documentation is currently being prepared for the next stage of construction and sealing works between the Stuart Highway and the Indulkana community. Once completed this section will provide all-weather access to the Stuart Highway and to the Marla airstrip. Work in this area is due to commence in August 2015 and be completed by November of this year. Contracts for the crushing of road base material are also set to be called and awarded in the coming months in preparation for the first major construction works which is programmed for early next calendar year.

The government welcomes the partnership with the commonwealth for this important project for the APY lands. It is a \$106 million project with an 80/20 funding split between the two governments. The project is going to significantly improve road infrastructure and employment opportunities for people living and now working on the lands. And, importantly, the South Australian government, in consultation with the APY Executive Board has committed to ensuring that a minimum 30 per cent of the total contract labour hours will be undertaken by local Anangu.

I am advised by DPTI that these targets are currently being met, and it is also a condition of the contracts which will be enforced. I look forward to providing updates to the house as this project progresses.

DISABILITY HOUSING PROGRAM

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:13): My question is to the Minister for Social Housing. Given that the budget omits any mention of meeting any targets or new targets in relation to disability

housing, how is the government planning on addressing disability housing, especially given the likely increase in demand due to the NDIS coming into effect in 2018?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:13): I thank the honourable member for her question. We had in fact last year initiated a major program in disability housing. I think that it was around 102 houses, which the state government has initiated through its program, but more importantly—and this has been put on the federal agenda through the Disability Reform Council—we are awaiting the final version of a discussion paper by the federal government to get a national policy.

Accommodation is going to be a challenge across the country. Finding the right amount of accommodation and the right type of accommodation will be a challenge. That is why we, as a state, actually drafted some proposals some 12 to 18 months ago which had to be put aside when the commonwealth decided to back away from providing some seed funding for accommodation for people living with disability. The money was going to be used to find models of providing that accommodation, in particular how do we get money from the non-government sector into providing provision because there is going to be a shortage unless we do something about that?

The state government has done two things. One, we have actually built some accommodation to meet some immediate needs and very specialised housing for people's individual's needs. Secondly, we have been trying to work with the commonwealth to make sure that we meet those targets. I have to say, the not-for-profit sector and the state government are worried that we do not believe the commonwealth are taking this issue as seriously at this point in time as they think. There will be a lag time involved from the time the policy position is adopted from delivering—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: No, no. The commonwealth through—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Yes, the commonwealth through the NDIA made it very clear about some money available to the states to look into some innovative programs to provide it. In good faith, we have spent money in developing some programs. The commonwealth then withdrew that amount of money and had said that money is not going to be available, but rather it will be put into each individual plan, each individual person's plan. You just cannot bring that money together to make something up-front, so what I would say is that our colleagues opposite should support us and make sure the commonwealth actually develops this policy very quickly and makes it very clear what they are going to do to assist and work with the states to provide housing answers.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Not at all. No, the state has made it very clear. We have a role to play and that is why we went out and tried to do up some models based on some funding we were expecting. The commonwealth, as part of its federal cutbacks, decided to withdraw their money.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Well—

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop is warned.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: The member for MacKillop, it is a pity he doesn't know much about the NDIS—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned a second time.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: —because he wouldn't have made the interjection. This state has signed up to the NDIS scheme, and funding for the whole scheme comes from that pool of money. We have committed our portion of the funding. The commonwealth has not. In fact, the not-for-profit

sector are pushing the commonwealth to release some of the additional money which is collected through the levy on Medicare which the commonwealth has refused to do.

MOBILE BLACK SPOT PROGRAM

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:17): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. As the relevant state minister for the federal government's Mobile Black Spot program, can the minister explain to the house why the state government offered no financial contribution towards this program which has led to South Australia receiving only 11 out of the 499 new mobile phone base stations which were built across the nation?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:17): As the Minister for the Public Sector, I am indeed responsible for engaging with the commonwealth on telecommunications matters, and I say it that way because part of the way to understand this is that telecommunications has always been a federal responsibility in combination with the telecommunications companies. It has always been the case.

Some time in the last year the federal government came to us and asked us if we were interested in contributing to what has always been their responsibility and at a time when we were dealing with—take your pick—stopping giving money to pensioners for their rates concessions, the removal of years 5 and 6 from the Gonski agreement that we had been led to believe they had signed up to, what they walked away from in health, homelessness. So, what we were confronted with is yet another example of the commonwealth government saying that something that has always been their responsibility suddenly is not entirely theirs.

In that instance, we decided to see what would happen, and what has happened is that we have received the equivalent of 8 per cent of the \$100 million that the commonwealth had set aside. We have received about our proportion of the \$100 million that they set aside. We have had 11 mobile black spot towers—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the Treasurer.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: We have had 11 mobile towers put in to deal with black spots, six of them in the APY lands which is not a particularly commercial decision to make for the telecommunications company but extremely important for the APY. There are also two in the Riverland, two on the Yorke Peninsula and one in the Hills.

We have let that run, we have seen what has happened, we have seen the extent to which the commonwealth government views states that do not want to participate in taking over their responsibility from them. There is another round coming up and we will very carefully scrutinise the circumstances under which the other states received what they received, and make a very careful and considered decision about what our participation may or may not be next time.

MOBILE BLACK SPOT PROGRAM

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:20): A supplementary, sir: given the minister's answer, and the fact that New South Wales contributed \$24 million to the program, Victoria contributed \$21 million, Western Australia contributed \$82 million to this program and Queensland contributed \$10 million to the program, can the minister explain to the people of regional and remote South Australia why they should believe this government considers them a priority?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:20): People of regional South Australia should be very clear who is responsible for telecommunications, and it is the federal government. They can spread the responsibility and the blame around as much as they like, but everyone knows what the federal government has been up to. They have been retreating from areas that are traditionally their responsibility—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am concerned about the impact on regional South Australia of the decision the federal government has made, and I have therefore undertaken to diligently and carefully assess what occurred, why it occurred, and how it occurred in the other states. There is another factor, and that is the commercial proposition represented by mobile towers and therefore the contribution made by the telecommunications companies. So I need to carefully understand what part that played in the decisions that were made in the other states versus this state, and we will then make a considered decision, as a government, as round two becomes available.

MOBILE BLACK SPOT PROGRAM

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:21): When will the minister complete that assessment?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:22): In time for round 2.

ADELAIDE OVAL

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:22): My question is to the Minister for Recreation and Sport. Has the state government paid any money to secure a one-day international cricket match at the Adelaide Oval for the 2015-16 season?

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) (15:22): No; the state government has not paid a cent towards securing a game of cricket in an oval that we rebuilt with \$550 million of taxpayers' money.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I hear the member for Hartley saying 'shame' that the state government has not paid one cent to get a cricket match—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: We spent \$550 million of taxpayers' money. We made that investment on the back of getting 22 AFL games at the Adelaide Oval each year, we made that investment on the back of having a test match at the Adelaide Oval each year, we made that investment on the back of having a Twenty20 game on Australia Day each year. That was the reason we spent \$550 million on the oval, because of the matches we already had there.

We will go out and we will pay for new content, we will pay for games like Liverpool, and we will pay for World Cup games. I noticed today that some independent advice showed that \$50 million was injected into the South Australian economy by 38,000 international visitors who came here for the World Cup in February and March. If you think it is a good idea for me to hand over \$1 million of state government money to get something—

The SPEAKER: No, minister; the opposition thinks it is a good idea.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Sorry, sir. If the opposition thinks it is a good idea for me to hand over more than \$1 million of taxpayers' money to pay for something we already have, they have rocks in their head. That is one of the worst ideas I have ever heard. We have stood up to Cricket Australia and we will be getting the first ever day-night test match at the Adelaide Oval starting on Friday 27 November. I am pretty confident, in our discussions, that we will also get cricket back on Australia Day.

An honourable member: What about the Rolling Stones?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: An interjection that we paid for the Rolling Stones. Of course we did; we got 10,000 people coming here from interstate and overseas. That is what we do, we pay for new events that will attract people from interstate and overseas. Unlike the opposition, we refuse to get caught up in a bidding war with other states. We were the only state to get the Rolling Stones Hyde Park stage out here. We also had a deal that for two weeks no-one would know that the Rolling Stones were going to play anywhere else in Australia. We had this exclusive deal. People going

online trying to buy tickets did not know they were going to play in Perth, Sydney and Melbourne; they only knew about the Adelaide concert. We managed to sell 50,000 tickets, including 10,000—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Of course we have used taxpayers' money to get the Rolling Stones staged at Adelaide Oval. It was a huge winner; 10,000 people coming in. I cannot wait until 20 July to see Liverpool out at the Adelaide Oval. It is possibly the best cricket ground in the world. It is certainly the best stadium anywhere in Australia, but we will not be paying for games that we already have.

Grievance Debate

WORKREADY

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:25): On most occasions grievance speeches are about good things that happen in electorates. Sadly, I have to confirm that this one is not. It is about a poor policy that the government is instigating which will have a very serious impact upon regional and metropolitan areas, and it is WorkReady, the government's training program.

We have all heard many questions in here about the fact that training numbers have reduced, and that is a decision that the government has made, even though it is at a time of high unemployment, when we are desperate for training opportunities to exist. To the opposition, the amazing part is that of the 51,000 places available, 46,000 are quarantined for TAFE facilities. It is a frustration that we have that hundreds of existing private RTOs across South Australia that do good work have had the opportunity to be competitive (by way of providing training places) taken away from them.

I can confirm that I have met with a private RTO in my electorate, Regional Skills Training. It has been quite outspoken in the media about this matter. I went there last week specifically to talk to staff, to talk to the people who run it, but also to gauge how they feel about their own future, and they do not think they actually have one. This organisation has existed since 2003 and it has hundreds of students across South Australia. It has been focused on ensuring that good outcomes come from it and, as a result of that, the skills that are needed in so many different areas, but it is just so frustrated. That is symptomatic of many of the RTOs out there that want the government to recognise the fallacy of their policy, change it and give the people of South Australia the training chances they need.

I will declare an interest. I have a daughter who works for a private RTO who will be impacted by this. However, I look beyond that and consider what is really a flawed policy. For example, this is an issue that impacts on regional areas, but has a regional impact assessment statement been undertaken? No. There is no evidence of that. Questions have been posed to the minister and the Premier about it. They talk about a modified form of a regional impact assessment statement, but there is nothing on the register, there is nothing that has been available to the public, but it will have an impact.

RTOs advise me that they are able to provide a course at about 40 per cent of the cost of TAFE SA. I am a supporter of TAFE. As a previous shadow minister for employment, training and further education, I recognise the work that they can do, but when it comes down to the simple sums, when there is a challenged budget, if you want to get training outcomes, you have to ensure that you provide an opportunity for private enterprise. Government policy that quarantines 90 per cent of training places being available to the government system within TAFE, taking it away from RTOs, I think is disgraceful and the government has to review it.

I do not know of any group that has actually come out in support of this. The media was consumed by it for about a three or four-week period. Every group that came on the radio expressed concerns about the lack of vision that the government was demonstrating, the fact that it would not achieve outcomes and the fact that it would take away opportunities from South Australians. The Premier and particularly minister Gago have held very firm on it, and I say shame on them, because they are not recognising the fact that people want changes to occur. They want to go back to a system such as the one where the member for Colton, as the previous minister in this place, was in charge of a training and skills report that highlighted the fact that you needed to open it up to

contestability. It was opened up and it was getting outcomes. It has now been taken away through a change in government policy.

Through a question from the opposition, we are aware that 300 places were available in the farm management business program; now there are only 20 across South Australia, and they are only available at Mount Gambier TAFE. The South-East is an important area, but agriculture—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: —as the member for Schubert highlights, is one of the strongest and most steadfast economic areas that has grown our population and our economy, but its future is being impacted because the state government does not support it.

I come from an area that is agricultural and is proud of that. It wants to make that leap from what are seen as traditional management principles to the next generation, to challenge itself to get improved productivity and strong outcomes and to ensure that South Australia grows as it grows, but it needs skilled people. They are not all sons and daughters of farmers. A lot of them are people who are not involved in farming, but they want their future to be there. They have had training opportunities in the past, but they have been taken away.

I cannot support what the government has done. I do not find any other group that supports what the government has done, and I, together with the opposition and so many people across South Australia, call upon the government to recognise the mistake it has made, to review its policy, and to ensure that RTOs have a future. If they do not, their future will be taken away from them probably by about Christmas, and from that will come not just job losses in regional areas but opportunities for training will be lost also. Without the training, in times of high unemployment, you take away the future of our communities too.

SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY GAMES

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:30): I rise to speak today about the Southern University Games which will be launched this Sunday and will continue throughout next week across our beautiful South Australian metropolitan area until they close on the evening of 9 July. We can all be very proud that South Australia will host these games for the first time since 2003 and showcase how much our city and metropolitan area have positively changed over the past 12 years and how much we have to offer.

I am deeply honoured to be the patron of this year's games which will be cohosted by the University of South Australia and my university, the fabulous Flinders University of South Australia, located primarily in our beautiful southern suburbs. During my time there, I was a very proud and enthusiastic participant (and I stress the word 'participant' rather than 'competitor') in university sport—touch football, in particular.

Whilst my success on the ground may have been low and continues to be low in basketball and my other current sporting pursuits, I have many happy memories of competing—or rather, participating—with friends, including the member for Newland who led our university touch football team with skill, confidence, humour and vigour, and of course, making new friends through sport, particularly university sport.

Sport is a great way to bring a community together and to ensure people feel included, equal and valued. This was my experience as a child in the many sports in which I participated and it continues to be so. The Southern University Games bring our university and broader communities together in a way that promotes physical activity and health and creates a great sense of camaraderie and healthy competition. It gives our elite athletes a chance to compete in an environment where the competition is both fierce and friendly.

I am very proud to be the Southern University Games patron and look forward to welcoming student athletes to Adelaide and promoting this outstanding event. Over 1,500 athletes and more than 500 officials, spectators and supporters will join us in our beautiful state for the games, bringing an estimated economic impact of \$1 million. These athletes will participate in a huge range of diverse sports including cheerleading, lawn and tenpin bowls, men's and women's Australian rules football, touch football, netball, basketball, futsal, ultimate frisbee and golf.

I am very much looking forward to welcoming athletes and helping to open the games from 6pm this Sunday at the Jeffrey Smart Building in the University of South Australia, and I am also looking forward to getting out and cheering for as many of these athletes as possible. The games are an excellent event for South Australia with so many people visiting and enjoying our very special state, our exemplary tourist destinations and our excellent sporting venues.

I am pleased that the games will utilise some of the best sporting venues South Australia has to offer, including ETSA Park, Flinders University, Immanuel College, Marion Fitness and Leisure, MARS Sporting Complex and Wayville Sports Centre. Our South Australian community can look forward to hosting these student athletes and supporters and to cheering on competitors.

I congratulate everyone involved in bringing this wonderful event to South Australia. Like all events of this scale, an enormous amount of work has been undertaken by various bodies, Australian University Games and Southern University Games administrators, administrators at local sporting venues, our South Australian Tourism Commission and an army of generous and dedicated volunteers. I thank and recognise each and every one of them for their work.

Since its inception, the Southern University Games have been renowned for providing both a friendly and competitive environment for student athletes from all over Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania. As well as the on-field competition, the event will also offer an action-packed social atmosphere featuring an exclusive four-night social program. Many a great friendship has been formed through university sport and I am sure that this event will bring many people together in a positive way.

I asked some of my younger university student friends about their participation in the games and it seems that even for those who do not compete in the sporting side of the games that they will voraciously support and participate in the social aspect. I am sure this will be the case for all involved and I look forward to helping close the event at the final social event being held in our city on 9 July. I hope all my parliamentary colleagues will get along to as much of the games as they can to cheer for our home side—I know I certainly will be. To every competitor, good luck in the games, and to every visitor, in advance, welcome to South Australia.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Schubert, we were only talking about you this morning.

WARREN RESERVOIR

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:35): Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I am sorry for whatever I did wrong. I apologise unreservedly in advance and arrears!

I rise today to continue the legacy that is the opening up of the Warren reservoir. It is one of the legacy issues that having the honorary title of member for Schubert I carry on, and I thought I would give a bit of a history lesson today to bring people up to speed on this topic.

The Warren reservoir is one of three reservoirs at the southern end of my electorate. The other two are the Barossa reservoir famous for its whispering wall, and the South Para, which at 4½ gigitalitres is the second-largest reservoir in the state behind Mount Bold. The Warren reservoir was built on the South Para between 1914 and 1916. Edgar Bradley was the construction supervisor and resident engineer overseeing the construction of the Millbrook reservoir.

So he could travel between the two construction sites, Mr Bradley was given a Model T Ford for \$444. He had to learn to drive so that he could make the 30-kilometre journey from the Warren to the Millbrook in just one hour. Before he had his car, the trip by horse and buggy took a full 2½ hours to cover. The Warren holds 4.8 gigitalitres covering 105 hectares and, according to the SA Water website, if the Warren supplied the whole state, it would last about eight days.

Currently anglers with permits can access designated areas between 8am and 5pm daily. The Warren also provides contingency supply to the South Para. But the Warren reservoir is important to my electorate for another reason because it is the catchment reservoir that holds the water that supplies Barossa Infrastructure Limited, which supplies roughly 50 per cent of the water to my electorate, to the beautiful Barossa Valley.

That water comes down via third-party access from the SA Water pipe network from the Murray where BIL buys Murray River water licences, stores that water in the Warren reservoir and then uses it in peak and off-peak times to augment the underwater and groundwater supplies in the Barossa to help grow what is arguably (or inarguably) some of the best grapes grown in the world.

It is an extremely important reservoir when it comes to the financial and infrastructure hub of the Barossa. It helps to genuinely supply life to the Barossa but it is also important for another reason, and it could be opened up for greater tourism opportunities through the provision of greater access for fishing—which it currently has at the moment and we are looking to extend that—but also in terms of providing more opportunities for families for nonpowered recreational boats and nonmotorised sports in the Barossa.

Last week, minister Hunter—and obviously my invite to his press conference announcement was lost in the mail—came up to the beautiful Warren and announced \$20,000 to create a master plan and early works program for the Warren reservoir. That sounds really good, the announcement was great, the photo was there, front page of the *Herald* and that is all wonderful, except the more I look into this issue and the more I listen to the previous member for Schubert, the more I realise that this is a project that should have been done a long, long time ago.

The bigger picture here is about opening up the reservoir for kayaking and for other passive water sports, and, as a former rower with my school, I would like to see the Barossa schoolboy and schoolgirl rowing regatta held on the Warren reservoir. If I were to go back over the history, Ivan tells me that this process started in 2004 and it took him in earnest, basically from that time to 2011, to get the minister for environment over the line. Just when he got the member for Colton, who was the minister for the environment and water at that time, over the line, and he said, 'Yes, we should do it', it was only a few months after that that the minister got dumped, then minister Hunter came in. So poor Ivan had to start all over again in order to get minister Hunter to realise that this is a great opportunity, and he did. To Ivan's credit and to the minister's credit, he did, and that was in 2011.

A committee was established to look at the process of taking this further, and that committee was disbanded the moment that I got there. After the election I rocked up to the first meeting, minister Hunter walked in and said, 'Our work here is done. Thanks very much. Let's wrap it up, pack it up and go home.' Since then, not much has happened. This process has taken so long that careers in local government have ended before this program was put in place. The long-term Barossa Council CEO David Morcom is no longer there, and Bim Lange, who was the head of engineering works, has retired but is lucky enough to try to see this project finished because he is now on the Barossa Council.

Can I say to the minister and to the government that we welcome the \$20,000, but we cannot delay this project any further. The minister, in his press conference, failed to give a time line on finishing this project. I would like to say that I am a young man and I expect to see this project delivered long before I retire from this house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Unfortunately your time has expired today. I am wondering if you were in a four or an eight, or you were actually the cox. Don't answer that. The member for Kaurna.

KAURNA ELECTORATE SERVICE CLUBS

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:40): I rise today to acknowledge some of the very important service organisations in the Kaurna electorate. We are very lucky to have some very important organisations. I take my hat off to all those volunteers who put in so many hours and contribute so much of their own time and money into investing in important community causes. As many members will know, this is the traditional time for handover dinners and lunches between those organisations, so I have been to some of them recently.

Last week, together with the member for Reynell, I was at the Rotary Club of Noarlunga's handover dinner. They meet in my electorate in Christies Beach, in the Rotary hall there. It was a good opportunity to congratulate outgoing president Dini Whyte on a fantastic year that that club has had, and also to welcome president Alan Nelson, who is back for another go as the president of that club. Some of the achievements that club has had this year are quite amazing. Once again, they held a very popular breakfast for Australia Day at Ramsay Place, Noarlunga Centre. They have

sponsored students, particularly from Christies Beach High School, to attend things such as the Health of the River Forum and the Rotary youth programs enrichment trips, as well as trips for special needs students at Christies Beach High School.

They have also sponsored a number of overseas engagements, such as sponsoring four Indonesian students' education and donating to the School of St Jude in Tanzania. I was happy to go to a couple of events with the member for Reynell. We attended the quiz night that they had for Halloween, which raised funds for Christmas hampers that were distributed by Junction Australia to those families doing it tough. They also had a musical matinee event earlier this year, which raised funds for a great new charity called Essentials 4 Women that helps people fleeing domestic violence and other homeless women with some of the essential feminine hygiene products that they need. I was happy to support them. In particular, Amanda Rishworth, the federal MP, put a huge amount of effort into supporting that program. I congratulate Amy Rust and Kelly Peacock, who ran that program very well. For the Rotary Club, next year the president Alan Nelson is going to have a big job in terms of planning the 50th anniversary of that club, which is going to be a fantastic event in September next year.

I was also very happy to attend the Willunga and Districts Lions Club handover lunch, which was held at Aldinga Beach. Despite being the Willunga club, their hall is in Aldinga and a significant number of the members are from Aldinga, including the ongoing president, who handed over to himself, Tony Bezuidenhout. He continues in that role and has been doing a fantastic job. They have been sponsoring a large number of local organisations, including the CFS, Girl Guides, McLaren Vale hospital and the Willunga District Community Bus. They have also hosted the Lions Youth of the Year Awards, which have helped local students to improve their public speaking.

The club has two very significant fundraisers. The women's auxiliary are the biggest fundraiser for the club, amassing an amazing \$150,000 a year through opening their op shop two days a week. It is a fantastic op shop and they do a really successful job. The other fundraisers, mostly from the blokes, are not quite as successful but they still do a great job. They do giant trash and treasure markets, swap meets and auctions, which are held at the Lions' property at Willunga.

A big thank you must go to Bunnings, who have donated to Lions some very large sheds for their property. That came from the new Bunnings that is being installed at Seaford on the old Wood 'N' Logs site. Those sheds are worth some \$100,000 dollars to the club, and will help their fundraising in the long term.

The last club I would like to mention is the Provisional Rotary Club of Seaford. This is just starting up now and is gaining momentum in the community. There has been a significant gap, with Seaford not having any service clubs in the area, particularly as it has grown very quickly over the past 20 years and is still set to grow significantly over the next decade.

I congratulate Mark Huddleston from the Rotary District, and also the provisional president Cecile Caldwell, for their tremendous efforts in helping the club to get off the ground. They have already been heavily involved in participating in Seaford family fun days and sitting on the Seaford network of community organisations. They are actively recruiting for new members and getting good interest. They are also very keen to work with Seaford Secondary College and other local schools to make sure that those students have access to the wide range of Rotary youth programs. I congratulate those three clubs and look forward to working with them all into the future.

HARTLEY ELECTORATE SERVICE CLUBS

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:46): At the weekend I not only attended one changeover function, but two. The first of those was for the Rotary Club of Magill Sunrise (a breakfast club), and the second was for the Rotary Club of Campbelltown. I wish to bring a couple of things to the house's attention today with regard to those wonderful clubs.

The Rotary Club of Magill Sunrise met at Sorelle Restaurant at the top of Magill Road for their annual changeover function. I congratulate president-elect Mina Ward, and wish her all the very best for this year. She is a hardworking, energetic and dynamic young leader in our community, and I know that she will do a wonderful job this year. I note that the Paul Harris Fellow medal was given to Mr Ian Carman, and I congratulate Mr Carman on his efforts, not only this year but also during the

array of years that he has spent at that club doing great things for the community. I would also like to congratulate Mr Lindsay Davis, who was given a second Sapphire badge as well.

Many attendees were there on the morning, including Ronda Grigg, who is a friend of the Magill group; Carol McKenzie; Jeff Neale, who is a new honorary member; Colin Hill, who is past president; Siony Gardiner—happy birthday to her for the weekend, and she is also Rotarian of the Year for 2014-15 for this group. Then there was Ian Coat, Julie Carman, Shirlie Roberts, Graham, Colin Hill, Pauline Hill, Greg (who is the membership director), and Sergeant Mark Thomson. Mark Thomson is very, very funny man; he was that funny that people paid to make him sit down. It was quite entertaining, but you had to be there. Plus, there was Kirsty, Chris Gascigne, Bron, Councillor John Kennedy, and many partners and their families as well.

Magill Sunrise had a great year, and some of the past highlights this year have been these activities: there have been educational programs, educating those, especially younger than us, in our community; there have been many youth programs; and they have had various guest speakers. They are a breakfast club too, so if you want to get to this club before work, make sure that you are out by 9 o'clock. It is a fantastic club to join. They have also had programs in respect of youth wellbeing, and they have had a youth wellbeing activity for many years now. Plus, their attendance rate is over 75 per cent, which is quite commendable.

They have had youth awards. Further, they have also supported many of the local schools, especially Norwood Morialta High School and Mary MacKillop. I also brought the house's attention to the Reel Event, with regard to short films, which they have held recently as well, raising money for charities including Can:Do 4Kids. This year, they have also set up a great website. They have sponsored the Hectorville Sports and Social Club, they had an appeal going for the Nepalese, and they also assisted in funding for Headspace. They have had over 900 meetings now, and they put out weekly bulletins. I wish that club well.

Secondly, I also wanted to touch on the Rotary Club of Campbelltown, which also had their changeover function on the weekend at the Fogular Furlan Function Centre. I congratulate Mr Damian Leach, president for this year, as well as the vice president Milton Lewis, secretary Lynton Nicholas, treasurer David Fenton, president-elect Mary Vincent, and the immediate past president Frank Orlando. I thank Frank for his service and the service of his family as well over the past year and wish the incoming board and president all the very best.

I also wish well the directors for this coming year: community service, Bryan Schell; fellowship, Elizabeth Gagliardi; fundraising, Netty Heinrich; international service in the Rotary Foundation, Stephanie Martin; membership, John Schubert; vocational service, Vince Belperio; and youth service, Brad Silby. Club service is obviously a very important thing, and there are many people who serve the club well in that regard, including Mary Vincent, Dean Crook, David Munro, Reg Bennett, Bruce Davis, Ralph Holmes, Enzo Piperone, Margaret Northcote, Jeff Neale, David Fenton, Jeff Blanco, Michael McCabe, Babu Kanagasabai and Vince Belperio.

There is also the special projects group. They do a great job throughout the year, particularly in regard to three projects. They have an art show every year. My office is full of art from the Campbelltown art show. There is also Carnevale, obviously, as well as the shed convene. I congratulate and wish well Elizabeth Gagliardi, Vince Belperio and Brian Stevens in their involvement. I also thank those from the district who were good enough to join. They are two fantastic groups in my community. I thank the board for last year's involvement and wish the current board all the very best this year.

KOSHNITSKY, MS EVELYN

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:51): I have the honour of opening an upcoming festival acknowledging the late Evelyn Koshnitsky BEM, AM, and her contribution to encouraging young people to play chess. Many of the details of the festival are under wraps, so I am unable to say very much except that the festival will start on 11 July and I am very honoured to be part of that festival.

The invitation came, however, through a friend of mine, George Howard—the president of South Australian Chess Association Incorporated—who, I must say, has done amazing work to encourage people, particularly young people, both on an Australian and international level, to play

chess over many decades. I have had the opportunity, again through Mr Howard, to work with Garry and Evelyn Koshnitsky when I was the chair—it seems like a long time ago—of the state youth advisory committee, advising minister Rann at the time, and then as a shadow youth minister and youth minister.

George Howard also reminds me that Evelyn Koshnitsky is noted as one of the 100 most important women of South Australia, and this is indicated in the Flinders University Walk of Honour. Another chess activist is Alan Goldsmith, who is also known for his work in the Henley Beach and West Beach Community Environment Group, but I think he is probably well known for being the *Sunday Mail* chess association writer. I quote from part of an account he has given with regard to Evelyn Koshnitsky.

He says that Evelyn met the other love of her life Garry in Sydney in the 1940s. Garry was an Australian chess champion and it was a match made for the chess board. Together, they went about creating an Australian chess set. Garry teamed up with another chess fanatic, Cecil Purdy, to write the very successful *Chess Made Easy*. I must say that, although they think it is easy, I am not one of those people who can easily work out chess moves, but it has been a reference for many people.

In the meantime, Evelyn established the New South Wales junior league and, later, the fledgling South Australian Junior Chess League, and that is when chess in South Australia really began to bloom. Evelyn, Alan says, helped promote chess everywhere, both in the junior and senior ranks and, in particular, school chess and the junior, state and national chess championships. Other members in this house have probably been to different chess tournaments that have been held over time in their electorates. Evelyn and Garry were quite often at the back of these things happening.

She also did everything she could to encourage girls' and women's chess. She was always practical and, for many years, the school matches in Adelaide were run in the Buttery section of John Martin's—a big department store. The noise, heat and fun associated with chess played there left an indelible mark on thousands of students who took part over the years.

It is very interesting when you talk to people about chess how they actually remember these tournaments and the effect that it has had on them and their interest in chess over the years. Again, as Alan says, it is impossible to do justice to all of Evelyn's work and achievements. She was churning out bulletins and letters in a time without computers and word processors or the internet; and when technology arrived she embraced it willingly. She was very instrumental in running the fabulous Karlis Lidums International and the subsequent Adsteam-Lidums tournaments. She made lifelong friends with people all over the world, and this will be an interesting announcement for those connections for the 11 July festival.

For many years she organised interstate chess matches for teams of women and girls using runners and phones to transmit the moves, and then when the internet arrived she started using that. Again, as Alan says:

Evelyn had a great love of life and people. She hated injustice and racism. She loved music, especially opera, and read widely. Evelyn was a wonderful model for us all and I know that we will miss her.

Bills

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

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

CRIMINAL LAW (EXTENDED SUPERVISION ORDERS) BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Long title, page 1—After 'orders' insert 'and continuing detention orders'

No. 2. Long title, page 1—Delete 'a related amendment to' and substitute:

related amendments to the *Bail Act 1985* and'

No. 3. Clause 1, page 2, line 4—Delete '*Extended Supervision Orders*' and substitute '*High Risk Offenders*'

No. 4. Clause 4, page 3, after line 9—Insert '*continuing detention order*—see section 14D(2);'

No. 5. Clause 4, page 3, lines 12 and 13 [clause 4, definition of *extended supervision order*]—

Delete 'in respect of a high risk offender by the Supreme Court' and substitute:

by the Supreme Court for the supervision of a high risk offender

No. 6. New Part, page 9, after line 33—Insert:

Part 2A—Continuing detention orders

14A—Arrest and detention of person subject to supervision order on warrant

- (1) If the presiding member or deputy presiding member of the Parole Board suspects on reasonable grounds that a person subject to a supervision order may have breached a condition of the order, the presiding member or deputy presiding member may—
 - (a) summon the person to attend before the Board; or
 - (b) for the purpose of bringing the person before the Board, issue a warrant for the arrest of the person.
- (2) If a member of the Parole Board (other than the presiding member or deputy presiding member) suspects on reasonable grounds that a person subject to a supervision order may have breached a condition of the order—
 - (a) the member may summon the person to attend before the Board; or
 - (b) for the purpose of bringing the person before the Board, the member may apply to—
 - (i) the presiding member or deputy presiding member of the Board for the issue of a warrant for the arrest of the person; or
 - (ii) a magistrate for the issue of a warrant for the arrest of the person.
- (3) If a police officer suspects on reasonable grounds that a person subject to a supervision order may have breached a condition of the order, the police officer may apply to—
 - (a) the presiding member or deputy presiding member of the Parole Board; or
 - (b) if, after making reasonable efforts to contact the presiding member and deputy presiding member, neither is available—a magistrate,for the issue of a warrant for the arrest of the person.
- (4) If a person fails to comply with a summons to attend before the Parole Board issued under this section—
 - (a) the Board may proceed to deal with the matter in the person's absence; or
 - (b) for the purpose of bringing the person before the Board, the presiding member or deputy presiding member may issue a warrant for the arrest of the person.
- (5) A warrant issued under this section authorises the detention of the person in custody pending appearance before the Parole Board.
- (6) A magistrate must, on application under this section, issue a warrant for the arrest of a person unless it is apparent, on the face of the application, that no reasonable grounds exist for the issue of the warrant.
- (7) If a warrant is issued by a magistrate on an application by a police officer under this section—
 - (a) the police officer must, within 2 working days of the warrant being issued, provide the Parole Board with a written report on the matter; and
 - (b) the warrant will expire at the end of the period of 2 working days after the day on which the report is provided to the Board; and
 - (c) the presiding member or deputy presiding member of the Board must consider the report within 2 working days after receipt and—

- (i) issue a fresh warrant for the continued detention of the person pending appearance before the Board; or
 - (ii) cancel the warrant, order that the person be released from custody and, if appearance before the Board is required, issue a summons for the person to appear before the Board.
- (8) If a warrant expires under subsection (7)(b) or a fresh warrant is not issued under subsection (7)(c)(i), the person must be released from custody.
- (9) The Parole Board may, if it thinks there is good reason to do so, by order, cancel a warrant issued under this section that has not been executed.

14B—Arrest and detention of person subject to supervision order without warrant

- (1) A police officer may, on the authorisation of a senior police officer, without warrant, arrest a person subject to a supervision order if the police officer suspects on reasonable grounds that the person has breached a condition of the order.
- (2) If a person is arrested under subsection (1)—
 - (a) the person must be taken to the nearest police station; and
 - (b) within 12 hours of the arrest—the presiding member or deputy presiding member of the Parole Board (or, if neither of those members is available, a magistrate) must be notified of the arrest; and
 - (c) as soon as is reasonably practicable after being so notified—the presiding member or deputy presiding member (or the magistrate) (as the case requires) must, by order, direct that the person—
 - (i) be detained in custody pending attendance before the Board; or
 - (ii) be released and summoned to attend before the Board; or
 - (iii) be released from custody.
- (3) In this section—

senior police officer means a police officer of or above the rank of Inspector.

14C—Proceedings before Parole Board under this Part

- (1) The following provisions apply in relation to proceedings relating to an alleged breach of a supervision order before the Parole Board under this Part:
 - (a) the person subject to the order and the Attorney-General must be afforded a reasonable opportunity to make submissions to the Board on the matter;
 - (b) if the Board is satisfied that the person has breached a condition of the order, the Board may vary or revoke a condition of the order imposed by the Board under this Act or impose further conditions on the order and, if the person is in custody—
 - (i) direct that the person be released from custody; or
 - (ii) direct that the person be detained in custody pending attendance before the Supreme Court for determination as to whether a continuing detention order should be made in respect of the person.
- (2) The Parole Board must, on imposing a condition or further condition on, or on varying or revoking a condition of, the order—
 - (a) provide the person the subject of the order with a copy of the order as varied by the Board; and
 - (b) take all reasonable steps to explain to the person the subject of the order the terms and conditions of the order and, in particular—
 - (i) the person's obligations under the order; and
 - (ii) the consequences that may follow from a failure to comply with the order; and
 - (c) forward a copy of the order as varied by the Board under this section to the Supreme Court and the Commissioner of Police.

- (3) Subject to any order made by the Supreme Court, an order directing that a person be detained in custody under this section authorises the detention of the person in custody pending determination of the Supreme Court proceedings relating to the continuing detention order.

14D—Continuing detention orders

- (1) If the Parole Board directs that a person subject to a supervision order be detained in custody pending attendance before the Supreme Court for determination as to whether a continuing detention order should be made in respect of the person, the matter is referred to the Court by force of this subsection.
- (2) The Supreme Court may, if satisfied that the person—
- (a) has breached a condition of the supervision order; and
 - (b) poses an appreciable risk to the safety of the community if not detained in custody,
- order that the person be detained in custody (a *continuing detention order*) until the expiration of the supervision order, or for such lesser period as may be specified by the Court.
- (3) The paramount consideration of the Supreme Court in determining whether to make a continuing detention order must be the safety of the community.
- (4) The Supreme Court may, if the Court thinks fit, order that a person the subject of proceedings under this section be detained in custody pending the determination of the proceedings.
- (5) The Attorney-General and the person the subject of proceedings under this section are parties to the proceedings, and the Parole Board has a right to appear and be heard in the proceedings.
- (6) As soon as is reasonably practicable after making a continuing detention order or an order under subsection (4) in respect of a person subject to a supervision order, the Supreme Court must issue a warrant committing the person to a correctional institution for the period specified in the order.
- (7) To avoid doubt—
- (a) if a person is detained in custody under this section until the expiration of his or her supervision order, the supervision order expires on the person's release from custody (but nothing in this paragraph prevents the Supreme Court, on application by the Attorney-General, from making a second or subsequent supervision order against the person); and
 - (b) if a person is detained in custody under this section for a lesser period, the person continues to be subject to the supervision order on release from custody for the balance of the duration of the order (and the date of expiry of supervision order under section 12 is not affected by the fact that the obligations of the person under the order were suspended during the period that the person was in custody).

14E—Variation and revocation of continuing detention order

- (1) The Supreme Court may, on application made by the Attorney-General, the Parole Board or a person subject to a continuing detention order, vary or revoke the order.
- (2) A person subject to a continuing detention order may only apply under subsection (1) with the permission of the Court.
- (3) The Court may only grant permission under subsection (2) if satisfied that—
- (a) there has been a material change in circumstances relating to the person; and
 - (b) it is in the interests of justice to grant permission.

No. 7. Clause 15, page 9, lines 36 and 37 [clause 15(1)]—Delete 'obtaining assistance in determining an application' and substitute 'proceedings'

No. 8. Clauses 17 and 18, page 10, line 12 to page 11, line 23 (inclusive)—Delete clauses 17 and 18

No. 9. Clause 19, page 11, lines 25 to 27 [clause 19(1)]—Delete 'on an application by the Attorney-General for an extended supervision order under section 7' and substitute:

to make an extended supervision order or a continuing detention order

No. 10. Schedule 1, page 12, lines 7 and 8—Heading to Schedule 1—delete the heading to Schedule 1 and substitute 'Schedule 1—Related amendments'

No. 11. Schedule 1, page 12, after line 8—After the heading to Schedule 1 insert:

Part 1—Preliminary

A1—Amendment provisions

In this Schedule, a provision under a heading referring to the amendment of a specified Act amends the Act so specified.

Part 2—Amendment of *Bail Act 1985*

A2—Amendment of section 4—Eligibility for bail

Section 4—after subsection (2) insert:

(3) Where a person is being detained under Part 2A of the *Criminal Law (High Risk Offenders) Act 2015*, the person is not eligible for release on bail.

Part 3—Amendment of *Correctional Services Act 1982*

No. 12. Schedule 1, page 12, line 14 [Schedule 1, clause 1]—Delete '*Extended Supervision Orders*' and substitute '*High Risk Offenders*'

No. 13. Schedule 1, page 12, line 17 [Schedule 1, clause 1]—Delete '*Extended Supervision Orders*' and substitute '*High Risk Offenders*'

APPROPRIATION BILL 2015

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:57): Innovation works provide support to firms in their earliest stages of development. Support for new business, investment in business. Following the lead of Pittsburgh could have significant benefits for all South Australians but the government must take the lead—it must engage with the private sector and it must develop a long-term blueprint for job growth and job creation.

The Labor government unfortunately does not have a plan. There is no plan for job creation and no plan for major new infrastructure projects. The Treasurer has put a freeze on government infrastructure spending, a freeze that will hurt the construction sector and do little to encourage investment in South Australia. This budget does not include a major new infrastructure project despite the massive cash injection from the Motor Accident Commission sale.

None of the major infrastructure projects that were listed as short-term priorities in the 2013 Transport Plan have been funded in this year's state budget. In fact, capital investment has declined, with the Treasurer announcing a capital investment budget of \$1.3 billion per annum for 2015-16 when the past five-year average has been \$1.9 billion per year.

Road infrastructure, public transport and a dedicated transport masterplan for the Mitcham Hills have long been on the agenda for local residents. Even the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure has designed a road management plan, but the Treasurer has ignored the Mitcham Hills residents in this budget and he has ignored his department by not providing any funding. This budget has failed to fund the upgrade of the Blackwood roundabout, the worst roundabout in Adelaide as rated by the RAA.

The Melbourne-Adelaide rail freight corridor carries approximately five million tonnes of freight annually. In a high-use/rail-use modelling scenario traffic on the line will increase 4.6 times by 2039. This is an increase from about five million tonnes of freight annually to approximately 22 million tonnes. Rail freight at that volume cannot pass through the Hills. A long-term plan must be formulated. The Premier himself stated in the Integrated Transport and Land Use Plan, released in October 2013, that:

...as we cast an eye toward our State's 200th anniversary in 2036, it is now our time to lead the way and set our plan for continued prosperity.

I ask the Premier: where is that plan? The consequence is that the people of South Australia suffer and the residents in my electorate of Davenport suffer when there is no plan.

The Melbourne-Adelaide rail freight corridor runs through the Mitcham Hills area, cutting Main Road at Glenalta and Belair. Taken together with Cross Road in Hawthorn, 63,000 vehicles cross the tracks daily. Lengthy traffic delays are experienced at all crossings. These delays frustrate commuters trapped in peak hour bottlenecks. The cost of traffic congestion is staggering both in terms of lost productivity and the impact it has on quality of life. It means people spend less time at home with their family, getting up earlier to beat peak hour and arriving home later from work because they are caught in traffic.

Investing in improved transportation infrastructure would reduce the costs of congestion by boosting productivity through the time people save. Rather than being stuck in traffic, they can spend more time with their families, more time having fun and more time generating additional income—money they could spend in retail, invest or use to improve standards of living, more money that will contribute to the GSP and our tax base.

The solution is simple. Invest in infrastructure and invest in the state's transportation needs. The Labor government has ignored the Mitcham Hills public transport needs and it has ignored the needs of Hills residents. The government has failed to deliver adequate park-and-ride facilities for the commuters of Blackwood, Eden Hills, Bellevue Heights and Flagstaff Hill. Park-and-ride is vital to attracting more people to use our train and bus services. People will not take the train if they cannot find a car park at the station. Public transport is a vital part of reducing congestion, but it must be accessible and an attractive alternative for commuters.

It is not just infrastructure and transport that have missed out in the state budget. Our hospitals have also been forgotten. South Australian hospitals are under immense stress with Adelaide's major hospital departments regularly operating above capacity and classified as 'code white'. Patients in emergency departments are subjected to huge waiting times as the system struggles to cope with the level of demand. Ambulance ramping outside the Flinders Medical Centre last month is another symptom of an ailing hospital system.

South Australia's major hospitals are already amongst the worst performing in the nation when it comes to treating patients in their emergency departments within the required period of time, and the government's closure of the Repatriation General Hospital is only going to make the situation worse, taking hundreds of hospital beds out of our public system.

The sale of the Repat is another attempt by this government to plug holes in its budget, another example of the inability of this government to manage the state's economy. It has sold ForestrySA, the Lotteries Commission and Gillman. Hampstead Hospital and the Repat have been added to the list, and now the Treasurer has announced the government is planning on selling the MAC over the next 12 months. Even with the sale of these assets, the government is still only estimating a \$43 million surplus for 2015-16 and even a paltry \$43 million surplus could be as elusive to achieve as job creation has been for this government given its recent record.

Looking at previous state budgets, all handed down by Labor governments, by now this state should be running a substantial surplus in the coming financial year. Alas, we have a trivial one, once again announced by this Treasurer. This state budget is more of the same from Labor, it is more broken promises, more debt, higher taxes and a higher emergency services levy. South Australians will be stuck with prolific red tape, unacceptable unemployment and outrageous utility charges.

Labor has remained gridlocked, unable to develop a plan for our future, unable to implement a plan for job creation, unable to address South Australia's urgent need for growth. We need a state budget that invests in our infrastructure, our business, our people, our future. If we continue to make the same decisions, we will continue to get the same results. It is time for political courage, for risk-taking. South Australia needs vision, we need answers. Unfortunately, this Labor government simply has none.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (16:04): I would like to spend my time on the Appropriation Bill talking about my key portfolio areas, particularly one that has been in the public mind for quite some time—

and, of course, that is employment and training opportunities for South Australians, young South Australians in particular.

I think the most damning thing about the budget is the fact that this government has claimed that the budget is a jobs budget; however, I did not hear it talking about jobs much before the devastating May job figures were released, that saw South Australia increase its unemployment from 7.2 per cent to 7.6 per cent, becoming the highest state or territory in the nation when it came to unemployment. Over 66,000 South Australians are unemployed. We have not had that number of unemployed in South Australia for nearly 20 years. It is an extraordinary situation this government has found itself in, but it was totally oblivious that jobs were an issue until it got that whack on the ABS figures that came out on the second Thursday of June, showing us that 8,700 South Australians lost their full-time jobs in May.

That has an enormous impact on the economy, when you look at the number of South Australians who are not working as much as they would like to work: the underemployed South Australians, those who have been relying on two full-time jobs in the family or perhaps a full-time and a part-time job in the family all of a sudden becoming two part-time jobs, or hours being reduced from someone who may be working and reliant on regular overtime. That money has been ripped away from families. At the same time we have seen increases in the emergency services levy for the second year in a row from this government. That is a hit straight onto family household budgets.

It was interesting this week when we saw some figures on how much more the education department is chasing in unpaid school fees. You do not need to put two and two together to realise that South Australians are really feeling the pinch of a poorly managed economy. If you need any more evidence about how poorly managed the economy is, look at the number of jobs that have been added in Australia since February 2010. Remember February 2010? It was a big month for the Labor Party. It promised it would create 100,000 new jobs in South Australia in six years. That six years expires in February next year, so we are only about nine months or so away from the expiry date of Labor's promise.

What has happened in other states in that time? In New South Wales they have created over 270,000 jobs, Victoria has created over 223,000 jobs. That job growth related to about 8.5 per cent. Western Australia created 185,000 jobs and Queensland 122,000 jobs. This is all since Labor promised about 100,000 jobs. Tasmania created just under 1,000 jobs, and here in South Australia it was just 6,651 jobs. I seek leave to insert into *Hansard* a statistical table that illustrates the predicament South Australia is in.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It has to be strictly statistical.

Mr PISONI: It is strictly statistical.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I can see pictures.

Mr PISONI: This is the table here, that can be snipped and inserted into *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Jobs added since February 2010	
New South Wales	271,610
Victoria	223,105
Western Australia	185,451
Queensland	122,761
South Australia	6,651
Tasmania	941

Mr PISONI: If we go back to that historic job announcement, it came with a second announcement which was a new training program, Skills for All. Skills for All was going to be part of the tool that created 100,000 jobs here in South Australia. Then we had the extraordinary situation of where the government ignored all the advice, because what it did before launching Skills for All was to defund all the skills councils here in South Australia. Those were the very bodies that were advising government departments and ministers on where the skills areas were needed, on what types of skills were needed—not just immediately but in the medium term, the longer term and way

into the future here in South Australia. This government has been warning us about the transitioning economy for the last 10 years now—the gunna government, they are gunna do something about it—10 years ago they started telling us that we had a transitioning economy. First, it was a move to mining, away from manufacturing. The new thing now, of course, is that they have gone back to the old stable.

I look at Tom Playford up there who did an extraordinary job in transitioning the South Australian economy before and after the Second World War. The government is now relying very heavily on the very established food industry here in South Australia, the primary producers, but it is not providing training providers funding in that area, whether it be in maritime or agriculture. We are seeing enormous reductions in funding opportunities available for South Australians to move into this area that is the new saviour. I would argue that it has always been there for us but it has just been neglected by this government.

In his reply speech to the budget, the leader spoke about the neglect of regional South Australia and how South Australia's share of export growth has almost halved, from 8 per cent down to just over 4 per cent, in the 13 years that this government has been in office. There is an old saying: if you want to start a small business, give a big business to a socialist and very soon it will become a small business, and that is exactly what has happened to the business of South Australia. We were a state that punched above our weight in all sorts of areas: education, health, exports. We always did better, with our share of the population, with outcomes, but this government has been completely focused on inputs and, unfortunately, the outcomes have been the problem.

The Skills for All program and now the WorkReady program has made that situation even worse here in South Australia. Remember, the government said that training was its pathway to more jobs in South Australia. Last year, there were 126,000 funded training positions in South Australia. This new jobs budget is now only going to fund 81,000 training positions in South Australia, a drop of about 40 per cent in the number of training positions available here in South Australia that are funded by the state government.

All states have had a long tradition of being involved in support for vocational training here in South Australia. We have support, of course, for all sorts of education in South Australia at the tertiary level. University fees are subsidised by the government by the tune of about 60 per cent, yet we have the Premier coming in here saying that there is a new paradigm when it comes to training in South Australia. That new paradigm is that if you are an employer and you need trained staff, you should pay for their training. I do not know of a single law firm, accounting firm, medical centre or pharmacy that has paid for the training of their professionals, whether they be pharmacists, doctors, lawyers or accountants. That has all been funded partly by the student but predominately by the support of funding through the government system.

Yet we almost have this snobbery when it comes to the Premier, where the Premier says that anybody who is not doing a degree should pay for their own funding, or alternatively their employer should pay for that training. We have a situation where if someone is doing a university degree, it is acceptable for that to be supported by government, but if you are doing tertiary study through some other means, through a provider of vocational training, then you are on your own or you have to find an employer who is prepared to pick up the bill. It is a very bizarre situation.

The new WorkReady program will not only reduce the number of places in South Australia, but it will also mean that only 5,000 of the 51,000 new places available to be funded will be outside the TAFE system. The government has totally botched the Skills for All process because they did not listen to the industry, and they did not engage the industry on how it should be rolled out.

We know that there were people who, having not completed cert I and cert II training, went on to apply for another cert I or cert II course and did not complete that either, and then went on to apply for another one. There are people on the books who have had up to 10 attempts at cert I or cert II training courses all funded by the government with very few of them completed.

As a matter of fact, the report that was commissioned by the department and by the minister said that only 30 per cent of the training courses funded under Skills for All were actually completed. Then, of course, the government is on the record as saying that they do not know what the jobs

outcome is from the Skills for All funding because they did not measure it. There was no measurement of jobs outcomes.

How on earth can you say that part of creating 100,000 jobs in South Australia is a new training program that is going to train 100,000 South Australians and then say, 'By the way, we're not going to measure it to see whether it is working or to see whether it is having any impact'? Despite the fact that there was no measuring of the process or the outcomes of that funded training, we saw changes introduced every three to six months, with caps brought in on existing courses or, alternatively, cuts made to the amount of money that was available.

The non-government sector—and I like the way the Premier always likes to say 'the private sector' as if there is something evil about the private sector—is obviously made up of small businesses and larger businesses but, predominantly, the private training businesses in South Australia are not-for-profit organisations which are connected either to organisations such as SACOSS or alternatively to industry organisations, such as group training organisations—an alliance of union representatives and employer representatives that has been very successful with 70 and 80 per cent completion rates for training programs connected to the industry and relevant to work.

All of these are now at severe risk. The industry itself is saying that at least 1,000 jobs will go in the training area before we even start looking at the lost opportunity for young people in particular to be properly trained to move into this new transitioning economy that the government claims we are in at the moment, even though the jobs growth that this government has budgeted for over the forward estimates is lower than the jobs growth they budgeted for over the same period in last year's budget.

To give you some idea of the impact of Labor's poor performance on jobs, it breaks my heart when I look at what is happening in the northern suburbs where I grew up. In Elizabeth, just in the last 12 months, we have seen unemployment increase from 31 per cent to 32½ per cent. Thirty per cent of people unemployed in a particular area is a shocking figure. The only other place you will see over 30 per cent unemployment at the moment is Greece.

If we go down to the other end of town, Hackham West had 17 per cent unemployment in March last year and the latest available figure shows nearly 19 per cent. In Morphett Vale West, we can see the figure has risen from 12 per cent to 13½ per cent unemployment. These are people who are denied the opportunity to be independent and to look after themselves through having a secure income and looking after their families.

In Parafield Gardens, an area that was very aspirational when I was growing up in the northern suburbs, there is 10½ per cent unemployment and we are looking at over 11 per cent unemployment in the district of Port Adelaide. In Salisbury, right in the middle of where I grew up, there is nearly 16 per cent unemployment. Then we are looking at Smithfield and Elizabeth North, and unemployment there now is at 23½ per cent. In the Parks area, we are pushing 13 per cent unemployment. These are very shocking figures for opportunity in South Australia and opportunity in particular for our young ones.

Before I finish up I would also like to touch on the education budget. There are some stark contrasts between the South Australian education budget and that of the states that we like to compare ourselves with, that is, Victoria and New South Wales. Despite all the rhetoric that we have been hearing from the conga line of education ministers in South Australia over the last five years, the total increase in the education budget in South Australia is just 1.4 per cent, a \$40 million increase which does not even pay for EBA increases in teacher salaries. So in real terms we are seeing a reduction in education funding in South Australia, compared to New South Wales at 4.6 per cent in the government school sector and 5.2 per cent in the non-government school sector.

It is interesting that there is a lot more detail in the New South Wales budget papers and you can break these things down more easily than we can in the South Australian budget papers. In Victoria, a 5.6 per cent increase next year over this year's budget in education. So you can see, again, an area where 15 to 20 years ago South Australia used to be the national leader. We are lagging behind in every metric. The facts are that not only are we lagging behind in our funding of education in South Australia, we are lagging behind in the most basic of educational outcomes and that is numeracy and literacy.

The government's own budget papers tell us that out of the 12 categories that they have listed in numeracy and literacy, more South Australian students did not reach the minimum standard last year than the previous year. That is a shocking figure for South Australia. It is not good enough for education ministers to say, as previous education ministers have said—like the Premier, like Grace Portolesi—that that is because we have a higher number of lower socioeconomic people in South Australia. Well I say that it is your fault Premier that we have that higher number. You have been in office for 13 years and these people cannot get jobs.

I have read those statistics to you from the ABS figures that show the shocking unemployment levels in some of our most disadvantaged suburbs in South Australia. It is a bit like the chicken and the egg argument. Do we have poor educational outcomes in South Australia because we have a poor economy in South Australia, or do we have a poor economy in South Australia because we have poor educational outcomes? That is one for the academics to debate but the fact is that I am not comfortable with either one of those matrix.

I do not want to be the state with the worst unemployment in the country. I do not want to be the state with the worst numeracy and literacy results on the mainland. There was a time when teachers left states like New South Wales and Victoria to come for the teaching experience in South Australia, and it was not that long ago, but that is long gone here in South Australia under 13 years of Labor.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (16:23): I rise to make a short contribution in reply to the 2015 budget, and with some caution I say that it is very lacklustre and it really gives little hope to South Australians, particularly young South Australians seeking employment, and particularly those South Australians who want to be part of a growing economy. There is little—and I mean little—in the budget to give them hope.

Of course, this budget was all about addressing unemployment in South Australia—7.6 per cent across South Australia, which is totally unacceptable. If I reflect back to when I was a young lad, after finishing my apprenticeship at Holden's there were high unemployment numbers back then. I was faced with a similar situation to many of the Holden workers now. I was a part of the Holden workforce as a toolmaker. We had high unemployment and we had restructuring in manufacturing. Back then, there was a workforce of over 20,000 people at Holden's. They were presented with structural adjustment within the vehicle manufacturing sector and there were large job losses. I remember being forced almost to picket at the gate for weeks on end because we had lost our jobs.

However, it got to a point where I had to say, 'Enough is enough,' and I was not going to dwell on the issue of being part of the restructuring program, and that was to be laid off from that very large workforce. There were 3,200 people laid off in one fell swoop, and I was part of that. I rested on my strengths, I rested on the apprenticeship that I had just undertaken, and I went out and started up a business of my own. That gave me the opportunity to spread my wings and look at what other sectors were offering in South Australia.

I wish every Holden worker that mindset, to get over feeling sorry for what might be about to happen and get out there and experience something new. If you do need to upskill, get out there and do it. If you do need support from other industries or if you are going to seek help from your union mates, get out there and do it. Do not just sit back and be part of this rhetoric and spin that we hear from the Premier and the Treasurer on a day-to-day basis that this is all someone else's fault.

The federal government, in particular, has been blamed for this downplay. In the national car manufacturing sector, we have known for years that this has been coming. The forecast was that Ford would restructure and close. The talk was that what happened previously with Mitsubishi would happen with Toyota and Holden's. We knew that it was going to happen. The government knew that this was going to happen and they did nothing to address it, other than whinge, bitch and blame someone else.

To all those people who will be impacted, I say that there will be life after the car industry. It will be tough, I am not saying that it will not be, but there is an opportunity now to diversify and do what you do. If you have to upskill, get out there and do it, but do not sit back and say, 'The government is going to fix it,' because it is clear that this Premier and this Treasurer are experts at

spin and they are not fixing the issue. I do not see any extra funding coming out of education, health or the water sector. They have spent many millions of dollars of taxpayers' money on campaigns on promoting themselves and not actually achieving anything.

Having got that off my chest, I will move on to some other points within this lacklustre budget. My speech revolves around unemployment. In the electorate of Chaffey we have a very high unemployment rate of 7.75. We see the state's economy relying on agriculture, exports and value adding. In particular, the wine sector is being held up as heroes to drag the economy back onto some level playing field, yet we have seen training facilities being defunded and closed down.

I am sure the Treasurer went to the training minister, minister Gago in another place, and said, 'Here is your budget. Go and do what you have to do, but make sure that you support our union buddies. Make sure you support TAFE and make sure that they still have a presence but, as far as the private service providers go, they are on their own.' That has had a significant impact in my electorate of Chaffey on the private service providers that do an excellent job, particularly with agriculture, service industries, horticulture and viticulture. They do a great job with safety, OH&S and ChemCert programs. All these programs are going to underpin what this state's economy has relied upon for over 120 years, and yet we see the minister casting aside the private training providers, giving TAFE a bit of a hand up and almost making it a monopoly when it comes to training. That is a real concern.

Last month, 8,700 full-time jobs were lost: that is 280 people losing their jobs every day. That loss of 8,700 full-time jobs in May is the equivalent of closing four Holden plants. When people are looking for context on the issue of unemployment, it is very concerning when you put it into context. South Australia needs to be transformed, and there is no secret about that. We need to be transformed into a state where people invest and where jobs are created. The only way that is going to happen is if we have good leadership driving optimism, driving hope, and giving people confidence to employ staff and grow their businesses.

We would like to see a small increase in jobs in South Australia, but sadly, over the past 12 months, we have seen 14 fewer businesses in this state while we watch other states grow. We watch New South Wales, with over 8,500 new businesses; we watch Victoria, with 7,200 new businesses; and we watch Queensland and Western Australia, with over 2,000 businesses new to their economies. Yet, we look at South Australia, and we have lost businesses. Why is that?

Is it because they are going interstate and starting up their businesses because the cost of doing business is much cheaper, or is it because people have simply said, 'This is too hard. It is too hard to run a business here, with the cost of WorkCover, the cost of electricity, the cost of water, the cost of payroll tax, and the cost of land tax'? The disincentive and tax burden of owning a business in South Australia is increasing. It is almost like a weight on your shoulders, and it gets to the point where people just cannot take any more.

There are up to 1,000 job losses in the non-government training sector. As I have said, in the next financial year, almost all of those 1,000 jobs will go from the health sector, as well as 300 jobs from education. There has to be answer to that. Reform has to happen in some areas, but the only way that we are going to address that is by giving small business owners who are prepared to invest in our economy, in South Australia and in employing people the confidence to do so. In some cases, you have to give them a leg up; you have to give them a boost so that they do have that confidence and an incentive to go on with it. Again, that was sadly missing in the Treasurer's budget.

A drop in infrastructure spending will also significantly add to South Australia's unemployment crisis. Labor is setting the capital investment budget at \$1.3 billion per annum. This is down from a budgeted average of \$1.9 billion over the past five years. That explains a majority of issues. The government are cash-strapped, they do not have the money, and yet we have a government prepared to spend millions of dollars on campaigns that are in their self-interest.

The Premier and Treasurer have paid Greg Combet to come over here to transform the car manufacturing sector. They have paid him large sums of money to come over here and make their bad announcements, and he tells everyone that it is going to get worse before it gets better. That is the Premier's job. It is clear that the Premier is devoid of making any bad announcements.

I have even heard rumours that, when businesses close their doors or reduce their workforce, the Premier is orchestrating when they are going to make those announcements. He curtails all of these job loss announcements into one week so that they make them one after the other, stemming the bad news so that it is not a constant flow. That is something that the media will have to expose. The Treasurer is a bully and the Premier is likewise. They are forcing these businesses to make these announcements so that they curtail the damage to the government. It is the government's bad doing in running this state, and they are draining the confidence out of all of the business sectors, whether it be the large, whether it be the medium or whether it be the small.

This year's budget predicts employment growth of 1 per cent for 2015-16 and, as the Treasurer said, this is about an employment budget. However, last year's budget predicted an employment growth of 1.25 per cent, so the supposed 'jobs budget' is actually predicting lower employment growth for the 2015-16 year, and I think it is outrageous.

I could go on. With the cost of living, the ESL is again going up by 9 per cent or \$23 per household. Again, it is the cost of living. It is that added weight on the shoulders of the average resident in South Australia. The ESL for properties worth \$426,000 is going up by \$187 (10 per cent) and, for an average commercial property worth \$1.5 million, it is up by \$178 (7 per cent), and the same for an industrial property worth \$1.2 million. Again, the priorities of government are all wrong.

This levy, of course, will impact on farmers. They mostly own multiple property titles and, in some cases, vacant land. A lot of the time, they have to have rotatory land. They are going to get hit the hardest because it is not only the ESL that is going to smack them around the ears, it is the rise in motor vehicle registration. Let's face it, the average household in Adelaide has one or 1½ cars per household, so let's say two. These households are going to get an increase of about \$14 in registration. When you go out to regional properties and farms, look at what they have to own to make a business model work. It is not just multiple cars, it is tractors, it is trucks, it is motorbikes and it is on-farm vehicles. There are multiple increases of \$7, so they are obviously going to be hit multiple times. It just all adds up to, again, them asking the question, 'What do we do to make ends meet?'

We look at the save the River Murray levy. Sure, it has been abolished, but it is going to save householders \$40 per annum. When the government continues to slug the owner of an average home worth \$500,000 with an extra \$250 for the ESL, is \$40 the real issue here? I think what we are seeing is they are robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Just reflecting on Chaffey, the great electorate of the Riverland and Mallee, we have about 4,000 small businesses in the Riverland and Mallee out of the 140,000 in South Australia. It is extremely disappointing that there is no plan to provide relief for those small to medium businesses in the budget. The red tape increases. We get told that the red tape reduction is out there, but I am yet to see any red tape reduction.

The regulation continues and the increased paper trail continues. I know that any time anyone walks into a government office needing to make a change or a transfer it is just a standard, 'Fill out this form, \$130; fill out this form, \$326; and fill out another form, another \$250.' The rot just never seems to stop.

We look at stamp duty on non-real property transfers and non-residential real property transfers being abolished. Why is it taking until 2018 to be able to do this? If you really want to make a difference, it is time to get on with it and actually implement the change. Do not just spin around the corner on it and say that it is going to happen and be fully phased in by 2018.

Businesses want a stimulation now. They do not want a stimulation in 2018 when it could potentially be too late or they have had a gutsful of what is going on here in South Australia. Let me tell you, businesses are moving out of South Australia and opening up their doors interstate. It is not just something that could be portrayed as maybe happening but probably not happening: it is happening.

I know that in my electorate there are many people who have just said, 'I have had a gutsful, and I am out of here.' They have gone to Victoria or they have gone to New South Wales. In many cases they have picked up stumps. They were going to the mines. We look at the reliance of this

government's overspruiking the resource sector and the way that it was going to be the saviour. That definitely has not worked.

What I would like to say is that we do have the highest business taxes, we do have huge burdens with electricity prices and water prices. I often hear the Treasurer telling everyone that the reason electricity prices are so high is that a previous government sold the electricity trust. Well, why is it that water has gone up significantly more than power costs? Please tell me, Treasurer. Over 38,000 people have left South Australia in net terms for interstate since Labor was elected in 2002 and 10,000 have left since Premier Weatherill was elected. On average 2,925 residents have left South Australia for another state during the term of this government. I think it is just outrageous.

That said, the \$90,000 upgrade for the Chaffey Theatre was welcomed, and it was badly needed. It is a great theatre. It is one of those theatres that needed a birthday, and \$90,000 is not enough but it is welcome. Sadly, there was no major funding for Mallee roads, given the cessation of rail. The governments stand by and watch rail disappear, yet we do not put any more money on the table to upgrade the roads, with potentially another 14,000 truck movements just on the three highways in the electorate.

It is great to see movement at the Loxton Research Centre, which was once a proud institution in South Australia. Sadly, it is about six months behind schedule, but we still have hope that that program will be honoured and finished by December 2016. The River Murray Ferries Replacement Program has had \$6 million injected into it. I acknowledge that and I think that, having met with him, the minister sees the importance of the ferry system within the Riverland.

With not much time to go, I want to touch on a few issues. The Port Augusta Sterile Insect Technology facility is over a year behind. I knew that it was too good to be true when the minister announced this and said that it was going to be up and running in 2015. It is now due to be completed in December 2016. The Almond Centre of Excellence should have already been finished, but it is great to see that there is support there for that centre.

I just want to touch on water and what contributions government has made to the Murray-Darling Basin Authority and the total of South Australian government contribution to the Murray-Darling Basin Authority maintenance program. Since 2012-13, we have made serious payments of about \$26 million. Out of this total contribution, the following amounts were paid by the Save the River Murray Fund—\$9.5 million out of \$26 million and \$12.6 million out of the \$19.1 million.

My concerns are: where is the money going to come from now that the Save the River Murray levy has been abolished? It is going to come from the NRM levy. Mark my words, the farmers, the water users in South Australia, are going to foot the bill. The government has dissolved its responsibility in the maintenance program for locks and weirs on the Murray, and I think it is an absolute disgrace.

We look further down south at the Lake Albert economy. The government is doing nothing to support an economy that is now just surviving at \$3 million per annum. It has the potential of generating over \$40 million. We look at the state government continually going on about how it is the saviour of doing all the heavy lifting within the river. Water security is the number one issue for this state, not only for irrigation, for producing food, but for people in Adelaide to turn on their taps, because, mark my words, the desal plant is not the answer.

Time expired.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (16:43): The leader and other members are going to (and have already) concentrated on the wider aspects of the state budget handed down by the Treasurer a couple of weeks ago. I want to talk in depth probably more about areas that are affecting my electorate and point out a few inadequacies that I see.

I am pleased to have \$50 million (\$10 million each year for over four years) put back into tourism, but I hasten to say that that is merely replacing what has been taken out over the last few years. It is not new money: it is putting money back in that was taken out. However, it is important and it is good, particularly in my electorate, both on the Fleurieu and the island, where tourism is such a critical part of the economy.

I am, however, disappointed that more money was not found for rural regional roads. I am satisfied that some money will be spent on the Myponga to Yankalilla road, although it will not be enough, but I would add that there is never enough money for roads. It is some money, but again there is no long-term vision, money or plans for the Victor Harbor-Adelaide road, and the Cut Hill section desperately needs duplicating or amending and fixing up. However, we will continue to plod away.

My electorate, the electorate of Finniss, is a great export electorate. We produce copious amounts of primary product on the land and, to a lesser extent, on the water. It is very disappointing to see that exports have gone down from 8 per cent to 4 per cent in South Australia, and that concerns me greatly.

I note the impact on the pensioner concession, removing the \$190 concession, and I think that it is complete nonsense and arrant mischief to blame the federal government for that. It is a state-based concession and, as has been said in here before, the federal component was \$19. I am worried that the Premier is sending out nice letters to people with \$200. Many of them will merely waste this money; I am not saying they all will, by no stretch of the imagination.

It would have been far better to have the money taken off rates and associated bills than to give them cash, and we saw what happened when former prime minister Rudd handed out cash some years ago. In my view, families who cannot manage money will waste that \$200, and I do not think it was a smart move. I am also significantly concerned about the impact on my constituents of the rising emergency services levy. It is nothing more than a land tax on the family home and it is disgraceful.

I also want to mention Sellicks Beach. For a number of years (since 2010), Sellicks Beach has been in my electorate since I acquired it from the electorate of Kurna. However, it has been a long battle to try to get something to happen with wastewater treatment and effluent drainage in Sellicks Beach and it needs addressing. SA Water are noticeably absent from wanting to make any commitment and pathetically inadequate in their lack of wanting to do something in that area. It is a matter I took up with ministers who have been and gone, and it was raised with me again today by Her Worship the Mayor of Onkaparinga, Lorraine Rosenberg, and Deputy Mayor, Heidi Greaves, in a meeting with some of us here. For Sellicks Beach to progress, this money must be spent and it has to be got on with.

There are isolated developments within Sellicks that have their own systems, but I do not think in any way, shape or form that it is appropriate for effluent water to be running out over footpaths, off lawns or onto grass verges. Children could be running around in it, and it is decidedly unhealthy and almost smacks of Third World conditions. The council are very keen to pick up the gambit on this; they cannot do it alone. I say again that SA Water have been tardy and non-responsive and that the ministers have been pathetically inadequate and failed to address this issue. Given the vast resources and money that go into the government coffers from SA Water, it should have happened by now. So, that issue of Sellicks Beach and the effluent drainage needs some attention.

I turn to the subject of drugs. I do not know how much money we have to put into this, whether it be through SAPOL or wherever, but drugs are a disaster, particularly ice and methamphetamines. They are having an enormous impact on the youth of this country and this state, and they are having a big impact on the lives of families, children and younger people in my electorate. You could well say that that is no different to anywhere else but I am conscious of what is going on. I am very conscious of what is going on and I am appalled at what is happening and what is not happening in relation to these drugs.

I know that they are getting into schools. I know there is availability in primary schools, area schools, high schools—I am well aware of that—and it appals me. I am sure that it appals everybody in this place. It gets significantly worse because the police who do their best cannot be on top of everything. I also believe there is a community responsibility to advise the police or the proper authorities of incidents that they become aware of or the highly likely distributors of drugs and the key people involved in that. They do their best but I know that in and around the south coast it is bad.

I know that the member for Hammond may well talk about it in his contribution in the town of Goolwa, but let me tell you that across those south coast towns—Victor Harbor, Middleton, Port Elliot, etc.—it is rampant, and on the island it is very bad. I am just not sure where all this is going to end up. I am concerned that we are degenerating as a community because of the impact of this. It is one thing to have marijuana around the place but it is another thing entirely to have methamphetamines and ice. I would like to see a huge campaign run in opposition to what is going on with these distributors and dealers.

I would be fully supportive of the government—federal and state—to put in place huge programs to try to do something about the scourge of these drugs. I know young people who are affected and they are not only young people. I know of people who should know a lot better who are involved in this business. I do not hesitate, if I get advice, to let SAPOL know, but SAPOL are limited in their resources and they cannot do everything, so I believe it is up to all of us to do something about it.

I would like to turn my attention to the activities of Families SA. I have had cause to have discussions with the minister and Mr Harrison in the past about issues to do with Families SA, but I tell you today that I have an absolute belly full of the activities of some departmental officers in sending dysfunctional families, children, etc., into areas where they cannot be cared for, thinking they know best. That is what really irritates me.

These people in Families SA, a number of them—and it is probably a small number, I am not sure—think they know better than everyone else. They think they know better than the minister, they think they know better than their department heads, they think they know better than the police, they think they know better than the education authorities, they think they know better than everyone else. They are continually sending these—and I have spoken to the minister about this—dysfunctional people into areas that are in no way, shape or form able to deal with the effects and the fallout from what happens.

It is significant in Victor Harbor, I know, because I get it from the staff of the different government agencies and departments down there, without getting too deeply into it. They do not know what to do with it. These people who are dysfunctional, possibly through no fault of their own, have to have some degree of fallback onto government agencies to look after them. They have these resources in the city. They have them in the city to deal with them. They have the school systems to deal with them. They have the backup support services to deal with them. They have the numbers of SAPOL officers to deal with them. But I can tell you that out in the bush we simply do not have it. It is not there.

It is almost criminal, in my view, that these officers from Families SA, who seemingly know everything, are sending children into areas where they are required to go to school, yet the schools cannot touch these kids. It is a sad indictment of society. It is not good enough. I think it is almost intolerable when I have public servants speak to me at the football, at social occasions or in the street, wherever I may be, who are scared out of their wits to say anything for fear that they will get into trouble over it, but they will talk to me privately.

I think it is inexcusable that continually these dysfunctional families—and I am talking particularly about Kangaroo Island now—are sent over there. Children are sent over there with foster parents, or whatever, children with all sorts of difficulties. It is simply not good enough. There is no special school on Kangaroo Island to deal with them. I feel immensely sorry for people who have children with a disability.

I would add to that by saying that only last Thursday, the Public Works Committee visited the Convention Centre—and I am sure other members, if they wish to, can speak—where 1,200 children with disabilities were attending a function put on by the Variety Club and the Convention Centre. It was a joy to see them in circumstances where they were being entertained. They had a good day. There were, obviously, some children there with disabilities that were pretty severe, but there they were. What I am saying is that places like Adelaide the city have the resources to do things for these children, but we do not have them.

What is happening as well is that there are all sorts of deadbeats getting around Kingscote, which we have never had before. There are people who have never worked and who never will work

who are lounging around, doing nothing, who have found accommodation on the island. I am told, allegedly, that many of them have been sent over by Families SA because they have found cheap accommodation. It is not good enough. You are destroying the fabric of that rural community. There are all sorts of things happening which have never happened before. It is simply not good enough. It has to stop.

I am on the point, and I will do it if I have to, of coming in here and naming the officers concerned and specific examples because I think it has gotten that serious. They will not do anything about it. No-one appears to be listening. My constituents are telling me that they are scared now. They are scared. They are worried. They are frightened. Elderly people are not game to go down the street in little old Kingscote anymore. They are not game to walk around the town at night.

As I said, there are four SAPOL officers on Kangaroo Island to look after the third largest island in Australia, an area that, if you stick it on its end, fits from Cape Jervis to the Barossa Valley. It is not good enough. It is impossible for them to deal with it. It has to stop. I know I have probably laboured on the subject, but it is a subject dear to my heart. I have family members who work in education as well and I fear for their safety. I know the CEO, Mr Harrison, is doing his best. I have no argument whatsoever with what he is trying to do, but it is simply not good enough. I want it to stop—it has to stop.

In the few minutes left to me, the fact is that the leader, today, outlined the need for an emergency response to South Australia's jobs crisis. This jobs crisis is critical. We are losing jobs hand over fist. It is bad enough that everybody else is out of a job, but when my own family members have to leave the state through lack of work it strikes home. So, they go to Darwin and they walk into work up there, no problem whatsoever. It makes it very difficult. If you think they wanted to go to Darwin, they did not—but that is where the work was. Last month alone our unemployment rates skyrocketed to 7.6 per cent and the Treasurer's budget, the Premier's budget, failed to deal with this jobs crisis.

I have heard the Treasurer go on about the reduction in the price of mining products—copper, iron ore—and yes, I know all that, but this government has had 13 years to do something about this, 13 years to try to stimulate the job market. What it proves is that it has been comprehensively unsuccessful and a total failure in trying to adjust the South Australian economy to a state where it can grow. Members only have to look at what has happened in Tasmania in the just over 12 months since the government changed hands there after many years of a Labor government; Tasmania has turned the corner. I think what the leader spoke about this morning with the New Zealand economy, with a population of four million people, is also testament; the population is now being increased by Kiwis who want to return across to the other side of the Tasman to get jobs back in New Zealand, their home country.

Our leader outlined what needed to happen: bring forward the planned stamp duty relief to take effect this year; increase the payroll tax threshold; slash the emergency services levy by reversing the \$90 million hike; commence the building of the Northern Connector to link the Northern Expressway to the South Road Superway—and he went on. All that seems to happen for us is that this government appoints another committee or pays a few more public servants to do nothing.

Some months ago in this place we debated the merits or otherwise of legislation around the Commissioner for Kangaroo Island. That commissioner has been appointed, and I get on perfectly well—always have—with Mrs Wendy Campana. That is not a problem at all. However, if you go into the budget, google it, it does not even talk about the commissioner; I cannot even find any budget item in there, and we searched high and low. The commissioner was a con; it was a con to the people of Kangaroo Island.

Unfortunately, a small group of gullible people fell for it and ran around rallying the troops, but in my view she has been given some sort of sword of Damocles hanging over her because she has no money to spend on anything and she is a public servant totally compliant with state government policy, whether that be the emergency services levy increases or anything else. The poor commissioner has a job where she cannot do anything because she has no money; however well-meaning she is, it is not going to happen, and I seriously question where that is going to finish up. I know where it will finish up eventually; it will disappear.

I would like to briefly talk about the South Coast hospital in the minute left to me. That is nearly completed, and I am hopeful that the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure will move quickly to get that project finished, that the car park will be attended to rapidly and the entrance. That will finish off the job, and that project can be tidied up and moved on. Most of it was federal funding—I think \$10 million; it was pretty much all federal funding—but it needs to be finished. So I call on the government to try to sort through the mess from the fall of Tagara and get on with what needs to be done. I am particularly keen to have the mess at South Coast hospital tidied up and that job completed for the betterment of that community.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (17:03): I also rise today to support the budget bill, except to say that I also have a number of concerns with regard to it. What I would like to do first is outline a series of broken promises in my own electorate that are still unresolved after this budget, and then also talk about the broader statewide issues and macro issues as well.

South Australia is certainly a great state, but it is definitely being held back by bad government and we need to be doing better, that is for sure. The first project I would like to talk about is the Paradise Interchange. I am very disappointed to advise that again the state Labor government has announced that it will be breaking its promise to deliver an upgrade to the Paradise Interchange car park.

Before the election, both sides of politics took the heat out of this project; hand in hand, statesperson like, they agreed that this was an essential and important issue. There was a prolonged campaign by the local community with my support and with that of the member for Morialta as well. A petition was tabled. Before I was even in parliament, I was on the ground collecting the signatures of more than 1,000 commuters and local residents.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TARZIA: Finally, in the year leading up to the election, the government announced in its budget that it was making funds available. But what did they do? They broke their promise. The people of Paradise will remember.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Hartley, there seems to be a lot of noise on my right at the back of the chamber. Do any members have a point of order?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No. I remind members of order 142 and ask them to hear the member for Hartley as I am, in silence. We share this duty together.

Mr TARZIA: I am always eternally grateful for your protection, Deputy Speaker. I know that you too are a big fan and supporter of the O-Bahn project and park-and-rides in your electorate and in my electorate. It is disappointing that we see from the Messenger article only a couple of weeks ago that a Treasury department executive director said park-and-rides were 'not a priority for the government'.

It is extremely disappointing to see that, despite the government's rhetoric on public transport, despite the government's rhetoric on wanting more users to use public transport, they cannot back it up. They cannot back it up when it counts. On behalf of the people of Paradise and the people in the north-east—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

Mr TARZIA: The member for Wright is fired up about the people in the north-east. She wants to see park-and-rides in her electorate as well.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am on my feet—sit down! Member for Wright, I will have to call you to order. The member for Hartley.

Mr TARZIA: Thank you again for your protection, Deputy Speaker. The member for Wright says—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hope you are not laughing at me.

Mr TARZIA: No, she would never laugh at you. She must be laughing at me.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You should not be laughing at anyone audibly.

Mr TARZIA: The member for Wright says gallantly that there is enough revenue in the budget, yet they want to—

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Wright has a point of order, which I know will not be frivolous.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: He has just deliberately misquoted me. What I said was that he voted the budget stream down, not that there was enough money in the budget. He is entirely responsible for the fact that the interchange did not go ahead.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! You will be able to address that later, if you wish, and you know the procedures for it. The member for Hartley is entitled to be heard in silence, and he will continue. Seventeen more minutes, everybody, so let's keep it together before tea, not that I am watching the clock or anything.

Mr TARZIA: I am going to say this slowly because the truth hurts.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, you can say it as slowly as you wish.

Mr TARZIA: The truth hurts. They say on the other side of the chamber that they do not have enough revenue stream to deliver a park-and-ride. Really, this is ridiculous. They keep putting things out on social media and all the rest of it. It costs \$2 million to build a park-and-ride facility. It is an absolute joke for members of the government to say to us that they do not have enough revenue to build a car park in Paradise. Come off it!

They wanted to spend \$160 million on a project, until there was such resistance that they had to backflip, ripping the guts out of the beautiful Adelaide Parklands. Thank God for the Adelaide Parklands Association, which got involved and saved the Adelaide Parklands. Come off it! They do have enough revenue. They do have enough revenue to put a car park in Paradise.

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr TARZIA: Exactly right, member for Kavel. Deputy Speaker, he does not comment all that often, but when he does he hits the mark perfectly.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: He should not be interjecting and you should not be listening to him.

Mr TARZIA: And he said it right on this occasion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! You should not be listening to interjections and you should not be responding to them.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, you should not be interjecting.

Mr TARZIA: He says it right, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We can stop as often—

Mr TARZIA: The government do have—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Sit down. We can stop as often as everybody wishes. It would be best if we all listened to the debate in silence.

Mr TARZIA: All this standing and sitting is the most work I have had to do physically all day.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Back to the topic.

Mr TARZIA: The government do have enough revenue stream. The government do have enough revenue coming in to fulfil their past election promises. The people out there in the north-east are not silly. The government should bow their heads in shame at the broken promises for which they have been responsible in the north-east.

Moving past the Paradise Interchange, we come to Lochiel Park, a project which was the signature sustainable development of the Rann Labor government in the early 2000s. It has been seven years since that project was completed and still, to this day, the residents of Lochiel Park do not have recycled water. This has been covered in the local media and in the statewide media and I implore the current government, the current water minister and the current planning and urban development minister to do whatever it takes so that water flows through the pipes of the homes of Lochiel Park residents. The current situation is simply not good enough. It is an embarrassment.

I have met with the CEO of one of the relevant departments and he agrees that it is an embarrassment. It seems as though he is having a go, and I appreciate that, but we really need to get onto the issues that exist at Lochiel Park. It has been like that for too long and it is simply not good enough. As the member for Hartley, I will not stand for it.

We then come to the Glynde substation. On the eve of the last election the former member for Hartley distributed to many in the suburb of Glynde a promise in writing. She made a promise to the people of Glynde that the government of the day would provide an alternative site in Glynde for a substation to be built. The government has the power to do this. It has been quite quick to accumulate land when it suits it to do so to provide alternative land for other sites and other issues, yet on this one, again, the government has backflipped.

The people of Glynde will remember the substation, just like the people of Paradise will remember the car park and the people of Lochiel Park will remember recycled water. The people of Glynde are not silly. I am here advocating strongly on behalf of the people of Glynde. I implore the government to come through on the promise to make sure that it provides alternative land to build a substation—not in a residential area of Glynde; that is not where it needs to go.

There are many schools in our electorate that are certainly in need of funding. I would have liked to have seen more education funding in this budget specifically allocated to schools in need, especially schools such as East Marden Primary School, and especially in regard to the University of South Australia.

There has been much talk of a tram going up The Parade. I would certainly be open to a tram going up The Parade. I would love to be able to catch a tram or a train in my electorate. The only time I seem to do that is outside of my electorate. Again, it seems that it is all rhetoric. Our strong leader today made mention of the fact that on average infrastructure spending is down this coming year compared to the years before. It is very disappointing. We have some clear broken promises by the state government in relation to my area alone, and I implore the government to provide funding to make sure that it comes through on these promises for the good people of my area.

In recent times a sad story came out regarding Tagara, a building company that has been here since 1992. I sent a text to one of the directors. It is a terrible time, a devastating time, for the workers, for the subcontractors, for their families, and also for the directors and executives of the company. It is certainly not a nice thing. Hopefully, contractors can be paid and workers can receive the entitlements that they are owed. Events such as those relating to Tagara, Alinta, Holden, BHP, and anyone else who has recently made any announcements of job cuts, highlights that the state government cannot just try to pick winners in one particular segment of the market. We need to create a more consistent, low-cost, level environment for jobs, a more consistent, level playing field for growth. We are a great state. We can be greater, but we are being held back.

Our leader spoke to us today about the need for an emergency response to South Australia's job crisis, because at 7.6 per cent, before these other job prospect announcements on the horizon,

we are in a crisis here. Let's not kid ourselves. We are not playing fear politics here; it is truth. Last month, we were told that South Australia's unemployment skyrocketed to 7.6 per cent and Labor's budget failed to address that worsening jobs crisis.

We have come up with an array of measures aimed at stimulating the economy and also at creating local jobs, and Steven Marshall, the member for Dunstan, today highlighted what our plans were. Firstly, we would bring forward the planned stamp duty relief and we would like that to take effect this year. Secondly, we would increase the payroll tax threshold to permanently lower the costs for businesses to employ people. I mean, talk about a regressive tax—you have got it in payroll tax right there. Talk about a tax that punishes people to employ South Australians—you have got it right there. It is just simply not good enough. I was talking to a small-business owner only recently who said to me that he deliberately tries to stay behind the threshold. What kind of incentive is that for someone in South Australia to want to employ more people?

Further, the leader also spoke about slashing the emergency services levy by reversing the \$90 million hike in Labor's last budget. We also spoke about commencing the building of the Northern Connector to link the Northern Expressway with the South Road Superway, because we in the Liberal Party are all about productive infrastructure. I will be the first one, on behalf of my electorate, to put my hand up if I see some productive infrastructure, because that is what this state needs. It needs productive infrastructure—infrastructure that takes us forward, infrastructure that allows us to value-add, infrastructure that allows people to spend more time with their families because they can get there quicker, and infrastructure that allows us to do business more easily. That is the sort of infrastructure that we are calling for.

We want to see the unlocking of South Australia's potential in all kinds of areas, such as tourism and mining. That is what we want to see. Finally, we would also like to establish a productivity commission to remove unnecessary regulations and red tape. There have certainly been ad hoc examples of over-regulation and overly burdensome laws in our state, and we as a parliament need to work together to make sure that we develop synergies and efficiencies and make sure that our law-making process facilitates what we are talking about.

To the Treasurer's credit, he has announced a plan, but the plan does not go far enough in regard to stamp duty. The question that we have on this side of the chamber is: why delay it? Why delay the plan to relieve people on their stamp duty? As we have seen, as alluded to by examples like Tagara, BHP, Alinta, all these others and the ones that are still to come, South Australians need tax relief right now. They need it right now, not in three years' time. A lot of businesses are struggling to hold their heads above water at the moment. Businesses are not evil empires; businesses are the ones that create jobs. We have over 140,000 small businesses in South Australia. If they all employed a couple more people, we would be out of a jobs crisis, we would not have a crisis, and we would be growing as a state.

We also have a plan to reverse the huge increases to the emergency services levy. That will certainly stimulate the economy and support South Australian families. We on this side of the chamber are certainly committed to creating jobs by supporting businesses and creating productive infrastructure. South Australia has the highest unemployment of all of Australia at 7.6 per cent. This budget here fails to deliver jobs. It fails to deliver a reduction in payroll tax, it fails to reduce the cost of living for households which by far are the biggest electorate out in voter-land, and it fails to deliver a plan for reversing the state's economic stagnation.

South Australians are paying more and getting less, and we see that. After forcing South Australians to endure some of the highest taxes and utility prices in the nation, the Premier and the Treasurer have again increased the amount of state taxation—revenue taken from South Australians—this time by \$149 million. They have increased the emergency services levy for the second time in as many budgets, bringing the total increase to \$205 for a \$500,000 home.

They have increased the average household water bill by \$804, and we heard today that, since 2002, average water prices have increased by 236 per cent. We have also seen premiums for compulsory third-party insurance increase to \$378, even as the government wants to privatise the Motor Accident Commission. That is before we talk about hospital closures, and some of the other members have illustrated, through real-life examples, the pressures on our hospital system at the

moment and how we need to be doing far greater things to make sure that people get the care they deserve.

I also want to alert the government to some of the macro issues. The macroeconomic trend has many implications for South Australian businesses. Obviously, there has been a sharp drop in commodity prices. I am a big believer in mining. I will be the first to put my hand up and be a believer in the mining sector and the need to work towards development in both the mining sector and the alternative energy sector. The mining sector is one of our greatest assets in South Australia and I will do everything I can to promote it.

However, the South Australian economy needs to do more than just facilitate that industry and, as the government has seen, we cannot put all our eggs in one basket. We need to do more to diversify. We need to make sure we are resilient in times of low commodity prices and that we are prepared to take the gains when prices are high. I also draw the government's attention to some of the federal government's forecasts in relation to business investment in mining and the non-mining sector, which are very important.

I notice that electric and hybrid cars are to be the preferred CBD mode of transport. I have a question for the government, and perhaps we can get an answer on a different day. But since electric and hybrid cars are to be the preferred CBD mode of transport, surely that would have a budget implication for South Australian tax receipts, not only in terms of federal receipts, which are not flowing through, but also in terms of the South Australian budget. We need clarification of that.

I notice there is provision for social housing premises to be renewed. I look forward to working with the government to make sure that my residents are kept abreast of any developments in that regard, and I thank the many staff in the housing area who have always been very friendly and supportive whenever I have had to raise something on behalf of one of my constituents.

State GSP is not growing as much as we would like and we are not getting the people coming here that we need. It comes down to basic supply and demand. We need to become more productive as a state; therefore, we need more people. More people in our state will create more demand and that can only be good for jobs and for what the government is trying to do to make this a better state.

South Australia is a great state. However, my area is being let down by this budget, and I implore the government to take that on board and make sure that the next budget addresses those issues.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (17:23): I am pleased to make some comments in relation to the Appropriation Bill. I want to start by saying that I do not believe this government will deliver on this budget. I say that with fairly good reason because, over the past 13 or so years, the government has pretty much not delivered on any one of their budgets. This is the 14th budget they have sought to bring down. They have a track record of not delivering on any of the previous 13 budgets so, to be honest, I do not think they will deliver on this budget either.

I can support that with some facts and figures. I have said in previous speeches in the house on previous years' appropriation bills that you just have to look at some pretty basic facts and pretty simple graphs that have been presented where the deficits have blown out and borrowings have blown out. The most recent example is over this last six or so months where the deficit for the 2014-15 financial year is \$279 million which is an actual increase of almost \$100 million on the December 2014 Mid Year Budget Review estimate of an \$185 million deficit. There is a blowout of \$185 million to \$279 million, which has occurred despite the government raiding \$459 million from the Motor Accident Commission. That is some clear evidence over the last six months of how wrong this government can get its budget.

But there are also some key economic indicators as to why things are running off the rails, so to speak. There are two quite clear indications of that. None of us on this side of the house get any real pleasure from highlighting how poorly the state is functioning economically, but unfortunately with a 7.6 per cent unemployment rate we have the highest unemployment rate in the nation. These two economic indicators must match up because we are the highest taxed state in the nation. So on the one hand we have the highest unemployment rate and on the other hand we have the highest taxation levels in the country. For anybody who focuses on economic indicators and how the state is going, those two key indicators must match up.

We heard the leader this morning, in leading the debate on the Appropriation Bill, saying that we have an emergency in relation to our unemployment figures and our level of unemployment and that we need an emergency response. The leader quite effectively, strongly and capably put a case forward to the parliament on how that can be remedied.

A couple of weeks ago when the budget was brought down, the Treasurer said that the budget was formed on job creation, that it was a budget for jobs. But what do we see? The leader highlighted earlier that there was meant to be 5,000 additional jobs created in the mining sector. What have we seen? There have been 5,000 jobs lost in the mining sector. He is spouting off in question time saying we aspire to be the mining state of the nation. I have been in this place for a little while and pretty much for that period of time—13½ years—I have heard a number of government ministers and previous and current premiers bang on about South Australia having a mining boom.

How many times have we heard ministers and the Premier on the other side of the house spout off about how we have a mining boom? We certainly do not have a mining boom at the moment. We have never had a mining boom. For a couple of years we might have had a mining exploration boom where mining exploration was going hammer and tongs, but we have never actually had a mining boom.

Over recent times we have seen a downturn. BHP Billiton is going to lay off a number of workers. We have seen, as I highlighted earlier, 5,000 jobs alone lost in the mining sector. Instead of creating 5,000 jobs in the mining sector, as the government had proposed, we have a negative of 5,000, so overall it is a negative of 10,000 jobs to the economy. It is a significant number of jobs lost.

Another thing that has been highlighted is that we are going to see an increase in payroll tax. Sure, the government and the Treasurer are talking about tweaking here and there and reducing some levels of taxation in other areas, but we all know on this side of the house that payroll tax is a tax on jobs growth. I know the Treasurer can spout off percentages like he does, full of rhetoric but very little action I might say, but payroll tax is a direct tax on the creation of jobs, so there is very little incentive.

The member for Hartley raised in his contribution that he knows businesses that employ workers so that their payroll expenditure just falls short of the threshold over which they have to pay payroll tax, and that is a disincentive for employment. We on this side of the house all know that there are hundreds and hundreds of businesses that would like to employ more people but they cannot deal with this regressive tax on jobs, that is, payroll tax.

Other taxes will also increase—the emergency services levy has gone up 9 per cent. On top of the government's remissions being removed earlier in the last year, we have seen a hike in the ESL, and that is just a backdoor property tax. The Treasurer floated the possibility about having a direct tax on the family home but I think he has gone cold on that idea. I think perhaps some of the members of the Labor caucus are fairly touchy about that issue, and rightly so because we all know that people work very hard, they save for a deposit, they borrow a lot of money from the bank, they work two jobs, and both members of the house, if it is a two-member household, the husband and wife each work to pay the home loan payments.

The family home is a very important part of our Australian way of life and the basis of the Australian economy, so for the government and for the Treasurer to even give any thought to introducing a tax on the home is an absolute abhorrence. However, he has had his way to a degree on this with the hike of 9 per cent on the ESL.

Another interesting thing came to the fore last week, which the Hon. Rob Lucas, shadow treasurer in the other place, highlighted in a press release he distributed. He highlighted the fact that the Premier told the national media that at next week's leaders' meeting he will push for the GST to apply to all financial services, so what is happening? Are we going back to the dim, dark days of the Labor Keating years where we saw the introduction of financial institutions duty (FID) and bank account debits tax? We are hauling ourselves back to the future, back to the 1980s and the dim, dark days of the Keating era.

Nobody in their right mind wants to go back to what the nation endured, in the way the economy was dealt with, under the Labor Keating years. But, as the Hon. Rob Lucas in the other

place has highlighted in a press release, the Premier has plans and is wanting to push for GST to be applied to bank services. Further:

Mr Weatherill knows that when the GST was introduced in 2001 it was done only on the basis that the Financial Institutions Duty (FID) was abolished.

Having come from a banking career, I know that bank account debits tax was abolished before the FID, and the thought of applying a tax on people's banking transactions is just completely wrong—it is just perverse if you ask me.

I was in the banking game when those taxes came in, and I just could not work out the logic, apart from being sheer and blatant revenue raising, no other reason, behind taxing people to deposit and withdraw money from their bank accounts. They were abolished, but it looks like they may be back on the agenda. So, we need the Premier to come in and rule it out. We need him to come into the house and definitely say, 'No, I'm not going to next month's leaders meeting and be pushing for the GST on financial services.' That is an absolute regressive step in terms of trying to stimulate activity and economic growth in the state.

I do not believe the government will deliver on this budget. We have seen that the state will receive into the forward estimates another GST windfall. That was the only thing that ever kept the previous treasurer's budget half in shape.

Mr Gardner: Sometimes.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Sometimes, that is right. They were half around the mark, even though the figures were rarely realised. The rivers of gold of the GST were just flooding into the state coffers. What have we seen this year and into the forward estimates? We will see \$892 million more of budgeted GST come into the state. We are looking at a projection of a \$43 million surplus. I do not think that will occur, because the government has an appalling track record of delivering on its budgets. We will wait and see. That is on top of, as I have highlighted, the influx of money from the Motor Accident Commission.

It gets back to the fundamentals of how this government is managing the economy and the model it has put in place to try to manage the state's economy and the states finances. It is blatantly wrong, and surely members on the other side can see that it is wrong, because everything is heading in the wrong direction: unemployment is up, taxation levels are up, business confidence is down. A lot of the indicators are heading south, because the government has put in place an old, failed economic model of tax, borrow and spend.

They think they can spend their way out of a problem. They think they can spend their way out of economic difficulty. They have tried—and we have seen federal Labor governments try—but they have failed. All they do is rack up massive debt. From memory, the debt will peak at \$13.7 billion—\$13.7 billion the debt will peak out at—and in anybody's language that is an enormous liability and an enormous debt to try to manage.

However, as the leader pointed out this morning in his excellent contribution, the government has the capacity to do away with its old model, to forget all that old failed economic model that may have worked in the 1950s and 1960s, when we were operating in a semiprotected economic environment, managing the exchange rates and with limits on how much banks could lend. We had high tariffs in place for imports, even though it made the cost of living very high for Australian people.

There is light at the end of the tunnel that the government can view, if it wishes, and that is adopting what the leader has spoken about in relation to how a modern, western, democratic, unregulated economy can look, and that is the New Zealand model. The leader highlighted the fact that it is pretty simple. It is not very complicated. You focus on exports, you focus on the industries that have a natural affinity to the land in which you live, you keep spending under control but you spend in the productive areas of the economy, and you look at Public Service productivity.

Unfortunately, over the 13½ years this government has been in power, the Public Service—and it has been driven, I think, in a major way by the way the government has dealt with the Public Service. Unfortunately, instead of the Public Service responding to the state's needs, they respond to their own bureaucratic needs. We know about the old failed model that the government uses: big government.

It is like previous prime minister Rudd said, 'The government is to be the solution; the government needs to play a big part in the economic recovery of the country.' Well, that all went to hell in a handbasket, didn't it? As we have seen, some of those schemes that he put in place were complete failures and, as I said, just racked up enormous debt that this current Liberal Coalition government has to deal with. It is not that difficult for the government to turn its mind from its old socialist, protectionist, high taxing, high borrowing, high-spending ways to implement a modern, western, unregulated economic model. As I said, we have highlighted on this side of the house the New Zealand model.

I want to quickly talk about some other areas that I have highlighted previously. I want to turn my comments to health services. The constituents in the northern part of my electorate would use the services at the Modbury Hospital. People in the towns of Oakbank, Woodside, Lobethal, Gumeracha, Birdwood, constituents in those northern towns in Kavel would use the Modbury Hospital. I am sure constituents in the southern towns of Schubert, as well as in the electorates of Morialta, Newland, Florey and Wright, all use the Modbury Hospital.

What concerns me is that we are not getting any straight answers from the Minister for Health on what is happening with the Modbury Hospital. I asked a couple of questions about the Modbury Hospital service cuts. I have a DL flyer that has your smiling face on it, Deputy Speaker.

Time expired.

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) (17:44): I rise today to speak on the Appropriation Bill and to highlight to the house the significant investment our government will continue with in supporting South Australian communities as we prepare to transition and diversify our economy. Of course, this budget is all about jobs. While we enter this period of transition, our government remains steadfast in our commitment to ensuring that no South Australian gets left behind. It is with this in mind that I seek to make my contribution to this debate.

I would like to start by talking about the investment in this year's budget for multicultural communities in South Australia. I am pleased that our government will triple its investment in multicultural communities, with the 2015-16 state budget including an extra \$8 million over four years to expand cultural festivals, develop community programs and to improve infrastructure. This \$2 million annual funding boost is an addition to the existing \$1 million spent on grants each year to promote multiculturalism in South Australia.

The government is committed to ensuring South Australia remains a diverse and harmonious place to live, work and raise a family. An important part of achieving this is through the staging of cultural events and festivals, which provide all South Australians with an opportunity to explore and understand the many different cultures that make up our great state. This additional funding will support communities in many ways, including through opportunities to modernise their facilities and enable better access to venues for an ageing population and to enable festivals to be inclusive of a wider audience of South Australians.

Further, the funding will also support the establishment of the Stronger Families, Stronger Communities program that will fund community development projects in areas such as family and relationship support, domestic violence and racial discrimination. I would like to thank the work of the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission in focusing on the areas that they are looking at, and that includes ageing and also economic opportunities for our migrant communities.

This investment supports one of the government's key economic priorities: to compete nationally and internationally for people and investment by creating an environment that encourages new investors, residents and visitors, and bringing fresh energy and life to Adelaide. This investment also proves the state government is committed to taking our multicultural journey to the next stage, from their acceptance to understanding and mutual respect.

I would also like to talk about how our government's budget is assisting and supporting the most vulnerable and disadvantaged people in our community. We have seen deep cuts from Tony Abbott and the federal Liberal government in their past two budgets, of which none was crueller than

the decision to walk away—without any discussion, without any notice—from the national partnership agreement on certain concessions. I am proud that this government, in contrast to Tony Abbott and the federal Liberal government, moved to protect pensioners and low-income earners for 12 months while we campaigned against these changes.

Despite these cuts not being overturned, our government has recognised the need to continue supporting pensioners and low-income earners with everyday household expenses through our new cost of living concession, which comes into effect on 1 July 2015. Eligible pensioners and low-income earners who own their own home will receive up to \$200 each year under the cost of living concession, while eligible tenants will receive up to \$100 per household. Self-funded retirees holding a Commonwealth Seniors Health Card who own their own home or who rent will be eligible for up to \$100 each year.

This concession is in addition to existing pensioner concessions for energy, medical heating and cooling, public transport, emergency services levy, water and sewerage. Most importantly, through our new cost of living concessions, more South Australian pensioners will be better off, with recipients of the former council rate concession receiving an extra \$10 each year. On top of this, eligibility for the new concession will expand to include around 45,000 pensioners and low-income earners in South Australia who are tenants.

Instead of being a rebate for a specific bill, like the former council rates concession, the cost of living concession is a direct payment, providing recipients with the freedom to apply it whenever it is needed most. The introduction of this new concession reinforces the state government's commitment to keeping South Australia an affordable place to live. The new cost of living concession brings the maximum amount available to pensioners and eligible low-income earners as concessions for utilities and living costs to \$866 each year.

Our housing and homelessness system aims to ensure that all South Australians can access safe, affordable and appropriate housing. South Australia has invested significantly in the development of innovative and comprehensive responses to homelessness and domestic violence, including through the National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness. Through this investment, we have achieved substantial reforms and gains. It is important that, as we move forward, these gains are not lost.

On 23 March 2015, the commonwealth social services minister, Scott Morrison, announced a \$230 million NPAH funding package for the next two years, 2015 to 2017. The agreement includes \$8.87 million per annum for South Australia. The state government has matched this commitment, allocating \$17.7 million over two years for homelessness services. However, the state government remains concerned that the commonwealth contribution has not included provision for indexation, equal remuneration order wage increases or capital investment. This means an effective loss of \$1.1 million in funding to the sector over the two-year life of the agreement. The commonwealth's longer term intentions regarding this important agreement also remain unclear.

This budget is about investing in our community and creating jobs, but at the same time we will not leave the more vulnerable people in our community behind. We are investing in measures that build stronger and more resilient communities where all South Australians can share in our state's prosperity.

Sitting suspended from 17:52 to 19:30.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (19:30): It truly is a delight to give an address to the Appropriation Bill 2015, and it is a delight to be speaking after the dinner break which is something we rarely do in these days of so-called family friendly sitting days. As a country member, I do not mind if we sit here half the night, but be that as it may.

One thing in the budget was the lack of attention to detail as far as agriculture spending right across this state. We have a government that for many budgets now—because the revenue generated from the proposed expansion of Olympic Dam is not happening—has had a seven-point plan and then a 10-point plan which included a so-called clean, green reliance on our agricultural regions throughout this state. Yet, we see very little effort as far as funding in the budget.

I guess we should be thankful for small mercies. After hundreds of millions of dollars budgeted for agriculture has been ripped out of the economy over the last several years—and many jobs, probably into the hundreds—I suppose it is something to see that it was a fairly even keel as far as agriculture spending compared to last year, not that that is anything to brag about by any tenure, especially when a government is keen to promote this clean green food but then does not do any work in regard to managing it.

We look at the SARDI budget which has not increased. Research is one of those things that South Australia has been able to pride itself on in past years in the work that was done in the Middle East and across this country in grain technology, dryland farming systems and the like. We have certainly been able to promote things like no-till farming across the world that have made all the difference, especially in years like last year where even though there was not much rain since early July there were still some reasonable crops across the state—no thanks to the state government.

There is very little in the budget for the regions. As was discussed today in question time, the Labor government was going to have 5,000 more jobs in mining, yet we have 5,400 jobs that have gone from mining, so basically that is a net loss of 10,400. Mining is going backwards, agriculture is just holding its own, and then we look at training. This is, I think, one of the major disasters as far as what has happened to funding for training our younger generations for the future. We have a Labor government that has essentially stripped TAFE of funding, staff and facilities over many years and, yet suddenly, the government has had this brainwave. I would say the union standover men have said, 'Fix it. Give us back our jobs.' They have said no more training opportunities for people in the regions who run these regional training providers like Regional Skills Training and the like, we are going to put it back all through the TAFE system. This is after many years of gutting the system. There is no sense to it at all.

Essentially there are 300 training spots across the state for agricultural training that have been whittled down to 20 that will be allocated to Mount Gambier. For the life of me, I do not know we are going to get anywhere near enough of the younger generation trained in agriculture with this new scheme. I mean, do not get me wrong, I support TAFE, but there is not much left to support. When we have seen independent regional training officers supplied as training and other training across the state, why break something that is not broken? It is just out of control.

We look at things like the increase to the emergency services levy. If you have a home worth \$500,000 you will pay an extra \$205. This comes after a hit of emergency services levy remissions funding of \$90 million and none of that money went into emergency services, by the way, it went into general. Yet, at the same time, the River Murray levy is going off households and that will only save households \$40.

I have had meetings with people and phone calls from people who do not want to pay the River Murray levy, but as the member for Chaffey said today: who is going to pick up the slack? Who is going to pick up the slack with regard to whether it is salt interception schemes, or whether it is managing the locks and weirs? Certainly, down at Goolwa those barrages will need a multibillion dollar birthday (it will be at least \$1 billion) one day to keep up with making sure that we have a freshwater river right to the mouth. That will be a massive project that will have to be funded from across the country, but this state will have to take its obligations as well.

I fear that now the government has found this bucket that it is calling the emergency services levy it will blame every incident like Sampson Flat and say, 'Well, there's been a big hit, we've got to hit everyone up a bit for another \$20 million to fund it.' What happens if we have five major incidents in a year and we have, essentially, budgeted for one or two? Sure enough, the minister will say, 'Here's another hit to the budget.' It is a land tax, that is exactly what it is.

This comes after the Minister for Emergency Services failed in his bid to amalgamate the emergency services. Why did he even bother? He came in with this approach, made out that he was consulting across the state, got upset when a few of us from this side questioned it, and it all fell through anyway. We saw the head of the MFS get headhunted and get a very handy job overseas when he realised there was no future here. So, we have lost some skillsets and lost a lot of ability. We already have good services in the field, whether it is the SES, the CFS, the MFS and other

players in the marine rescue field, and we are essentially back to square one, where it all worked quite well anyway.

If we look at the so-called health reform, this is going to have an effect on rural constituents. Many rural constituents end up in Adelaide hospitals, they could be a third of the clients, or patients, whatever you want to call them, in Adelaide hospitals at any one time. It is interesting, when you look at one of the disasters that is happening with the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, it is with regard to the Enterprise Patient Administration System (EPAS) and also the Oracle Corporate System. Another system that is in strife is the Enterprise System for Medical Imaging (ESMI) program. There is a comment straight out of the Auditor-General's Report, the supplementary report for the year ended 30 June 2014, which we got a hold of today:

This Report does not revisit the reasons for past delays for these systems but focuses on highlighting risks to meeting revised functionality, implementation deadlines and budget targets and their relationship to the nRAH.

What should happen at the new RAH, I would suggest, is they start going out and getting some bargains on filing cabinets. They are going to need them because EPAS just does not work. It has not worked in hospitals like Daw Park where they have rolled it out and they are still trying to work their way through it. There are a whole range of problems with these ICT projects. I quote again:

Delays experienced have exposed the programs to further scope creep pressure and the need to now manage multiple system implementations concurrently as the nRAH opening approaches.

Well, what a joke. It is just not going to work. Another quote straight from the Auditor-General's Report is:

SA Health's ICT developments, such as the EPAS Program, are intended to be a key component in achieving the objectives of the nRAH as South Australia's recent Transforming Health initiative.

As I said, this was trialled in hospitals like Noarlunga, the Noarlunga GP Plus Super Clinic, Aldinga, Morphett Vale and Seaford GP Plus Health Care Centres, SA Ambulance Service's metropolitan headquarters, Daw House at the Repat, Port Augusta Hospital and the Repatriation General Hospital. It is just causing massive problems.

I note that the report says that we are not going to take any notice of the money that has been burnt up before, but that amounts to hundreds of millions of dollars. It is farcical; it is farcical to think that this government has now confirmed it is selling the facilities at Daw Park, supposedly so that it can get a more central location. Well, Daw Park is only 10 or 15 minutes down the road from the centre of the city and in very pleasant surroundings. You have to wonder what the local member, the member for Waite, has been doing about retaining those services for veterans and others all in one place.

Mr Wingard interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Nothing; exactly right member for Mitchell, nothing. He has just toed the Labor Party line so that he can get that extra 80 per cent and a better pension at the end of it. However, I will leave those comments there.

This health reform is affecting people from right across the state. What will happen in emergency situations? Different hospitals will only be open for different things on different days. If you have a stroke, for instance, they will have to have a scroll come down on the back of the ambulance to tell them, 'Oh, it's Wednesday at 9.30 so we can go here,' or 'It's Saturday at 9.30 so we have to go somewhere else.' It is all about saving money; it is all so that the government does not have to have specialists in every major hospital in the city.

It is already affecting my constituents at Goolwa, who have a different triage process. They cannot get triage at the local medical centre but have to go to Victor Harbor. Then there are issues with what happens up the line, whether it is at Noarlunga or Flinders, etc. So there are going to be a lot of problems as we head into the major part of the health reform, which is the opening of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, down the track.

Something else I want to talk about is road infrastructure development supposedly improving road safety, sealing shoulders and audio-tactile line marking on high priority roads. Quite frankly there cannot be enough of that, especially on a lot of roads heading out from my electorate through

the member for Chaffey's electorate into the Mallee, especially in light of the fact that Mallee rail will be discontinued from 1 August. That will mean that on both the Karoonda Road and the Lameroo-Pinnaroo Road there should be at least two overtaking lanes built each way on each road. Where that has not happened, any parts that have not been widened need to be because of the extra truck traffic that will be on those roads, just for safety reasons for people who want to overtake.

I note that some work is going to go on with the commonwealth government to improve the Sturt Highway through the National Highway Upgrade Program. I also note—and I have mentioned this here before—that it was a fallacy in past budget years, where \$100 million was spent on the Dukes Highway putting a bike lane down the middle of it and putting in some extra overtaking lanes. It would have been far better to duplicate that highway towards Melbourne, just as the Victorians are coming out further towards Beaufort and Ararat. That would have been a far smarter way to spend that 80 per cent of federal money and the 20 per cent of state money that went into it.

We look at pensioner concessions and the farcical way this government tried to blame the federal government for everything on earth; you would almost think that life itself would not have happened. We had a government that held a gun at the pensioners of South Australia, our most volatile people—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Vulnerable; thank you, Mr Whip. They can be volatile, too, at times. They basically had them on a string over pensioner concessions, which is a state matter. Yes, there was some federal support, but when that small amount of federal support did not happen in other states, those state governments picked it up. But this Labor government has come along with this new concession arrangement, a cheque for about \$200 going to people to make it look like they have done a great job.

I was talking earlier about the jobs crisis. The unemployment rate in South Australia has hit 7.6 per cent. The government was supposed to have 100,000 new jobs by 2016. I am not sure whether it has got above the 3,000 mark, or somewhere in that range, but it is a long way short because there is just not the opportunity. People are going interstate to get jobs. Part of that extends to where we see no major infrastructure announcements in this budget. What do people do? In the last couple of days we saw that Tagara builders have gone out of business and left a lot of subcontractors, and certainly people from my electorate, heavily impacted at a big building site at Murray Bridge. I just hope they get their money one way or another. The more jobs, the better.

What we will see from this 2015-16 budget is that the state's net debt is estimated to reach \$13.7 billion by 2017. There have been some changes made to the tax regime, but a lot of these will not kick in for three years. Why have they not been fast tracked so that people can make the savings, whether it is stamp duty offsets or payroll tax relief? Why isn't it just brought forward. A lot of these things will not happen until 2018. By that time we will see more people leave this state.

As I said, this is what the Weatherill Labor government should do. We are saying that the government should bring forward planned stamp duty relief, commit to reducing payroll tax immediately, slash the emergency services levy by reversing the \$90 million emergency services levy hike announced in the 2014-15 state budget, commit to building the Northern Connector road, finalise an investigation regarding the Strzelecki Track upgrade, and create a state-based productivity commission.

I would just like to expand briefly on the Strzelecki Track upgrade. That is something that should have been done decades ago. This government really needs to have a good look at it and put a decent submission to the federal government. I guess it will be an 80-20 funding split. What concerns me with whatever is going on in the oil and gas industry in the Cooper Basin is that you can go from Brisbane to Innamincka, to the border, 24 kilometres from Innamincka, on bitumen all the way. When you can do that, it means that either people will base their supplies out of Brisbane or some trucking companies, if they are coming out of Adelaide, will have to do about 1,200 kilometres extra and do the ring route: Broken Hill, Cobar, Bourke, Cunnamulla and then in towards Innamincka that way. I think it is absolutely vital.

We hear this government talk about everything it is doing for the oil and gas industry, but let's get this road sorted out. Let's get it happening and do the right thing for our oil and gas industry in the Cooper Basin, where I spent a couple of years of my life in gainful employment back in the 1980s.

If we look at other issues in the budget, we have the sale of the Motor Accident Commission. This comes from a Treasurer and a government that says, 'No privatisation—no problem, we will just go out and get rid of the Motor Accident Commission, recoup a huge windfall of money and then still run a deficit.' It is just disgusting. It would be alright if things were better in the long run for people right across the state.

I also note that over the forward estimates it is estimated that at least an extra \$800 million of unallocated funding will come to this state (over the next four years) from the federal government. Let's just see where that goes. Let's just see if that does go to useful projects or if, just as has happened in the past, it ends up in the big funnel in general revenue and disappears in wasteful spending. This is not a good budget for this state. It does not do anything for the jobs crisis; it does not do anything for minerals; it does not do anything for agriculture; and it does not do anything, in my mind, for regional South Australia.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (19:50): I rise to make a contribution to the budget debate. I am pleased to support this bill and a budget that supports the community. It is aimed at creating jobs and providing a much needed strengthening of the economy. This year's budget has been framed with the changing times in mind and an eye to protecting those less able to speak up or adapt to change.

The continued failure of the federal government to invest in South Australian jobs while having its hands in the pockets of the most vulnerable in society has, and will continue to have, a profound effect on the state. Just today, we saw a rally highlighting the loss of \$1 billion in federal funding for jobs in the social and community sectors. Services will disappear for many already in intolerable situations.

There is no doubt that over the coming months and years Australia is going to face some tough economic times and, as we have seen, South Australia will not be immune. And so, the way our federation works into the future will be crucial. States and territories must be treated equitably and fairly, and agreements must be honoured to ensure certainty and effective planning. States have limited ways of raising revenue and will always rely on federal funding to help provide the services we all believe are essential.

South Australia is facing a good deal of change, particularly in employment, and that is why jobs are the centrepiece of the reforms in the budget and are rightly identified as the single most important of the challenges this state faces. Many factors have been involved in these employment challenges—the high Australian dollar and the drop in commodity prices, to name just two. Without significant intervention by governments, both federal and state, the closure and downsizing of large South Australian employers such as Holden, Alinta at Port Augusta power plant, the Leigh Creek coal mine, and just last week BHP, with its announcement about Olympic Dam, will have devastating effects on the economy and the community at large.

Transitioning our manufacturing industries is the highest priority. The need to focus on job creation and retraining for the already highly skilled workforce at Holden's at Elizabeth, and the other sites where car components are made, will receive additional state funding. There is no doubt that this transition has had to begin much sooner than anyone would have wanted.

The future of the Australian Submarine Corporation and contracts for submarine and frigate builds in Adelaide is an issue that should be of national importance and an obvious choice when weighing up and deciding what is best. This year's budget sees almost \$985 million invested into tax reform to create jobs that will deliver significant benefits for South Australia as a whole and, I am pleased to say, also in the Florey electorate.

There is a large number of small to medium businesses in the Florey electorate, and the reforms the Treasurer has outlined will give businesses the much-needed boost they have been looking for to grow and create real job opportunities. The area mainly around the Florey electorate office is a hub of small to medium, mostly retail, businesses—supermarkets, takeaway businesses,

hairdressers and gyms, motor and clothing shops, to name a few. These tax refunds will directly benefit these businesses. Payroll tax rebates will allow local businesses to invest in their operations, increase their competitiveness with large chains in the area, and allow for the creation of real jobs for real people in the coming years.

The budget has prioritised job creation at a time when it is really needed. This year, over \$1 billion will be committed on productive state infrastructure, underpinning long-term job creation, because we know public sector investment influences private sector spends and creates real jobs. This investment will see around 4,700 jobs per year created over the next four years.

This investment includes the project to deliver the extension to the O-Bahn track. The O-Bahn service is a very important service for those who live in the northern and north-eastern suburbs. The extension will cut significant time off the journey from Tea Tree Plaza interchange to the priority bus lanes on Grenfell Street in the city. Making the service more efficient and effective will encourage more commuters to utilise this important and more cost-effective way of travel. It will reduce congestion on our roads and greenhouse gas emissions, and deliver a project of significance for the CBD. This project alone is expected to generate around 450 jobs over the life of the project, something I am very pleased to hear.

There are big commitments to the regions as they face the changes in the mining industry, changes that will test all of us and our resilience. There is an emphasis on our state's strength in areas like food production, tourism, research and collaboration, and international education. A very important, yet perhaps downplayed, investment in terms of its significance is the investment over the next four years into international education.

There are more than 30,000 international students enrolled in South Australian educational institutions, and the sector is worth an estimated \$972 million to the state each year. It is great to see the government investing \$5.7 million over the next four years into this sector. This investment will help put our state ahead of the rest of Australia in terms of investment in international education and give us a competitive edge against other states.

International students arriving from 2017 will be guaranteed accommodation when they are accepted into a university, removing the requirement for them to, sometimes with difficulty, search for accommodation before arriving. This guarantee will bring together for the first time universities and private accommodation providers for the benefit of students. Having seen how much the international education sector is worth to South Australia, I am pleased that the Florey electorate will be directly positively affected by this investment. The Florey electorate has an international student accommodation facility in the Modbury central area. This investment will ensure these rooms continue to be filled with students, and the flow-on effects of students spending money in the economy will be of great benefit to local businesses and employers.

Provision is also made for upgrades to school and early-year facilities in the budget, with local schools in Florey receiving additional maintenance funding. Unlike the severe austerity measures seen across Australia and the world in recent years, which have proven not to work and have affected the most vulnerable, this government's budget commits South Australia to long-term public investment plans in key project areas, like for example the \$3.3 billion per year into key health projects and infrastructure. This government is working hard to make South Australia's the best in the nation and this investment, coupled with health reforms, shows it is still a major priority.

I am delighted that this \$3.3 billion includes a \$32 million investment in the Modbury Hospital, which will deliver for those living in the Florey electorate and those further afield in the northern and north-eastern suburbs. This investment will see rehab services upgraded by addition of a new swimming pool and gymnasium in the hospital precinct. These projects will allow for more and better rehab services to be provided in state-of-the-art facilities and, importantly, these services can be provided closer to home, often a major factor that prevents some patients, particularly the elderly, from undertaking these rehab services in a timely manner, often to the detriment of their health and recovery from major incidents.

Transforming Health changes are designed to give us access to the best health care possible first time, every time. It is a big aim with a big budget, so it is important that everyone understands how service delivery will work for them from now on and into the future. I want everybody to realise

rumours around Modbury Hospital are just that, and it is appalling that people are still peddling these untruths, creating unnecessary distress, particularly when people are needing health services and therefore at their most vulnerable. They must cease. This investment in Modbury Hospital, together with further investment in other key hospitals such as the Lyell McEwin and the Royal Adelaide, and a \$5 million boost to medical research at the SAHMRI precinct, will also see longer-term solutions found to continuing health conditions and problems facing the community.

This budget is a big-picture investment in the future of the state. The Treasurer and countless public sector employees have spent significant time and effort putting this budget together to ensure it can mitigate some of the effects from these tough economic times and the impact of the federal government's current and previous harsh budgets. I commend them for their work. I support this budget because the Weatherill government is a government that is sticking up for South Australians when others will not. Just as it has done for this state in water, it is doing it again for this state in submarines and many other areas. Let us work at the changes that face us together; do not just carp and talk things down. With everybody on side, South Australia will adapt and carve out a better future for each of us, our communities, and our great state.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): The member for Schubert.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (19:58): Thank you, Acting Speaker. Congratulations on your promotion; I hope it comes with a second parliamentary car and driver! I would like to acknowledge some friends I have in the gallery tonight who have been in with me. Thank you very much for coming in. I made it a condition of their dinner that they have to listen to me speak, so for the next 15 to 20 minutes I apologise to the rest of you, but not necessarily to them.

Can I say, Acting Speaker, that the Treasurer came into this place on 18 June and he spoke with a level of hyperbole that I think would make Homer Simpson blush. He came in here talking about this budget being a reformist budget and of this budget being a landmark budget, and I am not going to stand here and requote Simpsons Wikipedia—I think that is publicly available information that all people can see.

Mr Pederick: We'd hate you to do that.

Mr KNOLL: That's right. But can I say, for a reformist budget, this budget fails to deliver on so many different levels. The centrepiece of this budget is cuts to stamp duty, but these cuts do not fully come into effect until after the 2018 election. The Treasurer stood up here today and said we were trying to flip-flop on our decision on whether or not we support tax cuts. Of course the Liberal Party supports tax cuts; it is in our DNA. But for the Treasurer to sit there and say, 'We are going to save the economy, but we are going to save the economy after the next election, we are not going to save the economy now,' belies the fact that this government does not take the fact that we are in a jobs crisis seriously.

We have need of relief now. The jobs crisis is one that we have now. The unemployment rate is 7.6 per cent in seasonally adjusted terms and that is not in 2018, that is happening now. The job losses that we have seen at Leigh Creek, BHP, Arrium, Holden's, Santos, Caroma Industries and JBS Australia are job losses that are happening now. We heard just the other day about Tagara and the job losses that are almost certain to happen there. This is a crisis that is on our doorstep and it is here right now and the government, if it was serious about dealing with this issue, would commit to reform right now.

The second point that I would make about the stamp duty cuts is the fact that this is not a reformist agenda. In fact, this is an agenda that the government committed to be implemented in 2009-10. It was a reform that the government committed to reintroducing in 2012 and on both points the government squibbed their opportunity for reform in this area. To come in this place and reannounce for the third time that they are going to implement a reform is the same way that they come in here and talk about the infrastructure saviour of South Australia being the electrification of the Gawler rail line. It genuinely is a case of 'We will believe it when we see it.'

If this government was committed to dealing with the crisis that we have on our doorstep right now then it would commit to payroll tax reform. Payroll tax reform would hit at the heart of the disincentive that there is to employ people that is inherent in payroll tax. It would deal with payroll tax swiftly. It would deal with payroll tax in more than just a two-bit way by extending the threshold offset

for a further 12 months. If this government was committed to dealing with the jobs crisis then it would not try and pass off \$1.3 billion a year of infrastructure spending as being anything other than a cut, which is exactly what it is. The government would commit to building the Northern Connector straightaway. It would commit to finalising the investigation into the Strzelecki Track.

I am a little bit of a student of history in this place and it disappoints me that many in the community do not respect Sir Thomas Playford as they should. Sir Thomas Playford is unequivocally the greatest man to ever sit in this chamber. As he looks down upon us—and interestingly he looks down upon me—he judges me on a daily basis. He should judge this government on a daily basis because of their ability to denigrate and their ability to make South Australia much less of an entity than it once was.

When Sir Thomas Playford completed his term of office in 1965, South Australia was the third most populous state in Australia. South Australia was the third largest state economy in Australia. South Australia had doubled its population over the preceding 30 years. South Australia had brought hundreds of thousands of manufacturing jobs—in that time new industry jobs—to South Australia. This is a man who through his wit, tenacity and undying love for South Australia managed to cobble together what was otherwise an agricultural commodity-based economy and turn it into a manufacturing powerhouse. Ever since that time and undoubtedly over the last 13 years this government has sought to work away bit by bit at the legacy of the beautiful Sir Thomas Playford.

It is a legacy that we here should all acknowledge and it is lessons that we should all be learning. He was a great man whose legacy to South Australia should be taught fervently in year 10 Australian studies and social studies to make sure that we are aware of his remarkable history and that we give thanks for the fact that he was born in South Australia and did the good work that he did.

If the government was serious about dealing with the jobs crisis then it would deal with the waste, mismanagement and blowouts in this budget. Exhibit A is the fact that once again the government blew their own budget estimates from last year, this time to the tune of \$201 million. This comes on the back of \$331 million that they blew in their budget last year for a total of \$4.1 billion over the time that they have been in office. This figure will stand to condemn them for many years to come and is something that we on this side of the house will continue to remind the government of because it is an absolute shame. If I look at the opportunity cost of what that \$4.1 billion could deliver for South Australia, it beggars belief, not the least of which could be between \$40 million to \$70 million for a new Barossa hospital.

So where did the waste and the blowouts come from? We look no further than the health and ageing department which blew its budget by \$118 million; the education and child development department which blew its budget by \$56 million; communities and social inclusion was \$39 million; Attorney-General's by \$10 million; and planning, transport and infrastructure by \$95 million.

I could go on but the interesting thing is that in this year's budget there are only two departments out of all the selected agencies listed in the budget that did not blow out their expenses, and they were police and primary industries. Apart from that, every single minister needs to stand condemned because of the wasteful mismanagement of their own budgets. It is really frustrating that, because they cannot get their house in order, they find an ever-increasing number of ways, whether it be ESL increases, probate fee increases, stray dog fine increases and increased collection of speeding fines, to tax South Australians to pay for the fact that they cannot manage their own budget. It is an absolute disgrace.

That is why we cannot believe that next year there will be a \$43 million surplus because, if they have on average wasted about \$200 million a year in cost blowouts, that \$43 million surplus does not stand a chance. In fact, the figure would probably need to be about 10 times that size in order to withstand the waste and gross mismanagement that this government reports in its budget every single year.

It is interesting to look at the budget and at the fiscal targets that the government sets for itself. Its first fiscal target, and I will read it here, is 'a net operating surplus by the end of the forward estimates'. Now if I was a cynical person, and after 15 months in this place I am becoming slightly

more so, I would suggest that the government will meet its target as long as somewhere in the budget over the next four years it tells us it is going to deliver a surplus.

It does not say in this budget, 'We will deliver a surplus,' as one of its fiscal targets. All it says is, 'Across the forward estimates, somewhere off into the deep dark future, as long as we say that there is a plus sign and as long as we suggest that at some point we are going to get back into the black, we would have done our job.' The target does not say, 'We will actually have to deliver on this promise, as long as somewhere off into the future we promise we are going to do it,' and I think that is an absolute disgrace.

Having said that, I have to commend the government for achieving their target because over the last four years all they have done is predict surpluses well off into the future and none of them have been delivered—\$279 million again in this financial year and none have been delivered. How do I know that none of these surpluses have been delivered? It is because the amount of waste that exists within this government knows almost no bounds.

The first cab off the rank this evening—and you will note my repeated interest in waste and mismanagement; it does seem to be a hobbyhorse of mine and I hope to be the person who penny pinches on behalf of the South Australian people for many years to come—is that this government's targeted voluntary separation package scheme has been nothing short of a disaster: \$378 million has been spent for no net reduction in Public Service numbers.

The fundamental idea behind this program is the fact that we should be able to reduce the size of the Public Service and we have not been able to achieve it. In fact, the budget last year suggested that we would be 1,600 FTEs lower than this year's budget estimates for this coming 12 months—1,600 jobs.

To have spent \$378 million and to end up with such a disastrous figure, on the government's own figures, makes this program an absolute waste of time. If it was going to work it would have worked by now because the government has just halved the redundancy payout from two years to one year of salary, so if people were going to take those packages they already would have and, indeed, they already have.

If I look at the budget papers, in 2013-14, 1,479 people took TVSPs and in 2014-15, with the new regime in place, only 164 people took them. I do not mind that because I would suggest that that is less government money being wasted, but the whole point of the program in the first place is now lost because they have not been able to achieve their reduction targets. As always, as with the surplus, the target reduction number is always off into the never-never and the difficulty that I have is that, the closer we get to the next election, the less likely these targets are going to be achieved. If they were going to be achieved, those figures would have been achieved last year and this year, and it seems quite obvious to me that they are never going to be achieved.

There have been instances throughout this TVSP program where people have been given a payout, only to be hired by another government department weeks later. So, we are giving someone either one or two years' salary, and that person then goes to get another job within government only a couple of months later. There was an instance of a 76-year-old man being offered a redundancy. I am sure for him and his family that was Christmas, all paid for by the taxpayers.

There was an instance where an executive payout was given to somebody who was only one year into a five-year contract, and also an instance where somebody who had only two months left to go on their contract was given an executive termination payment of four months' pay. It would have been cheaper for them to sit in the transit lounge for two months than pay out that four months. But, heaven knows, this government knows no bounds when it comes to wasting taxpayers' money.

The government wasted \$226,000 building a website on STEM Australia that it took down 12 months later. This government wasted \$50,000 buying 85-inch TVs for parliament to replace 55-inch ones that were only 18 months old. The government wasted \$80,000 preparing the World Design Capital bid, only to abandon the bid and not even follow through to see if we would get there in the end.

The government wasted \$3 million spruiking the Transforming Health cuts instead of actually delivering better health care for South Australians; they thought they would go out there and spruik

health cuts. The government wasted \$550,000 on the botched emergency services reform—money wasted because the minister did such a bad job that they managed to get the entire sector off side, except for the United Firefighters Union, which was strangely silent. But, the rest of the sector were completely against the reforms, for what otherwise should have been a completely normal process aimed at getting better outcomes for the emergency services sector.

This government wastes \$1.6 million a year leasing office space it does not use, office space that is sitting empty because the government cannot manage to make sure that, if they are going to lease office space, they actually have some people to fill it. The government also wastes \$500,000 a year on buildings that it owns that remain empty and untenanted, that is, leasing income forgone.

This government spends \$90,000 a week cleaning Housing Trust tenants' properties instead of using that money to ensure that its roughly 1,000 vacant Housing SA properties are fixed and able to be tenanted. So, instead of dealing with the 22,000 person wait list that Housing SA (Housing Trust) properties currently have, they spend \$90,000 a week cleaning properties on behalf of themselves, something I do not think the private sector would countenance.

Each of these figures seems quite small in the context of a \$16 billion budget. Each of these figures I will admit will not, in and of themselves, help to deal with the \$201 million blowout, or deal with the incompetent waste and mismanagement that this government undertakes over a \$16 billion budget. But, all of these figures add up. These figures in the hundreds of thousands, the tens of thousands, the few millions, all add up. They add up to hundred of millions of dollars.

We sit in this place squabbling about the ESL increase of \$90 million a year or about the removal of remissions. We sit here talking about the northern connector project, we talk about the Paradise Interchange project, we talk about the Oaklands Park overpass project. All of these things could be paid if the government just took a different attitude and dealt with the culture of waste that exists, the culture that says that it is okay for a government department to spend \$6.50 on a cup of coffee, as opposed to the \$3.50 to \$4 that normal people would expect to pay.

It is endemic, and the more I look at this and the more information that is given to me, it says to me that there is a culture that, because it is somebody else's money and not the hard-earned money I put in my own packet, somehow the government as a quantum and as a whole have a different decision-making process than what I would do with my own money. That is why we on this side of the house call for smaller government: because we do not trust governments to be able to spend money properly and appropriately. We believe individuals are much better able, because they have a personal financial interest, to make sure that money is spent properly.

So, when a public servant, walking to their office, goes past a coffee shop in the morning and decides that \$3.50 is a good value proposition to buy a decent cup of coffee, they are right. But, if that same government employee then sits in their office and decides that spending \$6.50 on a cup of coffee is okay, that is the type of thing I have a problem with. I have a problem with so many different examples where it is deemed okay for the government to spend over the odds for different projects, and it is cultural and it is something we need to grapple with, and it is something the government needs to grapple with in order to be able to change the culture so that we do get a spend for South Australia.

I am going to tell you that on that score there is one man, whose painting hangs in this chamber, who was an extremely frugal man: Sir Thomas Playford. Sir Thomas Playford was a bloke who was so tight that he would not allow the public servants to put a telephone in his house because he considered it a waste of time. This is the same man who retired with an FJ Holden, which is the same car that he had had and been servicing himself for 20 years. This is the same man who, instead of buying fancy new bits of kit that he knew South Australia could not afford, would buy second-hand bits of kit and make sure that they worked properly.

Sir Thomas Playford was a man who made sure that every cent of South Australian taxpayers' money was used to the best example as it could be. This is a man who had one secretary, a sergeant standing at the door and one office adviser. We now have a Department of the Premier and Cabinet that has over 100 staff, where Tom Playford decided that he could do it by himself with three staff. The reason is that he trusted his department to be able to do their job properly, and if he

had an issue he would call them up on the phone. Nowadays we have a public sector that has blown out way above inflation and way above what the broader population growth has been, and it is an absolute shame.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: You really have been on Wikipedia tonight, haven't you?

Mr KNOLL: The member for Newland interjects, but the difficulty I have is that we need to change this culture, because otherwise we are not going to be able to put our budget back on track. As a last question before I wrap up, I was reading the Appropriation Bill, which is a short bill. It is a short bill that says that the government should have the authority to spend \$12 billion, but it is only two pages long, and that is okay. There is a question that I would like to explore in committee relating to part 4(2) of the bill, which provides:

The aggregate of the amounts issued and applied by the Treasurer under subsection (1) and under the Supply Act 2015 for each of the purposes listed in Schedule 1 must not exceed the amount set out opposite each of those purposes in that Schedule.

In the schedule it lists all the departments and all the administered items for each of the departments. For instance, the Attorney-General's Department gets to spend \$109,678,000. What I want to know is, if this bill suggests that the government 'must not exceed the amount set out opposite', what happens when they blow the budget? Does that figure come out of this figure? I may only be a naïve first-term MP, I may only be a simple, humble sausage maker—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are not humble.

Mr KNOLL: Unfortunately, machines have replaced the job that I used to do with my younger brother.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is what has happened everywhere.

Mr KNOLL: In fact, my brother and I could only get about 100 or 150 kilos an hour, but these new machines that have replaced us can get up to about 400 kilos an hour. Nevertheless, if I was to metaphorically be standing there at my sausage-making machine linking my sausages at 75 kilos per person per hour, I might be wondering to the Treasurer, 'How is it that in the Appropriation Bill it says that you must not exceed the budget that you set for yourself, yet the government is able to exceed the budget that it sets for itself?' It is a question that I look forward to exploring with smarter people than I in committee, and I am looking forward to a satisfactory answer from the government.

With those few words, can I remind everybody to go home and read *Playford, Benevolent Despot*, written by Mr Cockburn. I will be distributing exams into the pigeonholes of lower house members later this week and I expect 100 per cent pass marks by all members involved.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We will abstain. Sadly, your time has expired. We will have to wait for committee.

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) (20:18): What a pleasure it is to follow the member for Schubert.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The simple sausage maker.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, the mere sausage maker, with his very erudite call to arms for a return to the sort of socialism which Sir Thomas Playford imposed on South Australia. He was a great man; I completely agree with the member for Schubert. He introduced such forward thinking innovations as nationalising the Adelaide Electric Supply Company, which of course owned a power plant down at Osborne, of which my grandfather was the superintendent for a number of years. He also made it a very high priority for his government to continually invest in manufacturing operations. Indeed, he thought it was a great economic development policy to seek out new manufacturing opportunities and prosecute those for the benefit of developing a new working class in Adelaide's northern suburbs, making sure that there were levels of government assistance available for car manufacturing operations. What a salutary lesson we could be learning today from the musings of the member for Schubert. And, of course, I am proud—

Mr Gardner: We could probably afford to renationalise electricity if we—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Gardner: —cut down to three staff in PMC.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am interested to hear the member for Morialta say that his party, after selling ETSA, should now repurchase it. It is great to have these interjections, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, it's not; they are out of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It is akin to the sort of economic development investments that we have been making over the past 13 years, investing what was an unprecedented amount in the Techport Australia facility at Osborne, with a \$3 million investment in an effort to secure not just an air warfare destroyer contract but, of course, the Future Submarines contract, which was committed to by the then federal Labor government, as well as the then federal Liberal opposition, to be built here in South Australia—a project which would deliver not just many thousands of direct jobs, and a very substantial boost to the state's gross state product, but would have much wider flow-on benefits for our state.

So, I thank the member for Schubert for his contribution, reminding us about the backflips and the policy failures which his national party have imposed on South Australia and the sorts of economic detriments that they have been visiting onto our community. With that point aside, could I also say that, as Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, it gives me great pleasure to welcome and speak on our Treasurer's second budget to be delivered in our state, one which recommits our state to the sorts of investments and economic infrastructure which have become a hallmark of Labor over the past decade.

When you look back through the list, the record is impressive: improving the freighter export and import facilities at Outer Harbor by investing in deepening the channel there; investing in the Port River Expressway and the opening road and rail bridges down there, again to improve export efficiency; linking the Mid North and the Barossa Valley to our export facilities with the Northern Expressway; duplicating that great policy folly of the former Liberal government, the Southern Expressway; improving freight movements and other movements on top of the freight and logistics area at Wingfield with the South Road Superway project; and securing a sustainable water supply, not just for our community but also for industry, with the Adelaide Desalination Plant.

I have already mentioned the Techport Australia investment, but in addition there are ongoing improvements to the Sturt and Dukes highway upgrades, working in partnership with the commonwealth, which is something I am very pleased to have had an opportunity to do; developing a new burgeoning industry here in South Australia with the SA Health and Medical Research Institute; and supporting our tourism industry, not just here in Adelaide but with the flow-on benefits across the state, with two stages of investment in the Adelaide Convention Centre project.

That is just the economic infrastructure; that does not go to the investment in the new Royal Adelaide Hospital; the Adelaide Oval; the new schools public-private partnership, which we have delivered; refurbishments of all our major metropolitan hospitals, which have been delivered; two stages of the tram extension; and the extension and electrification of the Noarlunga line (now Seaford line).

I am very pleased that, based on this vast list of achievements, there is further money available in the next four years to continue these sorts of investments. Indeed, the Treasurer has said that in the coming financial year there will be \$1.3 billion of infrastructure spend just in the general government sector. Across the entire government (both the general government sector and the non-financial public sector), there will be \$10.8 billion of infrastructure investment over the next four years.

These are historically high levels against where we were when we came into government, when the level of capital investment made by the former Liberal government was not even keeping up with depreciation, at least in book-value terms, actively running down the state's assets.

This is not a bad juncture at which to pause and consider the sort of record which was left to South Australia by the former Liberal administration. Much is made, of course, of former treasurer Lucas's record of selling ETSA. The excuse was, at the time, to pay down state debt. Of course, after concluding that transaction, what did the then treasurer do? That is right: he racked up four continual budget deficits totalling over \$1 billion. So, not only was debt paid off but over a third of it was racked up again within four years.

Fortunately, through some more robust and sound financial management across the public sector, the first seven budgets of this Labor government were significantly in surplus. I note with some mirth the statistic the member for Schubert quotes about cumulative deficits while of course completely failing to recognise the significant amount of surpluses already delivered by this government, but then again that sort of horrendous record is the record of the person who we understand is the chief economic adviser to the Leader of the Opposition. That is the role that we are told the Hon. Rob Lucas plays from the other place: he is the chief economic adviser for the Leader of the Opposition—and what a stellar job he is doing.

Of course, the member for Schubert for another reason is right to mourn the passing of Sir Thomas Playford because what a pale imitation of a leader we are given in the Leader of the Opposition compared with somebody who was actually able to (a) come up with economic policies and (b) promulgate them throughout the community, let alone implement them. The complete lack of effort and diligence we have had from the leader in this respect is stunning.

Indeed, if we consider my portfolio areas at the last election, it is interesting to have a look at what was committed to by the leader and the deputy leader. What was the leader's and deputy leader's position on a very strong project for the north-south corridor, the Torrens to Torrens Project, a project with a cost-benefit ratio of 2.4:1? 'We should cancel that.' We should take the money from that and we should invest it in a \$1 billion scheme up at Darlington which had a cost benefit ratio of 0.6:1—it did not even stack up—in partnership with the commonwealth.

Fortunately for our state, wiser heads prevailed. The Labor government was returned, and I sat down with Jamie Briggs, somebody who recognises the value of investing in infrastructure, unlike the Leader of the Opposition we have. For an investment by the state government of an additional \$50 million, instead of the \$520 million that the leader and the deputy leader wanted to commit to the Darlington project, instead of securing one project of \$1 billion we got two projects of \$1.5 billion, both of which have a strong cost-benefit ratio.

So, thank goodness we were spared the efforts of the leader and the deputy leader when it came to upgrading the north-south corridor, but that is not where they left their efforts on the north-south corridor. The leader said that he wanted a full plan, a 10-year plan, for upgrading the north-south corridor, of course reiterating the commitment that had already being given by my predecessor, now Treasurer Tom Koutsantonis, and the then commonwealth government to develop such a strategy.

So, a reannouncement of what was not even a Labor election policy but just an ongoing government commitment was the centrepiece of their infrastructure commitments to the South Australian community, that and something else which was reiterated today, something which the leader is confident will unlock streams of gold to invest in infrastructure—that is, the creation of a committee, the creation of infrastructure South Australia, a committee which will front and centre replicate the work that is already being done by Infrastructure Australia, which will replicate the work that is already being done by the independent Public Service which already serves the South Australian community.

What strong economic policy that is! Let's appoint a group of potentially disaffected retired former Liberal MPs so that they can tell us what we want to then tell the community or so that they can present us with some work which we can then present to Infrastructure Australia.

Mr Williams: Tell us about the O-Bahn.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I will tell you about the O-Bahn. Thank you, member for MacKillop.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am on my feet; sit down. The member for MacKillop, I will have a look and see where you landed up at the end of question time. You are about to speak, sir, and you will expect the house to listen to you. I remind members of standing order 142, and the minister will be heard in silence. Minister.

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, sir, you are on one warning. I can let you know that now.

Mr WILLIAMS: I realise that, Madam Deputy Speaker. I ask you to call the minister back to the subject of the debate which is—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I cannot hear what he is saying because you are interjecting out of your place. If you sit down, we will listen to him—

Mr WILLIAMS: He has not mentioned the budget.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you sit down, sir, we will listen to him carefully and remind you that you will wish to be heard in silence yourself in your own turn.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It is a wonderful education for a first-term MP to have the member for MacKillop raise points of order, each more tedious than the last.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Back to the subject please.

Mr Picton: What not to do.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, that is right—what not to do, says the member for Kaurana. Of course, the last commitment which was made by the leader and the deputy leader at the last election was that they absolutely categorically ruled out the introduction of tolls here in South Australia. I remember vividly the language that the deputy leader used in her press release. She said tolls, even on heavy vehicles, were the thin end of the wedge with a slippery slope to tolls on all other vehicles. Of course, what happened? One hundred and thirty days after the last state election, very quietly and furtively, the deputy leader has backflipped and started welcoming in tolls. So, in the deputy leader's own words, she welcomes in tolls on light vehicles here in South Australia.

I suspect that that is because the deputy leader and the leader think that this is the way to secure funding for the north-south corridor, forgetting that with the delivery of the Northern Expressway, the Port River Expressway, the South Road Superway, the ANZAC Underpass, the tram overpass over South Road and the duplication of the Southern Expressway with the Torrens to Torrens and Darlington projects, \$3.5 billion of upgrades to the north-south corridor will be delivered without the need for one toll or one charge on a heavy or light vehicle.

But that is perhaps also to segue into the other positioning which has occurred here today by the leader. In the absence of being able to develop his own policy—and of course we know that he is not interested in the social issues. After his budget reply speech today we know he is not interested in the economic ones either. We would wonder why perhaps he is here at all, but I understand there are some people on the front bench on the other side who are actively working on that problem right now.

In an effort to position himself to try to claim the credit for the work that other people are doing both at the state and federal level, he has now shown two years after the state government's interest and after the interest that the member for Stuart shows he has finally shown some interest in the Strzelecki Track. He has finally realised that maybe this might be a good thing for the South Australian economy and by going out and saying in the media tonight that he supports the Strzelecki Track, maybe he will think that nobody else has mentioned this, that this is some bolt out of the blue for him, some brainwave that will be the economic salvation. Of course, none of us on either side of the chamber—not the member for Stuart and certainly not anyone on this side of the chamber—is that silly, and we know that once again it is the leader playing catch-up on other people's policies.

Up until now, perhaps up until today, he has always called infrastructure spending a false economy. He has always said that the wages taken home by people who are wearing hi-vis vests,

who are in construction jobs or engineering jobs or detailed technical jobs, the wages that they take home to put food on the table, to make sure they can put their children through school, to make sure that they can have meaningful fulfilling lives with a work component to that, is a false economy. That is something that should not be prioritised.

Of course, the Prime Minister Tony Abbott does not agree with that. He wants to be known as the infrastructure prime minister because he at least is one Liberal who recognised the value of investing in infrastructure. I look forward to continuing to work with him, our Treasurer, our Premier, and the Assistant Minister for Infrastructure, Jamie Briggs, on unlocking some further infrastructure funding. I can tell you it will not be thanks to the efforts of the Leader of the Opposition.

The member for MacKillop for his frivolous points of order did raise the O-Bahn, and I am very glad that we are investing in public transport infrastructure. Lord knows one side of politics needs to make it a priority because it certainly has been completely neglected by the other. I saw the member for Mitchell at the train station. It is good that he becomes familiar with public transport facilities like that. I am sure that it is a rare exception for public transport spokespeople from the opposition to actually experience public transport services. I admire him for getting out and about and seeing what the other 250,000 people in Adelaide think is important.

I am glad that we continue to invest money into improving our public transport infrastructure, and the O-Bahn—our most highly patronised public transport route—is central to that, as has been the extension of the tram network, as has been the electrification of the Seaford line, as is also the money that we have in the forward estimates for the electrification of the Gawler line.

All the while, since 2008 when these plans were promulgated by the government, silence, stony silence from the opposition about public transport. There has been not one policy to buy a new bus, not one policy to expand bus services, not one policy to buy new trains or expand train services or improve them through electrification. There has been complete and utter disinterest in public transport and public transport policy.

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Of course, on that interjection from the member for Morialta—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Which you won't respond to.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —it is perhaps timely to whip through some of the issues that members on the other side are wont to raise in this chamber. The member for Mitchell, of course, is a passionate advocate for the Oaklands crossing; indeed, he has even asked me questions during question time about the Oaklands crossing, but when the opportunity came for the Liberal Party to put their money where their mouth is at the last election and say would they do anything about the Oaklands crossing, there was silence. In fact, when the member for Mitchell—

Mr Wingard interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Order, member for Mitchell!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: When the member for Mitchell convened a public meeting about the Oaklands crossing, he went out there, he tried to whip up some discontent, he tried to get some more votes for himself in his seat, and eventually, when they turned on him and said, 'What would you do, Corey Wingard?', it was the sort of vacillation which was writ large on Matthew Pantelis's program on FIVEaa.

Mr Wingard interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mitchell!

Mr GARDNER: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have a point of order that is not frivolous, I hope, member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: No. I think at some point the minister should get back to the substance of the debate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: He is nearly finished. The minister will continue.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Deputy Speaker.

Mr Wingard interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for Mitchell, order! You are on a call to order. I will have to warn you if you continue.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I believe this is called pressing the bruise.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Minister, do not respond to interjections, and the member for Mitchell will be warned if he continues.

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: And you will be warned as well, and you are already about to leave us, so just keep it quiet. Minister.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: This will not be frivolous, will it?

The Hon. P. CAICA: It will not be frivolous at all. I think that any fair assessment of the rundown of the clock would say that he has missed out on—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No; I think if we can pack a lot into the next two minutes—

The Hon. P. CAICA: —at least a minute of his time.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If the minister would like to continue, he is wasting 10 seconds of his time.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. Of course, I am glad that the budget also contains a very substantial upgrade and investment in road maintenance and also shoulder sealing. In fact, the figures presented to me show that we will be spending, in road maintenance and road upgrades, \$400 million over the next four years. That is in addition to new money we are spending on bike lanes. I noted the deputy leader's head in the sand approach when it came to protecting cyclists on Portrush Road in her constituency. She does not believe in bike lanes, and that is fair enough, but at least we are doing something to protect them.

I should also point out that while we continue to work on getting more road funding out there, at least we are able to work with those regional members of parliament from the other side, those people who are able to come to government and say, 'Look, we think this is important. We think that is important,' and we are able to work with them. All I would say is, if only we had some metropolitan members of parliament from the other side who were capable of doing that there might actually be a constructive transport, or public transport, debate in South Australia.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (20:38): I too rise to speak to the Appropriation Bill. As we take a look at this year's budget it is an ideal time to take stock and see what it really means for the people in our community. It is wonderful to hear the transport minister prattle on, but when we hear the Treasurer spruik his message in the chamber or on TV, what does the budget really mean to South Australians is the question we are left asking.

I have been out and I have asked. I have doorknocked. I have been to the local shops. I went to the pub to listen over a beer. I have been to the schools in my community and to sporting events and the message was very clear. People were quite blunt in their response and no-one was very kind to Treasurer Koutsantonis, but there was one stand-out factor that, to a person, almost everyone raised with me when I brought up the budget. The key question was: why does South Australia continue to slide so far behind all the other states?

I asked a number of people if they thought this was a jobs budget, as described by Treasurer Koutsantonis. Do you know what they said? They recited South Australia's unemployment figure:

7.6 per cent, and it was noted that we had fallen behind in South Australia. We were the worst state in the nation. That is right, this Labor government has taken us straight to the bottom. Youth unemployment is an even bigger issue in the south of Adelaide, as members opposite would also know, and that was also raised in my conversations. People want to know why it is so much worse here in Adelaide and across South Australia compared with other states. There were 8,700 full-time jobs lost in South Australia last month, a figure that is absolutely staggering, and it is what they are talking about out in my community.

This year's budget predicts employment growth of 1 per cent for 2015-16; however, last year's budget predicted employment growth of 1.25 per cent for 2015-16, so the supposed jobs budget is actually predicting lower employment growth for 2015-16. This one percentage point growth is the lowest growth of all mainland states. There is no surprise there, and that is what people are telling me when I go out and speak to them on the streets.

National employment growth will be 1.5 per cent and employment growth in Victoria is also estimated to be 1.5 per cent, but not here in South Australia. In fact, the Treasurer has downgraded our employment growth to 1 per cent. In 2014-15 Labor predicted 1 per cent employment growth for that financial year, but actually delivered only 0.5 per cent growth. As we said, that has resulted in a 7.6 per cent unemployment rate in May 2015, which is the highest in the nation. That is what people are talking about when the Treasurer talks about a jobs budget; they are talking about our 7.6 unemployment rate, that is the highest in the country—mainland and Tasmania. Tasmania has surged ahead of us.

They also talk about the deficit of this budget. The deficit for the financial year 2014-15 is \$279 million, which is an increase of almost \$100 million on the December 2014 Mid-Year Budget Review estimate of \$185 million deficit. The blowout from \$185 million to \$279 million occurred despite the government raiding \$459 million from the MAC. When you say it quickly, a blowout from \$185 million to \$279 million does not sound that bad, but it is horrendous. The people of South Australia are catching on, and they know that is how this government operates.

In relation to GST from the federal government, the government's GST revenue over the forward estimates is \$892 million. More than last year's budget estimates, this \$892 million was unbudgeted and is therefore a bonus. GST revenue in 2018-19 will be \$1.66 billion more than GST revenue in 2014-15.

Stamp duty is another thing. The Treasurer spruiked on about stamp duty on non-real property transfers and non-residential real property transfers being abolished. They were commitments South Australia made back in 2001 as part of the intergovernmental agreement on the GST, and various commitments made by the Labor government since then have not been implemented. In the 2005-06 budget Labor promised they would be abolished by 2009-10—another broken promise, another false promise, another example of this government's financial mismanagement.

The Treasurer has talked about relief for households in this budget. Well, I go out and talk to people and yes, they are happy that the Save the River Murray levy has been abolished; that will save them \$40 per annum. However, the government continues to slug, on average, homes valued at \$500,000 an extra \$205 a year due to emergency services levy increases in the last two budgets. This government has just put its hand in the back pockets of homeowners and ripped cash out like you would not believe through its hikes in the emergency services levy. People out there I speak to know, they are aware, they see what is happening and they know that this government is just ripping money out of their back pockets to pay for its financial mismanagement.

The ESL hikes do not even add one extra dollar to our emergency services as well. We know they are good people working hard in our communities, giving back, but when people have to double the amount they are paying in their emergency services levies and not \$1 extra is going to emergency services they feel very, very upset.

Motor registration charges are up \$7 and drivers licence costs go up; a 10-year licence is now \$410. We just keep pushing these costs and charges for households up and up and up, and the people I speak to have had enough. Unbudgeted expenditure as well in 2014-15—the government overspent its budget by \$201 million. The total unbudgeted spending since the government was

elected is now \$4.1 billion. That is hard to stomach and the people out there have had enough of this government just frittering away their hard earned taxpayer dollars.

Population growth in South Australia is half the national average. People are leaving this state in droves. People just cannot get jobs here. There are no opportunities here and people are leaving South Australia and going into interstate to try to find work because this government is delivering nothing for the people of South Australia when it comes to jobs.

I noted with great interest the speaker earlier today talking about the fact that there are children in high school who have not experienced a state Liberal government. I have spoken to some of these children and their families, and their parents are very disturbed that these children are almost resigned to the fact that if Labor remains in power they too will have to head interstate, like the thousands before them, if they want to get employment. That is how people feel about South Australia. Well may the member for Fisher laugh, but that is how people feel about South Australia. They are very disenchanted with prospects here in this state.

I mention unemployment again. We sit on the bottom of the pile. On so many key economic indicators, South Australia sits at the bottom of the ladder. When you go out and speak to people, they tell you, they know it, they feel it, they are living it. Trust me, you have to get out and speak to the people more to find out how they feel. They see all the opportunity on the eastern seaboard and none here thanks to this government that is running South Australia.

The Liberal Party has proposed some measures to stimulate the economy and growth, and I support the leader and what he said today. Some of those stimulus plans revolve around bringing forward the planned stamp duty relief to take effect this year. Labor announced a plan for stamp duty relief; why are they delaying it? South Australians need tax relief now, not in three years' time, as the Treasurer is angling towards. He is going to fix the problem 'down the track'. Treasurer, the problem is here, the problem is now.

Increases in the payroll tax threshold permanently to lower the cost for businesses to employ people is another one of the stimulus commitments the leader made today. This government wants to take away payroll tax concessions in July next year. This is quite amazing because businesses are saying to me that they want to employ more people, they want to grow, they want to give people opportunities. Yet this government keeps increasing payroll taxes and it is going to take the payroll tax concessions away from these businesses next July and make it harder and harder for people to do business in South Australia.

The Marion shopping centre is in my electorate. A number of businesses have closed there. Small family businesses trying to work tell me that it is things like the payroll tax that this state imposes on them, restricting them from doing business—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr WINGARD: No, they are quite large businesses. The Treasurer does not even know who pays payroll tax and who doesn't—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do need to ask members not to interject and to not respond to interjections. I remind the Treasurer that, unfortunately, he is on two warnings and I would hate that to preclude him from making a contribution later because we would all like to hear from him, I am sure. Member for Mitchell.

Mr WINGARD: It is quite amazing, Deputy Speaker, that the Treasurer does not know which businesses at the Marion shopping centre would or would not pay payroll tax. I speak to them personally and they tell me that they pay payroll tax, and it is one of the biggest imposts on them doing their business. It is a very sad that he does not understand what is going on out there on the streets.

Regarding the emergency services levy, we have committed to reversing the \$90 million hike in Labor's last budget. As I said, this is a tax that all families I speak to out there feel they are hit by and hit by hard, and not one dollar more is going to the emergency services levy. The Treasurer just smiles as he rips the money out of their back pocket. It is quite amazing to see.

We have also called on the commencement of the building of the Northern Connector to link the Northern Expressway and the South Road Superway. Hearing the Minister for Transport talk about that, I encourage him to get moving on this project as quickly as possible. Upgrading the Strzelecki Track as well would be another great thing. Let us have a look at a feasibility study to find out the value in this, because we should not just be doing projects that might shore up safe seats for Labor members. I know that with a lot of the plans that is what they are looking at doing. We need to evaluate these projects, work out where the upside is, and deliver projects that have a benefit for South Australia. That is what we need to do.

Establishing a South Australian productivity commission to remove unnecessary regulation and red tape is another stimulus plan that was put forward today, and I think that would truly help take South Australia forward as well.

There is a number of projects there. We need to support business and create productive infrastructure for this state to move South Australia forward, to stop the exodus that I spoke about before, of people who are leaving South Australia in their droves because they only see the opportunity on the eastern seaboard. Once upon a time, South Australia did sit in the top three of the premiership table, if you like, in this country. We were very competitive with New South Wales and Victoria. In fact, any chance we got to beat Victoria we truly loved. Now we are mixing it with Tasmania and a couple of the regions—the Gold Coast, the Illawarra and even the Hunter. That is where we sit on the premiership table at the moment. South Australia is languishing and the people out there know it; they feel it and they understand it, and we have to turn this around.

I turn to my portfolio area as well. I know we will talk more about this in estimates, but there are a couple of interesting things that came out of the budget as far as transport and road safety are concerned. An increase in traffic fines is again a great revenue stream for this government. There is an 11.6 per cent increase in the infringement notice scheme. In simple terms, that means an increase in traffic fines. That is a plain \$9 million extra to the government's coffers. This increase is way out of proportion with CPI. I am told regularly that people believe this government uses motorists for revenue raising.

It was interesting to note a similar sentiment from Associate Professor Mike O'Neil, the director of the SA Centre for Economic Studies, in an article written in the paper over the weekend. This is not just me saying this; Associate Professor Mike O'Neil from the SA Centre for Economic Studies says that South Australians perceive that they are just there for revenue raising as far as motor vehicle and traffic fines are concerned within South Australia. It really is disheartening. That is how people feel; they feel like they are just a cash cow; motorists feel like a cash cow to this government, and this government really needs to understand more of how people feel.

I turn to road safety infrastructure spend. Digging a little bit further into the budget papers, we heard the government talking up its spend on roads. On close examination, this was exposed as a tricky sleight of hand. It is not the first time this government has had a tricky sleight of hand. The government has committed \$10 million a year to its road shoulder program, meaning it will spend \$30 million on road shoulder sealing in three years in the lead-up to the next election.

Looking back over the past budget papers, it is revealed that the government spent \$31.9 million on road shoulder sealing over the past three years, so in fact that is a decrease in real terms of \$2 million. It is unbelievable; they spruik up one project, and in fact it is a decrease in spending on road shoulder sealing. We know how important that is for road safety. We know in this chamber how important road shoulders are, especially in the rural regions of South Australia. Road shoulders can have a dramatic impact on reducing accidents, injuries and fatalities on country roads, so to see the government in fact reducing its spending on road shoulder sealing by nearly \$2 million is quite lamentable. It is a fact that has been noted by a number of key industry groups who identified the same issue, and they have the same concerns that I am raising right here and now.

Not to mention the \$1 billion road maintenance backlog that is there in South Australia. These are projects that just have not been maintained, have not been serviced. Our roads are in a very poor state of affairs. This money is not towards new projects; this is a backlog of road maintenance problems that this state has, and it is valued at \$1 billion worth of spend to get this fixed. Something that this government does not really spend much time on is maintenance of projects.

I turn to public transport as well. This really is a mess. We have had train and tram strikes disrupting university students doing exams, and all South Australians have been disrupted over the past few weeks. The most notable point is the lack of negotiation that the government has had. They have let this drag on for more than 18 months with the train and tram drivers, without doing much at all. That is really disappointing to hear. The unions even say that the government has not been negotiating for 12 to 18 months. Now all of a sudden that it has got to a crisis point, they are saying, 'Come to the table; we need to talk.' The government really has dropped the ball on this and this is a mess. No matter which way you look at it, it has been handled very poorly by the Minister for Transport. who must take responsibility for another Labor public transport mess.

It is also noted that the government has spent more than half a billion dollars on the rail revitalisation program, but we are still having problems. Just tonight, there were delays of almost an hour because of signalling issues. The new Seaford line and the Tonsley line were impacted hardest, and there were delays right across the system, frustrating commuters and hurting the reliability of the service—and that reliability is what is vitally important to maintaining people on public transport and growing public transport.

Issues like tonight and delays like tonight are signalling problems that are ongoing and have been ongoing for months and months and months without any rectification, and a lot of them are arising because of the poor management of the project by the government. Shortcuts, cutting funds and not completing projects properly have been real issues. We can run through some of them, too, and this is the problem and the legacy of not doing these things properly and cutting corners when they are doing these projects.

We had electric wires falling down near pedestrian crossings at Christie Downs just recently—incredibly dangerous and so very lucky that no-one was hurt. Rough riding on newly laid track is causing problems as well on the Seaford line, damaging brand-new rail cars and potentially impacting on their service and their guarantees of the new Bombardier trains. Servicing is a major issue there because of poorly laid track that is causing rough riding on the Tonsley line as well.

There are also countless speed restrictions on the new Seaford line. A new line with brand-new trains that all look nice and flash—the speed restrictions on this line are huge in number and despite the half a billion dollars spent on the rail upgrade project we have countless speed restrictions on the Seaford line the people are often not aware about because of the poor management of this project and the fact the government has just cut corners and not done things properly.

There are also the wooden sleepers. We talk about these regularly, and the government keeps trying to hide this under the carpet, but they are still in place. They have talked up again the multi-million dollar—half a billion in fact spent on the rail revitalisation, and there are still wooden sleepers on sections of the line that have not been upgraded and the project really is not completed. That is what this government delivers, and do not get me started on the \$50 million that was wiped out by the Auditor-General on the money wasted on the Gawler line by this government. That \$50 million just thrown out the window would have the member for Schubert absolutely up in arms as he counts dollars in his waste-watching as well.

That is without really touching on the tramline as well, with the report that was uncovered that said the tramline cable has to be dug up because it had been laid in such a hurry and so shoddily because this government wanted to get the project up before the 2010 election so they could show off some fancy new trams and spruik again—over-spruik—a project that actually was poorly done and poorly handled. From the report that this government had commissioned that they tried to hide away that actually came to us, it showed that the cable actually has to be dug up and replaced, digging up all of King William Street right around to Morphett Street to replace this cable. That is the only way you can actually get the project that was commissioned by the government to the standard it should be.

When you see some of the pictures in the report, and I know some journalists have seen it as well, they were absolutely appalled. I have plumbing mates of mine that I talk about who say that if they laid conduit on a job in your backyard like that, they would be sacked on the spot. They said it was some of the worst work they had ever seen. It is highly disappointing that this government will accept that sort of work with taxpayer money—\$20 million in the tram case that was spent on that

project—and the report that the government had commissioned said it should be dug up. They just turned their back on that: forget about that, ignore it and walk away. They will do a couple of repairs and just make South Australian taxpayers bear the brunt of their mismanagement on that project.

I will keep doing all I can for the people of my community, and I work with the government trying to grow jobs in our state because we desperately need it. We desperately need to turn around our unemployment rate from being the worst in the nation, and we need to prevent people from leaving the state in the droves that they are. I strongly urge the Treasurer to take up more of our suggestions and lift South Australia off the bottom of the ladder.

The Hon. P. Caica: What suggestions?

Mr WINGARD: You weren't listening!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Reynell.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am asking both the member for Colton and the member for Mitchell to go outside and continue their discussion away from the business of the house. Member for Reynell.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (20:58): Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I am sure that will not be necessary. I am very pleased to rise to speak this evening on the Appropriation Bill 2015 and to wholeheartedly commend it to this house and to commend our Treasurer and his hardworking staff on their economic and social vision for our state and their work on our 2015-16 budget. I am very proud that our government does have a positive vision for our state that positively takes account of both the social and economic issues that we face, and I am proud that we constantly articulate that vision.

When I had the privilege of being elected to this house just over 16 months ago, I was not surprised that those opposite did not articulate a vision for this state and do not seem to have one. But I am very surprised and actually very upset at the constant negative talk about our state. I love South Australia and I thought that when I came here I would find people on both sides of this house who similarly love South Australia, are prepared to stand up for South Australia and talk about all the fantastic things that our state has to offer. I am dismayed when I hear speeches like the one I just heard that is absolutely focused on negativity and does not actually talk up our state. It is very upsetting.

This is a budget that all South Australians can be proud of, one that delivers a balance between providing a safety net for our most vulnerable community members and that ensures the future prosperity of all South Australians. We must always ensure that government spending reflects our values, our community's compassion and support for each citizen, and our desire to see our state thrive. This budget does just that.

As the member for Reynell, I am overjoyed that our government has invested in schools in the south. A sum of \$50 million has been allocated for school infrastructure, part of which will go towards rebuilding and upgrading disability units at both Christies Beach High School and Christie Downs Primary School. This outstanding initiative will make a real and positive difference for local kids with disabilities, their families and our southern community as a whole. Our southern community has spoken about the need for these facilities for some time and I am proud that we have listened, we have heard and we have acted. I look forward to continuing to work with and for these schools to ensure the needs of our community are met through these developments and to continue visiting these facilities as they become up and running.

Also of great importance to people in our southern community is the \$159.5 million for the Flinders Medical Centre for a new 55-bed rehabilitation centre and older persons mental health service. Tackling mental health issues is one of the most pressing and difficult challenges for our generation. Having a family member who requires psychiatric care involving hospitalisation or contact with a hospital is one of the toughest and most heartbreaking challenges a family faces. Our government has shown its willingness to rise to the difficult challenges that occur with mental illness and we have shown our willingness to invest in quality services for older South Australians and those

affected by mental illness. Our southern community will greatly benefit from this strong decision to make a difference in this area.

Additionally, our budget confirmed that Noarlunga Hospital will receive \$17.2 million for the refurbishment of a dedicated elective day surgery centre, the refitting of ward space for dialysis services and a dedicated paediatric area for children in the emergency department. These reforms are of great importance to our southern community and they are reforms which, together with the member for Kaurana and the member for Fisher, in collaboration with our communities and the Minister for Health, we worked hard towards. We worked hard towards them because our community asked us to ensure that they continued to have access to good quality care that worked for them and their families in our local area. These reforms were based on data and show the rest of Australia how to discover and listen to what our community wants and needs and to deliver it using clear, brave and rational logic.

I am so proud to be part of a government that has put its money where its mouth is and supported services provided under the National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness. These services include support services, crisis accommodation and response programs, and prevention programs which engage through their dedicated workforce with our most vulnerable citizens. These programs and the workers who run them are often the first point of call for women and children escaping domestic violence, for those affected by mental illness and those experiencing extreme poverty. These services are focused on ensuring dignity for all South Australians and show our government's commitment to collaboratively working to end homelessness and to address associated social issues.

This measure is in deep contrast to the measures carried out by the federal Abbott Liberal government. In their recent budget uncertainty and insecurity of community sector funding to deliver quality services to our most vulnerable citizens was rife, with short-term extensions in some funding areas such as homelessness and with many of the cuts to community services from last year's budget remaining in place. This has had a huge and negative impact on those highly dedicated community sector workers, 85 per cent of whom are women, with their jobs now at risk, at least four of them gone, as spoken about at today's rally, and their salary sacrifice arrangements slashed by the Abbott budget in a move which will see the take-home income of those who remain employed cut.

Our commitment in our budget to investing in South Australian Housing Trust stock upgrades is also an important one. Some of the houses to be upgraded are in Christie Downs in Reynell and are well overdue. I commend the Treasurer for his leadership on this issue and look forward to continuing to work with him, our planning minister, Housing SA and our local community to ensure that our community's voice is strongly heard in how these upgrades are implemented, and how they accord with broader changes to the suburb in which these houses are situated. These houses are in a community and we must contemplate redevelopment in that broader community context.

Crucially, through the introduction of our cost-of-living concession, our government, as it did in the last financial year, has committed to reversing the effect of the Abbott Liberal government's cruel disregard for pensioners through its deep cuts to pensioner concessions. No matter which way those opposite attempt to shift blame for these cuts, the federal Liberal government remains the government that abandoned pensioners.

In contrast, our concession will provide \$200 annually, directly to eligible pensioners and low income earners who are homeowners. For the first time, 45,000 additional South Australians will receive \$100, with those who are renting and self-funded retirees holding a commonwealth seniors card eligible. This decision has been made to combat the effect of federal budget cuts on our seniors and vulnerable community members. We on this side believe that the first duty of government should be to ensure the wellbeing of all our citizens and at present this means ensuring that we insulate our citizens from the effects of an overzealous and cruel Abbott Liberal government.

In this vein, we are also abolishing the River Murray levy to alleviate some of the burden of cost of living increases on families. We believe even small contributions can make a big difference to the family budget. I know this will have a real impact for many families in Reynell.

Our brave CFS volunteers, who worked so hard and so selflessly to keep our community safe in the devastating Sampson Flat bushfires, have also been the beneficiaries of this budget with

\$6.5 million allocated to meet expenses incurred in responding to those bushfires. This budget also includes \$1.7 million over four years for the purchase of eight replacement bulk water carriers for the CFS, a substantial upgrade to existing fleets; additional funding for protective clothing for volunteers, necessary when fighting fires that last longer than one day; and for the recruitment of more volunteers to contribute to the outstanding work our CFS already undertakes.

Community safety is at the heart of our government's agenda. It is not always an easy issue to grapple with but it is one of our most important considerations. To this end, we are investing \$50 million over four years for a range of reforms to improve and widen services for children at risk or in care. Our most vulnerable children deserve the best that we can offer them and it is the responsibility of our entire community to work together to ensure our children are safe and emotionally, socially and physically thriving.

We are increasing the number of foster carers, expanding front-line support teams, and increasing the use of Other Person Guardianship orders which will allow children at risk to stay in stable homes of other relatives or foster carers. Additionally, we will establish a program to reunite teenagers in out-of-home residential care with their families where appropriate, and we are expanding the Positive Parenting Program which helps at-risk families get necessary parenting skills through support and training focused on their need.

The safety of our children is paramount to the safety of our whole community. We must be vigilant in ensuring that they are always our first priority and we must not play politics with those most at risk. I look forward to working positively with others in this place and indeed others from every part of our community to collectively impact positive change for our youngest people.

Investment in our veterans' services is something I feel passionately about, as I know many here also do. To this end, our budget's \$15 million investment for veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder, to create a centre of excellence, has been well received. The veterans' community, led by the chair of the Repatriation Foundation, will determine the model and location of the new centre, which will provide state-of-the-art services to our ex-servicemen and women. This will ensure our veterans are receiving the best possible care when they are most vulnerable, in state-of-the-art facilities. We are also increasing facilities and spending on veterans at local hospitals. This spending will go to medical and surgical services, palliative care and acute outpatient services and will benefit so many in our community.

Mental health and wellbeing is rightly a priority for our government. While the south specifically benefits from the mental health service at Flinders that I have mentioned, all South Australians with a mental illness will benefit from our \$12.9 million investment in continuing to build more mental health facilities. This measure recognises the increased demand for services and the complexity of the issues we face in mental health. We are already spending over the national average on mental health and wellbeing, but more must be done to ensure that not one community member falls through the gaps. Our new state government emergency department targets for those needing mental health care will ensure a stringent focus on assisting our most vulnerable patients at their hardest times.

To showcase our wonderful state on the world stage, I am so very pleased that this budget earmarks significant contributions toward Adelaide institutions, such as the Adelaide Festival, Adelaide Fringe, Film Festival and others. Over our time in government, and over decades in South Australia, we have proudly been the leaders in promoting the arts. We have recognised the role the arts play in exploring ideas in our society, and have helped the arts community transform their already great events into truly international headliners. Again, this is in sharp contrast to the shameful slashing of arts funding by the federal Abbott Liberal government.

Additionally, this budget contributes funding towards the Adelaide Fashion Festival, an event I am really looking forward to seeing take shape. We have so many wonderful local and national designers who should be promoted to the world. I believe, as does our Premier, that Australia and South Australia can be renowned fashion hubs with the best investment and the right people on the job.

Finally, and incredibly importantly, our budget focuses on creating jobs for South Australians here in South Australia. Through our budget we demonstrate our commitment to local workers, to

local jobs and local businesses. Through numerous measures we are facilitating job creation and supporting and enabling both job makers and future job takers. We know and deeply value the fact that access to secure and decent jobs is crucial for our economy, and a crucial factor in every community member and every family feeling and being engaged and valued. Employment is crucial to connectedness and to families and communities thriving, and our budget creates more opportunities for all community members and all families to thrive.

In closing, I again thank the Treasurer for his hard work in creating a budget that reflects our state's and our community's priorities and values, and I look forward to continuing to speak, alongside him and others in this place, about our budget and our vision for South Australia in a very positive manner.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (21:13): What an illuminating time I have had, listening to some of the members of the government endeavour to speak up this budget, which comes at the end of many years of Labor government, which has yet to produce a budget that will provide for the people of South Australia. I am delighted to hear the member for Reynell talk about vulnerable children. Our society is full of vulnerable children, and it is a great shame. The best thing we can do for vulnerable families and vulnerable children is ensure they live in a society where they have some hope and particularly have a hope of getting a job. Families need to have a solid income so they can put bread on the table, clothes on their children's back and shoes on their feet.

We have just seen the unemployment rate in South Australia climb well over the 7 per cent mark to 7.6 per cent. It is an absolute disgrace, in a state and community that is blessed with the natural resources that we have in this state, that we can have that percentage of members of our society not being able to find meaningful work. It is an absolute disgrace, and this government has to take a fair bit of the blame for that. This government has to take responsibility for what it has done.

We had this government proclaim that they have changed the WorkCover laws by introducing the Return to Work Act and turning around the problems that we have had for year after year. We had the government say that this will save business \$180 million a year. The changes to our WorkCover system that have been brought through this parliament in recent times are by and large similar to the changes that were proposed by the Liberal Party in government back in 1995, 20 years ago. Imagine where this state would be if this state had had \$180 million a year, in today's money, for the last 20 years to spend creating new jobs and building up the strength of their businesses. Imagine where this state could have been but for the Australian Labor Party in this state. It is a shameful set of circumstances that we find ourselves in.

I feel for every one of those vulnerable children. I feel for them, but I bear no culpability, but members on the other side of the house do, because they have presided over the problem and they have ignored it year after year. Yet they come in here and suggest that they are doing wonderful things, and complain and point to vulnerable children.

Members of the government come in here and talk about the federal government. I invite members of the government—and I hesitate to say new members, because they might have some excuse, but I invite all members of the government—to do the following, because I suspect that the vast majority of them do not understand the relationship between the federal government and the states. There is a thing called horizontal fiscal equalisation. I suggest members of the government familiarise themselves with that term and what it means. I will give them a brief lesson.

There was \$25 million available for river communities to compensate them for water buybacks and the loss of economic activity in the river communities along the Murray system in South Australia, yet this Treasurer turned down that \$25 million to be spent in river communities. Why did he do that? Because he said it would impact on our GST payments to the tune of some \$22 million. I remember asking him a question in this house about what the impact would be if the federal government acceded to his request to pay the additional money that was reduced through the winding back of the partnerships program for the pensioner concessions, and he refused to answer the question.

If the federal government reinstated the national partnerships program and reinstated the money that they were helping the state government to pay for pensioner concessions, we would

have lost most of it in GST payments. That is the reality and I ask members opposite to cease in their ignorance and get some understanding.

In question time today we had the Minister for Education talk about why the state government did not, as every other government in Australia did, participate in the blackspot funding program for mobile telephone services. South Australia is the only jurisdiction where there was not a participation. As a consequence, we have 11 new towers being built in South Australia, out of something like 400-odd to be built across the nation. The Minister for Education said, 'Because that is not our role.' I say to the member for Reynell: pensioner concessions are not the role of the federal government. Get your stories straight and sing from the one hymn book; that would help.

I was delighted to hear the speech to the house by the Minister for Transport (member for Lee). I just want to remind him of a couple of things. Given his lack of time in this place and his youthfulness, he can be excused for some of his ignorance, but when you are a minister of the Crown I do not think you can afford to be ignorant; I think you need to apprise yourself of the facts.

I heard the minister on the radio this morning talking about privatisation of the bus services in this state. Of course, there was no privatisation, just as there has been no privatisation of SA Water by the former Liberal government. We put out the operation of the bus services to be managed by private companies at great savings to the state. I hope the Minister for Transport reads this, as I clearly recall the previous member for Mitchell (Kris Hanna)—I use his name because there have been several members for Mitchell since he was the member and I do not want him to be confused with others—moving an amendment to a bill at the time that the contract for the privatisation of the management of those bus services expired.

The member for Mitchell moved an amendment to a bill in the house, the effect of which would have been that the operation of those bus services would have been taken back within government. I remember this very clearly because, as those who have been here for a little while might understand, if a division is called and there is only one person voting on one side, the names of the votes are not recorded. I crossed the floor to vote with the member for Mitchell to ensure that the names of every member of the ALP in this house were recorded as voting against that amendment. Every member of the ALP, which was in government at the time, voted for the continuation of the private operation of our bus services. I remember that very clearly.

The Hon. S.W. Key: Is this when you were an Independent?

Mr WILLIAMS: No, I wasn't an Independent. This was—

The Hon. P. Caica: This was when you sat on the other side.

Mr WILLIAMS: This was much more recent than that. I am surprised that you guys forget it because you were both here. The Minister for Transport talked about surpluses and deficits. I clearly recall, at the change of government after the 2002 election, when a significant payment from the South Australian finance authority was put back beyond 30 June so that it appeared in the next year's budget, which created a deficit for the last budget brought down by Rob Lucas and created a surplus in Kevin Foley's first budget. It was a sheer shuffling of money from one date to the next, yet the Minister for Transport stands up here and suggests that there were so many surpluses under Labor and deficits under Liberal.

The minister talked about public transport. The most successful public transport system in this state is the O-Bahn, and who built it? It was not Labor. I can assure you that it was not Labor. It was built by a Liberal government that came in with an incredible deficit. Notwithstanding that, our commitment to the people of South Australia ensured that we did what was necessary to provide vital infrastructure.

Speaking of infrastructure, I have heard lots of people in this government proclaim that they are doing wonderful things in infrastructure. I have a pretty good memory, but I am also a bit of a hoarder, and I have here a copy of the Capital Investment Statement 2002-03, the first of the Labor budgets. I think the total investment in infrastructure in this year's budget is \$1.35 billion. I remind the house that today's budget is well in excess of double what the budget was back in 2002-03.

This is the Labor Party's first budget, bearing in mind that the change of government occurred in March and the budget was brought down in May. I think everything was pretty well settled before

the change of government but, notwithstanding that, the opening line of the budget states, 'The Government's Capital Investment Program for 2002-03 totals \$942 million.' In today's terms, I contend that that would be over \$2 billion. It continues, 'This compares to the anticipated result for 2001-02,' the last year of the former Liberal government, 'of \$940.3 million'. Again, I contend that that would be over \$2 billion in today's terms.

It is very easy for people with short memories to express nonsense, and we have heard a fair bit of that in this budget. I do not want to dedicate all my time to talking about nonsense coming from the mouths of those opposite, but let me just talk about the Strzelecki Track. I recall taking the manager of Kidman and Co., Greg Campbell, to see minister Wright when he was the minister of transport way back in about 2002-03 to complain about the Strzelecki Track. The complaint was that Kidman and Co. were delivering livestock to Teys Bros, who have an operation at Biloela just south of Brisbane in Queensland.

Teys Bros took over a meatworks in Naracoorte in my electorate. Kidman and Co. wanted to deliver their livestock to Naracoorte to support the local abattoir, but because they could not operate triple-trailer road trains on the Strzelecki Track it was costing them—this was way back in 2002-03—the equivalent of about 14¢ a kilogram additional freight to transport them to Naracoorte as opposed to Brisbane. Just think of the economic activity that has been lost to this state just because of that failure of government over many years to do something about that road.

The government came out recently and said, 'We want to build a food hub in the north of Adelaide to boost employment.' You would be a lot better off doing something about the Strzelecki Track because all that beef that is processed in Queensland would be processed in South Australia—that is the sort of nonsense. Not only that, we have seen the fiasco of this government's land deal down at Gillman which is supposedly based on building an oil and gas hub. Where is the oil and gas industry in South Australia? That is right: it is at Moomba in the north-west corner of the state.

Mr Treloar: North-east.

Mr WILLIAMS: North-east, thank you—north-east corner of the state. You cannot have an oil and gas hub at Gillman without having a sealed Strzelecki Track. Do you know why? Because about 80 per cent of the services that are trucked in and out of Moomba to support the industry come on a sealed road from Brisbane to the South Australian border.

The Labor Party in this state just do not get it. It is joining the dots. How can you have an oil and gas hub when it will not work because you have not fixed the Strzelecki Track? We had the temerity of Johnny-come-lately, Minister for Transport, who suggests that we have not been talking about it except for the last five minutes. Give me a break.

The food hub is one of my favourite things because one of the things we did in government was to establish an organisation called Food for the Future. We did lots of things to develop the food industries in this state. We developed from scratch our aquaculture industry. I ask members to compare what we did—developing our aquaculture industry, farmed tuna, oysters on the West Coast, doing better things with our rock lobster before we exported them, adding some processing, value-adding—because we established an industry that was not there and established an industry that is probably worth \$400 million to \$500 million a year now through that process. What does Labor do in South Australia? They create marine parks and then lament that there are vulnerable children, that families do not have jobs. That is the difference between Labor and Liberal, because we understand how the economy works.

I read an interesting quote the other day. It went something along the lines that if a socialist understood economics, they would not be a socialist. That is a very good piece of thought, and I suggest it applies to many of those opposite because they just do not get it. In my electorate, the government said, 'We won't fund the operation and maintenance of the drainage system.' In my local paper last week there was a story about the local council imposing load limits on bridges at the request of the drainage board, not because the bridges were about to fall down, but because they have reached a certain age and nobody can ascertain the integrity of them which means that farmers on those roads cannot even have a fuel delivery.'

A 15-tonne load limit means that the local fuel supplier cannot run his truck down to those farms, so suddenly if this policy goes forward we will have farms which are highly productive in the lower South-East, farms which are running centre pivots which are fuelled by diesel motors and diesel pumps, farms which are running tractors, and those systems will all be broken down and high-value crops will not be grown. They will not be able to move livestock off their farms and take them to market or ship them out to an abattoir, yet this government wants to build a food hub to create jobs. What the hell are they going to do in the food hub if they cannot get the produce there because they will not spend a measly \$4 million to \$5 million maintaining the drainage system and the structures, principally bridges, to allow us to produce the food in rural and regional South Australia such that we can add value to it in a food hub? They just do not get it.

I see my time is just about expired. I will wind up there but I can assure the house that I have only touched on about half the dot points I have in front of me. I am highly disappointed that I do not get to get to the rest of them, but this is a budget that I cannot recommend to the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, you will have 10 minutes tomorrow.

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (21:33): And I look forward to that, Deputy Speaker, as do we all! I rise also to speak about the 2015-16 state budget which I think is a fantastic document and a fantastic blueprint for this state for growth, jobs and improved social services. Before I speak about some of the budget settings more broadly, I would like to highlight one of the particular benefits for the budget in the south and for my electorate and neighbouring electorates in the area of education. I am glad that the Minister for Education is in the chamber because I want to commend her in particular for her role in putting the \$50 million package in this budget together which is going to help some of our most deserving schools across the state. Some of those schools that often get overlooked by some of the squeakier wheels that will put together a more convincing case, sometimes, even though there are bigger needs out there.

In the south we have definitely seen that, particularly in the area of schooling for disability students. I know the member for Reynell has spoken about this briefly before and I want to touch on it as well. We have been working very closely together. Over the past year, as I have said in this place before, I have been advocating on behalf of children with disability in the southern suburbs to have the need for improved facilities raised, both with the previous education minister, the member for Wright, and now the current education minister.

I am very glad to see that this budget delivers for two of the most significant units in the south: both the Christies Beach High School and the Christie Downs Primary School. They have a large number of students with disabilities there. To be honest, the facilities are not up to scratch at the moment. We need to invest this money so that the kids there have the best possible chance to get a good education.

There is a growth in the demand and that is why there is also money that has been put aside in the education budget to build a new unit at Seaford Rise Primary School—I was at that school earlier this week and saw the construction underway, which was fantastic to see—and to upgrade the existing unit, which is very much outdated, at Seaford Secondary College. We can provide a much better facility for students there through that upgrade. So, across those four units we now have a much better network for students with disability in the south.

I commend the people who have raised this issue, both the principals and the parents of the students at those schools, but also a Port Noarlunga resident, Kelsey Walker, who raised this issue in the media and spoke to me and the education minister as well. I think it has been very important to raise and we are now going to see some fantastic action on it.

This also means more jobs for local people as well. I think that has been a clear part of the design of that package, that both the school upgrades, as well as road maintenance and updating housing stock, are all areas where we can see extra work for local tradespeople in South Australia. Whether they be builders, plumbers or electricians, it means more work for them and more jobs for South Australia.

Onto the budget more broadly, I commend this budget as a budget that backs business to create jobs. That is something that we see when we look at stamp duty. When we go to buy a business premises that is going to be eliminated completely, we are going to be the only state not to

have that. Stamp duty on transferring a licence or a non-real property, that is going to be gone. Stamp duty on share transfers, that is going to be gone. Payroll tax concessions are going to be extended. WorkCover levies have been vastly reduced.

One of the favourite measures of our critics has been the IPA report that put South Australia at the back of the pack in terms of business competitiveness in terms of tax. If you use the same measures, we are now going to go to the front of the pack of all states in terms of having a competitive tax base and a competitive place to do business. That is really important, particularly when we look at those taxes that affect people who want to start a business, who want to have a start-up or go out and buy a business, or people who want to merge businesses. It is going to be particularly important as we are dealing with the transformation from the closure of Holden and lots of the component suppliers are going to need to merge their businesses to be able to survive as best they can, and we are not going to be taxing them while they are doing that.

This is also going to drive investment in South Australia. I was particularly interested to see some of the comments that we saw from some of the commentators, including people like the Property Council. The Property Council said that:

Taking an axe to stamp duty on non-residential property transfers sends a strong message of confidence to South Australia's small and medium sized enterprises, but importantly, commercial stamp duty abolition will ensure that boards across the country will sit up and pay attention to our state's property market.

That was not a socialist, that was not a Labor Party supporter who said that. That happened to be a Daniel Gannon who said that, who, as I understand it, used to work for the Leader of the Opposition. He was the key media adviser and spin doctor for the Leader of the Opposition. He has gone out now, as the head of the Property Council, endorsing this state budget. We have also seen the CEO of the Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry saying that they 'applaud the government for having the foresight to take these bold initiatives to invest in growth.' That is not a Labor Party sympathiser who said that; it happened to be the former Liberal chief minister of the ACT, Kate Carnell, who came out and said that. So we are getting some very non-traditional people backing this budget because of what it means about investment in South Australia.

It is helping households as well, and I think that is very important because, as we know, lots of households are doing it tough out there. We are extending concessions to households, including to renters for the first time; there will be a \$100 concession to help with gas bills, electricity bills and water bills. We are also eliminating the River Murray levy, a saving \$40 to households but, importantly, we are keeping the work for the River Murray going at the same time. So we are seeing some very significant tax reforms but also help to households.

Of course, we know that there are big challenges for South Australia, and changes to the manufacturing industry will come to a head in coming years, but the work that we have done over the past 13 years, as well as the work we are planning over coming years, means that we actually have a plan for a prosperous future for this state. Let us not forget that there are actually 120,000 more people with jobs in South Australia than there were when we came to government in 2002; 120,000 more people with jobs. The unemployment rate, even though we would like to see it lower than it is at the moment, is still less than what it was under the previous Liberal government.

We need to put this in perspective, when you get people out there saying that the state is in some sort of crisis. Well, it is actually doing a lot better than it was when the previous Liberal government was in office. You just have to look across all the areas of South Australia to see what dramatic changes have happened since back then in 2002. Our economy has nearly doubled in size from some \$52 billion to well over \$95 billion now. Our school retention rates—and this is really important for training future employees and also entrepreneurs—has gone from less than 70 per cent when we took office to well over 90 per cent and perhaps 92 per cent now.

Our hospitals were in a state of disrepair and waiting lists were ballooning out, whereas next year we are about to open up the most advanced hospital in the country, and waiting lists are some of the best in the country right now. When you fly into Adelaide you do not fly into a dingy, old shed anymore; you fly into a modern, fantastic airport that is probably the best in the nation. We have 800 extra police and crime is down 40 per cent. People feel a lot safer in the city, and this city is a fantastic place to be. Not only do we now have Adelaide Oval that is creating a—to use the term—

vibrancy in the city, we also have new hotels being built. Three have already been built with another four or so to come, including the first five-star hotel to open in Adelaide in some 30 years.

We built Techport, which helped create the defence industry in South Australia, which was very small when we came to office. We now have something like 25 per cent of the nation's defence work in this state, and we want to see that grow. We have extended railways, which is the first time that has happened in some 30 or 40 years in this state. Luckily that has gone to my electorate, I am glad to say. We have also electrified that railway and we want to electrify more. When we came to office there were only four mines in South Australia and there are something like 20 now. The expansion of the minerals industry has been huge, and even though it is facing some pressure now with global commodity prices, it is still doing a huge amount better than it was in 2002.

You get people like KPMG saying that we are the most competitive place to do business in the nation. You look at investments we have had such as at Tonsley, where we have taken the former Mitsubishi and the former Chrysler plant and are turning it into one of the most exciting industry parks in South Australia. We have research, we have mining investment, we have IT investment, we have advanced manufacturing and medical devices, trades training, science and development all happening on that site. That is going to grow and grow and be particularly exciting for the South in future years. Unfortunately, the opposition has criticised this budget but it does not have any economic plan of its own.

In fact, today the opposition has come out and said that they do not think this budget is any good, but their best response is that they think we should do the measures in our budget quicker. So, they do not think they are any good but we should do them quicker—that is the best response they can come up with. Also, they think we should get rid of the Economic Development Board. So, we should get rid of this expert panel, this lean panel of economic experts that we have, including former Liberal Premier Rob Kerin, I should add, and they want to replace it with a big, fat bureaucracy of a productivity commission instead. What a ridiculous plan that is.

The truth is that they do not really know where they are going now. Just like Daniel Gannon, in their hearts they support the cuts to business taxes that we have put in this budget, but they do not want to show it. They want to try to prove that they have some sort of opposition to it.

In fact, the member for Waite, when he was in the shadow cabinet, kept pushing and kept writing these economic policies; they would never get released. They are now being delivered through this cabinet that he is sitting in, through our investment in defence, through our investment in mines, through our investment in a whole range of different industries to support exports. This government is moving to create jobs all across the place, and the best complaint that the opposition seems to have come up with relates to the measure of employment growth in the budget. They think we should have been aiming for higher in the budget. As the Treasurer has said, we were being very conservative in our estimates.

The incentive for government is actually to do the reverse and be overly optimistic. If we had come out and said that our employment growth percentage estimated rise would be 5 per cent, that would have delivered a huge increase in payroll tax revenue estimates across the forward estimates. But we did not do that. We came up with a conservative estimate so that we could get some conservative figures in the budget parameters so that we could plan for the next four years in a way that we think is going to be prudent. We do not come up with figures that we hope to get to because that actually plays out in a whole range of revenue estimates throughout the budget document. I think there are few people on the other side who have been involved in the budget process before who know what an impact changing those little figures has on some of those revenue projections.

Of course, we do need some support to get to the optimistic outlook that we would love to have for jobs, and that particularly includes the submarine industry, and we really, desperately hope that the federal government changes its position away from supporting Japanese-made submarines and towards supporting either a French or German bid to build submarines here in South Australia, because that is what they promised when they went to the people at the last federal election.

Lastly, tonight I would like to rebut something that we heard from the opposition about the great former Premier Tom Playford. These are the same members who exclaim that debt figures in South Australia are too high, but we are coming out tonight and talking about how great Tom Playford

was and what a great premier he was and how frugal he was because when he was premier he did not install a telephone in his house. I would guess that that probably has to do more with his adaptation to technology—perhaps like the Deputy Premier, who talks about the 'inter-web thingy'—rather than his frugal nature. You only have to look at the debt figures for when he was premier of this state. When he left being premier, the debt to GSP ratio for this state was about 50 per cent of our gross state product (GSP)—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

Mr PICTON: That's right. Not revenue of GSP. It was a 50 per cent rate. If you compare that to what it is now in this budget document, it is 4.1 per cent. So, it is well over 10 times less the debt ratio that Tom Playford had, yet we get members opposite saying, 'He didn't like spending money.' Well, he did spend money. He spent a lot of money. He borrowed a lot of money and he used it to build the electricity trust, which was later sold by then Treasurer Rob Lucas—

Mr Hughes: Borrowed from a federal Labor government.

Mr PICTON: That's right. He used it to build manufacturing industries in this state. So, to come out and say that he was somehow really, really frugal I think is a complete fabrication.

So, I support this budget. I think that this budget will be seen as a fantastic point in time, of which business gets fantastic confidence, the ability to go out and invest in this state. We have seen a number of the key groups coming out already and backing that. We want to see more and more investors; we want to see more and more start-up companies choosing South Australia as the place to invest, and this budget will help them do that.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (21:50): At this hour of the evening, I am pleased to rise and begin my contribution at least. I have to say what struck me is the variance in views as to how this particular budget, this Appropriation Bill, is viewed across the chamber. The other thing that struck me this evening is how often former premier Tom Playford has been mentioned by a number of speakers. The only thing that I can really say about Tom Playford is that his eyes follow me wherever I go, from his portrait, looking across the chamber.

Certainly, there was a time in South Australia that was known as the Playford era, and it was a time of great prosperity. It was when South Australia was a great state, when we came in third on all the national indicators. Adelaide was the third largest city in the country. South Australia's economy was the third largest in the commonwealth, and it was a place of productivity, of innovation and of growth. Sadly, it would seem that under this Labor government those days have gone.

In fact, there has been a bit of history spoken about this evening from the member for Lee and others on this side as well. It is worth noting that everybody's recollection of a period of events is somewhat different. I would suggest that the time of the election in 1993, following the State Bank collapse, was a time of extraordinary debt and extraordinary pressure that this state was under, and a Liberal government was swept to power. That State Bank collapse brought about the downfall of a Labor government. The Liberal government was swept to power and it had a task in front of it. The task was to restore the state's books, and it did so through some very innovative and constructive economic reforms.

The member for Lee also spoke about the early days of this particular Labor government, under premier Rann in those days, and how it was a time of a very stable and constrained budget. But of course, it has blown out. The first years of the Rann government were in fact ones of budget stability, but in recent years that has all gone to the wall, really, because of the spendthrift nature of Labor governments, which eventually and ultimately comes through, whether it is in this state, this country, or around the world. We are seeing it again when our debt and deficit are reaching levels approaching that of what they were when the State Bank collapsed.

It has been labelled a jobs budget by the Treasurer and by the government, and I would dispute that. It does not appear to me in any way a jobs budget. What they fail to realise, of course, is that governments do not create jobs—businesses do. Governments need to create the economic environment in which businesses can prosper, and my idea of a good government is the same as that of a good football umpire. They are necessary, they are on the field, but if they do a good job

you do not notice them. Sadly, this government is everywhere. Its tentacles are everywhere, and people are certainly noticing their impact on our economy and our day-to-day lives.

This year's budget predicts an employment growth of 1 per cent for 2015-16. This is down on last year's employment growth and of course, more significantly, is well down on the 100,000 new jobs that Mike Rann promised not too many years ago—a pie in the sky figure. Labor claims that jobs will be created because they have budgeted to spend between \$1.3 and \$1.45 billion per year over the forward estimates on capital works in the general government sector. This is significantly down on previous years.

The government is also estimating for the 2015-16 year a \$43 million surplus, with surpluses in the forward estimate years forecast to increase to \$961 million by 2018-19. We have heard these forecasts before. Year in, year out the Treasurer forecasts a surplus and year in, year out the government fails to deliver. As a consequence of not delivering those surpluses, the debt continues to grow. The deficit for the financial year in 2014-15 has been assessed at \$279 million, which is an increase of almost \$100 million on the December 2014 estimate of \$185 million. The blowout from \$185 million to \$279 million occurred despite the government raiding \$459 million from the Motor Accident Commission.

With regard to GST, the government's GST revenue over the forward estimates is \$892 million more than last year's budget estimates. This \$892 million was unbudgeted and is therefore a bonus, so in contrast to the government's rhetoric and a significant taxpayer-funded advertising campaign addressing supposed cuts from the federal government, in fact the exact opposite is true. Over \$800 million was unbudgeted and has come into the state's budget as a bonus, so therein lies the treachery of this government. GST revenue in 2018 will be \$1.66 billion, and that is significantly more than the revenue in 2014-15.

Stamp duty on non-real property transfers and non-residential real property transfers is to be abolished. This was first flagged as a commitment way back in the mid-2000s. It has taken until now for the government to put this into place. I welcome this move. It will certainly have a big impact on small businesses right around this state, and I am thinking particularly in my own electorate. For example, those who hold aquaculture licences or fishing licences can now make a transfer within their family business from one generation to the next without incurring stamp duty. Up until now, that has not been happening, and so we have not seen new blood in industries or the investment, the enthusiasm and initiative that the next generation can always bring to a sector.

There is really no relief at all for households in this budget. Certainly, the Save the River Murray levy has been abolished. This will save householders \$40 per annum, but in fact the government continues to slug an average home of a value of half a million dollars by an extra \$205 per annum due to the emergency services levy increases in the past two budgets. I would like to take a little bit of time to talk further about this.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like you to perhaps move to seek leave, because we are going to run out of time tonight, but that means you will have a point to start with tomorrow.

Mr TRELOAR: Indeed I will, Deputy Speaker. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (GAWLER PARK LANDS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 21:59 the house adjourned until Wednesday 1 July 2015 at 11:00.