

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 26 July 2016

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

CRIMINAL ASSETS CONFISCATION (PRESCRIBED DRUG OFFENDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Conference

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (11:02): I move:

That the sitting of the house be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the bill.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL 2016

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 July 2016.)

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (11:03): I indicate that I will be the lead speaker for the opposition on this bill, and I indicate that we will be supporting this as convention dictates. Do we support every aspect of this bill? Absolutely not. This is another example of a complete and utter wasted opportunity by this failed 14-year-old Labor administration to address the fundamental concerns affecting the lives of the people of this state.

May I remind the house that the economic growth rate for Australia post the resources and mining boom has actually been extraordinarily strong. In fact, Australia has grown at a staggering 3.1 per cent in the 12 months to the end of March 2016. By any metric this is a wonderful result for the people of our nation. But how did South Australia fare? I will tell you, Deputy Speaker. South Australia failed to get to half the national growth rate for the 12 months to the end of March, and we as a state were just a fraction of the fast growth states of this nation and therein lies the problem.

South Australia is behind the fast growth states in Australia and we are continuing to get even further behind. The peloton is leaving us. We are seeing it in the distance and we are getting further and further behind, and now, of course, we have this extraordinarily and unacceptably high rate of unemployment in this state. In fact, we have the unenviable mantle of having the highest unemployment rate in the nation for almost two years now.

As a result the government says, 'What we're going to do is to bring down a jobs budget.' We have had two jobs budgets in a row. Last year's budget was a jobs budget. Did it result in any additional jobs for the people of South Australia? The Treasurer thinks that it did. In fact, in a recent interview on the ABC with Matt and Dave at breakfast when asked the question, 'How many jobs have you actually created?' he said, and I quote, 'we have created 6,000 jobs since the last budget.' So we have the question that was fired back directly from the interviewers in that session, 'Were these full-time jobs?' He said, 'Yes, I believe they were.'

Herein lies the problem for the people of South Australia. The largest problem affecting the lives of the people living in this state is the unacceptably high unemployment rate, yet the Treasurer, charged with the responsibility of bringing down a budget which is going to transform the environment in which we live and transform the economy in which we are trying to find employment and prosper

as a state, does not even know the basic statistics. He did not even know that far from creating 6,000 jobs, as he claimed in prime time radio, we had actually lost jobs.

Let's have a look at the actual situation, and this is what most disturbing: in the 12 months to June 2016, South Australia lost almost 3,700 full-time jobs; he had it wrong by almost 10,000 jobs. He claimed that we had actually created 6,000 jobs with the job-creating settings that he moved in last year's budget. The reality is that we lost almost 4,000 full-time jobs in South Australia. It would be laughable if it was not so serious and such an impediment on the people of South Australia getting on with their lives.

The government decided that it would bring down a new jobs budget this year. What credibility does the Treasurer have when we look at the results from last year? Do not take my word, take a look at what Treasury officials themselves say about the budget that has been brought down for this current financial year. Again, the Treasury forecast for employment growth in South Australia for this year is less than half the national employment growth rate—less than half. This is completely and utterly unacceptable.

A Liberal government in this state would not stand for a situation where our employment growth rate was projected to be less than half of that for the nation. Moreover, Treasury officials actually give this year's budget a lower mark than they gave to last year's budget. Their forecast for employment growth from last year's budget was actually higher than their employment growth forecast for this year.

Therein lies the problem. We have a dangerous jobs crisis in South Australia and we have 145,000 South Australians who are now looking for work. The government said it was going to bring down a jobs budget last year and it resulted in thousands and thousands of people losing their full-time jobs in South Australia, and this year there is absolutely no evidence to suggest that there is going to be a changed situation whatsoever.

In fact, when we look at the detail of this 'jobs budget' there is one program—a \$109 million program over two years—so we are talking in round terms about \$55 million dedicated to job creation in this state for this year out of a budget total of \$18 billion. So we have an \$18,000 million budget of which \$55 million is going to be spent on the thing that we all identify as being the single biggest problem. It is not nearly enough.

When we look at some of the failed programs that Labor has put in place in the past, it fills us with even less confidence. Deputy Speaker, I will just remind you, and the parliament, of some of the failed programs that have been implemented, most of them tossed out, in this parliament since the last election. One of my favourites, of course, was the \$4 million regional loans program. This was really designed and targeted to address our unacceptably high unemployment rate in regional South Australia. Those of us on this side of the parliament will do anything that we possibly can to advance the cause of regional South Australia. We see that the unemployment rate at the moment is unacceptably high.

The government responded to this problem—and they recognised this at the last election—by saying after the election, 'We are going to start listening to the people of regional South Australia', and they put this program in place to address this problem. The \$4 million regional loans program was shut down after less than two years, after failing to issue one single, solitary loan. This is the level of incompetence that we see. Their major program to address regional unemployment in this state was shut down before it had even given one single loan.

One of the other programs that I would like to address today is the \$50 million Unlocking Capital fund. This is another program that was designed by this government to provide opportunities for South Australian firms to grow. But, after almost two years of this program operating, it has given just one single, solitary loan. The point is that there is no way that these programs, put in place by this inept government and supported by the Independents, have any chance whatsoever of transforming our economy here in South Australia.

Another one of the failed programs that is being administered by this incompetent government is of course the investment attraction fund, now the Economic Investment Fund. This is a particularly interesting example because this is a program that administers, or has administered, \$15 million worth of grants, and prima facie this seems like a good idea. We should be doing every

single, solitary thing we possibly can, as a parliament and as a state, to attract investment dollars into our jurisdiction. What has been the cost to this government of administering this \$15 million worth of grants? I will tell you: \$13.8 million was spent to administer \$15 million—

Members interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: This is a certain type of incompetence, that a government, propped up by Independents in this state, would spend \$13.8 million to administer a grant program of only \$15 million. If you need any further proof of just how incompetent this government is, take a look at the outcomes, not necessarily the inputs, but take a look at the outputs—economic growth is stagnant, growing at less than half the national average, nowhere near the fast growth states, and we have unemployment that is topping the nation.

I would like to throw in one more statistic here, because it is very important for the future of our state, and that is the net interstate migration out of this state. Last year 4,967 people from South Australia gave up hope. That is the net figure, not the gross figure—4,967. What was it in Tasmania? I will tell you what it was in Tasmania: 79. People are wanting to remain in Tasmania, which has a solid economy, lower unemployment than in South Australia and a good Liberal reformist agenda being implemented by the Hon. Will Hodgman, Premier of Tasmania. But they are leaving South Australia in droves because they can see the level of incompetence that is being presided over by this government.

One of the great boasts by the Treasurer when he brought down his budget almost three weeks ago was that the government had finally, finally, finally moved back into surplus. Whilst those of us on this side of the house strongly support the concept of presenting balanced budgets each and every year, we needed to just check the Treasurer's figures, not that we did not trust him, but we just thought it would be prudent to check whether we had actually posted a surplus.

It turns out that we have posted a technical surplus, but we remain with a structural deficit. I do not think anyone is really amazed that there might have been something a little bit dodgy about the figures. When we take a look at it, it is quite clear to us that there was a major payment from the Motor Accident Commission of \$403.5 million back in June, back into the government coffers last financial year, which allowed the Treasurer to post a very, very slender \$258 million surplus. Of course, without that transfer we would have remained in a massive deficit in South Australia, a deficit well in excess of \$100 million.

The Mid-Year Budget Review, of course, projected a much larger surplus for last financial year—that was not realised. You have to ask yourself: why was it not realised? It was written down by more than \$100 million in a six-month period. I will tell you the reason why and I will tell you the reason why we always fail in this state to realise the budget: it is because there is no fiscal discipline within this Labor administration. If you need any proof of that, just go through, department by department, see what was projected in their fantasy budget lines each year and see what was actually delivered at the end of the year. I would just like to put on the record some of these areas, which should really be of major concern to the people of South Australia.

Let us start with the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, presided over by the member for Lee. There was a \$38 million blowout—a \$38 million blowout—in the budget for this department. These are large sums of money. Then there is the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion: there was a blowout last financial year of \$49 million. This is the same dollar value as the entire job stimulus program put forward by the government for this current financial year: it was the size of the blowout in just one department last year.

Then, of course, we have the Department for Education and Child Development, an \$83 million blowout. You would not mind if we had the best education system in the country, the best NAPLAN results in the country, where we had moved our year 7s to secondary school like every other single state in the nation, but, no, our education standards are not being realised, we are not the top state, and we have these massive blowouts year in, year out—\$83 million last year.

Let us take a look at the big daddy of them all, the Department for Health and Ageing: a \$274 million budget blowout in that single department alone. I asked a question in this parliament of the Minister for Health last year, and I said, 'How are you tracking against your budget?' 'No

problems,' he said, 'absolutely no problems at all'. So, this begs the question: what happened in the last six months? Did we have a \$274 million blowout in just a six-month period? Usually, this minister, who loves to handball blame to somebody else—he is always ducking and diving any sort of responsibility himself—blames the flu season, but of course we have not had a flu season in the last six months. So, that \$274 million blowout is a blowout that sits fairly and squarely at his feet, and he needs to take responsibility.

As I said, we were very fortunate to have these unbudgeted windfall gains from the Motor Accident Commission. We never even contemplated these sort of transfers three, four, or five years ago. We first heard about the government's plan to close the Motor Accident Commission insurance division back in the 2014-15 budget. We have had some very major transfers since that period of time: \$853 million in the 2014-15 year; \$448 million last financial year. This year the budget bottom line is being propped up by a massive transfer of \$620 million in a single year.

Our major concern on this side of the house, of course, is for the people who pay their CTP insurance. When the government first raised the issue of selling the Motor Accident Commission, or privatising the Motor Accident Commission as the Treasurer refers to it as, we asked the question: what will this do for ordinary South Australians' CTP charges, the compulsory third-party insurance premium?

When other jurisdictions privatised these services, guess what happened? The insurance premiums went up, but we were assured by this Treasurer, when we raised these valid concerns, that this would not happen in South Australia. Why will it not happen in South Australia? Why will it happen in every other jurisdiction but not in South Australia? He says, 'Because we are going to put regulations in place which will cap any increase in the CTP levy.'

He then went on to say that we are not going to cap this indefinitely, we are just going to cap it until the next election. We are just going to cap it for a three-year period, and we are going to cap it at CPI. Here is the real deception on the people of South Australia, because we now have a locked-in increase for the next three years, and that increase is at 2.9 per cent. I thought: what is the forecast CPI increase for this financial year? I was astounded that it was going to be 2.9 per cent. This would be a very large increase on what it was last year or the year before.

As it turns out, the CPI increase is 1.75 per cent—another broken promise from the Treasurer, from those opposite, who said that there would be no increase in the CTP charges on the people of South Australia above CPI. At the very first opportunity for the Treasurer to demonstrate that he is a man of his word, and that is exactly what he is going to do, he failed. He failed the people of South Australia with a massive increase over and above inflation, the CPI figure for South Australia.

I make the point that this is not a business which has been sold off. The Treasurer often talks about this business as being privatised. What has essentially happened is we have ceased to operate. There was an overaccumulation in terms of the accumulated CTP charges paid for by the motorists of South Australia, and they have ultimately been transferred into government coffers. They have propped up the fantasy surplus that was posted last year, and will do exactly the same for the foreseeable years to come. Ultimately, road users in South Australia will be paying for this windfall gain that the government has had in the last couple of years.

We believe that this budget has not delivered for the people of South Australia, it has not delivered in terms of economic growth, it has not delivered in terms of jobs, it has not delivered the promised surplus and it has not delivered for young people deciding where they are going to be living in South Australia. We have flogged off an asset, or closed an asset, and we are going to be paying more with our CTP insurance.

The final thing I will address in my few minutes in the parliament today is one of the issues that I think will become a very large issue for the people of South Australia going forward, that is, electricity prices. What we have had for a long period of time are warning bells, warning bells that have been ringing. They must have been ringing in the ears of the Premier and the Treasurer, and they have been absolutely and unequivocally ignored. In fact, we have seen five or six different positions by this Treasurer with regard to electricity.

We have been raising this issue diligently in this parliament for a very long period of time, and we get this sort of undergraduate-type debating response: the Liberals privatised ETSA. Well, guess what? The lowest electricity price in the nation comes from Victoria, and they have privatised their infrastructure in their state. Then we get the argument that they are all climate change deniers on that side of the house. This is a debate worthy of a proper investigation, but we have had absolutely nothing from those opposite.

What are the consequences of this? We are now hearing that the contract prices that people are now signing up to are often 20 or 30 or 40 or sometimes 50 per cent higher than in other jurisdictions around Australia. We have heard somewhere the prices paid by South Australians are double that of Victoria. This is putting us at a competitive disadvantage from those people with whom we need to compete. Again, what is the government's response? In November last year, to their credit the government said, 'Let's call a crisis meeting.' Admittedly, this could have occurred two or three years previously, but they finally got around to calling a crisis meeting with users and consumers and generators in the room last November.

What were the consequences? This was a meeting that was attended by the Premier of South Australia. They said, 'We are going to come back with a plan as quickly as we possibly can.' Well, here we are in July, and there is no plan. This is what is missing from this state budget—a focus on addressing a problem that is only going to get larger, a problem that they have had a warning on for many years, a warning that has been completely and utterly ignored.

So, what is in the budget with regard to electricity policy in this state? I think you would all be as surprised as I am to learn that there is actually a lot of money spent in South Australia on policy and programs when it comes to electricity. In fact, the energy policy and program sub-program has a budget this year of \$28.6 million which begs the question: what sort of policy advice are these people actually providing the government? Can we see some evidence of the policy which has landed us with the electricity price crisis that is currently enveloping businesses and households in this state?

We are talking about \$28.6 million, and I note that over the last years they have been cutting back this expenditure, just as we are heading into a crisis and the government says, 'Let's cut the advice that has been provided to the government.' So, there are two questions for the government: what advice have you been given, and why are you cutting this back at a time when there is such a need for some proper robust energy policy development in South Australia?

We see a miserly \$500,000 mentioned in this budget going towards a study of a new interconnector for South Australia—\$500,000 in the budget to address the single biggest issue confronting our competitiveness as a state. This is a situation that has been presided over by Labor for 14 years in South Australia. So, \$500,000 will not deliver an interconnector and, in fact, when we asked when this will be done, it is going to be done in the next 12 months. There is no great alacrity on this issue, they are not pursuing it with great vigour and courage. They are saying, 'We are going to commission a study.'

They commissioned a larger study to update Cleland Wildlife Park's koala reserve yesterday. They are basically putting the koalas and the future jobs of South Australia on exactly the same level in this budget which almost beggars belief. Having said that, I went up to Cleland the weekend before last, and it is a fantastic facility. I am not sure whose electorate it is in.

Ms Chapman: Mine.

Mr MARSHALL: The deputy leader's, so she looks after it as a great custodian, and she is up there on a regular basis. But I make the point that there is no focus on the single biggest issue—\$500,000 for a study, the study will be delivered in a year's time, they are as casual as can be. How much is the interconnector going to cost? We are told it could be anywhere from \$400 million, \$600 million up to \$800 million, and it could be delivered in four to six years' time. South Australia will be gone. Business and households will have given up if we have these massive increases in electricity which are now being projected by the AER, the ASX energy futures wholesale price index, by Deloitte Access Economics. All of these warning bells have been sounding for a long period of time.

What should the government be doing in terms of electricity? They need to reconvene their crisis meeting. They need to be doing what we have been saying for a long period of time and that is establish a permanent productivity commission, the first state-based productivity commission, to be doing the important work of predicting what is going to happen and taking corrective action, making recommendations to the government independently. They need to be focused a lot more on demand management, lowering the total cost of electricity, the total demand for electricity in this state.

At the last election, the Liberal Party took a policy to the election which said that we wanted to look at demand management with the introduction of voluntary smart meters and differential tariffs so that we can lower the total cost for electricity consumers in this state. Has the government made any movement on this? No, none whatsoever. We want to see a situation in which any future increase in wind capacity in South Australia is providing the planning application with a market impact assessment. Before we take on any more, let's make sure we are not exacerbating the situation. The government has rejected this out of hand.

We say, sure, do the study into greater interconnection, but why was this not done five years ago? We very strongly recommend to the government that they need to be doing everything they possibly can to increase the storage capacity for these renewables in South Australia. It is a ridiculous situation that we have this abundance of renewable energy in South Australia but it cannot be used when consumers and businesses actually need it, so I think it is bleedin' obvious that we need to put more money into investigating ways that we can use this renewable energy when we actually need it.

We are also hearing continually that there are rumours that submissions have been put to the government to put an incentive back in place for base load power in South Australia. I think it is now time for the government to come clean with this. Do we need to put an incentive back in place to bring back base load for this transition period, either until we get an am connector or until storage capability rises to an acceptable level?

I will just say, on behalf of the Liberal Party, that we would be putting the people of South Australia first. We would not take one single solitary thing off the table. We do need to be addressing the issue of electricity prices in South Australia. There is no point continuing to do what Labor has done for 14 years, that is, to have this blind obsession with increasing renewables in South Australia with reckless abandon, with no eye to what it is going to do for ordinary South Australians and for job creation going forward.

I reiterate that the Liberal Party would be looking at every single option. That is exactly what this government should be doing. It is a disappointing budget. It is a disappointing budget because it fails to address the major issues confronting the people of South Australia: jobs, economic growth and, of course, increasing electricity prices.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (11:31): Thirty-two minutes was the opposition's reply to the government's budget—32 minutes. The time allowed for the debate was unlimited and the amount of time that has been used by the opposition is 32 minutes.

The gallery is empty of both staff and public. There are no media present. There is no interest. For there to be interest, for there to be anyone in the gallery, there would need to be something new to be said. There would need to be some substance. Instead, what we have heard for the last 32 minutes has been 99 per cent criticism of the government—in fact, 100 per cent criticism of the government. I was hoping that there would be just one constructive suggestion about what the opposition might do in the way of an alternative budget had they been in office. You have to suggest alternatives.

It is actually striking that the opposition leader could only come up with 32 minutes in the way of a budget reply speech—absolutely striking—and it tells a story. I attended the opposition leader's Press Club address. I really wanted to hear what the opposition had to lay out in the way of an alternative financial plan for the state. I had hoped that after four failed elections the opposition would now understand that you cannot fatten the pig on market day, as John Howard famously said.

You cannot work on criticism of the government for 3½ years, or 3¾ years, nothing but negativity, in the hope that in the last few weeks leading up to an election you can rush out some policies and people will suddenly vote for you. That may work when you have a government that is in freefall, such as the former Labor government in New South Wales, for example, where I would argue Barry O'Farrell probably only had to stand there and not make any mistakes and he was going to win the election. But he didn't. So, it might work in that instance, but it is not going to work in this case. It is not going to work.

What I think the opposition need to do—and, I may say, what I did when I was opposition leader—is try to get out there with some policies. You have a few strategies you can adopt: you can either criticise the government of the day and hope that as a result of a successful criticism campaign people will throw the government out come the next election because you have proven they are not up to it—and that may work in certain circumstances; I do not think it will in this—or you bravely go out there and state some positions of your own. I would just point out to the opposition that, in the federal opposition, Bill Shorten, I note, started to get traction when he went out there with some policies—

Mr Duluk: Don't quote him.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —and closed the gap, to the astonishment of many commentators and turned—

Mr Duluk: And he lost.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Davenport is called to order.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —what looked like a very clear decision to re-elect the government, into a very close election—quite a scarily close election. I just make that observation.

I want to start by addressing in my portfolio areas some of the errors of fact just put on the record in the house by the Leader of the Opposition, and he made the same mistake at the Press Club. He claims that \$13.8 million has been spent by the Investment Attraction agency in administering itself so as to provide \$15 million worth of grants. He has said it at the Press Club, he has repeated it in the house today, and what it demonstrates is that the opposition leader cannot read a budget paper. Not only can he not read a budget paper—and I have corrected him on this previously—he does not ask for briefings.

Let me just straighten out the facts because the opposition leader has misinformed the house today, and I would encourage him to come down and correct the record. The amount spent by the Investment Attraction agency in 2015-16 on administering itself, if I can use that term, was \$4.996 million. That was comprised of \$3.169 million for salaries and costs, \$233,000 for board fees and travel costs and \$1.594 million for supplies and services. This was not, as the opposition leader has wrongly claimed, \$13.8 million.

In this coming financial year 2016-17, IASA's operating budget is \$8.932 million for a full year, comprising \$5.370 million for salaries and on-costs, \$408,348 for board fees and travel costs and \$3.153 million for supplies and services. The opposition leader has just got his facts wrong, and the reason he has his facts wrong is he does not know how to read a budget paper.

I have corrected both him and the opposition spokesperson for investment on this previously when they have made other claims that demonstrate they do not know how to read the budget papers. They need to get some good advice into the leader's office. I certainly did. We hired a fellow called Tim Melrose. He was a terrific individual who provided great support to the opposition on budget and finance matters.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: I hope you have someone up there who is competent because, based on what was just put on the record, the opposition leader is wrong. If he keeps doing this, this is going to become a big issue—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Morialta!

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —because one thing you need to be able to do as an opposition leader and a shadow treasurer is read a budget paper. His statements to the house are wrong, and he should come down and correct them. I offer him a briefing on the Investment Attraction agency. I have done so previously. He has not taken it up. He needs to, then he might get his facts right. While we are on the subject of the Investment Attraction agency, can I just bring to the house's attention —

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Could members on my right lower their voices, please.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —the good work done by the agency. It has centralised across government efforts on investment attraction. We had too many people dealing with investment attraction. We have put them into a single agency, and we are getting better results already. The establishment of an Investment Attraction agency (IASA) with a world-class advisory board has been a long overdue initiative by this government, and I am very proud to be the minister responsible for having overseen its creation and its good work.

It has created 3,800 jobs and cap ex of \$950 million, which has been delivered drawing on resources previously spread across the whole of government. The opposition leader says, 'Where have they come from?' I am going to list them for him, and I offer him a briefing. If he would just get his facts right, I offer him a briefing which might help him to correctly inform the house. The jobs created have come from:

- ScreenAway, 300 jobs;
- Orora, 25 direct and 85 construction jobs;
- Babcock International—I spoke to their national meeting this morning—48 jobs;
- Wineflow, 50 direct jobs and 120 in construction;
- Micromet, 75 jobs;
- Hornsdale (Neon France), 10 jobs directly and 250 in construction;
- West Franklin Development on Franklin Street, 1,350 jobs in construction;
- Inghams Enterprises, 850 jobs and 620 in construction;
- Buddy Platform, 30 jobs; and
- NEC, 50 direct and 13 indirect jobs.

This gives a total of 1,438 direct and 2,438 construction and indirect jobs and \$950.7 million of investment. The facts are there: we are creating jobs. Yes, we are losing jobs due to structural reforms, but the investment agency is out there making a major contribution. If the opposition leader keeps misinforming the house, he is going to find himself embarrassed. He needs to understand how to read a budget paper, get himself some good advice, and others need to make sure that he does not come in here with incorrect information.

I want to move on to trade because that is a particularly strong story in this budget. The challenge has always been to increase trade as a key priority in transforming the economy. The process that the government has used has been to design and deliver a fixed-date calendar of trade missions that give businesses certainty and planning to coordinate government representation during inbound and outbound missions and simply to create jobs and investment.

What we have achieved is that South Australia has delivered the largest and most effective trade missions, with strategic frameworks for major targets in China, India and South-East Asia. Exports of targeted goods and services have increased, creating yet more jobs. What it means is simply this: more exports, more investment and more jobs as we build new enterprises into the economy to match the transformation away from old manufacturing.

Latest ABS figures show that an extra 78 companies in South Australia started exporting. That is the biggest increase in new exporters since 2006. The results are in, and I would note that

the allocation of funding to grow export activity in South Australia's economy has grown year on year, from \$9.8 million in 2011-12 to \$19.3 million in 2015-16, with more funds allocated in this budget for the Export Partnership Program and additional support for the South Australia-China Engagement Strategy by increasing our presence in the Shandong Province. I have been pleased to champion this increase in budget allocation.

As another example of the opposition leader and the shadow minister not reading the budget papers correctly and getting it wrong, I refer back to their oft-quoted figure (which I note they have now stopped since they have been exposed) of \$30 million in 2011-12. Of course, that resulted from a misreading of the budget paper, which ascribed a renewable energy fund one-off payment, made very clear in an explanatory note as a one-off, as an amount spent on investment and trade that was then cut. It was just a complete misreading of the budget paper. It is a very important thing with budget papers and formal documents: read the footnotes, read the detail—the devil is in the detail.

In relation to trade, wine is up \$159 million, or 13 per cent; wheat is up \$150 million, or 12 per cent; copper is up \$104 million, or 9.1 per cent; other confidential items are up \$313 million, or 14 per cent; vegetables and fruit are up \$102 million, or 22 per cent; international students are up nearly 8 per cent; new exporters in the high-tech space are penetrating new markets; and shortly we will take a mission to India with over 100 companies involved. The response has been extraordinary for the business community, and we are simply out there getting the job done.

If the opposition have any suggestions to make about how we can do it better with investment or exports, I would be pleased to hear them. If you come up with a good idea, I will take it on board. If you have a better idea on how to organise the budget to get results, suggest it, but there has been nothing but whingeing and whining. We need some constructive contributions from the opposition. The parliament deserves it and the people deserve it—and they are not getting it.

On veterans' affairs, can I make the point that we have delivered the landmark memorial walk along Kintore Avenue to commemorate 100 years since World War I. It was delivered on time and on budget at an extraordinary price of around \$10 million, and it has changed the face of Adelaide for an extraordinarily small amount of money. We have brought together a diverse range of stakeholders not only to achieve that project but to get veterans working together at a time when the opposition has been working through the repat program to drive veterans apart, to have them in conflict with one another. It has been very sad, indeed. I have just come back from the western front, where, with the opposition spokesperson for veterans' affairs, in a bipartisan way we represented the government of the state, and it was a very sobering experience.

I really want to move on to the issue of defence industries, because that is where the state government rocked the boat to stop the Coalition from building submarines and warships overseas, to deliver subs, frigates and APVs. We rewrote the guidebook on international engagement and kickstarted new investment into the state, and defence industries was at the centre of it. We coordinated a national effort that involved industry, the unions, state government, federal opposition, Independents and federal senators, to push the local impacts of defence projects to the top of the political agenda.

From July 2014 to February 2015, no-one on that side of the house was on our side—no-one. No-one in the federal Coalition was on our side in this state, except Senator David Fawcett, who has been rock solid. I must also commend the former member for Hindmarsh as being someone who came out early in support of the program, and Senator Sean Edwards. Those three voices on the Coalition side alone were on our side. No-one else cared. They were more than happy to go off and build submarines and warships overseas. It was only when their own seats were threatened that they started to take an interest.

Who positioned the public debate into that place? It was this government, by running the campaign that we ran, by helping industry and unions and federal senators who were on our side from the Labor Party, the Coalition and Independents like the Xenophon Team, to get out there and argue the case. By helping them to ask the right questions in parliament, by informing them, by briefing them, by making sure that they had the resources to mount a public campaign that was largely orchestrated from Victoria Square, from the State Admin Centre, we changed the entire

debate. Two prime ministers later and two defence ministers later, we finally got the result, but it is not over yet.

We forced the federal government to consider Australian industry and national capability in their defence procurement decisions. The case for change forced the federal government into a competitive evaluation process for future submarines, including options for a local build. Once that decision was made, it followed that procurement of frigates and offshore patrol vessels could be done locally as well. I was foremost in that debate. As someone who has spent 24 years serving this country in uniform, having commanded at regimental level a peacekeeping force and been involved in defence procurement, there is no-one more abreast of the risks, dangers and opportunities in this than me, and I will not let go of it now, or in the future.

The creation of 2,900 direct jobs for the future submarine project, with an estimated impact times three in indirect jobs, is something we should be proud of. By bringing forward offshore patrol vessels, we found 800 jobs, and frigates, 2,000 jobs, and as the air warfare destroyer program winds back we avoid some of shipbuilding's valley of death—not all, because decisions could have been made sooner but were not.

What is next? We need to leverage future submarines and the deal with DCNS to build broader engagement with Europe, maximise local involvement in Army and RAAF procurement programs, and make sure that we get the maximum share of the work into Australian shipyards. As I said, patrol vessels are a \$3 billion program with 800 direct and indirect jobs; future frigates, a \$35 billion project program with 2,000 jobs; and submarines, a \$50 billion project with up to almost 3,000 jobs. It is just an extraordinary opportunity.

It is not over yet, and that is why money is being provisioned in this budget to support Defence SA. I must commend Andy Keough, the CEO, and his entire team for the tireless work they are doing to ensure that we get the maximum percentage of the work here, that there is genuine technology transfer. For that reason, there needs to be close engagement with the commonwealth.

What Minister for Defence Industry, Christopher Pyne, should be doing is what every other federal minister does and what I notice is mooted in the papers this morning in regard to energy, where the federal minister is getting the state ministers together to work out how they can solve the problems. What minister Pyne needs to do is get all the state ministers across the nation who have a stake in this together into a ministerial council, as every other minister does. The health minister does it, the transport minister does it, the education minister does it, the energy minister does it; every minister does it except this one.

I will just say to minister Pyne that in three years' time the electorate will be looking for results, and I might suggest that he will need a lot of cooperation to deliver on this program. He will need cooperation from industry, he will need cooperation from the unions and he will need cooperation from every state government. And if that cooperation is not there—

Mr Duluk: Are the unions going to hijack it, are they?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —he will not be looking—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister! Is the member for Davenport interjecting?

Mr Duluk: No, ma'am.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I didn't think he was. Minister.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: It is what is absolutely essential and what industry—
An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Keep it up.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —and the unions expect. May I say, having been in defence for 24 years, what our professional men and women in uniform expect—and they are absolute professionals—is ministers to act like statesman. They expect a Team Australia approach. They want to see no political games with this very important project because it is about defending

the nation, it is about equipping our Navy, Air Force and our Army with the best, and it is about creating Australian jobs. So, let's see how this develops. We are going to need an outstanding Team Australia approach.

I met regularly with David Johnston, I met regularly with Kevin Andrews. May I say, Kevin Andrews was very competent, very experienced and very good at his job. Both those gentlemen understood that we needed a Team Australia approach. How will we go from here? Well, there are some very important challenges we face. All we have now is a decision to build. We now have to work out the detail.

In summary, I think in difficult headwinds this is a pretty solid budget. It is not perfect but it is pretty solid. I would like to hear from those opposite what they would do. If they have alternative plans, there may be a better way to do it—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Has the bell gone?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —but endless criticism alone will not solve the problems we face.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, we were wondering why we did not hear the bell. Nevertheless, are you on your feet to speak, member for Finniss?

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:51): I am, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will recognise you, then.

Mr PENGILLY: Thank you very much. I take the opportunity to announce that I will be supporting, along with members on this side, the budget. I think it is important to put that on the record, as indeed the leader did. After the last 20 minutes of verbal diarrhoea, I hope that we can get on with our budget speeches, quite frankly.

I took the time this morning to go back and read the Treasurer's speech from budget day, and then I made a few notes and put a few points alongside one another. It is interesting, because one of the things that came out in the federal election was that people felt forgotten. That is why we saw, in a lot of cases, the rise in the Xenophon vote and others. They have completely forgotten about people.

I read through the Treasurer's speech this morning, and nowhere could I find any place where the Treasurer talked about the cost of living impacts on families and individuals in South Australia—nowhere, not once, he did not mention it at all. I am sure, Madam Deputy Speaker, that you and other members in this chamber hear this complaint from people who come into their electorate office. I know I do in my offices in Victor Harbor and Kingscote and through correspondence through my office in Parliament House. So I was somewhat staggered.

The Treasurer talked about power but he did not talk about how the cost of power was impacting on the little people, on families and people doing it tough, mums or dads who are bringing up kids on their own. He did not talk about that or the cost of gas. He did not talk about what the astronomical costs of water are doing to families. He did not talk about that at all. The Treasurer did not talk about the impact of the emergency services levy on families. He did not talk about that. He left out all those things.

I would have thought that this is what the bleeding hearts of the Labor Party would be raising and talking about. Whether they have raised it in their caucus, I do not know, but the Treasurer mentioned it not once—not once. Let me tell you, apart from unemployment, of course, which is the highest in Australia—and we did not hear a lot about that either—there is nothing impacting more on South Australian families than the cost of living.

The fact of the matter is that the cost of living is what is killing South Australian families and the fact that there are no jobs is killing South Australian families. It is a disgrace. Let me tell you that this impacts very heavily in my electorate. You hear regularly that there is a lot of money down on the south coast or Victor Harbor. Let me tell you that there are pockets of wealth but there are also pockets of people who do not have a lot because they are on the age pension.

I refer to many, many people in Rosetta Village, Bay Village and those retirement villages across the Fleurieu. Elliot Gardens is a little bit different. The residents of Elliot Gardens probably have more money to spend, but those retirement villages are full of people who have generally retired from Adelaide, the northern suburbs or whatever. They have spent their lives working for Australia, and in many instances they have come to Australia, but they have been forgotten—completely forgotten. They are the ones who come into my office who are struggling to make ends meet.

Fortunately, their lives are rich in the locations they live in. Their lives are rich, but they are cash poor, and that is how it is. They have to pay for everything; they do not get it all handed to them. They have to pay and a lot of them live from one pension day to another. They budget carefully and they do not have too much, but did the Treasurer talk about them? Not once. I defy the other side of the house to tell me where in the speech the Treasurer gave he talked about those people.

The Treasurer talked about the business sector. Let me tell you that even yesterday I had some businesspeople come in to see me who have investments on the south coast and also in Adelaide. Their major complaint was that it is not a level playing field. So what are they doing? They are going to make their investments interstate. They are going to invest in further business activities that they undertake interstate because it is not a level playing field in South Australia. They are being done over. These are people who employ, through the centres they operate, hundreds and hundreds of South Australians.

A problem that is unknown to many in South Australia is what has happened with the fishing industry. If it was not enough to have marine park sanctuary zones rammed down our throats, we now have the problem with long-nosed fur seals rammed down our throats. It would not even impact on some in this chamber, but I can tell you that it is impacting deeply on members on this side who have constituents who rely on the fishing industry and who are being ruined.

Recently, there has been some media on the lakes problem and fishing in the lakes, but last week a gentleman I know well who has been fishing for a long time over on the island counted 300 long-nosed fur seals on North Cape. There never used to be a seal there a few years ago, but there are 300 there now. It is doing interminable damage and we are losing our fishing industry steadily and progressively.

Another thing I did not hear the Treasurer talk about was the impact of drugs, the impact of ice and the impact on our young people and the impact on society from drugs, particularly ice and methamphetamines. I am seeing, and I am sure other members on my side at least are seeing ongoing and growing issues with this. The prisons are getting full of prisoners, many young people who are involved in the drug trade.

I had dealings with one constituent last week down on the Fleurieu who has got himself in a mess over drugs, but I did not hear the Treasurer talk about it. A key issue for me is the impact of ice and the epidemic that is taking place with ice. Even though heroin is supposedly still the favoured drug, the impact of ice is a disaster for the communities in my electorate, and others I suspect, but I will talk about my electorate.

I was happy to hear from the Treasurer about the STEM funding for schools. I think that is important and I have no argument with that. It is a good thing. The money has to be found of course, but it is a good thing. Health continues to be the never-ending diabolical nightmare of finding enough money, but you have to wonder why it has ballooned out of control. We seemingly hear, day after day, more health-related stories that have not been fixed. Transforming Health has been pretty much a disaster in my electorate.

I have two health units—Kangaroo Island and Victor Harbor. The doctors at Victor Harbor (over 40 private practices across the south coast) have just about washed their hands of it. They are waiting for a tragedy to occur in the south coast hospital. It is simply not good enough. The figures I have on funding their own doctors in the hospital in the health service are diabolical. They still cannot find enough doctors. They cannot find enough to employ and it is a sad situation.

I would like to turn to the issue of blue gums. I think they need mentioning. It would not be the first time in this place that I have said that managed investment schemes were, as far as blue gums went, an absolute disaster introduced by the former Coalition government. I would have to say that, in relation to blue gums, they have been a disaster in my electorate. There are much smaller

plantations on the Fleurieu. Some of them have been sold and some of them have been cleared. Indeed, the Hon. Robert Brokenshire in another place bought one or two small parcels, cleared them and returned them to productivity, but I can tell you that in my electorate on the island they are a nightmare. They are an absolute nightmare. It is bound up in legal stupidity.

I am fed up with hearing smart ideas about using biomass for power production, and this and that and everything else. What needs to happen with these is what is happening in Western Australia. They need to be knocked down. The country needs to be brought back into agricultural productivity, provide food and fibre for the world, and get on with it. The trees over there are not worth a crumpet, quite frankly. All you would be buying is the land and then you would have an astronomical cost to clear it, but it has to be done. It is absolutely killing the centre and west end of the island. It is destroying the society and the schools and causing the lack of people. It is killing that area which could be such a productive area again agriculturally. I am fed up with hearing all of the ideas.

I would like to say a few words regarding the KI commissioner position. Just over 12 months or so ago, we were told in this place what a wonderful thing this was going to be for Kangaroo Island.

Ms Redmond: And has it worked out that way?

Mr PENGILLY: No, it has not, member for Heysen. It has not turned out to be wonderful. I have absolutely nothing against the person who was appointed commissioner, nothing whatsoever, and I will come back to that in a minute, but it has done nothing. I did say in this place that all it would be would be another bureaucracy and what has it been?

Ms Redmond: Another bureaucracy.

Mr PENGILLY: It is another bureaucracy—member for Heysen, you are spot on—consuming a million dollars of taxpayers' money each year. It supposedly was a two or three days a week position and that was about it. So what have we got now? We now have five people paid out of that million dollars and not all of them are full-time. We have five people and another bureaucracy.

I do not begrudge people their jobs, trust me, that is not my point, but from what I can see, and what increasing numbers of people on the island are learning, you will never change the hard core who support the position until the day they die. It is achieving very little or nothing apart from glossy brochures and traditional government spin. One thing this government is very good at talking about is transformation. So what is the office of the commissioner talking about? It is transformation and more spin, you have got it. People have woken up.

Ms Redmond: Transforming to what?

Mr PENGILLY: I am not quite sure what they are transforming. It is extremely disappointing. We have five employees—another bureaucracy. In my view, one of the problems is that the commissioner's office is hand in hand with the Kangaroo Island Council and they are wet-nursing each other. I do not think it is healthy at all because, if you go back to the act that we debated at length in this place, that was not the job of the commissioner and it was not the job of the commissioner to be a development officer at all. It was not the job.

The job was to discuss and relate between government departments over how things could be improved. I understand a lot of that is not happening either. There is the education system, the health system, the Department of Transport, and of course the list goes on. In my view, and I am a harsh critic of this I know, it is all show and no go. I think people have been promised the world and had their hopes built up.

There are two things happening on Kangaroo Island at the moment: one is the walking trails in Flinders Chase. Let me tell you, that is \$5 million or thereabouts of taxpayers' money going into the government's own business enterprise. People will go over it and it will be a great walking trail, I have no doubt about that; however, they will go over on the ferry service or fly over, they will take everything with them, they will go down and walk the trail for four or five days and then disappear—for the government's own business enterprise. The other thing that is going to happen, and this is once again all taxpayers' money, is the Kangaroo Island Airport upgrade. It will be good when it happens. There is \$18 million—\$9 million from the feds and \$9 million from the state—and that will be good.

They are the only two things that are absolute certainties at this stage. Much has been talked about, and I will be accused of being negative and knocking this and knocking that. That is not correct. I just want to see something happen, and it is not happening. Yet again, tomorrow they are having another Transformation series of meetings in Kingscote, and I understand that the Premier will be attending some of that, and good on him for going over. He is going over at my initial request to attend Settlement Day, so he and I will not be here tomorrow.

I am fairly disillusioned with what has happened with the commissioner's office, and I will put the commissioner's office on notice that I am going to be doing some serious FOI-ing in the near future on just where this money has gone over the last 12 months. I think we need to identify it. Let me also say on this particular subject that the answers I am not getting by writing to the commissioner are somewhat frustrating to say the least.

I have written to the commissioner about the issue of rubble royalties, which is impacting on local government councils—something brought in by the Treasurer. I have written to the commissioner and have not received an appropriate answer on that so I do not know where the commissioner stands on that. I got some gobbledegook answer which said nothing and I have written back asking, 'Can you please give me your position on this?' There was no answer. I reminded the commissioner again yesterday of this.

The other thing I reminded the commissioner about yesterday was that I had written to her asking her where she stands on the oil and gas search in the Great Australian Bight. It will come as no surprise in this place that the government and the opposition are locked into a position of being very supportive of oil and gas search in the Great Australian Bight. So, accordingly, I would expect that, as a public servant being paid by the government and by the taxpayer, the commissioner would be all in favour of it, but I cannot get an answer out of her, so I can only assume that the commissioner is backing the view of the local council over there, which is that they are opposed to it.

They are opposed to it, as is the Victor Harbor council. My view is they should both butt right out of it. Being several hundred kilometres right away from it, I do not believe it is any of their business anyway. The member for Flinders and I have met regularly, as have other members, and we are strong supporters of it. I am disappointed that the commissioner does not appear to have the fortitude. I am sure the Treasurer will be delighted that here is one of his public servants who will not come out and support government policy. I am sure the Treasurer will be delighted about that, but it seems that I cannot get an answer at the moment. There are some questions that need to be drilled down and looked into. As I said, I will be doing some FOIs on that matter.

On a brighter note, the government may not be aware (because they really do not take a lot of interest in these things) that we are having a particularly good season across my electorate, and much of South Australia as well, agriculturally. It is a return to a good old wet winter. As the old saying goes, 'There is more money in mud than there is in dust.' It is correct. We are having a good season. My electorate is a producer of large quantities of food and fibre for Australia and the world and I take great pride in it.

We have all sorts of industries, including rural industries and developing industries, across the electorate and, with a bit of luck and if we get a reasonable spring, we will have a fantastic season. I can assure you that there are many farmers who have put up with a few dry years as seasonal conditions who are delighted that this year is wet. It can never be too wet going into September, quite frankly. I look forward to seeing spring and the farming community having a good outcome.

Likewise, the tourism sector is hugely important. I attended a business breakfast at Victor Harbor on Friday morning where the main discussion was around the tourism opportunities for the South Coast and the Fleurieu. That was a good session. The tourism industry is absolutely critical and I look forward to them also having a successful season in front of them.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (12:11): The Appropriation Bill is the bill we are debating and the opposition will support the appropriation of money. This is the bill that enables our public servants to continue to be paid once the money appropriated in the Supply Bill, which we debated in May and June, runs out. The money from the Appropriation Bill will flow for the rest of the year and, of course, we will support it.

The job of the opposition in such a debate is therefore to critique the government's bill, which is what the Leader of the Opposition did earlier, as did the member for Finniss. One presumes that the role of a minister in such a debate, if they choose to speak, is to talk about the good things they claim to be doing in the area, and so inform the house and the people of South Australia. I will not go on about it, but I note that the minister who spoke earlier completely failed to do that and, instead, spent 20 minutes criticising other members of parliament—an extraordinarily strange set of behaviours.

I will talk at great length in response to the estimates process about matters within my portfolio responsibilities of education, multicultural affairs, the arts and higher education, science and the information economy. I will give a more general speech in the time allocated today in response to the broad situation with the budget, but I will just touch on a couple of matters in those portfolios. Of course, my constituents are concerned about a number of the ways in which the government's approach impacts upon their lives and on a day-to-day basis.

I will therefore talk about four key things. I wish to talk today about unemployment, the fiscal state of the budget (and, indeed, this claimed surplus, which technically, by the most generous of accounting terms might actually be a surplus but, on any reading, amounts to a structural deficit), some of the government's reckless fiscal management and, of course, the impact that all of this has on the cost of living for all South Australians and for some South Australians in particular who, as a consequence of this budget and the consequences of this government's mismanagement, will suffer increases in the cost of living and will face greater difficulties.

Unemployment in South Australia is our key problem. The Leader of the Opposition earlier identified an increase in excess of 40,000 net migration out of South Australia interstate. That is 4,900 more South Australians leaving South Australia to go to another state than coming in, which is over 40,000 over the life of this government.

Five thousand is a very high number for a net migration figure. I remember being appalled when I read that it was over 3,000 some 10 years ago and thinking that the government was not doing its job. I could see the impact, because it was my friends—people I went to school with, people I went to university with, young professionals and young tradies. These were people with a bit of get up and go who wanted to make a good life for themselves and their families and were finding the opportunities in South Australia so limiting that they were choosing to go interstate instead. That is writ large.

Where South Australia is, where the masses of migration have been consistently coming from over the life of this government, and when even Tasmania is now at nearly net zero interstate migration because people in Tasmania are now seeing a future for themselves and their families there, is a highlight and a beacon that this government is failing at employment. If that was not enough, let us look at the ABS figures, which show that South Australia has once again, which has been for more than a year and half, the highest unemployment in the nation at 7 per cent.

Jobs growth in this, the second of the Treasurer's so-called jobs budgets, is once again at less than half of the national projections for jobs growth. How can the Treasurer, as he did last year, call it a 'jobs budget' when his own officials are predicting that, with the measures he is taking in his so-called jobs budget, jobs will grow at 0.75 per cent while jobs across Australia will be growing at in excess of 1.75 per cent?

Unemployment is a concern. Unemployment is going to get better if you put in place the settings which will provide an environment conducive to businesses having the confidence to invest, as the Liberal Party has done in its reformist government in Tasmania and in other states. This government has manifestly failed to do that over and over again. I think one of the things that triggers that failure in confidence is that the business community, as indeed the whole community, does not and cannot have confidence in this government to put those settings in place when it claims its jobs budget and surplus based on these incredibly false presumptions.

Let us talk about the surplus in brief. We are pleased that the government seems to understand a surplus is in itself a good idea, but I think that the Treasurer clearly thinks it looks good on a press release, so having a technical surplus is enough. What he fails to grasp is that, ideally, we would have an actual surplus—a structural surplus; a surplus that suggests that we have

managed to live within our means and to grow the pie so that we have a growing economy—so that more people are in jobs, so that more people are paying taxes, so that more businesses are paying taxes, and so fewer people are requiring support from government.

Instead, we have a surplus that is built on increased revenues from the federal government. I note that, despite the state government's claims of reduced federal funding, South Australia will receive an extra \$528 million in GST funding in 2016-17 compared to 2015-16. The commonwealth is contributing an extra \$187 million towards health funding over three years. So, this is built on significant increases in funding coming from the federal government and, of course, \$400 million coming from the Motor Accident Commission this year.

I think that in accounting terms, it is unusual for, as the Treasurer has claimed, a privatisation of the MAC. Usually, one would not put that in the profit and loss statement but, because of the structure of what the government is doing, they do. So, they claim this surplus that is built on a tissue of convenience. The reckless fiscal management that has led us to this situation is reliant on the government. When confronted with a problem, rather than, 'How can I fix this and how can we make a long-term change?' they say, 'Okay, let's sign the cheque and worry about the rest later.' Consequently, we have had budget overspend in almost every year of the government's tenure.

As the Leader of the Opposition identified in his speech, there have been extraordinary blowouts across the health department, the education department (where there has been an overspend of some \$80 million), the transport department and others. When departments and governments consistently overspend their budgets that is a sign that you need to either have a look at how those budgets are set in the first place or look at what has happened in the intervening years. Occasionally, there are things that might come up that the government needs to base decisions on, but we see this every single year and it is a sign of a government that does not care about meeting its budgets, and that is another of its failures.

My former portfolio was in the Corrections department and for a number of years the opposition was calling for investment in rehabilitation programs, investment in perpetrator programs and domestic violence, for example. In this year's budget they have now seen a little bit of funding go in and we have seen an increase in the number of prison beds. Here is the thing: it is cheaper to have somebody in a prison bed that has been budgeted for in advance than it is to have somebody who is forced to be in police custody; for example, in one of those police cells at Holden Hill which is used as an overflow for when the prisons are full. It is cheaper to have somebody in a properly budgeted for and prepared for prison environment.

It is cheaper still, and it is a much better outcome for the community, if that person does not commit a crime in the first place. The best bang for your buck in reducing crimes is if you are able to change the behaviour of somebody who has previously behaved in a criminal way. If you are able to reach out to the person who has committed a criminal offence and is in Her Majesty's custody at Her Majesty's pleasure and change their behaviours—if they have cognitive behavioural problems then by dealing with that side—and if there are ways to get them into a skilled job where they can contribute to society, then that has to be the focus.

There has been some minimal investment in this year's budget—and it is minimal investment. It is the sort of investment that has been needed for years and years, but we see it all too late. That department has had cost overruns every year because of the increases in numbers that have been over and above the ludicrous 3 per cent increases that were budgeted for. I hope the programs that have now been funded—and it is not a great deal of funding—will have a significant impact and I hope that they will change the behaviours of some of those perpetrators. Critically, and this is so much more important even than the incredible budget savings potentially there for the people of South Australia, I hope that that will mean that there will be reduced impacts on the victims of those crimes and that there will be increased community safety.

The impacts of the budget are significant in terms of the cost of living of everyday South Australians, the people in our community and our constituents who come to express their concerns. They express their concerns about the cost of motor vehicles and running a car going up and the cost of public transport going up. However, there are some really significant impacts in this budget that are over and above that.

The massive increase in the solid waste levy will cost South Australians an extra \$64 million over four years. It is a politically clever, morally vacuous way to do it. The impact will be felt first and foremost by people when they are paying their council rates in the years ahead, because it is the councils that are going to be finding the money this year. Most of them, of course, have set their budgets well in advance of the state government identifying that they would have this increase. Most of them have set their budgets in the financial year before this financial year to which this budget applies.

The government delayed its budget and, in doing so, has made the job even harder for local councils that are seeking to do this. Of course, the impact on rates may follow for those who are unable to find the hundreds of thousands or the millions of dollars in increased costs to their local government area. It is a state government tax and it will be felt by the local government area but it will be felt, in the long term, by all South Australian ratepayers.

This budget has also found a novel way—novel in that it has not been done in South Australia before—to increase the cost of living for 457 visa holder immigrants working in those areas by, for the first time, introducing school fees of \$5,000 or \$6,000 for the children of 457 visas being educated in our public schools. This is another example of the way in which the government is increasing the cost of living for everyday South Australians. The things that really resonate—and the member for Finniss identified these in his comments—the things that people come into my electorate office about very regularly and are very concerned about are their utilities, their everyday cost of living, their electricity and water bills and charges.

I recently had a fairly interesting discussion with somebody who pointed out an app that you can get on your iPhone. I assume those of you on Android and other devices can get this as well, and I encourage everyone to do so. It is called PocketNEM and it has a fairly nice graphic that identifies at any given moment the cost of electricity in the states on the grid. At this moment in time, for example, I can tell you that in Tasmania it is \$29.27, in Victoria it is \$32.01, in New South Wales it is \$29.99, in Queensland it is \$28.69, and in South Australia \$39.22.

Ms Redmond: Only 25 per cent more.

Mr GARDNER: Yes, the member for Heysen has spotted it: only 25 per cent more than the rest of the country. When I say 'only', I mean 'significantly'. I was looking at it this morning and it was over \$300 at one point in South Australia, and it was high in one other state and the other states were lower. I have looked at it probably 30 times over the last week and there was one time when South Australia was below one of the other states and in all the other times we have been the highest in the country.

The leader set out in great detail in his speech some of the things that go into that, but I want to talk a bit about the impact that has on everyday South Australians by using (and I will do this in the water area as well) an example of the impact on one person who has asked me to share their comments in the parliament. This is not an example of the only sorts of issues, but I think it is useful to cite real-life examples. My constituent writes:

Hello John

I think you might be interested in the notification I have just received from AGL which represents a 40% increase in my fortnightly payments despite the fact that my usage has gone down by 46%...

He has provided attachments. He continues:

This represents an additional \$54 per four weeks (say \$60 per month) and is appalling. To say that I am angry is to say the very least.

We spent a bit of time talking with my constituent. He went on to write:

I am sure I will not be the only one who writes—tell me how many will be able to afford this. The lights will go out across SA as AGL forecloses on people.

My constituent was able to have his fortnightly electricity reduced, through negotiation in the end, to \$69 and the gas from \$46 to \$38. My constituent also wanted me to thank the person at AGL resolutions who was able to be helpful, but here is the critical thing: for so many vulnerable

South Australians, it is not going to be the first thing they do—they will pay their bill and make cuts elsewhere.

Those people who have the wherewithal or who have the support to do that negotiation, to find the best price and so on, will be better off, but the government, in its casual dismissal of the concerns about high electricity prices by saying, 'Oh, you can negotiate,' forget that often the most vulnerable are the ones least in the position to be able to do that negotiation, to do that checking, to do that shopping around. We are very concerned that many people in the community, pensioners and others, will just accept their bills and keep paying them, and when the government has the settings in place that lead us to having the highest electricity prices in the nation—double the prices in Victoria with the same privatised market—then that is a concern.

I also want to bring to the attention of the house some correspondence I had with the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion in relation to a constituent who had issues with their water bill. There are a number of constituents across South Australia whose water bill concessions were applied differently from last year. I have been helping one constituent in particular over a number of months since she came into the office in April concerned about her concessions, and she is a good example of what is a much greater problem for a much greater number of people.

Last year, she changed from being on Newstart Allowance to being on a low-income healthcare card. Since the change, she has not received concessions on her SA Water bills but is still getting concessions on the AGL bills. She has tried to get this sorted out (from October to April) but was not able to get anywhere. She kept getting shunted between SA Water and the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion.

My staff and I have been going back and forward with the minister's office, with SA Water and with the department since the beginning of April. Sometimes we got answers saying that she was eligible for the concession, was on the list, and sometimes she was not. I do not have time to go through the whole set of interactions, but there have been about 25. I finish with this letter I received from the minister that I want to read out for the illumination of the house and maybe others will have better insight into the use of the language therein:

Dear John, Thank you for your email on behalf of [the constituent]—

I will not name her.

about [their] concern she was no longer receiving water and sewerage concessions. The DCSI has advised on 1 May 2015 [the constituent's] water and sewerage concessions ceased as Centrelink records confirmed she no longer held a Pensioner Concession Card. The SA Water and Sewerage Concession Scheme 2013 requires that to be eligible for concessions an applicant must hold an eligible card or be in receipt of an eligible payment, as well as occupying the land as their principal place of residence.

On 18 December 2015 [the constituent] reapplied for water and sewerage concessions as she now held a Low Income Health Care Card. As a result, she was eligible for concessions for the following SA Water billing periods: April to June 2015, July to September 2015 and October to December 2015. For each of these periods, [the constituent] was eligible for \$46.25 water concession and \$27.50 sewerage concession, totalling \$221.25.

DCSI has informed me that on 5 January 2016, backdated water and sewerage concessions of \$221.25 were processed. The concessions were applied to [the constituent's] next SA Water bill, dated 9 March 2016.

I understand that in addition to the March account, [the constituent] received two additional invoices from SA Water: one dated 23 December 2015 for \$72.31 and a second revised invoice dated 6 January 2016 for \$331.06. I also understand that it was not clear to [the constituent] that the concession had been applied to her March 2016 account. DCSI contacted SA Water to clarify these accounts.

SA Water advised [the constituent] was reinviced for the three billing periods from April to December. SA Water stated for that period the amended amount billed totalled \$990.27. Of that she had already paid \$659.21 leaving a balance of \$331.06. On 29 February [the constituent] paid the \$72.31.

The March bill incorporated the \$221 concession. The bill totalled \$653. I will continue my remarks in my next opportunity to speak.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (12:31): I also rise to support the Appropriation Bill, and the implications of it, which is, as I am advised, an \$18 billion expenditure across the 2016-17 financial year.

I approach budget day with a sense of optimism. I really do look forward to it because I know that a tremendous amount of work from government members and staff has gone in to put forward a vision. I approach it from, sadly, the opposition side of things, where the need is to critique it, to identify those things that are not quite right, to identify those things that are definitely not right, but also to acknowledge those things that are done right. I will have a bit of a ranging speech that talks about those three keys areas.

Can I say, though, that the member for Waite seemed to critique the critique provided by the leader. I enjoyed the leader's contribution, as I have enjoyed the feedback I have received from the leader's speech that was made at the Press Club on the day after the budget was delivered. From what I am told, it was a good presentation of the perspective that the leader takes to the budget papers; indeed, as I understand it, the minister and the member for Waite were actually in attendance that day.

I picked up one little thing from the member for Waite's contribution, that is, he talked about electricity costs and energy prices because the leader had focused on this, and quite rightly so. The member for Waite approaching the 2014 election was actually the shadow minister for energy, and the leader, as part of his response, referred to Liberal Party policies at the 2014 election, in which the member for Waite had been a driver.

Quite rightly, the critique was provided, but the member for Waite seemingly does not acknowledge, if indeed he has this vision of what the world was then and a vision of what the world is now—and he has a collection of knowledge he had brought into the position that he now holds, which I presume he would have used in a far wider ranging area because he used to talk in many different areas, and there is no doubt about that—from the cabinet perspective and from his fellow ministers, what he is actually pushing on the issues that he believed in very strongly before the 2014 election. I cannot see where the things that he talked about in that energy portfolio have actually translated into any form of action that is actually improving South Australians' cost-of-living pressures. I put that on the record as my observation of what I recollect and the member's critique of the leader's critique of the budget papers.

I will talk initially about the good things that I see as a local member of parliament that are from my electorate, and for which I put on the record my thanks. The budget papers highlight that in 2016-17, \$1.57 million will be allocated to the Pinery fire. We have had a variety of conversations within the chamber of the desperate days of 25 November and post days, and the recovery of that community of over 83,000 hectares that were impacted by it, the terrible deaths, people seriously injured, 80-odd homes and a numerous number of outbuildings and machinery lost, the hundreds of millions of dollars lost and the tragedy that has come with that, the ongoing psychological challenge and the physical impact it has had, which has been foremost in people's minds for the eight months since that terrible day. So, it is entirely inappropriate that the government is putting an allocation of funds towards continuing services to the community. So, on that, I say a sincere thank you. It is well-expended money, something the community wants and the community certainly does appreciate, so thank you for that.

I also note in the budget papers that, within the Goyder electorate in particular, there is \$4.9 million for the Warooka and Point Turton water supply upgrade. I have had a bit of an interest in this in a past position before coming into this place, so I commend the government through SA Water on the effort that is going there to improve that. I hope it results in not just the physical infrastructure, which improves the reticulation of the water supply from the basin, but that it also improves the water quality that comes through the system because (if I can use the term 'hard') it is very hard water, and it has to go through a process before being used in homes.

I am pleased to see construction related to the last mile program, and the Minister for Transport has been part of that effort—a 90-day project, minister, was it is not? It was conducted early in the 2015 calendar year, and the minister and his ministerial colleagues (ministers Bignell and Brock) have been good enough to brief the opposition and wider industry members on what will be undertaken. That is a good thing because if the first mile and last mile challenges can be fixed it will certainly help the issues in between and make productivity improvements, and therefore profitability, an option for all, so that is a very good outcome.

I was pleased to see, within the Minister for Education's portfolio area as announced by the Treasurer, \$250 million for STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics), and I think it is absolutely fantastic. As someone who was challenged in some of those areas when going through school but who loved it—mathematics in particular, but did not progress it to an area I would have liked—I think it is a wonderful example of where that effort needs to be driven in schools to achieve the quality of knowledge that we will possess to have a strong economic viability into the future.

I have been a long-term believer in the fact that we all need to continue to upskill ourselves. We need to make sure we are ready for that next work-related challenge that will require a skill set, knowledge and information to be able to do that. For our young people in school, many of those who, when they leave school or university, will be taking on jobs that do not currently exist, the ability to understand the implications of what chances STEM will provide to them in the future is profound. So, that investment is a very appropriate one.

In the Goyder electorate, as I understand it, \$1 million has been allocated to the Two Wells Primary School, \$3.5 million to the Kadina Memorial School—and, as a plug for them, with 1,100 students it is the largest school by student enrolment numbers outside Adelaide, as I understand it—and \$3.5 million to the Moonta Area School. I have written to the Minister for Education thanking her for that contribution.

I also posed the question of how the schools were actually chosen. I found that rather interesting because I am not aware of schools being able to tender for an opportunity or to put forward a proposal with education for an opportunity to be selected as one of those. I am grateful for the investments that occurred, but I have asked about the fact that I have two schools within 14 kilometres of each other that have been funded, where I can see a profound needs exists across all our schools.

Money stretches only so far, I understand that, but I am interested and that is why I have written to the minister, to get some information on that selection process, because it is something that I think is important. I look forward to the development of these resources that will exist within the schools and the fact that children will be excited by the challenge of it.

It is difficult to study in areas that mum and dad might not have for various reasons, but which you have a great passion for. Hopefully it is only a matter of one little thing that they might do at an early age as a student that will make them think, 'Wow, I love this and this is what I want to do.' I think STEM will do that, it will be a significant driver in it. So that is the kudos and the thankyou, and it is important to put them in place.

I am going to talk about a challenge that a lot of other members already have spoken about or will speak about, and that is cost-of-living pressures. Electricity is very foremost in people's minds. It was only earlier this week that one of my regional newspapers asked me for some comments about disconnections that exist in the electricity system. That is the sad case where people cannot afford to pay their bills. I am sure that all of us in this place have been contacted by people who are facing that challenge, and no doubt our response to them is, 'Please make sure that you engage with your retailer, that you talk to them about challenges, that you enter into a regular repayment plan, that you try to budget to ensure that that exists.' But the facts are that across South Australia it has been very hard to come up with the dollars in far too many homes.

I was provided with some information, with the assistance of the member for Stuart's office, which really highlights the disconnection issue that faces South Australia. This is for the 2015-16 financial year. In the first quarter of 2015-16, 3,182 premises were disconnected. In the second quarter of 2015-16, 2,540 disconnections occurred. In the third quarter it was 2,531. There is a bit of a lag, so we do not know what the fourth quarter figure is for the 2015-16 year, but I do have the total figure for 2014-15: it was 10,179.

That is 10,000 properties. The absolute majority of these would be homes. In some cases, in reading a report that was put out by Mr Ross Womersley a few months ago where he talked about the fact there had been up to five disconnections across a three-year cycle in some homes because of the continued challenges of paying all their bills, that is 10,000 homes that, even if it was for a day, lost what we consider one of the basic needs of our society, and that is electricity.

That is the sort of crisis—and I do not use the word 'crisis' all that often—and part of the challenge that actually faces us as policymakers collectively, for the government perspective on things especially, those who put the budget in place, what the financial commitments will be for the next financial year and across the forward estimates. That is the challenge that actually faces us: to ensure that, not just electricity but across all of those basic commodities that a modern society requires, we have the capacity to ensure that the cost of providing that, and the cost to consumers of that service, is not beyond their capacity.

I am sure that there are other members in this place who are contacted by constituents who have had to reduce their expenditure in other areas, things they might love doing and necessities that they have held in the past, because they are proud people who want to pay their bills. The figure of 10,000 that I quoted for the 2014-15 year, and the potential for that to be even more at the completion of the 2015-16 period once that last quarter figure comes in, worries the life out of me. That is the reason why policies that come from the opposition, and from government and minor party members, need to have a focus on ensuring that what we are doing for South Australians is the right thing because, if we are not doing that, we are in the bloody wrong industry, I have to tell you.

That is why I am proud of the fact that the Liberal Party—and the member for Waite certainly reflected upon this in his critique of the leader's critique, what he saw as a lack of policy initiatives—since the very major significant launch of the 2036 policy statement by the Leader of the Opposition, has put out 23 policies.

For me, as a portfolio area, one has been rate capping—not liked by councils, I understand that. We have had the debate about the legislation on that, and it has been lost. My conversations with local government have been interesting. There have been some challenges and that sort of stuff, but it has created a discussion about the efficiency of service delivery and a cost-of-living pressure, and I use that as an example of where there is a regular bill that goes out that people need to pay for, that is making it harder for them.

When you look at some of the components of a council rate notice, though—and other members have spoken about this—and one example is the solid waste levy, it is the significant increases that are being declared by another level of government (in this case, the state government) upon the collector of the tax (in this case, local government) where it is over \$30-odd million in the next four years. In the information provided to me by the Local Government Association, only \$14 million of that over \$30 million actually returns back in grants and programs to ensure a reduction in the amount that goes to solid waste.

It worries the life out of me, and I think it should worry everybody, when seemingly a tax or a levy goes up but a proportion of that is siphoned off and put into Treasury. It is not being used for what it was created for, it is being used to make the balance sheet look better, and that is what it basically becomes—just a bottom-line improvement figure opportunity—and an increasing number of Treasury decisions are being made to help the bottom-line figure.

It comes at a cost all the time. It is not about government at all levels ensuring the efficiency of the service they deliver. They think, 'We will tax more.' That is totally abhorrent to me. I cannot accept that as a response to how to provide services at a government level. That is why there will be a discussion on an ongoing basis about cost-of-living pressures, because it is a thing that hits us all the time. The budget, by virtue of the fact that it is a very strong policy statement, is a very strong indication of where the dollars are going to be spent. It is \$18 billion.

Employment growth is absolutely key, there is no doubt about that. I am saddened by the fact that South Australia has a near 7 per cent unemployment rate. I am exceptionally saddened by the fact that the Yorke Peninsula-Mid North area has been at 9.5 per cent in recent times. For the member for Frome and I, and others in this chamber who share that common boundary in their electorates, that has to be a cross we bear every night when we go to bed. What can we do to ensure that we have opportunities in place to give people the chance to build their lives and to be a wage earner, not reliant upon any other funding source, and to be totally responsible for what they do and to pay all the bills?

It is a psychological issue, too, as well as the position in which you hold yourself, so I think that is where job outcomes have to be a key. We link what the cost of living is, and the pressure that

creates, with what the job needs are, and that is where we have to start to get things right. It disappoints me when we talk about the cost of living. There was a member in this chamber who, as part of the response given to the rate capping legislation that I proposed, talked about the response from government being the cost-of-living concession. The mad part about that is that tax dollars are used to provide a concession which in itself recognises the challenges of the cost of living.

Why do we not look at what the base problem is; that is, the need to actually ensure efficiency of service delivery? I think it is the wrong side from which to look at the argument, but it is part of the challenge we all face. I am one of these masochistic people who look forward to the detail provided during estimates. I think it is a great example of where the minister, the minister's key staff, the Public Service who support the minister, the opposition, and therefore by association the people of South Australia, can know as much about the budget as possible, even if it is only for one day. It might only be for that short period but it allows the information to be put out there and allows questions to be asked.

Good examples are given by the government through the questions they ask their own minister about things which they are proud of, and I understand that, too. The argy-bargy occurs, but it disappoints me that it is for a lesser period than it has been previously. I saw a figure today which referred to the fact that there had been an 11 per cent reduction in the time available for estimates now. I am a believer in accountability, absolutely at all times. For every word and every action there is someone who will review it, and I think that is where estimates is one of the keys for us.

I am a bit of a numbers person. I am not sure if it is one of my problems or not but it is something I love knowing about, but when I look at the budget surpluses that have been proposed regularly in budgets in future years going out that have not actually been delivered it frustrates me. People have talked to me about the budget and the surplus that is projected. I said to one person, who is a regional newspaper staffer, 'Look at the creation of the opportunity behind that and look at the fact that it is from asset sales.' The budget was predicted to be in surplus, not based on that asset sale, but it had to occur, which turned what was going to be a significant deficit into a projection approximately equal to last year's budget because of an asset sale.

Yes, we have the short-term revenue hit but we have the long-term loss. We have the long-term loss of the capacity to control what that asset used to charge people, too, so there is a multiplication of what the impact of this is. It is part of the engagement process that we need to conduct with people to make them understand that. We hope we know as much as possible about a lot of the information we receive, but it is impossible to project that to all people, so you have to target some things. That is what opposition members do in their contribution to the Appropriation Bill.

Even though there is commonality in what we say, everyone has an individual nuance and a particular focus on an aspect of which they want South Australians to be aware. They also use the media in their community to also put out some information. It is not just a continual bagging session opportunity but it is an opportunity to put out information for people to then develop their own set of questions: 'Do I believe what I am told by one side, or should I challenge what I am told by the other side?' There is a truth somewhere in between.

Ms Redmond: What we tell them is true.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes. The member for Heysen says, 'What we say to them is true,' and the member for Heysen is a person who tells the truth at all times, I understand that. I would like to think that on my epitaph it might be that I say the same thing too. It will be an interesting debate as it goes forward. It is \$18 billion that provides an opportunity to ensure that South Australia becomes a good place. I am a person who is a glass half full, and I know that many debates have occurred in this room for the last 127 years and we have seen amazing things occur outside this room. We have gone through Federation, wars, depression, other wars, tremendous growth in the state, fuel crises, high-interest periods, higher unemployment periods, a return to some level of prosperity, the GFC has come in, the challenges are there now still, but I have to believe—

Mr Goldsworthy: GST.

Mr GRIFFITHS: GFC. Global financial—

Mr Goldsworthy: *Interjecting.*

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes, true. The rivers of gold with the GST, the member for Kavel highlights to me. A lot has occurred outside this place in the last 127 years. What we talk about in here might be deemed, when reviewing history in 25 decades, to be inconsequential, but it is all part of what makes us. Therefore, we have to try to make sure that—and I believe the absolute majority does—what we do in here is for the positive. The opportunity to be in this place is a privilege that we hold for a short time, and we have to make sure the legacy we leave is one of which we can be proud.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (12:52): I am pleased to make a contribution in the house today in relation to the Appropriation Bill that we are currently debating. I have certainly listened to the leader's excellent contribution earlier this morning giving quite a comprehensive summary of the budget and other issues impacting the state of South Australia and the communities within our state. I have been in this place since 2002, so I have made a number of speeches over the years in relation to the budgets brought down by Labor governments. It is interesting to reflect on some of the figures and the amounts of money that we deal with in relation to the budget.

From memory, in 2002, when I, the member for Heysen and others were first elected, the state budget was about \$12 billion. Now, 14 or 15 years later, it is up to \$18 billion. So we have seen a 50 per cent increase (\$6 billion) from 2002—\$12 billion to \$18 billion. As the member for Goyder said when summarising his comments, we have experienced quite a number of changes that have impacted on the economic outlook and outcomes of the state. We can talk about the rivers of gold that were flowing in when the GST was cranking along, back in those earlier days of the Labor government between 2002 and 2010, but that is all in the history books now and we have to face the reality of the current situation that all South Australians are dealing with.

As the leader pointed out and we have highlighted previously, really, without the assets of the sale of the Motor Accident Commission, the budget would be in deficit. The net operating balance would be in deficit because the surplus was written down by \$97 million in the Mid-Year Budget Review and the net operating balance for the 2016-17 year is budgeted at \$254 million.

We all remember the cries back a number of years ago of 'No more privatisation. No more privatisation under Labor governments.' We all remember that. That all went out the window years ago because the government has realised that previous Liberal governments were on the right track in terms of selling some assets to restore what was a complete fiasco as a consequence of the State Bank debacle. That, again, is all in the history books but, really, South Australia is still suffering, financially and economically, as a consequence of the State Bank disaster.

As I said, if the \$448 million in payments from the privatisation of the Motor Accident Commission and the \$624 million payment forecast for the 2016-17 year had not eventuated, then the surplus would not have been created. I would like to call it a book-entry surplus really. It might be old terminology, but I might be an old banker. My friend and colleague the member for Davenport is an old banker too.

Members interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: He is perhaps a more recent old banker; nonetheless, he cut his teeth in the banking game before he moved into public life as a state member of parliament. So, really, it is a book-entry surplus brought about by privatisation and the sale of public assets, which is something that this Labor government, this Labor Party, vowed and declared a number of years ago they would never do. 'No more privatisation.' I remember the previous premier, Mike Rann, shouting from the rooftops, 'No more privatisation under my government.'

Mr Duluk: And 'never sell the Repat'.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: All of those things. All of those things are absolute untruths and broken promises, however you want to describe them. There is a list as long as your arm of broken promises made by these successive Labor governments since they came into office in 2002. We can analyse the budget, and members will do that. The leader did it very well. We could go through portfolio by portfolio—education, arts, science and information, multicultural planning, local government, you name it—and there are pages and pages of analysis in relation to where this government has the wrong priorities and are not meeting their budget projections.

An important point to make is, in the 15 years that I have spoken on Labor government budgets, never has a budget forecast eventuated. They have forecast their budget. They have said, 'This is what we are going to do. These are the results we are going to deliver. These are the outcomes. These are the estimates pushing out into the forward estimates.'

But never, ever have any of their budget forecasts eventuated, so how can we really believe what the current Treasurer is trying to peddle out there in relation to this budget? As I said, in the most recent Mid-Year Budget Review, the surplus was written down by \$97 million. When we look back over the years, there are always readjustments of the figures, but nothing ever eventuates. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

DOG AND CAT MANAGEMENT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

MENTAL HEALTH (REVIEW) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Local Government Annual Report—Northern Areas Council Annual Report 2014-15

By the Premier (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

Regulation made under the following Act—
Unauthorised Documents—General

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

Regulation made under the following Act—
Victims of Crime—Imposition of Levy

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

Regulation made under the following Act—
Return to Work—Volunteers

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

Motor Accident Commission—Charter

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

Stony Point Environmental Consultative Group—Annual Report 2014-15

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Aquaculture—General

Primary Produce (Food Safety Schemes)—Meat Food Safety Advisory Committee

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

Local Council By-Laws—

The Coorong District Council—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties

No. 2—Roads

No. 3—Local Government Land

No. 4—Dogs

No. 5—Moveable Signs

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

Environment Protection (Air Quality) Notice and Policy 2016

South Australian Water Corporation—Direction pursuant to the Public Corporations Act 1993

Regulation made under the following Act—

Environment Protection—Waste Depot Levy

Ministerial Statement

ZEMA, MR MATT

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:04): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Matt Zema, the Managing Director and Chief Executive Officer of the Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO), passed away suddenly at his home in Melbourne on Saturday 23 July 2016. This state and Australia have lost a good, decent and exceptional man. Matt was a passionate South Australian with deep family connections in the South-East of our state, coming from the Coonawarra, where his family own and operate the iconic family winery, Zema Estate.

Over a distinguished 30-year career in energy, Matt accomplished many things, not least of which was playing an integral role in the development and creation of AEMO as its founding chief executive officer in 2008. His vast knowledge and expertise in the operation of the National Electricity Market will be very difficult to replace, but such was the professionalism of the man that he built an organisation that will no doubt cope with such a traumatic and sudden loss.

No other person in this country had a greater expertise and knowledge of our electricity market than Matt. He helped build this nation by operating a national market that was changing daily but always ensured our industries and homes had electricity delivered reliably. He was instrumental in delivering the Moomba gas hub and a number of initiatives that helped assist South Australia and the nation develop its industrial base.

I was saddened to hear of the passing of Matt because not only was he a trusted adviser and confidant to the South Australian government but he was a good friend and I will miss him deeply. We are all better for having known him and for his service, as a nation and as individuals. Our nation has lost an exceptional individual, and his family has lost a loving husband and father. My deepest sympathies to his wife, Teresa, his son, Demetrio, and his family here in South Australia. May he rest in peace.

INTEGRATION OF CARBON AND ENERGY POLICY

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:07): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The key to a coordinated approach to the transition of our electricity supply is the integration of carbon and energy policy. At the COAG energy ministers' meeting in December 2015, the council recommended unanimously that officials be tasked with developing a nationally cooperative effort to integrate energy and carbon policy within the National Electricity Market. I congratulate Prime Minister Turnbull on the appointment of the Hon. Josh Frydenberg as the new Minister for the Environment and Energy. I wish Mr Frydenberg well and offer our cooperation in his new role.

The appointment of a single federal minister to oversee energy and environmental issues will help ensure a coordinated approach during the energy market transition and continues the important work begun at the last Council of Australian Governments meeting. A properly functioning national market for electricity will be essential for the success of this policy integration and implementation.

We saw the impacts of an outdated national electricity market on South Australia over the last few weeks, when the scarcity of uncontracted gas, extreme cold and infrastructure upgrades to the interconnector left some South Australian businesses with unacceptable energy prices. Some in the media and other commentators used this perfect storm to direct the blame directly at alternative energies like wind and solar. This could not be further from the truth.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I note the laughter of members opposite. A confluence of events conspired to leave South Australia vulnerable while work on the interconnector continued. High gas spot prices, availability of tradable gas, gas storage issues in Victoria, unusually high winter demand for gas and energy on the east coast and weather conditions not conducive to wind generation or solar energy all meant we were highly reliant on expensive peaking generation.

The government acted immediately and encouraged dormant gas-fired generation to come online into a market that offered limited incentive for them to do so. In short, the National Electricity Market failed when faced with conditions it was unable to react to or send market signals into to drive a satisfactory outcome for consumers. The electricity market needs to ensure low carbon generation capacity can be developed in the optimum location for the fuel source and reach demand centres to increase competition in wholesale electricity markets, breaking up the privatised monopolies, and provide pricing outcomes in the long-term interests of consumers.

South Australia is uniquely placed to assist in fulfilling the nation's bipartisan policy aspirations of meeting the renewable energy target of 33,000 gigawatts per annum by 2020 and the Paris carbon abatement agreements committed to by the Turnbull government. We can maximise our economic advantage and benefit our economy by unleashing the power and potential of our renewable energy resources across the National Electricity Market.

This is why the government recently announced a contribution of half a million dollars towards a feasibility study to explore greater energy interconnection with the Eastern States. Stronger energy interconnection to the Eastern States, to either New South Wales or Victoria, will improve wholesale market competition and power system security for South Australia by reducing our reliance on the Heywood interconnector.

I advise the house that the South Australian government is also pursuing a number of other activities to address the challenges associated with our transitioning electricity supply and to ensure we have a properly functioning national market into the future. To ensure the Australian Energy Market Operator has the appropriate mechanisms to manage supply and demand for electricity, I proposed a rule change request which has recently resulted in amendments to the National Electricity Rules to ensure that the market operator can continue to contract for reserves if there is forecast to

be inadequate generation capacity to meet periods of high demand. Silence. I also submitted a new rule change request which seeks to ensure—

The SPEAKER: As there should be during a ministerial statement for which leave is given. I call the Treasurer to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir. I also submitted a new rule change request which seeks to ensure that electricity frameworks provide the South Australian Energy Market Operator with the necessary flexibility to manage security challenges that may emerge during the electricity supply transition. The request responds to calls for a mechanism in the rules to deal with the declining inertia in the South Australian electricity system.

I have also called on the Essential Services Commission of South Australia (ESCOSA) to conduct a series of inquiries to address challenges associated with our electricity supply transition. ESCOSA is also reviewing the regulatory and price regulation agreements for small-scale operations in markets, including the sale or supply of electricity outside the national electricity market, and this will ensure that consumers are protected as new locally distributed electricity markets emerge.

More recently, I have tasked ESCOSA with providing advice on whether the electricity price increases by major retailers in South Australia are justifiable. I will also be seeking to change the national electricity law to enable the Australian Energy Regulator to periodically and systematically monitor the performance of the electricity wholesale market. The regulator will be able to analyse whether market features are observed which could be detrimental to an effectively competitive market environment.

The SPEAKER: For interruptions during that ministerial statement, I call to order the leader, the deputy leader, the members for Morialta, Schubert, Hammond, Chaffey and Unley. I warn for the first time the deputy leader and the members for Chaffey, Unley and Hammond. I warn for the second and the final time the deputy leader and the member for Hammond. Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries.

BABCOCK AUSTRALIA

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:13): I seek leave to make ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: I rise to inform the house of outcomes and opportunities arising from a recent visit to Britain and France. The house will already know that while in London I concluded an agreement with the international engineering support services company, Babcock. The result is that Babcock is bringing its Australasian headquarters to Adelaide. Investment Attraction South Australia has played an important role in this. For us, it is a \$2.5 million investment in return for an immediate injection of jobs and benefit to South Australia of \$100 million. I spoke to their national management conference this morning here in Adelaide. For Babcock, it is a step towards their expansion strategy not just in Australia but in our region. They understand what talent we already have here in their fields and they want to engage it. They will drive their regional expansion from here in Adelaide.

I also had useful talks with other defence-related companies at Farnborough that may be interested in following the Babcock example of concentrating their South-East Asian presence in Adelaide. In France, I was made very welcome at the highest levels of government and industry and took part in the Bastille Day celebrations in Paris with Their Excellencies the Governor-General and the Governor of South Australia. It was good to see Australian soldiers and their colours lead that march, although of course the day ended very tragically indeed.

I was also able to begin developing broader relations with leaders of the region in Brittany. This region, apart from its historical focus on fishing and agriculture, is of course also home to the great naval port of Brest and the not far away DCNS submarine building operations at Cherbourg. In all my dealings in France, it was borne in on me that the longstanding affinity the French feel for

Australia remains strong. As well, for them, the submarine project resonates with that common history.

Two clear messages emerge from my meetings during the trip. First, it is impossible to exaggerate how important all this is for the future of South Australia. We are not just building submarines, frigates, patrol vessels and a cluster of supply enterprises, we are doing far more. This is because military equipment is always at the leading edge, whether it is in large-scale platforms like submarines, destroyers and frigates or the direct combat systems, cybersecurity or the boots that soldiers wear. It has to be: it is a matter of life and death.

Things developed to meet the special needs of space travel or defence find their way into our kitchens, where we take them for granted. The microwave oven is an almost accidental but direct outcome of urgent wartime attempts to improve radar capability. That is the game we are in. It is true that in dealing with the immediate future in building vessels for the Navy that we have a strong focus on defence industries, but history tells us that seizing this opportunity to build defence industries can carry us beyond the horizons we presently imagine.

The submarine project does not begin in 2022; it is underway right now here, in Britain and in France. We have hit the ground running to prepare for the future it offers South Australia. Our support for developing supply chain opportunities is welcomed by all major participants. We will continue that support, and I can announce to the house that South Australia will be taking a large stand at the massive Euronaval expo in Paris in October, where naval technologies of the future will be on display. It will not be the only Australian stand, but it will be the biggest. Sixteen companies will be represented there, including the nation's major shipbuilder, the ASC, the only Australian shipbuilder to have built a submarine and a major large surface ship in the air warfare destroyer.

There is a second message from my encounters in England and France. Our friends in France are approaching this massive project with a united and multifaceted approach. I was able to see clearly that they are operating as Team France and they are seeking to develop relationships with us at all levels. It is only fair and reasonable that they would expect us to honour that commitment, that unity and that embrace of new opportunities by matching it—matching it in kind and matching it in spirit.

To meet the reasonable expectations of our friends in France, all levels of government, industry, unions and other stakeholders must all focus unwaveringly on what is good for the country and what is good for the state. We enjoy the goodwill of the major contractors, but we have to understand that nothing will be given to us out of kindness. We have to be the place that people want to be. We have to foster the partnerships they value. We have to prove our willingness to seek and to meet challenges, and our capacity to perform at the highest level.

All of us have to be resolute in bringing our best selves to the task. All of us—government, investors and management, members of the workforce—have something to contribute and each of us needs the others. A simple message to everyone from the electorate, from business and from unions—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is on two warnings. If I hear from her out of order again, she will be out, which is a pity because she appears to be on the question list.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: A simple message to everyone, particularly those opposite, and to business and to industry and to the electorate, is that we are determined to see these projects succeed and that there is simply no room for petty partisan politics.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The remedy is not with me if ministerial statements offend the house. The remedy is with the member, who should terminate leave.

*Question Time***ELECTRICITY PRICES**

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Can the minister explain to the house why South Australian households have more outstanding electricity debt, more hardship repayment plans in place and more forced electricity disconnections than any other state in the nation on a per capita basis?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:21): There was a report commissioned and I think conducted by St Vincent de Paul into this and that report showed that South Australia did have a high number of disconnections on a per capita basis, but basically very closely correlated to Victoria's. Victoria, obviously, have a very different price structure because they have greater interconnection into the New South Wales and Tasmanian markets as well as South Australia.

One of the highlights of that report that the Leader of the Opposition is not quoting is the report found that there was no direct link to electricity prices from disconnections, and that in fact there are broader questions to be asked about that. Yes, unemployment is an issue—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Laughing at the unemployment rate is beneath the Leader of the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —and interjecting across the chamber without offering alternatives really is a sign of how little regard the Leader of the Opposition is held in this place. So, it is not fair to say that these are linked to electricity prices, because the report that I think the member was quoting from says so in one of its findings.

Mr Marshall: But that wasn't the question. Why didn't you answer the question? It said, 'Can you explain why?'

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Interjecting doesn't make it any better. It's still a bad question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned. The member for Mitchell is called to order, as are the members for Stuart and Kavel, and the Leader is warned a first time. The member for Torrens.

CHINA SOUTHERN AIRLINES

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:23): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house of the benefits for South Australia of attracting international airlines flying direct into Adelaide?

The SPEAKER: I think I neglected to say that I warn the member for Unley a second and final time. The Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:23): The government recognises the importance of these direct flights from overseas destinations to South Australia. I was very pleased today to be down at Adelaide Airport celebrating the in-principle decision by China Southern to have a direct link from the Chinese mainland here into Adelaide. This is an extraordinary win for South Australia.

We were in competition with other Australian jurisdictions to actually get this link into South Australia first, and I am very pleased to say that we have got there through a sustained period of advocacy, calling on a range of international partners to join with us in this enterprise, including—and I must say we are very grateful for the support of the Consul-General of the new Chinese consulate, Consul-General Rao, who is here in South Australia and has offered his support to this important enterprise.

An honourable member: Chairman Rau?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, not 'Chairman Rau', Consul-General Rao. Can I say, about this link, that not only does it tick off on four of our ten economic priorities (international tourism, international students, premium food and wine, and also the international connections), but it does something more profound than that: it links the largest urban conurbation on the face of the planet to Adelaide—an extraordinary connection.

That is not just an economic connection; it is a cultural connection. It begins to create an ease of movement of people and allow their decision-making to actually promote South Australia's investments and jobs. This could be one of the most profound decisions that have been made to South Australia's economy in recent memory. This is a—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This is an incredibly important decision for South Australia. When these Chinese billionaires begin to look up and consider the world in which they invest, they very quickly focus on Australia. When I spoke to one of these Chinese billionaires recently, he identified at least eight reasons why Australia is a destination of choice for their investment. South Australia needs to be amongst their targets for this investment.

They are familiar with the big global cities of Melbourne and Sydney, but what they need to have is Adelaide on their radar. When they have a place where they can see their investments with a quick, direct flight connected from Guangzhou into South Australia, it enables them to be more comfortable with making these investments. That is why there is such a profound connection between this new airline and jobs and growth in the South Australian economy.

We know that we have invested about \$35 million into the tourism sector in the last state budget to grow this state as a destination of choice. You cannot create preference without awareness, and we are doing that through the agreements that we have reached with China Southern to jointly market our two regions. We are expecting that the new visitors flying direct to Adelaide will create not only the jobs in the servicing of the plane (which is around 100 jobs just by itself) but also in the hotels, the education services and the goods and services that need to be provided to those various bodies.

The Australian Hotels Association believes the increase in Chinese visitors will allow further investment into high-end luxury accommodation. They see it as underpinning the economy of the existing tourism opportunities in South Australia. In closing, I want to repeat what Chinese Consul-General Henry Rao said this morning:

It is a big day, an exciting moment for South Australia and for Adelaide. This will not only boost Chinese tourists to South Australia but enhance and strengthen our cooperation in other fields—trade, investment, education and culture—as well as people-to-people exchange.

The SPEAKER: For interrupting the Premier's answer, I call to order the member for Adelaide, I warn the members for Schubert and Stuart for the first time, and I warn the member for Chaffey for the second and the last time. Leader.

ELECTRICITY PRICES

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): I like how you slowed down to add that emphasis, sir; it gives a real gravity to the situation.

The SPEAKER: A bit like Rick McIntosh's race calling.

Mr MARSHALL: I am not familiar with that body of work. My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Is the minister aware that the AER has forecast that over the next three years, contract electricity prices will be a whopping 32 per cent higher in South Australia than the national average, and what is the minister doing about it?

The SPEAKER: I suppose 'whopping' could be seen as a comment. Treasurer.

Mr Marshall: How would you describe it, sir? Gargantuan?

The SPEAKER: Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:28): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. The Australian Energy Regulator, as part of its market monitoring and enforcement, publishes a weekly report on the operation of the NEM, which includes a graph and forward prices for energy in each of the regions.

In 2014-15, about 8.8 terawatt hours were contracted throughout the entire National Electricity Market. The forward contracts that the Leader of the Opposition is talking about in South Australia make up 2 per cent of that entire 8.8 terawatt hours.

Mr Marshall: Just answer the question. Are you aware that they are higher, and what are you doing about it?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am answering that question. I know you don't understand it—I know he does not understand it, so I will explain it to him slowly.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This is exactly what—

Mr Marshall: You didn't answer the last question because you've got no answers.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Oh dear. The Leader of the Opposition is talking about the AER's—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mitchell is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Leader of the Opposition is talking about the AER's contracted prices. I am talking about how many of those are done nationally every year: it's about 8.8 per cent.

Mr Marshall: The question is about the contract price.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Exactly—I am getting to it.

Mr Marshall: Are you aware or not, and what are you doing about it?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think the desperation in the voice of the Leader of the Opposition is telling because while I am trying to answer his question he is just yelling out, blowing Botox all over the carpet. It is looking refreshed, but it's not what it's there for.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am trying to answer, but you just keep on yelling. Yelling doesn't make it any better, Steven. Yelling doesn't make it any better. Let me answer the question.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned for provoking the Leader of the Opposition, who hardly needed any provocation and was already carrying on.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, sir. I see the fluorescent vest is on again today.

The SPEAKER: Yes, and the fluorescent shoes as well.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Excellent, good, sir. So on average, of those contracts the Leader of the Opposition is talking about, I am advised that 2 per cent of all those contracts signed every year are within South Australia. That means a vast majority of the South Australians who are contracted don't sign up to the prices the Leader of the Opposition is talking about. They have long-term hedged contracts.

The forward price of the Australian electricity futures market is highly volatile and very hard to predict. In fact, it is very rare indeed that those prices that are predicted in the forwards market are actually ever met; indeed, they always generally come in under. If you are looking at the average demand in South Australia in any one day, it is about 1,500 megawatts per day, and on a peak demand, say, in summer, it goes up to about 3,000.

The contracts the Leader of the Opposition is talking about make up, on average, in 2014, about three megawatts for a day. They are the contracts that he is talking about.

Mr Marshall: Just answer the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am answering the question. Most South Australians are not exposed to the prices he is talking about. What he is attempting to do is to say to everyone in South Australia—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The truth is that most residential customers and most business customers are not exposed to the volatility in the wholesale market. They have signed forward contracts. Those companies have hedged against these volatile prices. They are not paying them. What he is talking about is a very small section of the market that most people are not exposed to, but he doesn't understand that, probably because his dad did all the purchasing of the power prices.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader will shortly be out and the Treasurer is warned for the second and final time.

An honourable member: That's three, sir.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I know how many it is. I give the deputy leader many lives before she goes.

INDONESIAN STUDENTS

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (14:32): My question is to the Minister for Investment and Trade. Minister, how many students from Indonesia study in South Australia?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:32): I thank the member for Wright for the question because South Australia has seen strong growth in international student enrolments over recent years. There were over 32,000 international students studying in Adelaide in 2015. You can see them every weekend walking through the CBD. This equated to \$1.166 billion in export earnings for South Australia in 2015, making international education the largest services export for the state and the fifth largest export overall.

There has been a positive start to 2016, with over 9,000 international students commencing a course of study in South Australia between January and April this year. This growth has been driven by growth in key markets, like China, India, Hong Kong and Malaysia. There have been statements—misinformed statements—made in this place about the number of students from Indonesia studying in South Australia. The number of international student enrolments across all sectors from Indonesia in South Australia for the last few years has been over 400 per year: in 2012, 430; in 2013, 424; in 2014, 417; in 2015, 404.

Over three-quarters of these students are enrolled in higher education sectors. The VET sector is the next largest component, accounting for just over 10 per cent. The member for Chaffey has previously stated wrongly that there were only 286 Indonesian students. That is half; he can't count, apparently. The member for Chaffey was referring to the number of students for April 2016, but he didn't realise that the enrolments continue after April until the end of the year. He just stopped halfway through.

I explain to honourable members, including the member for Chaffey, that further students enrol during the year, so part-year figures are not really very wise and not comparable with the full-

year figures. I am sure he will be more careful with his use of statistics in the future. I know there are some problems reading the budget papers as well, getting the facts right, but it is a work in progress on the other side.

There is certainly room to increase South Australia's share of international student enrolments from Indonesia. That is why the government is supporting South Australian universities to establish new partnerships and new ventures in Indonesia and exploring the feasibility of VET partnerships as part of our strategy to engage with South-East Asia. The recent business mission we have completed to Indonesia included a range of activities designed to increase international student enrolments from Indonesia, including international education forums run by TAFE SA to promote the importance of VET collaboration.

TAFE SA signed MOUs with three significant Indonesian colleges which will now lead to discussions on ways to further collaborate, including study tours, licensing course materials, Train the Trainer, pathways to further training in South Australia and other things. TAFE SA representatives were also invited as special guests to the graduation forum of a leading private vocational college, attended by numerous industry representatives, over 300 students and Indonesian media, where TAFE SA presented on the opportunities to study here.

There are new university scholarships, the launch of South Australia's first international research and development prospectus in Indonesia, in Jakarta—it just goes on and on. StudyAdelaide is very active in the Indonesian market, undertaking destination marketing. I am currently consulting with the international education sector on an action plan to take that further. The information that has been provided to the house and elsewhere once again is only half right. Those are the correct figures.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: St Therese Primary School were here earlier from Colonel Light Gardens in the electorate of Waite. The member for Stuart.

Question Time

ELECTRICITY PRICES

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:36): Thank you, sir. My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Does the minister agree with the Premier, who said publicly this morning:

...our advice from the Australian Energy Market Operator is that within a couple of years we will be having similar prices to other states.

In December last year, company ACIL Allen advised the government that South Australian electricity spot prices will be significantly higher than other states until at least 2030.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:37): I was in the meeting when the national energy market operator advised the Premier and I that by 2018 prices would stabilise, given the upgrade to the interconnector and the change in the national market with what is occurring in Victoria and New South Wales. The truth is this: we are undertaking a transition, and that transition, like all disruption, can be very difficult. We are seeing disruption in areas like public transport, where we have Uber using technology, using Apple iPhones to disrupt the way ride sharing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The members for Schubert and Stuart are warned for the second and final time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —ridesharing occurs, and it is no different with renewable energy. There is going to be disruption in the market.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: But, of course, what the opposition—

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is on his last chance.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What the opposition do not quote are articles like in today's *Australian Financial Review*, where Richard Dennis, from the Australian Institute, says this:

The average annual wholesale price of electricity in South Australia has fallen by 40 per cent since 2007-08. Scary isn't it. The same old bed-wetters...[who] have been spooked by some big spikes in the spot price of electricity in South Australia. Cooler heads have highlighted that the vast majority of industrial and domestic customers are on long-run contracts, and that renewables sometimes push the electricity spot [market prices to negative.]

That means that renewable energy is actually removing the peaks out of our wholesale market. It is actually allowing—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, I said yes, and I was in the same meeting with him.

Mr Marshall: So you agree?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

Mr Marshall: ACIL Allen were wrong?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, the market energy operator was right.

Mr Marshall: So ACIL Allen was wrong?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The market energy operator was right, and interjecting—

The SPEAKER: I think the leader has his answer. He will cease interjecting.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What we are seeing is that wind has actually brought prices down, and the reason there are such large companies playing the spot market is not because they don't want to hedge, it is because there is an advantage in playing the spot market because at some point of generation these long-run industries are actually being paid to take power when wind comes online, bringing prices down to below zero. That means they are being paid to take energy.

There have been times over the last six months when BHP, Alinta and Nyrstar have been paid to take power because of renewable energy. Of course, the opposition are not interested in those moments. What they are interested in is when the gas spot market is so high that they would rather sell their gas on the spot market—

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Davenport to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —than generate electricity. If the Leader of the Opposition actually understood this policy, rather than whingeing and fake laughing, he would come up with an alternative policy. Instead, it is just whingeing, it is just complaining, it is just the same old rhetoric. They don't like renewable energy, they don't like wind energy, they don't believe in global warming, so they attack the disruption. That is their MO. They attack the disruption.

Yelling out in the parliament is not a substitute for alternative policy because an alternative policy—put it up and let's have a debate. Let's debate the idea. Let's debate the policy. Let's look at its impacts. Thus far, it is just the highest paid whingers in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: I note the member for Davenport transgressed in the pre-lunch period; therefore, he is on a warning.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ECONOMY

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:41): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer update the house on recent economic reports on South Australia's economic prospects?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:41): I thank the member for his question because recent reports give rise to some cautious optimism for South Australia. Our

economy is facing unprecedented challenges as a result of the global decline in mineral commodity prices, gaps in naval shipbuilding and the closure of the Australian car manufacturing industry, but despite these challenges there are a number of positive signs. The ANZ/Property Council observes:

...a strong positive move in sentiment [business confidence and conditions] in South Australia. There is a clear correlation between this improvement in outlook in South Australia and the aggressive approach of the Weatherill Government in lowering property taxes.

These are the tax cuts that the Leader of the Opposition opposed, stating they would not create a single job and they called on us to bring them forward. Our nation's leading tax reform is the most comprehensive package in our state's history which sees us abolishing business stamp duties, returning \$670 million to businesses and families, making South Australia the most attractive state in which to do business.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will tell the family business groups about what the Leader of the Opposition is saying about these tax cuts. On top of our WorkCover reforms, which have delivered over \$180 million of annual savings to businesses, it has resulted in 6,900 additional jobs in the past 12 months to June 2016. The KPMG Competitive Alternatives report in 2016 ranked Adelaide as the most competitive city surveyed in Australia, ahead of Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane.

ANZ's latest Stateometer says that South Australia has picked up steam and is expanding. The SA Centre for Economic Studies expects respectable growth for the South Australian economy, supported by improvements in business investment, strong performances in agriculture, agrifood and service exports. The latest CommSec State of the States report, which the opposition were very quiet on yesterday, shows signs of growth in the South Australian economy and has South Australia rising two positions to fifth place, despite the Leader of the Opposition saying we were destined for last.

Our unemployment rate is unacceptably high and there is much more work to be done, particularly as the closure of Holden approaches, but the CommSec report also shows other green shoots and reasons why we should remain cautiously optimistic. CommSec notes the South Australian job market has improved in the past year and, in particular, in the past quarter.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I note the member for Schubert tweeting about the impressive unemployment rates in his own seat of the Barossa. You're welcome. Retail turnover has risen for seven consecutive quarters in South Australia, and improved retail spending could help the state climb further in economic performance rankings.

As of May, trend dwelling approvals have risen for five consecutive months and are 23 per cent higher than a year earlier. In addition, the number of housing finance commitments by owner-occupiers rose for the 12th consecutive month in May. South Australia's state final demand in the March quarter was 1 per cent higher than a year earlier above the national growth of 0.8 per cent in trend terms—green shoots, as I have said.

We are transitioning away from traditional manufacturing to an economy based on advanced manufacturing and other high value-adding industries. Last year's budget cut taxes, making us the lowest taxing state in Australia for business, and this budget provides strong stimulus to go out and employ new South Australians. We have extended the payroll tax rebate and are offering businesses with payrolls of under \$5 million incentives to hire new South Australians. These measures, along with defence projects, will help grow our economy. It's about time they stopped whingeing and came up with an alternative.

ELECTRICITY PRICES

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Has Nyrstar advised the minister and local member that forecast electricity prices will put its operations in Port Pirie in jeopardy even after its current productivity and environmental upgrades are completed and, if so, what is the government's response? When previously asked the

same question in question time on 19 May, the minister said that he would be meeting with Nyrstar the following week and expected to discuss the matter with them then.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Goyder is called to order. The member for Mitchell is warned for the second and final time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:46): Someone will be here with an orange tie sitting in that chair—it will be an orange tie. I meet with Nyrstar regularly, and I have been talking with Nyrstar at length, as has the member for Frome, as has the Premier, as have, indeed, a number of cabinet ministers—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Interrupting won't make you leader. What will make you leader is to grow a set, but that's a different argument. The difference here is that we work cooperatively with Nyrstar. We're working with them. Not only have we helped underwrite their new dramatic investment in Port Pirie, which is making them viable, but we are also working with them to try to make sure they have availability of gas and power. Of course—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yelling across the chamber is not a substitute for policy.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: You know when he's under pressure.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You know when he's under pressure.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: He gets very screamy.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Very screamy—and you get the fake laughter following after the screaming. But we are working with Nyrstar cooperatively about a number of issues to try to deal with their issues. The first issue they've got, of course, is continuation of the gas supply. That's the more urgent need that they have. Given the most recent breakdowns in the pipeline, as managed by Epic, that's a very large concern for the government, and we are working cooperatively with them. We are also working with them about investments to be made in Nyrstar about electricity supply.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We see a solution for the entire Upper Spencer Gulf as being integral, whether it's a new form of energy at Port Augusta, a new form of renewable energy, or some other form of cogeneration plants made available to Nyrstar and Arrium. The Leader of the Opposition is bellowing out across the chamber, 'What did Nyrstar say?' Well, companies come to us and speak to us about their confidential commercial realities. We don't come back into the parliament and lay them out in the chamber. If that's going to be the policy and method of members opposite, they should say so.

I also point out that not one of these companies went to the opposition and complained about the spot price market and what was occurring before it appeared on the front page of *The Advertiser* because none of them are speaking to them—not one of them. If they knew what was going on, they would have been out there, but they are so out of touch with business that no-one speaks to them.

Nyrstar, Arrium, all of our regional high energy intensive industries are looking for solutions. The government is working on it through the COAG auspices. We are working for greater interconnection. We are working to break up the monopoly energy providers that were imposed on us by the guilty party who privatised our assets. Of those members opposite, still at the helm of all their economic policy is the architect of the privatisation of ETSA.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The architect—they don't like it—Rob Lucas, is still in charge.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order: debate.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is that it is debate?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Yes, sir. Standing order 98.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you very much for your impartial ruling, sir. We are working cooperatively with all these companies. We will work with them and continue to work with them. What we won't be attempting to do is politicise their issues. We intend to work to solve them. Nyrstar, I have to say, has been very complimentary of the government and the work we have been doing with them. They are very complimentary of the work that the member for Frome has done for Nyrstar. Quite frankly, they are very lucky that he was elected to the seat of Frome and not a Liberal member, because I suspect that reinvestment in Port Pirie would not have occurred.

NUCLEAR FUEL CYCLE ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:50): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house about the community engagement on the findings of the Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission, in particular the first citizens' jury?

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:50): It is good to see that even the member for Finnis is getting involved in the spirit of community engagement.

Mr Pengilly: Get on with it, I said; get on with it.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Get on with it. Yes, tremendous. We will note that remark and take it into account. The first citizens' jury into the findings of the Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission has now concluded. As members probably appreciate, about 50 randomly selected South Australians were asked to examine the commission's report and identify key issues that should be considered in depth in the next and probably most significant phase of the process, which is the community consultation program.

Those who took up the invitation to attend the jury or viewed the live streaming online would have seen that jury members were highly engaged in the topic and took their responsibilities as jurors very seriously. Most of them, in fact almost to a person, regarded it as a great privilege to be able to participate in this new form of democracy. After deliberating over two weekends and hearing the evidence of more than 30 expert witnesses representing a range of fields, they presented me with their report on Sunday 10 July, which we have now published.

The issues that they identified focus first on the high-level international used storage facility. That was the fundamental narrowing, if you like, of the issues, so now that is the focus for the attention of the next stage. They basically considered four critical issues: safety, consent, trust and economics. The jury highlighted the importance of social consent and a robust regulatory requirement. The members asked the broader community to consider the safety of both people and the environment, and the economic risks and benefits, including to future generations.

They had, I think, an important insight, which is that they believe that a critical factor for the community in beginning to understand the issue is to be able to grapple with this dispute that seems to have emerged about the benefits. I think most people, even those who are benign about the question of the storage of nuclear waste, say, 'Why would we get involved unless the benefits are very profound?' and so they need to understand it.

There are differences of opinion about that: on the one hand, the royal commission's findings are regarded by some experts as conservative; on the other hand, there are some experts who say that they are generous estimates. I think, intelligently, what the citizens' jury did was to unpack those expert opinions. Like all expert opinions, they are based on assumptions, and they thought that the way of resolving this was to interrogate the assumptions more deeply. The critical assumption really is how much an overseas country would be prepared to pay for the storage of this waste. They have asked us to do that further work. We will undertake that work, and it is an important part of ensuring that the community is able to take the next stage in the process.

The truth is that complex public policy decisions require a new way of actually reaching consensus in our community. We can get into our corners and shout at one another and have, essentially, referendums like the Brexit debate. I think we saw that extraordinary outcome where the most googled term after the referendum outcome of the weekend was, 'What is the EU?' What you had was a debate that was conducted which did not really grapple with the questions at stake. A proxy debate broke out over immigration and other concerns.

When you are dealing with complex issues, there is a real need to be able to reconcile these questions, and that's why we are undertaking such a detailed processing here. I do invite all those to keep participating. We will be out to 100 locations across metropolitan and regional South Australia. It kicks off this Friday, 29 July, in Rundle Mall, and people can visit online the www.yoursay.sa.gov.au/nuclear website.

AGED-CARE FACILITIES

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:54): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney inform the house when he was first asked for a meeting with Noleen Hausler, who had footage of her father being abused in an Adelaide aged-care facility, and why he denied this request?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:55): I thank the honourable member for her question. I have been checking the records in my office, and I am able to provide the following advice. There was an email forwarded to the Attorney-General's Department on 8 June this year from the lady concerned. She says that she 'would appreciate' (I am partially quoting here from the document) 'the opportunity to meet with you to discuss the current regulations of installing CCTV in resident's private room in Aged Care Facilities.'

The letter then goes on to say that she has sought private legal advice and names her lawyers. It also contains a statement about the nature of her legal advice. It goes on to talk about her concerns, generally, about the safety of her father, which are entirely understandable. I formed the view that, in essence, I was dealing with an individual who was seeking a legal opinion from me in the context of her having her own private lawyers engaged regarding the use of, in this case, as it turns out, covert CCTV. I subsequently became aware of the fact that there had been criminal charges and the matter dealt with in respect of that matter.

Ultimately, after taking advice from the Attorney-General's Department, I then wrote back to her by a letter of 8 July, first of all explaining how I sympathised and shared her concerns about the welfare and safety of her father, as outlined in her email, and making the point that as Attorney-General I am not in a position to be able to offer private individuals legal advice, particularly in circumstances where they have retained their own legal counsel.

I then provided her with information about the appropriate methods by which complaints regarding the behaviour of aged-care providers should be managed and in particular gave her details of the Aged Care Complaints Commissioner, with their telephone number and email address, and the Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner, inasmuch as it might have been a retirement village question, which of course I understand this not to be.

I think I should add also, Mr Speaker, that it is the case that nursing homes are completely regulated and governed by federal legislation. Obviously, there would be policy considerations to do with the industry, which the federal people should be intimately involved in. Can I say that, so far as the state is concerned, we stand ready to be of assistance if indeed the commonwealth requires any assistance but, of course, the commonwealth could simply regulate the prescription of CCTV within their own regulatory regime governing these establishments should they choose to do so.

Can I say that in light of this matter, which only came first of all to my attention late in the afternoon yesterday, I am in the process of preparing a letter to the relevant federal minister to invite them to study the circumstances of this case with a view to consideration as to whether or not regulatory changes should be made across the board to deal with matters of this kind.

CHEMOTHERAPY TREATMENT ERROR

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Health. When the minister told the public in August 2015 that none of the 10 victims of the chemotherapy dosing errors had died, was he or Professor Bardy aware that one of the 10 patients had already died?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:59): No, I wasn't, and I was basing what I said on what Professor Bardy had already publicly said, and that was that none of the patients had died. In fact, if my recollection is correct, he said so sitting next to me in an interview on 891. I think it would be reasonable for the Minister for Health to rely on the head of haematology at the Royal Adelaide Hospital when he provides advice that no-one had died.

ABORIGINAL HEALTH

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Health. How is the government supporting residents on the APY lands to improve their access to health care closer to country?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:00): I would like to thank the member for Giles for his question and acknowledge his keen interest in the delivery of health care on the APY lands. In July last year, while attending the Aboriginal Health Summit in Darwin, the federal government announced capital funding to Western Desert Dialysis, also known as Purple House, a non-government organisation, to set up a dialysis clinic in Pukatja.

This came as a bit of a surprise, given there had been no consultation with the state government or SA Health about this proposal and it appeared to have come out of the blue. It was later admitted that the reason the federal government had neglected to discuss this issue with us was because they simply did not realise that Pukatja was in South Australia. After assessing the feasibility of the proposal, I am pleased—

Mr Marshall: That's offensive.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It is offensive. It is offensive that the federal government would announce funding for a program in South Australia not realising that the town was actually in South Australia. I am glad to see that the Leader of the Opposition agrees with me about how offensive the federal government sometimes can be.

After assessing the feasibility of the proposal, I am pleased to inform the house that SA Health is now in a position to enter into a formal contract with Purple House for the delivery of dialysis services to Pukatja. There will also be an MOU with SA Health, Purple House and Nganampa Health Council to clearly identify the roles of each agency. Nganampa Health Council is the provider of health services in Pukatja, and we respect this role and look forward to working with Nganampa and Purple House on this important development.

One of the major hurdles will be the number of suitable houses available for patients in the Pukatja area. Discussions with Housing SA and the APY council will continue to ensure this issue is resolved by the time the unit is operational. Another consideration of SA Health is how this service may affect services currently offered at Port Augusta and the cross-border flows with the NT government. Discussions are continuing to occur with the NT government health department so that services are improved through the development of the Pukatja service.

It goes without saying that having a stationary unit will lead to better outcomes for residents needing the service. Currently, patients are either treated by the mobile dialysis unit or relocate to either Alice Springs or Port Augusta to receive their treatment. While this has not been ideal, it is to date the only way to ensure patients are treated with best practice and in accordance with safety and quality guidelines. However, as the demand for this treatment rises, it is becoming evident that we need to increase our services on the lands.

While better consultation and perhaps a map may have hastened this process, the state government is now prepared to commit in this important health area. The government takes the

health and wellbeing of our Indigenous population very seriously. This important step forward comes on top of the 2016-17 budget, which commits \$49 million over the next four years to restore Closing the Gap funding after the federal government took it away.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister confirm that the current plans for the new Royal Adelaide Hospital will not allow the vast majority of the more than 300 clinical trials currently underway at the existing Royal Adelaide Hospital to transfer to the new hospital when it opens next year?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:04): No, that is not correct.

NORTHERN CONNECTOR

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (15:04): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister inform the house how South Australian jobseekers and industry can apply for work on the Northern Connector project?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:04): I thank the member for Little Para for his question and I commend his hard work as head of the Northern Connector Jobs Taskforce in ensuring that both the maximum number of jobs are secured by South Australians but particularly those people residing in the northern suburbs.

As the house would be aware, the Northern Connector project is another step in creating a nonstop north-south corridor between Gawler and Old Noarlunga. The project involves the construction of a new six-lane 15.5 kilometre road to the west of Port Wakefield Road, linking the Northern Expressway and Port River Expressway to the South Road Superway and Salisbury Highway connector.

The Northern Connector project will support, on average, 480 full-time equivalent jobs each year during construction. It has been a priority of this government to maximise the number of jobs for South Australian workers. It is imperative to ensure that those who are seeking work in the northern suburbs, especially those feeling the full brunt of the federal Coalition's decision to chase Holden out of South Australia, are given the best opportunity to secure work on this project.

As I previously advised the house, the successful tenderer is Lendlease, the company which delivered the duplication of the Southern Expressway. To their credit, they are working to ensure that at least half of these jobs on the Northern Connector are awarded to northern suburbs workers from the local government areas of Port Adelaide Enfield, Salisbury, Playford, Tea Tree Gully, Light, Mallala, Gawler and Barossa. I hope this project can achieve similar outcomes to the works undertaken on the Southern Expressway where, I am advised, more than 90 per cent of the 1,800 workers were South Australian, with 58 per cent of those in the workforce residing in the southern suburbs.

As the house would be aware, a training and employment centre, called NorthHub, is established on the site at Waterloo Corner, and once works on the ground get started (with works ramping up in October this year) this will be a major location for jobseekers not only to seek out employment opportunities but also to receive on-the-ground training.

While these centres provide a great service, in order for those seeking work on the project to easily access information about potential employment and training opportunities, whether it be as a civil construction worker, a formwork construction worker, a site supervisor, a project engineer, a safety professional, administrative professional, trainee or apprentice, today I am pleased to announce that the NorthHub website has gone live. The website can be accessed at northhub.sa.gov.au.

The NorthHub website will advertise both current job opportunities and expressions of interest for future roles. The website will help keep jobseekers updated who are interested in working on the project and those who express an interest in a specific role when it becomes available. For applications, those people who have registered on the Lendlease careers page will automatically

receive notifications for all roles advertised in that job area. They will also receive updates from the project team about how works are progressing and anticipated time frames for when employment opportunities will become available.

Further, Lendlease will be working with jobactive providers in the northern region to help connect the project with jobseekers. The NorthHub website will also contain all employment opportunities with Lendlease and all of their local industry partners delivering the Northern Connector project. Further, the Northern Connector project will set a new benchmark for local industry participation on public infrastructure projects in South Australia, and I encourage local industry and suppliers to find more information about potential opportunities on the ICN Gateway or by visiting the NorthHub website and clicking on Local Industry.

CHINA SOUTHERN AIRLINES

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:08): Will the Premier inform the house how much money has been paid to China Southern Airlines by the South Australian government?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:08): No, I won't do that. We don't routinely disclose those numbers for reasons of commercial confidentiality. It is a substantial sum, but I think the benefits will flow to South Australia.

HELPMANN AWARDS

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:08): My question is to the Minister for the Arts. Minister, how was South Australia represented at last night's Helpmann Awards?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:08): I thank the member for Reynell for her question. Last night, Live Performance Australia hosted the Helpmann Awards at the Sydney Lyric Theatre, and I was pleased to attend the event on behalf of the government.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The Helpmann Awards, named of course after Mount Gambier-born dancer and thespian Sir Robert Helpmann, celebrate the best theatre, dance and musical awards that our country has to offer. Here again, the Leader of the Opposition rubbishes our arts industry and throws interjections across the chamber rubbishing our arts industry and questioning my role as Minister for the Arts.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, sir: I ask you to bring the minister back to the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: The minister should not respond to interjections.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: This year, South Australia was very well—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Once again rubbishing our arts industry. The Leader of the Opposition just can't help himself. South Australia was well represented—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: He gets very screamy when he is under pressure. I am not sure if you have noticed, but the Leader of the Opposition starts to scream a lot. I don't know—there is something going on over there, Mr Speaker. There is something going on. I don't know what it is.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Could it be the worst result since 1983?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It could just be the disastrous federal election results in South Australia. I don't know, but I do know the Leader of the Opposition does get very screamy when he is under pressure. He gets very angry. Mr Potato Head has the angry face on today.

This year, South Australia was very well represented, with Michael Griffiths nominated for his Adelaide Cabaret Festival and Fringe show, *Cole*. Michaela Burger and Greg Wain were nominated for their Adelaide Cabaret Festival and Fringe show, *Exposing Edith*. Adelaide-based

Australian Dance Theatre was nominated for best dance piece of their production, *Habitus*, with both dancers Kimball Wong and Lonii Garnons-Williams also nominated in their respective best dancer categories. I know the Australian Dance Theatre is located in the Waite electorate and the member for Waite is a great supporter.

The annual delight that is WOMADelaide was up for Best Contemporary Music Festival, and Slingsby was up for Best Presentation for Children for their stunning Adelaide Festival production—

Mr Marshall: Who got best comedy?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Best comedy would have gone to the Leader of the Opposition, but unfortunately he was not eligible.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You would have to win something.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: You would have to win something, indeed. Slingsby was up for Best Presentation for Children for their stunning Adelaide Festival production, *The Young King*. Our State Theatre Company co-productions were also in the mix, with Colin Friels nominated for Best Male Actor in a Supporting Role in a Play for their joint production of *Mortido*, and Catherine McClements was nominated for Best Female Actor in a Play for her role in *The Events*.

While not technically South Australian, we also claim Adelaide Cabaret Festival co-director Eddie Perfect as one of ours. He was nominated for his Adelaide Cabaret show, *Songs from the Middle*, in the category of Best Original Score. It has been widely reported today that *Matilda* was the standout success of the night, winning all 13 categories for which it was nominated, including Best Set Design.

I congratulate the Adelaide Festival Centre scenery and engineering workshop, who toiled over the design and brought the set to life. I understand that Ron Wood, who manages the workshop, is about to retire, and what an outstanding achievement to go out on. Apart from *Matilda*, other artists did get a slight look-in. I would like to place on the record my congratulations to WOMADelaide, Michael Griffiths and Kimball Wong, who took out their respective award categories.

Of course, there are also many national productions which have graced our state's stages, including *Little Shop of Horrors*, Australian Ballet and *Ghost the Musical*, and I am sure we are all looking forward to upcoming seasons of *The Sound of Music*, *Singing in the Rain*, and the absolute standout of the evening, *Matilda*, which will be coming to the Festival Theatre in May. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate all our winners and nominees on their outstanding contribution and dedication to the arts in this state. We are all extremely proud of each and every one of you.

CHILD PROTECTION SCREENING

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:13): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister advise the house whether parents are required to apply for a police check in order to coach a sporting team at a public school?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:13): My recollection of the change to the rules that we put in place in order to normalise the arrangements between parents being involved in activities that their kids are involved in, in any case, was that we did not require a police check or a working with children screening clearance for interactions with the students of their schools that would normally be interactions that their kids would be a part of. That includes going along and reading with children and undertaking sporting activities.

What we have continued to do, however, is make sure that if students are in any sense staying overnight with parents (for example, going away on camps with schools or any kind of hosting of students) then they would continue to require that. That is consistent not only with the legislation but also with the recommendations that came out from the federal royal commission, and this has helped bring us into line with what occurs interstate.

REGIONS IN FOCUS ROADSHOWS

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:14): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. How are the Regions in Focus roadshows progressing?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:14): I thank the member for Giles for his question.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert will suffer the heavy penalty of withdrawing for the remainder of question time under the sessional order.

The honourable member for Schubert having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I am pleased to update the house on the progress of the second round of the Regions in Focus roadshows. The first round of the roadshows were held in the middle of last year to identify the particular issues of concern to each region that was seen as holding back economic development and growth, as well as the shared issues and priorities across the whole state. I am now undertaking the second round of the roadshows. I am sitting around the table with regional development associations, Regions SA and other state government representatives, as well as business and community leaders to discuss the progress made on each of the regions' top three priorities.

So far I have had roadshows in the following regions: Barossa Light and Lower North, the Riverland and Murraylands, Yorke and Mid North, Far North and also Kangaroo Island. This morning I was in Strathalbyn for the Fleurieu and Adelaide regions roadshow. I was pleased to hear experts from across state government agencies report back on the top three priorities identified last year which were: reform in planning, reform affecting employment arrangements, and tourism.

I was also pleased to see significant progress made on these three priorities, including the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 being recently passed by parliament, championed by the Attorney-General, and the extension of the small business payroll tax rebate for an additional four years as announced by the Treasurer in the budget. This will save eligible small businesses up to \$9,800 per year.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is on two warnings, as is the leader and the member for Morialta.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: Job creation grants, another excellent initiative in this budget which will deliver up to \$10,000 over two years for each new full-time equivalent job created in small and medium-size businesses liable for payroll tax in South Australia; the establishment of the Simpler Regulation Unit to address costs to small business; to address the tourism priority, a number of regional branding and marketing initiatives have been developed with the support of PIRSA to promote the unique experiences available in the Adelaide Hills and the Fleurieu region; the 90-day transport project, which DPTI and PIRSA are working on together to assess and resolve issues of movement of agricultural machinery; and efficiencies for logistics in the primary industry sector will deliver immediate gains in productivity, creating opportunities for food and wine businesses to expand or co-locate specifically in regional South Australia.

The roadshows have been about listening to the aspirations of communities. It is about looking at what we can do as a state government to assist regions to meet those aspirations. We all know how important our regions are to South Australia and I want to keep working across state government with the federal government, with local government, and with all the innovative and inspiring businesses out there to create opportunities that allow our regions to grow and prosper. I look forward to continuing our active progress on the priorities that are most important to each region.

CHILD PROTECTION SCREENING

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:18): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. What mechanism does the education department have in place to ensure that parents who have previously failed police checks to volunteer in schools are not now volunteering in their children's classrooms or coaching sporting teams, given that police checks are no longer required?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:19): I will confirm what internal process is in place but I would just take this opportunity to make two points: one is that if people are questioning what requirements are necessary, as I should have added into my previous answer, they can check on the website, a very handy way of clicking through what category you are in. The other point which is more important in this context is that having a police clearance or a working with children screening clearance is no guarantee that children are safe. It is a useful additional piece of information, and that is why we have it, but by no means ought it be seen as a guarantee.

What we need to do is make sure that we have ways in which children are cared for by everybody around them to keep eyes on them and to make sure that people are responsible for how their children are looked after. So, while it is important to have these clearances under certain circumstances, their presence or absence should not be regarded as the only gatekeeping for the safety of children. Everyone is responsible, everyone needs to be watching children. We need to make sure that we run our organisations in a way that promotes as much safety and security as possible for parents.

SUBMARINE PROGRAM

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:20): My question is to the Minister for Defence Industries. Can the minister tell the house how government assistance for the Future Submarine program impacts on the economy?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:20): I thank the member for Kaurna for the question because members would be aware that the Productivity Commission today criticised the level of government assistance for the submarine construction program in its latest review of trade and assistance. The commission's conclusions are made in 2½ pages of observations in a broader 85-page review of government assistance to industry. They don't seem to be very interested in the future of the defence and submarine project.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Off they go, showing about as much interest in jobs and investment as they have from the outset. The commission is an agency of the Australian government located within the Treasury portfolio and it undertakes a variety of research, some extensive, some cursory. The commission's review of the defence industry policy statement and the submarine decision is made with several caveats. The assumptions on which it is based are flawed. The commission says at the outset:

It is difficult to ascertain whether the intended support is an increase in what would have been provided had previous programs continued, as previous funding arrangements were not transparent.

That is strike 1: it is a limited analysis. The commission says:

The recent decision to build the new submarines locally at a reported 30 per cent cost premium, and a preference for using local steel, provides an illustrative example of how a local cost premium can deliver a very high rate of effective assistance...

The analysis is based on a reported per cent cost premium. That is not their figure: it is someone else's. The figure comes from RAND, a report titled 'Australia's naval shipbuilding enterprise: preparing for the 21st century', which was released in April 2015. RAND said that by adopting a continuous build program, and reforming shipbuilding practice, the current 30 per cent cost premium could be reduced by half by midway through the Future Frigate program.

As we know, the federal government has adopted the concept of a continuous build, so the Productivity Commission's underlying assumption of a 30 per cent cost premium is already halved. Since the time of the RAND report, the productivity at Australia's only naval shipbuilder, ASC Osborne, has improved markedly. This was natural, as they moved from first of class to follow-on ships. The commission's 30 per cent assumption, which it admits is hypothetical, now looks very wobbly indeed—strike 2.

Finally, the commission states that its conclusions are based on a local spend of just 50 per cent. The federal government is on the record stating that at least 90 per cent of the project

will be local—strike 3. While there is a role for innovative think tanks such as productivity commissions, it should be careful when making a sweeping statement that the decision to build submarines in Australia is 'a major step back from the historical reduction in using government procurement preferences as industry policy'.

I remind members of the comprehensive analysis commissioned by the Weatherill government in 2014 and carried out by the National Institute of Economic and Industry Research. The report used detailed cost data on building overseas and locally. It gathered and checked numerous Australian overseas reports. My agency, Defence SA, will be writing to the Productivity Commission to counter the assumptions, falsehoods and hypotheticals contained in its 2½-page analysis to make sure that the sweeping statements of today don't become accepted as the presumed wisdom.

The fact is that this project is going to stimulate innovation, stimulate jobs, generate tax revenues and benefits across the board that have not been identified by the Productivity Commission. Its report is not complete and should not be relied upon. This is a great project for Australia, and taxpayers' money very well spent indeed.

Ministerial Statement

RIGNEY, MR R.G.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:24): I table a copy of a ministerial statement, relating to Mr Robert Gordon Rigney presenting at Yatala Labour Prison, made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Hon. Peter Malinauskas.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:25): I table a copy of a ministerial statement, relating to budget measures in South Australia Police, made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Hon. Peter Malinauskas.

Grievance Debate

AGED-CARE FACILITIES

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:25): In South Australia, if you hit someone on the head, attempt to violently force-feed them or in any way cause harm and injury to that party, when it is deliberate or reckless and you are over 10 as an offender and you are of sound mind, clearly you are liable to be convicted of a criminal offence. The Criminal Law Consolidation Act and a number of other provisions in our law make it a state responsibility, and it is a matter which is clearly within the domain and responsibility of this government.

That is exactly what happened in September last year when Mr Lucas, a carer in a Mitcham residential care facility, was convicted of two counts of aggravated assault and received a 10-year gaol sentence. As we now know, he has been dismissed from that facility. The victim was an 89-year-old man, whose story has now been sent around the country, and the treatment of this man in an aged-care facility has been met with horror by Australians.

Our sentencing in South Australia also makes it absolutely clear that if your victim is a vulnerable person—usually very young, very old, disabled—the penalty that applies should be much higher in the application of that. That is the criminal law that is clearly the domain of the South Australian government, the Premier and the Attorney-General. Elder abuse, more generally, is described as an act occurring within a relationship where there is an implication of trust which results in harm to an older person. Abuse can include physical, sexual, financial, psychological, social and/or neglect. It is a broad phenomenon which makes the people who are victims of it cringe, as it does those who witness such assault and are very concerned for the relatives.

The case that was reported and exposed by the Australian Broadcasting Corporation yesterday makes it very clear that the public will not tolerate this kind of behaviour and, as I said, the perpetrator in this particular case has now been sent to gaol. However, when the opposition raised

today the important reaction to this, in saying that the situation should not be tolerated, that we would work with the government to look at the law reform to protect persons such as the 89-year-old victim in this case to make sure that this is not repeated, the government's response—both the Premier's response and that confirmed today by the Attorney-General—was that they would not be taking action other than to write a letter to the federal government and to refer it to them for review, as they are the regulators of the operation of residential care facilities in South Australia and aged care.

Certainly they are that, but the South Australian government is responsible, and this parliament has the responsibility to act in legislation to deal with law and order in this state. This is a criminal offence. It is unacceptable behaviour. It is illegal and it is the responsibility of this government to act. It is shameful that the Premier and the first law and order person of the state should stand here in this parliament today and tell us that they have just written a letter to the federal government.

Do people who are living in aged-care facilities not deserve the protection of the criminal law in this state? Of course, they do. They are entitled to it. They live in South Australia, they are living in their home and, if they are assaulted and they are a victim of a criminal offence, they are entitled to the protection of the police and every other law enforcement agency. It disgusts me that the Premier and the Attorney-General should walk away from this responsibility.

We are prepared to take up this action to ensure that there is an opportunity to provide extra protection. Whether that is under our surveillance law, whether it is added to our criminal law, whether it is made a provision in a regulatory obligation, whether it assists by speaking to our federal colleagues in making a condition in relation to aged care facilities' licences, all of those things can be added. However, the primary responsibility to deal with people who are victims of a criminal offence is the man who sits across the room in this chamber, the Attorney-General, and it disgusts me that he has walked away from that. When the now Premier was the minister for ageing, he published a booklet in which he said:

We recently released our ageing strategy...The State Government has a zero tolerance for the abuse or harm of older people and we are committed to protecting older people from harm and to keeping them safe in their homes and in their communities.

He has clearly forgotten that. The concern this Premier has expressed in the last 24 hours is insincere, his response is concerning and his refusal to act is alarming.

Time expired.

COAST PARK, PORT NOARLUNGA

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (15:30): It is my pleasure to talk to the house about a very exciting announcement that has been made for the southern suburbs. As people would know, and I am sure you know, Deputy Speaker, Port Noarlunga has one of the most spectacular coastlines in South Australia, if not Australia. Unfortunately, it is currently not nearly as accessible as we would like for pedestrians and cyclists at the moment. The paths through there are very narrow, there are gaps between the areas, and it is therefore not the most attractive place to go for a cycle or a walk.

This limits its potential as a world-class tourism destination and limits the recreation opportunities available for local residents. That is why I am very delighted that the government is working to fix this. As part of the Coast Park vision for Adelaide, the Deputy Premier recently announced that the state government is going to provide \$2 million in funding for the next steps of the coastal park through the Port Noarlunga and Port Noarlunga South area.

This project will address foreshore access issues and safety all the way, from the Port Noarlunga Surf Life Saving Club, across the Onkaparinga River, and then down past the South Port Surf Life Saving Club, down Weatherald Terrace, and then connecting at South Port where there is an existing shared-use path that is in good quality. The key elements of the project include:

- a continuous shared-use path (something I know the Minister for Transport is very excited about), with additional cycling provision being available;
- upgrading the existing reserves along the path;
- new viewing areas and improved access connections;

- new facilities and amenities;
- landscaping across the path;
- biodiversity and revegetation works;
- pedestrian crossing points;
- coastal fencing;
- coastal protection works;
- car park modification and reconstruction; and
- interpretive signage.

There is quite a lot that is going to be delivered as part of this package. It is going to be built by the City of Onkaparinga, and I thank them for matching the funding that the state government is investing in this project.

Of course, this project will maintain and enhance our open space links. It is a very popular area for fishing, kayaking and swimming, and it is going to benefit all those recreation pursuits. It will provide additional connection for the community for people who already live there and also for tourists we want to see more of visiting the area. It is also going to improve the quality of pedestrian and cycling access and make this a real destination for leisure and recreation activities for people in the southern suburbs and across the whole city.

The project will use design, landscaping and public art that will highlight the local history and cultural heritage of the area. We recently had the dedication of the Mid Coast Surfing Reserve that I have previously spoken of in the house. The member for Reynell is also very supportive of that reserve which covers this area. I know that further dedications and marks in the history are very important to the group behind the reserve as well, so they will be very supportive of that.

The project will mean more support for local businesses through additional tourists who will be attracted to the area. Very importantly, it is going to provide easier access to our local surf lifesaving clubs, particularly in the area of Port Noarlunga and South Port surf lifesaving clubs, which will have greater access to their clubrooms, which are of course a large source of revenue for those clubs, and it means that they can put that funding into activities to save people's lives on the beach.

I would like to note some of the hard work of the people in those clubs, particularly the outgoing president at South Port, John Devitt (Devo), and the president of Port Noarlunga, Jarid Turner, for his hard work. I was also recently at the AGM of the South Port Surf Life Saving Club and lucky enough to be able to present three life memberships to three outstanding women, who between them have contributed 86 years of service. They are Sharryn Campbell, Liz Colegate and Jenny Whitmee, and between them they have contributed countless volunteer hours to protecting people along the coast. They are absolutely to be thanked for their hard work.

Connected to the coastal park, I would also note that our hardworking local MP, Amanda Rishworth, the member for Kingston, who has recently been re-elected in a landslide, secured a funding commitment from the federal opposition for further works on the coastal park at Aldinga and Hallett Cove. I would like to hope that the federal government will contribute some of that funding as well and match that commitment from the federal opposition so that we can have all three levels of government working together to improve our coastal walking and cycling links.

SA WATER

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:35): Prior to the luncheon interval, I was making some comments on the budget; regrettably, the time allocated was all too soon brought to an end. I wish to conclude some of those remarks.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: Indeed. I was unfortunately distracted early on in my speech by some extraordinarily unusual comments and behaviour by a member of the government benches and ran out of time. Fortunately, we have this brief time now to resume. I will conclude the comments that I

was going to make. At the time, I was quoting from a letter from the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion to a constituent of mine.

The context was in relation to the water bills, for which my constituent had previously been receiving concessions last year. Because of a change in the form of pension my constituent was receiving, and the way that the concessions were applied, her concessions were cut off and it took a long rigmarole to identify how to restore those concessions and find out what was happening for the time in between. I was quoting directly from the letter, and I will continue now. The minister wrote:

The March bill incorporated the \$221.25 concession. The bill totalled \$653.96 with the account summary indicating

- a previous balance of \$331.06
- an amount paid of \$293.56, and
- new charges of \$616.46.

The previous balance represents the amount outstanding from [your constituent's] previous accounts. The amount paid comprises the \$72.31 [your constituent] paid on 29 February 2016 and the \$221.25 concession.

I am unable to comment on the process used by SA Water to calculate the December and January bills, as this does not fall within my portfolio responsibilities. However, I am satisfied the concessions were correctly applied to the March account.

Regarding concession visibility, as [your constituent] now holds a LIHCC, she will no longer see the concessions listed as separate items on her SA Water account, as is the case for PCC holders.

Due to the way SA Water processes its accounts, concessions for Health Care Card holders, including LIHCC, are not displayed on the bill as a separate item. For this group of cardholders, the concession shows as the difference between new charges incurred and the amount due on the bill. To determine if the concession has been applied, customers compare the amount due and the new charges and, excluding any outstanding balance from previous accounts, will be able to calculate the difference which represents the concessions.

The concession amount on water charges for owner-occupiers for a financial year is 30% of the total amount of the water charges, subject to the minimum (\$185) and maximum (\$295) amounts. Concessions are calculated at the minimum concession per quarter; this means that on her next bill, [my constituent] should look for a concession of \$73.75 (\$46.25 water concession and \$27.50 sewerage concession). She may also be entitled to a top-up water concession. While SA Water processes PCC holders automatically, LIHCC holders are required to submit all water accounts for the financial year to DCSI, to enable DCSI to determine if customers are eligible for the top-up.

If [your constituent] needs any more information, I would encourage her to call...

And she provides some details. I am certain my constituent has needed more information after receiving this letter because I am not sure if anyone here was able to fully understand it. I certainly think that everyone can understand exactly why so many of our constituents are confused when this is the approach that is taken. I again quote the minister's letter:

I am unable to comment on the process used by SA Water to calculate the December and January bills, as this does not fall within my portfolio responsibilities. However, I am satisfied the concessions were correctly applied...

My constituent is paying hundreds of dollars of water bills, having concessions reapplied and backdated and put on new bills and then retrospectively provided. It is confusing as all hell to any member of the public.

Especially given that so many of the people in our community receiving these concessions are vulnerable, the government needs to get its act together. The government needs to sort this out and stop passing the blame from DCSI to SA Water, back and forth, back and forth, as my office found, when we tried to assist this constituent and were constantly shunted back and forth, back and forth. There are some good people working in these areas, but the processes set down by the government make it impossible for people to effectively administer and very difficult for members of the public to understand. The members of our communities deserve better.

LIGHT ELECTORATE

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:40): I would like to take this opportunity to raise in this house matters of interest in my electorate. On the weekend, on Saturday, I had the opportunity to attend an event at the Gawler National Trust Museum in the main street of Gawler. The Gawler National Trust Museum organised a reunion of the Timer Fashions factory. For members of

the house, Timer Fashions was a factory in the main street of Gawler which closed in the mid-seventies. At one stage, not only was it one of the biggest businesses to operating Gawler but it was one of the biggest clothing manufacturers in Australia.

Over 80 women attended the reunion on Saturday at the museum in Gawler. I say 'women' because the factory employed mainly women. I think at any one time there might have been six men employed in various maintenance roles. I also understand that some of the cutting roles in the factory required, as it was said on Saturday, people who were tall and perhaps a bit stronger.

According to a local trust member, who has undertaken a history of Timer Fashions, Ms Marilyn Tucker, Timer Fashions had its origins in a small business started by Joe Jacobs in the 1920s. He was of Middle Eastern background and a migrant to the area. Ms Tucker said that Mr Jacobs set up the business in Murray Street, where he employed untrained women to do simple machine sewing. I understand from the talk that they made nursery squares, which we refer to as nappies, and they also made aprons and pyjamas and, with training, workers progressed to making dresses and skirts.

The business continued during the hard times of the Depression. With the start of World War II, manufacturers were required to make military uniforms. Despite the war, the government implemented a decentralisation policy, so the company continued throughout the war. The Myer Emporium approached Joe to set up a clothing factory in Gawler with a view to an exclusive deal for children's clothing.

The business was very profitable and, as a result, the company grew from 20 to 60 machinists within three years and kept growing. The company was established as the Gawler Manufacturing Company Limited and later changed to Timer Fashions. The business flourished, and garments were made to cover all ages under the Timer brand: Day Timer, School Timer and Sports Timer. Whilst the origins of the business are not known, because of its success a name change took place.

During the fifties, an extension was built for the factory. At this point, it employed about 300 people and used half a million yards of imported fabric a year, representing about 250,000 garments made. The company continued to grow. In 1970, Joe retired from the business, where his wife also worked, and his son Keith, who still lives in the town, took over the company. The plant was eventually sold during the seventies because of the changes to tariff laws, etc., and the increasing importation of fabrics and clothing. The factory gave women a lot of opportunities for employment in the local area.

I would like to thank the Gawler National Trust Museum for organising this very important event, and women came from right across the state. You just had to hear some of the stories and reminiscences of days gone by. Interestingly, I met one of the ladies, an Italian migrant who had worked for 23 years in the factory, a factory that provided a lot of valuable work for many women in the area.

With the bit of time I have left, I would like to congratulate Café Sia, which is a café based in Gawler or Evanston. Café Sia won the prestigious Café of the Year Award at this year's South Australia's Restaurant & Catering Hostplus Awards for Excellence, trumping its many city-based rivals. As I said in the media release I put out after their success, we have just proven that anything the city can do Gawler can do better. That also goes to prove that we remain the best of town and country in Gawler.

I would like to congratulate co-owners Gaby and Danny Haidar, who run the business with their partners. As they point out, it is a fusion of both Middle Eastern and Italian cuisine with them being from a Lebanese background and their wives being from an Italian background. Congratulations to them.

SETTLEMENT DAY

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:45): One of the things that comes to the fore in my electorate is the relationship with the French explorers and the English explorers, and the connections between the two. Over the last week or two, we have had various celebrations of Bastille Day. I congratulate the Victor Harbor community on their efforts in relation to that and also Mayor Graham Philp, who is

keen to progress the French connection so to speak. He is looking to build on the French connection and particularly, as I suggested along with others, that we should build on it now that the submarines are going to be built by French company DCNS, so I congratulate them on that.

It is going to be a useful exercise so far as the tourism sector goes and everything that goes with it, so I look forward to that in the future. Unfortunately, I was not able to attend the Bastille Day ceremony in Adelaide with Mayor Philp, but next year I will try again. I also recognise the importance of Rapid Bay, where Colonel Light and his merry band came ashore early in the settlement of South Australia.

That leads me to tomorrow. For those in the chamber who may not be aware, and that is probably most people I would think, without drawing attention to members, tomorrow is Settlement Day. It is 180 years tomorrow since the first British settlers came to South Australia and landed on Kangaroo Island, in Kingscote. Tomorrow, the Premier and I will be attending various Settlement Day ceremonies and functions, and it is important that this day is not forgotten. It seems to be on the mainland that everything centres around Proclamation Day and the founding of the state in December, but is far more important to us that Settlement Day on 27 July is remembered and that things happen.

Kangaroo Island Council coordinates the celebrations, which is their role, and there are young achievers awards and various speeches. Halfway through, most of the kids who are there from the schools get bored. Invariably, it is a cold, windy and wet day. There is no question that only the British would have arrived in a new colony in the middle of winter. I might suggest that it was one of the smarter things they did, arriving in the middle of July westerly gales, and almost always it is cold and wet.

I would also like to mention the KI Pioneers Association. There are two chapters, the Adelaide one and the Kangaroo Island one, and tomorrow night they have a dinner in Kingscote, which I will now be able to attend. Unfortunately, the Premier will be returning to Adelaide, but I will be there, and Mr Hartley Willson is the guest speaker from Penneshaw. The Willsons were early settlers on the island. They arrived a bit later in South Australia than we did. They arrived in 1838 or 1839 and we arrived in 1837; however, I married one so I have to be a bit careful.

Both chapters of the KI Pioneers Association work to perpetuate the story of the first settlement in South Australia in those rugged days when the Duke of York arrived. Indeed, Boyle Travers Finniss, the first premier of South Australia, after whom my electorate was named, landed at Kingscote and then moved over to Rapid Bay, where his wife had what is referred to as the first white child born in South Australia, a daughter. It is quite an interesting story.

Tomorrow, the weather forecast does not appear to be too bad and hopefully the celebrations at Reeves Point where the settlers landed will all go ahead as planned. It will be a good day for one and all, followed by a good community lunch in the town hall, and then, as I said, the Pioneers Association dinner tomorrow night at the Ozone Hotel.

I just repeat ad nauseam that, although South Australia plays up Proclamation Day, it is indeed Settlement Day when the Duke of York did arrive, and that is the important day for us and for the Pioneers Association. I commend those responsible for tomorrow. I think there is another ceremony we have to attend—I have not got it in front of me at the moment, but I look forward to the day.

SHARING OUR KNOWLEDGE PROJECT

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:50): I rise to speak today about an important launch that I recently had the honour of MCing: the launch of the Sharing our Knowledge—Mental Health and Domestic Violence Cross Sector Collaborative Project. The project is a collaboration between the Southern Domestic Violence Service (a crucial service in our southern community), Life Without Barriers and an array of dedicated domestic violence and mental health sector leaders.

The project has produced innovative resources and training materials that will make a deep difference in terms of growing understanding about the ways in which mental health issues and domestic violence, sadly, sometimes intersect. These training materials and resources are now being used by workers in both the domestic violence and mental health sectors, and through their use

these workers are building their expertise in positively supporting people in our community experiencing a multiplicity of issues, particularly mental health and domestic violence.

We began the launch with a generous welcome to country by the extraordinary Auntie Georgina Williams, a proud Kaurna woman who is an incredible leader in our southern community and beyond. I thank her not only for her welcome to country but for her voice, her resilience, her enormous heart and mind and her willingness to stand up for what is important.

We were also honoured to hear from some of the dedicated community workers and advocates who worked tirelessly on this project and whose work resulted in the excellent resources produced by it. The first of these was Karrin Marshall, Life Without Barriers' Area Operations Manager for SA mental health, alcohol and other drugs and homelessness services. Karrin's words drew our attention to the stark realities we are dealing with when we talk about the intersection between domestic violence and mental health and to the difficulties faced by those experiencing domestic violence and how such experiences can exacerbate mental health issues for people already in the most difficult of situations.

Secondly, Sue Underhill spoke. Sue is a long-term worker and leader at Southern Domestic Violence Service, and indeed a leader in our southern community. Sue has been with the organisation for 17 years and is currently serving as Director of Services. Her commitment to working with women and children in difficult situations to empower them to resolve their issues is commendable. Importantly, her passion also extends to more broadly addressing gender inequity in society and to building awareness around the nexus between gender inequality and the prevalence of violence against women.

Lastly, we heard from Larissa Roberts, a counsellor, therapist and trainer of professionals in community services and students in the vocational education and training sector. Her skill in writing and developing training packages was integral to the project's success, particularly in ensuring the professional standard of the training packages developed and offered.

There are two other women I would also like to acknowledge: firstly, the incredible Megan Hughes, Executive Officer of Southern Domestic Violence Service, who I am proud to call a friend and whose wisdom and vision was instrumental in bringing this project together. She has inspired, motivated and encouraged so many of us to dedicate ourselves to preventing and ending violence against women. She is a giant amongst women and someone who I am proud to work with on collaborations such as this.

Secondly, I acknowledge Helen Oxenham, a woman who was a special guest at the launch who blew me away with her story of working together at a community level decades ago to develop our very first women's shelter on Beach Road in Christies Beach. She is an outstanding woman whose energy, tenacity and determination provide us with the blueprint for making important things happen, whether resources are available or not. Helen gave her support at the launch and I know continues to be a role model for many working in this sector.

Thirdly, I wanted to acknowledge Sarah Gun who, through her company GOGO events, gave her time to organise this launch. Sarah started GOGO events after 13 years of creating events for international and South Australian companies and conferences. In 2012, Sarah saw a new opportunity and transitioned GOGO events to a social enterprise scheme. I also thank the wonderful women of the Hutt Street Centre for their delicious catering and for what they do to strengthen pathways to employment and education for those in our community experiencing homelessness.

Thank you to all who contributed to this project and to this launch, and to those workers who work relentlessly to support and empower those experiencing domestic violence and those experiencing mental health issues and illness. These workers will now bring to life the resources created through this project in a way that benefits those whom they serve.

Work on the most difficult of issues is always best progressed when we collaborate and work together with a deep and shared understanding of the interconnectivity of the issues that we confront. The collaborative focus and the deep learning that has happened throughout the project will deeply benefit those who are experiencing these issues. Thank you and congratulations again to all involved.

*Bills***APPROPRIATION BILL 2016***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (15:55): If my memory serves me correctly, I think I was just finishing off making the point that the budget surplus is really only what we would refer to as a book-entry surplus, and is only a consequence of privatisation of a public asset, which is something the Labor Party has said that they would never do.

I would like to talk about some other quite relevant issues that are confronting the state. We spent quite a lot of time in question time today traversing these issues in relation to energy supply and its cost to South Australians. I would like for the house to cast its mind back to around 2002, when then premier—or he might have been the opposition leader; I cannot remember—Mike Rann (member for Ramsay) issued this infamous pledge card that he produced. The second pledge on that pledge card was in relation to electricity supply. I think there were five pledges, and this was the second pledge:

2. We will fix our electricity system and an interconnection to New South Wales will be built to bring in cheaper power.

What are we faced with now? What are we faced with today? Fifteen years ago, we had this pledge from the government of the day that an interconnector would be built to New South Wales to bring in cheaper power. What is the current Minister for Energy and Treasurer saying now? He is saying, 'We need an interconnector.' What have they been doing for the last 15 years? They have been wasting their time, to a fair degree, on blowing hot air around the place to drive these wind turbines. If it gets too hot, we know that the turbines actually turn off and they do not generate any power at all.

That is what has been happening. The whole focus of this government has been in relation to constructing wind turbines and not getting on with the pledge that they made 15 years ago to build an interconnector to New South Wales. There was the Murraylink build, but that was private funding. I remember 15 or 16 years ago there was talk about a Riverlink interconnector, but that was never constructed.

This is what Mike Rann and his mates—I do not think any of the members across the other side were in parliament back then, but there is still a fair number in the caucus that were around at the time those pledges were made, including you, Deputy Speaker. So what have we got? We have a complete shambles on our hands, where only a week or two ago, when some pretty significant storm events hit the state, the Treasurer went to the company that owns Pelican Point supposedly pleading with them to crank up energy production at Pelican Point.

I am reminding the house about what they said on the pledge card 14 or 15 years ago, and I also want to give the house a history lesson on what happened even before that, probably 16 or 17 years ago, and what the Labor opposition did when the then Liberal government wanted to construct Pelican Point power station: they gave them absolute hell. The Labor opposition at the time gave the Liberal government absolute hell when the government was proposing to build Pelican Point power station. You will remember it, Deputy Speaker, because you were here.

There were protests out the front of Parliament House, with coffins, saying that the dolphins would be killed in the Port River because of the hot water coming out of the power plant—absolute nonsense. The Labor opposition at the time hounded the Liberal government to the ends of the earth over the construction of Pelican Point, but what do we see now? We see the Treasurer going cap in hand to the company that owns Pelican Point and saying, 'We're in a bit of strife. The wind farms aren't doing what we need them to do. We've focused for 15 years on the wind farms. We haven't built the interconnector that we promised on our pledge card that Mike Rann signed for the South Australian community back in 2002, whenever it was. Can you get the show cranking along for us?' What a complete joke!

In this place, you have to be careful what you wish for, and it is all coming back to bite the government on the you know what. Their position when they were in opposition and when they first

formed government or running into that 2002 election (I cannot quite recall the details of when this pledge card was first run around the place and whether they were in opposition or they had just formed government) is coming back to bite them. They did not want Pelican Point and now they want it.

I remember that at the time they hounded the Liberal government to the ends of the earth over the construction of Pelican Point. The member for Morphett was around—he would have been a candidate back in those days—and he would remember that. Some of us in this place have quite long memories on what the Labor Party has done. They pledged that the interconnector would be built, but they have not done any of it, and what they have opposed and what they have not done is what they are seeking to do now. Well, it is too little too late.

The government ministers in question time can duck and weave as much as they like in relation to not answering questions we put to them about power, but we know the real reasons—their lack of action and their opposition to something over a decade ago. Now they are going cap in hand and begging the energy company for some power.

I also want to talk about health, particularly the Transforming Health initiative. The member for Finniss highlighted this earlier because he realises that health services down in his electorate are not running very well at all. I have spoken about these issues in the house a number of times, particularly relating to the Modbury Hospital and the reduction of services, the downgrading of services, in the Modbury Hospital and the supposed transfer of some services to Lyell McEwin Hospital.

I think the last speech I made in the house a few weeks ago was on this very specific issue. I warned the government that when the flu season hit they would see an incredible increase in demand on the services required at Lyell McEwin Hospital. What have we seen just last week at the Lyell McEwin Hospital? The emergency department over capacity—and do you know why? The health professionals have come out and supported this position: the reason is that the services at Modbury Hospital have been downgraded.

They have been downgraded, and the minister was trotted out in front of the media, again ducking and weaving on the real reasons for the overcrowding and the overcapacity situation at the Lyell McEwin. He said, 'There's only been several transfers from Modbury to Lyell McEwin.' Do you know why? Because nobody is worrying about rolling up to Modbury. The patients know that they are not going to get the level of services they need at Modbury, so they get in the car and, instead of going to Modbury, they go straight out to Lyell McEwin.

They go straight out to Lyell McEwin Hospital; hence, you get this chronic situation, where we see that the emergency department and the services at Lyell McEwin Hospital are over capacity and cannot cope, so people are walking out. People are just walking away and giving up. Talking about walking away, we have seen somebody walking away—this gentleman trying to present himself back to prison, having been on temporary parole—

Mr Pederick: He was on compassionate leave.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: —compassionate leave—to go to a funeral, the tragedy we saw out in the north. He goes back and tries to present both at the prison and at the police station, and he gets sick of it and walks away. This government has some form in terms of not being able to deal with people who present for a whole range of reasons.

We might talk about it here in the house and raise these issues, and government members might joke, interject and chiac about it, but this is a really serious issue in relation to the significant effect Transforming Health is having on the health sector. It is not transforming health at all for the better: it is transforming health for the worse. You have patients and staff and hospitals that cannot cope with the demand. The minister rolls out in front of the media and makes some flippant one-liners just to get through the press conference, but we know that the situation is extremely dire.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (16:08): The budget papers, the budget process, the Treasurer's speech, they are all a sight to behold. How they have changed in my 14 years in here. There were the rivers of gold flowing into this state in the early 2000s and the state had massive opportunities. Unfortunately, the budget papers this year, with some delving and with some

interpretation, show that the state of the state is not rosy. The future is not rosy, and that is where as members of parliament in this place we need to have the opportunity to digest the budget and dissect it.

The way the budget is presented now is quite different. In fact, every budget I have seen presented in this place in my 14 years in here has been different, but this one is quite different in its lack of detail compared with the detail we used to get in the early budget papers. It is astounding. To try to then come into estimates and ask questions, you are being forced by this government to go on more of a fishing expedition in many ways rather than being able to ask about some of the issues that the budget is showing.

Some jurisdictions around the nation have put out another volume of the budget papers about interpreting and understanding the way the budget is put together. I am just a humble veterinarian, I am not an economist or an accountant, but I do know in business that turnover is vanity, profit is sanity. When you start borrowing to pay your recurrent expenditure, you are in deep strife.

We remember then member for Napier, Michael O'Brien, saying to a meeting at Mount Gambier that this government was borrowing to pay its wages, its recurrent expenditure. We knew then, and that was a number of years ago now. We know that this government is going backwards and that they were in deep strife then. I suppose in some ways they were insolvent because you cannot do that. You cannot borrow to pay recurrent expenditure.

The other false economy that we see now by this government, which is being dressed up as a budget surplus, is the fact that this government is now doing something that the member for Kavel said before in relation to the pledge card, 'No more privatisations,' with hospital beds and that sort of thing. We had no more privatisations. That was the chant, that was the mantra that was put out by Mike Rann, 'No more privatisations'. However, this government has continued to privatise government-owned asset after government-owned asset.

This year again we see the government out there spruiking a budget surplus based on having sold some of the farm. They have sold some of the farm, they sold the cows and the chickens a long time ago, but now they are actually starting to sell the farm. There are starting to sell the bit that they can actually use to make more money. They have sold the Motor Accident Commission. They are saying about the money they got from that, 'Look at us. Aren't we so good? We have some money in the till now. We are in the black.'

Well, you might have paid off some of the overdraft but you still have one hell of an overdraft out there and you have one hell of a mortgage deal out there, but you do not have the income and you are reducing your ability to earn that income by selling off the farm. Continuing that analogy, you are also then making sure that the people working for you and the livestock that you are caring for on that farm are not able to be as productive as they would ordinarily be, either by imposing penalties on them or providing conditions which are suboptimal for them to thrive and grow that enterprise, return the enterprise to profit and go on to have a real surplus, a real profit.

Remember this: turnover is vanity, profit is sanity. The numbers of times I hear businesses say, 'We are turning over \$10 billion,' or even \$1 million in the smaller businesses—well, that is fine if you are making \$1 million plus \$10 or \$1 billion plus \$10, but if you are making \$10 less than that, you are not making any money. You are actually going backwards in real terms. This is what this government does not seem to realise. For 14 years now they have been building a false economy, they have been building so-called surpluses based on having sold assets and increased taxes.

The latest little insult to the people of South Australia that I have seen is the 'budget at a glance' flyer, a little mushroom-coloured DL that has been put out there. On one side it says, 'The government has delivered a budget surplus for 2015-16 and is forecasting further surpluses in the future. This is the eighth budget surplus that the government has delivered since coming to office.' Well, there must be some funny accounting going on or, as I have said, it is because they are relying on asset sales to put themselves in the black for a short period. That is the only way. That is a false economy, that is a false surplus. It is not budgeting; it is a complete mismanagement of the economy.

For 14 years, South Australians have put up with this, but I hope that it will not be for much longer. The younger members in this place, particularly the younger members on the Labor side of the house, are in for a real shock. When they come into opposition, they will really start to have to

question and look at the state of the state. They will know that their legacy for the people of this state is one that is completely deplorable. They will know and understand that this state has gone backwards under the Rann/Weatherill government. They will know that it has been their former and current colleagues who have so badly mismanaged everything in this state.

This is not just me carping on as a member of the opposition and opposing for opposition's sake. As I tell people, I am doing the work of Her Majesty's loyal opposition: I am trying to bring the government to account—and possibly bring the government down, if I can—because what we need to do in opposition is to be not only opposing but proposing. That is where, in a number of my portfolios—namely, Aboriginal affairs, disabilities and veterans—I do work in as bipartisan a way as I possibly can. We know that particularly in those areas there are long-term problems. So, we need long-term solutions for long-term problems. That is why it is important for all of us to do what we can to work in a bipartisan way.

I must admit that my experience with this government is not as bad now as it was when we had the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse over on the other side, when we were doing hand-to-hand combat in here every question time and at other times. There is a glimpse now of some opportunity to have some reasonable discourse between people in this place, when you can actually work in a bipartisan way. Even then, it is sad to see that when push comes to shove you find out after the fact about issues that are being announced, rather than hoping that you will be not on the stage with the minister but at least aware of what the minister is going to announce. That is not hard; to me it would make fairly common sense.

If I am privileged enough to be a minister in 2018 in this place, I put on the record that I will have the shadow minister in as many meetings as I possibly can because I want them to be not only part of the problem but also part of the solution. I want them to know that we need to move this state forward. This is not about adversarial combativeness, but combativeness in this place. It is about making sure that we get good results for the people of South Australia, long-term solutions for long-term problems. That is what this state needs—leadership and statesmanship. It does not need posturing. It does not need populist politics.

The chameleon-like politicians we see nowadays will say anything to suit their cause—whether it is to divert, deny, distract, or in some other way get the people of South Australia to think, 'Well, things aren't as bad as the media are saying.' The things that these chameleons are saying and doing continue to astound me. While I can live with the fact that Independents, and so-called Independents, see opportunities for themselves to further their own interests, and they might dress it up as serving the state, I can actually move past that. What I cannot move past is the complete 180° turnaround on values, policies and ideologies by politicians in this place.

The classic example is the difference between the arguments on nuclear energy we heard in 2004 in this place and what we are hearing in 2016. I can well remember the vitriol that was launched across at us because we in the Liberal opposition were supporting the then federal opposition's proposal for a low-level nuclear waste repository in South Australia. I remember the pain we took over that to try to sell what is now being seen as sensible. But now what do we see? We see one of the biggest political diversions I have seen for a long time.

We saw in the federal campaign the massive lie about selling Medicare. Everybody knows it was a lie—everybody. Who is going to buy a business that loses \$20 billion a year? Geniuses, yes—but, relying on the people's not ignorance but their inability to take in only some of the message, the federal opposition got away with telling that lie. What I see here, though, is that with the nuclear energy issue we see a massive distraction away from the state of the state. We see that this is going to be the new El Dorado. The mirage in the desert is really now looking more like a mirage than a reality.

The other day we heard BHP Billiton announce that they were going to do more underground expansions, that they were not going to go ahead with the more extensive work that had been promised. We remember when the now health minister, then the treasurer, opened his budget speech here with promises of the Nirvana, the new El Dorado that was going to be delivered to all of us from up the road. What happened? They raised expectations and failed to deliver.

It is crisis management 101 really: divert, divert, divert, deny, deny, deny. That is what we are seeing. We are seeing it with driverless cars, we are seeing it with time zone changes, we are seeing it with nuclear power. I wonder what else it is going to be. Are we going to get the cable car to Mount Lofty next? What else is it going to be? Perhaps a tunnel to Kangaroo Island. I do not know; the member for Finnis might like that, anyway.

People, I hope, will start to see past this. They deserve better than this. What we need to make sure is that people are at least treated like the hardworking taxpayers they are and that the legacy that this government leaves is not going to be one where our children are paying off the current government's credit card. We do know that debt and deficit are the biggest legacies this government is going to leave this state at the moment.

We might have a new hospital down the road, but medicos are telling me that is the next State Bank down there, that is the next State Bank. It is the third most expensive building in the world, the most expensive hospital in the world. Some people say that is per GDP or something. It does not matter; it is a massively expensive investment down there—for what? I am yet to be convinced that that is going to deliver the results, the benefits for South Australia, other than a new facility, but that new facility is going to be overcrowded and overused right from the word go.

The legacy that this government is leaving the state is not going to be one that is going to be very pretty at all. We have the highest rate of unemployment in the nation, including that island state, Tasmania. We are, unfortunately, worse than them. Our electricity prices are just beside—who can afford to run a business in South Australia when you are paying the power prices we are? This is all part of the legacy of this government. They have just gone ahead and used, again, rubbery figures to try to justify their own outcomes.

We all know that solar and wind energy are heavily subsidised by the federal government, both Labor and Liberal. If it was not for those heavy subsidies from the federal government, we would not have renewable energy. We all want to have renewable energy to cut down carbon emissions, but let us be realistic about it. As a proportion of world carbon emissions, the carbon emissions from this state are miniscule, so why throw the baby out with the bathwater? Why destroy our state economy for some utopian wish that we are going to stop global warming by what we are doing in this state?

Sure, if every state adopted these sorts of measures, we might go some way towards reaching the targets that have been proposed, but that is not happening, so we have to be realists. We actually have to live for today. We have to do what is required today, not what is going to be required in 10, 20 or 30 years' time. Look at that, prepare for that, plan for that, but let us make sure that we are able to look after today, make sure that my electors in Morphett, all my constituents in Morphett, everybody's constituents in here whom they want to represent, are being treated fairly, because they want reliable, inexpensive power today. That has not been delivered by this government.

It is easy to drive up north and see the turbines flicking over, but if you go a bit further north what has happened? The power stations at Port Augusta and Leigh Creek have shut. When the wind does not blow and the sun does not shine, what are you going to do? We heard the member for Kavel talk about the history of the interconnectors in this place. There is nobody to blame here but the Labor government. Fourteen years of hard Labor have delivered for this state if not the world's highest certainly the nation's highest electricity prices, which send people broke. People cannot afford to pay these electricity prices—the number of disconnections!

I will be interested to ask questions in the short time we have in estimates committees this year. Do we all remember (and if we do not we should talk to the older members in this place) the hours we spent in here examining the budget during estimates? In the short time that we have, we will be asking questions about the number of people who are on energy concessions, whether they are dead or alive, particularly the live concession recipients. How many of them experience hardship because they cannot pay their power and water bills? What is going on in this state?

It is more than this government can do than to hide behind the old mantra, 'It's all the Liberal's fault because they privatised electricity.' That is the same fib, the same lie, the same mistruth, the same complete distortion of the facts that Bill Shorten was going on about in selling Medicare. It is

not true. Look at the Auditor-General's Report in 2002 and the result of having leased ETSA and what it did to help reduce the debt and deficit that this state was left by the Labor government.

Look at the history of the National Electricity Market set up by the Keating Labor government. It looked good, it sounded good, but if you do not have the poles and wires going between states you do not have a national electricity market. We do not have those interconnectors here. Why? Because they have been stalled. Why? Because former Labor governments have not done their job. What was happening in 2002, when things could have happened?

Remember, members, this place has been the victim of 14 years of Labor, not 14 months but 14 years of Labor. When they had the rivers of gold from the first few years of the GST, they could have done a lot more to build interconnectors. They could have seen the potential for renewables and making sure that we had reliable base load power. The base load coal and gas was not able to compete with the heavily subsidised solar and wind.

This Treasurer and this Premier cannot say that it is because the Liberals privatised ETSA. They can tell that story out there but it is just not true. You cannot lie to yourself. What we need from this government is the truth. We need them to face up to the facts to say, 'Look, we do have a crisis here, we do have some issues here. Yes, our priorities at that particular time were different, our expectations were different. We expected Roxby, we expected other things to happen, we expected things to turn out better than they did, but they didn't.' Only dead men and fools do not change their minds. So, you have to go back and say, 'This is what we need to do now, this is what we should have been doing.' Accept some fault. Stop blaming other people. It is too easy to blame other people.

I remember a minister standing up in here saying that the downturn in the economy was due to SARS. We all remember the epidemic of sudden acute respiratory syndrome in China, which did have an impact around the world. It was not because of SARS; it was because of mismanagement. That is what we are continuing to see in this place—continued mismanagement of the state budget, high taxing, high spending—and it cannot continue. There is no better authority on this than Professor Dick Blandy, who in an article written a couple of weeks ago in the InDaily, entitled 'Looking beyond the budget spin', wrote:

The underlying state of the South Australian economy—as implied by the Government's own budget measures—is therefore disastrous.

It is a disaster. It is a disaster that is not waiting to happen; it is a disaster that is happening now in every home out there in South Australia. This government is obliged to make sure they do better.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:29): I rise to speak to the Appropriation Bill 2016 and note that we are dealing with a sum of around \$18 billion in this year's funding for our state budget. Treasury figures indicate that jobs growth in this state will be only 0.75 per cent in 2016-17. That is less than half the national jobs growth figures, which are at 1.8 per cent. I note that in June South Australia's unemployment rate was 7 per cent, and that is the worst in the nation, with youth unemployment at 14 per cent.

The net operating balance for 2015-16 was a \$258 million surplus, but this was written down by \$97 million since the Mid-Year Budget Review. The MAC is being privatised over three years, which this government has done after their many years of saying that they would not be privatising assets. The Motor Accident Commission is being privatised to the tune of around \$2 billion and this is the only reason this state Labor government have managed to get a surplus. That is the only way this surplus has eventuated. Non-financial public sector debt is now forecast to peak at \$14.2 billion in 2017-18, up from \$13.5 billion as previously forecast in the 2015-16 Mid-Year Budget Review.

In this budget there is no cost-of-living relief for already struggling South Australians. On this side of the house, with our emergency services levy relief, we have committed to \$360 million to provide South Australians with that relief. If we look at what this government is doing as far as funding its so-called environmental outcomes, we have had an increase in the solid waste levy from \$62 per tonne to \$103 per tonne by 2019-20, yet there are tens of millions of dollars already in the Zero Waste fund. This government is looking at introducing a wagering tax of 15 per cent, with the estimated revenue expected to generate \$10 million.

Let's look at health, which covers about a third of the state budget. There has been a \$274 million budget blowout. What have we got to blame for this? We can look at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. Will it ever be completed? Will it ever have a patient go through the door? That is the question.

The Hon. S.E. Close: Yes.

Mr PEDERICK: I hear a yes in the distance. Somewhere in the wilderness I hear yes. Will it happen? It will not happen until the tramline is extended down East Terrace so that it can be a ferry service for patients and equipment from the old Royal Adelaide Hospital up to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. What a bungle of bungles this build has been. It is the third most expensive build in history—not in this state, not in this country, but in the world.

It is the third most expensive build yet, as I have learned, the building will not be heavy enough to hold the paper documents because EPAS, the electronic management of patient records, does not work. There has been a blowout of hundreds of millions of dollars over its budgeted figure of somewhere over \$200 million to run EPAS. At least up to \$463 million is the current funding that is going into EPAS and the hospital will not be able to take the weight of paper files.

I fear for the patients who are going into this hospital, patients like me. I am slightly heavier than the average weight. Am I going to fall through the floor if I am on one of the upper levels? It is just ridiculous that this has gone on. You hear of building bungles of light switches being put in behind doors and the emergency services fitout of piping not being put in the right place and then having to be ripped out. Then you hear of \$50 million to correct the bungled system of trying to get hot water at tap at a certain temperature within 15 seconds. The amount of money being blown at the Royal Adelaide Hospital is just outrageous. It is not to fix up an old hospital; no, this is to repair something being built from the ground up.

Ms Redmond: Before it is even open.

Mr PEDERICK: That's it, 'Before it is even open,' says the member for Heysen. It is totally out of control, and this goes with the shutting down of the Daw Park Repatriation Hospital. We saw the veterans make their protest out in front of this place for many, many nights, and they make their protest every week on a Monday. They certainly need to be mad against the local member, the member for Waite, who is a former soldier himself, yet he turns on his fellow man, as he has done in this house, and decides that we will close down their health services.

I do note that the federal government is assisting South Australia, as they have had to do over many years. We are going to receive an extra \$528 million in GST funding in 2016-17 in comparison with 2015-16. Certainly I note that our federal colleagues will also be contributing an extra \$187 million towards health over three years, and I commend them for that.

We note that in the transport sector there is expected to be a \$1 levy on all Metro tickets, taxis and chauffeur rides and that kind of thing, and there will also be an additional \$2 fee for peak periods on weekends. Compulsory third-party insurance is increasing by 2.9 per cent, and registration of a six-cylinder vehicle will be up by 1.6 per cent. Driver's licence renewals for 10 years will increase by 2.4 per cent, to a whopping \$420.

I note that in education we see some money going throughout the state, though I note that in my electorate I only have two schools, and I guess I should be grateful for that. Murray Bridge High and Murray Bridge North School are getting science, technology, engineering and mathematics buildings as part of \$250 million over three years in primary and secondary schools throughout the state in the public system. The other \$250 million out of the \$500 million will be a low-interest loan facility for non-government schools. What this means is that about 370 schools do not receive this funding, so there is not equity across the board, but there is more to watch in this space.

An issue that will certainly affect my electorate is this Labor government, at the behest of their union masters, introducing specific school fees targeting those holding a temporary work (skilled) visa 457. This fee will apply from term 1 in 2017 for dependents of new visa holders who arrive on or after 1 January 2017, and it will extend to existing enrolments of children of current visa holders from term 1 in 2018. A per annum index fee of \$5,100 will be charged for primary students and a fee of \$6,100 for secondary students. So, here we go again.

Only today—and the words must have stuck in his mouth—we heard the Treasurer talking about how good agriculture was going for this state. Do you know why we have these 457 visa holder workers? Because we do not have the numbers of people who are either willing or able to work in all these jobs, especially in my electorate, whether it be at the mushroom farm, whether it be at Thomas Foods at the meatworks, or whether it be at Swanport Harvest.

Before Labor keep listening to their union masters, and I have had this conversation with several ministers, they should go out into the real world and see the people who are putting the extra value in value-added industries, mainly in my electorate but they are in other electorates as well. We also have the backpackers, and if we did not have those 30,000-odd backpackers coming through this country every year a lot of our rural industries would just shut down.

I note the federal government are doing a review of the so-called backpacker tax, and I hope they have a darn good look at it because, unless they get that right and come to a sensible outcome, we will be left with fruit literally withering on the vine. These 457 workers are absolutely needed, and I hear so much rot about them being paid less and that the companies get away with doing this and that.

Actually, it costs these companies more to hire these people, and the government needs to be aware of that. Not only that, but they now want these people to pay a tax. They have turned up to contribute to the wellbeing of this state, and yet here we have a government that just wants to tax them out of business. They can get cheaper fees at some of the private schools and they may end up sending their children there. They are a vital part of our society, as are the local employees of those companies.

I note that in regard to prisons, 70 extra beds are to be implemented within the prison system, with 26 of them being placed at Mobilong. We are just in the middle of seeing 72 more beds being built at Mobilong. From talking to the people that work there, such as the correctional officers, I know there are concerns at Mobilong. Mat O'Brien, who was federal Labor candidate for Barker, works in Mobilong and he has concerns about the security arrangements of the prison.

They have built out on the available space around most of the buildings and are now encroaching on the greenspace. There are serious concerns when you have a prison that was built for 160 inmates and after these builds will house up to something like 460 inmates. There are concerns about how secure it will be, and the government really need to have a good hard look at what they are actually doing at Mobilong. They also need to look after the welfare and the working conditions of the staff.

Under the Attorney-General's section in this year's budget, the government are looking at legislative administration and compliance targets, and the implementation of the Statutes Amendment (Rights of Foster Parents, Guardians and Kinship Carers) Act 2016. I was very pleased to get this through after nearly two years of negotiations in this place. I note that one of Education and Child Development's 2016-17 targets is to 'increase the number of other person guardianship carers, and therefore increase the placement stability for children in foster or kinship care'. I do applaud that, because that was a private member's bill I brought to this place and which finally received support.

We note that the government has finally realised that they need to actually supply some blackspot funding seed money so that we can attract money from the federal government for more phone towers in this state. There is \$1 million coming from the Regional Development Fund to contribute to that. I also look at a topic dear to my heart, the Lakes and Coorong Fishery. I note that in the Primary and Regions section, it highlights for the last year that it has finalised and implemented a new management plan for the Lakes and Coorong Fishery.

It is to be noted that, for the second year running, the government have had to forgive licence fees because of the impact of New Zealand fur seals not just on the fishery but also on the native wildlife and ecology. You will not see DEWNR and the natural resources management group admit that. They are doing all they can in reports to say, 'There's nothing to see here,' because they are getting that directive from the minister down. They say, 'No, there's no problem here. We don't know why that pelican has lost its head. We don't know why that pelican has been ripped to bits. We don't know why there are dead pelicans laying on the Tauwichehere barrage.'

It is interesting that one of the measures costing \$260,000 was funded between DEWNR and PIRSA. Tauwichee barrage on the Coorong and Lakes is 3.6 kilometres long. The government, in all their wisdom, put up a fence that I think was around 80 metres to try to keep the seals out. I come off the land. When you build a fence, you build it from one end to the other. That is what I always do. If my contractor only built an 80-metre fence when I had a 3.6 kilometre line, I would expect it to go all the way. But, no, this was the state government in all their glory. They need to help these people. They are having severe mental health issues, they are having severe health issues, and they need to have a look at what is happening in the real world instead of blatantly saying, 'There is nothing to see here,' not just with the fishing industry but with the native ecology and wildlife.

We notice with agriculture that \$100 million is disappearing because the South Australian River Murray Sustainability scheme is running out and the government has not lobbied any federal funds to replace that. We note that the government is cutting \$1 million out of the Australian Centre for Plant Functional Genomics. There is our research and development, one of the last vestiges of research and development we have left in the budget.

I want to talk a bit about what I have done in trying to get some information from the families and communities department. I have lodged two freedom of information requests with them. One still to this day did not get acknowledged, and an extension was asked for this freedom of information request three times. On the last time, I did not grant permission; however, the documents were still not provided by the due date, which was 18 July this year, and still have not been provided.

The second FOI request was rejected as they advised no submissions were made in relation to those requested. However, upon lodging a secondary FOI, I attached a copy of a document detailing all the submissions made which allegedly were not. I was hoping, with how specific my request was, that the documents would be relatively easy to locate—how wrong that was—and I named all the people who made submissions. I recently received a letter of determination from the Freedom of Information unit, which advised, and I quote:

It is not clear from your application what you intended by your reference to 'submissions'. Generally, a reference to 'submissions' refers to submissions made by legal counsel on behalf of their client during proceedings, or to some form of written submission. I understand that no submissions were made in these terms before the Commission during these dates. I note that the evidence provided by witnesses will not ordinarily be referred to as 'submissions'. It is therefore not clear to the Agency what documents you are referring to in your application.

Just for the department, and I will try to help them out a bit here, the definition of 'submission' is:

The action of presenting a proposal, application, or other document for consideration or judgement.

It could have been an oral submission, which I assume a lot of them were, but will I ever find out? If the word 'submission' did not suffice, you would think a copy of the document specifying all the documents I was requesting would have made it clear.

There are so many other things I could speak about but I am running out of time. This is the obfuscation that this department is putting in front of me when attempting to get some reasonable information. You get this balderdash sent back to you (and the FOI officer can look up that word to see what it means) by a department that is out of control, out of its league and out of step with reality and working with real people. It wants to put things in the way of people. It does not know how to deal properly with foster carers. When you simply ask for a freedom of information submission, it comes up with these ridiculous statements.

In the closing few seconds, I want to concur with my colleagues in regard to the ridiculous power prices that we put up with in this state. And do you know why? Because now we do not have a coalmine in South Australia. All it is about is making sure we get more interconnectors so that we can import that coal-fired power from Victoria. That is what it is about and that is the only way, at the moment, that we will get stable electricity in this state. I really fear for the people of this state, who are being shafted, quite frankly, for the price they have to pay for power, especially when you look across the border where you can get it for about half the price. It is a disgrace, and this government should hang its head in shame, and with the talk which came from the Treasurer today—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member's time has expired.

Mr PEDERICK: —in trying to defend wind and solar, it is just ridiculous.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PEDERICK: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have to protect the member for Hammond every time he stands up. It is not acceptable any longer. Minister.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (16:49): I rise today to speak about the importance of adapting to change. Change comes in all shapes and forms and quite often can be challenging. We also know that those who do not change with the times risk being left behind, and that is something that we are not prepared to have happen, in particular for the young people of this state.

There is no question that our state is in a period of significant transition, with the closure of many of our traditional forms of manufacturing that have provided a significant portion of our employment in South Australia. It is necessary that, as a community and as a government, we respond to these changes and we do all we can to anticipate future ones. What better way to do that than to engage our children's interest in growth industries and to equip them with the skills to prepare them for the jobs of the future, many of which have yet to be envisaged.

We know that 75 per cent of the jobs in the fastest growing industries have a focus on science, technology, engineering and mathematics, known as STEM. It is critically important that we make sure that our children are learning the skills that they will need to fulfil these roles. The government's \$250 million STEM Works program is one of the biggest investments in school infrastructure that our state has seen. It will provide around 75,000 South Australian children, from Ceduna to Bordertown, Roxby Downs to Kangaroo Island and many places in between, with innovative and engaging learning facilities to help open their eyes to what is really an exciting and dynamic area of study.

These exciting new facilities will encourage an energised and dynamic approach to STEM, capturing children's imaginations and giving them the push to take their studies to a new level. They will give students hands-on learning experiences and the chance to bring their knowledge in subjects like science and maths together into real applications. DECD will work with schools to determine what their students need to really accelerate quality STEM learning at their site.

Following the announcement of this program, I had the pleasure of visiting Torrensville Primary School with the Premier and the Treasurer to talk to some students about what this would mean for them. What we found were students already interested in science and maths, but without any specific infrastructure to help support and nurture this interest. All of the kids I spoke to were incredibly excited about the prospect of having their own specialised science lab where they could explore ideas such as robotics and chemical reactions. It was wonderful to be able to witness the excitement of these students at the prospect of such an investment in their school and in their education. It is one of the great privileges of being Minister for Education.

We are committed to ensuring that children have access to facilities based on need, not where they go to school, and that is why we are also supporting non-government schools to upgrade their school infrastructure and also to build early childhood facilities. Two hundred and fifty million dollars will be provided in low-interest loans to Catholic and independent schools to improve the education and care outcomes for their students and to cultivate a love of learning and particularly interest in STEM subjects.

It is also important to acknowledge that this government school infrastructure program will have a broader impact that goes beyond the 139 government schools across South Australia receiving STEM facilities and the Catholic and independent schools that take up the loans offer. The building works undertaken as part of STEM Works and through the low-interest loans scheme will provide an important boost to our local construction industry as well.

It is estimated the STEM Works program alone will create more than 600 jobs and because it spans remote, regional and metropolitan schools those jobs will be located throughout the state. To ensure South Australian workers benefit from the construction, the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, in collaboration with the Office of the Industry Advocate, will incorporate criteria into project contracts, encouraging builders to employ and source materials locally.

This budget is also investing in further improving the South Australian Certificate of Education (SACE). The SACE is a world-class high school certificate that gives young South Australians excellent preparation for future study or work. It is also used by schools overseas to prepare their young people for the world. Currently, schools in Malaysia and in China use our SACE, and there are more to come, not only in China but also an interest from Vietnam.

Our investment of \$10.6 million will modernise the delivery of the SACE and further incorporate the development of innovative, entrepreneurial and IT skills in the curriculum. We are moving with the times by shifting towards online assessment. This will save 42,000 envelopes and papers by introducing eight online exams, and cut back on the paper traffic flowing between schools and the SACE Board.

Administrative processes will be streamlined, helping ensure that teachers are spending more of their time where it counts, face to face with their students. This modernisation process will also allow for reinvestment into subject renewal and a focus on making sure that the SACE is better preparing students for future learning, training and employment. We already have an excellent secondary qualification and we are making sure that we adapt to the times, where possible, to make it even better.

The 2016-17 state budget continues our record of investing in education and in our children's future. Since 2002, we have invested more than \$2.2 billion in infrastructure alone. We are also increasing our spending on education and care by \$174 million compared to the previous budget, and our funding per public school student is now \$16,040, more than double the amount in 2002. We are also continuing to deliver our share of Gonski funding with an additional \$229.9 million across the full six years.

Every South Australian child deserves the right to an education that helps them to achieve their very best, regardless of their postcode or their parents' income or educational achievement. But we also know that socioeconomic disadvantage continues to have a significant effect on education opportunities. Right around the state, Gonski funding is being used by schools to address the issues that face their individual communities from early literacy to school engagement and pastoral care for at-risk students.

I have spoken a number of times in this place about the amazing work that is being done in schools and the demonstrable impact on thousands of young people, thanks to the Gonski funding. I am very proud of the work that our schools are doing to address educational disadvantage and am pleased that this budget delivers on our promised ongoing commitment to the final two years of Gonski reforms.

As we know, on 5 August Justice Nyland will hand down the findings of the royal commission into South Australia's child protection system to the Governor. This budget retains additional funding and contingency to respond to Justice Nyland's final recommendations. We will make those plans public once the final report has been given the consideration it deserves. This is another opportunity for change and we do not shy away from it.

This budget is squarely focused on our next generation of South Australians. It is an excellent one for children and families in South Australia. It is about giving our students an excellent education and setting them up for our changing economy through improved educational opportunities, innovative and exciting STEM facilities in schools, and an even higher quality secondary certificate.

Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (16:57): I was hoping to say it is a pleasure to rise to make some comments in relation to the budget but, sadly, as usual it is anything but a pleasure. Before I proceed with the comments I was going to make, I want to respond in a small way to the comments made by the minister in relation to both education and child protection because the reality is that this government continues to measure things in terms of inputs rather than outputs.

Over successive years, we have seen the decline in our education to the point where, far from being a leader in education—and we once were in this state at the very forefront of education around the nation—we now sit right at the bottom in the NAPLAN results in many of the areas of testing. Also in the area of child protection we have an absolutely appalling record over the entire period in which this government has been in office, beginning from the Layton review. Robyn Layton did a fabulous review when this government first came to office and made some excellent

recommendations. I have reviewed them again recently. Many of her recommendations have never been implemented and things have continued to degenerate at an alarming rate in the child protection area.

In the education area, of course, all of that has been achieved with a bureaucracy which is in absolute numbers larger than the bureaucracy in Victoria, notwithstanding that the Victorian education system has the responsibility for educating far more young people than that in South Australia. Indeed, one of the things I was going to comment on in any event in discussing the litany of financial mismanagement that is this government's current budget, and every budget that I have ever been here to comment on, is how it is just a history of financial incompetence.

One of the areas I thought I would comment on was the Skills for All program, which has now been abandoned by this government. I noted that in the leader's speech this morning he referred to the fact that, far from the 6,000 jobs that the Treasurer had spoken about in last year's budget, we actually had a depletion of some 4,000, making a total of about 10,000, as I recall the figures. That is down, in overall terms, from where we were meant to be according to the Treasurer's previous budget, and we have really a major problem with employment.

The Skills for All program was set up with the idea that what we were going to have was a regional-based approach to looking at what industries were, in any area, and what were the likely future industries for an area, where employment might be generated, and taking on the task of training people within each area for suitable qualifications to undertake the employment in whatever appropriate field of employment might be available within a given area. I looked at the figures a while back on what was to happen in South Australia and then, in particular, at the Adelaide Hills-Fleurieu area, which is the region that the electorate of Heysen encompasses.

The figures show that the government intended to provide some \$750,000—not a huge amount in terms of the overall budget of the state, but quite a significant amount of money for the area. That \$750,000 would provide Skills for All training for people in the Adelaide Hills-Fleurieu region. They had a target for how many people were going to be trained, how many people were going to be of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander extraction and how many people were going to have a disability, all that sort of stuff. They had all these fabulous targets in their proposal.

After some time, after the program had been going for more than a year, I wrote to the minister and said in the FOI I sent to both the minister's office and the department, 'Could you please tell me how many people have been entered into courses, how many people have completed courses, how many people have been employed subsequent to their courses and how many people are still employed six months later and 12 months later?' I thought that was not a bad FOI request to find out how much value there was in the spending of this \$750,000 in setting up yet another bureaucracy called Skills for All.

Surprisingly, the response that came back from both the department and the minister indicated that there was no information whatsoever. Apparently, there was no actual completion of any courses, or at least the FOI indicated that there was no documentation in the minister's office or the department to indicate how many people had been engaged in a course, how many people had completed a course, how many people got a job and how many people still had a job six months later, or 12 months later.

That is yet another example of the way in which this government manages to waste an enormous amount of money. I recall in the leader's speech this morning his mentioning that they had spent \$13.8 million administering a program that was only valued at \$15 million. There is an enormous amount of money spent on establishing and running bureaucracies that seem to achieve very little. By way of comparison, and one of the main things I want to address this afternoon, is the issue of the Motor Accident Commission which I consider to be just a straight out theft by the government from the people of this state.

Everyone knows that when they pay the registration on their motor vehicle the registration includes a component for the compulsory third-party insurance, and the Motor Accident Commission has been the body charged with managing the fund created by the money paid in for that purpose. I happen to have been involved in this area for quite a number of years, from way back when it was SGIC running things and some limits and caps were put on how much could be claimed against the

system if you had a motor vehicle accident in the state. It was not an overgenerous system, especially once these caps were put in place in the late 1970s, but it was running efficiently. The Motor Accident Commission not only ran things efficiently but it managed the investment portfolio involved with that fund very well. The result was that it had a significant amount of money.

The government then decided to do several things. First of all, they had their budget in such disarray that they decided they needed to prop it up a few years ago. In the first instance, they just simply one year grabbed \$100 million from the Motor Accident Commission to prop up their budget and their financial mismanagement. Then they decided that they would maybe be able to get some more money. Indeed, over a period of years they have significantly reduced the fund because they have now decided to get out of the business altogether.

They are not getting out of the business for any legitimate reason. They are not getting out of the business because the Motor Accident Commission was failing. Indeed, the Motor Accident Commission was an example of how something should be run. It had an excellent board which made excellent decisions both as to the management of the claims and as to the investment portfolio. One of the first things the government did was they said, 'What we are going to do is we are going to reduce the amount that people can get by way of compensation for their motor vehicle accidents.'

They justified this in the first instance by saying, 'What we have to do is introduce some provisions to allow for what happens when someone is catastrophically injured.' Members might remember some years ago the issue of John Blake, the actor who had an accident in our Far North and was left, basically, in a permanent vegetative state. That sort of claim, where a young person who was potentially going to earn a lot of money is left in that state and requires 24-hour a day care, can be a massive calculation of money.

The reality is, firstly, that very few of those cases occur; I know because I have acted in a number of them. There are very few that are really at that catastrophic end. The fund had plenty of money in order to cope with that, even if such claims did occur. Nevertheless, that was the excuse used by the government to allow them to then minimise the amount and indeed, in some cases, remove altogether the entitlement that people might have to compensation under the system. The government then realised, though, that there was quite a big fund of money.

Having reduced the amount that people would be entitled to under the arrangements they had introduced meant that they lessened what is called the long-term tail. When they closed the Motor Accident Commission, they would have to keep a certain amount of the fund available for the claims that were already in existence under the current system but had not yet been finalised (these cases often take a number of years to finalise), and they would, by reducing the entitlement, reduce the amount that had to be left in the fund and thereby maximise the amount they could take out of the fund.

Of course, it has already been mentioned, I think in the leader's speech earlier today, that some \$853 million was removed from the fund the year before last, and another \$448 million last year, and this year over \$400 million. Indeed, as has been pointed out by a number of other speakers, the fact that there is technically a surplus in this budget is entirely down not to the good management of the Treasurer but to the fact that they have removed money yet again (over \$400 million) from the Motor Accident Commission fund so that they can pay it into government coffers.

As I said, as far as I am concerned, it is simply theft. The people who have registered their cars in this state and paid their compulsory third party into that fund have already paid their taxes. They have already paid their registration. They have already paid all the other excessive costs of living in this state, and the government has turned around and stolen that money from them to prop up their own poor management.

What is so annoying—and I have mentioned it probably every year since the global financial crisis—is that this government had years before the global financial crisis when they were earning absolute rivers of gold through a property boom and the GST flowing into this state well in excess of their budget forecasts. Yet, in spite of those excesses above budget forecast, not only did they spend all that money but every year consistently failed to balance the budget. Then, over a succession of years, they sold off things like the forests in the South-East and the state lotteries commission. You get to the point where you think there is nothing left to sell, and now of course they have sold off the

Motor Accident Commission. Indeed, the prize is for guessing what they are going to sell off this year: they are going to sell off the Lands Titles Office.

I am probably not going to have time to go into great deal of detail about the Lands Titles Office. Suffice to say, the sale of the Lands Titles Office I think is an absolute travesty, given that Robert Richard Torrens, whose portrait hangs in the hallway outside this chamber, founded the system of Torrens title, which was so successful that it was adopted not just in every other state of Australia but around the world.

I was talking to the director of the library earlier, who said that the original paperwork in relation to this system is held in our library. We are the founders of this wonderful system, and this government is selling it off. My concern is not just the niceness of having that history and heritage here, which we should not be giving away, but also a range of other issues, which I will not have time to go into today.

Another issue I want to mention is the probate office. What this government has done surreptitiously, by stealth, via regulation under the probate rules, is introduce effectively death duties into this state. They have done that in the following way. By way of explanation, I will say that probate is simply the formal recognition by the court of someone's will so that it can then be administered. You do not always have to get probate, but most of the time you have to apply to the court to get a will formally recognised in the Supreme Court.

The probate division accepts the application and you pay a standard fee for the application to be lodged and dealt with. That standard fee remains the same regardless of the value of the estate. The government, however, changed that by introducing a differentiated fee. I would not mind it if all they introduced was a differentiated fee that said that in some circumstances there might be people whose estate is so small and who are so poor that they need to have a discount. But what this government has done is introduce a graduated system and so estates over a certain amount pay a much, much higher fee than they would have done.

Furthermore, the way in which they assess the value of the estate is on the gross value of the estate, not on its actual value. For instance, if you happen to have a million-dollar house and a \$950,000 mortgage, just to take a very simplistic example, then the value of the estate in net terms is only \$50,000, but the probate office will assess the value of the estate on the gross value of the estate, that is, \$1 million, and charge you the maximum amount of fee that can be paid. I happen to serve on the Legislative Review Committee, and we happened to have someone before that committee who gave evidence about what had motivated this.

The evidence was very clearly not anything to do with the probate office in particular but, rather, the fact that the government had said to the Courts Administration Authority, 'If you want the new computer system that you tell us you need, you've got to find somewhere and some way to create the money to pay for it.' So, the poor old probate office is having to meet the cost of supplying the new computer system for the whole of the courts system.

The people of this state who happen to become involved in any probate issues are going to have to pay the costs of the new computer system on behalf of the government because it should be a government responsibility. Of course, in the meantime, people might have seen more recently in the media that the courts are still crying out for some appropriate accommodation. Every little while, this government makes some noises as though they might do something about it one day, and then they back away from it yet again.

The previous speaker, the member for Hammond, mentioned the cost of the hospital and the fact that this new hospital of ours is the third most expensive building in the world. It is not that it is actually the third most expensive building because of the cost of building, it is actually the third most expensive because of the way it has been financed. People do not realise that from the day the doors open and we actually get any patients in—although we are increasingly getting a view of it like in *Yes Minister* where the hospital does not have any patients and seems destined never to have any patients.

Assuming we get patients into the hospital, from the moment we take possession of it and start operating it, because of the way the financing of the building has been organised, it is going to

be costing us something in the order of \$1.1 million every single day, seven days a week for 30 years. The people of this state have every right to be horrified, firstly on the basis that, had this government in its first few years up until the global financial crisis actually managed their budget in a way that should have been very easy and very straightforward—just keep to the budget that you have even set out—you would have had an enormous amount of money already held in your bank account and you could have paid for the building without taking these financial arrangements.

Instead of that, what we are getting is a hospital that is going to cost us \$1.1 million every single day for 30 years, and that is just for the building. That is not for doctors, nurses, all the specialised equipment and all those other things: it is just for the building. Of course, that means that we are in an increasingly difficult position in relation to the finances of this state. It is no wonder that, in net terms, almost 5,000 people have left this state over the last year and gone elsewhere to find employment. It is a sad and sorry state that we have under this government. They have failed this state in an enormous way and with no excuse. They have continued to spend well beyond their means.

I sometimes think that the government in fact takes the view that it does not matter how bad they make it because eventually they will lose an election and another group will come in, presumably the Liberal Party, that will have to try to fix up the mess and the worse the problem is that they have created the harder the decisions that will have to be taken. Therefore, in the cynical way of Labor governments generally around this country, it will make it easier for them to get back in because the decisions will be so tough by the time anyone gets into office beyond them.

Ms COOK (Fisher) (17:17): I rise today in support of the 2016 budget, which sees the state government delivering millions into education funding to support science, technology, engineering and mathematics. The budget sees investment to help create and maintain jobs during a period of massive transition in this great state's economy, as well as delivering the budget back to a surplus.

Within this, the budget delivers some key work into the Fisher community. The budget delivers a record \$3.5 billion in education funding to ensure that our children are given the highest standard of education possible in order for them to be ready for the jobs of tomorrow. A key feature of the funding was \$250 million, which will see 139 schools across the state get their science, technology, engineering and mathematics facilities upgraded. The public-school upgrades will ensure they are able to deliver contemporary science, technology, engineering and maths programs, giving children the skills needed to one day forge a career in key industries. This will see our next generation of graduates secure work on locally based major projects, such as the Future Submarines program.

I am honoured that Aberfoyle Park High School was selected to receive this funding. Aberfoyle Park High School is the official Department for Education and Child Development (DECD) school for gifted students in the southern metropolitan area of Adelaide. DECD provides extra resources for the innovative Ignite program designed to cater for the academic, social and emotional needs of gifted students.

The \$2.5 million provided to the school will greatly enhance the STEM programs that they have already been able to provide, indeed taking them to the next level. Enhancements include expanding on the number of STEM subjects provided by the school and developing career pathways with a flow-on of providing more opportunities to take part in external STEM initiatives, with the school already taking part in the SA Power Networks Drone Challenge, Young Women in Technology Experience at the University of Adelaide, Science Alive and a number of other competitions.

The funding will complement the school's Advanced Technology Industry School Pathways Program, which it runs with the Defence Materiel Organisation. Work on the first schools is set to begin by the end of the year and will ramp up next year, generating jobs for local businesses and tradespeople and significantly stimulating the SA economy. To help businesses also keep on employees, the budget will extend the payroll rebate for another four years, which is a great initiative.

The Happy Valley BMX Club, which has been operating in Fisher since the eighties, and indeed I bear the scars of this, has always been an integral part of the community, whether it is for keen riders taking part in their gate events or cyclists who use their facilities at other times, often with

very small children, having a great time on the weekends. The gates are kept open to the community, which is a wonderful initiative.

The club is also the proud home to Sam Willoughby who, after leaving his home at the age of 16 (in fact with a backpack on) in search of better competition, won his first world championship in 2012. He is now a household name, and I hope that with this investment in the world-class facility we will see many more world champions rise from our state but also, importantly, be able to remain here as a home base as well as return with teammates to showcase the facility and compete at a national level in their own backyard.

It is fantastic to see Happy Valley, as well as the Hallett Cove club, with a role to play in what will be an exciting time for BMX riding in the southern suburbs. The track will be built on Majors Road, in partnership with the Marion and Onkaparinga councils, who each bring \$750,000 to the project. With the \$2 million commitment made by the state government in this budget, it brings the total investment to \$3.5 million. The project delivers the first international standard BMX track for South Australia and with it the capacity for the state to attract events of the scale of the BMX National Championships. The last event of such attracted over \$8 million in economic benefit, so this will pay for itself.

I have lived in the south all of my life, and even when driving my very first car, which from memory was an antique and very broken down Hillman Hunter, I used Kenihans Road frequently. With the increase in population in and around Happy Valley, which in the seventies and eighties actually was known as 'Nappy Valley', as well as the opening of a fast-food store in the area, the roads, particularly around that shopping precinct, have been quite notorious. Both during the 2014 Fisher by-election and since being elected to represent the people of Fisher, a large number of people have raised concerns about Kenihans Road to me.

People are concerned about confusing intersections, T-junctions at the end of sharp hills and many dips in the road, as well as several blind intersections. The community has worked hard to bring these issues to the attention of myself and also the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. I know that Happy Valley and Reynella East residents are very happy to see that the state government is funding a road management plan to investigate the best way to manage these transport issues locally.

Importantly for the people of Fisher, this budget is also about helping South Australia and South Australian businesses create jobs. The payroll tax rebate provides payroll tax savings to eligible employers with a taxable Australian payroll of less than or equal to \$1.2 million. The rebate eligibility criteria will remain unchanged. Eligible employers will receive the rebate following the finalisation of the previous financial year's payroll tax annual reconciliation process.

Since 2004, the state government has progressively cut the payroll tax rate from 5.67 per cent to 4.95 per cent and increased the tax-free threshold from \$504,000 to \$600,000. The payroll tax rebate was first announced in the 2013-14 state budget to give employers a temporary payroll tax cut of up to 2.45 percentage points for taxable payrolls up to \$1 million, with the concession phasing out for payrolls between \$1 million and \$1.2 million. The extension of the payroll tax rebate follows on from last year's budget, where the state government delivered more than \$900 million of tax cuts for businesses and the community.

To assist also with the creation of new jobs, the South Australian Economic Investment Fund will receive an extra \$20 million over two years as part of the state budget to attract new businesses to the state, promote job creation and develop key industry sectors. The Economic Investment Fund is available to new projects that deliver significant economic benefits to the state, and is focused on attracting large interstate and overseas companies to relocate or expand their operations in South Australia. The budget measure builds on the continued economic transformation of the state and the early success of the fund, which includes investment attraction and new jobs at NEC, Aurora Limited, Inghams and ScreenAway.

The budget sees the government committed to investing in jobs while presenting a fiscally sound plan for South Australia. I thoroughly commend the budget, as along with ongoing infrastructure investments in health linked with Transforming Health, and other large transport infrastructure projects, the public have plenty to be happy about in respect to this budget. The people

of Fisher can be confident that their priorities are being listened to: education, jobs and health care, as well as transport and facilities that support wellbeing.

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (17:25): It is always good to be able to talk on South Australia's budgetary environment, and the replies to the state budget give our side of the house the opportunity to do that. This evening, I want to just cover a few issues which I think are particularly pressing economic and policy issues for South Australia. I will then focus on a couple of items within my own electorate to which I would have liked to see some attention paid in the state budget, but unfortunately that has not been the case.

The first issue I want to discuss from an economic point of view is South Australia's crisis when it comes to power prices. There is absolutely no doubt that South Australia is facing a very difficult situation economically because of a range of factors, many of which I would put down to the government's mismanagement, none more so than the difficulty that we as residents of South Australia and also as business based in South Australia are facing with regard to the surge in power prices that this state is enduring at the moment.

There has been a 280 per cent surge in spot prices for electricity in South Australia from July 2015 until July 2016. The spot price for electricity per megawatt hour is currently \$279.50. In July 2015, it was \$73.50 per megawatt hour, and a year before that, in July 2014, it was \$51.76. This is a massive leap in the wholesale price of electricity, and it comes after the Treasurer said, 'I am quite confident that we will be fine,' before the Port Augusta power station was closed earlier this year.

It is quite clear that when it comes to electricity prices and the impact they have on residents and businesses in South Australia, we are not fine. This is a very difficult time for the state and we are certainly facing a crisis with regard to electricity prices. We saw just a couple of weeks ago the government having to run begging to the private operators of the Pelican Point power station to get them to fire up the power station, take it out of its mothballed status and get it up and running in order to plug the gap in our electricity production.

That is not the sort of situation that you ever want a stand-alone jurisdiction to have: having to rely on running to that operator to bring a facility out of its mothballed state, and also having to go begging our interstate friends and jurisdictions for additional power. It is a very difficult situation, and it is not one that this state should be facing. It is putting businesses into a state of crisis and it is putting many jobs at risk.

We have heard from businesses coming out publicly, and large business operators in this state are saying that the lack of stability in our wholesale electricity prices is putting jobs at risk. It may cause some of these businesses to slow or cease their operation. It is certainly something that needs urgent government intervention.

There is no doubt that we have heard statements from the Treasurer and from members of the government that this is something that the government is now paying attention to, but could it be too little too late? This certainly has not been a lightning bolt from the blue. There have been plenty of warning signs, and this is unfortunately a consequence, a symptom, of our rush towards renewables during the early years of the Rann regime.

It pains me to say that because I am someone who has a strong interest in and support for clean green industries, and particularly the renewable industry, but it is increasingly apparent that with the way South Australia went about embracing renewable energy, particularly wind power in the early 2000s, we did not have the appropriate policy framework in place, we did not have the appropriate agreements in place to manage our move into renewable energy, again, as I say, particularly with regard to wind power.

That has resulted in 2016 in our having among the highest reliance of wind power in the nation and, as a consequence of that, we have significantly traded away our ability to have energy security going into the future. It has made South Australia much more susceptible to peaks in electricity pricing, and these surges are hurting business, they are hurting business confidence and they will increasingly hurt South Australian households into the future. I think we are into a very hairy ride when it comes to energy security, moving into the future. It is going to be a real challenge for this state and a real challenge for political parties of both political persuasions from now going forward.

It is a huge challenge for this state, and I really hope that the state government rises to that challenge and that it is able to get the appropriate policy considerations in place to enable South Australia to say to significant businesses and householders that we will be able to control energy prices going forward. I fear that that may not be the case, that that security might not be reached and that it will be a very difficult time for South Australia with regard to energy prices in the future, and that will have a significant negative economic impact.

The other topic I want to discuss is Transforming Health. We know that the situation facing South Australia's health sector at the moment is very problematic. Another thing that certainly this side of the house has been very keen to press in recent years is that Transforming Health is certainly turning out not to be what it was cracked up to be. I do not believe that Transforming Health is about futureproofing our health system. Instead, there is absolutely no doubt that Transforming Health is about getting our budget into a state where it can cope with the problem that is the affordability of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital.

As the member for Heysen said just a few moments before me, that hospital will cost this state \$1.1 million every day for 30 years because this government chose to build a huge monolith—many people would say a tribute to former premier Mike Rann—further down North Terrace. There is no doubt that South Australia did need investment in new health infrastructure, but was a hospital of that size and scale required? It may very well have been required but is it affordable? That is the issue: can South Australia afford to be spending \$1.1 million every day before there is a doctor, before there is a nurse, before there is medication, before there is high-tech medical equipment in the hospital? Is it something that is affordable?

Yes, it will be nice when it is open, and I am sure that it will be a fantastic part of South Australia's health infrastructure, but have we managed the health budget in such a way that we can afford it? I do not think we have, and I think that Transforming Health is unfortunately the very negative response to managing the introduction of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital into the health system. I am not sure that management is happening very well at all.

What are we seeing down in the southern area of Adelaide that I am fortunate enough to represent? We are seeing the closure of the Repat Hospital, and I know that is one of the most common issues to be raised with me in my community—the concerns of the residents I represent about the closure of the Repat Hospital. They feel that the closure of the Repat Hospital is removing a key platform within the health system in the southern suburbs. Without the services the Repat Hospital provides, many of the residents I represent feel that they will be squeezed into the increasingly monolithic Flinders Medical Centre.

The pressures on the Flinders Medical Centre are enormous. Imagine being an elderly person whose spouse is receiving treatment in that hospital and trying even to get a park, trying to find their way through that hospital, with the size and the scale of Flinders Medical Centre. I was told recently that that is the second largest medical centre in Australia. It is a huge precinct and it is increasingly unmanageable. Partly because of the size of the Flinders Medical Centre, we see significant pressure put on our paramedic services across Adelaide but particularly in the southern suburbs.

Our paramedic services are really, in my view, the glue that holds the health system together. I have two very close friends who are paramedics; in fact, it was a career pathway I considered earlier in my life. Because I have friends working in that sector, and because of my interest in the services that ambulance staff provide, it is an area I keep a close eye on. The pressures that have been placed on the ambulance service as a result of the Transforming Health process, which have flowed from the downgrading of three metro emergency departments and the centralisation of medical and surgical services, are dramatically increasing the demand for ambulance services, the pressures on paramedics, and the system is just not coping.

There has been a 6 per cent increase in emergency call-outs over the past year, but the current government has only increased the staffing arrangements for paramedics by 2 per cent, so that is just unsustainable. It is a real concern of mine, and I know it is a concern of many of the residents in my community who are using paramedic services or who feel that that is something they will need to rely on in the future. I watched with interest the very dignified process that paramedics

went through with their silent protest, when they kept their lights flashing while ramped at hospitals in recent days, and I salute them for doing that.

They get on with their job. They are at the absolute coalface of healthcare provision in South Australia, and they are continuing with their job, fronting up day in day out, despite the significant pressures this government is putting on them. Their way of protesting is that rather than going on strike, rather than walking away from providing the key service they need to provide, they are still turning up for work but leaving their lights on when ramped as a way of letting people know that there is a real concern with the way the government is funding and supporting our ambulance service. I salute the paramedics who work day in and day out to keep South Australia's hospital system moving.

I also want to speak briefly about our child protection system and voice my disappointment that the budget did not provide significant additional resources to deal with the very pressing problems in the child protection system. This is yet another crisis, and I have used the word 'crisis' too much in this speech—a crisis with energy prices, a crisis with Transforming Health, and a crisis with child protection in South Australia.

There is absolutely no doubt that our child protection system is failing. We had the report released just a few weeks ago from Justice Nyland, and it was the darkest day for the current Labor administration. In its 14 years in power, that was the darkest day because on that day it became apparent that the excuses that we have had, the shuffling of bureaucracies, the restructures, the arguments for why the child protection system needed to be embedded within the education department, on that day all that fell apart.

There was blood on the hands of our Premier because it was completely apparent that the decision to embed the child protection system within the Department for Education and Child Development has led to young people, the most vulnerable people in our state, dying—and there is no doubt about that. The bureaucracy that our child protection system was embedded in did not allow appropriate resources to be in the right places at the right time to adequately protect our most vulnerable young people. That is heartbreaking.

I know it is heartbreaking for the minister to have been involved in the process over the years, and I salute the work of many public servants who have been trying their best within a very difficult system. I have on a regular basis Families SA workers coming to me and telling me confidentially stories about the horrors that are taking place within the child protection system. They feel entirely powerless, they feel that they are not listened to because of the bureaucracy and they are hoping that the removal of the child protection system from the Department for Education and Child Development is an opportunity to restart this incredibly broken system.

It is a tragedy that we need a child protection system, but we do, and it needs to be a safety net; that is exactly what government is for. It is to protect the most vulnerable and it is to make sure that there are appropriate checks and balances in place to support those who society has sadly failed. Those young people, those vulnerable people, had only the government to rely on, and sadly the government let them down. It was the Premier who continued on with this obsession that child protection needed to be embedded within the education department, and that is a tragedy. As I said, there is blood on the hands of the leader of this state. I wanted to speak briefly about a couple of local issues which were—

Mr PICTON: A point of order, Deputy Speaker: I think the member for Bright's comments, using terms such as 'blood on the hands', are really going beyond the pale of the standing orders, and I would ask you to ask him to withdraw those comments.

Mr Whetstone: When did you wake up?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Chaffey, you are on two warnings so I would not push it any further if I were you. It is not unparliamentary, so I will draw you back to the point of your speech which I am sure is not blood on the hands, it must be other things, surely?

Mr SPEIRS: I have moved on to local issues now, Deputy Speaker. I would like to welcome the arrival of Nicolle Flint as my federal colleague representing a significant proportion of my electorate. Her election on 2 July represents a new generation of federal leadership for my

community, or a significant proportion of my community, and I look forward to working very closely with Nicolle Flint, the new member for Boothby. It was great to be able to be part of a number of election announcements during the 2016 federal election campaign. One of particular interest to my community was the federal government's pledge of \$40 million as catalyst funding towards the grade separation of the Oaklands crossing at Oaklands Park. I have spoken many times in this place about the difficulties associated with the Oaklands crossing. My colleague, the member for Mitchell, has also raised it on far more occasions than I have.

Oaklands crossing is a traffic apocalypse in our community. It is a complete nightmare. We have a situation where the Seaford rail line, with its increased frequency of train movements across that crossing since the electrification, crosses Morphett Road and Diagonal Road very close to the Westfield Marion shopping precinct and the state leisure and aquatic centre. You have a confluence of a huge number of vehicles coming through that area every day. It is a huge traffic problem, and it has been identified by people in that community for around 40 years, I understand, as a huge problem.

For the first time ever, we have a significant envelope of funding on the table courtesy of the federal government. I would urge the state government to take that money, courtesy of Nicolle Flint and the campaign that Corey Wingard, the member for Mitchell, and myself have been heavily involved in, and use it as an opportunity to get that project moving to fix Oaklands crossing and see a grade separation in place.

Deputy Speaker, the time has not moved for some time. I am happy to keep talking, but I bring that to the attention of the house. I also want to encourage the government to look at providing some funding towards the Brighton sports precinct in my community. The Brighton sports precinct is a community facility that I have raised, year on year, since my election in 2014. Of course, that is the precinct to which they pledged \$1 million in writing in the 2014 election, and I always take the opportunity to remind the government of that. I have that letter from the former member for Brighton on my desk upstairs.

That letter quite clearly states that if a Labor government was re-elected in 2014 that they would provide \$1 million towards the upgrade of the Brighton sports precinct. Specifically, that money was directed towards the Brighton Rugby Union Football Club. Of course, it was a great surprise to the sports minister and the Treasurer when it was revealed in this place, and it was a greater surprise for the community that I represent when the government chose not to provide resources towards that very important community facility.

It is an area that I am continuing to fight for funding on, and I would love to see the state government, in a future budget, pledge money towards the upgrade of the Brighton sporting precinct. That includes the Brighton football club, the rugby club, the lacrosse club and the cricket club—all really important sporting facilities, very heavily used and, like many sporting facilities built in the 1970s, in a sad state of disrepair and in need of an urgent upgrade. So, the Brighton sports precinct remains right at the top of my agenda in terms of community infrastructure and will be one area that I am continuing to lobby for because that sporting community desperately needs an upgrade.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You were very lucky, weren't you? Member for Chaffey.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (17:48): I too will make a brief contribution before we break for dinner. The budget, I thought, was quite lacklustre. I am not going to come out and whinge about the whole thing, but there were some positive parts to the budget. Again, we see the gap widening between metropolitan Adelaide (safe Labor seats) and what we see as regional economic driver seats in South Australia.

Today, I listened to the member for Dunstan, the opposition leader. I thought his speech was spot on. He talked very pointedly at the economic barriers to the state moving forward. He did highlight the deficiencies, the reason why many businesses in South Australia have a lack of confidence to move forward. Why are they not expanding? Why are they not employing more people? Why are they not investing in their business or their companies?

I think it has become quite obvious in many businesses here in South Australia. The businesses that I talk to in my portfolio roles, particularly in investment and trade, are telling me a

very similar story; that is, the cost of doing business in South Australia has not been addressed in the current budget. We see some tax concessions, yes. Some of those tax concessions were implemented in the previous budget, but they did not work. We did not see an increase in activity, and they are now going to be extended into this upcoming budget.

They did not work, so that is something the government is just going to continue to roll out because they did not work. That makes one scratch one's head. Businesses are asking: why is the government not putting up initiatives that will further stimulate new initiatives that will help the state's economy? Yes, we have high unemployment. We have the highest unemployment in the nation. If you look at unemployment in specific towns in the electorate of Chaffey, in Berri it is unacceptably high, in Renmark it is unacceptably high.

The Mallee has a pretty good record of employment as people live out in the Mallee because they choose to live out in the Mallee. They have a job, they work hard, they are resilient people. They are out there not for the sake of sitting on their backsides and watching TV; they are out there working and working productively. They are making a contribution to the state's economy. The 4,000 small businesses in my electorate are all dealing with this taxation issue. They are dealing with levies and charges, and the increasing taxes that are, I think unjustifiably, imposing a serious load and disincentive, and really knocking confidence out of those businesses. This is what we are seeing over and over again.

The solid waste levy is going to hit people in the regions disproportionately. The NRM levy is a cost-shifting exercise that is going to hit regional South Australians disproportionately because they are large landowners. Yes, they do have water allocations. Yes, they are going to receive fewer programs from the NRM organisations. They are paying more and receiving less because of this cost-shifting exercise, primarily from the Save the River Murray levy, which has now been abolished as a broad-based tax in South Australia and is now being put to the productive end of South Australia. It is going to hurt them.

Last year, a business in my electorate paid \$787,000 as the water component in the NRM levy. If you do your sums, the NRM levy will increase by 10 per cent on the water levy and 150 per cent increase on the land levy, but they will get a 9 per cent reduction in their services, in their programs. It beggars belief. I understand that government members on the other side of the chamber do not give a hoot because it does not affect them. It will perhaps affect some in one regional seat on the other side, but there are no large water licences over there. There are some large landowners, but they are not going to fall under the bus when it comes to the increase, particularly in the NRM.

The ESL levy has increased twice over two years. That is outrageous. Again, I point to a Liberal policy that will reinstate the reimbursement for those ESL increases. I think it was a bold vision by the Leader of the Opposition to come out early and try to reduce—he will reduce—the cost of living. How are we going to reduce the cost of doing business here in South Australia? In relation to the cost of power, I have recently done a tour around part of my electorate dealing with the issues of high power costs, particularly with a large part of my electorate that borders Victoria. We can actually put a hand across the border, and we can almost touch cheap power, but we just cannot have it. When I say 'touch cheap power', I mean half price.

In South Australia, irrigators, who have given up their water for commonwealth government money administered by the state, are now using more power because they are water efficient, they are putting more pressure into pipes, they have to water at peak times, and they have to water when the plant needs it because they are using highly efficient water emitters and techniques. Research and development has played a big part. It is about watering plants five, six, or seven times a day, and not just at night-time or during off-peak periods. They are getting smashed when it comes to power prices.

The cost of having power on demand, the cost of delivery, is a disincentive. They give with one hand and take away with the other. As I said, we are dealing with the basin plan, we are dealing with food producers, and we are dealing with what I call the state's economic driving base, which is being penalised by these high power prices. We have seen the Treasurer, the Minister for Energy, come out and say that we need to shop around to get cheap power prices; it is someone else's fault.

This is a trademark of the government at the moment. Every time a minister, a frontbencher, gets up, it is always someone else's fault or it is something that someone else did not do. 'It is not our fault. We are not to blame for this.' The Treasurer says that these large and small companies did not hedge their bets. Then they said, 'It was the opposition's fault because Rob Lucas sold ETSA.' It is funny how Victoria's power supply has been privatised. They are still paying half of what South Australia pays. We look at the federal government, and it is their fault. If it is not someone else's fault, it is the federal government's fault.

Surely, South Australians are awake to this government playing the blame game without dealing with the issues at hand. We have seen 15 years of this state government sitting on their hands. They did not put a mechanism in place to deal with the transition from fossil fuel-generated power to green power. So, yes, we are seeing those huge spikes. The reason we are not seeing a lot of businesses sign contracts is that they are so scared of what those power prices will mean to their business.

I will give you one good example. I have a business in my electorate that has just decided to expand their business but they are going to do that in New South Wales. They are going to invest \$30 million in New South Wales because they are a large power user, and they can go to New South Wales and have certainty of their power prices and forward projections. It is another loss for South Australia.

If we look at power augmentation, I have another business that has just been awarded a government grant, a serious amount of taxpayer-funded money, and they are going to hand the money back because they cannot afford the power augmentation. It is absolutely outrageous. This just goes to show that the benefits of doing business in South Australia are few and far between.

I want to point out power bills. If we look across the border, we put a hand into Victoria and say, 'Oh, there's that cheap power over there, but I just can't afford it.' Another of my constituents is paying over \$4 million a year for his power bill—\$4 million. Yet, if he stepped across the border he would be paying \$2 million. Where is the incentive? Where are the mechanisms? Where is the government's foresight? They lack vision and they lack planning to entice business to come to South Australia.

Sitting suspended from 17:58 to 19:30.

Mr WHETSTONE: I hope everyone enjoyed their dinner, but we will get back to the important meat in the sandwich—that is, how South Australia is going to move forward and remain an economic stablemate in the nation's economy. Sadly, as I have already said, South Australia is at the bottom of the premiership table with regard to unemployment. How is the government going to address unemployment? I note that government members and ministers always refer to the opposition as 'carping on', but what are they doing about it?

What is going to stop us from carping on? Affirmative action. It is about putting confidence into our economy. It is not about them, because they do not employ people; they are the people who administer the state. They are the people who drive the confidence, and they have the policy settings that will enable small business in this state to move forward. As I said, I think there are about 146,000 businesses in South Australia. Imagine if we could get every one of those businesses to employ just one more person. Our unemployment numbers would be credible.

There are over 4,000 businesses in my electorate but some of my major towns have some of the highest regional unemployment levels. If every one of those businesses employed one more person, we would have unemployment licked. Yes, it is easier said than done, but it is about leadership, it is about policy settings and it is about a budget that actually deals with unemployment. I know the Treasurer said that he was providing a stimulus, but his department's own forecast predicted that we would see a 0.75 growth in employment in 2016-17. That is less than half of the federal government's predicted need.

Why are we being so conservative when it comes to punching under our weight? I have either employed people or have been a project manager for almost all of my life, and it has been pretty simple: if we could find efficiencies in business models, we would employ more people. If we could do that, if we could bring business online earlier, if we could bring production lines on earlier,

and if we could bring a level of confidence into a workplace arena, that would give the employer some satisfaction that he or she would see merit in employing more people.

Again, I ask the question: where is the government's policy on actually employing more people and driving confidence? We cannot just rely on the spin. I will be very open and honest and say that we in this place know that the South Australian Labor government are very good at campaigning into elections.

Mr Picton interjecting: Hear, hear!

Mr WHETSTONE: They are crap at being a government. They are very good at campaigning, but they are crap at government. They do not drive the economy. They do not drive employment. They do not drive confidence in the businesses in South Australia.

I note the member for Kurna got up on his heels when I said they were very good at campaigning, but when it comes to government they are crap. I say that again and again because we have dealt with it for 15 years in this state. They were reliant on the golden rivers of the GST flowing into this state, and now that we see a decline in the revenue—in the streams of gold coming into South Australia—they are left wondering just exactly what they are going to do. The Treasurer is blatantly telling mistruths about the issue of power on a daily basis, and it really beggars belief. The state government's budget, over the period to 2020, has pulled \$100 million out of PIRSA. It is a renewable department. It is a renewable commodity and we are depriving it from being world competitive.

Looking at resources, we are hurting. Look at Olympic Dam and all those subsidiaries around Olympic Dam and all the other mines in South Australia. We are hurting big-time and we know that. If we look to our strengths, if we look to the green carpet—the wheat, the grapes and the wattle seed—and we look to what we do best, the budget is just smashing those commodities. It beggars belief that they are looking a gift-horse in the mouth, yet we come back to their being 'great at campaigning'.

We are cutting off our nose to spite our face. 'We are prepared to rob the people who support our economy, so that we can get back into government once again.' To the people of South Australia, I say, please look at what is best for South Australia. Look at those policy drivers. Look at what this state needs—that is, a driver for confidence, a driver for the state to be great again. We used to sit at about No. 3 in the national picture. Today, where are we? We are bottom of the premiership table and it saddens me.

I have had an agricultural background nearly all of my life. I diverted into oil and gas for a number of years and I diverted into my own small business for a number of years, but I have come back into an electorate that is a premium food bowl of South Australia. It is probably one of the most diverse food bowls of this state, yet increased levies, taxes, uncertainties with water restrictions and uncertainty with power prices are some of the key ingredients that this state is looking at.

I do not want to waste my time speaking about the member for Waite because we know what the member for Waite is all about. The government knows what he is about and the opposition knows what he is about: he is about himself. He is not about the greater good. He does his trade missions. He gets over there, puts on his make-up and goes out and addresses the people, but where are our trade numbers?

When this government came into power in 2002, South Australia's footprint was admirable. We were punching above our weight. Today, we are at 4.7 per cent of the national average. We should be back up there where we were, at over 7½ per cent of the national average. What is he doing? He has defected, gone across the chamber. That is fine. We do not mind. We do not have the leaks and we do not have the heartache that we have always had, but he took Liberal initiative over there. Is he installing that Liberal initiative? I do not think so.

I am getting reports back from business that they admire that the government is taking them over on these trade missions. Left in the lurch, yes; ill prepared, yes. Are they getting the ongoing support? No, because it is all about the funfair. It is all about the spin: 'Get them onto the main stage, look what we're doing, send 50 press releases back into Australia.' But what are we actually getting in terms of traction?

What are we getting in terms of ongoing support? What are we doing in terms of getting that ongoing relationship with our trading partners? What are we getting? We have a state government riding on the back of a federal government initiative—free trade agreements. We are looking at transpacific partnerships. We are staring those partnerships in the face. We are trying to understand how they are going to benefit South Australia, yet we see a person who is on an endeavour to garnish himself as a great South Australian.

I notice that he made attacks on a number of MPs over here today at the next state election. I would like to see what his numbers are at the next state election. South Australia is a great state. It is being led down the garden path when it comes to the real issues, when it comes to our economy. I will continue my remarks in the following grievance.

Mr PICTON (Kaurana) (19:39): It is a privilege to speak to this house about this year's state budget, which I think is a remarkable document not just for the numbers and figures that it contains. Budgets are always about projecting what a government stands for and what its objectives are. This is the first budget I have had the opportunity to work on with the Treasurer as the assistant minister. It has been a privilege to work with him and to be part of the process leading up to this budget and to see the hard work that has been done not only by him and his team but also by the hardworking officers in the Department of Treasury and Finance, who put in a huge amount of work to make this happen.

Of course, this budget builds on our last budget, which cut a substantial number of state business taxes. We obviously undertook the state tax review last year, looking at how we could be the most efficient place for businesses to operate as far as tax environment goes. We cut a substantial number of taxes, including share duties, stamp duties on non-real properties, stamp duties on commercial property, the Save the River Murray levy and the Hindmarsh Island Bridge levy—they have all gone out of the last budget. We are seeing already the benefit that is having in attracting more investment to South Australia and making this a more attractive place to do business, and this budget really builds on that.

Of course, in the last budget we projected that in the 2015-16 financial year we would be in surplus in South Australia and, as of this budget, we have been able to show that we did deliver a surplus in that financial year. It is not a projection; it is actually delivered for that financial year to the tune of \$258 million over that time, which is a quite substantial surplus as far as South Australian budget surpluses have historically gone. Not only did we deliver that surplus last financial year but over the next four years we are projecting surpluses, net operating balances in the positive over those four financial years, and we are maintaining all the fiscal targets we have set for ourselves.

When you look at the process that the government and particularly the Treasurer went through in setting this budget, there were really two principal aims; one was to maintain and deliver a strong fiscal position for the state that not only gives us strength now but gives us flexibility in the future to deal with any shocks that might come from either nationally or around the world. The second focus, clearly, was to boost the economy in South Australia and to deliver economic growth now and into the future. They really were the two major focuses of this budget because we want to see more jobs in South Australia.

We do not want to see the unemployment rate stay where it is. We would like to see it much lower. Over the last year, we have seen more jobs delivered in South Australia—to the tune of 6,000 more jobs, according to the ABS stats—but we want to see more into the future. This budget delivers funding and support for, firstly, those traditional businesses we have in South Australia, places like Arrium. We want to make sure that we continue to produce steel in Australia and particularly in Whyalla and support that community.

We are also, of course, delivering and continuing to deliver funding and support to transition our automotive industry in the northern suburbs and elsewhere to other industries, so that funding is delivered for our traditional industries. We also want to deliver for businesses across South Australia now, so there is a significant package in this budget—the Jobs Accelerator package—which will give businesses up to the tune of \$5 million payroll per annum, which covers about 90 per cent of South Australian businesses, a grant of up to \$10,000 if they are paying payroll tax or \$4,000 if they

are a very small business not paying payroll tax, or if they are a start-up business, for each new full-time equivalent position that the business puts on.

We are very clearly partnering with businesses to create more jobs in South Australia. This is a strategy we have unashamedly picked up from New South Wales, where it was introduced by then treasurer, Mike Baird, and it has proved quite successful in New South Wales in boosting the number of jobs in that state since it was introduced, and we are hoping it is going to have the same effect here. Already we can see that there is very strong interest from the business community. You see people like Business SA jumping up and saying what a huge opportunity this is for 90 per cent of businesses in South Australia to look at, potentially, hiring a new apprentice, and \$10,000 goes a very long way to help cover the costs to a business of hiring a new apprentice.

We are hoping that this will be very successful. The projections are that this will cost us \$109 million over three years and will deliver 14,000 new jobs over that time, but this is not a capped program. Those are projections and we are hoping that we exceed those projections. We are hoping that business will seize the opportunity to go out and hire more people and get this extra support from the government to do that.

The other thing that we are doing to help business right now is delivering more infrastructure. If you look back to when we came to government in 2002, if we had just maintained that level of spending on infrastructure we would have nowhere near the amount that we currently are spending. We now have the target of spending at least \$1.5 billion a year on infrastructure in South Australia that we are maintaining over the forward estimates. That means, across areas like health, transport and SA Water, that we are employing more South Australians to do those jobs and keeping our construction businesses working. The flow-on effects to the broader economy are very clear from that.

The other thing that we are doing, associated with that, is supporting the Office of the Industry Advocate. I think Ian Nightingale, since he has been appointed to that position we created, has done an amazing job in working with local South Australian businesses to make sure that they are part of the supply chain for projects that we are working on, whether that is big road projects or whether it is some of our smaller projects in places like hospitals and schools. We want to make sure that South Australian businesses get the most of that supply chain. I have to say that it is very disappointing that at the last state election the opposition wanted to scrap that office and that position. We are not scrapping it; in fact, we are boosting its resources so it can do more to support South Australian businesses.

So, that is very positive, but we are also doing a lot of work on the jobs of the future. These are the things that are not going to pay dividends immediately, but we are going to see for the future of South Australia in five, 10, 20, 30 years' time, because all of us on this side of the house believe very strongly in the future of this state. We believe very strongly that we need to build and develop our economy in a whole range of new areas.

The first thing we are doing is spending a lot of money on school infrastructure, particularly in the science, technology, engineering and maths areas, and 139 schools are going to be redeveloped with new STEM labs going into them. That is not going to have an immediate pay-off but it means that over time we are going to be better training our young people for what are clearly the jobs of the future in those STEM core areas, so that we are training the next computer engineers, engineers, technicians and defence workers. These are skills that we need people to be working on right now because, particularly when we look at the future pipeline that we now have of defence projects in South Australia, we want to make sure that people from South Australia are the ones working on those projects.

Another thing we are doing, which is going to have a long-term pay-off, is investing in innovation. As a government we commissioned the McCreadie report, looking at innovation projects across South Australia. What that showed is that we have a very strong base of start-ups. I have spent a bit of time working with some of the start-up community in South Australia, which is very strong. One of the issues they face is a lack of venture capital in this state. It is a good place to set up, there is a lot of support to set up, but when you want to go to the next step people find that they, potentially, have to move to New South Wales or Silicon Valley to get that venture capital support.

So, we are going to set up a \$50 million venture capital fund that is very clearly going to be supporting the best and the brightest talent of that start-up and medical science and technology community to develop those next businesses which we want to see. That is very clearly something that is going to pay off in the long run. The third thing that we are doing is investing in our defence industry. As people would know, we fought very hard to get the new submarines contract in South Australia. We are happy that we have convinced the federal government to do that. We are happy we have convinced them to build the frigates and also the first offshore patrol vessels in South Australia, but we need to make sure now that we get the most of that supply chain work here in South Australia.

We are going to be working to build our partnerships in France, to build our links with the defence industry there. We are also going to be working on attracting more defence businesses to South Australia, and we have a fund dedicated to that. We also have money to plan the future of the Techport facility because that will need upgrading as the new submarines and frigates projects roll out. We want to make sure we do it once and do it right for the future, so there is money in the budget to do that.

Across those areas, we have huge support for jobs now and jobs in the future. That really is the guiding message. We are really trying to pull all the levers we can in this budget to support those jobs because, on this side of the house, this is a core belief of the Labor Party. We are the party of labour, we are the party that believes that having jobs for people and families is essential. We want working families in South Australia. We do not want a society that is dependent upon welfare or other measures to support them. We want people working in good, well-paying, well-supported jobs.

I have to make a few comments in terms of my own electorate. I am very happy that some of those school projects are going to be benefiting my electorate. The day after the budget, I was very pleased to go out to Seaford Secondary College, which is one of the recipients to the tune of \$3.5 million for new STEM labs. The principal there is a former science teacher and he is very excited about the potential for his school and his students. In fact, when I rang him on the night of the budget to tell him the good news, he could not sleep because he was so excited by what this could potentially mean for his school.

This is a working-class area. We want to see more kids involved in science and involved in technology, and I think they are really going to flock to these opportunities once those new facilities are installed. Other areas in the south to benefit include Willunga High School, Christies Beach High School and Wirreanda High School, and a lot of my constituents go across those three schools, as well as Aldinga Primary School, and I was very excited to see it is one of the primary schools that is going to benefit under that package as well.

Also in my electorate we are very excited to see \$1.5 million delivered for the Seaford Rangers soccer club, which is going to transform that club and mean more people are able to play sport in the future there. We are very excited about the other sporting opportunities in this budget, particularly the fact that there is the new \$10 million fund for women to have new sporting facilities built dedicated to women's sport. When you look at places like the Seaford soccer club, or the Aldinga football ground, these were grounds built dedicated for men's sport and there was never a thought given to one day there might be men's and women's teams using these facilities. It really is a limiting factor to getting more women engaged in sport, that those facilities are not there.

That was something I was very glad to work with the Treasurer on, looking at this project and how we could deliver this money, looking at some work that has been done interstate as well. I think that this is going to take off. These are not matching funds, these are funds that the state is going to deliver itself, so it is not limited by the councils coming up with the money themselves. I am hoping that we see some really creative, really exciting proposals put up that are going to get more and more women involved in sport in the future.

Overall, I am very excited about this budget. I think it is bound by our Labor values of having people in good, solid, well-paid, high security jobs for the future. It is about building upon not only what we have now in South Australia, but looking to the future. It is also about making sure that we have a firm financial footing now and in the future as well, which is really vitally important because

we need to be prepared for whatever shocks may come our way. I am very happy to commend this budget to the house.

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (19:54): A little over 12 months ago, I had my first opportunity to respond to this house in regard to the state budget. At that time, I called on the government to be courageous and look at new programs and new initiatives to kickstart our lagging economy.

I strongly encouraged our political leaders to look abroad at cities that have experienced similar challenges to those confronting our state—a sharp decline in key sectors of the economy, high unemployment, increasing living costs and population decline—cities that have successfully confronted these challenges and transitioned to a new modern economy. Last year, I highlighted Pittsburgh in America, and I commented:

The revival of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, has lessons for us all...The city of bridges has built a bridge from its steel past to a diverse 21st-century economy...Following the lead of Pittsburgh could have significant benefits for all South Australians.

I found it very encouraging when a little over six months after making my comments in the house the Premier travelled to the city of Pittsburgh to learn for himself how the former steel city had turned its economy around and to gain an insight into the ideas and opportunities that South Australia could capitalise on. I was further encouraged when the Premier released the report by RedFire Consulting which outlines a plan for fostering an innovation ecosystem in South Australia.

These important steps by the government illustrate a willingness to explore the potential in areas beyond South Australia's traditional sectors, and they are steps which I warmly welcome. I also welcome the Treasurer's announcement that the 2016-17 state budget includes an innovation support package. Government support and a strong commitment are critical to fostering entrepreneurial activity across a broad range of sectors.

Pittsburgh's success in developing new industries in advanced manufacturing and venture capital was built on a broad range of dedicated government programs. The New Zealand government has been luring entrepreneurs with co-working spaces and publicly funded business accelerators like the Lightning Lab, a four-month program that helps new companies grow and is the only accelerator in Australia or New Zealand to be a member of the invite-only Global Accelerator Network. The success of Block 71, a Singapore start-up nucleus, has been underpinned by government collaboration with the private sector and the National University of Singapore.

Each example has two important elements in common—strong government investment and sound leadership. Whilst I was happy to see the government act on several recommendations of the RedFire report and announce significant investment in initiatives designed to encourage industry innovation, including establishing a \$50 million South Australian venture capital fund, I was disappointed that the government failed to act on a key recommendation of the report, and that is the establishment of a new innovation agency, AccelerateSA. AccelerateSA would bring all innovation programs under one umbrella to enable consistent and coordinated development and implementation of innovation policy. RedFire made this recommendation after it found that currently:

Innovation Policy is administered across multiple government departments and ministries...there is often conflict, duplication and inconsistencies within Government in relation to goals, programs and initiatives...

Indeed, RedFire noted that despite renewed efforts across Australia to develop innovation programs at the state level, with New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland all making relevant announcements over the past year, the report found:

...none of these States appear to have done this in a coordinated and joined up way.

Like South Australia, efforts on the east coast to establish a vibrant innovation ecosystem have been shackled by poor governance. An opportunity beckons for our state. So, it is incredibly disappointing that the government failed to take definitive steps in this year's state budget to establish a coordinated and integrated approach to innovation through AccelerateSA. It is concerning that valuable funds allocated to the innovative support package are now at risk of being wasted by a government that has a strong track record of mismanagement and inefficiencies, and I will be watching the developments in this area with a great deal of interest.

I am especially interested to see how South Australia's venture capital fund is rolled out, given RedFire recommended that a key facet of the funds management structure included AccelerateSA. I am also surprised that it appears that only \$750,000 has been set aside each year for administration costs for the venture capital fund. This is in relation to the RedFire report having noted that the annual cost to run a venture capital fund is typically equivalent to 2 per cent of committed capital. So, for the maths and science students out there, on a \$50 million fund, this implies an annual cost of about \$1 million, so we are falling short already at the first hurdle in terms of our new venture capital fund.

I look forward to the opportunity to explore these figures in budget estimates along with questions I have concerning the source of funds, governance, management and the investment process. As I have indicated, I am a strong supporter and advocate for investment and innovation in South Australia. I believe government support is critical to fostering an innovation ecosystem, but government support is twofold. It involves both investment and, more importantly, sound management—something that has unfortunately been missing from successive Labor governments.

If you tuned into this debate and only heard the member for Kaurna's contribution, you would have thought that the 2016 state budget was a work of art and South Australia was in some golden era. The member for Kaurna touched on the Labor Party being the party of the working person, the working man in the street. Well, after 16 years of long, tired Labor government, I do not think anyone on that side can say that the Labor Party stands up for the mum-and-dad worker in the street, given where unemployment is at the moment and given what the real figures within this year's state budget are.

The 2016-17 state budget illustrates how poorly South Australia's finances are being managed. Net debt will jump by more than \$2 billion to \$6.25 billion largely due to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital hitting the books. Non-financial public sector debt is forecast to peak at \$14.2 billion in 2017-18. This financial year, South Australian taxpayers will cough up \$638 million in interest payments to service non-financial public sector debt. That is over \$1.7 million each and every day. That, ladies and gentlemen, is \$1.7 million in interest a day. That is an opportunity cost that I have talked about in many of my speeches. That is an opportunity cost that does not allow us to invest in health, education and infrastructure because of course we are servicing our debt.

Let's not forget that the Treasurer's much-vaunted surplus is only made possible by the Motor Accident Commission's sale. Without the \$448.5 million in payments from the privatisation of MAC in 2015-16 or the \$624 million payment forecast for 2016-17, this surplus, this paper surplus and the one that is forecast for next year, would not be possible. In fact, without funds from the MAC sale, the state budget would show a deficit of almost \$0.5 billion.

Indeed, beyond the Treasurer's smoke and mirrors, this state is in structural deficit, and until the government realises this, stops the spin and pretence and actually deals with the real issues and the real structural issues that face South Australia, we are never going to get ahead. This budget surplus is a sham. It has not been achieved by prudent economic management. It is not based on improved efficiencies and saving measures. The state budget is propped up by yet another asset sale.

The sale of MAC in 2015-16 can be added to a long list of asset sales that the Labor government have used to save the budget. We had ForestrySA, which I know has had a huge impact on the member for Mount Gambier's community. We have the lotteries commission. We have the Glenside acreage, the Hampstead hospital, of course the closure and sale of the Repat and, again, in this year's budget, the state government announced that the transactional services administered by the Land Services Group would be commercialised.

Essentially, we are seeing the sale of the LTO in this year's budget. Industry experts expect the government to move towards full privatisation of the agency, and I think we can see this. I know that the PSA are one group who are very concerned about this and are having a rally on Friday in Hindmarsh Square in relation to the sale of the LTO. As we sit in this house, I think we can reflect on our third premier in this state, Sir Robert Torrens, whose portrait hangs in this building. I have no doubt he would be turning in his grave to know that the institution that he founded, being Torrens title, is being stripped the way it is by this state government.

South Australia is of course running out of assets and, soon enough, there will be nothing left to sell. How is the budget bottom line going to look when there are not any more quick fixes available to this government? The government cannot continue to turn a blind eye to the underlying issue. As every household knows, if expenditure exceeds income, then you either need to spend less or earn more.

Adding insult to injury, the Commonwealth Grants Commission reports that South Australia is now the highest-taxing jurisdiction in the nation. So, even though it is hitting the hip pockets of South Australians again and again, the government still needs to sell the state's assets to prop up its income, and let's not forget the contribution that South Australia makes to our economy. Despite the Labor government's repeated claims of reduced federal funding, South Australia will actually receive an extra \$528 million in GST funding in 2016-17 compared to the previous year.

What is the Labor government doing with all the extra money that is coming in from Canberra, with all the extra taxes that South Australians are paying and with all the extra income from our asset sales? Why does the government still need to sell assets to prop up income revenue? Is it because of the Gillman sale that wasn't or the payment of taxpayer-funded electricity concessions to almost 4,500 dead people? Maybe it was the \$13.6 million spent on public servants at the Investment Attraction agency to distribute \$15 million in grants to businesses?

Perhaps it is due to the likely \$245 million cost blowout for the EPAS hospital records project, the \$46.5 million added to the budget for the Adelaide Convention Centre renovation, the \$30 million in rail electrification assets written off after further delays in the Gawler line modernisation project or perhaps the \$3 million spent to spruik the government's changes to the health system? There is an extra \$3 million we could find that did not need to be spent by this government. Perhaps it was the \$236,000 paid by SA police to rent vacant stations at Blakeview, Malvern, Newton, North Adelaide and Tea Tree Gully or the \$195,000 spent for an episode of Jay TV. There are a couple of savings that could be found in this year's budget that could have been reinvested in South Australia.

Whilst there is an obvious need to stop this ridiculous waste of taxpayer money, we must also find a sustainable revenue stream, one that is not reliant on asset sales and one that does not impose crushing cost-of-living pressures on households. We need economic activity. The South Australian Centre for Economic Studies forecasts South Australia's gross state product at just 1¼ per cent for 2016-17 and 1½ per cent for 2017-18. The depressed outlook is the result of a crippling unemployment rate, low wages growth, depressed property activity, declining business investment and a contracting mining investment program. South Australia needs a government committed to getting our economy moving. It needs a government that is able to stimulate growth and especially stimulate the jobs growth that our state desperately needs.

Last year, the Treasurer announced his budget was a jobs budget, yet it delivered only half of the 1 per cent growth promised, that is just 0.5 per cent growth. Twelve months later, we have been told we have another jobs budget on our hands, yet it does not look to be faring any better. The Treasury Department's own forecasts predict only a 0.75 per cent growth in employment in 2016-17 and 1 per cent for each of the following three years. The Deloitte Access Economics Business Outlook report released last week forecast even lower employment growth than that of the Treasurer, with just 0.6 per cent growth expected in 2016-17 and 0.8 per cent in 2019-20.

As the leader touched on in his remarks, as have many other speakers, the government, given the facts that we know about percentage growth, has committed \$109 million over two years on a job creation grant scheme. That is \$109 million over two years of an \$18 billion budget to job creation which we all recognise, and even the member for Kaurua recognises, is the single biggest issue facing our state. We have this \$109 million job creation grant scheme for the next two years from this government. We have a host of other big ticket expenditures to stimulate our economy and, after all of this, we can only find a 0.6 per cent employment growth as our forecast for South Australia. Dare I say, thank goodness this is a jobs budget because who knows what we would be looking at if it was not.

At a time of unemployment being the highest in the nation (currently at 6.9 per cent) and youth unemployment at 13.5 per cent across the state and, of course, much higher in certain regions, underemployment is growing and participation rates are declining. The jobs budget is forecast to only make modest inroads into employment growth. The job creation incentive program is not the great

white hope that the Treasurer purports. I have previously mentioned that we should look at other transitioning economies to see what has worked, and learn from their experiences. Equally, we should look at and learn about what has not worked, and the effectiveness of wage subsidies is, at best, questionable.

There is little evidence that this type of grant actually entices hiring and encourages job creation. A review of the research available on this, and other similar policy instruments, show no definitive answer as to its effectiveness. The Alberta government recently abandoned their 2015 budget commitment to the job creation incentive program due to mild business interest, despite a two-year \$178 million appropriation.

Closer to home, the commonwealth's Restart incentive to encourage employers to hire mature age students could, potentially, have limited success. Going back federally, only 230 employers took advantage of a \$1,000 annual subsidy under the two-year life of the Gillard-Rudd government's Jobs Bonus scheme. That program was meant to benefit up to 10,000 employers. Furthermore, the 2014 report of the National Commission of Audit, entitled *Towards Responsible Government*, found:

The effectiveness of wage subsidies is open to question, given that they may displace other job seekers or simply result in employment ceasing once the subsidy is finished.

Of course, there are then the administration costs of such a program. How much will it cost the state government to spend \$10,000? The administration costs of establishing the program—advertising it, processing applications, managing case files, making payments, ensuring compliance—all have a cost. How many public servants will be required to shuffle paper just to create a 1 per cent lift in the private job sector under the Treasurer's job creation incentive program?

At a time when small businesses are asking government to reduce red tape, the effect of this program, in my mind, is just the opposite. It is more paperwork and more hassles: first, you have to understand the program and check you meet the criteria. Then you have to complete a bunch of paperwork and hope that your business can sustain the position for the full two years and that your new staff member sticks around. Then you have to chase the government for the first half of your entitled payment 12 months later, and then the other half a further 12 months after that. This is more paperwork, and more work for business owners.

Businesses, especially small businesses—the mum-and-dad businesses that our state is built upon—want government to simplify things for them, not add layers of complication. The state budget fails to address the real burden of employing staff. Ask any business and they will tell you that taking on new staff is not a snap decision. Additional staff are employed when there is a genuine need, not when the government hands out the money to do so. Those businesses that do take advantage of the incentive would, more than likely, have made the decision to hire someone, irrespective of the grant. It is why wage subsidy programs have been so ineffective elsewhere.

Taxpayer dollars are precious. For every dollar of the \$109 million committed to the job creation incentive program, there is an opportunity cost. That is the cost of that dollar not being spent on far more productive programs that would actually help create jobs and deliver better outcomes than the 0.6 per cent employment growth predicted—perhaps a scheme where the wages of workers hired are excluded from the calculation of workers compensation premiums, where vouchers are available to assist apprentices purchase new tools and equipment and payroll exemptions apply for trainees and apprentices, or we could look at tax rebates that are provided for taking on a new trainee or apprentice.

Efforts to reverse the disturbing decline in the number of apprentices and trainees would be far more beneficial to the state's economy. This government has stumbled from one embarrassment to another in the vocational education portfolio, and it simply cannot hide from the figures recently released by the National Centre for Vocational Education Research which confirm a massive drop in the number of apprentices, falling from 28,600 in 2011-12 to just 10,200 in 2015. Traineeship commencement has plummeted as well, from 23,000 in 2011-12 to only 6,100 in 2015. That is a 75 per cent decrease.

How can we expect to sustain our future economic growth and expect businesses to take on new staff with such a significant and growing gap in skills amongst both young people hoping to start

their working lives and older workers in need of retraining? Wage subsidies is not the answer—removing red tape is. Stimulating business confidence in the economy with good policy will create jobs in their own right—good policy that includes investment in skills programs and training.

Time expired.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (20:14): I rise to support the Appropriation Bill 2016 as a matter of process, but I am far from impressed. There are some key issues that the government has not addressed, and I would like to take this opportunity to outline some of them here tonight.

First, I would like to look at electricity prices and the impact on the household budget for South Australian families and businesses. Unfortunately, over 14 years the state Labor government has got its mix of energy production wrong and there is an over-reliance on renewable energy, which means that when the sun is not shining or the wind is not blowing, or if the wind is blowing too hard, South Australians are forced to pay exorbitant prices for electricity. This is a rising serious issue, with elderly people and families forced to keep their heaters off during winter because they cannot pay their bills.

It is a big concern, yet the Treasurer and the Premier spout that everything is going to be okay, that they have prices under control. I can tell you that that is not the case: electricity prices are out of control and they do not know what is going on. Their poor policy has forced this. They have got the balance wrong and South Australians are paying the price. Let's go to the spot market and look at July over the past three years.

In July 2014-15, South Australians were paying \$51.76 for their electricity. In July 2015-16, that went up to \$73.50. Let's have a look at July 2016-17: South Australians are paying \$279.50 for electricity on the spot market. That is right, \$279.50 on the spot market. That is absolutely unbelievable. If we look at some of the contracts as well, South Australians are paying double what Victorians are paying if they have a negotiated contract with an energy provider. That is a business killer and that really does hurt. It hurts families, it hurts households, and it hurts business as well.

Recently, we heard that BHP and a number of other big businesses—including, of course, Adelaide Brighton Cement, Nyrstar and other big companies like that, big employers here in South Australia—have major concerns over the price they are paying for electricity. We do not need those businesses packing up and moving interstate, but when the cost of electricity is half as much in Victoria as it is in South Australia these companies face really serious issues.

We have also learned that South Australia had the highest per capita rate of electricity disconnections in the nation in the March quarter. In fact, 2,531 customers had their power cut off. South Australia also had the highest number of customers in the nation on hardship programs in the March quarter—13,192.

The Weatherill government's disastrous mismanagement of South Australia's electricity system will see South Australian customers and large companies and pensioners pay more for their power into the future under this state Labor government. Over the next four years SA's contract electricity prices are 34 per cent higher than the national average and almost 57 per cent higher than Victoria, as I pointed out. That is a real slap for South Australians. The price of electricity is a very key issue that is biting, and that is what the people in my electorate are telling me.

What we want to do as well is look at some of the other issues. Jobs, like electricity prices, is another key issue that people in my electorate are talking to me about. The Treasurer talks about this budget being a jobs budget. In fact, the last budget, he said, was a jobs budget. That was 12 months ago. In the ensuing 12 months we have had the highest unemployment rate in the nation. In fact, if we go back 19 months, South Australia has had the highest unemployment rate in the nation. That puts us at the bottom of the premiership table.

I do not like to make too many sporting analogies, but I will on this occasion because sitting at the bottom of the table is not what we want for South Australia. When it comes to jobs, we have had 19 months at the bottom of the table, despite the Treasurer claiming that the budget just recently, and the budget 12 months ago, was a jobs budget. History does not go well for him. We know that he has struggled to deliver, and I am concerned that he is going to again struggle to deliver for families, for young people, and for people of all ages in South Australia who are looking for a job.

The Premier also spruiks the jobs budget, but we know that we have a higher unemployment rate than Tasmania. Tasmania has been beating us for 19 months. It is unbelievable. Thousands of people are leaving our state and seeking working opportunities interstate because they cannot get a job here in South Australia. Families are being separated, torn apart, and young people have to go interstate to find opportunities because there are no opportunities to get work here.

If we look at the ABS report, Barriers and Incentives to Labour Force Participation, Australia, July 2014 to June 2015, it found that, on average, 145,000 South Australians who wanted a paid job did not have one—145,000 South Australians want a job—and 91,000 are underemployed. That lays bare the depth of the unemployment crisis confronting our state. The official unemployment figure is merely the tip of the iceberg of South Australia's unemployment crisis. When the unemployed, underemployed and those not in the labour force are added together, some 236,000 want to work or want to work more than they currently do. These are the forgotten South Australians left to languish in poverty, deprivation and disadvantage as a result of the failed jobs policy of the Weatherill Labor government.

Again, I stress that the Treasurer keeps talking about a jobs budget but he has not delivered. He said that 12 months ago. He did not deliver. We still sit at the bottom of the pile. Sadly, we know that the closure of Holden's is just around the corner. A few weeks ago we found out that 300 jobs will be cut from Holden as the Cruze goes out of production in October. That is another 300 jobs, 300 people looking for work, and under this Labor government they will just struggle to find a job because the government has failed to deliver.

However, there are programs in the budget to help people. An example of how this government has struggled with the car industry is when the government put together the Automotive Transformation Taskforce. You would think that, knowing this was coming, knowing that the closure of Holden is just around the corner, the government would be spending this money on initiatives to create jobs and to create an environment that will generate employment and get these people working, in particular in the northern suburbs.

Last financial year, the government had \$16 million budgeted to spend on its automotive transformation scheme. How much did it spend, Deputy Speaker? I can tell you: they spent \$6 million; that is, \$10 million unspent at a time when this money needs to be spent. It needs to be spent to help these people who are coming out of the Holden workforce and looking at (we hope not) unemployment. Without this money being spent on programs that can help these people, help them into a new job, help them upskill, we wonder what the government is doing. There is \$10 million budgeted, sitting there ready to go, to be spent as part of this Automotive Transformation Taskforce, yet the government just leaves it sitting in the coffers. It does not know what to do with it, it does not know how to help the jobs crisis in South Australia.

We have the nation's highest unemployment rate. I mentioned that our youth unemployment is at 13.5 per cent. Then you listen to what Treasury says about the forecast for this government. The Treasury department's own forecast predicts a 0.75 per cent growth in employment in 2016-17, less than half of the 1.8 per cent predicted by the federal government. Nationally, 1.8 per cent is the forecast growth, but in South Australia it is 0.75 per cent, half the national growth. It is just not good enough.

As we know, the Treasurer and Premier spruiked the last jobs budget from the rooftops. How did that go? They delivered half of what was promised: a 0.5 per cent growth compared to a 0.1 per cent growth, which was forecast in the 2015-16 budget. The government is missing its target on jobs growth by half. All it is achieving is 50 per cent. That is just proof that this government does not have the answers to what is going on. We can have a look at some of the solutions as well because we have looked at and talked about them.

We want to immediately put \$360 million back into people's pockets by taking away some of the nasty ESL increases that this government has put in place. The increases to the ESL really were just a hit on people and their hip pockets. We have a \$360 million commitment to put the money back into the pockets of South Australians so that they can go out and spend it and generate revenue and income for themselves. We are not taking money, we are giving it back, and that will help with the cost-of-living pressures, as well as help all the people who are feeling the pinch at the moment.

We have also talked about capping council rates. That is another cost-of-living measure that we think will help put money back into the pockets of South Australians. As I said, we are not taking money, we are giving it back to people. We want money to go back into people's pockets so that they can spend it as they see fit. We are also set to introduce a state-based productivity commission and an inquiry into water prices because we know that water prices are hurting South Australians right across the board. So that is something else that we want to do. They are some of the measures that we want to put in place to help with the cost of living that is really, as I said, hurting South Australians right across the board.

The third point that I want to talk about is health and the chemotherapy bungle which saw incorrect dosages given to cancer patients. The error was one thing, but the lack of accountability by the Premier has been incredibly disappointing. This is a very serious issue at a time when we see in the Transforming Health space that the opening of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital keeps getting delayed and delayed, while the cost of the hospital keeps blowing out. We are up to something like \$640 million. That is the blowout figure—\$640 million over budget for the new Royal Adelaide Hospital and we are still not sure when it is going to open.

The Premier's Transforming Health program has also downgraded the emergency department at the Noarlunga Hospital just around the corner from my house and in my electorate. It is also putting extra pressure on the Flinders Medical Centre. I know the member for Bright spoke about that too. He has some concerns, as I do, because the Flinders Medical Centre services our communities and there will be extra pressure put on to that facility.

We also know about the Repat Hospital. Despite the protests of more than 120,000 South Australians, we know that the Repat Hospital has been earmarked to close under Transforming Health, which is a crying shame, because again that is a very much utilised and very much needed facility in our regions. Health is another major concern for the people in my community.

I want to go back to the chemotherapy bungle. I know it has been in the media, it has been in the newspapers and it has been on TV, but when you retrace what has actually gone on here, it really does leave you shaking your head. When we have a look at how this government has performed over the journey, this really does typify its poor, shoddy performance. I will just recap what has happened with the chemotherapy dosing bungle.

Former CEO and SA Pathology chief Ken Barr claims that for three years attempts by senior SA Pathology staff to implement key changes recommended by a 2012 review were blocked by SA Health because it was industrially and politically risky for the minister and had no financial benefit for SA Health. A review was undertaken in 2012 and nothing was done about it. In a submission to the Legislative Council's Select Committee on Chemotherapy Dosing Errors, Mr Barr wrote:

Implementation of the Brennan review [in 2012] may have enabled the incorrect AML dosage protocol to be discovered and corrected avoiding the dosage errors.

What we are saying is that if this review (undertaken in 2012), the Brennan/Szer review, had been followed, it could have prevented the incorrect dosages given to these chemotherapy patients. That was done in 2012. It was not followed, and in fact Mr Barr goes on to say that minister Snelling and the chief executive, David Swan, had created a 'fear and blame culture' in SA Health. That culture that is overseen by this state government has caused this issue to be exacerbated. In 2012, the government was warned in a review. Let's move on to 2015, where it gets worse, where another independent review of the chemotherapy dosing bungle, undertaken by Professor Villis Marshall, found that poor governance within SA Pathology and the Royal Adelaide Hospital had contributed to the situation.

As far as the Marshall review could establish, the recommendations from the 2012 Brennan/Szer review had not been progressed. It called for 'a rectification plan, referencing the 2012 report'. In 2012, they were told to fix it, and in 2015 they said, 'Go back to the 2012 report. It really needs fixing and you should follow those recommendations.' The 2012 recommendations were reiterated in a second external report in 2014 by Ernst & Young. Three years after SA Health received a report calling for change, another review found that poor governance which should have been addressed contributed to the adverse outcome.

There are three reports that say this chemotherapy bungle should not have happened. Warnings were put in place; no-one listened. The minister and the Premier are ultimately responsible, and that is where we got to as far as the chemotherapy dosing bungle was concerned. South Australians do not accept this. It is not good enough and it is another example of how this government's management of our health system really has been low, poor and shoddy over the journey. It really is quite disgraceful.

We can also talk about the EPAS electronic records system, which we know is really struggling and millions of dollars over budget. They are talking about putting paper records in the hospital, but the hospital floors cannot hold the paper records, so there is another disaster going on there. It is really a joke. I know some of the speeches in this chamber mentioned how much it is going to cost to run the hospital, but \$1.1 million every day for 30 years is what we are going to be paying, what our children are going to be paying and what our grandchildren are going to be paying. It is going to cost \$1.1 million every day for 30 years to pay for that hospital. They are concerns that people are having in my community.

Fourthly, I raise the issue of child protection. We have seen some very sad cases in South Australia recently. A numbers of Families SA workers have contacted my office and other offices around my community, but they have been too scared to speak out publicly because of ongoing safety issues in the area and fear of losing their jobs. We have called for a commissioner for children and young people with executive powers so that we can get to the bottom of these cases. Unfortunately, too many incidents are slipping through the net with tragic consequences, and this was not followed up in the budget. The front page of *The Advertiser* on 22 June states:

SA's dysfunctional child protection system has failed our most vulnerable again and again. Its design was the Premier's first major reform and he's defended it across years of scandals. Now, he's finally admitted—

and it says in bold print, 'I was wrong,' with a picture of a very unhappy looking Premier. The article refers to the interim report handed down by royal commissioner Margaret Nyland, who said:

The child protection system has not been working for some time and is now in crisis...

The newspaper article goes on to state:

...finally, the Premier is forced to act.

Amongst a number of the recommendations in the interim report handed down by royal commissioner Margaret Nyland, one says that the child protection agency Families SA should be moved out of the wider education and child development department and create a child protection department of its own. That is what we have been calling for for a long time. The Premier resisted because this was his baby, but according to this report the proof is in the pudding: the Premier made a massive mistake when it comes to child protection. As recently as 17 February 2014, the Premier is quoted as saying:

It would be a retrograde step. This has been a very important reform for this government. It's regarded as one of the most progressive reforms in the nation.

That was in relation to his move to put Families SA in with the education department. When this report was handed down by the royal commissioner, he admitted he was wrong. It took him kicking and screaming to get to this point. From our side of things, we are very glad that he has, because we have been calling for this for a long time.

Amongst other things that royal commissioner Margaret Nyland outlined needed desperate change was improved engagement with the public to spread the message that child protection is everyone's responsibility. I think that is a really important point as well. As we look through the article and we talk about child protection, for those who are not familiar:

Child protection agency Families SA will be split from the Education Department in the wake of a shock retreat by Premier Jay Weatherill, who was the architect of their merger four years ago.

That is from an article written by Lauren Novak, political reporter for *The Advertiser*, on 22 June this year. It goes on to say:

Mr Weatherill has abandoned his strident defence of the super-department in the face of surprising and scathing recommendations by the woman charged with finding ways to fix the state's child protection system.

Royal Commissioner Margaret Nyland said she felt compelled to release interim recommendations now on a system 'in crisis' so the Government could 'take immediate steps' to begin setting up a new child protection department. It will be run by a new chief executive with 'established credibility' in the field.

That is a major concern to people in my electorate and to me as well. Child protection is incredibly important. As I said, I do not think that the Premier has gone far enough. We are calling for a commissioner for children and young people with investigative powers so that people can come forward, make their complaints and not feel like their jobs will be threatened. At the moment, they are still not confident enough to come forward, so the Premier has not gone all the way, but he is to blame. As he has admitted, he was wrong with what he had in place as far as child protection in South Australia was concerned, and it is not good enough.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (20:34): I rise, very pleased, to speak on this particular Appropriation Bill. It has been, I think, a few years since I spoke on the budget bills, but I am pleased to do so today because I actually think it is a good budget. I have been squirrelled away in my office for quite a while trying to get my tax done, not only for this year but for the previous financial year and, I must admit, I am struggling.

Mr Bell: You're earning too much money!

The Hon. P. CAICA: No, I'm not earning too much money, but I was listening to the contributions of the opposition and, quite frankly, I expect oppositions to be negative. I expect them not to be able to come up with any ideas. I expect them just to have a go at what it is the government is attempting to achieve. I just listened to the contribution from the member for Mitchell and it really did not have a great relationship, I think, to the budget. It was just more of a slander contribution on this side of the house. I would remind the opposition that they have been in the opposition benches for 14 years for a very good reason. That is because they are not even a very good opposition—

Mr Bell: What about a gerrymander? Forty-seven per cent.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mount Gambier is called to order.

The Hon. P. CAICA: —let alone having the capacity to ever become a good government. I do not think we should compare the situation that arises today in relation to the way in which votes are cast in South Australia to the Playford gerrymander, just in response to the member for Mount Gambier. The simple fact is that we are quite happy for the member for Flinders or the member for MacKillop to maintain a 76 per cent two-party preferred and whack \$100,000 to get an extra per cent in those areas, but we know that elections are won in marginal seats. What we have seen—

Mr Treloar: You don't know how much was spent.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I don't know, I'm just—

Mr Treloar: You don't know how much was spent.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Flinders.

Mr Bell: What about the fairness clause?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier is—

The Hon. P. CAICA: I'm sure it was—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Sit down. The member for Mount Gambier is warned for the first time. You will not make a contribution tonight if your lips move again. Member for Flinders, I am appalled.

Mr Bell: I've got another warning, haven't I?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No; I called you to order and I warned you.

Mr Bell: So, I've got one more warning.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I wouldn't push it. Member for Colton, I apologise for the interruption.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Thank you very much. No, it's fine. The member for Flinders is quite correct: I do not know how much money he spent, but I can tell you it was a damn sight more than we spent in Flinders, and that reflects the vote that you received. I think you should be very proud to have a two-party preferred of 75 or 76 per cent or whatever it is. Long may that last, as long as in Colton, we get a 51.5 or in Ashford we get a—

The Hon. S.W. Key: 51.9.

The Hon. P. CAICA: 51.9—I will take that any time. I am being distracted and I apologise, Deputy Speaker, for that. I will focus on the budget. As I said, I was squirrelled away in my room and I was listening to the opposition contributions and I thought, 'God, I wish *The Bugs Bunny Show* was on,' because I would get almost more laughs out of that than I have from the contributions that have been made to date by the opposition.

Let us just focus on a few aspects of the budget. We have heard a lot about the new Royal Adelaide Hospital and, of course, I am very proud of what is happening down there on North Terrace. We are going to see possibly the world's best hospital fully integrated with research facilities that will make it, without doubt, the most advanced and significant health precinct in the Southern Hemisphere, if not the world.

We are also seeing unprecedented expenditure by this state government on all aspects of infrastructure. We have seen, in the 12 or 14 years that we have been in government, a transformation of this city and of this state. It is no longer the rust bucket it was when we came to government in 2002. It is no longer a state that is rudderless and meandering, if that is the right word, in all sorts of directions.

We have a state that is building a foundation for the future, and this budget goes no small way to achieving that. If we have a look at infrastructure, there is a \$12.2 billion total spent on transport, health and education infrastructure. As I said, the precinct that we will see on North Terrace from a health perspective will be unprecedented in the Southern Hemisphere. I make this point, too: I have been here a little while, but on all occasions when we have put forward proposals and we have built infrastructure, whether it be Adelaide Oval, and I remember the opposition complaining about Adelaide Oval—

Mr Bell interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: I was in my room and listened to you in silence if, indeed, you have actually spoken but, if you do, I will listen to you in silence. We had complaints about Adelaide Oval, and now the opposition are the first ones to put their hands up to get a ticket to go to any event at Adelaide Oval, and who can blame them because it is a magnificent venue.

We had complaints about the trams, a waste of money, and within a period of time the argument is, 'It doesn't go far enough,' although they are still complaining, I heard today, during some contributions, about the spurs. Well, we know that every single journey starts with the first step and you cannot extend anything unless you start extending—in this case, with the trams, going those extra yards, those extra kilometres—and then from there you will keep doing it.

On public transport, it was not that long ago I was in Melbourne. I took Simon, our beautiful youngest son, to Melbourne. He has gone to live over there not because he is fleeing the state, as the opposition might say, because there are no jobs: he is going there because Melbourne is a very attractive place, as is Sydney, for young 24 year olds, or young 28 year olds like my son James, and who can blame them? I know they will come back. I looked at the public transport system in Melbourne and it was quite incredible. It is used heavily because it is convenient and more convenient and more cost effective than using cars.

Our objective is to build an integrated public transport system in this state that will be attractive for people to use. We are a long way from that, but at least we have a plan to do that—and it is not a plan that is reflected in the '2036' plan or whatever it is, that flimsy little document that actually says nothing—to ensure that infrastructure in South Australia continues to be built that will benefit the people of South Australia but also leave a legacy for those in the future, and I do not see that coming from the Liberals.

We have seen \$12.1 billion in total infrastructure spend on transport, health and education infrastructure—the most unprecedented spend, the most transformational infrastructure build that this state has ever seen. I was very pleased about the money that was allocated within the government for education, particularly to see the money that is going in for laboratories and learning facilities that are going to focus particularly on science, mathematics, engineering and technology. I think that is fantastic. I am very pleased that \$6.5 million is being spent across five schools within my electorate.

The only complaints I have had about the budget so far are from a couple of schools that said we missed out, but of course there has to be some decision-making process. I assume that the decision-making process has as much to do with critical mass and other things by the department, and I accept that. I would have liked every school to get them, but there needs to be some type of criteria that are used. This will be transformational. I have spoken to the minister, and I guess what I am interested in, and I know that I will continue discussions with the minister, is that facilities of this kind are going to be transformational.

But they are only going to be transformational if we can staff them properly with teachers who are able to deliver not only those educational needs but the inspiration that children require and kids require. Having said that, I have seen what the NBN down at Willunga has done for that school there, which is a school lucky enough to have fibre straight to the school. They have been able to recruit IT teachers who are fantastic. They are changing the way in which education is delivered in that school, and it is actually hooking, if you like, those young students who previously were disconnected. It is fantastic.

I see that this money that is going to be provided to our schools here in South Australia for the establishment of those laboratories and those learning centres as an investment in the future and an investment in an area that we know, and indeed the opposition knows as well, as an area that we need to focus on to ensure that this state is able to continue to transform into a smart state underpinned by people who have acquired skills in those areas that are skills required for a modern economy.

The other aspect of the budget, amongst the many that I liked, was the global competitive economy, and that is the \$135 million program to attract and create new industries while fostering an innovative culture by supporting our entrepreneurs. I think this is very good. I must admit, I was very disappointed when Playford Capital, for example, was closed down and nothing replaced it. Here is an opportunity for the work that Playford Capital did to not only be replaced, but to be properly advanced to a level beyond which Playford Capital operated.

What we do know is that if we are talking about start-up companies, unless it is the government that actually contributes to those start-up companies and supports those start-up companies, nothing will happen. In Australia, I do not think we have a very good record in the commercialisation of intellectual property. This will provide us the opportunity to do that. I have not spoken to the minister about this, but what I do want to know a little bit more about is how this is going to be administered.

I do not really want to see it nestled within a department. I do not think that would be a good look. I would like to see an independent board that looks after that, provides recommendations to the relevant ministers and, indeed, to cabinet, through that particular process. I think that will be a much better outcome. I am going to monitor that very closely because I think this is a good opportunity for South Australia to go well into the future and go forward in relation to transforming our economy.

That also might include, and I hope it is not mutually exclusive of, entering into arrangements to attract other potential start-ups from interstate and across Australia that will provide a niche for our economy in South Australia. We have also seen the magnificent transformation of Adelaide as a vibrant city. I do not like saying this, Deputy Speaker, but I am a bit beyond, from an age perspective, being vibrant—

An honourable member: Young at heart.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I am young at heart, but what I have been able to see in Adelaide, on the occasions that I do venture into the city in the evenings and the night-times, is a city that is pumping—one that is being really enjoyed by the people of South Australia. This money will go

towards ensuring that we continue to make Adelaide not just a vibrant city for the people who live here but also for the many people who visit South Australia.

We know that we do have many people who visit South Australia, and why would they not? I have said that—and call me biased if you like—living in the western suburbs I believe that I live in the best suburb, in the best city, in the best state, in the best country in the world. I am sure that there are many people who—save and except my focus on my suburb and my area of the western suburbs—would say the same thing about their area in South Australia, and it is true.

I get a bit annoyed with the opposition and all their negativity, but I accept that is what oppositions do. But maybe you might want to change your tack because being negative has not worked for the last 14 years, and if you actually want to get to government maybe you have to start—

Mr Bell interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Excuse me, member for Mount Gambier, please do not abuse me while I am on my feet. It might be that you want to come up with something positive, and that would be novel, I think, so I hope that you are able and capable of doing that.

A lot has also been said about the environment and the increase in the level of waste levy. One of the best ways, and this is why I personally have always believed in a price on carbon, and the only way of changing behaviour is by putting a price on something. I think that increasing the level of the waste levy is a mechanism by which behaviour will be changed. I am very pleased that, on this occasion, the increase in levy is going to see an enormous amount of money go back to the industry and others to help with their ability to be able to ensure that that is exactly the case—that we divert, and continue to divert, fill and other substances from going to landfill and tackling what is a problem around the world: the appropriate ways by which we reuse that material.

I think it is a good thing to do and I know that industry will adapt. I know they are not happy about paying that particular money, but the less that is sent to landfill and waste, the more they save. This is, if you like, an incentive to be able to actually do that. As I said, I am very pleased that on this occasion it is not all going into the hypothecated fund. A significant proportion of that is going to be used to plough back into industry and that is a good thing. I could go on and on, and you know I can go on and on, Deputy Speaker.

Mr Duluk: Only five more minutes you are allowed to go on.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I might not even use that because I would like to show you people over there that you do not have to use your whole 20 minutes, or whatever it is, you can actually be a little bit more succinct in the way you go about things.

Mr Duluk: You've been succinct.

The Hon. P. CAICA: But I know it is very difficult—

Mr Duluk: It is because you have been here for so long.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Davenport.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I know it is very difficult for people on the opposition to be succinct because it is hard when all you have to do is just complain, without anything positive going forward. There was something said by the member for Hammond earlier today about 457 visas. I want to correct the record, and I am glad the minister is here because she will correct me if I make a mistake in attempting to correct the record. He talked about the costs involved in relation to 457 visas and their children going to school. What I want to alert the house to is that before that hooks in, because it is means tested, a 457 visa holder has to earn \$77,000 to pay the full amount. Under that, and means tested, there are varying levels of what will be paid.

The Hon. S.E. Close: To zero.

The Hon. P. CAICA: To zero. I think this is a very good move. What makes it an exceptionally good move, as I understand it, is that money that is collected through these fees that are paid for the education of those 457 visa holders' children will go directly, and in their entirety, to early childhood development in reducing the teacher-child ratio. That is a good thing because we

know that the most important aspect of education for anyone growing up is early childhood intervention and early childhood development. I think this is a very innovative and very good initiative for this state, and I congratulate the minister and the government for implementing this initiative. I think it is a very good one.

We can go on about defence, and we know that we are going to be the defence capital of Australia. I look forward to the relationship that will be developed, despite what Christopher Pyne might say and his relationship with Martin Hamilton-Smith. I actually believe that—

Mr Bell: Get a minister they can trust.

The Hon. P. CAICA: —relationship will further develop, because it has to. If Christopher is really interested in making sure—

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mount Gambier.

The Hon. P. CAICA: If he is really interested in making sure that South Australia does benefit from a maximum perspective on the defence industries, he has no choice but to pull his head in and work with the state in an appropriate way. I am going to finish there, Deputy Speaker, and just thank you for the opportunity, for giving me the call. I am very pleased with this budget.

As I said, I do not think I have spoken on an appropriation bill for several years, and that is not to reflect on those budgets and say I did not like them, it is just that I did not feel the cause to stand up and talk about them. On this budget, I do, because I think this is a sound budget. We have to remember that we are in hard times, and that is not just here in South Australia, that is in our nation and across the globe. I believe this is a budget that provides an appropriate, solid and sound foundation for this state to build upon. I am very pleased that I have been part of the government that has delivered this budget.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sure everyone will give the member for Mount Gambier the same support he has given the member for Colton.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (20:53): I will try not to antagonise the opposition.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will not be able to save you.

Mr BELL: I also rise to support the budget. There is one thing I do find curious. I have not been here for a long time, but the rewriting of history that many members on the government side try to do does intrigue me a bit. I just want to correct the record: it was the Liberal Party that sought to bring football back to the CBD. In fact, in Isobel Redmond's office there are plans drawn up for a covered, purpose-built stadium, which obviously in the middle of winter would be a fantastic addition to the AFL calendar. But, of course, the government was so keen to redevelop an oval that the Treasurer had to go behind the Premier's back and have secret negotiations with certain parties and not even inform his own party of what he was doing. But again I distract myself.

It is a little disappointing when you look at your own area out of this state budget and see the vibrant and potentially expanding region of the South-East and what support the government is offering to residents of the South-East. Out of the state budget, there was \$900,000 for the Sir Robert Helpmann Theatre upgrade, basically replacing external tiles on that building; \$2.95 million for an airport upgrade, stage 1; and a 40 prison bed expansion.

It is only when you have been around a little bit and then twig to go and have a look at last year's budget that you find in last year's budget there was the same \$900,000 for the Sir Robert Helpmann Theatre upgrade. It obviously had not been spent, so the government just rebadged it, repackaged it and put it out as a new budget item. The \$2.95 million for the airport upgrade is actually money allocated to the South-East out of the \$27 million forest partnership program which the state received \$640 million for and, as a sweetener for the South-East, put a \$27 million investment back into the forest industry. That had not been spent, or \$2.95 million had not been spent, so it was taken from there, rebadged and put out as an airport upgrade. Of course, the ever expanding Mount Gambier Prison will see us continue to expand with another 40 beds.

The real kicker for the people of the South-East is that this comes at the expense of 10 mental health beds. I say quite honestly that if you actually invested in 40 mental health beds, you would probably only need 10 prison beds. This government has that priority entirely around the wrong way. I would love to see at some point, with 40 per cent of prisoners re-entering the prison system after they are released, at least a token effort at rehabilitation or looking at those who are in the prison system and transitioning them onto a pathway that leads to a prosperous future for them, not one of reoffending and entering back into our prison system.

It is something that I am pretty passionate about, and I will work any of day of the week with the minister on this. Addressing that 40 per cent will actually have a major impact on the number of prison beds needed, and instead of ever-expanding prisons—and, make no mistake, I see the Mount Gambier Prison ever expanding because it is the cheapest prison to run in South Australia because it is privately contracted to G4S and it is not landlocked. In fact, the land down there is very cheap, so it can keep going for as far as the eye can see at minimal cost to the state government which, as the member for Colton has just said, is in difficult times. I put it a different way: basically, it is broke.

One of the cruellest things that you could do to a young person, I believe, is put them on the dole and then forget about them. I see that time and time again where the solution to young people's unemployment is the dole. There are lots of things I would love to see in a state budget that would try to address this, and apprenticeships is one of them. My father was an apprentice at E&WS, like most of his mates who were at E&WS, ETSA and the council. These government bodies actually took responsibility for the young people in the state and provided apprenticeships, pathways and mentoring. Not all young kids are straight up and down, and that mentoring from an older hand or a leading hand or someone working in that area is vital to their progression through life, and keeping them out of prison in some respects, but certainly a mentor can be a guiding light.

You compare that to the modern day when they are on the dole, they have to rock up and everyone knows that the job sector is swamped. If you actually spend any time talking to somebody on the ground at one of those job network agencies, if they last more than 12 months, the people themselves become institutionalised when they know they cannot spend the time with the individual who is in front of them. We have created this massive circle of churning young people—and I am focusing on young people but, obviously, other people as well—through the employment facade of being work ready or whatever.

This government could invest back into its government departments such as SA Water, through its councils, and actually provide incentives on a much bigger scale to be employing young people as apprentices. With government contracts, they could actually say that, if you want a state government contract, you need to employ X number of apprentices per dollar value of that contract.

Another good idea I am trying to support this government in would be a payroll tax exemption. Imagine going to a business and saying, 'If you put on an apprentice, I know they are going to cost you money, I know they are going to cost you time and they are going to make the odd mistake but, for that, we will give you a payroll tax exemption, so you will not hit the thresholds where payroll tax will come in. You will have WorkCover exemptions or a reduced rate for apprentices.'

We really need to start focusing some of this government's effort on our young people and being productive contributors to their wellbeing and their pathway. I think this state government could do a lot more than it currently is. As a state, we have done it before, and I think we can certainly do it again. In fact, if I reflect back on many of the people with whom my father went through trade school or an apprenticeship, whether it was with ETSA or E&WS, most of them have gone out into their own business. They are actually now employing more people themselves. Some of them, I would hasten to say, may have chosen a different path had they not had that mentoring provided by the state government.

One of the other initiatives in this budget that I was really pleased to see was the \$250 million for the education department in the science, technology, engineering and maths field. I think, in the South-East, we are a long way down this road, but I will put a caveat on this: the quality of the teacher is of paramount importance.

If you have a fantastic teacher, one of those gifted teachers people remember, they could have 40 kids under a tree with not a whiteboard in sight, and each one of those kids would be inspired and progress well. If you put a teacher who is a poor performer, who the system knows is a poor performer but cannot do anything about, in the most technologically advanced classroom with the best facilities, the best opportunities and the lowest class ratios, those students will underperform compared with any other group. The quality of the teacher is paramount. In fact, there is an old saying, the student very rarely rises above the level of the teacher.

So, with STEM, I welcome the investment in the physical upgrades; however, I caution that there needs to be a lot of work done on supporting gifted teachers entering into this field who will inspire kids and who will challenge our young people to pursue one of those STEM disciplines as a pathway going forward. If we do not do this, if you just put a whiz-bang classroom or science lab together, and put somebody who is a poor performing individual with that class, you have lost the plot, and those students, unfortunately, probably will not go down that path.

In the South-East, I really want to pay tribute to Adam Box, who is our regional director—I still call him regional director, but I actually do not know what his real title is now—and Emma Handford, who really took STEM by the collar and have involved the entire community in its development.

It started with a student-free day, with 750 teachers in attendance in one location, the Barn Palais, with lead speakers inspiring those teachers by talking about what STEM is, how it is transformative and how our region is going to be embracing this. It was then followed up by Saturday and Sunday linking in with our local council and businesses. It was a Saturday and Sunday of mass activities put on by either the council, interest groups or businesses, exposing parents and the wider community to science, technology, engineering and maths. It saw over 2,700 people attending those two days.

I took my three children to many of the events. Unfortunately, a lot of them were booked out. The Surfing Scientist was certainly one of those highlight events where my children were inspired seeing scientific activities. There was also Lego Australia, where basically they have their own kit of Lego and were building structures, as well as the Double Helix Science Club. There was an auditorium made with star spotting and all that sort of thing.

The point I am trying to get at is that our education department has not operated in a silo. It has actually worked with the community. It has worked with businesses within that community and is really pushing science, technology, engineering and maths as a regional approach to our educational future. It was amazing to see, as I said, 2,700 people on Saturday and Sunday going to all of these events, from the Railway Lands to the main corner, etc. I think there were over 40 or 50 activities that kids could be involved in, and I know my children certainly went to school the next day inspired by science, technology and engineering—maths perhaps not so much, but that is some work I need to do at home.

Three schools received money out of this budget. Jane Turner from Mount Gambier North Primary School is amazing. When she leaves, that will be such a detriment to that school. When I was a teacher, I had a kid in my class and he was a bit rough around the edges. He was in year 12. He had pretty much been quasi adopted by Jane. This is going back years and years ago. She is the type of person who really cares and works every weekend in her school.

Mount Gambier North Primary School has a great reputation for really caring and looking after new arrivals and all students. It has a Housing Trust area around it but, I can tell you, every one of those kids is getting a quality education. In fact, we used to joke in education circles that Jane Turner was the principal factory because every deputy principal at Mount Gambier North Primary School went on to be a principal and thrived.

In fact, at the next school, Chris Edmonds at Mount Gambier High School was one of those deputies and now he is in charge of the largest high school in Mount Gambier, with 930 students. The work he is doing around STEM and this money coming in as an investment to Mount Gambier High School are amazing. Fleur Roachock, who has 700 students at Grant High School, is exactly the same. In fact, I have to be a bit cheeky. I have had many teachers come and congratulate me for some of this funding and, of course, I have taken it as—

Members interjecting:

Mr BELL: No, I have given credit where credit is due. It is a state government initiative, but I am very proud to be supporting all of my schools in the region. Really, I have seen a huge lift in the attitude of some of the teachers with this type of investment in their specialty area, and it is a credit.

One of the threats facing my region, which I want to touch on quickly, is the cost of power. Mount Gambier sits about 25 to 27 kilometres from the border. I have many dairy farmers coming to me talking about cost power and how if they were only 25 kilometres away their power bills would be halved. When you are starting to talk \$120,000 to \$150,000, half of that (being \$75,000) is a lot of money.

This issue is going to be one of the major issues facing our state going forward, and it is one that we need to put some serious effort into unless we can get the cost of power down. One of the things that the government needs to understand is that the input cost of business determines where a business sets up. If the input cost is too high, yet 27 kilometres in one direction it is half, there is a fair chance that those businesses will be setting up where that input cost is lower.

In our region, we have Kimberly-Clark, and I have been through Kimberly-Clark a couple of times. They employ somebody to monitor the spot price of power every minute of every day. There is a control room, and when it spikes they literally shut down sections of Kimberly-Clark. It is cheaper to pay people to go and have an extra long lunch break, or not rock up, than to keep the power operating in that section. It is a bit like Homer Simpson where he is sitting at this desk, and when it spikes he will just shut off a section. That is of major concern because they are a huge employer in the South-East. The top 10 per cent of wages would be earned out at that factory, and if you get a job at Kimberly-Clark you are doing very well.

We also have a lot of timber mills. Timber mills are power intensive, and if you start shutting down our major industries because they are uncompetitive with power they will set up in Dartmoor, 27 kilometres across the border, and we will lose that revenue coming into the state. I cannot stress enough, that power has to be at the forefront of this government's mind, every day, because it will hamstring this state.

Very quickly, the other thing that I would love to see some action on is ambulance cover. For many in my region, not having national coverage for ambulance is just not an option. A lot of people work across the border, or they play sport across the border, or their kids play sport across the border. So, to be slugged extra just to have nationwide cover is really not acceptable and is something that I would like to see addressed.

Lastly, my main concern—I said it right at the start and I am going to finish with it—is mental health beds. We do have issues, like every other region has issues, but the reduction of 10 mental health beds is having an impact on our hospital, which is an acute-care facility, and we need those beds reinstated. I will work with the minister every day of the week to make sure that happens.

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (21:13): I rise to also make a contribution regarding the budget that was recently brought down. As they say, it is not what you make, it is what you spend and how you spend it. This government year after year, seems to outspend its earnings. One of the reasons I was compelled to run for state parliament was the mismanagement of the economy and the poor spending priorities of this government, year after year.

Whilst we have a budget surplus forecast for the 2016-17 year of \$254 million, and a \$415 million surplus in 2017-18, firstly it is a far cry from the \$961 million predicted last year for the 2017-18 year, and the surpluses are underpinned by selling the Motor Accident Commission which contributes over \$1 billion to the budget.

Basically, the surplus we have is by selling the silverware to pay the bills. Eventually we will run out of silverware and assets around the house that we can sell. This Labor government has already sold the lotteries, the forests and now the Motor Accident Commission. What is left? When will this government finally be financially responsible, if ever? All we can hope for is for a Liberal government one day that will be financially responsible.

As an accountant, I look at this budget and how we go through all this trauma of estimates and analysing and questioning figures which end up being just a guesstimate. They might as well just make up anything in the budget because what actually happens and what they predict will happen is not very close at all. It is a whole lot of effort. A mathemagician probably puts the figures together and we spend all this time trying to analyse it and believe that it might even happen. I do not think the government has any idea on how to run a state or a budget or an economy. I wonder if any of them actually have any accounting background at all.

South Australia, unfortunately, continues to have the highest unemployment in the nation, at 6.9 per cent, with youth unemployment at 13.5 per cent, which is a very sad state of affairs for our young people. One of the reasons that we lose so many people to interstate is jobs. There are many cost-of-living pressures added in this budget. The solid waste levy is contributing another \$64 million to the state budget, which basically means that the taxpayers of South Australia will be paying that. That is another cost that will be cost shifted through to local government, and they will have to collect that money and take the wrath of the already angry ratepayers who are sick of paying emergency services levies and endless levies through their council rates. The average household will be paying an emergency services levy of \$268 next year, with the tax rising for the third year in a row.

The price of electricity, as we know, has been in the paper a lot lately and all over the news. South Australians are struggling with some of the highest electricity prices in the world, not just in Australia, with the Australian Energy Regulator estimating the annual cost of electricity for the average South Australian household at over \$2,330. If you are on a pension, that is an incredibly high amount of money. If you are on a fixed income, you cannot do anything about that.

On my Meals on Wheels rounds, I often visit elderly people who are pretty well living out of their lean-to room at the back of their house, which is where I deliver their meals. It is the only room in which they can keep warm with a bar heater, which is also very expensive. They cannot afford to heat their house so they live in one room, in very poor conditions, in what should be a First World country. One of my other 94 year olds carts her water by bucket from her rainwater tank in order to try to save money and then comes to my office in tears when the majority of her bill is the service charge just for living in Prospect, where the land value is so high. The water usage is something like \$30 and the rest of it is her supply charge, something she has no control over. She struggles and ends up injuring herself while carting water around her backyard.

Both South Australia and Victoria have privatised electricity markets. It is the generation mix and not the privatisation that has caused the current crisis, as evidenced by Victoria having the lowest average prices and South Australia having the highest. This government continues to blame the privatisation of ETSA. They have had 14 years to bite back. If privatisation was so bad, why is it so cheap in Victoria?

As we have heard from the member for Mount Gambier, businesses in Mount Gambier see their neighbours just across the border paying half the amount. It is no wonder that we are losing businesses to interstate. The member for Chaffey also mentioned a business in the Riverland moving to New South Wales mainly because of the cost of power, which is a shame. With our high unemployment, the last thing we need is to be losing businesses that employ people to interstate because of our high electricity prices.

We also have issues around policing. The state Labor government is reducing the opening hours of 10 police stations across metropolitan Adelaide. With the Wakefield Street police station being closed (the North Adelaide police station has already closed), it will leave only Hindley Street as the 24-hour station available for my residents and constituents of the Adelaide electorate. I have questions around access. Firstly, you cannot turn right. If you come from Main North Road, Prospect Road or North East Road down to O'Connell Street into the city, you cannot turn right to get into Hindley Street. It is a very long way out of your way to work out how to get there.

If you do manage to get to Hindley Street, where do you find a car park? One of the most common reasons that people flee to a police station involves domestic violence. When you are in tears, dishevelled, at the worst point in your life, feeling helpless and hopeless, Hindley Street is not exactly the place that you would want to go to. It is full of partying people and bright lights and there are people everywhere. There is not really a reception area in the Hindley Street Police Station where

you can go quietly to be assessed. It is very public. There is a big window looking out onto the street, and there is only a very small entrance area.

I think it is completely unacceptable and unsuitable that the Hindley Street station is the only 24-hour police station in the city which is, of course, the most accessible place for many suburbs, and all public transport leads to the city. I think that is a very big mistake. In a SAPOL review, which proposes reductions in police station opening hours, 90 per cent of police officers believe that it is as a result of the government's budget cuts. That was according to a PASA survey. Whilst the police might be determining their own changes, it is as a result of budget cuts that they are forced to do that.

The spending of \$160 million on the O-Bahn, which also still appears in the budget, has been a huge issue in my electorate and surrounding electorates. People say that they do not have much money. Often, the government says that the federal government has cut money and that they cannot afford more money for intervention in child protection, that they cannot afford more housing because they do not have the money, and they blame the federal government. Yet, here we see \$160 million spent on the O-Bahn to save 2½ minutes from the north-eastern suburbs.

Even the marginal Labor seats of the north-eastern suburbs agree that that is not the best use of money; in fact, they would have preferred a park-and-ride or an extension of the O-Bahn rather than the same O-Bahn—no extra buses, no extra services and no extension. However, by spending \$160 million to get what you already have to save 2½ minutes, you are destroying Rymill Park and removing over 80 significant trees. We are losing about 93 car parks along Hackney Road, which will reduce access to the Botanic Gardens, the Zoo, WOMAD and all the public functions that are held in that area.

There will be more danger and safety issues for students at St Peter's College. There is a church in that area. There are businesses along Hackney Road. The petrol station will be pretty well inaccessible for people leaving the city, and we know most people fill up their cars with petrol on their way out of the city. So, the O-Bahn is a disaster. Given the state of our budget, the state of our homeless people, the state of our child protection crisis, was that really the best use of our money?

There is \$250 million being spent on STEM facilities in schools. As a person who studied physics, chemistry, biology and maths to year 12 level, I have a fondness for STEM subjects. However, of the \$250 billion, 77 primary schools are included, 18 schools (reception to year 12) and 44 high schools. It makes sense to upgrade your science facilities in a high school, because that is where science is taught, and in R to 12 schools, because that has great use.

I assume that more than half of the money is going to the 77 primary schools. If the state government accepted the Liberal policy of putting year 7 into high school, you would not need science facilities in primary schools, and it would also align us nationally. All the schools in my electorate that I visited and every single governing council—and my electorate is receiving zero dollars—said that they will still have the same problems that they had last year when I spoke to them about this.

The issue with year 7 being in primary school is that they do not have the expertise of the maths and science teachers, nor do they have the equipment. This might help with some equipment, but realistically, eventually year 7 is going to have to assimilate with the rest of the country and then you have just wasted your money, like the money they spent on the Building the Education Revolution only to pull down the schools. It is a usual Labor way of spending money. However, without the teachers, the facilities have no point. As the member for Mount Gambier pointed out strongly, it is the teachers who make the difference, not the facilities. If you do not have the expertise of the science teachers, then that is of no use.

I will congratulate the government on the \$35.2 million to redevelop Her Majesty's Theatre. That is a welcome spend in my electorate and for the arts. That is a beautiful theatre, and it will be great to see that back to its old majestic self and to have the capacity to get other shows to South Australia that we are currently missing out on. There are lots of issues around homelessness. There was not really much spending on homelessness. A figure of \$587 million or \$588 million has been announced as a capital injection into housing. Whilst I welcome upgrades, redevelopments, rejuvenation, repairs and maintenance of housing, I will point out that this \$588 million will not take

one single person off the Housing Trust waiting list. The over 20,000 people who are on the waiting list for social housing right now will not be helped at all by this \$588 million.

The 1,000 homes in 1,000 days will rehouse people who are already tenants of the Housing Trust, and the houses that they move out of will then be used to pay off the \$202 million that is coming out of the cash reserves of the South Australian Housing Trust in order to fund the project. Whilst 1,000 houses in 1,000 days sounds wonderful—and it is good to have new houses that maybe have the right number of bedrooms and the right fittings for people with disabilities, the elderly and for the demographic—it does not help address our shortage of housing, our over 20,000 people who have been waiting a very long time.

It does not address the 880 people expected to be homeless by next year, which is a doubling from the 2013-14 year. I find it astounding that the government could predict a doubling in homelessness, yet at the same time not announce any housing projects that will actually help address the homelessness crisis. It is disappointing that the 880 homeless will not be helped at all by the \$588 million, even though it is such a large figure.

In relation to child protection, where do I start? There is \$1 million announced for the royal commission. That is really for the six staff who will be implementing some of the recommendations from the royal commission. Obviously, a lot of money will need to be applied to child protection in order to restructure the department, to remove Families SA from the Department for Education. The Weatherill failed policy initiative was held onto for too long, even though three years ago the Liberal opposition had a policy to remove Families SA. It was quite clear that it was being absorbed into a monolithic huge department and not enough attention was being paid to child protection.

We have had crisis after crisis, and we certainly did not need a royal commission to tell us that. However, we have had the interim report that clearly states that child protection is in crisis and that the best thing to do is to remove Families SA from the education department. I welcome that the government has finally listened and will be doing something about it, but clearly \$1 million is not going to be adequate. I expect that that will be announced in the Mid-Year Budget Review because the government wanted the best surplus that it could possibly show and did not want to ruin its own figures.

Regarding other spending in child protection, given that the PSA has been threatening strike action due to a lack of staff, we have unanswered calls in the thousands, we have ECAL up to six weeks behind and being followed up, we have children not being removed in a timely manner that potentially is fatal, you would think that you would have money spent on early intervention, extra staff, more people answering phones, people following up the ECAL, front-line staff and social workers to remove children in a timely manner but no, we do not.

Instead they have said, 'We do not have a dollar spent on that, but we have \$15 million to build a new building, because of course everyone I have heard from said that we need a new building.' Nobody has said that we need a new building. I do not know if this is just a distraction or how on earth the government came up with this. I have spent the last two weeks since the budget came down visiting and meeting with all of the stakeholders and NGOs involved. No-one can believe that this could ever be seen by the government as the highest priority of spending for child protection, given the crisis that we are in.

The government is going to spend \$15 million to close Salisbury, Elizabeth and Gawler and combine them at Smithfield Plains. Firstly, it has been said to me that Gawler is a regional office with a completely different demographic, so why would you combine it with Elizabeth and Salisbury? They are completely different demographics. Secondly, how will people access Smithfield Plains? It is not near the train line, no buses go there, and it is unsafe as it is on school grounds.

What about the staff? The people that are visiting them there are people who—you have probably removed their children. They probably do not like you that much right now, and you are going to be on isolated school grounds in the middle of nowhere. You are not in a shopping centre where there are people, and where there is movement, security and safety. You do not know what will happen when you are walking back to your car through the car park at night. It is completely unsafe in many people's opinions, including mine, and it is the wrong mix.

Many people say that the whole point of Families SA is to be part of the community and work with the community to stop the removal of children. Having big offices that are removed from the local area and the local community means you will probably get far worse outcomes. We also know, from the contributions made by the Coroner, that there are issues around notetaking. I have had FOIs where there have been 11 different Families SA workers on one case over a two-year period and then they remove a child.

The more people you have working on a case, and the bigger the office, the more the likely it is for mistakes to be made. I really question the reasoning behind why the government would have decided that spending \$15 million to build a new building and close down three offices was the highest priority for spending in a department that is clearly in crisis. I have always questioned this government's priorities and that is why I stood. I would like to read out the thoughts of the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia (YACSA) on the budget:

Job Creation Grants Scheme

The \$109.2m (over 3 years)...

While YACSA supports the scheme, we are disappointed that this program does not focus on unemployed young people. South Australia has a youth unemployment rate of 20.1% and young people, the community sector, the business sector and government need to work together to develop a coordinated jobs strategy.

Jobs for tomorrow

YACSA also supports the \$500 million investment in science and technology...in public schools in order to prepare young people for the jobs of the future. However, YACSA is concerned that we need to address the lack of jobs now and without a dedicated youth jobs strategy there is potential for already high youth unemployment figures in South Australia to persist in the future.

On public transport, YACSA have noted that the price of public transport is going up, and they have said:

While the government has announced transport and infrastructure projects such as the tram extension to East Terrace, young people and the youth sector are telling us that public transport options in rural and regional areas are either non-existent or unsatisfactory. A lack of affordable, regular and reliable public transport is a barrier to work, study and socialising. YACSA again calls on government to commit to funding outer metro, rural and regional public transport.

With that, I will finish.

Mr DULUK: I would just like to bring to your attention the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Now what? Did you just want an audience?

Mr Duluk: I want everyone to listen to the member for Schubert.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you serious? You called a quorum for that? Member for Schubert.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (21:35): I rise to make my contribution on the Appropriation Bill for 2016-17. Interestingly, I stood here last year and asked some questions in relation to the amount that was in the Appropriation Bill speech. It was funny because the amount was about \$3 billion less than the total budget figure and I was unable to get an answer even from the Treasurer. When I asked him the question, he said, 'Look, I'll get back to you, because I'm not sure what the difference is between the two numbers.'

It is interesting that, this time around, we have actually been able to get an answer to that question. It is about the actual appropriation from the Consolidated Account as opposed to the total moneys that the budget wishes to spend, which is quite interesting. Obviously, there are fees and charges and external revenue sources that are also used to expend then on the budget, as opposed to it just being about revenue from the Consolidated Account coming across. Obviously, it is great to get an answer to a question. I had to go and get it myself, but at least we can all have faith in the fact that the figures did indeed marry up.

Tonight, I wanted to take a slightly different tack from where things have been at for the rest of the afternoon. I am sure that many of our speakers will have given a fairly damning critique of this budget and I do not propose to spend too much time on that topic except, potentially, to explain why I think we are where we are and why I think we will always end up where we are under a Labor government. Again, we have a jobs budget that fails to actually deliver any jobs. We are still looking at the highest unemployment rate at 6.9 per cent with a youth unemployment rate of 13½ per cent.

The Treasury's forecast predicts us having growth here in South Australia of 0.75 versus 1.8 per cent from a federal perspective. We have less than half the growth in South Australia than the federal government has predicted. Interestingly, in terms of gross state product and state final demand, when I compared the budget figures to what Deloitte Access Economics had to say, I found there to be quite a discrepancy. It was interesting that the Treasurer did not mention the Deloitte Access Economics report when he was talking today about CommSec and about other reports that were potentially more favourable.

Deloitte Access actually provides a slightly more pessimistic view of South Australia's growth forecasts over the next couple of years. Instead of 2 per cent GSP growth, they are looking at 0.8 of a per cent. Indeed, instead of 2 per cent of state final demand growth for this coming year, they are only predicting 0.4 of a per cent. Those are damning statistics when compared to what Treasury has forecast. Interestingly, those growth forecasts will play into what the taxation revenues are going to be.

Last year and the year before and the year before that, in my brief time in this place I have seen nothing but writedowns in the Mid-Year Budget Review. Indeed, a trend that we have seen continue even from last year's Mid-Year Budget Review until now is a further writedown in revenues. I think we have here some fairly optimistic forecasts that are not consistent with those that external commentators are making and, again, I think that is going to have an impact on budget revenues.

There are, again, a number of cost-of-living increases in this, and I am sure that they have been gone over in terms of the new wagering tax, in terms of the increase to the solid waste levy, in terms of the \$1 levy on ride sharing and on taxis, and increased costs for 457 visa workers. I find it extremely interesting that we actually want to punish skilled migrants for coming into this state, even though in South Australia we do not get our national fair share of the skilled migration take. In fact, I have heard a lot of calls from a lot of people about our potentially going back to a special migration zone so that we can provide incentives for businesses to try to put on more 457 workers.

Instead, the government feels that they are a portion of the community that needs to be taxed, even though every single skilled migrant who comes here and has a job provides more stimulus and more demand into our state's economy than the supply of their own labour brings. By that, I mean that skilled migrants coming here help to create jobs, but heaven forbid that we would want to do that. In what the Treasurer calls his 'jobs budget', he wants to punish those who come here to work hard and to create the demand that goes on to create further jobs.

What I really want to talk about today is the difference in the cultural mindset of the Liberal and Labor parties. For me, it is crystallised in a comment made by the Premier on, I think, the day after our '2036' manifesto was put down. At that stage, he was in France or China, or wherever he was gallivanting across the globe at that point. He said, 'Well, I haven't read the document, but I'm sure there's nothing in it that is exciting.' He then went on to say, 'This is typical of the Liberal Party. All they are is a bunch of retired farmers and failed businessmen.'

He said that on ABC radio, and he thought he was extremely clever and extremely smart, but that statement speaks more to me about his lack of understanding of the South Australian economy than any other statement he has made because what South Australia needs more of in parliament and not less are failed businessmen and retired farmers. The fact that he does not understand that means that he does not understand what it is going to take to help grow the South Australian economy.

There are some looks across the chamber from those who maybe do not understand what I am getting at, but since the dawn of South Australia, since the inception of South Australia, our largest exports have always been agricultural—and so they still are today. Whether it be beef

products, whether it be wine products, whether it be wheat, our major exports since day one have been agricultural, and they still are today. I think it would be great to have in this parliament a few farmers who understand what it is like to grow a crop, to harvest a crop, to grow a few grapes and to make a bottle of wine, or how to herd cattle and get them into the condition where they are decent to eat.

The fact is that it is the largest set of our state's exports, and the fact is that still basically 50 per cent of all exports that come out of this state come from agricultural or mining products, but of course the Premier does not see the value in that. The Premier also stands across from us in the chamber and says that he has all the answers when it comes to jobs growth, but once again I think this government is continuing to focus only on picking winners and trying to pick the big headline winners that can help to change the perception of the South Australian economy, as opposed to actually change the reality. By that, I mean that he keeps focusing purely on large business at the expense of small business.

When he says that the Liberal Party are just a bunch of failed businessmen, he is wrong, but I would like to see more failed businessmen in this place because a failed businessman is somebody who has chosen to take a risk, to expend their own hard-earned capital, their own money on trying to start a business, potentially employing people, potentially creating jobs. They are exactly the type of people who are going to grow our economy because failed businessmen do not always fail. In fact, they might fail the first time or the second time, but if they are the ones who get up and try again and try again they are the ones who are going to create the jobs.

Can I tell you that I am a failed businessman. I have made so many mistakes in my life as a general manager, from having shops that lost money to making poor decisions on contracts, to making decisions about trying to expand into new markets that did not work. I know that I have cost my family a lot of money, but in those failures I learnt lessons about how to succeed. From a business that started off with one employee that now employs over 200, I thank God that I made those mistakes and learned from those mistakes and that I have gone on to create jobs for South Australians. I think we need more of that in here, not less.

The government can spruik about wanting to be there to support small business, who are the ones who are most likely to fail. Indeed, half of them are most likely to fail in the first year of operation. Does the government consider every one of them a failed businessman? Does the government consider that they are not worthy of support, that they are somehow inferior? The truth is that we need these failed businessmen and failed businesswomen to learn from their mistakes, get up again, start new businesses, start more of them—because heaven forbid that in South Australia we have more people start businesses than fail—and then get on and create the jobs we need.

I look at those opposite and I see a monoculture. I see a monoculture of members who come from a very narrow and increasingly narrow band of our society—that is, those who are affiliated with the trade union movement, which now represents only 12 per cent of the private sector workforce. We are seeing people leave unions in droves because unions no longer provide the types of services that people feel are valuable enough for them to continue with their membership. Here we have a party that is representing such a narrow band of interest in our state. Indeed, it seems that you have to be affiliated with a union to get a gig in state parliament as a member of the Labor Party.

When I look through the roll call, it seems that every single MP—maybe with one exception—actually has an affiliation with a union. I am not suggesting that that is in and of itself an inherently evil thing, but what I am saying is that it creates a very narrow band of understanding of the South Australian economy. A member opposite and I were discussing small business in South Australia, and he said, 'Stephan, there is this trend where people are moving to insecure work,' and I said, 'Yes, it's called small business. It's called sole traders. It's called freelancers.' He said, 'We have to deal with this phenomenon.'

I said, 'Mate, I don't know where you have been, but there are 150,000 businesses in South Australia and 97 percent of them don't employ anyone. Those 150,000 businesses have been dealing with insecure work for decades.' The fact that he looked at everything through the prism of big business and big unions showed that he did not understand the fundamental nature of the

South Australian economy. I think that is very much what we see on the other side of the house. It is why they continue to try to focus on the big wins—because that is where union membership can potentially be derived. On this side of the house, we have a completely different and opposite approach.

I have done a bit of research into the background of my members on this side of the house, and there is a huge and varying background that gives a great depth of understanding and knowledge and a grassroots connection to the South Australian community. The member for Mount Gambier is a former teacher and a former small business owner who owned his own restaurant. We have the member for Kavel and we have the member for Davenport who previously had a career in business banking and in retail banking. We do have a bunch of retired farmers, who also bring with them the wisdom of what it takes to actually grow and manufacture food that all of us get to eat. I am talking about—

Mr Treloar: I'm not retired.

Mr KNOLL: —the member for Flinders, who is telling me that he is still an actual farmer rather than a retired farmer; the member for MacKillop; and we have the member for Hammond and the member for Finnis. They bring with them a practical, real-world experience. Every single farmer also happens to be a small business person who has had to use their hard-earned money and risk their own capital to try to derive a crop. From time to time, I do look at farming as a really odd form of gambling, in the way that you are beholden to the seasons and to the weather and to changing patterns. They still go out there and they still provide the backbone of South Australia's merchandise exports.

We do have a legal background, with the member for Heysen, the member for Hartley and the member for Bragg. We also have a lot of small business backgrounds. I know the member for Adelaide ran a successful modelling business beforehand. The member for Stuart successfully ran roadhouses in the outback, and he has a great number of stories to tell. We have former furniture manufacturers, in the member for Unley and the leader. We have the member for Morphett, who used to be a vet. We have former TV presenters, former irrigators and we have former physiotherapists in the other place. We have a wealth of talent from a variety of different backgrounds that help to bring a different perspective to parliament.

But can I tell you that the main reason I believe the Liberal Party will always be superior in developing jobs growth for South Australia is that the growth in jobs is going to come from small businesses putting on more people. As the party who lives small business, as being retired farmers and failed businessmen, we are the party that understands what it takes to grow and to employ people and to create jobs. Those opposite do not like to hear it because the scab is being peeled back.

We are talking about a budget that purports to be a jobs budget that does nothing to heal the unemployment rate in South Australia. It still predicts that we are going to have the highest unemployment rate in South Australia. Those opposite do not want to hear it, but the truth is that I will take my party's background in small business any day of the week because I know that is where it is going to come from. It is going to be the 150,000 small businesses that are going to create the jobs that are going to help to put our economy back on track.

What is going to become increasingly clear, as it already is, is that that shrinking sector of the economy that the Labor Party clings to support is going to become less and less relevant in the larger context. What that is going to lead to is, I think, ever more extreme outcomes, and an ever increasing disconnect between those opposite and the general community. They can choose to ignore it, they can choose to yell across the chamber because they do not like to listen to what is being said, or they can functionally deal with it. The truth is they do not.

That is fine, because I understand that in the Labor Party it is all about patronage, it is all about looking after union and factional masters, and that you need that sponsorship to get in here. That is fine. I understand that we will then get a virulent defence of that system because that is the system that brought these people here, but unfortunately it is not good for South Australia. It is disgustingly not good for South Australia.

When we stand up in this place and we defend small business, it is because we are small business, when we get up in this place and we defend farming, it is because it is a major export in South Australia. When we get up in this place and talk about the cost of doing business it is because we actually know what that means in practical terms rather than in the abstract.

Ms Digance: So do many of us.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr KNOLL: In that instance, I will take my side any day of the week over what those opposite have to dish up. That is why I think we can stand here and talk about the fact that we have all had to live, within our small businesses, with the budgets that we have put forward. We do not have the opportunity to go back to our customers and ask for more money, we simply cannot do it, it does not happen in the real world. But in here governments do have the ability to raise taxes to cover off on the expenditure that they would like to expend.

What is more galling than that is when governments and members opposite preside over budgets that they set for themselves and then fail to meet. I am talking here about the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion, which blew out their budget by \$49 million; the Department for Correctional Services by \$14 million; the Department for Health and Ageing by \$274 million; the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure by \$38 million; the Department of State Development by \$14 million; Tourism by \$34 million; and Treasury itself, the one department that you would expect to know how to live within its own means, blew out its budget by \$19 million.

I think that these results, which have shown now over \$4 billion worth of unbudgeted expenditure, speak to the fact that those opposite do not have the real-world small business experience to actually manage a budget. I think that is why we are going to see this continuation time after time. It is why those opposite have a very warped view about how the South Australian economy is going to get back on track.

Ms DIGANCE: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Elder has a point of order. What number is your point of order?

Ms DIGANCE: I am not quite sure of the number, but it is debate. It is definitely debate.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Sit down, member for Elder. We have listened to everybody today in the same vein. I see no point of order; however, I do feel misrepresented by the member for Schubert and I will speak to him later about that. You have two more minutes.

Mr KNOLL: Actually I was quietly thinking that the member for Florey might be an exception to the rule.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: How dare you lump me in with everybody else?

Mr KNOLL: I was trying to extricate you from the lump, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You didn't to start with.

Mr KNOLL: Okay. Having said that, I did not want to go individual by individual, but that is fine.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, of course not. Why let the truth get in the way of a good story?

Mr Hughes: Well, it is not a good story.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It's made up, anyway.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Let's hear the last two minutes.

Mr KNOLL: I think the culture that exists within the Labor Party is the reason we continue to get budgets that look the way they do. I think that the South Australian people are fed up with that. Whether it is the highest electricity cost in the nation, and that is empirical fact—and the Treasurer may argue about why and how but the truth is that is what it is—

Mr Hughes interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for Giles!

Mr KNOLL: —whether we are talking about the emergency services levy—

Mr Hughes interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Giles!

Mr KNOLL: —and the increased costs that have been put on to South Australians in the emergency services levy, whether it is increases to the NRM levies or the solid waste levy, these are all instances where the government fails to understand that this impacts upon small business and the part of the economy that creates jobs. It is why we are going to continue with the culture that exists within the Labor Party. We are going to continue to see these budgets and these outcomes because unless they fundamentally get in tune with how to create jobs, these results will happen time after time.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (21:56): I rise to positively speak in support of the Appropriation Bill and in support of the opportunities that it provides for our state and South Australians. In doing so, I thank and pay tribute to the Treasurer and his staff and to the assistant minister to the Treasurer (member for Kaurna) for their work to deliver a good a budget surplus for the eighth time since 2002 and to deliver a budget that speaks to our government's vision of creating a strong economy and community, a community and an economy which encourage jobs growth and innovation, which continue to focus on ensuring that all community members are able to live with dignity and be included in all aspects of community life and which focuses on keeping our communities safe and connected.

As a member of this government, it gives me great pride to speak about the initiatives that we have prioritised in our budget, initiatives which will ensure our state has a viable future in a competitive world. Our state faces challenges as we transition to a new economy, but our government is prepared to positively and cleverly meet those challenges. Our budget is a clear demonstration of our government's commitment to jobs. A \$109 million package to encourage businesses to employ more staff will have a significant impact in my electorate of Reynell. I know many members of the Lonsdale Business Association (ably led by the chairperson, Rick Warren), members of the Reynell Business and Tourism Association and members of the Christies Beach Business and Tourism Association (ably led by the chairperson, Gail Pounsett) will likely benefit from both this package and others in our budget.

Each new job created under this scheme is a real full-time job. Our government is conscious of the dangers of unemployment and underemployment for individuals, their families and our communities, and will support businesses to employ people to engage in decent, secure and meaningful jobs that enable them to live with dignity. The scheme offers a grant of up to \$10,000 over two years for each new full-time equivalent job created in small and medium businesses in South Australia. A small business and start-ups grant of up to \$4,000 over two years is also available for each new job of 22 hours or more per week created by eligible businesses.

Crucially, there is no limit on the number of jobs a business may create. We want to grow, not stifle, opportunity in our state, and it is right that our policies reflect this. What is also important is that businesses in this economic climate grow faster, and we believe this grant will assist them to do just that while at the same time providing meaningful employment for more community members. As the member for Reynell in our beautiful southern suburbs, I can wholeheartedly attest to the incredible opportunities created by this forward-thinking budget.

I am so proud of our record investment in education and child development. Our enormous investment in education and care to support South Australian children and families is a representation of our government's deep understanding that when we strongly invest in education we are investing in our future.

Sitting extended beyond 22:00 on motion of Hon. S.E. Close.

Ms HILDYARD: Our children's education and development must be of the highest priority, and this investment demonstrates that, for our government, indeed it is. I am very proud that four schools in Reynell will be the beneficiaries of huge investment in contemporary science, technology, engineering and mathematics facilities. There will be \$1 million provided to Pimpala Primary School and O'Sullivan Beach Primary School, \$2.5 million will be provided to Christies Beach High School and the Southern Vocational College, and \$2.5 million will also be provided to Wirreanda Secondary School.

These are all schools I have the pleasure of spending much time with and whose values, programs and deeply innovative spirits I respect. These schools are hubs of innovation and creativity, with students being supported to participate in everything from community gardens and cooking programs, which are conducted at both Pimpala and O'Sullivan Beach primary schools, to social justice programs at Wirreanda in partnership with Cambodian development organisations and excellent Aboriginal programs like Cultural Connections at Christies Beach High School, to name just a few.

These investments will make a profound difference at these schools. These school communities will use these funds to build facilities and spaces that encourage more children to engage in and enjoy STEM initiatives, and that will encourage more young people to envision a further education and employment pathway into STEM careers. These investments ensure that, no matter where you go to school, no matter what your background is, you have a place in studying, working in and innovating in the industries that will shape the future of our state.

This STEM investment in our schools, totalling \$250 million in infrastructure money to 139 public schools, will give South Australian students the opportunity and skills to ensure they can secure the jobs of the future. These jobs will be in industries that may be fledgling now and that we may not yet have conceived of. This investment will ensure that students will have the opportunity to work on building our submarines and frigates as well as participating in other forms of advanced manufacturing. It will also create hundreds and hundreds of jobs—jobs that will be in local communities across our state. I am thrilled to be an ambassador for the STEM works program and look forward to the opportunity to talk with school communities across our state about the benefits that will be realised through this investment.

As assistant minister to our Premier, as a lifelong advocate for gender equality in all aspects of community life and a lifelong enthusiastic participant rather than skilled athlete in many aspects of many sports, I have been very happy to work with a number of outstanding women and men to set up our South Australian Women in Sport Taskforce. Together with our Treasurer and our Minister for Recreation and Sport, and dozens of up-and-coming girls and young women from sporting clubs across our state, it was a wonderful moment to announce our \$10 million investment in women's change rooms at sporting facilities—an announcement I and others strongly advocated for, an announcement that is indeed a game changer, and an announcement that sends a message to clubs of every code across our state that our government is committed to working with them to see girls and women welcomed to equally, actively and fully participate in their chosen sport.

For far too long, sport has been racked by gender inequality. This initiative and others that our task force and government will take forward, together with thousands of girls and young women and their supporters, will see that gender inequality addressed in sports coverage, in spectatorship, in pay and in the leadership of sporting bodies. I am hopeful about this change because our government is prepared to back women's sport and women in sport, and because I am blessed to attend many women's sporting events in every code and, at everyone I go to, I am inspired by the strong and growing movement for change. This announcement demonstrates that our government's commitment to ensuring that women can equally participate in all areas of life is one that we are prepared to bring to life. It is not just a statement.

Reynell is home to the mighty South Adelaide Panthers and Pink Panthers, who are major beneficiaries of this budget. As part of a \$10 million funding measure, they will receive a well-deserved and hard fought for upgrade to their facility at O'Sullivan Beach. This \$1.25 million of funding will ensure the club can transform its facilities and meet the growing demand and interest in

this sport. It will also ensure that, together with the Seaford Rangers, whose home is in the electorate of Karna, we are able to host and build support for top-class soccer to be played in our community.

The money will go to building an artificial pitch which is equivalent to three natural turf pitches because there is no limit to the games that can be played on them. Eight new pitches will be built across South Australia with the \$10 million of funding, ensuring that many of the 40,000 registered players will have increased access to much better facilities. The South Adelaide Soccer Club is filled with generous, big-hearted and clever people who are committed to bringing the best out in our young people and to supporting them on and off the field. I look forward to seeing the incredible new pitches in action.

The South Adelaide Panthers host one of my favourite teams whose strip I am very proud to wear—the South Adelaide Pink Panthers. The Pink Panthers are exemplary in terms of how they have welcomed girls and young women into their club. For more than 10 years, they have helped many young women from the south develop into fine sportswomen and excellent young community leaders. Testament to this is that a number of their players, including Phoebe Edwards and Katie Ross Masters, have been chosen to play soccer with US college teams, that young players, like Kaitlyn Lewis, are being selected in state sides and that the Pink Panthers captain, Molly Duigan, is extraordinarily respected across South Australian soccer circles and beyond.

Women's soccer is now the fastest growing participant sport in Australia, and our budget measures to ensure facilities are appropriate to cater to this growing need is a clever measure that will make a difference. In other sports announcements, our community welcomed a \$2 million commitment to building a world-class BMX facility in our southern suburbs that has the capacity to host national and international events and will include the best training facilities in Australia. The track will be a UCI-standard track and will be located in O'Halloran Hill. It will be a fantastic way to attract tourists to South Australia and, in particular, to our beautiful southern community.

BMX in South Australia is a rapidly growing sport, with participation in the sport doubling in the past five years. Previously, if athletes like those at the Cove and Happy Valley BMX clubs wanted to progress to compete at the highest levels of their sport they had to move interstate. I am proud that our state is opening up opportunities for athletes in South Australia, particularly as BMX grows internationally. When we made this announcement, it was inspiring to see some of our youngest competitors, girls and boys, excited about the possibilities that this budget measure opens up for them. The site has been thoughtfully chosen to ensure a noise buffer to surrounding residential areas. It will be a tremendous asset to the south, and I am proud to have advocated for this excellent initiative.

As many of you would know, open democracy and deep community engagement is a passion of mine. To every community member and group that I bring here, I go to great lengths to let them know that this place is also their house and that they are always welcome here. Despite my very best efforts, I have so far been unable to bring every single member of my electorate into Parliament House. I am certainly working on it. The \$1.4 million to begin live streaming our deliberations in parliament, which was announced in this budget, is a great step forward to ensuring that all citizens of South Australia have the opportunity to hear what their elected representatives put forward here. Eventually, this may also be extended to cover committee proceedings, something I know many community members passionate about particular issues important to them will appreciate.

It is important that the work we do here is open to scrutiny and that we welcome feedback and debate about what we discuss. I look forward to ensuring that everyone I represent is able to hear directly from me on the issues they care about, not just in the electorate, but here in our other place of work. In the scheme of things, it is a small investment, but one which will have far-reaching impacts for South Australians wanting to have a better connection to the work we do in this place.

There are many facets to this budget which I am sure my colleagues will touch on, but I would like to highlight an initiative that is very close to my heart because of the people it will continue to help. South Australia has won acclaim from domestic violence campaigner, Rosie Batty, for our Multi-Agency Protection Service. I have spoken about MAPS many times before, here and in our community, and it is an initiative that deserves much attention and praise for the lives it is saving.

The first of its kind in Australia, MAPS ensures a coordinated response from government agencies for people at high risk of experiencing domestic violence. This budget provides funds to assist in incorporating the community sector into the work of MAPS to ensure that we are better able to service our community. This is the result of significant campaigning from the women's sector and I deeply applaud their work in helping to secure this investment. It is a program that South Australians truly can be proud of and one that speaks volumes of our priorities as a government and, indeed, as a state.

I know that my fellow CFS members (Morphett Vale and Mawson), and our local SES volunteers, are excited to hear that this budget includes upgrades to safety equipment on fire trucks and increased opportunities for training. Our government understands the importance of properly funding these services, particularly in light of recent devastating bushfires.

Some of our budget measures include \$2.6 million to retrofit safety systems to existing CFS, MFS and Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources fire trucks, as well as accelerating the replacement of CFS fire trucks. It will also include \$1.5 million for increased training and support for CFS and SES volunteers—something that I know will be eagerly undertaken. This investment is so important for ensuring that our brave volunteers are able to continue to do their important work, to keep our communities safe.

A measure of any community is the way that it treats its most vulnerable community members. I am proud that our government is investing \$110 million to support people living with a disability, those with mental illness, and others on fixed or very low incomes. It was due to our outstanding state leadership that South Australia was amongst the first to sign up for the National Disability Insurance Scheme, and the fact that we are less than two years away from it being available to all South Australians is an amazing achievement. An estimated 32,000 people will benefit from the scheme, which should be completely rolled out by the 2018-19 financial year at an annual cost of \$723 million indexed.

In this budget, we are providing \$50 million to support the transition to the National Disability Insurance Scheme and a further \$40.5 million for people living with a disability to access services including accommodation support, community access and respite services. I know the difference that organisations, like Community Living Project in the south, make to carers like my friend 92-year-old Olive Weston of Christie Downs who, along with her 62-year-old son, Steven, for whom she cares, was instrumental in starting the Community Living Project service. I know that the impact of this scheme on how Olive and Steven can manage their needs and resources, and how the Community Living Project can now interact with them, will be a positive one.

We are also spending \$12 million on our new cost-of-living concession to help alleviate the burden on households caused by the federal government's previous cut to concessions on council rates. This will now continue to also apply to renters, not just homeowners. This increase continues to bring down utilities and living cost concessions for pensioners and other eligible low income earners.

It is through the arts that we explore bold and new ideas—through moving and cutting-edge theatre, through comedy, through music and through dance. Investment in the arts keeps our community aware and critical of itself, connected and thoughtful. It also brings new jobs and opportunities. As part of our commitment to this important sector, our government is investing \$15 million in the arts sector over the next four years to sustain our state's cultural activity and to support our major cultural institutions.

Importantly, as part of our recent selection as a UNESCO City of Music, this budget also commits \$1.35 million over the next three years to support new festivals and events, with the potential to grow into major tourist attractions and job creators. I know that for many artists and musicians in South Australia, these funds represent much-needed opportunities and are gratefully received by the community, particularly in light of the federal government's cruel cuts to this important sector.

Another important facet of this budget is the focus on safety and local jobs. Our government is making a \$16.1 million investment to deliver 313 police officers and pushing back our time line on this to 2020 to ensure that these jobs go to local people, instead of launching an overseas recruitment campaign. While recruiting within South Australia may take longer, the direct benefits to our state are

considerable. Our new officers will be able to focus on critical and emerging crimes, such as domestic violence and cybercrime. This funding is important to the safety of all South Australians, but also important for ensuring that jobs in our police force are genuine career options, which are properly funded and invested in for local people.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I commend the budget to you and again convey my sincere thanks in respect of our Treasurer, Tom Koutsantonis, for his strong commitment to South Australians, and our future, in his budget priorities. This is the work of many months to ensure that our budget is both fiscally responsible, whilst meeting our community's needs. I thank him and his staff for their work.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (22:14): Here we are, at the 2016 budget, the Appropriation Bill, to accommodate the announcements by the Treasurer, and I remind members that it is a budget that has been approved by cabinet. No-one should underestimate the significance of that because the whole of the cabinet has endorsed the plan of action in respect of the expenditure of \$18 billion of South Australians' money to the application of the priorities of this government.

Every year we hear speeches about those priorities, and I am one of many who question a number of those. Many of them are meritorious in the application of moneys and priorities, but a very substantial number just perpetuate the waste, fiscal ineptitude and gross irresponsibility on behalf the government. I will refer to just a few issues that I find to be inconsistent, unacceptable and shamefully discriminatory against people who are most in need in South Australia.

Let me say at the outset that it is a great budget for koalas. They get \$500,000 to have a plan prepared in my electorate, in Cleland national park, for an upgrade to facilitate the global attention to koalas. They are not a native species to South Australia, I might add. They are not even a very pleasant little creature, but they have become iconic in relation to the promotion for tourism purposes.

I am happy to talk about the personality disorders of koalas if you want me to be induced into that subject, but the fact is that they are presented as a tourism opportunity. People already come to Cleland from all around the world and visit not just the koalas but the kangaroos, wombats and other species that are native to South Australia. We have donated, I think, six or seven koalas from Cleland to a private park in Hong Kong. They, along with a few wallabies, have been sent over there.

We have grown forests for them and have spent a lot of money to promote an exchange of koalas. We have an abundance of them on Kangaroo Island. We would be very happy to give one to every tourist who comes. We could actually have a program to advance that, but I do not think we need a \$500,000 study and maintenance upgrade to do that at Cleland. Nevertheless, that is the government's priority.

On the other hand, at a local level (and this is a selfish assessment), we have nothing else in the state seat of Bragg—nothing, no new school, not even a new science lab at any of our schools. That is probably because our schools are so chock-a-block with children that we cannot fit anything else on the school grounds. We certainly cannot fit in any more children. Most of the schools are capped. If any child from the plains of Adelaide wants to go to a school in my electorate, they have to drive up to the Adelaide Hills and go to Uraidla Primary School. It is the only school left that has any vacancies, yet the government consistently refuses to even consider a new school for the people of Bragg.

They are proposing a major development on the Glenside site but they will not even reopen or secure the occupancy of the closed Jewish school, Massada College, sitting next to Glenside, when we have children on the rafters at our school. That is the priority of the government, and it is very concerning to me.

I will identify five other features of this government that I find quite disturbing. First, it is recorded in Budget Paper 3, I think, under the general division, that we had nearly 5,000 people net leave the state of South Australia last year. That is the highest net number of people leaving the state to go and live in another state or location since I have been here in the parliament. We know, of course, that the profile is mostly young people. It is disturbing because it adds to a continuing trend, but it has usually been around 3,500 to 4,000 people. Last year, it was nearly 5,000 people.

What does the government do to address that? Many people have spoken about job initiatives or lack thereof. Let me put this to you, Madam Deputy Speaker: the government's decision harvests \$5 million a year from people who come to South Australia on 457 visas because they now want to charge them for their children's attendance at public schools. We have a payment for attendance at public schools from people who are overseas residents, and that has worked quite well. This harvests, though, from families who are here working, mostly for the state government, I might say, but some are in regional parts of South Australia working for abattoirs and other industries that need a workforce. They will be charged to send their children to school. Even though they are paying tax, they will be charged.

What is the sense of doing that if what we really want to do is encourage people to come, bring their families, like the place and apply to stay? We actually want population in this state. What will be the effect of this tax? I predict that the 457 visa holder will leave their spouse and children behind in the country from which they have come. What does that do for South Australia? Nothing. We need the spouse and children here with the person who is working. I wonder whether it is just some union that has put up this idea or whether they are just so desperate for money that they have to charge people who are coming here to do work in skilled areas where we have a shortage. We are turning our back on an opportunity to increase the population of South Australia. It is short-sighted and it is stupid.

The second matter I raise is the fact that the government has announced an amalgamation of the Elizabeth, Salisbury, Gawler families and community facilities, Families SA facilities, which deal very substantially in child protection, into one larger accommodation at Smithfield Plains. We have stood here and listened to the government for two years talk about how they have undertaken a commitment and paid for Margaret Nyland QC, former judge of the Supreme Court, to undertake a royal commission into child protection services in our state.

Every time we have raised an initiative, including current legislation before the parliament, to appoint a commissioner for children, with powers, the government standard answer has been, 'Well, we are waiting for Ms Nyland's report because we need to have an understanding of what she says.' She provided an interim report recently in respect of having separate departmental structure, and the government accommodated that. It is something that we on this side of the house have been calling on for years.

However, here we are in a situation where we raise case after case of shocking circumstances of child abuse, and what is the government doing about it? 'Well, we are waiting for Ms Nyland to explain to us what we should be doing, so we will not be precipitating it, we will not be prejudging it. We are going to wait for her report.' For two years we have been waiting for this report. It is apparently to be delivered on 5 August. And what does the government do?

They say they are going to shut down Families SA services, amalgamate them into one spot, without a scintilla of an indication from Ms Nyland or any other interim report to say that that is what is requested, that is what is recommended and that is what is advised. There is not a jot of evidence to support that. So, a cost-saving measure gets thrown into the budget as a means of streamlining services for Families SA without even waiting for that report. It is totally inconsistent with the mantra that they have given us for two years now.

After they were embarrassed by the Shannon McCool case, they rushed out in 2014 and said that they were going to have a royal commission, and now, in mid-2016, we are about to get a report. They go out and pre-empt that, having claimed that they could not advance any other initiative until they had Ms Nyland's advice. It is totally inconsistent. It also adds a cost saving with no identified provision for initiatives that she might make.

Thirdly, we have this extraordinary situation where the Treasurer has announced that there will be a major expansion of prison beds. At the same time, they close mental health beds in the South-East, and they do not make any provision for the forensic mental health patients who are in desperate need of extra facilities at James Nash House or at some other facility, if the government wanted to have another separate site. Nothing—not a single provision for extra forensic mental health patients.

Here we have a situation in government where we have, on a regular basis, mental health patients being sent down to the gaols. We now have something like 25 patients being held in our prisons in South Australia. Yet, what does the government do? Instead of cleaning out and making provision for these people in mental health services, they keep them in gaols and add more prison beds. It is disgraceful. It is inhumane. It is 19th century, and it is totally unacceptable. At the same time, they are still pursuing the flogging off of space at the Glenside Hospital campus. They are selling off 40 per cent of that site for a housing development when we are in desperate need of help for our mental health service.

Fourthly, I mention the provision for increasing the solid waste levy from \$62 per tonne to \$103 per tonne. This smashes the budget of the people who are struggling. They are already having to pay for their power bills and trying to take out a loan to pay their water bills. This is one other major impost as a cost of living. This is at a time when the waste levy fund has a budget balance of \$85.4 million. The fund has money in it. Another \$89 million has come in and out over the last 13 years, but minister Koutsantonis has held this other money back to keep his balanced budget up to standard, namely to make it look good.

The people of South Australia are being raided again with an increased cost, with no justification for it. We have \$85.4 million sitting in a fund which the Treasurer does not want to let go, yet it was paid into this fund under the pretext of saying to the public that we need to encourage recyclable opportunities, we need to encourage resource recovery and we need to bring the community with us, so we will pay a levy. I think there is a large group of the community which is happy with the direction of that. What is absolutely stunningly unacceptable is, of course, the refusal to spend it because it is there to prop up the Treasurer's position.

Finally, I will speak on initiatives, or lack thereof. I speak now of the women of South Australia, in particular those who are vulnerable to being victims of domestic violence. Late last year, there was an important initiative—namely, what is colloquially called Clare's Law—to have a register to be able to identify those who may have a propensity or have had some history in relation to domestic violence, to help women to be able to identify when they may be at risk. The Attorney-General announced that there would be a review. In fact, the Premier came out and announced that there would be a review and that an issues paper would be prepared and published.

Just on Sunday, that document was published—seven months later. Guess what? We have, I think, some date in late August or September to make a response to it, and then the government might act. To change the law on Clare's Law, you do not need a jot of money; you just need some legislative reform. The Attorney could bring it in here tomorrow. The issues paper makes recommendations in respect of seeking submissions on fixed terms for injunctions for intervention orders. I have already introduced a bill to the parliament for that. The government said, 'We are working on an issues paper. We will cover it then, so we are not going to pass your piece of law.' It could have been done months ago.

These are initiatives that should have been budgeted for in this budget. Women die, we know, around Australia at the rate of between one and two a week at the hands of their partners. So what does the government do? They announce this issues paper, belated as it is, telling us what we already know. Most victims are women. Most perpetrators are men. Most often it happens in a person's own home, and most often the perpetrator is a partner or former partner of the victim. We know this. We have had bucketloads of reports on this. We do not need to be told this again.

We know what the situation is, and yet the government has chosen to publish its issues paper seven months after it had announced that it would do something about this, and then put an advance date months ahead to even action anything. We will be into 2017 before anything happens. How many more women have to die or be brutally assaulted in South Australia while the Attorney-General, the Minister for Police and the Premier fail to act on this matter? Women die or are injured, families are fractured and broken, and the government has done nothing to advance even the legislative reform, let alone funding the programs that are urgently needed.

There are many contributions we can make in respect of what we think priorities should be individually. Governments obviously have the opportunity to decide how the money is spent. As I said, some of those initiatives are worthy. However, the absence of provision for people with mental health issues; to advance a population increase to ensure that we have some job security for our

young in South Australia; the failure to deal with child protection and its funding, other than to amalgamate Families SA's resources; the stealing of more money from the people of South Australia; and the abandonment of women all produce for me a sickening feeling about this budget. It fails the most vulnerable and the most in need.

Today, I add to that the indication by the Premier and the Attorney-General that they are going to do nothing about the brutal assault of a resident at the Mitcham aged-care facility. The best they can do is write to a federal minister and seek reform on regulations under the Aged Care Act. That is utterly scandalous. Every person in South Australia deserves the protection of our criminal law, and they have been abandoned because the Attorney takes the view that the best he can do to protect other people in that situation—after the offender in that case had been prosecuted and convicted—who may be frightened in aged-care services in South Australia, is to say, 'We will let the feds deal with that.'

Well, hello. They have a primary responsibility to protect South Australians and have failed to do so yet again. This government has fundamentally failed the aged, mental health consumers, women, children and our unemployed young people in this year's budget. It is the worst I have seen. I could talk long and hard about waste and mismanagement, and many other speakers have done so, but when I see that they do all that and still fail to deal with the most vulnerable, it just makes me sick.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (22:32): I would like to make a contribution on the Appropriation Bill and, in supporting it, highlight some matters which are obviously of particular interest to me and my electorate. The first thing I would like to mention is that the budget will deliver a surplus of \$258 million. I think this is very important because it sends out a very positive message to the community that this government has the discipline it requires to deliver surplus but to manage within its means, while at the same time we have a massive infrastructure program to make sure that we have a very strong economy for the future.

Within that framework of a \$250 million surplus, I was very pleased to see the \$250 million allocated to education for the refurbishment and development of contemporary science, technology, engineering and mathematics facilities in 139 public schools. I am particularly pleased that two of the schools in my electorate will share \$4.5 million: \$3.5 million for the Gawler and District College to refurbish or develop new facilities and \$1 million to Roseworthy Primary School. I acknowledge that these additional facilities themselves will not deliver good outcomes, but they will certainly complement and support the teachers in our communities.

Just as importantly, it also builds confidence in our community that our schools have the equipment and facilities for that. The reality is that, when you talk to parents, they do look at what the school has to offer in terms of facilities, whether a child goes to school A or school B. That is why it is important for our public schools to maintain that standard of infrastructure. In addition to that, there are some millions of dollars left in the budget this year to finalise the complete redevelopment of Evanston Gardens Primary School, which is also in my electorate.

I am very pleased that schools in my electorate will have a major cash boost to improve their school's performance and also to give children in my area the best possible chance for a good education and a good foundation for life thereafter. Again in education, I was pleased to see the announcement of the \$250 million loan facility for the first time for non-government schools, which means they will be able to borrow money at the government rates, which are very favourable.

That will assist the non-government schools to improve their facilities and opportunities for their students. In particular I look forward to Xavier College, Trinity College, St Brigid's and Immanuel Lutheran School accessing these funds and I would support them should they wish to do so because, not only are they great schools but also they are low-fee schools, which means they actually do support their communities. They are not elite schools by any stretch of the imagination.

I mentioned a bit earlier the \$3.1 million to complete the building of the Evanston Gardens Primary School, which is overdue, in my view, because I remember starting lobbying some ministers ago. I am glad it has been delivered and certainly it has been acknowledged and been noticed by the community there. In the area of social services, it is been mentioned that some money has been

put aside to consolidate a number of offices for Families SA. On this point, I have a slight difference of opinion with the minister and I have conveyed that to the minister's office.

I certainly support the view put by my Families SA that they should remain in Gawler. I understand that the minister has given very sympathetic consideration to those issues and I thank her for considering that, given that Gawler is a very separate community. They certainly view themselves as a separate community to northern Adelaide—not a better community, just a different community. I have been supporting the staff and also the client base in my community to have that decision reviewed.

I am also pleased to see an additional \$90.7 million for disability funding to support the transition to NDIS. One of the most important decisions I made as a minister was to support our joining the commonwealth scheme and, very importantly, the northern areas will be the first area where the NDIS will be rolled out. I am particularly keen to see this money spent in my area and I am working with a number of providers and also the community to make sure that accommodation and other services are available to people with disabilities.

I also acknowledge the wonderful work our schools do in supporting young people living with disability to make sure they get the best opportunities in life. I note the additional \$1.5 million funding to support and rehabilitate people affected by problem gambling. Just recently, I attended a gambling awareness seminar organised by Relationships Australia and the Hewett Centre. The stories I heard firsthand from people who suffer from gambling are quite horrific, so this money, which will support those services, will be money well spent.

In terms of some other support for my community, \$8.5 million has been allocated to assist the community to recover from the Pinery fires. The Pinery fires left a huge scar on the northern part of my community and the moneys there will be well spent to support those communities recovering from those fires. Equally, I am glad to see the additional \$2.6 million in the budget to help retrofit safety systems to existing CFS, MFS and DEWNR fire appliances and to accelerate the replacement of CFS fire trucks to significantly improve protection for fire crews exposed to burnovers during bushfires. That came up particularly in the last two fires—Sampson Flat and also the Pinery fires—where people were affected by burnovers.

In the areas of business and employment, \$927,000 over three years has been allocated for a trial of a micro-enterprise development program in northern Adelaide which will enhance financial self-sufficiency and self-employment opportunities for vulnerable South Australians and support young people to enter into business. This government support for start-ups is most welcome. In particular, I would like to support the \$109 million for job creation grants. This decision has been extremely well received in my community.

There are businesses in my community that are now saying that it is much more attractive to employ people, and they are certainly looking at this grant scheme as a way of increasing staff but at a reduced cost. Whether it is \$10,000 for businesses which have a taxable payroll below \$5 million or \$4,000 for people who do not pay payroll, this is a welcome grant for the business community, and I am more than happy to communicate this to people in the community.

This is in addition to the \$750 million in total tax relief announced in the last two years of budgets to support South Australian businesses. Non-residential stamp duty and non-real property stamp duty are abolished, and share duties, stamp duty on genuine corporate restructures and the Save the River Murray levy have been abolished. Those reductions in costs to a whole range of small businesses will be welcome in my electorate. It also continues with \$40 million for small business by reducing their payroll tax, extending the small business payroll rebate for four years of up to \$9,800.

There is also \$24.2 million to support the northern suburbs areas, which are part of my electorate, on a range of initiatives aimed at job creation, innovation, business and industry growth and community programs in northern Adelaide. There is also \$450,000 to continue the work in northern and southern Adelaide under the government's Thriving Communities agenda. I recently met with the CEO and facilitator of Together SA for the northern project, which is essentially based in the City of Playford. I look forward to their working with a whole range of non-government agencies and government agencies to target the resources not only to make a difference in our communities for the most vulnerable but also to help communities thrive and grow.

In the area of sport, I welcome the announcement of \$10 million for sporting clubs to provide facilities for female participation, and certainly that has been well received in my community. Two women's sporting areas in my electorate have already contacted me—netball and women's football clubs—and I am sure there will be others once the grant criteria are announced. It is a welcome addition. I note the \$2 million to build an international standard BMX track at O'Halloran Hill. Of more interest to me was the \$25,000 given to the Gawler BMX Club, and that was extremely well received and will help them build a track which is of state standing and they can have competitions at a state level.

In terms of economic support, I welcome the announcement to spend \$2 million on Brand SA for the SA Made campaign, Choose South Australia. This is not a protectionist move; this is about giving people the information to make a choice or make a decision, which they want, and I think the very basis of good competition is that people know what they are buying. I think it is very important when people make a decision to buy product A or product B. If they choose to buy product B because it is made in South Australia, well, good luck to them, they should know that.

An additional \$6 million to attract defence companies to South Australia is welcome. I think the \$4 million for French engagement is very important, and it was mentioned today in this place that we are not just building submarines but that we are building a long-term relationship with France that will deliver good outcomes for the state in terms of advanced manufacturing skills and jobs for our state. There is \$2.3 million for the Defence Teaming Centre to support local businesses to gear up for major defence projects, as well as \$1 million for the Techport Australia master plan, which will help expand the shipbuilding hub.

In terms of health, \$30 million has been provided to the South Australian Ambulance Service to ensure that paramedics and support staff can respond to growing community demand, and that is very much welcome. I would say that people are starting to understand the issue of what Transforming Health means when you sit down with them and explain Transforming Health, particularly in the country areas, and say, 'Transforming Health means that we have a dedicated hospital for elective surgery, and it means that if you come from the country the chance of your elective surgery being delayed is much less now because you have a hospital dedicated to elective surgery where previously it competed with emergency operations as well.'

The additional funding represents a strong investment in health services within our local community and will improve the safety, efficiency and effectiveness of staff who provide front-line services and care to South Australians. The opening of a second cardiovascular intervention suite at the Lyell McEwin Hospital (obviously as a member who represents a northern area) is also very much welcome, as is the \$500,000 towards \$2.9 million for regional dialysis services at Gawler. I was there only yesterday and met with the renal support group which is supporting people with kidney disease, and they very much welcome the facility, which hopefully will be opened very shortly.

In terms of emergency services, the \$16 million to boost police numbers by an extra 313 officers certainly continues the program which was started by previous governments. That will obviously assist police to deal with crime in this state. The \$1.3 million to introduce a national system for SA Police to share information on domestic violence is very much welcome and should help us in prevention of domestic violence. The \$6.2 million for CFS and SES volunteer training and support is very much welcome. One of the positives—if you can call it a positive—to come out of the major fires and other disasters is that people in this state do put up their hand and want to volunteer. After the Sampson Flat, Pinery and other disasters in the state the number of volunteers for our emergency services has increased, and clearly they would need additional training for that to occur.

There is an additional \$9 million to improve appliance safety equipment and also \$16 million to strengthen the capacity to respond to bushfires. I would like to support the Regional Capability Community Fund, which provides small grants to both individuals and organisations to improve their capacity to deal with emergencies at the local level. Whether it is a farm fire unit for a farmer or other equipment, that program has been extremely well received in the community, and I was with the minister when he announced the latest grants in my electorate. I can tell you that the farmers in my electorate certainly welcome that support.

In the area of transport, additional money to upgrade the diesel railcar fleet is very much welcomed, as is the \$153 million to start work and extend the electrification on the Gawler line from Adelaide to Salisbury. It is unfortunate that we do not have a federal government which shares our commitment to public transport because we could actually go all the way to Gawler if they put in some money as well. It is unfortunate that former prime minister Abbott made it very clear that his was not a government that would support public transport. Unfortunately, that has continued under the new Liberal government as well.

Of particular importance to my community is that in this budget there will be \$3.5 million spent to start the south east link road, or the Gawler East Link Road, which is an important project and piece of infrastructure, not only to deal with traffic and also to help promote the Gawler East development, which would mean more housing, which means more jobs, but also, helpfully, will deal with those traffic issues in and around the eastern and southern parts of the town. The previously announced Northern Connector project, which is a joint state and commonwealth project, is also welcome in the electorate, and it will start. For those people who live in my electorate who work in the western suburbs, it will add to the Northern Expressway, and it is a much more efficient way to travel around that area.

In terms of cost-of-living pressures, the government has made an additional \$1.5 million available to get a better deal on electricity prices and increased interconnection with the national energy market. They are some of the highlights of the budget, which obviously were of interest to myself in terms of the impact on my community. Overall, the budget does, I think, deliver very good outcomes. It is committed to job creation, it is committed to building the infrastructure which will deliver economic efficiencies and a sound foundation for a more productive economy in the future, and one that is worthy. It is one which has been well received in my community. Certainly, like every other community, we would like more, but in terms of the distribution of funds—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members on my right!

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Certainly, as far as my community is concerned—the electorate of Light—we have received a reasonable amount of investment, but I do look forward to lobbying further and making sure that I get more in next year's budget.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (22:49): I rise to speak on the Appropriation Bill 2016 and in doing so tonight will touch on only a few of the significant areas that this budget addresses. Our government cares about today and about the future. We understand the importance of what having a job means to families, a job here in South Australia. That is why the government is supporting business to grow through the introduction of measures to make it easier for business to employ new staff.

The 2016-17 budget provides \$109 million in incentives to businesses to employ additional staff. Between July this year and 30 June 2018 it will see a \$10,000 grant for businesses with taxable payrolls below \$5 million for each additional new worker and a \$4,000 grant for small businesses and start-ups for each additional new worker. This is expected to provide grants for 14,000 full-time equivalent positions. Around 2,300 businesses will benefit through the extension of the small business payroll tax rebate. Employers with taxable payrolls of \$1.2 million or less will receive up to \$9,800 each year. I have already spoken to some businesses in Torrens that will benefit from these measures.

We need only to lift our heads and look around us to see the transformation that is being achieved right now by way of our infrastructure investments, investments that are augmenting and improving our state's transport, health and education, investments that create and sustain jobs in the present while anticipating future employment needs in a transitioning economy. We are meeting the challenges ahead with responsible fiscal management while ensuring that we create more jobs, develop future industries, and give our children and their children the skills and the environment they need right here in South Australia.

The government is working hard to address the unemployment rate by growing our modern industries, by supporting businesses and creating the environment for our state to be a modern, high-technology and globally competitive economy. The government is investing in education, education to equip our children with the skills to prepare them for jobs of the future, jobs that we can see

evolving and those that have not yet been envisaged. Consequently, the government has allocated \$500 million to upgrade our school facilities to prepare our children for these jobs of the future.

Research indicates that close to 75 per cent of jobs in the fastest growing industries have a focus on science, technology, engineering and mathematics, what we have come to know as STEM. This is the area we need to shine a light on in our schools. Roma Mitchell Secondary College is a STEM school, and one of my local primary schools, Hillcrest Primary, has been working with them to develop their STEM program. Hillcrest Primary School and Hampstead Primary School in my electorate are among the 77 primary schools being allocated \$1 million each to develop contemporary STEM (science, technology, engineering and maths) facilities.

As the Minister for Education pointed out this afternoon in this chamber, the government's \$250 million in the STEM Works program is one of the biggest investments in school infrastructure that our state has seen. It will provide about 75,000 South Australian school children with innovative and engaging learning facilities, giving them hands-on learning experiences and the opportunity to bring their knowledge in STEM subjects into real applications. One hundred and thirty-nine public schools (77 primary schools, 44 high schools and 18 R-12 and area schools) across our city and regional centres will benefit through this refurbishment and development of contemporary science, technology, engineering and mathematics facilities.

This is significant because research is telling us that the vast majority of the fastest growing employment sectors are now technology dependent, and this can only increase. To secure work on our submarine, offshore patrol vessel and future frigates projects, for example, or in new economy industries like knowledge-based start-ups, clean tech and bioscience, or any number of new ventures, our children will need skills in exactly these STEM areas. These initiatives will also provide support and stimulus to the construction sector. It has been estimated that the STEM Works schools program will result in more than 600 jobs across the state, and project contracts will incorporate criteria encouraging builders to employ and source materials locally.

Importantly, our government is committed to ensuring that children in South Australia have access to facilities based on need, not where they go to school. To this end, the government is also supporting non-government schools to upgrade their school infrastructure as well as build early childhood facilities. Catholic and Independent schools will have access to \$250 million of low-interest loans to fund infrastructure that improves school learning facilities.

I am particularly pleased with the investment of \$10.6 million that will improve the delivery of the South Australian Certificate of Education (SACE). I was pleased to hear the minister say this afternoon that we are moving with the times by shifting towards online assessment and introducing online exams. I look forward to the not too distant future when all year 12 students can access this technology to sit their SACE exams.

I am proud to be a member of the government that has committed to Gonski and is continuing to deliver its share of Gonski funding, with an additional \$229.9 million across the full six years. I have seen the benefits in our schools of the Gonski funding, and teachers, principals and parents speak to me about how the funding is benefiting their children. It is an investment in the future. In addition, the government is allocating \$38.1 million to support our public preschools to lower the number of students per teacher. We want every child in this state to achieve his or her potential. That is why, since taking government in 2002, Labor has invested well in excess of \$2 billion in preschool and school infrastructure. As a former teacher, I know the importance of this.

We want Adelaide to be the capital of a unique part of Australia that welcomes visitors and new residents alike in a safe, clean and harmonious environment. This year's budget will deliver more than \$100 million in extra funding for public transport over the next three years. This is in addition to the \$1.5 billion we have invested since 2007. These funds include an allocation of \$50 million for the tram network extension to the East End via our major educational and cultural institutions, connecting these with the new hospital and related health education facility (SAHMRI) and a rejuvenated West End, readying itself for a new influx of businesses, services, residents and visitors.

Despite the nay-sayers, the trams have become a major success and this can only continue to grow with the network's extension. The government will upgrade our current diesel railcar assets

and ensure improved infrastructure in terms of signalling upgrades, CCTV availability, lighting and enhancements approximate to public transport, and general station upgrades. While Adelaide Metro rail services, even at a consistent on-time running average of 94 per cent can be improved, the electrification of the Gawler line from Adelaide to Salisbury to begin in 2017 will assist in improving performance, as will the Torrens Junction rail underpass project.

These initiatives, in tandem with the O-Bahn Access project and related road improvements, will alleviate congestion during peak periods and during necessary capital works and reduce travel times for all members of the community. As an adjunct, of course, they will create additional jobs in construction, infrastructure maintenance and upgrading. It is a win-win equation.

The government has allocated \$144 million to support wellbeing in the community. This includes \$90.7 million in additional disability funding to support the transition to NDIS and provide additional disability services support; \$44.4 million funding to improve Aboriginal health outcomes; \$9.9 million to increase the capacity of existing rehabilitation programs and to introduce new programs to assist in reducing the rate of reoffending; \$10.6 million for the implementation of a system that continuously monitors screening assessment for people who work with children.

In my electorate of Torrens, I was particularly pleased to announce the transfer of 1.68 hectares of the Ross Smith school site to the Port Adelaide Enfield Council for the development of a \$15 million multicourt indoor community sport and recreation facility. This will benefit the existing and new families in the area and surrounding suburbs and, of course, returning the land to the community for this purpose is a great outcome.

In addition, Adelaide City Football Club in Oakden received \$1 million for facility upgrades, which include an artificial pitch, as part of the \$10 million grant to Football Federation South Australia. This is significant because there is no limit to the frequency with which games can be played on the artificial pitch. In discussions with the club, I have highlighted the need for local children to have access to the new facility, with an emphasis on the club offering soccer-focused boys' and girls' school holiday programs.

In highlighting today the government's intentions and its aspirations in the areas of education, jobs and infrastructure, I do not mean to exclude from discussion our wages, employment, payroll tax and off the plan stamp duty policies, our tourism and SA-made campaigns, our strategies to assist innovative start-up enterprises to better attract long-term investment, our reforms to the justice system and, in regard to community protection, our specific focus on dealing with domestic violence with \$1.3 million allocated to introduce a national system for SA Police to share information on domestic violence orders within and across jurisdictions as part of the national domestic violence order scheme.

There are also our health initiatives, incorporating a particular emphasis on closing the gap in health outcomes for Indigenous South Australians, our enhancements to the ease and efficiency of doing business in our state, our community arts, sport and culture initiatives, our support to the regions and our continuing commitment to tackling climate change. I will, however, address these areas at a later date.

These, like the budget measures I have discussed, represent the ways in which the Labor government seeks, always with the support of the community, to take South Australia forward into the future. The government's program moving forward is complex, it is ambitious and it is achievable within the framework of fiscal responsibility that is our hallmark, which is amply demonstrated by way of the eighth surplus to be delivered by an economy that, despite often uncertain local, national and global environments, has grown every year in which Labor has been in office.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (23:02): I rise tonight at this late hour and, as the Opposition Whip, I am probably the last contributor to the Appropriation Bill 2016 second reading. I understand, Deputy Speaker, you have listened to all 25 speeches; is that right?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have, and you could still win.

Mr TRELOAR: Let's see what happens. We have heard much about this budget, which has been much spruiked by the government as a jobs budget but, of course, just because you call something by a name, it does not necessarily mean it is so. Unfortunately, South Australia is still

coming in with the highest unemployment rate in the country at around 6.9 per cent, our youth unemployment is around 14 per cent and the Treasury's own forecasts predict just a 0.75 per cent growth in employment in 2016-17, which is less than half the 1.8 per cent predicted by the federal government across the nation.

It is important to talk about the numbers in this budget because, ultimately, that is what budgets are about, and I will spend a little bit of time talking about that before I go on to some issues that relate particularly to my electorate of Flinders. The 2016-17 state budget illustrates just how poorly managed South Australia's finances are. As a result of this budget, the indications are that net debt will jump more than \$2 billion to \$6.25 billion, largely due to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital being over budget.

The non-financial public sector debt is forecast to peak at \$14.2 billion in 2017-18 and, this financial year, South Australian taxpayers will cough up \$638 million in interest payments to service non-financial public sector debt. That is \$1.7 million each and every day that South Australians will be paying out, simply servicing the debt. That is interest alone. It is \$1.7 million in missed opportunities. Let's not forget that the Treasurer's much-vaunted surplus is only made possible by the sale of the Motor Accident Commission worth \$448.5 million. There was also the \$624 million payment for 2016-17. The one forecast for next year would not be possible.

So why does the government still need to sell assets to prop up its income revenue? Was it because of the Gillman sale that wasn't or the payment of taxpayer-funded electricity concessions to almost 4,500 dead people? Maybe it was the \$13.6 million spent on public servants at the Investment Attraction Agency to distribute \$15 million in grants to businesses that actually cost \$13.6 million to administer? That is an indication of how wasteful governments can be.

Perhaps it is due to the likely \$245 million cost blowout for the EPAS hospital records project, the \$46.5 million added to the budget for the Adelaide Convention Centre renovation, the \$30 million in rail electrification assets written off after further delays to the Gawler line modernisation project, the \$3 million spent to spruik the government's changes to the health system, the \$236,000 paid by South Australian police to rent vacant stations at Blakeview, Malvern, Newton, North Adelaide and Tea Tree Gully or, of course, the \$195,000 spent on an episode of Jay TV. The spending goes on. Unfortunately, in all of this, there is a failure to balance the budget. As the member for Bragg mentioned, there is also \$500,000 in a planning project for koalas in her electorate.

With all of the money being spent on health, I can inform the parliament and the minister that, despite the fact that there was \$39 million spent at the Port Lincoln Hospital, which we are very grateful for and we attended the opening some few months ago, the outside lift that provides access to the reception area still, after all this time, is not working. Despite correspondence between my office and the department, we have not managed to get that fixed as yet. I will explain the importance of this lift.

The geography of Port Lincoln is such that the hospital is on quite a steep hill and access to the reception area is up a flight of 10 or so quite steep steps. Alternate access is given via quite a long two-way ramp, and for those who are disabled, frail, infirm or otherwise not able to take the ramp or the stairs a lift is to be provided. Unfortunately, for all this time, the lift has not been working. I sincerely hope that somewhere in the country health budget there is money found to make that lift work. We can, after all, put men on the moon.

There seems to be very little relief for households and businesses with regard to cost of living. We have had much talk, even today, in this parliament about electricity prices. The member for Mount Gambier mentioned a number of his dairy farmers and dairy businesses are paying double for electricity compared with their counterparts just a few kilometres away across the Victorian border and this is a significant input cost to a business such as a dairy farm and really impacts on their very viability. For anybody contemplating a new business, of course, one would look very seriously about which state and where they might set up.

The emergency services levy, the natural resources management levy and the solid waste levy, of course, have all gone up and have been much discussed in this parliament already, but they continue to be an impost on the cost of living, on families and on businesses right across this state.

It is not a good place to do business and it is a very difficult place to raise a family, particularly those on low and limited incomes.

I would like to highlight though—and I am very pleased to be able to do this and give credit where credit is due—the STEM funding that has flowed out right across a number of schools throughout the state. In fact, three schools in the electorate of Flinders, Cummins Area School, Ceduna Area School and Port Lincoln High School, are all sharing in around about \$9 million for science, technology, engineering and maths centres, so those schools will be very appreciative of that.

I have done some work with the Port Lincoln High School over recent years in lobbying effort to have some money spent. It was not specifically for a STEM project, but was more to do with the replacement of temporary classrooms. The classrooms were placed there some 40 years ago as temporary classrooms and remain there, and are still being used. Unfortunately, they are without air conditioning. I am sure that, despite receiving this very important STEM funding, the Port Lincoln High School will continue to lobby for the replacement of those classrooms, considering that in the seat of Flinders the Port Lincoln High School is the one and only dedicated high school. It is also the largest school in the electorate.

Of course, roads remain a priority for country people, and it would be lovely to think that the government at some point in one of their budgets could begin to address the backlog in road maintenance. Mobile phone towers continue to be an issue. My understanding is that the government intends to make more of a contribution this time than they did last year, which, of course, resulted in just four of the 11 mobile phone towers. I urge the government to continue supporting this. It is dependent on federal funding, and I understand that, but the communication in this day and age is of vital importance, and country people, unfortunately, are missing out.

The coastal conservation zones continue to be an issue, and I will discuss that more in the grievance debate, but I will just flag it at this stage. What has been happening over the previous decade or so is that councils around Eyre Peninsula have been encouraged by the government to put in place coastal conservation zones. It has been a very difficult process. It has not been without its challenges, and it has not been without its concerns from both councils and also landowners, who often are agricultural and farming people who live and work within a coastal environment and all of a sudden have a coastal conservation zone imposed upon them not really knowing what this might mean for them, the future development of their properties, what impact it might have on the value of that property and how it might affect their equity and long-term planning.

There does not seem to be a lot of effort with regard to the reduction of red tape, and I notice that the Productivity Commission earlier this week released a report highlighting the importance of reducing red tape in agriculture. It would be nice to think that the government could consider that also to be a priority. I know some of the work by the Department of Transport has been done in relation to heavy vehicle transport. It was a 90-day project, initially, and it seems to have dragged out to well over 12 months now, with just one recommendation in relation to farm machinery.

On discussion with the Agricultural Bureau of South Australia, that seems one recommendation to be unworkable and impractical. It is really important that the department and government recognise that technologies are moving on in industries such as agriculture and that legislation and regulation needs to also move in line with the technological advances that are occurring, otherwise our industries are going to be constrained. On a brighter note, I noticed also last week that there was a very complimentary editorial in *The Advertiser* in relation to Eyre Peninsula where it was described as an economic powerhouse.

I spoke about this last week, and I think give credit where credit is due. I congratulate all the people who live and work on Eyre Peninsula, particularly those who are involved in primary production because it was on the back of the upcoming Eyre Peninsula field days at Cleve. It highlighted the profitability, and the advances and productive capacity of agriculture on Eyre Peninsula.

That is not to say that our seafood and fishing industries have not also progressed. It is really important that we recognise and support these industries, and the best way I think that support can

be given from government, particularly state governments, is to reduce red tape and green tape and streamline some of the regulations that impact on people's lives and business.

I would like to talk about the Department of Environment, with regard to an article that I read in last week's *Stock Journal*. This matter has been brought to my attention on a number of occasions, particularly in recent times, by constituents of mine, but it goes much further than that. It is in relation to the control of wild dogs, or dingoes, if you like. Pastoralists are calling for more help with the increasing wild dog population.

A lot of our pastoral country and much of our agricultural zone here in South Australia is enjoying a good season, and rains in the pastoral country mean that the carrying capacity of these pastoral properties is much improved. It also means that there is an increase in wildlife, and amongst that wildlife are the wild dogs or dingoes.

There is a fence that traverses South Australia and around New South Wales and into Queensland, and it separates essentially the sheep country in the south from the cattle country in the north. Sheep and cattle prices are very good at the moment. Meat prices are very good and the wool price is as good as it has been probably since the collapse of the reserve price scheme—when was that?—in 1991, 25 years ago. So things are buoyant, but what has happened as a result of good stocking rates and a good season is that the dog numbers have increased.

I understand that the Dog Fence is in reasonably good condition, and we in this parliament just a few months ago passed legislation, supported by both sides, I might add, that increased the levy that would be paid by landowners and a transaction fee as livestock goes through the saleyards. We supported that. We do not always support levies, but we did support this one because there was a commitment from the government to match always dollar for dollar the moneys raised. This is going to be a significant increase, almost a doubling of moneys that will go into the maintenance of the Dog Fence itself. That is not the only solution.

As dog numbers increase on the outside of the fence, more and more pressure comes on the fence itself. There is a bit of baiting that goes on. Our local NRM boards are responsible for that under the auspices of the Department of Environment, of course, but certainly the suggestion is that much more could be done. More baiting could be done outside the fence to reduce the pressure on the fence and more effort could be made inside the fence with regard to baiting and also trapping.

My understanding is that Victoria, our near neighbour, has 23 dog trappers, all of whom are funded by the state government in Victoria. We had just one trapper until very recently, when the funding for that was pulled, so we have no dedicated dog trapper here in South Australia. As I said, neighbouring Victoria has up to 23. There is a call to reinstate the funding for that dedicated trapper. Trapping dogs is a dying art; it is an antiquated skill. All of this seems a long way away. It is a long way from Victoria Square and it is a long way from North Terrace, but it is so important to these people who live and work in the state's north, who are busy working in what I would say is one of the highlights of this state's economy, and that is the agricultural sector.

Part of the Dog Fence extends into my electorate in the far west. It ultimately wanders around the north-west pastoral country and comes down just north of Ceduna and then abuts the Great Australian Bight. Certainly I have constituents who deal with dogs, both inside and outside the fence, and it really is a scourge. I sympathise with them. All they ask for is that it be recognised that this is an issue and that funding be properly allocated so that control can be carried out. It is an ongoing problem and it is not going to go away.

One other matter I would like to talk about while time allows is the issue of land tenure. In the Productivity Commission's report, which I mentioned earlier, there is also the possibility of changing the type of land tenure and perhaps freeing up equity, especially the pastoral zone. Of course, much of the north of South Australia is managed under pastoral leases. Generally, they are a 42-year lease term with the right of renewal.

Those leases can be bought, sold, borrowed against, and they form a big part of a pastoralist's equity. However, if the government were to consider freeholding some of these pastoral leases, then that could create much more wealth within that industry. I think it is an idea that is worth

pursuing. There is an area between the wheat zone and the pastoral zone and some of these properties could also benefit, I believe, from improved tenure arrangements.

The last issue that I would like to talk about, of course, is electricity prices. It has been a big topic today. The spot price I understand moves all over the place. The member for Morialta may even be able to give me a spot price right now.

Mr Gardner: The app is not working.

Mr TRELOAR: No, the app is not working. We looked earlier, and I think the spot price in South Australia was \$120 and in Victoria it is?

Mr Gardner: It was less.

Mr TRELOAR: It was much less. This is a challenge for the government. I am not quite sure how the government is going to find a solution to this but they need to find it very quickly for the benefit of all those households and businesses in South Australia that are burdened by these exorbitant electricity prices far and above what our neighbouring states are paying.

Bill read a second time.

Estimates Committees

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (23:22): I move:

That this bill be referred to estimates committees.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (23:22): By leave, I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that the Minister for Employment, the Hon. K.J. Maher, the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, the Hon. I.K. Hunter, and the Minister for Police, the Hon. P.B. Malinauskas, members of the Legislative Council, be permitted to attend and give evidence before the estimates committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill.

Motion carried.

Appropriation Grievances

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (23:22): I move:

That the house note grievances.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Treloar.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (GENDER IDENTITY AND EQUITY) BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 23:23 the house adjourned until Wednesday 27 July 2016 at 11:00.

*Estimates Replies***MINISTERIAL STAFF**

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (22 July 2015). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change): As the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, and Minister for Climate Change I have received this advice:

Ministerial Appointed Positions	Total Employment Cost
Chief of Staff	\$170,822
Ministerial Adviser	\$122,989
Ministerial Adviser	\$122,989
Ministerial Adviser	\$122,989
Ministerial Adviser	\$122,989
Personal Assistant	\$86,345

Non Ministerial Appointed Positions	Total Employment Cost
Receptionist (0.6 FTE)	\$37,569
Receptionist (0.4 FTE)	\$9,989
Correspondence Officer	\$50,092
Correspondence Officer	\$62,615
Correspondence Officer	\$57,849
Parliamentary Officer	\$85,665
Office Manager	\$109,288
Cabinet Officer	\$88,906
Communications Officer (0.8 FTE)	\$88,006
Personal Assistant	\$67,373
Ministerial Liaison Officer	\$99,094
Ministerial Liaison Officer	\$99,094
Ministerial Liaison Officer	\$99,094
Ministerial Liaison Officer	\$85,435

*Answers to Questions***FAMILIES SA**

In reply to **Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (17 November 2015).

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills): I have been advised:

A significant number of Commercial Care invoices are received throughout different directorates within Families SA for checking and approval.

A review on the payment performance and associated practices with Commercial Care Invoices is currently being conducted by KPMG. This will include the revision of instructions for the field when approving Commercial Care invoices.

The review is planned to conclude by 30 June 2016 with short-term improvements to be implemented early into the 2016-17 financial year.

Longer term recommendations will be reviewed and considered, with implementation to occur as soon as practicable.

Until such time as the review is concluded and its findings considered, DECD will continue to work closely with stakeholders to manage the invoice payment process and the timeliness of invoice approvals.

APY LANDS, TAFE CAMPUSES

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (9 February 2016).

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills): I have been advised:

Most delivery in the APY lands relates to units from the Certificate I in Education and Skills Development. The TAFE SA APY lands program does not focus on full certificate completion in this qualification, rather it develops individual training plans to meet the needs of each student and delivers training that is relevant to employers.

In recent years TAFE SA has seen:

- an increase in vocational qualifications on offer, the number of students participating and the number of qualification completions
- increased delivery of skill sets relevant to specific employment. These are requests from employers often related to accredited units or skill sets rather than a full qualification
- increased activity in the delivery of short courses following feedback from Anangu, employers and service providers. These short courses provide life and employment skills for Anangu and in recent times have included 'Team skills and managing conflict', White Card, First Aid, Load Shifting, Tag and Test, Child Safe Environment, Driver Education, 'How to fill in a time sheet'.

Delivery in remote areas is always more costly than delivery in the metropolitan area due to geographical constraints which also includes difficulty in accessing reliable, consistent technology.

STATE ADMINISTRATION CENTRE

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (19 May 2016).

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

Settlement is unlikely to occur prior to 30 June this year.

I am unaware of any pending legal proceedings in respect of the sale.

FAMILIES SA DRUG TESTING

In reply to **Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (6 June 2016).

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills): I have been advised:

The information is not collected in a manner that facilitates aggregate reporting and given workload priorities in child protection an aggregated report will not be provided.