

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**Wednesday, 5 July 2017***Parliamentary Procedure***SPEAKER, ABSENCE**

The CLERK: I advise the house of the absence of the Speaker. I call the Deputy Speaker to take the chair.

The Deputy Speaker took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

The DEPUTY 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***PUBLIC INTEREST DISCLOSURE BILL***Conference*

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (11:01): I move:

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

Motion carried.

*Parliamentary Committees***NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: LEVY PROPOSALS 2017-18**

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:01): I move:

That the 120th to the 122nd reports of the committee, relating to various natural resources management board levy proposals for 2017-18, be noted.

One of the responsibilities of the Natural Resources Committee as set out in the Natural Resources Management Act 2004 is to consider and make recommendations on the NRM levy proposal by a natural resources management board where the levy increase exceeds the annual rise in the consumer price index for Adelaide, or where a regional NRM board is conducting a statutory review of its regional NRM plan.

These reviews must occur at least once during each period of 10 years following the adoption of the plan. This year, of the seven NRM regions raising levies, three regions were conducting regional plan reviews. The Eyre Peninsula NRM Board proposed 3 per cent increases for both land and water levies, the South Australian Arid Lands NRM Board proposed 1.2 per cent increases for both land and water levies and the Kangaroo Island NRM board proposed a 118 per cent increase for its regional levy. The KI region does not have a water levy.

The committee was satisfied that there were no issues with the Eyre Peninsula and Arid Lands levy proposals, which are similar to those proposed in each region's business plan as presented last year. Special consideration was given to the KI NRM levy proposal, as 118 per cent was significantly higher than the others and much higher than the year's CPI reference rate of 0.7 per cent. On this matter, however, the committee accepted the advice of the KI NRM board presiding member, Richard Trethewey, that this increase was absolutely necessary primarily due to the need to maintain staffing in priority program areas. Mr Trethewey said:

There has been quite some discussion off the Island about our new NRM levy because we have made a bold move to increase the levy from what is currently \$36 per rateable property in 2016-17 to a new figure of \$79 per rateable property for 2017-18...It will raise the levy that we generate on the Island from rateable properties from \$176,000 to \$385,000, so it virtually doubles that amount of money.

We believe [it's] absolutely necessary because we are currently totally understaffed in our weed and feral animal program. We have two people working there. We desperately need to increase that to three people and maintain the equipment, et cetera, that works with that, and we need to be able to [create] greater emphasis on our water management area. We need to recognise that we [have been] able to leverage money from other various government departments and other areas by having the board intact and by doing this work. The amount of money that we [have been] able to leverage was an extra \$17.24 for every one of those dollars that we raised in the levy, so there is significant capacity.

Given that the KI NRM Board is authorised under the NRM Act to select a basis for rates, it is my view that in the future options other than a flat rate charge on all rateable land should be considered, as options prove fairer and more equitable to the community.

For the time being, though, the committee accepted the argument that the actual increase per rateable property was reasonable, justifiable and, on its own, unlikely to cause the community undue hardship. After deliberation, the Natural Resources Committee resolved unanimously at its meetings on 19 May 2017 and 2 June 2017 that it did not object to the levy proposals for all the regions under consideration, namely, Eyre Peninsula, South Australian Arid Lands and Kangaroo Island.

As always, I would like to take the opportunity to thank the boards, the volunteers and the DEWNR regional staff for the excellent work they do under very challenging conditions. Every time the committee visits the regions, we are without exception extremely impressed by the hard work and dedication shown by all the people that we meet who work for and with the natural resources management boards.

I commend the members of the committee: the member for Napier, the member for Colton, the member for Flinders, the Hon. Robert Brokenshire MLC, the Hon. John Dawkins MLC and the Hon. John Gazzola MLC for their contributions. All members have worked cooperatively on their deliberations and this report. Finally, I would like to thank the parliamentary staff for their assistance: Mr Patrick Dupont, executive officer, and Ms Barbara Coddington, our research officer. Sadly, Ms Coddington will be leaving the committee shortly, and I would like to wish her all the best in her future activities. She really has been a very important part of our team. I commend this report to the house.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker, I welcome today to parliament media students from the University of Adelaide, who are accompanied by Mr Ron Kandelaars. They are guests of the Hon. John Gazzola and the Hon. Leon Bignell. We hope they enjoy their time here in parliament today. I hope that it is not your first visit to parliament and that you remember fondly your school day visit to parliament and recognise that it is not always as orderly as this, but it is always as exciting as what you are going to hear this morning.

Parliamentary Committees

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: LEVY PROPOSALS 2017-18

Debate resumed.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:08): Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, and I note your comments in relation to the guests. I had the opportunity to speak to them briefly before, so that was good.

I commend the member for Ashford for her role as Presiding Member of the Natural Resources Committee. I listened with interest to what she had to say here this morning, and I thank her for involving me at any time when there is a matter pertinent to my electorate. I pick up on the KI natural resources levy, which has been a subject of conjecture and some deal of concern for some time.

I have had discussions at length. I get on very well with my local NRM board, and I know Richard Trethewey very well. They do their best, according to the funding they get, but it brings up the wider issue of funding for NRMs around the state and why it is so ridiculously wrong that you have the Adelaide Hills board, which is flush with funds because they have the City of Adelaide to

collect money from, and then you have these poor little country boards, such as Kangaroo Island, which are trying to scrape together a few dollars to do everything they can.

I have been of the view for some time that this whole thing needs flattening out so that the money is much more evenly distributed and that the smaller regional boards have the opportunity to do things without grovelling to the parliamentary committee to approve their rise. I should not say 'grovelling'; I should say 'pleading', which is probably better terminology, but I think you know what I mean. They should not have to do that.

By the same token, I think there are various programs that do need looking at (and I am referring holistically to all of them), but there are issues they do not need to be involved in as much as they are. The areas that need work should be funded, but others need their cloth cut accordingly. It was an interesting exercise, and I was very pleased that the committee came over and looked at the proposed Smith Bay port site, which I think is an arrant disaster. I am absolutely, totally and adamantly opposed to a port on that site. As the committee knows, it is just ridiculous, and I will have more to say about that later. In the meantime, I thank the member for her comments and commend the report.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:11): I rise to make a quick contribution on these three reports in regard to the natural resources management levy proposal, including Arid Lands, Eyre Peninsula and Kangaroo Island.

Every year, we seem to have rises in natural resources levies, and I note the reasons given for the 118 per cent increase in the Kangaroo Island levy, from \$36 per rateable property to \$79. When I first saw the 118 per cent figure, I just about fell out of my chair, but as it was such a modest start rate perhaps it is not so bad. I certainly have a lot of respect for Richard Trethewey, who has been mentioned here, and his comments. He has put a good case for why that levy should rise. He spoke about weed and feral pest management. Let's hope that is where the money is spent appropriately because what has always confounded me, and I have said it in this place many times, is the amount of money spent on administration in natural resources management.

I will put on the record again that my wife help set this up years ago. She is an environmental scientist and she was involved in the South Australian Murray-Darling Basin Plan. The frustration is because of the legislation, which needs major reform. There are many plans that need five-yearly reviews and three-yearly reviews, and my concern has always been that so much time, effort and revenue are spent reviewing these plans that people are frustrated by what they perceive as a lack of effort out on the ground.

In regard to pest management, or management of corellas, for instance, it is interesting when natural resources management decides, 'No, we don't do anything with that. We will leave that up to councils.' Corellas are one of those things that a lot of councils have trodden carefully about. When you look at the other side of the issue, corellas are causing massive environmental damage, especially along the coastline, around Strathalbyn and in my electorate of Murray Bridge, yet NRM boards say that it is not their responsibility. I am a bit dumbfounded by that because I would have thought that that is the exact thing that should be managed.

Yes, it is a difficult issue, but some councils, like the Coorong council, have a relocation program in place, and some of these corellas are permanently relocated to a better place, and it has been very successful. It just goes to show that if you have the desire you can do it. Not only is there damage to the natural habitat and trees and plants around the place but there is also the issue of tearing buildings apart. In regard to a building like the Coorong council's reasonably new offices, external wooden slats seem to be the trend now, and I have seen this on other buildings around the place, such as some education buildings. They are quite decorative, but they are a fair target for corellas.

Sometimes people need to have a good look at the bigger picture and what is happening and not see just one side of the argument because parts of the environment are being affected. It is a little bit like an overabundance of koalas on Kangaroo Island at times that tear through the habitat and gum trees and can have quite a detrimental effect. The agriculture minister mentioned fur seals, and that really needs be looked at into the future. I know there is a lot of timidity about New Zealand fur seals, but people really need to have a very good look at the issues and what else is being

impacted, like pelicans, musk ducks and other species along the Coorong and Lower Lakes, and realise that it is not just a one-way discussion.

I am not a marine scientist, but I believe that some marine scientists, if they were able to speak freely, would certainly agree with me that they are having an impact on fish stocks. We see whiting breeding grounds under pressure, and we see that garfish have been fully fished now for several years, which means that, being fully fished, they are at their max. I think there needs to be a good assessment of what management protocols can be put in place. The one thing I wish is that natural resources management boards do just that—manage some of these natural resources.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:17): I rise today to speak on the 120th to 122nd reports of the Natural Resources Committee, relating to various natural resources management board levy proposals for 2017-18. I rise to speak on this as a member of the committee, a committee which I enjoy very much. We are the hardest working committee in this place without any doubt, and I see the member for Ashford is concurring with that. Of course, the committee is ably chaired by the member for Ashford. Members of the committee are the Hon. Rob Brokenshire, the Hon. Paul Caica, the Hon. John Dawkins, the Hon. John Gazzola, Mr Jon Gee and, as I said, the member for Ashford and myself.

We were considering the boards of Eyre Peninsula, the Arid Lands and Kangaroo Island. I guess one of the real pleasures for me being on this committee is that we actually go out and visit these areas. We have made a commitment to the parliament to visit each and every one of the natural resources management board areas within this state. We visited Eyre Peninsula recently, Kangaroo Island even more recently, and our plan is to get to the Arid Lands before the end of this year. I understand that plans are well in place for that.

I need to declare not an interest any longer but that I was a member of the original Eyre Peninsula NRM board. That was a role I greatly enjoyed. I only served one term because I got busy doing other things, and those other things led me to this place, so it was not fair that I retain my place on the board. I came to that through Landcare, the soil board and other such ventures.

The management of the environment remains very close to my heart. I think what we often forget, but I would remind people in this place, is that the vast majority of land management in this state is carried out by the owners and operators of the land, those farmers and pastoralists who actually make their living from the environment. The maintenance of a productive and sustainable environment is paramount to the ongoing success of their businesses.

The NRM Act states that a regional NRM board may amend a plan at any time but must review its business plan anytime it proposes an increase in its NRM levy or levies and at least once every three years. A couple of years ago, this caused much angst because, as a result of circumstance, which I think was probably very much a result of government policy and directives from Treasury, the NRM boards significantly increased their levies. Of course, the levy payers, the constituents within those areas, were required to pay that.

It was a time of some angst for our committee, but we got through it. Be that as it may, two years on the proposed increases are entirely within the regime that we would deem fair and reasonable. The South Australian Arid Lands NRM Board, having completed its 10-year review of the entire regional NRM plan, has proposed increases of 1.2 per cent to both the division 1 (land) and division 2 (water) levies for 2017-18.

As I mentioned, we plan to visit the Arid Lands later this year, and I am looking forward to it very much. I have not been to the far north-east of the state for any great period of time, and I am looking forward to the opportunity to meet with board members and also staff and landowners within that region. It covers an area of about 520,000 square kilometres, which is just over half the total land area of South Australia. It is more than twice the size of the state's next largest NRM board area, that of the AWNRM Board, some of which falls within the electorate of Flinders.

Only 2 per cent of the state's population lives in the Arid Lands region. The largest towns are Coober Pedy and Roxby Downs and the rest of the population is spread over about 20 towns. The region's water comes from mainly the Great Artesian Basin's groundwater system and also from infrequent rainfall events in a boom and bust environment.

My recollection is that last summer, the summer of 2016-17, there were quite good summer rains in that part of the state. I trust that the status of the natural environment is in good heart and also that there is plenty of feed for the pastoralists. We very recently visited the Kangaroo Island NRM Board. Amongst other things, we discovered a fellow who makes gin. Many of us brought a bottle home, and my son informed me that the gin produced on Kangaroo Island is in fact world famous.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: World famous?

Mr TRELOAR: World famous, not just famous in this state.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: So if I asked anybody in the world, they would know about it?

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: It has won international awards.

Mr TRELOAR: Indeed. Thank you.

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: Old Tom was named best gin in Australia three years—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I'm worried that you know so much about it.

Mr TRELOAR: The Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries and Tourism is across the Kangaroo Island gin. Can you remember the name of it?

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: Kangaroo Island Spirits, Jon and Sarah Lark.

Mr TRELOAR: Of course, and they were wonderful hosts on the day, and I am pleased to say that the committee stocked up to the weight limit that Rex would allow. The Kangaroo Island NRM Board, having completed its 10-year review of the entire regional NRM plan, has proposed an increase of 118 per cent to the division 1 regional levy in 2017-18. In this case, it is a flat rate according to property ownership. The committee has heard that the NRM board considers this increase to be generally supported by the regional community.

I must make the point here that Kangaroo Island was beginning from a very low base. The moneys they raised from levies up until a couple of years ago were really quite small. They felt some consequence and responsibility, but they felt they could charge the levy payers more than they had in an effort to be able to better fund the board's works, and our committee agreed with that.

The Kangaroo Island region is one of South Australia's eight NRM regions established under the Natural Resources Management Act. Everyone knows Kangaroo Island well. It lies 15 kilometres from the tip of the Fleurieu Peninsula off South Australia and covers just 4,370 square kilometres and has 457 kilometres of coastline. I must say, looking at the island just a few weeks ago from a farmer's eye, that it looked to be in very good heart. Once again, the natural environment is in very good shape. There is ongoing work with regard to feral pests, weeds and particularly animals. That takes up a big part of the board's time and farmers' time, I suggest. They are working on cats, deer, goats, pigs—

The Hon. S.W. Key interjecting:

Mr TRELOAR: Goats are not; goats are sorted, but certainly the pigs are still a challenge, so they are doing good work. Last of all, under consideration today is the Eyre Peninsula NRM Board, of which I was a member and where I occasionally get to sit in the public gallery. The NRM board, having completed its tender review of the entire regional NRM plan, has proposed increases of 3 per cent to the division 1 and 2 levies over three years of its business plan. As with the others, in its meeting on Friday 19 May, the Natural Resources Committee resolved that it did not object to the board's levy proposals.

The Eyre Peninsula NRM Board covers an area I am very familiar with; I represent much of it in this place. I am a born and bred local and spent 35 years farming there. As I said, I was very active with Landcare, the local soil board and, ultimately, the very first of the NRM boards. It is a huge area that covers around 80,000 square kilometres, including Whyalla, which is not in my electorate but is a near neighbour. It includes 2,355 kilometres of coastline and 182 islands. People often forget the extent of the coastline and the pristine nature of the coastline in the west of the state.

It is the meeting point of two continental ecosystems, creating unique biodiversity. Just over half the region is farmed, with about 43 per cent under native vegetation. It is quite an extraordinary figure. We often think that Europeans came and clear felled all the natural vegetation, most of which is mallee scrub in this area, but in fact 43 per cent of this area is still under native vegetation. There are more than 100 conservation parks in the region, and about 650 heritage agreements are in place throughout the region on private property.

The big news for this house and beyond is that we received some rain over this last week. We were very dry—unusually dry—on Eyre Peninsula for this time of the year. The north-east received good rain in April, and they were able to sow crops. We received follow-up showers for much of Lower Eyre Peninsula and the Far West. There was very little rain to report; in fact, farmers sowed crops on a wing and a prayer. Some emerged, others had not. I am pleased to report that much of Lower Eyre Peninsula and the West Coast is looking forward to receiving about an inch of rain, in the old money, over this week, with some falls higher than that—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

Mr TRELOAR: —and the island as well, so that is good news for the farmers and producers of this state.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker, I would like to acknowledge our guests in the gallery this morning, a group of constituents from the electorate of Torrens. We welcome them to parliament this morning and hope that they have enjoyed their time in the parliamentary precinct and the chamber. They are, of course, guests of the member for Torrens. It is very nice to welcome you to parliament today.

Parliamentary Committees

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: LEVY PROPOSALS 2017-18

Debate resumed.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:29): I would like to thank members for their contribution, particularly the members for Finniss and Hammond. Although the member for Flinders is a member of our committee, I thank him for his very fulsome response this morning. I think the good thing about the Natural Resources Committee is that we have our members on the committee but we also do a lot of work with other members. I have mentioned the member for Hammond; we see him as part of our group. Certainly, we work with the member for Finniss, the member for Stuart, the member for Goyder, the member for Giles and the member for Chaffey. I am sorry to leave you out of this particular group, member for Davenport.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does he drink gin?

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I am not sure. There is a slight possibility the member for Davenport might drink gin, but I do not want to misrepresent him in this house. We also have a lot of attention from the member for Bragg. Whenever I hear anything about foxes, I think of the member for Bragg because of her concern about foxes as a pest in her electorate but also in general in South Australia. The member for Mount Gambier, the member for MacKillop and the member for Light all seem to have a very close association with our committee, and that is not even mentioning the previous members of our committee. The member for Little Para (Elizabeth) has certainly kept his interest in our committee.

I want to emphasise the amazing contribution made by the members of the various iterations of the Natural Resources Committee, as well as the volunteers in the area and certainly the DEWNR workers. The member for Flinders mentioned the landowners. I have been really impressed, having had the opportunity to travel around this state with the Natural Resources Committee, at the tremendous input that we have had from landowners, large and small, in the regions.

One of the things the Natural Resources Committee will be doing is a regional report because it is the focus of our government to make sure that there is that agenda on every committee's list,

and we feel that we can certainly fulfil that request. The other thing the committee is thinking of doing—and this will be of interest to our fellow Natural Resources Committee people—is looking at an agenda for the next committee. One of the reasons we want to do this is to invite members in this house who have criticisms of the process as it stands. I would certainly endorse the cumbersome timetable that our committee has to deal with, not to mention the natural resources committees out in the regions.

As to the way the levies are raised, there is a lot of discussion on our committee about the inequities of the way in which the levies are raised, and we believe that needs to be looked at again. Also, the work and the relationship with local government need to be looked at, as does the department. At a future date, I will be asking and inviting members of parliament to put in a submission to us about how they think the natural resources framework can be improved. It may be, member for Hammond, that your wife would be a good person, all these years on, to give us her view of how she thinks it has or has not worked.

What we would like to do as a committee is leave an agenda, as I said, that talks about some considerations that the next Natural Resources Committee might want to look at. I thank everybody for their contribution and support. I commend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE: GRAFFITI CONTROL (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT ACT

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (11:33): I move:

That the report of the committee, entitled Inquiry into the Operation and Impact of the Graffiti Control (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 2013 (SA) Amendments to the Graffiti Control Act 2001 (SA), be noted.

The Graffiti Control (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act, which I will refer to from here on in as 'the amending act', inserted section 14 into the Graffiti Control Act by way of the following text:

As soon as practicable after the expiration of 3 years from the commencement of this Act, the Legislative Review Committee must inquire into, consider and report to the Parliament on the operation and impact of this Act, including the effectiveness of sections 10A and 10B of the Graffiti Control Act 2001 (as enacted by this Act) in reducing offending for prescribed graffiti offences (within the meaning of those sections).

The amending act commenced on 3 August 2013. Consequently, the committee was required to conduct the inquiry under the terms of reference set out within the act. On 6 August, we invited members of the public to make submissions to the inquiry. This was published in *The Advertiser* and we sought submissions.

The committee invited 34 organisations and individuals to make submissions to the inquiry. In the end, we received eight submissions and we held three public hearings into this matter. Respondents to the public consultation included agencies, obviously the government, local government, non-government organisations, retailers' associations and members of the public. The Attorney-General noted during the second reading of the Graffiti Control (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill that the submissions generally supported tougher legislative measures to minimise graffiti vandalism and to deter potential offenders.

He also noted that respondents supported wider programs to reduce incidences of unlawful graffiti, including education and rapid removal. As a result of this public consultation process, the amending act inserted new offences, sentencing options and a new power to seize graffiti implements into the Graffiti Control Act. The new offences introduced in 2013 included:

- marking graffiti in a cemetery, public memorial or a place of worship or religious practice;
- failure by a retailer to securely store all graffiti implements, extending the obligation from spray cans only;
- the sale of a graffiti implement to a minor, extending the obligation from spray cans only; and

- supplying a spray can to a minor, not including the sale, which was intended to dissuade persons 18 years of age or above from purchasing spray cans on behalf of younger associates.

Section 4 also notes a number of further matters introduced by the amending act, such as increased maximum penalties for the offences of mark graffiti and carry graffiti implements. Courts were also empowered to order a graffiti offender to participate in the removal of graffiti from any location, amending the provision so that a court was no longer restricted to ordering the removal of the graffiti marked by the offender, and to order a graffiti offender to pay to a person who has removed or obliterated graffiti a reasonable sum for that removal or obliteration.

Police were empowered to seize graffiti implements in the possession of a person in a public place without charge on the basis of a reasonable suspicion that they will be used in contravention of the act. However, perhaps most controversially in relation to a prescribed graffiti offence, where the offence is not a first offence courts were empowered by this act with a discretion to disqualify a graffiti offender from holding or obtaining a driver's licence for between one and six months.

A considerable amount of the committee's time during the course of this inquiry was spent looking at this matter, whether it was a fair measure and, more particularly, whether it was an effective measure in deterring graffiti. The committee heard a lot of evidence that suggested that it had a negligible effect on offending. The committee did conclude, however, that the evidence either way was inconclusive and no recommendation was ultimately made to discard or retain the measure. In any case, it appears to have been very rarely used by the courts, if at all.

Section 5 of the report considers matters of importance, as set out in the submissions received and the evidence heard, including suggested causes of graffiti, finalised graffiti offences, finalisation of new offences since the change of legislation, the power to seize graffiti implements without charge, issues arising as a result of disqualifying graffiti offenders from holding or obtaining a driver's licence and other sentencing options. We also considered the penalties most likely to deter graffiti offending and other programs that may reduce graffiti offending. We heard from several witnesses about various programs interstate and overseas. We also heard about the difficulties in assessing the operation and impact of this act.

As a result of all these submissions and the evidence received, the committee made four recommendations. Recommendation 1 simply notes that there was limited available information upon which the committee could justifiably base findings regarding the operation and impact of the amending act in reducing incidences of prescribed graffiti offending, as defined by the act. As a result, it was recommended that the Attorney-General give consideration to conducting a further review after the passage of six years from the commencement of the act, that is, as soon as practicable on or after 3 August 2019.

Despite recommendation 1, the committee's second recommendation is that consideration be given to increasing the funding available to provide crime prevention and community safety grants for the purposes of reducing incidences of prescribed graffiti offending. The committee accepted evidence to the effect that, whatever the status of the criminal law, it must operate in conjunction with broader strategies that seek to address the causes of graffiti offending.

Thirdly, the committee recommended that consideration be given to identifying ways to increase the number of sites available for the marking of graffiti with lawful authority. The committee considered that this had the potential to reduce incidences of graffiti in the vicinity of the legal space, to improve the quality of work where the content is managed and to improve the safety of participants.

If you go to any of the major cities of the world, you will find areas where this type of activity has long been tolerated and, more recently, has been actively promoted not only as an outlet for potentially criminal activity but also as a tourist attraction and an activity that adds to the vibrancy of a precinct. We see this to a certain extent in Melbourne and parts of Sydney, and we are starting to see it in our own laneways here. In London in particular, this can be clearly seen in places like South Bank, parts of Waterloo and whole artists suburbs like Hackney Wick.

There is always, of course, the perennial argument about whether this type of thing is art or not. I would submit that a large part of it is not, and I am not arguing that the best of it is fine art, but I personally like a lot of it. The best of it takes an enormous amount of skill and practice, and I think

it is clear that, while it may not be fine art, it certainly adds to the vibrancy of a precinct when it is done right.

Finally, the committee recommended that consideration be given to providing educational material to learner drivers with respect to all offences which may result in their disqualification or which may result in the imposition of restrictions regarding the use or possession of a motor vehicle. At present, that information is limited to driving offences. The evidence suggested that a proportion of offenders may be completely unaware of the potential for such penalties to apply in relation to graffiti offending.

In conclusion, I want to thank the members of the committee. I want to thank the committee secretary, Mr Matt Balfour, and the committee's research officer, Mr Ben Cranwell, who provided such valuable support during the conduct of this inquiry. I commend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY 2017-18

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Odenwalder:

That the 95th report of the committee, entitled Emergency Services Levy 2017-18, be noted.

(Continued from 21 June 2017.)

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Davenport has nine glorious minutes left.

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (11:42): Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I am sure they will all be glorious. Firstly, in terms of my local community throughout the Mitcham Hills, we rely on the CFS and SES to attend to all of our emergency services needs. I would like to make mention of the Belair, Blackwood, Eden Hills, Coromandel Valley and Cherry Gardens CFS brigades, who volunteer their time tirelessly, day in, day out, in my community, which, whilst it is fully serviced by a CFS brigade, is predominantly a metropolitan community.

The work the volunteer CFS units do in my community is of vital importance, so I congratulate them and Dale Thompson, who is the head of the Sturt CFS group. Of course, the Sturt SES group plays an important part in our community, and I would like to put on the record my congratulations to group officer Chris Shaw, who was the recipient of a Queen's Birthday honour, being granted a PSM earlier this year. Congratulations to Chris and all his volunteers on the work they do for my community.

We are talking about the emergency services levy report 2017-18. Total expenditure on the emergency services levy for 2017-18 is projected to be about \$302 million, which is \$10.3 million higher than in 2016-17. The committee was told that the increase in ESL expenditure reflects the growth in base expenditure and additional funding for new initiatives, including enhancement of the state SES and Metropolitan Fire Service 132 500 and 000 call response systems, purchase of new protective clothing for MFS firefighters, and delivery of training to volunteer marine rescue members and SA SES volunteers. We know the emergency services expenditure is to be funded by the ESL as well as some minor revenues from the Community Emergency Services Fund.

We all know that the ESL is an incredibly important part of funding our emergency services across the board, both in metropolitan Adelaide and in greater South Australia, but one thing that the committee report highlighted this year, and something that we have all known for quite a long time in our community, is cost of living pressures, and currently those cost of living pressures are being reflected in so many instances. We have the highest electricity prices in the world thanks to those opposite and their 16 years of hard Labor. In terms of the ESL, it was confirmed that, up to June 2017, 21,000 South Australians are yet to pay their ESL bills. Last year, there was almost \$5 million in unpaid ESL bills that had still not been collected.

Families are forced to prioritise which bills they pay: electricity, water, council rates, ESL. Electricity is probably the number one bill that families in distress are prioritising, especially this time of year for heating homes, and then it is gas, water, council rates and the ESL. As we know, the ESL is levied on sporting clubs, community groups and organisations, churches and independent schools.

These are the organisations, especially some of our smaller community clubs, that struggle to pay their ESL bill as they face mounting costs in terms of their other energy needs.

The government are very cognisant of this issue, that the ESL is on the increase and that families are struggling to pay, and rightly they have said, 'We know people are struggling to pay their ESL, so we are giving every household a \$3 reduction this year to help them pay their ESL bill.' This year, in 2017-18 the ESL bill will reduce by about 1.1 per cent, which works out to be about \$3 per annum for the average household, leaving the average household bill at about \$260 a year. Those opposite understand that there is an implication for cost of living and they are going to give a piccolo of latte back to the average South Australian household in their ESL bill.

The Liberal Party and a future Liberal government will have a different policy position. We understand that cost of living is a huge issue for South Australians and we want to return a greater amount of the ESL to households, reinstating the remissions that were removed by the Treasurer in 2014 on the back of some spurious claims. By reintroducing the remissions we are going to bring in as a future Liberal government, we will see a saving of about \$150 per year to the average household, and that is a tangible saving for South Australian households.

Together with our policy on capping council rates, it will see positive measures that will help South Australian mums and dads, families, pensioners and people on fixed incomes pay their bills. It will put a bit more money in their pocket, money they can spend in the economy, money that they can spend at the local shop and money that they can spend at the local cafe having a sandwich, as well as their \$3 cup of coffee they are getting back under this current government, and that in itself will stimulate the economy because it is all about putting money back into the economy that is required.

It is not about government taking money out of the economy; it is about consumers putting money back into the economy that grows the economy. As those of us on this side of the house know, it is not the government that stimulates and it is not the government that creates; it is individuals who stimulate and create when it comes to economic growth. By having the Liberal Party policy of reinstating the remissions on the ESL, we will be able to do our bit to help stimulate the economy, which is most important.

One thing in the report I would like to talk about in the time I have left is that it was disappointing that funding could not be found in the 2017-18 state budget for the Adelaide metropolitan reserve CFS brigade. The CFS has been attempting to build capacity to support its existing brigades, and there has been a successful trial of the reserve brigade in the Adelaide northern suburbs. I think it is called the Para Reserve Brigade, and the member for Little Para probably knows a bit about it, and it is the first of its kind in South Australia.

Reserve brigades are not deployed on the first report of a fire but are deployed to support crews at major bushfires. They can be deployed to longstanding fires in the state or to support other existing fire services interstate. With this type of reserve, the CFS brigade would have been perfect in the Pinery fires that we had not that long ago, for example.

Expressions of interest were sought in October last year to potentially create other reserve brigades in other Adelaide metropolitan areas. A really good example would be in the member for Bright's new electorate—through the Hallett Cove area, down through Seacliff, as well as in the new parts of Davenport, through Happy Valley (as there is a CFS brigade there), up through Cherry Gardens and beyond, in my neck of the woods. It would be a really good innovation not only to be able to keep the community together but also to support local communities and support the MFS where they are and other CFS brigades.

To me, it seemed a very innovative way to capitalise on existing resources and, of course, there are many people who move from country areas into metropolitan Adelaide and greater metropolitan Adelaide who have previously been volunteers in their country CFS but who are no longer affiliated but still have those skills that can be utilised, as well as adding depth to existing resources by providing training support to crews, to add numbers in that severe crisis where necessary. There was a fantastic response to this, and CFS management are very supportive of it, but unfortunately there was no funding for this in the 2017 state budget. As usual, the government always talks the talk when it comes to supporting the community, but never, ever walks the walk.

Time expired.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:51): I rise to speak to the Economic and Finance Committee's 95th report, entitled Emergency Services Levy 2017-18. I note that this levy intends to raise \$302 million, with the levy and other funds, which will go into emergency services around the state. That is \$10.3 million more than was required in 2016-17.

The breakdown of the \$302 million includes the estimated return from the emergency services levy, which is \$291.5 million. There are some minor revenues to the Community Emergency Services Fund of \$1.9 million, and the rest will be a run-down in the Community Emergency Services Fund to make up the \$302 million. In relation to the levy and how it is put against mobile property and fixed property, there will be approximately \$46.8 million raised from mobile levies, that is, registrations etc. on vehicles, and \$244.7 million raised from fixed property.

One of the concerns that continuously comes to me in my office is the amount people pay on their fixed property, and then they see all their registrations. Certainly, in the agricultural world people can have many items that they register, including farm equipment and utilities, etc., and they all have the mobile levy. They are concerned about always being hit up for a levy. I think the biggest concern that comes to me in my office is what happens when we have a major event, and I have spoken about this many times here before. As soon as there is a major event, the Treasurer sees it as an excuse to up the amount that, in his eyes, needs to be raised for emergency services.

I would have thought that it should all be budgeted in the forecast contingencies because that is exactly what emergency services are there for—those big events. They are there for the Sampson Flats, they are there for the Pineries and they are there when disasters happen in the South-East, as they have been over decades, and I think it is used as an excuse at times to add more money to the government coffers. Some of this money goes into facilities and trucks. I note that there are about 37 trucks coming on line in the next season, and that is a good thing, but other equipment is needed around these trucks, in particular, the brigade bases and the sheds to house these trucks.

On Sunday, the member for MacKillop, Nick McBride (the candidate for MacKillop) and I attended the opening of the new facilities for the Coonalpyn CFS brigade. They are great facilities, but the issue for me was that people started talking about getting a new site 14 years ago. They spoke both to me and the member for MacKillop. Even though Coonalpyn is in MacKillop, quite a few people just outside Coonalpyn, north of Coonalpyn, are in my electorate and connected to that station. Obviously, with me being a CFS member at Coomandook, we are connected as well, so I had connections both politically and as a CFS firefighter. People talked about getting a new site 14 years ago and it has taken that long to find land.

It was mentioned in some of the speeches on Sunday that you would think there was some available country at Coonalpyn. Certainly there was, but for different reasons the initial parcel of land could not be used. Eventually, they settled on some land, and from what I gather there was going to be some other work done—some old pine trees taken down—but they have ended up where they are. It is not quite as big as they expected, but they have a great facility that will easily house three trucks and some smaller vehicles and some equipment. They have a nice new base area with a little kitchen and a captain's room. It is something that is sorely needed for the situations they deal with down there with fire and also vehicle rescue on the Dukes Highway. Those volunteers see some horrendous incidents.

I do question why it took so long. It was also raised on the day that the powers that be wanted kerbing put outside the CFS land. As was said in the speeches: really? There is no other kerbing on the same street, so they managed to get around that one. People need to look at the different sites instead of having a one site fits all philosophy based on essentially a larger town or urban needs. However, they got there and they are thankful for that. Chief Officer, Greg Nettleton, and Dean Elliott, who has had a long association at Coonalpyn, were there, and Greg and Dean were honoured to be on the opening plaque for this new CFS facility.

Mr Williams: He got life membership.

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, he did. As the member for MacKillop just said, Dean was awarded life membership of the CFS on Sunday. In 2007, he was also the recipient of a Queen's Birthday award, the Australian Fire Service Medal. I want to go through some of the comments about him receiving that medal back in 2007:

Dean joined the Emergency Fire Service...in 1961 as a firefighter with the Coonalpyn Brigade.

He was heavily involved in the formation of the Coonalpyn Downs EFS Association and became a Supervisor of Fire Control Officers in the Coonalpyn Downs area.

He oversaw the building of a joint EFS and ambulance station at Coonalpyn, including the purchase of several appliances for the Association.

When the EFS transformed into the Country Fire Service and the Coonalpyn Downs CFS Group was formed, Dean was elected Group Officer and held that position until 2004.

He also held the position of Group Equipment Officer between 1999 and 2004, [and he] was instrumental in developing Fire Prevention Committees and protocols, and was Chair of the Volunteer Fire Brigades Association, Murraylands Branch.

I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Bills

RETAIL AND COMMERCIAL LEASES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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) (12:00): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Retail and Commercial Leases Act 1995 and to make related amendments to the Landlord and Tenant Act 1936.

Second Reading

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) (12:01): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading speech inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The *Retail and Commercial Leases Act 1995* is legislation that regulates 'retail shop leases', principally by protecting the interests of lessees.

For example, it requires lessors to provide certain information to lessees, it regulates certain costs that can be imposed upon lessees and inserts certain terms and warranties into retail and commercial leases.

Importantly, section 5 provides that 'a provision of a lease or a collateral agreement is void to the extent that the provision is inconsistent with this Act.'

So it can readily be seen that from the perspective of lessees (who most often are the least powerful party in such arrangements), the Act is a type of 'consumer' protection—from lessors (or Landlords) who are usually the more powerful party to any lease agreement.

Barring some changes to the regulations however, the Act has not been varied since its inception in 1995. Accordingly, it is highly appropriate for a measured and sensible review of this important piece of legislation.

Pursuant to section 7 of the Act, the Small Business Commissioner is responsible for the administration of the Act.

I am now able to advise the government has, through the Office of the Small Business Commissioner, undertaken a review that consisted of 2 tranches of extensive industry and stakeholder consultation.

Following this lengthy consultation and review process, the government is determined to improve this legislation by broadly improving transparency for lessees and lessors alike and wherever possible, removing ambiguity relating to the processes under the legislation.

I expect the amendments within this bill to contribute to improved operation and efficacy of the updated legislation, in line with the extensive consultation that has occurred, and broadly in line with industry's expectations.

A number of the proposals within the bill simply make common sense. For example, the proposed changes that clarify the operation of 'rent threshold' have been described by the Law Society of SA as 'long overdue'.

I will now briefly outline to the House, the review process that has been undertaken:

In December 2013, the State Government committed to undertake a review of the *Retail and Commercial Leases Act 1995* (the Act).

In December 2014, a formal review process was initiated by the Small Business Commissioner (the Commissioner) on behalf of the (former) Minister for Small Business.

The Commissioner initially published an Issues Paper in December 2014 seeking public comment on various issues relating to the Act. Advertisements were placed in *The Advertiser* on 20 December 2014 and 10 January 2015.

On 13 February 2015, submissions to the Issues Paper closed with 37 submissions received from a broad range of organisations, industry groups and individuals. Some submissions raised a number of complex issues.

The submissions made to the *Issues Paper* went on to inform (retired District Court Judge), Mr Alan Moss, as he formulated the *Moss Review* on 14 April 2016. The Small Business Commissioner released the Moss Review for the 2nd tranche of public consultation on 24 May 2016.

The *Moss Review* made 20 recommendations on a wide range of issues relating to the Act.

Out of that broad industry consultation, the amendments in this bill will seek to give effect to 16 proposed changes to the Act and its regulations. These amendments aim to build further on the existing protective measures for lessees within the legislation, including:

- clarifying important aspects of the legislation, such as making it express that retail shop leases can 'move into' and 'out of the jurisdiction of the Act; the means of adjusting the 'rent threshold' (that triggers the operation of the Act); and making certain that various sums such as the rent threshold and security bonds are clearly understood to be exclusive of GST;
- clarifying arrangements for the provision of information to lessees entering into leases such as draft leases and Disclosure Statements, as well as clarifying various terms and definitions to improve certainty, and removing redundant terms;
- broadly increasing (by around 60%—roughly the rate of CPI from 1995 to 2015), the various maximum penalties within the Act by CPI since 1995.
- These maximum penalties have not been reviewed since 1995 and the submission proposes an increase of 60% which is broadly in line with the 68% movement in the CPI over the 20 year period from 1995 to 2015. Further, maximum penalties of \$8,000 have been proposed for two new offences under the legislation;
- permitting the Government to exclude certain 'classes' of leases and licences from the coverage of the Act; and also
- permitting the Small Business Commissioner to certify Exclusionary Clauses, and to exempt leases and licences from the Act.

I also note that regulation 14(1)(b) will also need to be amended to remedy a mismatch in the regulations regarding the 'rent payable' threshold:

Section 69(1) of the Act properly states that the 'rent payable' threshold is \$100,000. However, regulation 14(1)(b) states that that same threshold to be \$40,000 – which is an error. The two should be the same.

Accordingly, the regulation needs to be varied such that the threshold is the same amount as that set out in the Act—i.e. \$100,000.

Having now contributed significant resources into the two tranches of consultation, the retail and commercial leasing sector arguably has a legitimate expectation of the legislation being amended and thereby improved.

I commend this bill to the House and seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Retail and Commercial Leases Act 1995*

4—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause inserts definitions of *GST* and *GST law* which are consequential on the amendments to the Act in relation to rent and rent threshold. A definition of *public company* (a term is used in section 4 of the Act) is also added, to have the same meaning as in the *Corporations Act 2001* of the Commonwealth. This clause also inserts a new subsection setting out the meaning of *prescribed threshold* in relation to the rent payable under a retail shop lease. The prescribed threshold of rent is for the purposes of section 4 of the Act, being the amount of rent that will determine whether or not the Act will apply to a particular retail shop lease. The threshold of rent is defined to mean the amount of \$400,000 per annum or such greater amount that may be prescribed by the regulations. The amount of \$400,000 is the same amount as is currently prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of section 4. The definition also clarifies that the threshold amount does not include GST.

5—Amendment of section 4—Application of Act

The amendments to section 4 are to clarify (as from the commencement of the provision) the manner in which the prescribed threshold of rent is intended to operate to determine whether or not the Act applies to a particular retail shop lease. As is currently the case, the Act does not apply to a retail shop lease if the rent payable under the lease exceeds the prescribed threshold (that is, \$400,000 per annum). The amendment clarifies that the prescribed threshold will operate to exclude the operation of the Act at any point the rent under a lease exceeds the threshold, regardless of whether or not, at the time the lease was entered into or renewed, the Act applied to the lease (by virtue of the amount of the rent payable). This means that the Act may apply or cease to apply to a particular lease during the term of the lease, either as a result of a change in the amount of rent that may be payable (for example, as a result of a rent review), or as a result of any increase in the amount of the prescribed threshold (by way of a regulation under the Act). The provision also sets out some examples in order to illustrate the manner in which the 'rent threshold' provision is intended to operate.

6—Insertion of section 6A

This clause inserts a new section.

6A—Valuer-General to review prescribed threshold

The proposed new section provides for the Valuer-General to conduct a review of the amount of the prescribed threshold for the purposes of section 4 of the Act (and thus the threshold amount of rent at which the Act will cease to apply to a particular lease). On completing a review, the Valuer-General is to provide a report to the Minister on whether an increase in the prescribed threshold is recommended. The first review is to be conducted within 2 years of the commencement of this provision and every 5 years after that. The regulations may (but need not) specify requirements in relation to the review regarding such things as matters to be considered by the Valuer-General, or consultation to be undertaken.

7—Amendment of section 9—Commissioner's functions

This amendment is consequential on the amendments to sections 20K and 77(2) of the Act by this measure, and reflects the fact that the Act assigns other functions to the Small Business Commissioner in addition to those set out in section 9.

8—Substitution of section 11

This clause substitutes a new section 11.

11—Copy of lease to be provided to prospective lessee

This clause provides that a lessor who offers, or invites an offer, to enter into a retail shop lease, or advertises that a retail shop is for lease, must provide a prospective lessee with a written copy of the proposed lease as soon negotiations are entered into. Under current section 11, a copy of the lease need only be made available to the lessee for inspection. As is the case for the current section 11, the copy of the proposed lease need not include the particulars as to the lessee, rent or term of the lease. In addition, the lessee must provide the lessee with a copy of the information brochure published by the Small Business Commissioner.

9—Amendment of section 12—Lessee to be given disclosure statement

This clause amends section 12 to provide that a lessor must, before entering into a retail shop lease, serve on the lessee a signed disclosure statement in duplicate. The lessee must then sign both copies of the statement and return 1 copy to the lessor within 14 days.

10—Amendment of section 14—Lease preparation costs

This amendment deletes the reference to stamping and stamp duty in relation to the lease, as this is no longer payable.

11—Amendment of section 15—Premium prohibited

This clause increases the penalty for the offence of seeking or accepting a premium in connection with the granting of a retail shop lease from \$10,000 to \$15,000.

12—Substitution of section 16

This clause substitutes a new section 16.

16—Lease documentation

This section, which sets out the requirements for the provision of an executed copy of a lease to the lessee, has been rewritten to remove the references to stamp duty, as this is no longer payable on a retail shop lease. If a lease is not to be registered, the lessor is required to provide a copy of the executed lease within 1 month after it has been returned to the lessor following its execution by the lessee. In the case of a lease that is to be registered, the lessor must lodge the lease for registration within 1 month of its execution and return by the lessee, and a copy of the executed, registered lease must be given to the lessee within 1 month of the lease being returned to the lessor following its registration.

13—Amendment of section 19—Security bond

The amendments to this section are to clarify that the reference to a maximum bond of 4 weeks' rent does not include GST. The clause also increases the penalty for failing to provide a receipt for payment of a bond or failing to pay the bond to the Commissioner from \$1,000 to \$1,500.

14—Amendment of section 20—Repayment of security

This clause increases the time in which a written notice of dispute as to repayment of a bond must be lodged with the Commissioner under subsection (4) from 7 days to 14 days, and makes a consequential amendment to subsection (5).

15—Insertion of section 20AA

This amendment inserts a new section 20AA.

20AA—Return of bank guarantees

The proposed clause requires a lessor who has received a bank guarantee to return it to the lessee within 2 months of completing the performance of the obligations under the lease for which it was provided as security, unless the guarantee has expired or been cancelled, or for such time as there are court proceedings in relation to the guarantee. A consent or release necessary to have the bank guarantee cancelled may be provided instead if a lessor is unable to return the original guarantee. A lessor may be liable to pay a lessee compensation for any loss or damage suffered as a result of failing to return a bank guarantee, as well as any reasonable costs incurred by the lessee in connection with cancelling the guarantee. This provision will apply to a bank guarantee given in relation to a lease whether entered into before or after the commencement of this provision.

16—Amendment of section 20B—Minimum 5 year term

This clause amends section 20B by removing the reference to a period of holding over exceeding 6 months. This is to make it clear that a period of holding over after the termination of an earlier lease greater than 6 months, does not imply a new 5 year term of the lease.

17—Amendment of section 20K—Certified exclusionary clause

This clause amends section 20K to include the ability for the Commissioner, in addition to an independent lawyer, to sign a certificate in relation to a certified exclusionary clause. The Commissioner may require payment of a prescribed fee for providing such a certificate.

18—Amendment of section 20L—Premium for renewal or extension prohibited

This clause increases the penalty for the offence of seeking or accepting a premium in connection with the renewal or extension of a retail shop lease from \$10,000 to \$15,000.

19—Amendment of section 20M—Unlawful threats

This clause increases the penalty for the offence of making threats to dissuade a lessee from exercising a right or option to renew or extend a retail shop lease or exercising the lessee's rights under Part 4A of the Act from \$10,000 to \$15,000.

20—Amendment of section 24—Turnover rent

This amendment increases the penalty from \$1,000 to \$1,500 for the offence of a lessor requiring a lessee to provide information about the lessee's turnover when the lease does not provide for rent or a component of the rent to be determined by reference to turnover.

21—Amendment of section 44—Premium on assignment prohibited

This clause increases the penalty for the offence of seeking or accepting a premium in connection with consenting to the assignment of a retail shop lease from \$10,000 to \$15,000.

22—Amendment of section 51—Confidentiality of turnover information

The amendment to this section increases the penalty for the offence of divulging or communicating confidential information about the turnover of a lessee's business from \$10,000 to \$15,000.

23—Amendment of section 75—Vexatious acts

This clause increases the penalty for the offence of parties to a lease engaging in vexatious conduct in connection with the exercise of a right or power under the Act or a lease from \$10,000 to \$15,000.

24—Amendment of section 77—Exemptions

This amendment provides that, in addition to the Magistrates Court, the Commissioner may grant an exemption from all or any provision of this Act, on the application of an interested person, in relation to a particular retail shop lease (or proposed lease) or a particular retail shop (or proposed shop). The clause also increases the penalty for contravening a condition of an exemption granted under section 77 from \$500 to \$800.

25—Substitution of section 80

This clause substitutes a new provision setting out the regulation making powers under the Act.

80—Regulations

The proposed new section 80 sets out the regulation making powers under the Act to include those provisions now more commonly included. It provides that any regulations made may be of general or limited application and may confer powers or impose duties in connection with the regulations on the Minister or the Commissioner. As is currently the case, it also allows for regulations to prescribe codes of practice to be complied with by lessees and lessors and to impose maximum penalties of \$2,000 for contravention of a regulation. The regulations may also make provision of a saving or transitional nature and make different provision according to the classes of persons or matters to which they are expressed to apply, fix fees and make exemptions.

Part 3—Amendment of *Landlord and Tenant Act 1936*

26—Insertion of section 13A

This clause inserts a new section.

13A—Jurisdiction of the Magistrates Court

Proposed new section 13A clarifies that the Magistrates Court has jurisdiction to hear and determine applications and proceedings under Part 2 in relation to distress for rent. If the jurisdictional monetary or property value limits of the Magistrates Court are exceeded, the proceedings are to be referred to the District Court.

27—Amendment of section 24—Adverse claims

This amendment is consequential on the insertion of new section 13A.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

**BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY SECURITY OF PAYMENT (REVIEW)
AMENDMENT BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

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) (12:01): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Building and Construction Industry Security of Payment (Review) Amendment Bill. Read a first time.

Second Reading

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) (12:02): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

In December 2015, the Senate Economic References Committee Inquiry into Insolvency in the Australian Construction Industry found that *'it is a fundamental right of anyone that performs work in accordance with a contract to be paid without delay for the work they have done.'*

When it was enacted in 2009, the *Building and Construction Industry Security of Payments Act 2009* (the Act) was intended to ensure that a person who carries out construction work or who supplies related goods and services, under a building or construction contract is entitled to receive and able to recover progress payments for carrying out that work, or supplying those goods and services.

Under the regime of the Act, a claimant is deemed to be entitled to payment on a claim pursuant to the Act, unless the respondent provides a 'payment schedule' setting out how, or why, payments will be made, or withheld.

- If the claimant is dissatisfied with the payment schedule offered by the respondent, the claimant can take the matter to 'adjudication' via an Authorised Nomination Authority that will appoint an Adjudicator.
- Alternatively, if the respondent simply fails to provide a payment schedule, or provides a payment schedule but fails to pay in accordance with it, then any unpaid part of the claim automatically becomes a debt that is able to be enforced through a Court.

I am now able to advise the government has, through the Office of the Small Business Commissioner, undertaken a comprehensive review of this legislation across two extensive tranches of industry and stakeholder consultation.

As is evidenced by this lengthy consultation and review process, the government is determined to improve this legislation by making the processes under it less ambiguous, more transparent and broadly improving accessibility for participants that encounter issues with payments under building and construction contracts.

As important, will be the improved confidence of industry participants in the process given the serious concerns that had been flagged by the Small Business Commissioner about the ability of some sub-contractors to achieve payment, whilst head-contractors broadly contended that the process is unfair, and in some cases, biased against them.

I expect these amendments within the Bill to contribute to improved operation and efficacy of the updated legislation, in line with the broader industry's consultation and expectations. Indeed a number of the proposals within the Bill simply make common sense such as some simple changes to better clarify the Christmas shutdown period.

I will now briefly advise the House of the review process that has been undertaken.

The State Government was obliged by legislation to commence a review of the Act by December 2014. That review was initiated on behalf of the former Minister for Small Business, by the Small Business Commissioner.

Former District Court Judge, Alan Moss undertook an initial review of the Act and formulated a suite or recommendations in the 'Moss Review'. After considering the 24 submissions received, the Government tabled the Moss Review in the Parliament on 12 May 2015.

However, following on from the collapse of Tagara Builders in June 2016, the Small Business Commissioner instigated another tranche of consultation with industry, industry associations and key stakeholders on 16 specific proposals – a number of which built upon the recommendations made in the Moss Review. That two-month consultation period closed on 19 August 2016 with 37 submissions being received.

Legislative changes

The Bill will execute the following legislative changes to the Act:

- The Bill inserts into the Act new sections 7A – *Administration of Act* and section 7B – *Commissioner's functions*.

Section 7A formally allocates the responsibility for the administration of the Act to the Small Business Commissioner's. Section 7B then sets out the Commissioner's functions under the Act in some detail. This will provide greater transparency of the operation of the adjudication process and assist in educating subcontractors and other building industry participants of the positive outcomes which can be achieved by using the Act.

- Importantly, the Bill inserts penalty provisions against 'persons' (natural or corporate) utilising harassment, intimidation, coercion or otherwise applying undue influence or pressure to a person that is seeking payment under these laws.

Maximum penalties will be – in the case of an individual—\$50,000 or imprisonment for 2 years, or both; and for a body corporate—\$250,000.

- As recommended by Mr Moss in his Review, the Bill will also insert a provision to enable the Small Business Commissioner to publish adjudications made under the adjudication arrangements of the Act.

This will add further transparency to the sometimes opaque payments arrangements that occur in the building and construction sector.

- The Bill clarifies the Christmas shutdown period in section 4 to (as proposed by Master Builders Association) to exclude any day that falls between 22 December in any year and 10 January in the following year. This measure will clarify that period within the building and construction sector, as well as preventing any 'ambush' claims by construction workers on the eve of the traditional industry shut down period.
- The Bill will also reorganise the ANA Authorisation regime that currently applies to the 7 ANAs which are authorised within South Australia. The new regime will place some light-handed rigour and oversight to the 'open-ended' authorisation arrangements that were implemented when the legislation became operational in December 2011. The Bill provides the Commissioner with some greater oversight of the arrangements for both ANAs and the adjudicators that operate under them.

Non Legislative changes

There are three non-legislative measures that are proposed as part of the review of the Act. Briefly, they can be described as follows:

The establishment of an ongoing Education Program to promote the legislation and educate the broader industry

In his review, retired District Court Judge, Mr Alan Moss found that 'There were a number of submissions that subcontractors were unaware of the Act and that Government and industry bodies should do more to promote its use.'

Where any legislation is being changed significantly, it is imperative that those that will be impacted by those laws are educated about the changes by the Government. This is even more the case when a new offence is being enlivened – one that could result in heavy penalties and/ or imprisonment.

The Education Program will need to be ongoing because of the ever-changing nature population of the building and construction industry within the State. At the contractor and sub-contractor levels—the levels where late payment or non-payment most often occurs—there is a significant rate of 'churn' within this industry – the 3rd largest in the State.

New participants enter the building and construction industry all of the time. These might be small start-ups such as a newly qualified tradesman that has set him or herself up as a new contractor. It is these types of businesses that are extremely vulnerable to late payment, non-payment or intimidation and coercion.

It is these businesses that need to access education about their rights to payment for work done and the protections that can be afforded to them by this (amended) legislation.

The role of the Education Officer tasked with delivering this Program will have a much broader role than merely educating the industry on the legislative changes to the Act. This Officer will also:

- engage closely with relevant industry associations (including the Master Builders Association (SA), the Housing Industry Association (SA), the Civil Contractors Federation (SA) and Business SA) to support the delivery of information, education and resources to industry participants;
- conduct regular information sessions for sub-contractors;
- prepare marketing materials including on-line and social media;
- coordinate the investigation of complaints of harassment, intimidation, coercion or otherwise applying undue influence or pressure of a person seeking payment under the Security of Payment laws (as set out in the Bill below) ;
- oversee the operations of ANAs under the proposed new arrangements proposed (also as set out in the Bill below) ; and
- investigate complaints made under the Act, as well as providing advice and support to the Commissioner on complaints that might be made under the proposed new *Building and Construction Industry Code* under the *Fair Trading Act 1987* (as Proposal 1.7).

The Small Business Commissioner will work cooperatively with the Industry Participation Advocate to develop a policy that will effectively impose a 'good behaviour' test for principal contractors who bid for Government projects of \$4 million and above for the metropolitan area and \$1 million and above for regional areas.

In recent times the Small Business Commissioner has had dealings with one particular subcontractor who has a \$3.5 million claim against a large principal contractor in another state.

The question that this subcontractor has constantly asked is, 'why do these people who behave so badly keep getting government contracts in South Australia?'

As part of the development of this Policy, the Small Business Commissioner will consult with relevant government agencies to define this 'good behaviour' test which will be broadly consistent with current Industry Participation Advocate thresholds for local participation assistance.

A *Building and Construction Industry Code* will also be developed under the *Fair Trading Act 1987*. This Code will mirror the 4 existing Industry Codes (Farming, Newsagency, Motor Vehicles and Franchising) that are in place and will provide the Small Business Commissioner with extra powers to compel disputing parties to participate in an alternative dispute resolution, which will include mediation.

Alternative dispute resolution (ADR) gives parties the opportunity to work through disputed issues with the help of a neutral third party. ADR is generally faster and less expensive than going to court.

One of the main benefits of ADR is that the process puts the parties in control (rather than their lawyers or the court) by giving each party an opportunity to tell their side of the story, and have a say in the final decision.

The SBC currently monitors the following industry codes:

- Farming Industry Dispute Resolution Code
- Motor Vehicle Industry Dispute Resolution Code
- Newsagency Industry Dispute Resolution Code
- Franchising Industry Dispute Resolution Code

Each Industry Code promotes the successful resolution of industry related disputes in a streamlined and defined manner. Each Code provides mandatory alternative dispute resolution processes at no or low cost to participants.

The SBC has a variety of powers under each Code to assist in resolving a dispute. Parties can be compelled to:

- attend meetings;
- exchange information;
- answer questions; and
- participate in an alternative dispute resolution processes.

Another Code provision (as contained in existing Codes) is the ability of the SBC to engage a technical expert to help resolve disputes.

There are two levels of penalties for breaches of the four Industry Codes under the *Fair Trading Act 1987*. On one level, the SBC can issue a civil expiation notice for breaches of a particular Code, or alternatively, the SBC may take court action to obtain a civil penalty of up to \$50 000 for a corporation or \$10 000 for a natural person.

The proposed Building and Construction Industry Code would give the SBC the same powers as the existing Industry Codes, with mandatory requirements for parties to assist and participate.

Having now contributed significant resources into the two tranches of consultation, the retail and commercial leasing sector arguably has a legitimate expectation of the legislation being amended and thereby improved.

I commend this Bill to the house and seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Building and Construction Industry Security of Payment Act 2009*

4—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

Definitions are inserted for the purposes of the measure.

5—Insertion of sections 7A and 7B

New sections 7A and 7B give the Small Business Commissioner responsibility for the administration of the Act and set out functions.

6—Amendment of section 29—Nominating authorities

Certain amendments to this section insert a new scheme for the Minister to grant persons authority to nominate adjudicators for the purposes of this Act. Authorities will be granted for a term of up to 5 years and on conditions determined by the Minister.

The Minister may limit the number of persons who may be authorised and can revoke an authority in certain circumstances.

Other amendments provide for the Commissioner to obtain copies of adjudication applications or other information from authorised nominating authorities.

7—Insertion of sections 32A and 32B

New section 32A provides for an offence relating to assaulting, threatening or intimidating a person in relation to progress payments.

New section 32B supports the new offence by providing that the conduct and state of mind of an officer, employee or agent of a body corporate acting within the scope of his or her actual, usual or ostensible authority will be imputed to the body corporate.

8—Insertion of section 33A

New section 33A provides that neither the Commissioner nor the Crown incurs any liability for the publication by the Commissioner in good faith of a determination of an adjudicator in relation to an adjudication application (in accordance with the Commissioner's function to publish such adjudications).

9—Repeal of section 36

Section 36 provided for a review of the Act 3 years after it commenced operation. The provision is spent and is being repealed.

Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

1—Revocation of authorisations

In connection with the amendments to section 29 of the Act in clause 6 (above), existing authorisations under that section are revoked. Despite the revocation of authorisations, the transitional provisions allow for authorised nominating authorities to complete determinations of adjudication applications made before the commencement date.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

APPROPRIATION BILL 2017*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 July 2017.)

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (12:03): I rise to speak in support of this bill and also the relevant budget measures. The budget, at its fundamental level, is about taxation. It is about the price we pay for a civil society and, if you like, the taxation we pay reflects our values as a nation. The tax we are prepared to pay reflects the values of not only our nation but also our communities.

In an increasingly globalised economy, the ability for governments to influence economic policy is increasingly decreasing. As a result, budgets are not only economic documents—and this is something I learnt in high school economics—but they are about what we actually do as a society. Budgets are based on two components: the economy, as I mentioned just a minute ago, and it is also a political document. By 'political document', I mean that it is a judgement about how taxation revenue should be collected and expended. They are contested spaces, and that is what makes it political.

In a world where inequality is increasing at a rapid rate, the budget is also seen as an important way to maintain a civil society. For me, a civil society is one that is based on the values of fairness, justice and dignity. It is this increase in inequality in our society that makes ordinary people—and by 'ordinary people' I mean everyday people like working people, tradespeople, small business people in my community, farmers and the like—see that the benefits of globalisation are accrued by few and that the costs are borne by many. It is this increase in inequality that is destabilising many of our Western democracies.

The research is very clear. Over the past 10 to 15 years, a small number of people in our society have become increasingly wealthy and an increasing number of people have become less so. Accordingly, it beggars belief that some governments would use their budgets to increase this inequality. The recent federal Liberal budget is a case in point. Taxation for the wealthy was reduced and taxation for the middle and lower income earners was increased. At the same time, wages were cut for people on lower incomes through the attack on penalty rates. Who are the people who actually lose out?

Ms Cook: Workers.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Exactly right—young people who invariably work casual hours outside school or university, women who often work outside normal working hours because they have child care, children and family requirements and work to raise an income for their family, and migrants who work outside normal hours in work such as cleaning and the like. The federal budget is based on an ideology of increasing inequality in our society. This state budget is not based on that ideology, and that is why I support it.

It is based on the premise that those who can pay more should, to ensure that we have just economic and social outcomes. Its focus is on infrastructure expenditure to improve efficiency and also to increase jobs in our community. A good education, good health and meaningful work are keys to fulfilling and successful lives. There are many ingredients, but those three key things underwrite the other aspects of our lives. It is good that this budget focuses on those three things. This budget focuses on the three things that create fairness in our society.

For example, in health, the additional more than \$50 million to improve accident and emergency care at Lyell McEwin Hospital will improve the southern parts of my electorate and also support the Gawler Health Service. It supports additional dialysis and chemotherapy services at the Gawler Health Service. It supports a new women's hospital to improve the quality of care for women in our community.

It has funding for education in my electorate. It has additional funding for STEM programs and STEM facilities, which increase the ability of children in my community to compete for those jobs in the future. It has funding for the finalisation of the redevelopment of Evanston Gardens Primary School to ensure that children in my community have a fair go at a good education. It has funding for a new B to 12 school in the Munno Para area to make sure that, again, children have access to a good education.

It has funding for work programs, in particular the job accelerator program, to ensure that young people in our community, through traineeships and apprenticeships, have an opportunity to get their first or second job, as the case may be. Through that, it also supports small business. There is funding for the Northern Economic Plan to ensure that we support our workers and small businesses in the northern area as a result of the closure of Holden, an industry that was abandoned by the federal Liberal Party.

It also has funding for disability workforce programs to ensure that the most vulnerable people in our community have opportunities to lead meaningful and fulfilling lives. It has money for infrastructure, such as the Gawler electrification project, which is subject to federal funding, which will go ahead and be great for not only additional services but also the jobs it creates. There is funding for a range of programs that support small business. There is also \$200 million for the Future Jobs Fund to improve new businesses, start-ups, etc.

There is funding for Our Energy Plan. It is no accident that that new and additional investment was made by the private sector when the state government made the decision to enter into the energy market in a very direct way, through additional powers, or to be a player in the market. That is no accident. The reality is that by entering the marketplace we broke the monopoly some energy companies had on our power, our energy. It was a monopoly that was granted by the Liberal Party when they privatised ETSA some years ago. We also have money to fund My Neighbourhood projects to ensure that we respond to local communities and their priorities, rather than the priorities the government thinks are appropriate.

On the revenue side, I would like to say a few words about the big bank levy. The big bank levy is important for two reasons: it provides additional revenue that this government intends to put into programs to support small business and job seekers and it is also a very powerful statement about what is fair and reasonable in our society and what sort of society we want. The reaction to the proposed big bank levy is very instructive and says a lot about (1) the culture of some parts of corporate Australia and (2) the Liberal Party itself.

The outrage demonstrated by the big banks and the Liberal Party says a lot more about corporate culture and the Liberal Party than the proposed big bank levy itself. What is the impact of this big bank levy? According to research undertaken by The Australia Institute—and I quote from their report—it is as follows:

The South Australian bank levy is designed in the same way as the federal bank levy. Banks cannot avoid the levy by not banking or investing in South Australia. The proposed levy will therefore not disadvantage South Australia compared to any other state or territory.

The South Australian bank levy is proposed at 0.0036 per cent or 0.36 basis points. That is \$3.60 in every \$1,000,000 of determined liabilities. It is expected to raise about \$90 million per year over the next four years. Together the five CEOs of the big banks make about half of what the levy is expected to raise each year. The amount the levy is expected to raise also represents just 0.2 per cent of the \$44 billion in pre-tax profits the big five made last year...

I note that these figures are quite instructive when you talk about fairness in society. Half of what we propose to have as a levy is earned by the CEOs of the big banks. That reinforces the point I made earlier, that over the last few years a smaller number of people have increasingly become wealthy at the expense of the poor and middle classes.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Don't take my word for it; let's see what the impact of the big bank levy is according to bankers themselves. ANZ chief executive Shayne Elliott told ABC radio on Thursday regarding the big bank levy, 'This is a wealth transfer from the rest of Australia to South Australia. You are asking 95 per cent of our customers and shareholders to pay for this who do not live in South Australia.' This nonsense that this big bank levy will hurt South Australia is exactly that—just nonsense. The bank's CEO himself says that it is a transfer of wealth from the wealthier states to South Australia. We will actually benefit from this. I should not end there. Sam Jacobs of financial magazine *Business Insider* stated, 'The impact of the South Australian levy on the banks' bottom line will be minimal.'

So why the outrage by the big banks? The banks' opposition is not so much about the impact of the levy on their bottom line, because it would be minimal if anything, but they are opposed to the introduction of new state taxes. It is as simple as that. They wish to determine how we have taxation policy in this country.

On the one hand, we have the federal Liberal government saying that states should not rely on the federal government and federal taxes and should have their own taxes. We are doing that. It is interesting to note that the federal government big bank levy is a good tax, according to the Liberal Party in South Australia, but the state big bank levy is not a good one. It is the same type of levy and basically the same taxpayers are involved. One is good, one is bad.

The Liberal Party have announced that they will block the big bank levy in the upper house. The Premier in his appropriation speech yesterday said in response that the Liberal Party's decision is appalling and reflects the lack of integrity and character of their leader, the member for Dunstan. The photo of the Australian Bankers' Association (ABA) representative in the chamber gallery yesterday said it all. The ABA were here to ensure that the Liberal Party leader did not flip-flop once again. I say 'flip-flop' because this is a decision to block the big bank levy, not only in an attack on the budget but also on parliamentary conventions.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

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

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): Order! I assume the member for Finniss will want to be heard in silence shortly.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: What is the Liberal Party view about the convention? I will quote one of their members who wishes to be a minister should they be re-elected. In a talk on FIVEa on 15 August 2016, the member for Unley said the following when he was talking about the levy dealing with the taxi industry. He was asked why the Liberal Party would not block it in the upper house, and this was his answer, 'The levy and the compensation were part of the budget. That is dealt with now. Budget bills go through the parliament because we simply can't have a situation where the state stops to work. That has been the convention for 170 years.'

The decision by the Liberal Party is quite instructive to oppose the big bank levy because this is an indication of what they will do should they win government. They will start breaking every convention possible. They are quite happy to do it today from opposition, so why wouldn't they do it from government? The Liberal Party are wrong to block the big bank levy. They have no mandate to do so.

Mr Pederick: Take it to an election.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I agree. That was my next point exactly. If they want to oppose it, they can make it their policy at the next election, but they have not. But it does not give you the right to block it today. In closing, I would like to go back to my earlier comments and talk about this big bank levy. It is clear that on my side of politics we are supporting the battlers, the people who go out there every day to work, ordinary people, tradespeople, the small business people, the small retailers the Liberal Party wishes to destroy through completely—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Mr Speaker, can I have some—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): Order!

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: —unregulated shopping hours, the small battlers. On the other side, we have those who support the big banks. The lines are very clear: on our side, we support the battlers; on the Liberal Party side, it is the big banks. The choice is very clear at the next election.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): Thank you, member for Light. Member for Finniss, I think you have set the tone for your speech.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (12:20): I do not think I will even comment on that diatribe, quite frankly. Mr Acting Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to make some comments on the recent budget brought down by the Treasurer. I am not quite sure whether it is a communist budget, a socialist budget, a combination of both or whatever. However, it is doing very little for the people of South Australia, apart from considerable—

An honourable member: Pork-barrelling some seats.

Mr PENGILLY: Well, that was my word. 'Considerable pork-barrelling' I had written down here actually. It is all about pork-barrelling in the lead-up to the election next year and it is all about the failing Labor leadership of the state government and who is going to take over when the Premier gets his political head chopped off by the SDA, which I suspect might not be too far away. We have the pickpocket Treasurer on the job trying to get into everybody's pockets at the expense of everybody else. Unfortunately, we have the state of South Australia, which I am very proud of, on its knees.

I want to read out a few quotes from previous *Hansard*. This came from a budget reply speech on Tuesday 19 June 2007:

This is a bad budget—a bad and a sad budget. This is a budget that taxes, borrows and spends; but, as it taxes, borrows and spends, it avoids the key steps to building a better South Australia...The first thing this state needs is water...

That was during the drought, of course. The next time the same speaker made some comments was in the budget reply speech of 18 June 2008, when nothing much changes:

You cannot trust the Treasurer; you cannot trust the Premier. There is no action now for the future, just an eye on the next election date. It is all about buying your way into another term and hoping that the South Australian

people will be suckered in. Let there be no doubt that come the next election there will be no desalination water available for use in Adelaide...

Yet another quote from the same speaker on 16 June 2009 in another budget reply speech was:

South Australians cannot trust this government to deliver on any of the promises in this budget. It has broken promises in the past and will break them again. This is a budget full of promises. I predict today that, if this government cons the South Australian people into a third term, those promises will not be delivered, as the razor will be out.

Guess who said that? The member for Waite, now a member of the current government. He made those three budget reply speeches in those three years and he is there now in the thick of it making decisions that are going to absolutely further bring down South Australia economically and as a society.

You only have to look at the record of this government on a number of issues: child protection, shameful; abuse of the elderly, disgraceful; water prices, appalling; power prices, a hanging offence; the ESL, greed. There are endless examples and I could go on all day; however, I do not think there is any need to do that. The leader, in his budget reply speech, touched on many, many matters, and I thought it was a very fitting reply to a very horrible budget, quite frankly.

I am not quite sure why previous members on the other side, and in particular the last speaker, got stuck into the banks. I really do not understand the psyche of the Labor Party in trying to beat up class warfare in South Australia. It is absolutely ludicrous. You need only go back to the global financial crisis. Basically, the only reason that Australia came through the global financial crisis was because of the solidity and performance of the banking system in Australia. They got us through.

The prime minister at the time, Kevin Rudd, went on a spending splurge which we are still recovering from and which is still impacting. He was followed by Julia Gillard. They took us on a borrowing-spending spree of astronomical proportions, but the completely solid business of banking in Australia was the underpinning reason that we did not go down the gurgler during the global financial crisis. They seem to forget about that.

I have no real reason to love the banks, let me tell you. I do not love them. I have been an ANZ client for longer than I care to remember. From time to time, things have been very difficult, as I am sure they have been for other members, particularly those on this side. During the credit squeeze some years ago, we paid 28 per cent on our overdraft on a farming business. We survived because my wife was out working, I was out working and we just had to get on with it, but that was the way things were.

As you would recall prime minister Keating saying, that was one of the recessions we had to have. It was an absolute nightmare. We had collapses in commodity prices but, even then, the banks got us through. Banking is an extremely important sector that underpins Australia as an economic performer—the solidity, independence and the strength of our banks—so do not give me any nonsense about class warfare, as the member for Light did. That is complete and utter tommyrot, quite frankly. He should be ashamed of himself, in my view, for producing that sort of performance this morning and hammering the banks. We all have reasons to get cranky from time to time about all sorts of things.

The Treasurer said that if anyone has bank shares they should not even be speaking in the house on banking matters or the bank tax. Let me tell you that I do not scroll through the Register of Members' Interests to see if they have bank shares, or any other shares for that matter. I do not see that being necessary, and I think the Treasurer is just continuing the good old class warfare. If people have shares, good on them; that is their business.

I would like to turn to a few matters relating to parts of my electorate. The government have absolutely failed to deliver for regional South Australia. This morning's announcement about Arrium being sold was a good announcement. The government did not bring it on, I can assure you. I am sure the Premier and his entourage are going to run around saying, 'This is what we are doing for regional South Australia.' I think this is what they are doing to try to save Eddie, quite frankly, but do not forget—

Mr Hughes interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: Hello, he is here. Welcome, Eddie. You get up and say a few words shortly. I think Eddie—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): Member for Finnis, you—

Mr PENGILLY: Yes, I remember—the member, sir. I understand where you are coming from.

The Hon. P. Caica: The member for Giles.

Mr PENGILLY: The member for Giles, yes.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): Excellent. I accept your apology.

Mr PENGILLY: Thank you. The member for Giles must be in a fair bit of strife, I think. I noticed he was on Twitter this morning standing beside the Premier and the Treasurer—without a tie, I might add, which is an embarrassment for them. I am delighted that Arrium will be bought by another company and will continue to sustain Whyalla for decades to come. I hope it works.

Aside from that, there is not a lot in regional South Australia for us to be happy about. I guess we will get announcements of spending coming out from departments over the next few months, but there was nothing of substance in the budget. I will turn to the outer metropolitan area shortly, which sort of incorporates regional South Australia, but nothing of significance came out in the budget for regional South Australia. They are forgotten— they are absolutely forgotten—and that is not just a reflection.

We travel to the Northern Territory to see our family and grandchildren reasonably regularly and drive up once a year. I can assure you that people in those regional areas of the Northern Territory, where most places do not have mobile phones or anything else that we take for granted, are struggling as well. The reason that two of our children have left the state is that there is nothing here for them at all. They cannot progress to the extent that they want to so they have left the state.

In reference to my own electorate, pork-barrelling is alive and well down in Finnis, part of which is due to go into the electorate of Mawson in the next state election next year. I recall recently giving a speech in here and presenting a petition about the Main South Road from a group at Aldinga and having a bit of a crack at the member for Mawson and the member for Kurna. Well, lo and behold, all of a sudden we have this pork-barrelling of Main South Road. But, hello, it is not going to start for a couple of years, so the locals down there have pooh-poohed it already.

They have said, 'It's not funded. When is it going to happen? It's not going to happen.' The member for Mawson is down there trying to spin the yarn that it is all going to happen in the immediate future and save his political scalp. Likewise, with the announcement of a super school in the Aldinga-Sellicks area. That is unplanned, uncosted, unfunded, and heavens to Betsy knows when it will arrive—sometime in the distant future I would suggest. I am not opposed to that in any way, shape or form. I think it is a good thing, the area needs it, as it is a growing area with lots of children going to school.

In the Sellicks-Aldinga area, half the school numbers at Myponga Primary School, about 70 children, go from Sellicks each day. A number also go to Aldinga and some of the senior students go to Willunga High School. They go all over the place, so long term—and it is something that the Liberal candidate, Andy Gilfillan has picked up on—there are major issues with schooling in the region. He is as pleased as I am that this announcement has been made, but whether it ever happens is something else.

On Monday night, I attended the Yankalilla Lions changeover dinner along with some 80 other people, and I sat at a table full of people from Myponga and they were highly bemused. One gentleman told me that it was quite funny that the member for Mawson appeared at the football at Myponga on Saturday. It was about minus 15° and he appeared in a T-shirt, which they found somewhat bizarre. At Myponga, you do not go anywhere in a T-shirt in the middle of winter, I can assure you, so he is overcooking his goose down there.

Mr Duluk interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: My colleague says that perhaps he had been drinking the Argentinian red; I do not know and I cannot answer that. That amount of infrastructure, particularly down south on Main South Road, is interesting.

Another thing concerning people down there is the \$11 million project that went through when I was a member of Public Works Committee not so long ago to do with roundabouts and speed limits along that way. They are now asking seriously, 'Why on earth would you go and do that if you are going to upgrade the road? Why don't you put that off?' My understanding is that the work is not commencing until October this year anyway. Their preference would be for it not to happen.

They have a distinct preference for the road speeds down there to be brought back to 100 km/h. On Monday night, when I came back at about 11 o'clock on the 90 km/h stretch—it was a wet and windy night, and it was a pretty dangerous drive—I sat on 90 km/h and was passed by just about everybody on the road. People do not want to be told to slow down when there is no need to, and there are sections of that road where there is no necessity to go back to 90 km/h even currently, but we will see in due course what comes out of it.

There is some good news in my electorate from private investors. Oceanic Victor arrived in Victor Harbor yesterday. That is going to be great for the local area and will bring in more visitors, both local and international, and it will be an attraction in its own right. It will create jobs, and I am sure that it will also boost business.

There are some forgotten areas, namely, Second Valley, Rapid Bay, Cape Jervis and Delamere. All those little towns and villages would not know what the government was. A visit once every decade or so really does not give them a lot of confidence in the Labor government; in fact, it gives them a certain ironic cynicism that is well grounded and well thought about. You are not going to turn that around overnight. In my view, this was a Harvey Norman budget: it all looks wonderful, but who can afford it? It was a Harvey Norman budget.

In the short time remaining, I would like to raise some issues in relation to the Kangaroo Island part of my electorate, which once again the member for Mawson has been visiting regularly. I will not make any comment on some of the remarks that have been made by my island constituents in relation to the visits by the member for Mawson, such as taxi rides to the football, frequent overseas trips and a host of other things that I am sure will come out over a period of time.

The airport project on Kangaroo Island is continuing and the terminal is proceeding. There is a fair bit of spin to do with the announcement of the Qantas arrival. I went to a Qantas briefing last week that I thought was particularly dismal. I was disappointed and expected a lot more, actually. The Qantas representative only spoke briefly, and then the South Australian Tourism Commission covered the rest of it. They are getting it all wrong, even their announcements.

In the current issue of *Australian Aviation* (and I have not got to the bottom of this) is an item written by a journalist. I presume that he got his information from the Tourism Commission, but I cannot clarify that. This magazine goes all over Australia, and it refers to Kangaroo Island as the third largest island; correct. It states that it covers 4,400 hectares. Well, hello—it actually covers 4,400 square kilometres. This is in a national magazine that is trying to promote the island. Someone has got it seriously wrong. It goes on to say that 'sealed roads ring the island'. Well, hello—the north coast road is not sealed and they indeed do not ring the island. It is arrant nonsense.

We are going to have to track this down and find out where that information came from. If it came from the state government, they stand to be ashamed of themselves, quite frankly, but I am not sure that it does. This is where everything goes wrong: we have this spin campaign directed towards the island and all these wonderful things that are happening without getting things right. They simply do not have the infrastructure right.

They go on about the golf course, but the fact of the matter is that there is not the water available for the golf course. Indeed, if you investigate SA Water and talk with their people, there is no actual plan to put in the water for the golf course, and if indeed it was to happen it needs to be put in by the developer. My view is that this golf course, if it ever happens, is years and years away. Secondly, the government has not advanced the issue of power infrastructure from Parndana west. The SWER line system is 40 to 50 years old, and is deteriorating rapidly. There is simply not the power out that way. You have to upgrade the powerlines to advance the island's cause.

In relation to the road system, the Minister for Transport made an announcement on \$8 million for KI roads over the next four years. That is actually just a continuation of the \$2 million a year that has been spent over the last few short years. The problem is that they are B-class and C-class roads instead of A-class roads. They would be far better off building sealed roads with the \$2 million a year and building them properly. The first two years of roads are packing up rapidly, which is leading to a deterioration in those roads, which are main tourist roads, like the north coast road. Bitumen roads are what is needed, and infrastructure is what is needed—not more spin. I conclude my remarks.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (12:40): It gives me great pleasure to rise and speak about this most recent state budget. It is a good budget and a good Labor budget. It delivers surpluses, it doubles down on our infrastructure spend, it funds key projects across South Australia and it delivers—as good Labor budgets do—record tax cuts for South Australia.

With the payroll tax cuts that we have delivered over successive years, with the WorkCover reforms and the reduction in WorkCover levies that we have delivered over successive years, with the cuts to stamp duty that we have delivered over successive years, with the cuts to land tax that we have delivered over successive years, South Australian businesses and households are saving more than three-quarters of a billion dollars in tax every single year thanks to Labor budgets. That is an extraordinary result.

Of course, at its heart this budget also has job creation. It is about promoting and providing for jobs at this time when the state's economy needs that additional support, not just through tax cuts, not just through infrastructure projects, but also by providing further cuts to payroll tax, particularly for small business, for the Job Accelerator Grants extended for apprentices and trainees, as well as for the existing Job Accelerator Grants for full-time and part-time employees, as well as very significant loan and grant facilities for businesses looking to grow their operations, to grow jobs and to grow their contribution towards the growing South Australian economy.

We have to raise revenue for that. One of the ways in which we can do that is by raising a levy on one part of Australian industry that can most easily afford it, and that is the major banks. To make sure that we can fund these tax cuts, these job grants, these grants and these loans for small South Australian businesses, it is not unreasonable to ask the most undertaxed sector of the Australian industry, the major banks, to make their fair share available. What we are asking for is one-third of 1 per cent of their profits, not of their turnover, not of their EBITDA, not of their earnings before interest, tax depreciation and amortisation, but of their profits, of the money that they have made after all those costs.

After announcing this measure, in response what we have seen is the most scurrilous and misleading campaign by these banks and by the Liberal opposition that I think I have ever seen in all of my time either as a member of parliament or someone working in and around parliament. I have to say, though, that it is not so much a reflection on the banks. I think Australians, unfortunately, have grown used to their anti-competitive, cartel-like, rapacious behaviour, designed to extract as much cash as possible from Australian households and Australian businesses, but it is more a reflection on the Liberals and their leader, the member for Dunstan.

They are seeking to block this budget for purely political purposes. They cannot establish a viable alternative to this government except by opposing every single thing that we do. There is no policy agenda, there is no vision for our state, no economic strategy and no social mandate that they are seeking. Instead, they hope, once again, at this coming election—like they hoped at the 2014 election and the 2010 election before that and the 2006 election before that and the 2002 election before that—to be successful merely by opposing whatever Labor says we will do for our state, just like the leader opposed those payroll tax cuts for small business, just like when the leader opposed those stamp duty cuts and just like the leader opposed those infrastructure projects put forward by the government promising to cancel upgrades of the north-south corridor.

In this campaign, this unscrupulous campaign of deception, who has the leader found a friend in? The Australian banking community. The Australian Bankers' Association immediately pricked up its ears and thought, 'Here's one of ours. Here's someone who we can bring under our wing, who we

can foster and support. This is the sort of person who knows exactly what we're about and supports exactly what we would do.' The leader has found a friend in one of the most unscrupulous, unreconstructed, rent-seeking industries there is in Australia—big banking.

Big banking has greeted this campaign with a campaign of lies, of unsubstantiated claims and spin. The banks know they can absorb this levy and that it does not need to be passed on to consumers. We know this because the head of the ANZ admitted as much publicly. Whoops, what a slip-up! He gave rise to the lie that we all know, and that is that the banks can not only afford to pay this but that they should be paying this levy.

I have to say that the head of the ANZ must be pretty good. He came over to here to meet with the leader after the leader had said as soon as this budget was released that he would be likely to support the budget and the bank levy therein, because it would be unprecedented to do otherwise, and that the leader would not block the budget or the levy. In only 30 minutes of meeting with the Leader of the Opposition the head of the ANZ turned the leader around.

What was said in that meeting? What must have been so compelling that was put to the leader in that meeting? We can only speculate. Perhaps the head of the ANZ started with the outrageous, false claims that he and his banking mates have been spreading throughout the media: that this bank levy would cost jobs and investment in South Australia—claims that, despite being made after two weeks, still remain unsubstantiated. Perhaps he started by saying that this would cost jobs—another outrageous and unsubstantiated claim. It will cost jobs, will it? How many? In what areas? In what time frame?

Of course, there has been no form or substance given to these claims because they completely lack substance. They are without merit. By how many jobs would it impact the economy? By how many jobs would it impact the economy in comparison to the payroll tax cuts, the Job Accelerator Grants, the grant facilities and the loan facilities that this government is making available to the business sector to grow their businesses and to grow jobs? What are the figures? What is the justification? We have none.

Simply put, these claims by the banks are lies: lies by an industry that is increasingly becoming known as untrustworthy and unscrupulous. Perhaps in the meeting with the leader the head of the ANZ said that he and the Australian Bankers' Association would be engaging in an unprecedented campaign against this government, and that the leader should get on board or else be in the firing line as well. Perhaps he went even further and speculated about what sort of assistance this campaign by the banks and by the Australian Bankers' Association would be providing to the Liberal Party by running such a campaign in the lead-up to the next election. Perhaps there was even more direct assistance offered to the Leader of the Opposition. Who can say? None of us can say because that is a question that has never been—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order: the minister is currently contravening standing order 127, which states, 'A Member may not...impute improper motives to any other Member.'

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): I do not believe the minister was doing that. The member was speculating in a vacuum, I think, but I will listen with interest.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. I hope it touched a nerve, indeed, with the opposition, as well it should, as it is touching a nerve with the community of South Australia. Who knows the answers to these questions? They still refuse to be answered by the Leader of the Opposition. What we do know—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order: the minister is imputing improper motive. The word 'imputing' is very clear from what the member has suggested the Leader of the Opposition apparently needs to answer, in the minister's words.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I do not accept that.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): He is not imputing any improper motives: he is simply stating a fact, that we do not know the answers to the questions that the minister is posing.

Mr GARDNER: By suggesting questions, one imputes that they need to be answered.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: That is tenuous at best.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): Yes. I do not think there is—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): Order! I will listen to the minister. I do not accept that there is a point of order at the moment, but I will listen with great interest.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. What we know in the absence of these answers is that, as the Premier said yesterday in parliament, the banks have one new branch in South Australia and it is the South Australian branch of the Liberal Party. Their blind obsequiousness, their supplication to the banks, is galling. They feted the arrival of the Australian Bankers' Association and the heads of the various banks like they were Pompey Magnus returning to Rome. This shows how bereft of spine, how willing to sell out South Australians, the Liberal Party is.

In direct contrast to the growing jobs spin that we have heard from the banking sector, what we actually know is that in the last 18 months there has been an ongoing campaign by the big four banks to close down branches in South Australia. I have to say that I was unsurprised by this—after all, the banks have long been showing the way to other Australian corporates, how to offshore Australian jobs to cheaper labour countries—but I have to say that I was surprised to learn of the location of these closed branches.

What a rollcall of shame this is: Baramba, Booleroo Centre, Burra, Orroroo, Eudunda, Balaklava, Crystal Brook, Gladstone, Riverton, Streaky Bay, Cleve, Mount Compass, Mount Pleasant, Lameroo, Meningie, Penola, Robe, Tintinara, Wallaroo, Yorketown, Willunga, Freeling, Lobethal, Hahndorf, Cummins, Tumby Bay, Cowell, Moonta, Port Broughton, Ardrossan, Birdwood, Woodside, Booborowie, Kapunda, Peterborough, Laura, Bute, Snowtown, Penneshaw, Lucindale and Port MacDonnell. Nearly four dozen branches closed across regional South Australia in 18 months.

This is the audience, this is the welcome, that the South Australian Liberal Party gives this sector that shuts down branches and jobs in their own electorates. There were nine branches in the electorate of Stuart alone.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: There were five branches in MacKillop—

Mr Pederick: How many in Frome?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —six in Flinders, five in Goyder, three in Hammond and, if you want to know how many in Frome, three as well. The difference between the member for Frome and those who sit opposite is the member for Frome's lack of obsequiousness and supplication to these vested corporate interests.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Don't they squirm when the facts of the matter are pointed out to them?

Mr Pederick: You killed this state in 1991.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): I know the member for Hammond thinks he is whispering, but we can all hear him.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: After these closures in the last 18 months, these Liberal MPs, these people who pretend to represent the interests of their country communities, have their party room decide the fate of this bank levy and they lock in behind the banks. This Liberal Party has decided to back the sector that strips jobs from regional communities, that makes it hard for elderly residents in these communities to transact their banking affairs in their townships, that makes it cumbersome if not impossible for new small businesses and entrepreneurs to go and speak to a bank staff member or a bank manager about financing a new business measure in these townships.

They backed the corporate vested interests that are decimating our regional towns and did over the state budget, a budget that cuts taxes, a budget that funds small business, a budget that builds infrastructure, a budget that grows jobs and grows our economy. It is a budget that provides for all of this yet only asks one sector of the Australian industry that does not pay GST, that is undertaxed, to pay its fair share towards these endeavours but, according to the opposition, this should not happen.

The leader came in here yesterday thumping his chest and boasting about how he is sticking up for banks, how he is blocking this revenue measure, how he is blocking this budget. They had the head of the Australian Bankers' Association watching by, conveniently placed both for the Liberal Party and for them. He did not sit downstairs, where he looked too close to the Liberal Party—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order: Speaker Atkinson has repeatedly ruled that it is out of order to make reference to anyone sitting in the gallery during any debate to provide ballast to any argument in this chamber.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): There is no-one sitting in the gallery that the minister is referencing.

Mr GARDNER: Sir, reference to people in the gallery at any stage of the debate is out of order, according to Speaker Atkinson's repeated rulings.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): Stop the clock. I am advised that the ruling was in relation to people who are currently present in the gallery. However, I would ask the minister to return to the substance of his debate and refrain from referring to anyone in the gallery to avoid quarrels.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: And did we not witness yesterday how proudly the Leader of the Opposition said that he would, in an unprecedented way, block this measure and block this budget? This state will rue the decimation of that convention forevermore. Is it really unexpected that we would see this from the Liberals? Of course, they are all about the Americanisation of Australian institutions. We know this. We see this time and time again with Liberal administrations. Whether it is their current shadow treasurer—the guy who privatised our hospitals, who privatised our electricity network—this is the sort of thing that we can expect from them, that every single state budget in the future that a Liberal administration brings down becomes contestable. Well, we are absolutely happy for that to occur should they ever jump over the bar they never seem to be able to and form government.

Mr Pederick: Bring it on!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: 'Bring it on.' Yes, we have heard that in 2001, in 2005, in 2009 and in 2013, and now we are hearing it again in 2017. The other thing that is so galling about those opposite is their reflection on the treatment that this state gets from Canberra, and the language they use to describe it is just unbelievable. Rather than reflect on Australian taxpayers having revenues collected by an Australian government and disbursed to the states and territories, all of them bar none say, 'Oh, Canberra gives to us. Canberra gives to South Australia'. This is the problem with those opposite: they do not understand that the role of the federal government is to collect these revenues and disburse them to the states.

These are not Canberra's revenues, these are not Malcolm Turnbull's revenues, these are not Scott Morrison's revenues. This is not asking a parent for a \$20 note so that you can go to the films with your mates. This is money raised through income tax, through GST and through other revenue sources from the people of South Australia, from the people of Australia, that should be spent across the country and should be spent in South Australia.

The mindless excuse-giving by this Liberal opposition for the failures of Canberra is absolutely galling, but we see it time and time again, the refusal to stick up for car manufacturing here in South Australia when Joe Hockey chased them offshore daring them to leave, the excuses they made for cutting funding to our hospitals, the excuses they made for cutting funding to our schools and the excuses they made when the off-shoring of the submarine build looked imminent. We had the member for MacKillop and the member for Davenport saying, 'Well, Mazdas are alright. Japanese submarines can't be too bad'. They were willing to sell out thousands and thousands of

South Australians jobs just to meet a political imperative of their masters in Canberra. Really, that is what it comes down to.

The reason why they do not have a vision for South Australia is that their federal mates do not have a vision for South Australia. It is a void. It is a vacuum. They have nothing to consider or contemplate for the people of South Australia. The Leader of the Opposition does not know what to suggest because Malcolm and ScoMo and Christopher have not told him what to suggest because they do not care what happens to South Australia.

It is only when we stand up for the people of South Australia, it is only when we drag them kicking and screaming to fund our submarines, to finally get in behind Arrium in Whyalla, to restore some funding to our schools, to try to restore some funding to our hospitals, to try to get in behind those pensioners who had their concessions cut in the 2014 federal budget, it is only when we wrestle them to the ground and force them to do it that they actually do something for South Australia.

My suggestion to the Liberal opposition is this: park your fawning supplication to your federal masters for one minute.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order: do we have a break at 1 o'clock, according to the standing orders?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): Stop the clock. Yes, I have been advised by the Clerk that we have 40 seconds left of the minister's dulcet tones.

Mr GARDNER: It is 12.59 and 20 seconds, is it, sir? We have not moved any amendment to those orders? The clock over there says it is 1.02.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): I am ruling that the minister has 40 seconds to go.

Mr GARDNER: I look forward to that ruling being applied elsewhere, sir; thank you.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. In conclusion, my advice to those opposite is to stop their fawning supplication to their federal masters and think about what might be best for the communities of South Australia, what might be best for small businesses, what might be best for households, what might be best for pensioners, and what might be best for our hospitals and our schools rather than what is in their best political interests.

Sitting suspended from 13.02 to 13:58.

Petitions

ROAD SAFETY

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): Presented a petition signed by 268 residents of Victor Harbor and surrounding districts requesting the house to urge the government to review the Mount Compass to Victor Harbor Road, implement measures to improve the safety of users and address the high vehicle accident rate of this main tourist and residential route.

Ministerial Statement

ARRIUM

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:01): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I would like to inform the house of the successful sale of the Arrium Group to Liberty House. Deed administrator, KordaMentha, this morning informed the South Australian government that Gupta Family Group Alliance has acquired Arrium as a whole, including the steelworks at Whyalla and the associated mines and infrastructure. This is undeniably welcome news for the workers and management at Whyalla and the people of Upper Spencer Gulf.

Today's news will no doubt take a huge burden off the shoulders of the people of Whyalla, who have demonstrated great patience and strength as the sale process took its course. GFG Alliance, led by Executive Chairman Sanjeev Gupta, submitted a modified offer last night after the exclusivity period granted to the South Korean consortium, Newlake, expired on Friday with no deal reached.

The unconditional offer was accepted by the administrators and the process will now proceed to a recommendation to the Committee of Creditors and remain subject to Foreign Investment Review Board approval. This competitive process demonstrates the strong international interest to invest in Whyalla and South Australia, and I want to acknowledge the faith the Gupta family and the team from Liberty House and SIMEC have shown in Arrium and Whyalla.

The Premier and I spoke with Mr Gupta this morning and offered our congratulations on behalf of South Australia. Mr Gupta reaffirmed his strong commitment to the long-term future of the Whyalla operations. The GFG Alliance has shown around the world, and in the United Kingdom in particular, that they are great supporters and believers in the future of the steel industry and its workers. They will be a welcome addition to the South Australian business community.

After 15 months in administration, I am confident that the Arrium Group of Companies can now successfully transition into new ownership with a long-term plan for the steelworks at Whyalla and the associated mines and infrastructure. I also want to acknowledge the member for Giles and the local council, led by Mayor Lyn Breuer, for their continued support throughout this process.

I look forward to further updating the house with more information as we continue the work required to secure the jobs and future of Whyalla and lock in the benefits of the new ownership for South Australia and the nation. It is critical to the sovereignty of this nation that we continue to produce our own steel, and I hope all members of the house will join me in applauding this latest good news for this regional community.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I draw the attention of honourable members to the presence in the gallery of Tim Fisher, former member for the federal division of Farrar, former deputy prime minister, former ambassador to the Holy See and current train buff. Also present in the gallery is Neil Andrew, the former member for the federal division of Wakefield and Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:05): I bring up the 48th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:05): I move:

That standing and sessional orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable me move a motion on the state budget without notice forthwith.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the house and, as there is an absolute majority present, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

An honourable member: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: I put the motion.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:06): I move:

That the time allotted for debate be an hour in lieu of question time.

Motion carried.

Motions

STATE BUDGET

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:06): I move:

That this house commends new initiatives announced in the state budget to create jobs and—

1. Supports the creation of a Future Jobs Fund accelerating jobs growth in the shipbuilding and defence, renewable energy and mining, tourism, food and wine, health and medical research and IT and advanced manufacturing sectors; and
2. Supports the revenue measures contained in the budget that will fund these job creation initiatives.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before the Premier commences, I welcome to parliament year 11s from Cummins Area School, who are guests of the member for Flinders.

Motions

STATE BUDGET

Debate resumed.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:06): The circumstances that South Australia is faced with at the moment demand strong leadership, leadership that takes charge of our own future, not meekly accepting the international and market forces that are washing over our state but, rather, strong leadership that maps out a future direction for our state's economy. This is no less than our families, our children and our communities are asking of us. This is the question on everybody's lips.

The old certainties of life are changing and people want to know what the future looks like for themselves and their families. Fundamentally, they want to know which jobs they are going to be able to get. They want to know which businesses they should be investing in. They want to know what skills their children should be acquiring to permit themselves to participate in this future. I can remember a time seeing some statistics where in western Adelaide one in five people was employed in the car manufacturing sector. My uncle was employed in the car manufacturing sector—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —and my mother was employed in the car components sector. This was a story that many South Australians could say about their connection with this industry. It was not just western Adelaide; it cascaded through the whole of the South Australian economy. Much has changed, of course, in the period since the 1950s when those statistics were true and the diversification of the South Australian economy has been well underway.

The internationalisation of the South Australian economy, and indeed the national economy, beginning in 1975 with the unwinding of tariffs, accelerating very suddenly in the mid-eighties through the internationalisation of the South Australian and Australian economies with the great opening up reforms of the Hawke-Keating governments, have accelerated and made changes to the old Playford model. The old verities are gone. The idea of cheap land, cheap power and cheap labour, all behind large tariff walls that protected local indigenous industries, are gone. They are washed away and they are gone forever.

The question becomes: do we stand up as a community and as a government and take charge of our own future, or do we just leave ourselves to the market? This was the choice confronting this government and we decided to seize control of our own future. That is why we stepped up and have put in place a budget which has at its heart jobs for the future of our South Australian community. We have mapped out a plan which has been carefully crafted by a cabinet

that has the public policy intelligence to craft those policies and by a party that believes it is the role of government to step up and invest and create jobs in partnership with the private sector.

Strong leadership, competent government and a party that understands its values, these are the centrepieces of what we are putting forward to the South Australian community, and the budget sits at the heart of that strategy. The budget lays down a future fund—\$200 million to invest in these fast-growing sectors of the South Australian economy: shipbuilding and defence; renewable energy and mining; tourism, food and wine; health and medical research; and the advanced manufacturing and IT sectors.

What we have established are some magnificent icons which we have invested in as a government in each of those sectors. The first, Techport down at Port Adelaide: the only reason that exists is because a Labor government put it there. The Tonsley precinct: reimagining an IT and an advanced manufacturing future from the ashes of a car industry, an industry rising up from those ashes and an investment to create jobs and opportunities in the car manufacturing industry.

And then one of the most magnificent expressions of values that this Labor government could ever project to the nation and the world—our biomedical precinct. When you come to this state and you see that magnificent building, you see that magnificent South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute building, an icon of health and medical research—

Mr Duluk interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —it projects to the nation and to the world the values of this community. Health and wellbeing count. These are things that are important to us, and we understand the jobs and opportunities that swing from those things.

We also continue to invest in the infrastructure which is necessary to grow some of our old traditional industries that have a new and important future in this international marketplace—our food industry; our wine industry; our tourism sector, which is so inextricably linked with the identity of our beautiful state; our investments in the northern irrigation zone area to open up the literally thousands of hectares of new irrigated land to allow us to grow our food sector to sell our premium product grown in clean water, clean air and in a beautiful clean environment; and premium products exported to the world and a food park which will allow our manufacturing industry to move into those businesses to actually create opportunities and expand, being landlocked in the suburbs as they are at the moment.

Finally, we see the magnificent investment in Our Energy Plan, taking one of the most perplexing issues that is facing our planet and in a clear-sighted way anticipating a carbon-constrained future and realising that the opportunities that exist to first movers who actually are able to unlock the future for renewable energy. Renewable energy is the future for our energy production. While those opposite sit there and cheer those who hand around lumps of coal in the federal parliament, we have clearly seen the future and are investing in a renewable energy future. Mark my words: we will be celebrating South Australia as not only having the cleanest energy and the most reliable form of energy but also the cheapest energy in the nation off the back of our investments in renewable energy. Watch this space, ladies and gentlemen.

These investments that we have made in the state budget have been needed to be funded through sensible measures to raise revenue because we believe that it is appropriate to be delivering sound financial management, so we have presented a series of revenue measures in the budget, the central of which are being opposed by those opposite. But I do not hear them complaining about any of our expenditure initiatives. They do not complain about our expenditure initiatives; they just complain about one of our revenue initiatives imposed on the big banks.

There is an absurdity about this proposition, 'Yes, we are happy to take your expenditure but, when it comes to revenue, we have been worked over by the big banks and we have decided to take that off.' What that effectively means, because they are happy with our expenditure but have deprived us of our revenue, is that that shortfall will now be borne by the people of South Australia. There is no way of actually adding this up that does not lead to that ultimate conclusion. This money does not disappear—

Ms Sanderson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: If the member for Adelaide interjects again, she will be named.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This money does not disappear from the budget and those opposite are not seeking to deprive us of the capacity to spend it. They just want to complain about our capacity to meet the revenues necessary to cover it. So what they are expecting is that that should fall on every single South Australian. The deficit that is real, through their conduct, falls on every single South Australian. There is a choice between the big banks or ordinary South Australians, and they chose the big banks.

What do we get out of these public investments, the investment in the food park and also the irrigation precinct in the north of our state? This is an incredibly important investment: \$7 million to the Food Business Attraction Fund is now available to help businesses looking to relocate into this precinct, a bureau service allowing them to share services together. Many of them are in our suburbs, often in the north and north-eastern suburbs, beautiful food manufacturing businesses that have grown over time, but because they are in suburban areas they are now landlocked. They are having trouble with food waste, they are having trouble getting their trucks into the back suburban streets; they need to expand but they do not have the capacity to do that.

That is why we have created the food park. Applications opened on 4 July, just yesterday, and there are currently four well-known and reputable South Australian companies that are already in negotiations with us to move into the food park. This is what South Australians want to do. They want to grow their businesses and we are prepared to work with them to achieve that.

With the investment in the South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, we are going to have the Southern Hemisphere's only proton therapy unit. There is a beautiful symmetry between the technology that the Bragg's, the father and son team created, which led to the creation of the X-ray and ultimately the proton therapy unit, discovered here in Adelaide for which they won a Nobel Prize, now returning to this state so that we can cure the diseases that exist not only in this state but in the nation and around the world. Here in South Australia—the intellectual capital and resources that gave us the proton therapy unit were born here in this state. We are going to use those skills and capacities, together with government investments, to create the jobs of the future.

This is a consistent pattern of this government, taking the intelligence, the skills, the capacities of our citizens, not going meekly into the night or allowing the invisible hand of competition to somehow rescue this state, or cuddling up to the banks and somehow hoping they might run to our rescue. No, we are taking charge of our own future. That is why we are investing in jobs in this budget, and that is why we are asking for a modest contribution from the five big banks to help us do it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Before the leader starts, I call to order the members for Finnis, Mount Gambier, Mitchell, Kavel, MacKillop, Hammond, Chaffey, Unley, Stuart, Newland, Morialta and the leader. I warn for the first time the members for Adelaide, Mount Gambier, Hammond, Stuart, Unley and MacKillop. I warn for the second and final time the members for Adelaide, Mount Gambier and Unley. Leader.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): I indicate that I would like to amend the motion. I move:

After 'That this house'—delete all words and replace with:

'has no confidence in the ability of this government to create jobs, noting:

1. This is Labor's third consecutive 'jobs budget';
2. South Australia has had the nation's highest trend unemployment for 30 consecutive months; and
3. Introducing a new state bank tax is not the way to turn around the state's jobs crisis.'

We have just had the Premier saying in this parliament that what we need to do here in South Australia is seize control of the problems that exist in South Australia and not let the private sector have anything whatsoever to do with these solutions, that government is the only solution.

I think this really makes very clear the difference between those opposite and those of us on this side of the house who believe in the people of this state, the capacity of the people of this state to get on and to help make this state reach its full potential. We on this side of the house believe that the way to do that is to get government out of the way, especially this government, the worst government in this state's history.

I make this point to the house. From time to time, genuine headwinds come before a government, genuine headwinds come before a state, but never before in the history of this state have we had so many headwinds and burdens inflicted upon a state by the government that is in office. That is what we have after 16 years of failed, divided and dysfunctional administration in this state.

Let me tell you what the government promised. They promised that we were going to have a jobs budget. We agreed this was a pretty good idea, and I will tell you why we thought it was a good idea—because we have had the highest trend unemployment rate in the nation not for one, two, three, four or five months in a row, not for 10 months in a row, not for 20 months in a row, but for 30 consecutive months. This is outrageous! This is what you get when you elect a Labor government here in South Australia.

So we were pleased when the government said, 'Let's have a genuine jobs budget.' Then, of course, we were disappointed when the budget was handed down because was it a jobs budget? No way—no way whatsoever. The centre point was \$200 million, yet when we look at the fine detail very little of it was new money. There were very few new initiatives. Apart from what they were offering to trainees and apprenticeships, most of it was just a continuation of the policy settings that they have had in place while they have been presiding over this jobs crisis that now faces the people of South Australia.

If you want to know why we think it was a very poor jobs budget, it is contained within the budget itself. In fact, Treasury tells us unequivocally that we have the lowest jobs forecast, the lowest jobs creation forecast in the nation. That is the outcome of their third successive jobs budget for South Australia: to be the worst in the country, half Victoria and well behind Tasmania. Of course, we read with very great interest on Monday this week, just a week after the budget was handed down, that the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies—an independent think group—said they do not even think that we will get to the position that the government themselves have put forward. So, there you go.

This is not a jobs budget, but I will tell you what it is: it is a tax budget—\$200 million worth of jobs initiatives, \$400 million worth of new taxes heaped upon the productive component of this economy, heaped upon the mums and dads of this state. Not one person is exempt from the Treasurer's cash grab. Every mum and dad who has a deposit in a bank, every mum and dad or family who have a mortgage on their family home, every kid who is putting money into their bank account at school every single week, trying to build up that nest egg, is going to be hit. The cost of servicing our state debt is going to blow out, but I will tell you the real problem.

For superannuants in South Australia, investment share prices have gone down, and their dividends are going to further deteriorate because this government has created a situation where there is greater risk here in South Australia. It is not a jobs budget, it is a tax budget, and let me tell you the reason why. If we look at the detail of this budget in Budget Paper 3, page 14—look it up while you have some time—it shows the projection of state-based taxation revenue, and what does it show? Does it show a picture of the state performing like the Premier has just encouraged us all to think—a growing vibrant economy? No it does not.

I will tell you what it shows. It shows that payroll tax receipts are forecast to go down. Stamp duty tax receipts are forecast to go down. Payroll tax, stamp duty and land tax are all forecast to go down. That is because our economy in South Australia has ground to a halt. There is a \$438 million write-down in land tax, stamp duty and payroll receipts in this budget compared to the budget that was handed down just 12 months ago.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland is warned.

Mr MARSHALL: Of course, a massive black hole has now been created. How did they decide to deal with this? It has been created because the private sector in South Australia has given up confidence in this government. They are no longer investing in South Australia. The only entity that has any money to spend in this state is the Labor government. In the private sector there has been a crisis of confidence. In fact, over the five years that this Premier has been in this place, since he knifed his predecessor, South Australia has averaged an economic growth rate of just 1.4 per cent—half the national growth, a fraction of the fast-growing states in Australia—and that is the problem. Our economy has slowed and our state-based taxation revenue forecast has gone through the floor.

When your economy slows and the consequence of that is that your state-based taxation revenue slows, what do you think the logical response would be? We would say that the logical response would be to provide some stimulus, provide something that is going to give the private sector and households some encouragement to go out and spend. We said, 'Let's put \$360 million back into the economy.' What did they do? They took \$370 million out of the economy, because they are addicted to taxes and they are addicted to spending. They think they are the only game in town and the simple fact of the matter is they have been in government for 16 years and we can all see the consequences of a bad government for this state.

This government has not only failed the people of South Australia in terms of the economy but they have also failed the people in terms of their energy policy, their taxation settings and the regulatory burden that they put on every single business and every single household in South Australia. They thought that this new tax grab, this \$370 million hit to the people of South Australia, was going to be enormously popular. They thought this was going to be a fantastic idea. They thought they would take a swing at the banks, but they missed and they hit the people that they, on that side of the house, are pretending to protect. They have hit the people of South Australia. The people of South Australia have woken up to the spin that has been coming from that side of the house for an extended period of time.

I think the people of South Australia are very smart; I think they are very savvy. I think that they can tell when they are being conned. The government would have you believe that there are no consequences whatsoever of having a go at the banks. But do you know what the people of South Australia have told us? They have told us that there is not one person in this state who really believes that the banks are going to pay the bank levy. They believe that the people of South Australia—mums, dads, kids, grandparents and superannuants—are going to pay. Those people who are looking for a loan for their business to expand their operation, those people who are looking to invest in South Australia are saying, 'There's too much risk and too much uncertainty in South Australia. We have a government that changes its mind, changes the policy settings and we are not going to be investing in South Australia.'

If the people of South Australia have worked out that this is a con, then it begs the question: who did the Treasurer and the Premier seek their economic advice from? This is a pretty interesting question. We asked the question yesterday in the house, 'Did you speak to any of the business leaders in South Australia?' In fact, the answer that was given was very disparaging. There was scoffing at successful people who have put their own capital on the line to create jobs because they think they are in the business class, the employer class. They treated them with disdain because they do not like people from a private sector.

Who did they speak to? Did they speak to their key economic advisers, the Economic Development Board? No. Did they speak to Rob Chapman at the Investment Attraction agency? No. Did they speak to any of the business advisory groups or business industry sector groups in South Australia? No.

Yesterday, I asked the Treasurer a question: did you speak to any one of the 145,000 small businesses in South Australia? Do you know what he said? Not one—because he says that he has an entitlement. Can you believe he used that word, sir? An entitlement to inflict this tax on anybody he likes, and he believes that we on this side of the house should just suck it up and pass their bad tax. Well, let me tell you that that is not going to happen.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: We are drawing a line in the sand—no more bad decisions from this hopeless, dysfunctional failure of a government. We have the opportunity to block this very bad measure, and that is exactly and precisely what we are going to do. Some people have made some comments about how we arrived at this position, but the important point for everybody to understand is that we have arrived at the right position.

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

Mr MARSHALL: We have arrived at the right position. We have arrived at a position that is in the best interests of every single South Australian, the best interests of those people who are wanting to get ahead in life, the best interests of those people who might want to grow their business, the best interests of the next generation and the best interests of those people who are wanting to invest in the future of South Australia.

I give this commitment: should we have the honour of being elected as the government of South Australia in March next year, we will not be playing tricky, political games with potential investors in this state. We will be providing certainty to those people who want to come to South Australia and who would like to invest in South Australia and who have already invested in South Australia. We are going to put the people of South Australia first. That is what the Labor Party in South Australia has failed to do over such an extended period of time.

I have opposed this tax since the moment it was first mentioned. It is a bad tax. It is going to hit the people of South Australia. All the people on this side of the house have been opposed to this new tax. Now that we have the opportunity, we will move to extract this bank levy in this house. We encourage any members of the government, any member of this house, to join with us. Let's knock it out here in this house. If we are unsuccessful, we will again move to take this tax out in the Legislative Council.

The people of South Australia cannot afford this additional, differential constraint on our economy. That is the key point. This is not a national bank levy; this is an additional, state-based item that is going to put us at a competitive disadvantage with every other state in Australia. Those opposite think that they are on a winner. Those opposite think that this is a great idea and that it is going to be very much loved by the people of South Australia. If that is the case, my challenge to each of them here today is, 'Put your money where your mouth is.' Here is the challenge: you declare it as a bill of special importance; it will give you the trigger for an election. Go to the people of South Australia. Do not inflict this on them, but go to the people of South Australia.

I will tell you what we do on this side: we trust the people of South Australia to make the right decision in the best interests of the people of South Australia. That sets up a very, very clear opportunity for people at the next election. You can have another four years of failed, divided, dysfunctional government that want to basically tell you they have the answer to every solution, that cannot keep the lights on, that have highest taxes and increasing taxes—you are not even going to know about the new taxes you are going to get until they are sprung on you—or hit the reset button and have a refreshed line-up, a Liberal reformist government that is once and for all going to put the people of South Australia first in this chamber.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The members for Davenport and Mitchell are warned a first time. Apart from regrettable interjections by the member for Newland, the Leader of the Opposition was heard in silence. I trust the opposition will present the same courtesy to the Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:34): Thank you, sir. The Leader of the Opposition says, 'Bring us your investment. You're welcome here, unless of course you're in the oil and gas industry, then you're not welcome here. But, of course, unless you're in the nuclear industry, please don't come here.' Of course, if you are attempting in any way to honour a tradition that has been in place in this state since 1857, this opposition under this leader is wrecking a precedent that has held South Australia in good stead since we came here. Members opposite have to ask themselves—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —a very serious question. They have followed this leader to ban unconventional gas in the South-East despite overwhelmingly the oil and gas industry being a major employer in this state. They have followed him to end the debate on the nuclear royal commission. They have followed him time and time again on his jaunts that have moved the Liberal Party further and further away from who they really are. Now he asks them one more time, 'Do it one more time for the Gipper. Ruin a tradition that we have had in this state since 1857.'

Mr Wingard interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: 'Follow me over the edge,' he says. What do they all do? 'Yes, sir.'

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: Lemmings.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Lemmings—just follow him. Well, okay, this is the new paradigm now. The opposition says that from now on budgets are not sacrosanct. From now on, governments do not have a right to set a budget. Governments have no right to set their agenda. There will be an election whenever the upper house says that they do not like a measure. That is the new test the opposition are setting—fine. If they think that they are better at this than us, they are dreaming. They are dreaming because what they about to unleash, because of their loyalty to a failure, to a man who tells his constituents to vote Labor time and time again, and what they are saying is, 'Look, we're so desperate we'll say anything. We'll say and do anything to win.'

I was talking to my colleagues privately saying that if the Liberal Party actually believed that they were going to win the upcoming election they would have supported this measure and then said, 'We're taking it to the election and we're going to withdraw it after the election.' You would have suggested an amendment that it not take place until later. But, no, what have they done? Panic—and they are trashing convention with it. What they are actually voting against are payroll tax cuts to small business. What they are actually voting against are measures in the budget bill that help South Australians grow their economy; that is what they are voting against.

They think that they can govern from opposition. They think that they can carve things out, but there are consequences for wrecking governments' budgets. As the Premier has said, we have offered the parliament a budget that has revenue and expenditure. Our revenue exceeds our expenditure, the budget is in surplus and we can manage our debt. Rather than tax five banks, the opposition now say, 'No, we want South Australians to foot the bill,' because they have not once suggested a spending measure that we should stop.

In fact, they cry out that there should be more in the regions. They want more spending, yet, rather than support us on two taxes that no South Australians will pay—that no South Australians will pay—what do they do? They take the side of the big banks; one meeting with one bank and he is there. The Leader of the Opposition has said he has been consistent. He has had two positions on this: a variable and a standard rate position. He started off saying, 'I'm opposed to this. In fact, I was opposed to the Prime Minister's tax; I just didn't say anything to anyone. I am going to let it pass because it is a convention,' but then he has a meeting with a bank and then he meets with the banking association.

The question is: why is he here and why aren't they? Why are we speaking to the monkey and not the organ-grinder? Who is really running the opposition? How can you possibly say on budget day that you are going to support this measure because it is a convention that governments' budgets are passed and then later, after meeting with the banks, change your opinion? As we know with the banks, when they give you an investment they expect a return. What is the return they expect from the opposition? What is it that they get for their opposition, for breaking up a convention we have had in this state since 1857?

I thought you were Tories. I thought you were traditionalists. I thought you supported conventions, but not anymore. We shall see that you will reap what you sow. That reaping that members opposite are inflicting on the people of South Australia is appalling, absolutely appalling.

The Leader of the Opposition all of a sudden thinks that he is onto a winner. These are the facts about the South Australian economy that the Leader of the Opposition ignores. In 2014-15, on a per capita growth basis of state gross product, South Australia ranked where? If you believe the opposition, we were last. We were third. In 2015-16, if you believe the opposition, we came last. We were ranked third, and in 2016-17 where we were ranked? Second, but the opposition are constantly out there talking down South Australia. He says he wants this state to have the same average growth as that of the nation. That means we need to slow down because we have exceeded GDP growth. Our gross domestic product has grown faster than the national economy, but the Leader of the Opposition says, 'No, no, no.' He pretends that somehow we are behind the eight ball despite us growing.

He then says that the only investment in South Australia is from the government, yet when state final demand was released just recently to the March figures, the biggest increase in state final demand that gave us a second highest growth in the nation was from where? The private sector—4 per cent—yet members opposite continue to perpetrate this myth that there is an investment strike despite Liberty today buying Arrium.

Apparently, no-one will invest in South Australia other than the increase in state final demand, other than people purchasing Arrium, other than the oil and gas industry, other than BHP spending millions of dollars operating the mine and other than Carrapateena, but of course members opposite think that banks make these investments, not people. They think that these people, the banks, are the ones who are taking the risk, not the people who are borrowing the money. What are we asking for in return? One-third of 1 per cent of their super profits.

Mr Whetstone: Another tax.

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey will withdraw from the chamber under the sessional order for the next hour.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The NAB, \$6.4 billion in profit; Westpac, \$7.4 million—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: You will do it now or you will be named.

The honourable member for Chaffey having withdrawn the chamber:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —ANZ, \$5.7 billion; Commonwealth Bank, \$9.2 billion; Macquarie, \$2.2 billion. In terms of their total salaries, because apparently they cannot afford to pay us \$19 million to \$20 million each they would be paying us, in terms of total expenditure on executives and senior executives NAB spend \$35 million a year on salaries on senior executives by paying their chief executive over \$6 million a year. Westpac pay their chief executive \$6 million a year and pay \$41 million to their senior executives. ANZ pay their chief executive \$5 million a year and their senior executives \$44 million a year. CBA pay their chief executive over \$8 million a year and their senior executives over \$48 million a year.

Yet, when the commonwealth government introduced their levy, did the Prime Minister ruin the investability of this nation? Did he ruin foreign direct investment in Australia? Did he make Australia less competitive? No, he did not. Did they pass on the cost to a captive country that had nowhere else to go? No, they did not. Why? Because the commonwealth passed legislation to protect them, the same legislation we are passing, yet one meeting with one bank and he folds—one meeting with one bank and he folds.

He is taking the Liberal Party away from its base. He looks down at you and he does not recognise you. Playford looks down at all of you and says that you are not the party that he created in this state. You are opposed to investment in gas, you are opposed to bringing in new industries and now you want South Australians to pay more taxes because you are opposed to a bank levy on the most profitable undertaxed part of the Australian economy. You are all a disgrace.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:43): I rise to support the amended Liberal Party motion in the debate we are having today. This is extraordinary, what we have just heard from the Treasurer. It is extraordinary that somehow this Treasurer has not even remembered his first economics lesson in year 10 at high school—the idea that there is no such thing as a free lunch.

The Treasurer just stood up and said that no South Australian will pay this tax. Well, I do not know where the money is going to come from, but it is either going to come from consumers, it is going to come from business, or it is going to come from the 150,000 people in South Australia who have bank shares or everybody's superannuation. The Treasurer can decide potentially which one of those groups gets to pay, but someone always has to pay.

This government has a history of trying to hoodwink South Australians. It has a history of this behaviour. They stand up here and they are in complete denial of basic truths. They are in complete denial of why our electricity prices have skyrocketed and complete denial of their own complicity in not being able to keep people safe, whether that be at Oakden, whether that be people in our child protection system, or whether that be every South Australian.

Now they stand up and deny basic maths. They deny physics. They deny basic year 10 economics. They stand up here and think that somehow the people of South Australia are just going to swallow it. Well, they do not. In fact, the most exciting figure that I saw in the mass of polling that was done over the weekend was the fact that 77 per cent of people understand that they are going to be paying this tax.

The 30 members (or thereabouts) opposite may not understand it, but the South Australian people get it. The South Australian people are smarter than this government. They woke up long ago to the spin, the empty rhetoric, the diversionary tactics, and the complete and outright mistruths. In the same vein, this government stood up on budget day and said—and the Treasurer just said it again—that South Australians will not pay this tax. They thought they could stand up here and be really smart and tricky, and I agree with the Treasurer that they are better when it comes to craven cynical politics than we are.

We will vacate the field when it comes to craven cynical politics, because he thought he was so smart that he could stand up and create this wedge that somehow the South Australian people were with them. We Liberals have always been for lower tax. Tom Playford who is looking down upon us today was for lower tax, and so are we. We have been consistent since the day this party was formed and they thought they could create this wedge, but guess what? They thought that the South Australian people were mugs. They took South Australians for fools and South Australians have resoundingly said, 'We are smarter than our government and we know that we are going to end up paying this tax.'

South Australians are too smart to buy the spin from the Premier. He has got up and talked about the heavy dead hand of government as it glides over everything that it surveys in South Australia. Let's look at the facts. Let's look at basic mathematics. What has this delivered us? It has delivered 7.1 per cent unemployment, the highest in the nation. What it has delivered us is six out of eight in economic growth.

The Treasurer wants to talk about state final demand. He certainly does not want to talk about the economic growth figures at 1.9 per cent. Somehow that inconvenient fact gets washed away, that only Tasmania and Western Australia were worse off than us in 2015-16. But it is okay, he just chooses to selectively quote the figures that prove his argument. Last year, 6,500 South Australians voted with their feet to leave South Australia because of this government, another inconvenient fact that the Treasurer and the Premier do not want to hear about.

Unlike this economically illiterate government that needs to go back to high school, we on this side of the house and the South Australian people are one. We understand that increased taxes hurt our economy. We understand that increased taxation hurts households. Most importantly, we understand that increased taxes hurt jobs growth. We have the extraordinary situation where somehow the Treasurer was talking today about the fact that nobody is going to pay this bank levy, but in the same breath yesterday was advocating for a GST on financial services.

Who pays for the GST, Treasurer? Who pays the GST? Every single South Australian would pay under that measure. Every single business, every single sole trader, anybody who ever had an idea in their head that they would dare to employ a South Australian would pay, and they will pay under this tax.

The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:

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

Mr KNOLL: This is a government that did not see a problem that a tax could not fix—the car park tax, the state-based carbon tax, the rubble royalties tax or the massive increase to the emergency services levy. Tax is always their answer. If you have a problem, let's tax it. The thing is that South Australian people have had enough.

Yesterday, in question time, the Treasurer used the word 'entitled' seven times in relation to increased taxes. Here is a man who thinks that it is his birthright to keep his hand in the pocket of every single South Australian. I reckon I have about \$4.50 in my pocket and I wonder how much he is going to come after. I think that every single South Australian should be worried about any loose change they have in their pocket because the Treasurer is coming after it.

We on this side of the house are at one with the South Australian people and we have an opposition leader who actually understands economics. We have an opposition leader who understands how to create jobs. We have an opposition leader who has put out more policy to this stage of the electoral cycle than any other leader, any other generation. We have been prepared to put our ideas out there before they become law and actually have them debated. We have put out there that we are going to reverse the government's disastrous decision on the emergency services levy and take it to an election.

We have put out there that we are going to cap council rates in South Australia and take that idea to an election. We have put out the idea that we are going to deregulate shop trading hours so that people can actually shop when they want to shop and compete with online businesses, and we are going to take that policy to the election. We are going to take Globe Link, an idea about actually helping our exporters to improve their export capability, to an election. There are also new trade offices and major events funding. We have put so much policy out there that we are willing to debate at any point in time, anywhere.

We have a Liberal leader who has been prepared to put ideas out there for discussion and for consultation, two things that were missing from the bank tax announcement—consultation or discussion.

Ms Sanderson: Announce and defend.

Mr KNOLL: Announce and defend is alive and well, and the worst excesses of premier Rann have come back and the Premier of this state, who pretended he was a clean and new brush, is simply an old feather duster trying to paint himself as someone in new clothing. What we need in South Australia is somebody who is prepared to put an idea on the table, debate it, discuss it and help the South Australian people to be brought with it when it comes to doing it.

That means we are going to have a stable, methodical, potentially sometimes boring government, but what business wants is a boring, stable government. Business wants somebody who understands that lower taxation is actually the way to create jobs and that we are actually going to be the adults at the table, as opposed to the craven, cynical spin masters opposite who simply come into this place trying to dream up some new trick or some new wedge to somehow again screw with the people of South Australia in trying to win an election.

With all these policies that I have talked about, what is the one factor that they all have in common? They are all designed to create jobs in South Australia. This is what a jobs budget looks like. This is what a jobs plan looks like. I will be very proud in March 2018, next year, when we can put this plan into action. This is what real leadership looks like. This is what real character looks like. Mugging South Australians is not leadership; it is lazy. It is lazy policy. This government are going to get exactly what they deserve when the people of South Australia get their final chance to have their say on this government.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

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

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) (14:52): Hasn't it been wonderful listening to the auditions from those opposite—one who wants to

be Premier and one who wants to be leader? The rhetoric, the lack of substance, the lack of knowledge about economic matters, the lack of detail in their arguments, the lack of economic savvy and the apparent lack of understanding about how business works nationally and at the state level are simply breathtaking.

As to this Liberal world of no taxes, where we are not going to pay any taxes and they are going to go up to the machine and pull the lever and jobs, like popcorn, are going to rush out of a gate and fill up a bucket, and it will only take six months, I am glad the member for Schubert talked about year 9 economics, because that is what we have just heard. Somebody must have told the leader in grade 8 or 9 that if you cut taxes, well, obviously jobs just flood at you.

It is not as easy as that. You know what? If you cut taxes, you have to find the money from somewhere. How do you do that? Do you add to state debt? Do you cut 20,000 public servants—she is not here—or perhaps 30,000 or 40,000? Let's just go to a milk-off and think something up, but the money has got to come from somewhere. This wonder world of no taxes, that is what we are being promised.

I do not think South Australians are stupid enough, though, not to ask the question, 'Where is the money going to come from?' That is before we even posit the question touched upon by the Treasurer about whether, if ever South Australians were brave enough to elect those opposite, they would ever be able to get a budget through the house. I think the precedent they have created might put that at risk.

A lot of what has been posited during the debate so far is simply false. It is made up. It is wok-in-a-box economics. We know that. The Treasurer's budget is moving money from big businesses making super profits—the four big banks that, compared with British and American banks, are two to 2½ times to three times more profitable. These are the most profitable banks in the world. They are undertaxed, according to all key economic commentators. They are making \$30 billion a year. They are paying themselves extraordinarily. They have admitted themselves that they can afford to pay this tax with ease. The Treasurer is giving that money to the little guys. He is giving it to small business. He is giving it to entrepreneurs. He is handing it to them in the form of payroll tax cuts and grants for R&D and to assist them to grow their businesses.

We have heard about how many people the banks employ. What about the 140,000 small businesses? What about the 250,000 to 300,000 people they employ? They need a bit of a hand up, because when those opposite and their colleagues in Canberra closed the automotive industry, they left South Australia in a tight spot. When they failed to stand up for all the industries mentioned by my parliamentary friend the Treasurer that they wanted to close down, they cancelled jobs.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart is on two warnings.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: What we are doing is stimulating those jobs by moving the money from those who can pay to those who cannot. I think those opposite might be surprised at how the people of South Australia receive that news. The claims that this is somehow going to cost South Australians a lot and be a disincentive to investment simply do not stack up. The financial commentators decry that point. Basic business savvy would tell those opposite that that is not the case. It is a claim that simply does not stack up. The banking association got torn to pieces on ABC TV this morning trying to defend that very point. They were unable to verify their claims.

It is not backed up by any evidence of a slowdown in inquiries at our Investment Attraction agency, let me tell you. In fact, we are at the centre of investment interest, and announcements just today underline that point. In 20 months, the agency has created 18 projects, nearly 6,000 jobs and \$1.1 billion worth of capital expenditure, delivering a benefit of \$4.7 billion. They are over here telling us that no-one wants to come and invest in South Australia. The only trouble is the facts do not support their arguments. When the facts change, you change your arguments.

Members opposite, there is hardly anyone over there who has ever been in government. There is hardly anyone over there who has run a significant business. Wake up. Find out what is really going on in the business community. You are wrong. Companies such as Boeing, PrimeQ,

Neon and Babcock are coming here. They want to invest, and the bank's argument that they will not come because the banks are paying an extra levy or an extra tax is simply false.

In relation to trade, I must say the opposition are particularly naive. The leader talks about our share of exports seeming to have declined a little bit. He seems to have missed something. There was this thing called the mining boom. It was in Western Australia and it was in Queensland. Do you know that Western Australia exports 42 per cent of Australia's total exports? They dig it up and they sell it. Good for them. Aren't they lucky? What does he think, that you pull the popcorn machine and out they will come, masses of jobs? He is going to come in there, pull the lever and within six months all our problems are gone. It is naive. It is silly. To present these arguments in the house is simply foolish. To block this measure and create the precedent they are creating is a mistake not only for this budget but for parliamentary democracy in the house.

On trade, we have \$15.2 billion worth of exports. We do not have the oil, gas, coal and minerals of Queensland, New South Wales and Western Australia, but we do pretty well. It has gone up extraordinarily—72,000 meals go on the table every night directly from exports. We are punching above our weight on services—11 per cent growth compared with 9 per cent annually. The number of small businesses exporting is heading towards 2,600 and is up 8.6 per cent. The national rate is only up 5.4 per cent, and that is before we get onto small business, the people who are generating \$34 billion are significantly more than the opposition's friends in the banks.

What is the budget doing? The Treasurer is using the money raised from the tax and the levy on the banks to deliver the lowest payroll taxes in the nation, Job Accelerator Grants, apprentice and trainee incentives, export assistance to small business, red-tape reductions and an Industry Advocate policy that has seen the amount of access to local contracts rise from 52 per cent to nearly 90 per cent for South Australian businesses.

We are deploying those funds to do good things for jobs and growth in this state. The wok-in-a-box economics opposite presumes that this will be passed on. I will tell you who is waiting in the wings for the big four banks to pass this on to those poor consumers. I will tell you who is waiting: Adelaide Bendigo Bank; the Beyond Bank, formerly Community CPS; the Members Equity Bank; Suncorp Bank; HSBC; Credit Union—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: There he is, jack-in-the-box, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley will leave the chamber for the next hour for that disgraceful outburst and if he says anything on the way out, he will be named.

The honourable member for Unley having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: And the People's Choice Credit Union—these other institutions that are not involved in this measure are waiting in the wings for that to be passed on. It is called competition. During the GFC, the big banks swallowed a lot of their competitors. There needs to be more competition and this measure will encourage it.

The threat of a collapse is simply wrong. Tony Pearson of the Australian Bankers' Association, who graced the chamber yesterday, tried to run the argument, as I said, on ABC TV. Virginia Trioli tore him to pieces this morning. Mark Bouris, the founder of Wizard Home Loans, Australia's second largest non-bank home lender, says, 'The banks have no reason to pass on the levy and, if they do, customers will simply shop around.' In late May, Bouris addressed that assumption that the federal levy—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —will be treated as a cost on banks and passed on to customers as fee increases or interest hikes. A raft of commentators are making it clear that the banks can absorb this tax and actually, in many respects, it is simply rebalancing the ledger. As the banks continue to tell us with their friends opposite that it is all doom and gloom, they run advertisements, no doubt generating thousands of dollars of revenue for the commercial media,

talking down the state, rubbishing our state, and sledging our state. Why? To save themselves some taxation revenue.

Well, I tell you that there are two certain things in life: death and taxes. Those who can pay are being asked to pay so that those who need a hand up at the moment can be assisted to do better. That is where the jobs are in small business. By the way, it is not BankSA; it is Bank New South Wales, a wholly owned subsidiary of Westpac, and it is worth remembering. I would say to South Australians that there are South Australian options for them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is called to order. The member for Kavel is warned and the Treasurer is warned for the second time and the last time. The member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:02): This has been a deeply disappointing display by a dysfunctional Labor government that has long forgotten that they are here to represent the people of South Australia and do what is in their best interests, yet the people of South Australia cannot turn a corner these days without being mugged by this Labor government that does not care for their future, but only cares for their own political survival.

We have had a lot of discussion in the last few days about conventions and the Treasurer today and the member for Waite have said that this convention, which has apparently stood since the 1850s, is being broken, but I would say that I would rather break a convention than break the state—break the state for the second time when we are talking about matters to do with the State Bank.

This convention, which apparently the Treasurer says will rain fire and brimstone upon the people of South Australia and any future government, which the Minister for Health said would rain fire and brimstone on any future government when this opposition did the right thing by the people of South Australia in blocking the car park tax in 2014, is not worth anything if it damages the interests of the people of South Australia, because they are our first, second and third responsibilities as members of parliament. We swear an oath that we will support their interests and their needs.

In fact, this government was not interested in supporting convention at the 2014 election when they said, 'Don't vote against the car park tax because there is a convention in place with the 2012 decision to remove the costs orders against police,' which was another example of a bad tax measure put into a budget, and in the best interests of the people of South Australia the opposition supported the opposition to it.

And of course there is the biosecurity tax, which this government also tried to put into a budget and which the member for Waite supported the opposition on—the member for Waite supported the removal of it, as he did the cause for a reversal of onus. This is a government that does not have the interests of the people of South Australia in their heart, and they are using this convention as a fig leaf to cover their shame. The fact is that the opposition is acting to protect the interests of the people of South Australia, and that is what we are here to talk about today.

The Premier started his speech by talking about leadership. Leadership—from this Premier. Let's have a talk about the Premier's examples of leadership. This is the sort of person who went to an election promising that he was the only person who would protect the people of South Australia from an increase in the GST and then went on national news to fight for an increase in the GST. This is the Premier who went to an election promising that he was the only person who would protect the people of South Australia from a nuclear industry starting in the state and then, as soon as the election was over, he went to the people of South Australia and said, 'We want to have the world's biggest nuclear dump here in South Australia.'

This is the sort of person who would get elected to parliament and, three elections in a row, go forward on policies, such as no privatisation despite the privatisation of the forests and the MAC and the Lands Titles Office to come. This is the sort of person who would go to an election and win an election three times on a promise that no Labor government would ever, ever sell the Repat and then, once he is elected, would act against the interests of the people of South Australia to sell the Repat.

This is the sort of person who would put \$600,000 of taxpayers' money into a joint venture with the Adelaide city council and a private company to run a stall at a beer festival in China without doing any due diligence and then, when it goes bad, he will walk away and blame everyone else involved except for himself. Who would go into business with this guy? Who would invest in a state where this is the sort of person running the show?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: Who would possibly invest in this state under this Premier?

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer will not get any further warnings.

Mr GARDNER: The Treasurer has been warned three times and he still does not get it. This is the Premier who promised a kinder, a gentler politics. This is the Premier who came to office promising a break with his predecessor who would have a debate-and-decide approach, not an announce-and-defend approach. The reality is that this Premier makes Mike Rann look like Mother Teresa by comparison.

Here is his latest scam on the people of South Australia: pick a target in the banks which he assumes everyone will be happy to kick, surprise them with a raid to demonstrate his masculinity and to try to win some cheap populace points despite the disastrous consequences for the state that he pretends and purports to lead, despite the impact on confidence, despite the impact on jobs in South Australia, despite the impact on South Australia's reputation interstate and internationally and despite the potential impact on every mortgage holder, every business with a loan, every person who wants a job in this state, anyone who holds shares in superannuation. It will make the cost of doing business in South Australia more expensive, and it will make the cost of living in South Australia more expensive.

The trick is that the people of South Australia, as the Leader of the Opposition correctly said, are smarter than this government. The people of South Australia, as the member for Schubert correctly said, know that this tax will impact on them and their cost of living. The Liberal Party is only interested in protecting the interests of the people of South Australia, and they will see that. We are prepared for this fight, and we will fight this tax through to the election.

So much for the leadership of the Premier. What about the toadies who surround him—the South Australian Labor Party? Not content with having broken South Australia once with their State Bank disaster, they are now seeking to break South Australia again with their state bank tax disaster. This is a state that understands what that pain has meant when it has been inflicted before, and they will not stand for it again. The Liberal Party of South Australia will not stand for it again. We will block this tax, and this government must take this to an election—an election that I am confident they will lose because the South Australian people know that they deserve better.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:08): I will not keep the house. I just want to let you know that I have listened to all the debate and I find myself in the invidious position of being unable to support either proposition in its entirety.

The house divided on the amendment:

Ayes 19
Noes 22
Majority 3

AYES

Bell, T.S.
Goldsworthy, R.M.
Marshall, S.S.
Pengilly, M.R.
Sanderson, R.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.
Wingard, C.

Duluk, S.
Griffiths, S.P.
McFetridge, D.
Pisoni, D.G.
Speirs, D.
Whetstone, T.J.

Gardner, J.A.W.
Knoll, S.K.
Pederick, A.S.
Redmond, I.M.
Treloar, P.A. (teller)
Williams, M.R.

NOES

Bettison, Z.L.
Caica, P.
Gee, J.P.
Hughes, E.J.
Koutsantonis, A.
Piccolo, A.
Snelling, J.J.
Wortley, D.

Bignell, L.W.K.
Close, S.E.
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.
Kenyon, T.R. (teller)
Mullighan, S.C.
Picton, C.J.
Vlahos, L.A.

Brock, G.G.
Cook, N.F.
Hildyard, K.
Key, S.W.
Odenwalder, L.K.
Rau, J.R.
Weatherill, J.W.

PAIRS

Chapman, V.A.
Digance, A.F.C.

Rankine, J.M.

Tarzia, V.A.

Amendment thus negatived; motion carried.

*Grievance Debate***UNITY COLLEGE CLOSURE**

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:13): Today, I would like to speak about the unfortunate closure of the Unity College at Spring Head at the end of this year and pay tribute to its extraordinary history over nearly 150 years. It was originally the Spring Head School and then the Spring Head Trinity Lutheran Primary School, the name by which most old scholars and most people in the community knew the Spring Head Lutheran School.

This school in Mount Torrens is the second oldest Lutheran school in Australia, an extraordinary history. Unfortunately, it will close its doors at the end of this year—we hope not forever. Unfortunately, though, demographics, the state of the economy and the cost of running a school has, for the moment at least, meant the Spring Head Lutheran school will not be able to continue. However, I want to pay credit to everybody who has worked there, continues to work there for the rest of this year, the student body, the staff, the parents and the Lutheran Schools Association who have been providing support for this school over many years.

The school was founded in 1856 with the head teacher, Mr Hammer, followed by Pastor Ey, and then the following year, from 1857 to 1866 Mr Ferdinand August Andrae, who established the tenor of the school for years to come. In fact, when I visited the school I noted they still had a photo of August Andrae and the school as it was at the time with all of the students. He was a very striking individual and one can imagine the austere times and the benefit that this early South Australian school leader gave to those students, and the strong foundations he built for the school.

The school was closed in 1917 by an act of parliament, as it was a school where German was a language spoken. Of course, during the First World War the parliament closed a number of schools. However, happily the school reopened in 1931 under the leadership of Mr R.T. Schueller. I pay tribute to the most recent principals and head teachers, Mrs Tori Weiss, Mr R. Williams, Ms Rebecca Heinjus, Mr Andrew Boesch, and now currently the head teacher Julie Mariner who does a marvellous job, along with her staff, Dusk O'Brien, Steve Hahesy, Kathy Juers, Ros Schubert and Jennifer Stewart, a number of whom have been teaching at the school for decades.

It is very important that it is noted in this parliament that these staff are doing an excellent job. It is a challenging time for them. They are looking for new positions as well but I am sure that they will find new positions and continue to be able to teach, whether in the Lutheran school system or in other schools around South Australia. Of course, many of them are local to the Mount Torrens area so that does make their job a bit harder.

We also note that there are 33 current students who will be going forth into new schools next year. They face new challenges and their families face these challenges with them, and I pay tribute to those families. I am sure that they will do an excellent job. However, it is a challenge and we pay

tribute to the work they are doing. I pay tribute also to the work of the school council, chaired by Mr Jeff Sander.

The facility in this community is a significant asset. It is a beautiful school and is beautifully situated. We hope that this facility will be maintained for educational purposes and available for the community in the future to potentially even open a new school or, should I say, reopen the Spring Head Trinity Lutheran Primary School again in the future if more favourable times arise demographically.

I also want to pay tribute to the old scholars. One old scholar who attended for all of her primary school tuition in the 1980s wrote to me stating, 'This news is incredibly sad for generations of old scholars in and around the Mount Torrens community.' It cannot be an easy thing to note that a school, which would be so fondly remembered and so favourably looked upon and which provided such a foundation for so many people to succeed in life, is closing. Unity College at Murraylands has stepped in over the last year to assist the school in trying to stay feasible, but it has not been able to continue past the end of this year—and we are sorry for that.

We pay tribute in this parliament to the school's proud 147-year history. We pay tribute to everyone who has worked there, everyone who has nurtured young minds and helped them on the road to a strong future. I thank the members of the school community for their continued optimism and their continued encouragement of the students who they still have in their care for another two terms. I look forward to a strong future for them all and hopefully one day in this parliament, marking the reopening of the Spring Head Trinity Lutheran School.

GOLDEN EYE TO EYE BALL

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:19): Today, I would like to talk about the Golden Eye to Eye Ball which was held at the Stamford Grand at Glenelg last Saturday. I would like to make particular comment about the extremely hard work of the woman responsible for the evening. Her name is Raj Vasan. She is the CEO of Eye to Eye. I would like to quote her opening remarks in the evening's program:

My mission is to ensure as many people as possible know about Eye Play Sport, what we do and the people we assist...

[Eye Play Sport is there] to raise funds to finance recreation, sport and associated projects to ensure blind and vision impaired people of all ages have opportunities to fulfil their dreams.

She thanked the board of Eye Play Sport. I am sure there is a great number of them—they are not listed in the program. She noted their tireless work and input into making the event the success it is and the work that they continue to do. She especially thanked Phil Smith, Cleo Cooper, Victor Velgush, Matthew Cooper and Dan Kuss, who are members of the Eye 2 Eye subcommittee that put on the ball.

She also thanked the major sponsors: Fox Creek Wines, Skill Hire, CMI Toyota and Lexus of Adelaide, ANZ, Graham's Jewellers, Kiwanis Club of Glenelg and the talented people who performed on the evening: Jyoti Singh, Blue Raine, Kristin Lester and Sigurdur Thor Sigurdsson and Annalisa Zoanetti. They included the Lindy Hip Big Band. One of the band members is a member of one of my local Rotary clubs, so it was really terrific to see him and all his mates performing there on the night. There were also vocalists and a great duo of Latin American dancers. The evening was emceed by the wonderful Alice Monfries. There was much fun and enjoyment on the night and dancing at the very end.

Eye 2 Eye made several presentations on the evening. One was the Karen Cornaggia Memorial Scholarship. This year, the male winner was Stephen Palmer. In 2016, Stephen obtained a Certificate III in Business Administration at Elizabeth TAFE, and today he is an admin support officer at the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion, where he works very closely with minister Leesa Vlahos. I am glad that she is here to hear me say this. In itself, that is an impressive achievement—

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey will not use a member's Christian name—

Ms BEDFORD: I am disgusted. I am very sorry.

The SPEAKER: —and surname because it tends to disorderliness.

Ms BEDFORD: Leave it for today, and I will not be disorderly anymore—the Minister for Disabilities. This is an impressive achievement for a young man who is blind, but it is on the sporting field where Stephen has amassed an even more impressive resume of international accomplishments. He epitomises what Eye Play Sport is all about and he has grabbed every opportunity presented to him with both hands. He is very interested in cricket and was very happy to speak to Alice Monfries' husband, Cameron, on the night.

The female winner of the award was Alana Tiller, who was born with oculocutaneous albinism, which means she has a very severe vision impairment. She is legally blind with poor visual acuity and other vision challenges, including nystagmus, severe photophobia, optic nerve hypoplasia and no stereopsis (no depth perception). At only eight years old, she was identified as having a bit of a talent for goalball and she has gone on to represent the state. She has attended five Australian goalball championships, winning two gold medals, three bronzes and countless medals in three school sport association competitions. She was selected by St John's Grammar School this year to compete in non-para sprint and relay events at interschool competitions as at her school sports day she ran the fastest 100 metres of all the 14-year-old girls.

The Eye Play Sport Perpetual Trophy for Hall of Fame Inductee 2017 was Rosemary Penn, who is probably very well known to a lot of members here. Along with her husband, Malcolm, she was one of the first people I met who had anything to do with vision impairment in this state. Unfortunately, Malcolm has passed away. Rosemary absolutely stole the show on the night with an outrageous routine where she put on a tiara and had a very plummy English accent. Her commitment to blind sport over the years is exemplary.

It gives me great pleasure to commend all those people and note them here in the house, but I also wish to say how sad I am that the South Australian Blind Bowlers Association, a group which I have been a patron of for many years, has unfortunately ceased its operation, or it had the last time I heard. Most of the members were advanced in years and unable to fund the travel for both the guide and the bowler to go for competition. I had hoped that younger bowlers would take up the sport, but that has not happened. Congratulations and thanks to everyone who was involved with the South Australian Blind Bowlers Association over the years.

NORTHERN FORESTS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:24): I rise to put some comments on the record about the government's handling of the Northern Forests subsequent to the Bangor fire. Most members would know that, back in January and February 2014, the Bangor fire ravaged much of the upper Mid North and southern Flinders district, including most of the Wirrabara forest. Members may not be aware that before that fire there were other fires in the Wirrabara Forest and the Bundaleer Forest in the years immediately preceding 2014.

I think everybody in the local community understands that the fire ravaged the area and added to the impact of the previous fires. It meant that there did need to be a reset of exactly what ForestrySA wanted to do with those two forests: at one end, do a complete replant and try to get back to business as usual, understanding the long time frames involved with that, and, at the other extreme, sell or give away all of the land for completely different purposes. The reality is that the sensible, practical approach would be in between those two extremes.

In August 2015, a community meeting was held at Wirrabara outlining what the government wanted to do. At that stage, it was largely about seeking expressions of interest for the lands. The community was assured that the process would be completed by the end of that calendar year, by the end of 2015. People thought that was pretty quick, that it was a big job being done fast and that it may not have been completed to that time line and would perhaps finish in early 2016. People understand that there are no perfect results out of all this. People really do get that not everybody is going to be happy with the final result.

However, the government went on to receive all those expressions of interest, and then gone back and asked for requests for proposals. The first set of expressions of interest was exactly that: expressions of interest. The next set of requests for proposals were to be binding offers that the

government could accept or reject. As well as taking more time and getting people to do a lot more work, what people found when they put their proposals forward was that the government then started their negotiation.

I am not saying that the government should not participate in negotiation. Of course the government should, but people really did think from the way the RFP process was described that it would be yes or no to their offer, given that it was asked to be a binding offer. The government has gone back and asked for these binding offers in many cases to be changed, adjusted, or they have taken that binding offer on behalf of the proposer and started the negotiation from that point.

This process has dragged on and on to the detriment of the community. The longer it goes on, the near-impossible it becomes for significant productive replanting to occur, and if it does happen then certainly we have lost these years in between. Another thing I want to say is that in my mind this is all about the community, including local jobs. That is the highest priority. Morgan Sawmill at Jamestown plays a key part in this because they are the owner-operators of the mill and they employ 50-plus people locally. It is the jobs of those 50 people that are my highest priority, and other potential employment opportunities that may develop in this region from other land uses are very important.

There is not one person who has come to me is satisfied with this process. It is dragging on and on. It may not be the highest priority that the government has on its books at the moment, but I can assure members that, for local people, who fear for their job because the mill they work at might be closed because there will be no timber locally to process, it is the highest priority. For them, it is all about their home, their rental, their mortgage, their kids, and that sort of thing. It is a big deal for people who have organised finance to acquire land to use it in other ways. They are sitting there waiting to know whether or not they have got the go-ahead.

This is all about jobs, and the government has not yet been able to articulate clearly how many new jobs net (new jobs minus jobs to be lost) will be achieved under their plan. They must get on and develop this plan and explain how it is going to be for the benefit of the local region.

REYNELL ELECTORATE

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:29): I rise to speak about a number of groups and events in our southern community, events and groups that I have been proud to be involved in alongside our extraordinarily, kind and connected community. Our Mid Coast has held a special place in my heart throughout the course of my life. It is a place that as a child, a surf lifesaving nipper and a fledgling board rider engendered in me my great love of the ocean and our South Australian beaches.

Last year, after tireless work by surfing legends of the Mid Coast—Dick Olesinski, Sue Bennett and number of others—our Mid Coast was named a National Surfing Reserve, the only one in South Australia and one of only a few across our nation. That group continues to drive initiatives to mark significant surfing spots, to treasure their history and to ensure they are preserved for future generations of young people to enjoy and to find their ways to love our ocean and our beaches.

A Mid Coast surfing reserve member, Chris Lemar, has set up a very special subgroup, the Mid Coast Butt Collectors Group, a group I have happily joined and of which I have become an active member. Together with my fellow Mid Coast butt collectors, I recently cleaned up part of our Mid Coast where the Christies Creek runs into the sea. It was a pleasure to work alongside a group who care about our natural environment, our Mid Coast and are prepared to work together to keep it clean.

As a Mid Coast butt collector, I have also taken responsibility for ridding part of our Mid Coast of littered cigarette butts, and the week before last I went down to the beautiful Christies Beach Y steps to collect butts and to empty the specially marked Mid Coast Surfing Reserve cigarette butt bin that I am responsible for. It was excellent to see so many butts in the bin and to see that this simple step of placing specially marked bins across our Mid Coast is working splendidly. Keeping our beautiful southern beaches clean is important as our southern community continues to grow and as visitors continue to flock to our area.

Madam Deputy Speaker, as you know, this week is NAIDOC Week (or National Aboriginal and Islanders Day Observance Committee Week). The 2017 theme, Our Languages Matter, focuses on considering the essential and special role that Indigenous languages play in identity, in linking

people to their land and to their history and spirituality. As National NAIDOC Committee Co-chair Anne Martin says:

Aboriginal and Torres Strait languages are not just a means of communication, they express knowledge about everything: law, geography, history, family and human relationships, philosophy, religion, anatomy, child care, health, Caring for Country, astronomy, biology and food.

Across our nation, Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities are gathering to commemorate NAIDOC. On Monday, I was privileged to attend a remarkable gathering in the City of Onkaparinga council chambers to do so. This was an excellent opportunity to think deeply about Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander culture and the outstanding contributions that our Aboriginal brothers and sisters have made to our local southern community and beyond, as well as the struggles they have overcome.

I thank the mayor for hosting this event and I deeply thank and recognise Aboriginal elder Auntie Georgina Williams for her Welcome to Country and her wise words, her son Karl Telfer and his children and nephews who are Yellaka for dancing so well and for educating us through their art and their words. These moments were very special, as were the performances by Auntie Margie's Porlis Pulgi kindergarten children and the children of Christie Downs Primary School. We were very well fed by the Cultural Connections group and were also able to view an exhibition of NAIDOC posters put together by local group, Neporendi.

One of the other initiatives that I was privileged to be part of last week was a brilliant and ongoing one that happens at Christies Beach High School. Since starting at the school last year, the school's wonderful principal, Graham Clark, the deputy principal and a number of other staff, together with the very generous and kind local man, Uncle Chris Coomer, barbecue a breakfast for the lovely kids of the school.

It was a pleasure being able to help serve students, to chat with them and staff. It is wonderful that senior school staff and local community leaders take time to do this every single week. It was not just about feeding ever hungry teenagers. It was a great way to connect, to talk and to find out in a casual environment how kids were going, what is important to them, what was happening for them inside and outside of school. I look forward to barbecuing and chatting with them again.

It has been truly lovely this week to be joined in my electorate office in our southern community and here in parliament by two fine young people, Connor Stewart and Harrison Hobart Hards, two lovely Cardijn College students who have joined me for work experience and who give me very great hope for the future of our community. Thank you to both of them for their help and for their commitment to our community being the best, the fairest and the most inclusive place it can be for all its members.

MOUNT GAMBIER ELECTORATE

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:34): The 10th anniversary of Swinging with the Stars was celebrated on 24 June, with over 580 people attending The Barn Palais to enjoy a night of dancing. Swinging with the Stars raises money for the Stand Like Stone Foundation. This year \$123,000 was raised by the eight contestants alone, and the total effort was \$140,000 which was raised throughout the night and event.

Contestants this year came from all over the Limestone Coast and include Amanda Flint, a mother of three, who represented the Penola and Coonawarra communities; Peter Zeitz, a White Ribbon Ambassador, former police officer and A-grade player and coach at West Gambier Football Club; Nicole Hocking, a keen netballer from Lucindale; Grant Fenson, a Port MacDonnell ex-football larrikin and Kingsley Country Fire Service group officer; Beck Laurenson, owner of To Go Sandwich and Espresso Bar in Commercial Street, Mount Gambier; Christian Cella, a building designer and draftsman who is also Inter Soccer Club A-grade captain; Samara Greer, a Mount Gambier High School teacher; and Jack Kelly, the Robe Football Club A-grade coach.

The contestants performed swing, waltz, tango and hip-hop routines on the night. Amanda Flint, together with her partner Jordan Brennan, were crowned the best dancers on the evening. Grant Fenson was awarded the people's choice and is to be commended for raising \$44,788 for the foundation. Grant was supported by his wife, Emma, and the Port MacDonnell community in raising

such a significant amount for the foundation. Kim Cella from Hype Dance Studio choreographed the dance routines and also trained all the contestants. Kim was assisted by Alex Williams and students from her studio.

Over the last 10 years, only 80 local stars from the Limestone Coast have raised over \$525,000 for the Stand Like Stone Foundation. Past winners include the inaugural winner, Lynnette Martin, the Mount Gambier of Commerce president and owner of Chapmans Newsagency; George Haskas from Carlin & Gazzard; schoolteacher Lisa McCormick; Lucindale's Peter Stock; Penola Coonawarra Arts Festival president, Rhett McDonald; Mount Gambier High School teacher Tom Hart; Naracoorte builder and avid hockey player, Derek James, who is also the Liberal candidate for the seat of MacKillop, so well done, Derek, for putting your hand up; George the Farmer co-creator and singer extraordinaire, Ben Hood; and Mount Gambier High School teacher Steven Speck.

Events like these are not possible without the support of businesses and organisations throughout the Limestone Coast region, which have all been generous with their support. Stand Like Stone holds over \$3 million in trust for the region and, since its establishment in 2004, has distributed just under \$1 million to charitable projects, school students and educational scholarships benefitting Limestone Coast communities.

Sue Charlton AM was the inaugural chairperson of Stand Like Stone and held this position for over 10 years. Sue remains involved with the Stand Like Stone Foundation and is a member of the Swinging with the Stars organising committee. Sue remains a patron of the foundation. Donations to the Stand Like Stone Foundation are pooled and invested. The income generated from this investment is used over time to support charitable projects and organisations and to give to educational scholarships, whilst holding the principal in trust.

I would like to thank the current chairman of Stand Like Stone, a good friend of mine, Bill deGaris, for extending an invitation to myself for the evening. As Adam Lindsay Gordon wrote:

Life is mostly froth and bubble,
Two things stand like stone.
Kindness in another's trouble,
Courage in your own.

CITY OF ONKAPARINGA

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:38): I rise to talk about an important issue in the southern suburbs, and that is the medium density housing policy of the City of Onkaparinga. Of course, the City of Onkaparinga is not an inner city council; it is in the outermost southern suburbs of Adelaide, up to 40 kilometres away from the city. In 2010, the City of Onkaparinga changed its development plan and introduced what it called Medium Density Policy Area 40. A massive 2,200 hectares was designated in that zone across what I think is a random assortment of areas.

Take Port Noarlunga South in my electorate, which is a relatively similar suburb all over. The suburb was divided along ordinary suburban streets; one side was in and the other side was out. One side would have ordinary houses in residential zones and the other was put in Area 40 where pretty much anything goes. There is no need for good design of properties. There is no need to have proper consideration of neighbouring properties or the location.

I have spoken to many residents over the past four years who have been impacted by these developments in their suburbs, 30-plus kilometres away from the city centre, as have the members for Reynell and Fisher. I believe this zoning went far and above the permissible zoning in council areas right next to the city, where you have access to the whole range of major services and transport corridors that you do not have in the outer suburbs. In fact I was shocked when I was told by some councillors that, when the plan was proposed by council staff and they voted for it, they did not really know what the staff were putting in front of them at the time and they did not understand the ramifications, and they now regret the decision they made.

Council failed in their duty to represent the people in proposing this plan in 2010 for the area's best interest. Everywhere I went, every street I doorknocked in these areas, people would raise their serious concerns with me. Many people said what council was approving was impacting upon their

physical and mental wellbeing. I have seen some shockers built. Cheap designs with little light or little, if any, green space. I have been told council encouraged people to put more houses on subdivided blocks than they originally wanted to. Many residents have raised these issues directly with me. For instance, Garry from Moana said:

It's understandable that infrastructure pressures have resulted in subdivisions whereby one house has been replaced with two dwellings...However, crowding five units onto a corner block will surely look out of place and reflect a developer's lack of interest in maintaining the character of our suburb.

Elaine from Christies Beach said:

Round the corner from where I live, they are demolishing two old houses and replacing them with eight two-storey properties. The council seems to be approving everything developers put before them, and many residents believe that the council is only interested in the extra rates it will raise if they squeeze as many buildings as possible onto one block.

Jude from Moana was concerned about:

Five townhouses joined together, no gaps, situated right in the middle of all of us. Although it would be lovely to retain full-sized blocks, we understand and are not against subdivision done properly, but this proposal is outrageous.

Margaret from Christies Beach said:

When I look out of any of my rear windows or back door, all I will see is a huge grey concrete wall well over 20 metres in height and I will have no light in my front yard after midday.

So over two years ago, together with the member for Reynell and Fisher, I wrote to the mayor of Onkaparinga raising our concerns with this policy. We raised concerns about the minimum block size, the privacy of residents, car parking impact on the developments, the need to factor in natural light, the lack of consultation that council was not conducting with residents and the need for these developments to fit into an overall plan.

I am now pleased that Onkaparinga has proposed an alternative plan and pleased that the planning minister has agreed to the new plan, taking immediate interim effect. It was very positive that earlier in the year the council organised for a tour with the Minister for Planning to show some of the developments council now admits were poorly designed and not fitting for the area. The revised plan addresses a number of the concerns raised.

Suburbs such as Port Noarlunga South and Moana will be excised. Block sizes will be increased. Design principles will be improved. Setbacks from the road will be increased. However, I remain concerned about a number of factors in the plan. In particular, there are new areas that have been brought into the medium density zone that are not there already—parts of Noarlunga Downs in the new electorate of Kaurana being one example. Some areas have now been deemed to be a target infill precinct, particularly around Seaford, Noarlunga Downs, Christies Beach and Aldinga Beach.

I think it is clear from my conversations with residents that council has not communicated to these residents the impact that this will have on their neighbourhood. Very few residents are aware of what is being planned in these new zonings. In fact, they had one meeting to consult with the public at Seaford but only gave people one day's notice for the meeting, and many people got the notice in their letterbox after the meeting had been held; hence, we may well be back here a few years' time to address this.

I will continue to do my job in advocating on behalf of the community. I will support the improvements to this plan but will be discussing with residents some of the risks that this plan also contains.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (YOUTHS SENTENCED AS ADULTS) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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) (15:44): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the

Young Offenders Act 1993; the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988; and the Sentencing Act. Read a first time.

Second Reading

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) (15:44): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Statutes Amendment (Youths Sentenced as Adults) Bill 2017 inserts a new provision in the Young Offenders Act to provide that, if a sanction is being imposed on a youth who is being dealt with as an adult, then the paramount consideration of the court when deciding the sentence must be to protect the safety of the community. The new provision also states that this paramount consideration outweighs any other consideration, object or policy, including the need to rehabilitate the youth and, in addition, regard must also be had to the deterrent effect any proposed sanction may have on other youths. The new provision also outweighs the usual statutory object in sentencing young offenders to 'secure for youths who offend against the criminal law the care, correction and guidance necessary for their development into responsible and useful members of the community and the proper realisation of their potential.'

The bill responds to community concern over the perceived inadequacy of sentences imposed on young offenders who have committed grave offences and are to be dealt with as an adult offender and the underlying principles to be applied during sentencing. I share the community concerns. The bill provides that when a young offender's crimes are so grave so as to warrant them being treated in sentencing like an adult, then the usual considerations, objects or policies that apply to sentencing a young offender are set aside, and community safety and public protection become paramount. The bill mirrors the Sentencing Bill 2017 now before parliament that the general paramount consideration in sentencing should be the safety of the community. I seek leave to insert the remainder of the second reading explanation in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The Bill also amends section 31A(a1) the *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988*.

Section 31A(a1) states that a number of provisions do not apply in relation to a youth (whether or not the youth is sentenced as an adult or is sentenced to detention to be served in a prison or is otherwise transferred to or ordered to serve a period of detention in a prison), being sections 32(5)(ab), 32(5)(ba), 32(5a) and 32A.

The Bill amends section 31A(a1) so that these provisions do apply to a young person sentenced as an adult.

As a result, for a young person sentenced as an adult for murder, the requirement in section 32(5)(ab) to set a mandatory minimum non-parole requirements for murder of 20 years will be applied to a youth sentenced as an adult. In addition, for a young person being sentenced as an adult for serious offences against the person, the mandatory minimum non-parole period of four-fifths the length of the sentence as required in section 32(5)(ba) must be applied.

The Bill will also amend section 46(1) of the *Sentencing Act 2017* (once it commences) to mirror these same changes.

The Bill represents a shift in how a young person is sentenced. We have recently seen the court declare that even when sentencing a young person as an adult, the court continues to be bound by the principles set out in section 3 of the Young Offenders Act.

The rationale behind this reform is that the most serious young offenders should not receive the benefit of the rehabilitative focus of section 3 of the Young Offenders Act in sentencing. In short, they lost this right when they chose to commit such serious offences.

This reform is not aimed at the typical young offender but rather at enhancing public protection from the very small group of serious young offenders, whose offending is so bad they are to be sentenced as adult offenders and whose offending is so bad they should not receive the mitigating benefit of the usual rehabilitative focus of section 3 of the Act in sentencing.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Young Offenders Act 1993*

4—Amendment of section 3—Objects and statutory policies

Section 3 of the *Young Offenders Act 1993* (the YOA) sets out the objects and statutory policies of that Act. The object is to 'secure for youths who offend against the criminal law the care, correction and guidance necessary for their development into responsible and useful members of the community and the proper realisation of their potential', and the powers conferred by the YOA are to be directed towards that object with proper regard to the statutory policies set out therein. The intent of the proposed amendment would be to displace the principle that primacy is to be given to the object of the Act and the statutory principles, and to rehabilitation, when sentencing a youth who is being dealt with as an adult. Rather, the paramount consideration of the court when determining sentence for a youth who is being dealt with as an adult must be to protect the safety of the community. The amendment provides that the paramount consideration outweighs any other consideration, object or statutory principle, including the need to rehabilitate the youth.

Part 3—Amendment of *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988*

5—Amendment of section 31A—Application of Division to youths

The proposed amendment to section 31A is consequential on the amendment to the YOA.

Part 4—Amendment of *Sentencing Act 2017*

6—Amendment of section 46—Application of Division to youths

Section 46 of the *Sentencing Act 2017* mirrors section 31A of the *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988* and is necessary because, in due course, the *Sentencing Act 2017* will repeal the *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988*.

Schedule 1—Transitional provision

1—Transitional provision

The transitional provision makes it clear that the amendments to the *Young Offenders Act 1993* effected by Part 2 of this measure apply to a youth who is being sentenced as an adult after the day on which Part 2 of this measure commences, whether the offence in respect of which the youth is being sentenced occurred before or after that day.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

APPROPRIATION BILL 2017*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (15:47): I am pleased to make a contribution this afternoon to the Appropriation Bill. What we see with this budget is Groundhog Day, because this budget is pretty much like every budget that we have seen this government bring down over the last 16 budgets. It is a high-taxing, high-spending budget. As the leader pointed out in his contributions to the house yesterday and today, there is a staggering \$400 million increase in taxes being raised by this government.

The Premier and the Treasurer and all the speakers on that side of the house are talking this budget up as a jobs budget. They are saying that this year's budget is a jobs budget. What did they say last year when they brought the budget down? I happen to have the 2016-17 budget papers in my office and I went back and had a look at the budget speech delivered by the Treasurer, the member for West Torrens. I would like to quote the last page, page 7:

We have a state budget that is in the black and is building new productive infrastructure across our state. And we are training the next generation of South Australian high-tech workers by starting them on a path of science and technology at schools today.

At its heart—this is a budget about jobs. We are pulling every lever available to government to create new jobs.

Because every extra job that's created in South Australia is another family that is better off, another family that can afford to provide more for their children and build a more prosperous state.

Those were the Treasurer's exact words last year: 'this is a budget about jobs.' If it is a budget about jobs, why does the state have the highest unemployment figures in the nation, at 7.1 per cent? How can you trust this government when they said that last year's budget was about jobs and that this year the budget is about jobs? The Premier, the Treasurer and every other speaker on the other side of the house is saying that this year's budget is about jobs. How can that be factual when the state has the highest unemployment figures in the nation, at 7.1 per cent?

Have a look at the other states: Western Australia, 5.8 per cent; the Northern Territory, 3.2 per cent; Queensland, 6.3 per cent; New South Wales, 4.8 per cent; Victoria, 6.1 per cent; and Tasmania, 5.9 per cent. South Australia is well and truly the leader of the pack when it comes to unemployment figures. That is the unemployment rate trend, to be accurate in quoting those figures, so there is no misunderstanding. So how can we trust this government when they said last year that their budget was about jobs and this year they are saying it is about jobs? You cannot trust them because the facts and the figures do not stack up.

As I said earlier, this is a high-taxing, high-spending government. I have said this before in the parliament because it is the truth: it is a hallmark of all Labor governments around every state and federally since the 1970s, the Whitlam years, that Labor governments are high taxing and high spending. In his budget reply speech yesterday and in his contribution today, in debating the motion that was put before the house, the leader certainly laid that out for all South Australians so that they have a clear understanding of why that is the case: \$400 million of new taxes in this budget.

Another interesting observation that was raised again today is that when the Premier came to office, when he took over the job of Premier, he came along with rhetoric, 'We're sick of the old way that we were doing things. It's not the way to be able to communicate with the South Australian community—this announce and defend. We don't like that. That's a thing of the past. That was the previous premier, the previous deputy premier, the previous treasurer—that's what they did, and it was no good. I am coming into the office of Premier with a new approach, with an approach of consult and decide.' That was what the Premier said at the time he took over the job a number of years ago.

I will not go into any of the machinations that took place leading to the member for Cheltenham taking over the number one political job in the state because that has been traversed previously, but that was what he said, that there will not be any more 'announce and defend'. Well, what have we seen with the state bank tax? It has been sprung on us and sprung on the South Australian community with no consultation.

Yesterday in question time, the Treasurer was asked, 'Who did you go and talk to? Who did you consult?' He said no-one. They did not talk to anybody in the South Australian community about this new state bank tax. So how can that be 'consult and decide'? How can that approach that the Premier adopted when he first took over this role be the approach under which he would operate? It is not. That is how the previous regime worked. That is how the previous premier, the previous treasurer and the previous deputy premier operated—announce and defend. We know that the South Australian community, the people of South Australia, have rejected that outright. They do not want the state bank tax.

As outlined in the house over the last two days, we know the disastrous record that Labor governments have when they deal with banks. We saw what happened in the late 1980s and early 1990s in relation to the State Bank debacle. It brought this state's economy to its knees and it was only the courage of a newly elected reformist Liberal government that got the state back on track.

Government members talk about privatisation: there is going to be no more privatisation; on that pledge card you saw back in 2002, no more privatisation. Those on the other side of the chamber are the kings of privatisation. What have we seen them privatise? They have flogged off the forests to pay for the Adelaide Oval, they have sold part of the Motor Accident Commission and they are talking about getting rid of the LTO. They are the kings of privatisation. The government cannot come

in here and preach to us that we negotiated a long-term lease of our energy utilities, because the members on the other side of the chamber are the kings of privatisation.

It is clearly evident that after 16 years of a Labor government in South Australia the economy is not where it should be. The government's policy settings have been wrong. Continuing to implement a policy of high taxation and high spending is clearly the wrong way to go. I think I understand, philosophically, where Labor Party members are, but there has to be some realisation that government is not the answer to these problems. The government has tried high taxing and high spending for 16 years, year in, year out, and it is not working.

We have the highest unemployment figures in the nation. We have the highest electricity and energy costs in the world. It is good to be number one in something, but it is not good to be number one in having the highest electricity prices in the world. They say that privatisation was part of the cause. That is absolute nonsense because Victoria privatised its electricity assets and its electricity prices are a lot lower than South Australia's. We have high water prices and we have high taxes, so there has to be some realisation that the policy settings, the economic levers that are being pulled and manipulated, just do not work.

The Treasurer, the Premier and others have said that this is a jobs budget, but they have said that previously. They have to realise that you cannot tax your way to prosperity. It does not work that way. Taxing the community—whether it be corporations, small businesses, families, mums and dads, children's bank accounts—does not work. You cannot tax your way to prosperity.

Government members complain that they do not get enough money from Canberra. We hear them whingeing, whining and carping that the federal government does not give them enough money to do what they need to do. During the next year, the government will get more than \$10.5 billion in federal funds. That is close to \$700 million more than this year.

I think we have a budget totalling about \$19 billion and that the state budget is bumping up to the high 18s or \$19 billion. If Canberra is providing \$10.5 billion in federal funds, that is more than half the state budget, and they are getting close to \$700 million more this year, so I do not think that they have any grounds to whinge and whine and carp about a lack of funding from the federal government. But it is typical Labor, and this point has been made today. It is typical Labor—they blame everybody but themselves.

Listening to the debate, listening to the Premier yesterday and listening to him today and listening to other members of the government benches, they know deep down that things are not working for them and that their policy settings are not working. What they do is typical, and I have seen it in the 15¾ years that have been here and before that as an observer of politics; that is, when they are in trouble they do not debate the merits of the issue, and they do not debate the merits or whatever of the policy; they go for the man. They get into the area of character assassination. They do not debate the merits of the policy or the merits of the issue; they attack the person.

We saw it today and yesterday, with personal attacks on the leader. I think that is an indication that they realise that they are in strife and that they have backed themselves into a corner. They have painted themselves into a corner, and they know that the high taxing, high spending policy does not work, but they have nowhere else to go. They have been fishing around trying to find new avenues of taxation and they have hit on what they think might have been a goldmine, that is, to bring in a state bank tax. Well, it is no goldmine because we are going to block it.

I worked for a bank for 22 years before I entered this place, so I have an understanding about how corporate life operates. If any impost is put on a corporation, it is usually passed on. That will be passed on maybe not in tweaking interest rates, but it may well be passed on in fees and charges, in impacts on shareholder dividends and in impacts on superannuation returns. Do not be fooled, and do not think that they are taxing big wealthy bankers who are going to absorb it, because it will be passed on to every person within the South Australian community.

The vast majority of people have a home loan and have borrowed money. The vast majority of people have home loans, mortgages they refer to. In the banking game, we did not call them mortgages; we called them home loans because that was what they were. If they are not a borrower, they are an investor. If you are not borrowing money, you may well be investing money, either side

of the ledger. The borrowers and the investors will be hit by this state bank tax, so do not be under any misapprehension about that. That is why we are blocking it—because it is a tax on families in South Australia, it is a tax on businesses in South Australia and it is a tax on the economy pushing ahead in South Australia.

I now want to talk about a couple of issues in relation to the budget to do with my electorate of Kavel. There was a funding commitment of \$2.5 million for the regional sports hub at Mount Barker, and that will go towards the \$3.75 million that was previously committed before the federal election last year. The federal Turnbull government reaffirmed that commitment upon being re-elected. Those moneys will go to constructing some change rooms and two soccer pitches.

That is a good thing and we welcome it; however, it falls significantly short of what we requested and what the community requested. We sought that the state government at least match the \$3.75 million funded by the feds. With a contribution from the council—and they are working on that and a few weeks ago formally passed a resolution at a council meeting—that would have allowed stage 1 to progress. Stage 1 is the construction of some clubrooms, an AFL-grade oval for football and cricket, tennis courts, netball courts and the two soccer pitches.

That is what we would have had if the government had been prepared to stack up another \$1.25 million, but they have not. So, while I am pleased that there has been \$2.5 million, it is disappointing for those other sporting clubs and codes that an AFL football and cricket oval, some clubrooms, tennis courts and netball courts will not be able to be constructed as part of stage 1. The construction cost is \$11.8 million and, because it is short by \$1.25 million, it will not be able to proceed at this point.

The other initiative that we called on the government to look to fund a solution to was the Nairne intersection, the T-junction at Old Princes Highway and Woodside Road in Nairne. I have spoken about that at length over the years and more recently in parliament. I have written to the minister. The candidate for Kavel, Dan Cregan, has run a strong local campaign calling on the government to find a solution for the Nairne intersection but, unfortunately, to date that has fallen on deaf ears.

There has been no commitment in the budget for that, and that is disappointing. It has become a significant intersection not only in the Nairne township but in the Hills district because traffic flows through that intersection down onto the newly constructed Bald Hills Road freeway interchange, a magnificent infrastructure project delivered by the previous member for Mayo. I strongly lobbied for that project.

Time expired.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (16:07): I rise to support the Appropriation Bill, and I do so on a day that will go on to have a degree of historic significance, given that we have witnessed the signing of a binding agreement to sell the Arrium operation in South Australia. Obviously, it is a day that the Whyalla community was desperately hanging out to see come to pass. The signing of that agreement will give the community some comfort, some cautious optimism, about what the future will hold.

The alliance, Liberty House, that has become the successful purchaser came as a little bit of a surprise. These negotiations have been extensive, protracted and complex, with a number of twists and turns. Certainly, it was a twist and a turn at a late stage when the Korean consortia did not eventually sign off, running out of time in relation to the exclusivity arrangement. So we are going to have Liberty House. Hopefully, Liberty House will replicate some of the practices they put into place in the UK.

The feedback we have had from the UK about Liberty House has been positive, especially in relation to the workforce and the way that it is willing to deal constructively with the union movement. Of course, in Whyalla, over many years we have had a very constructive union movement, a union movement that has been through some serious challenges over the decades with the steel industry. We still have a steel industry, so that is partly a testament to how willing the union movement has been to engage constructively.

Our state does face major challenges. The Premier earlier today gave a bit of a potted history of the Playford years and the growth of manufacturing behind tariff walls. That happened in many

parts of the western world in the postwar years—into the fifties, the sixties and the seventies—when things started to change and then to fundamentally change. That has exposed South Australia to some particular challenges in comparison with most other states, possibly with the exception of Victoria, and given our exposure to manufacturing. The opening up of the world, the global economy, has had an impact.

It is interesting to listen to members opposite. You would think that for the last 16 years of the Labor government in this state it has been all doom and gloom. There have been periods when employment has been very good. There have been periods in the community that I come from, in Whyalla, when things were incredibly positive for a period, and it was not all that long ago. For a period, we went under the national unemployment average, so we had an unemployment rate with a four in front of it. We were booming, and a number of decisions were made then. I think you always have to be careful about judging decisions in hindsight.

A private sector board in Sydney made some decisions that came back to haunt the structural steel industry in Australia, and they came back to especially haunt the community of Whyalla. I have said in this house before that in the lead-up to administration the community of Whyalla lost 1,000 direct jobs, or thereabouts, and that happened over a 2½-year period, so it did not get the sort of headlines that the closure of the power station in Port Augusta did, which involved far fewer jobs. You can imagine 1,000 direct jobs—and we are not talking about the indirect jobs in a community like Whyalla lost out of the steelworks and lost out of the mining sector. That was one in 10 jobs in the labour market in Whyalla.

I often find the argument that governments should just get out of the way and let the market operate very interesting. If, in the case of Whyalla, the government had just got out the way and let the market operate, we would not have a steel industry; we would have social devastation. There is a clear need for government to intervene in a number of ways in Whyalla to keep the show on the road, and that process has not come to a conclusion.

With Liberty House, there will be ongoing negotiation in relation to the final assistance package from the state government and from the federal government. I am not one of those people who has drunk from the fundamentalist free-market Kool-Aid. I believe that there is a strong role for government when it comes to ensuring that we have a well performing economy. I do not subscribe to the ideology that suggests low taxation and small government is the best way forward.

I will point out, though, that in terms of this budget, with the latest tax changes, I notice those opposite talk about the increase. They are talking in the main about the bank levy. When you look at the overall tax take on a per capita basis, the only state that has a better outcome in terms of per capita taxation is Tasmania. The Northern Territory is better as well, but we all know that the Northern Territory is a beneficiary of a massive input from the federal government and probably will be for many years to come. When it comes to the steel industry and securing the future of the steel industry, the relationship that has developed between the federal government and the state government on this particular industrial sector has been a positive one.

Fortunately, in Australian politics there is a streak of pragmatism that runs through both of the major parties, and that streak of pragmatism dilutes some of the people who are more committed to a deep ideological position. I am talking mainly about the fundamentalist free-market approach, which just does not work. There is not much evidence of it working anywhere in the world, and I think it is in these last few decades of neoliberalism that we have had this backlash happening globally because of the impact on communities and the impact on working families. So, there is a backlash and, unfortunately, that backlash sometimes takes quite a negative approach, as we can see in the United States with the election of Donald Trump.

I am pleased to see that the federal government and the state government are working together when it comes to the steel industry. The importance of the state budget is that it has been framed in a way that gives us the capacity to call upon the funding that might well be necessary as part of that assistance package to ensure that we have an ongoing structural steel industry in this country.

As I said, the feedback that I have been getting about the federal minister's approach and the Prime Minister's approach has all been positive, so we have all played nicely and we have not

played politics over the future of my community, which I think is something very welcome. But it just goes to show that if government got out of the way, we would not have had a steel industry. We would have been left with social devastation.

When it came to the consequences of those 1,000 job losses in Whyalla, the state government have been left to pick up those pieces on our own. We were able in quick order to pull together \$10 million to assist the contractor base in Whyalla when they were facing the risk of going under because of the cash flow issues that were generated by going into administration. That money actually saved a number of companies that had developed over many years, in some cases family companies that employed local people. I always find it a bit rich when those opposite say we are somehow anti-jobs. When the going got tough, we were there. The Premier and the Treasurer were up there and we had provisions in our budget, the capacity within our budget, at the time to ensure that we could help out at an incredibly important time.

In this budget, once again, we have the \$50 million that we announced locked in for the steel industry; that might well end up being significantly more than that. We will see through the negotiations that go on with Liberty House. In addition to that, we put an additional \$1.6 million towards the South Australian Steel Task Force. We set up that taskforce many months before the company went into administration in an attempt to discuss and negotiate with the previous board about the future of the company and what we could do to help.

Another initiative in the budget is the \$200 million Future Jobs Fund. I warmly welcome that. I believe a lot of companies in regional communities will be in a position to put in bids for some support, with \$120 million in grants and loans and \$60 million for industry attraction. Diversifying our economic base is incredibly important. I am pleased to see that there are some companies looking to set up in our region that might be able to be assisted by this money.

The PACE program is another fantastic Labor initiative that has stood the test of time, and the return on the investment has been huge, and there is \$5 million in this budget for the PACE program. I have seen firsthand just what an important element of funding that is. When we start talking about jobs and jobs in regional South Australia, we can look at Carrapateena, which in its initial exploration phase was assisted by funding from PACE.

Rudy Gomez is a small explorer and he hit the jackpot with the assistance of the state government. As a result of that, we are going to see many tangible jobs. There will be 400 jobs for the development of the mine site and 400 ongoing jobs. There is then the potential for a copper concentrate plant, which will generate 100 jobs in construction and 100 jobs once construction has finished.

Of course, when it comes to copper and what will be a world-leading copper concentrate plant with some of the purest, if not the purest, copper concentrate in the nation, the state government has allocated \$20 million to the state's Copper Strategy to carry out a very sophisticated exploration program, in addition to a number of other activities. We do believe that there are additional copper resources in South Australia and that could set us up very nicely for the future. A lot of the benefits from those particular developments occur out in the regions.

It is good to see that Roxby Downs' Olympic Dam is on the move again and increasing its workforce, which is very promising. One of the good things about this budget is the up to \$15,000 that is available for employers to take on apprentices and trainees. I think that is a very positive initiative within the budget. The money that has gone in on the education side of things to the STEM projects is also incredibly positive. In itself, it generates some construction jobs. I know that the four STEM projects in the community of Whyalla have injected \$4 million into the community. Two local contractors won the work, so it has been a very positive initiative.

A lot has been said about the bank levy, which will raise \$370 million over the next four years. The reason the banks are really hot under the collar about this is that they see this as a very useful levy, potentially, for state governments. This is a levy that does not do the sort of damage that those opposite are claiming. These levies are common overseas and there were absolutely no complaints out of those opposite when the federal government at a national level introduced the same type of levy. We are talking about \$3.60 in every \$1 million worth of bank liabilities, so we are not talking about a huge levy.

When the levy was announced, it was interesting that BankSA came out and said, 'As a result of this levy, we are going to put on hold 150 new jobs,' which I do not think any of us over here knew anything about and I do not think anyone opposite knew anything about. But apparently there were going to be 150 jobs. It turns out that those 150 new jobs, to my shock, horror and surprise, were going to be part of a business process automation team. BankSA employs 3,800 people in South Australia, so they were going to get a dedicated team together to see how many of those 3,800 people could be got rid of. Some of those jobs might have been outsourced to overseas and some of those jobs would have just disappeared into the ether.

I make no apology for being an incredibly strong supporter at a federal level of holding a royal commission into the banks, given some of the unconscionable activities that the banks have engaged in over the last decade or so. It has been an absolute disgrace. The damage that they have done to individuals, to families and to small and medium-sized businesses is absolutely disgraceful, and it does warrant a royal commission.

People have talked about the salaries of employees at the upper levels of the banks. They are busily getting rid of as many employees as they can and shutting down the branches. It has been said that the five CEOs receive a total of over \$45 million. I was interested to hear that, if you just go a layer or two down from the CEOs, we are talking about an enormous amount of money.

I come from a community where people do not see that sort of money. Nobody earns that sort of money. This is not jealousy, this is not class war; this is just calling out something for what it is, which is an absolute disgrace. It is this sort of thing that is having an incredibly damaging effect on democracies that attempt to promote, through redistribution, relatively egalitarian societies, because relatively egalitarian, affluent societies usually generate some of the best results.

For those opposite who say, 'No, we should reduce taxes and reduce government,' just look around the world. The best performing governments in terms of a whole range of measures actually have a very reasonable tax take and they also have government sectors that are far bigger than what we find here in Australia both at a national level and at a state level.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (16:27): There has been a lot of debate around this most recent state budget, potentially more than ever before. The government's failed Transforming Health program has come under scrutiny. The constant ramping of ambulances at the Flinders Medical Centre is a hot topic. The issues of emergency departments closing across the city, the downgrading of services at Noarlunga Hospital and the shameful government decision to close down the Repat hospital have South Australians up in arms.

Child protection and this government's inability to care for our most vulnerable children have also had South Australians fuming. We all know the story of Chloe Valentine and her suffering. We were also left shocked when the Shannon McCoolle case was uncovered and equally stunned at how he could have infiltrated the system of Families SA.

More recently, there has been the ill-treatment of some of our state's senior citizens at the Oakden mental health facility. The handling of the situation by the government has been widely reported in the media, with the dismissive manner around the lack of care being the most shocking. Who could forget the culmination of the ill-treatment turning into a passing conversation by the minister at Bunnings? It was a sad outcome for families who have already been through a lot.

South Australia's horrendous unemployment rate has also been a key talking point. We have had the worst unemployment rate in the nation for the past 30 months straight. Unemployment, underemployment and youth unemployment in South Australia are worse than in every other state, including Tasmania, and there is more to come when Holden closes later this year.

They are just a few of the state government's major failings. They are failings that have left our state low on confidence; failings that have driven businesses out of town, taking valuable jobs away; and failings that have created an environment where everyone in South Australia is feeling strangled by the Premier and the Treasurer and all those on the other side of the chamber. They are failings that have seen our brightest young people pack up and leave our state.

It is this feeling that has people stopping me at the supermarket, at local sporting events, at the local school and at the pub. They are screaming, 'Enough!' They have had enough of feeling the

restriction and suffocation that has been inflicted by the Premier and the Treasurer and the entire South Australian Labor team.

All this leads us to the Premier's and the Treasurer's proposed state bank tax, another tax to go with the state Labor government's ESL rises, to go with our state's high-priced and unreliable electricity, our sky-high water prices and other state fees and charges, such as land tax and stamp duty. They are all hitting South Australians any way they turn, so on this side of the house the Marshall Liberal team says that enough is enough. The state Labor government cannot tax its way to prosperity. For the good of this generation and the next, we have made a stand for all South Australians.

We have to be the party for all South Australians. We have to block this tax to remove the suffocating measures on people wanting to have a go, wanting to take a risk and wanting to grow a business and generate jobs in our state. South Australian families with a mortgage and bank accounts are being attacked by the South Australian Labor government. That is what the Marshall Liberal team will do, and it starts now by making a stand. We are clearly stating on behalf of our community that enough is enough. We must remove SA Labor's toxic state bank tax from the budget.

The Marshall Liberal team wants our state and, more importantly, our people to thrive into the future. In this debate, the SA Labor government will throw around the usual spin. They have already spent and will continue to spend millions of taxpayer dollars on political advertisements in the paper, on radio, TV and social media to propagate an imaginary fight. What I am asking people to do is this. Every time you see this state government propaganda, every time you see the Premier or the Treasurer in the media, ask yourself this question: how is South Australia going as a state? Be honest, and if you are honest the answer is that we are not going good, and that has been the answer for too long.

Well, the Marshall Liberal team does not accept that anymore. We know that we have a great state with great people, and that is why we say that enough is enough and that the Weatherill Labor government has to go. When you see the Premier and the Treasurer walking along awkwardly holding their latest high-priced taxpayer-funded flyer, ask yourself: can you really believe anything they say? For the last three budgets, the Treasurer has promised jobs budgets, and in that time we have had the worst unemployment rate in the nation, worse than any other state, worse than Tasmania. The state Labor government have trumpeted jobs program after jobs program, but they have no measurable outcomes. They produce no jobs.

Manufacturing Works, Our Jobs Plan, the Northern Economic Plan, these are the proposals they put forward that cost millions and millions of dollars to South Australian taxpayers, but there are no outcomes. Now they have the Future Jobs Fund, which is more spin and, like the other programs, no outcomes. The Manufacturing Works program was a 10-year program, and just a few years ago the government did a review into its own program. The Frost and Sullivan report was commissioned and the findings showed that the Manufacturing Works program lacked outcomes. Millions and millions of dollars have been spent but, as far as generating jobs are concerned, the Manufacturing Works program lacked outcomes.

What have they done? They have ordered another review in to Manufacturing Works. Two years after the last one, spend some more money, do another review, and again that review will be released after the budget so that any measures could not even be put in place prior to this budget. This government has been here too long, they are tired and they are not getting outcomes for South Australia. As we look at this budget, the third in the series of his jobs budgets for Treasurer Koutsantonis, what does it say? It says 1 per cent jobs growth for South Australia, less than half of what Victoria has forecast and below Tasmania again. In fact, you guessed it: we have the worst outlook in the nation. I say again: enough is enough. You cannot believe the Treasurer's spin.

Even the Treasurer cannot spin the fact that the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies, an independent body, has done a review on the Treasurer's own forecast of jobs growth, which they put at 1 per cent—again the worst in the nation—and what does the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies say about this forecast? They say, 'It is overcooked and highly unlikely to be achieved.' So again the Treasurer is overtalking and massively underdelivering to South Australians. Remember that premier Mike Rann promised 100,000 jobs, but that deadline came and went and the government had not produced 20,000. They missed by that much. They promised

100,000 but did not deliver 20,000 jobs. However, again the Treasurer stands up on the other side of this chamber and spruiks again and again, 'I'm delivering a jobs budget,' but the facts show that he is failing, that this government is failing, and South Australia has had enough.

As a result of the poor economic conditions that are created by this state Labor government, we are seeing our youngest and our brightest exit South Australia. They are up and leaving and heading for brighter opportunities in other states. In fact, net migration to other states totals 6,903. That is right—people are getting up, abandoning this state Labor government, abandoning South Australia and heading interstate because they know there is no future under this state Labor government.

I have talked about unemployment and, as I said, for 30 months in a row on trend we have had the highest unemployment rate in the nation—below Tasmania. There used to be a time when we had the worst unemployment rate on the mainland and Tasmania was excluded because no-one thought we could go below Tasmania. Now we go below Tasmania, and we have been there for 30 months in a row. Holden has not closed and does not close until October 2020, so we have more pain ahead. This government has not been able to get the settings right to create an environment that will generate opportunity for people in South Australia to grow jobs. It is so evidently obvious and, although the Treasury comes out with this budget and says that it is another jobs budget, no-one out there can believe him.

What we say on this side is that we need to grow exports. That is something we are very bullish about. We need to grow the size of the pie for South Australia and not keep strangling or restricting people in this state. If we look at South Australia's export performance, over the last 12 months alone our exports fell 5.2 per cent, to just over \$11 billion. The government set a guaranteed target this year of \$18 billion but only hit \$11 billion. That is a massive shortfall for this government, when \$18 billion was the target and \$11 billion was the delivery. We need to grow our exports, and I will talk more about our policies to help achieve that.

This government has failed on so many levels, and people out there are feeling it. During the Premier's time in office, economic growth in South Australia has been 1.4 per cent against the national average of almost double that. That is where South Australia sits on the national scale. We are at 1.4 per cent and the national growth has almost been doubled in the Premier's time here in South Australia. How do they keep talking about surplus budgets and what do they do? Before the last election, and they kept this hush-hush, they planned to sell off the Motor Accident Commission, drop a whack load of money into the back pocket of the Treasurer—again, money raised by South Australians—and he has used it to prop up his budget.

A fake budget surplus really is what we are looking at. They promised not to privatise, yet here they are selling off the compulsory third-party insurance market, the MAC as we know it, the MAC that is so actively involved in a lot of community organisations, sponsoring a lot of community sports and community events, and it has been sold off by this government. It will disappear and not come back, and when that money is not there people will know that it was the Treasurer of our state at this very point in time who made this happen. What has he done with the money? He has tried to use it to make himself look good. He has tried to be tricky in saying that he is producing a surplus budget.

Last year, \$297.8 million was put into the budget from MAC. The surplus he produced was \$239 million, so more went in from the MAC than the surplus the Treasurer claimed. Really, it was not a surplus at all but a cover-up with the MAC money. The Treasurer has tried to be very, very sneaky, but South Australians are waking up and they are saying that enough is enough. Over the last 16 years, Labor has spent \$6 billion above budget—\$6 billion above budget. That is the way they operate and that is the way they work. That is \$6 billion that could have gone into funding projects, but the government instead just overspends. It overspends and overspends, and it is a situation that again has South Australians screaming that enough is enough.

When we look at this budget over the next four years, payroll tax revenue is almost \$5 billion. That is a \$5 billion tax on jobs. On the other hand, the government are saying that they are going to put \$200 million into a jobs fund, and I have talked about their previous job funds and about the fact that they do not have outcomes and do not generate the jobs they promise at the start. They are

good at pumping up a big figure—a \$200 million jobs fund—but bear in mind that they are getting \$5 billion in tax revenue from payroll tax, which is a tax on jobs.

So \$5 billion is coming in and they are putting \$200 million out in their jobs fund, but what is it going to deliver? That is the question that South Australians are asking. When you compare \$200 million for the jobs fund with \$5 billion coming in from payroll tax, really the disparity is quite alarming. Because of that big tax on jobs, and because of the payroll tax that this government grab, they admit that they need to put money back in through rebates and concessions to create and grow jobs in South Australia. The problem is again that it is not working.

That is what this government does. They are a taxing government. They want to get their hand in your pocket any way they can. They want to take money from you any which way they can, and the latest way that has come through in this budget, where we say enough is enough, is the state bank tax. We know what this government did to the State Bank back in the eighties, and now they are coming after a state bank tax as well. This is the government's plan, to tax the banks, which we know flows through to every South Australian, anyone with a mortgage or a bank account or who uses EFTPOS in any way shape or form. If you have an association with a bank, this government is coming after you and they want to get money from you.

On the federal scene, we know that there is a bank tax and that creates a national perspective. Everyone is in the same ballpark. This tax for South Australia means that we are at a competitive disadvantage. Make no bones about it: this puts South Australia at a competitive disadvantage. It means that businesses and industry and people will keep leaving, as I was saying a few moments ago. They will go where there are better economic conditions to invest their money and to grow industries in other jurisdictions.

When the government came up with this bank tax idea, did they do any economic modelling? Did they have a look at what damage this will impart on our great state? Did the Treasurer speak to anyone in industry, in the banking fraternity, small business, big business, anyone or anywhere that this might impact? Did he speak to families and ask how they might feel about it? No, the Treasurer spoke to no-one. They did no economic modelling of what this tax will do to the South Australian economy. The Treasurer did nothing, and again I say that enough is enough. A Treasurer who does no economic modelling on an impact such as this has to have some serious questions asked about his operations.

The Labor government has an Economic Development Board, they have an Investment Attraction agency and they have people in place to help give them advice and guidance on how the state should operate when it comes to economic development and investment attraction. In charge of that Investment Attraction agency is a gentleman called Rob Chapman, a very astute person who has had a long career in the banking industry. He is one of the advisers to the state Labor government.

Was he asked what impact this bank tax would have on South Australia? No, he was not. It just beggars belief that the Treasurer of our state will not speak to anyone when he is implementing a tax that will put us at a competitive disadvantage. Everyone out there who has an association with a bank—be it a bank account, a mortgage, shares or superannuation, or someone who uses an EFTPOS machine—knows that this tax will be damaging to them and to South Australia's prosperity. I say once again: enough is enough. South Australians have had enough. We need a change of direction, and the Marshall Liberal team is offering that change of direction for a prosperous South Australia.

From opposition, we have been forced to do this because it was a damaging tax to South Australians. We have already announced more than 40 excellent policies that we believe will reinvigorate this state and take South Australia forward. We have to take off the shackles. We have to stop strangling our state because that is what the people out there are feeling, and that is why South Australians are leaving, that is why business is leaving and that is why we have the jobs crisis we have here in South Australia. Already, we have committed to reducing the emergency services levy. This is a cost again on South Australian homes and businesses. It is another one of those strangulations that this government keep imposing on the great people of our state.

We are going to cap local government rate increases which will again reduce the cost of living on all South Australians. We are going to pursue the Globe Link project, again, an opportunity to grow and export out of South Australia, get businesses that are doing great things in South Australia and take them to an international market through a faster, safer and more efficient railroad and air link project. That is exciting and that is what we should be doing. We should be looking to grow our pie here in South Australia, not strangle it as this state Labor government is doing.

We will also ensure much more effective overseas representation for South Australia, opening up more trade offices overseas to allow our businesses and industries to export—again, to grow that pie. Let's sell overseas. Let's sell interstate. Let's bring money into South Australia so that businesses can grow. When businesses grow, they will employ more people.

We are going to deregulate shop trading hours to allow businesses to operate and compete against other companies that are selling on the internet. This will allow people to shop when they want to shop and allow businesses to open when they want to open. If they have a new and unique way of making money and selling their produce, let's let them do it. Let's take the shackles off South Australia again.

We will also introduce major reforms to our health system. I have talked about the problems with our health system here in South Australia. Wherever you go in local communities, people will tell you that our health system is in all sorts of trouble. We will give local communities and health professionals much more involvement in the decision-making at a local level. That is very important for all the community.

We will move year 7 into high school, and we will look at opening entrepreneurial specialist schools in South Australia as well to allow people to be entrepreneurial and to allow people to start thinking, 'We can do something great.' We can use the greatness that exists within South Australia to open businesses, to open opportunities and to open markets so that we can grow South Australia and, again, take the shackles off and stop strangling South Australians. People are sick of what this state Labor government is delivering. Enough is enough, we need to open up this state and we need to create more things.

As well as that, we will roll up our sleeves and work with South Australians. We will not strangle South Australians as this state Labor government has done. They strangle and they suck the life out of everyone in this state. They suck it out with taxes. Tax is what they know. Someone said to me other day, 'It is T for Tom and it's T for tax. It's all this state Labor government knows.' We need to put the life back into South Australia and we will work with the South Australian people. We will roll up our sleeves. We know that the situation we are in is not good. I have talked about the unemployment rate and I have talked about the lack of growth here in South Australia, but together we can do it.

The Marshall Liberal team is determined to get South Australia back to its prosperous best and to give South Australians, the people of today and the people of our future, an opportunity to grow. We need to get rid of this state Labor government. A Marshall Liberal government will deliver for South Australia. We need to say to this state Labor government, the Premier and the Treasurer, 'Enough is enough. We need to get the shackles off and grow our great state.'

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (16:47): I rise to commend this bill to the house. I am very proud that our South Australian Labor government has delivered a budget that focuses on job creation and the boosting of our state's economy through the creation of an environment in which businesses have the opportunity to grow and thrive, which takes account of the need to empower and support the most vulnerable members of our community and rightly focuses spending on infrastructure and health.

It is a budget that provides an opportunity across our South Australian communities for sporting clubs to have inclusive facilities and for community projects to be developed by community members in a way that is impactful and strengthens the fabric of local communities. This is a budget which reflects our values, which speaks to what we, the South Australian Labor government, stand for, and which potentially benefits all South Australians.

I am proud that there are many budget measures which will have a meaningful impact on the lives of many local community members. Getting to work, to study, to visit friends or family, or to go to or from our beautiful beaches and other local attractions is a core part of life. As our southern area grows and as more and more people want to visit our stunning Mid Coast and southern areas, our train patronage is increasing and it is important that we resource transport for our public well.

In this budget a funding boost will rightly deliver more public transport services to South Australians. We have committed \$22.4 million to increase train services, including along our Seaford line. This means that local southern community members and visitors to our area can access more train services in the evenings, on weekends and on public holidays, and also during major event periods. This means that more people can get home safer and sooner.

We want more South Australians to use public transport, which is why we are continually expanding and improving our network. For people who work late for a living, including those in essential and emergency services and in hospitality and a number of other professions, these additional services will make getting home easier. Just last week, I was out early at the Noarlunga Centre station and it was wonderful to hear that many people were very happy that we have made their journeys easier through these additional services. As Connor Stewart from Morphett Vale, who was here this week doing work experience with me, said:

My friends and I use the train all the time to commute from the south to the city to hang out and have fun, to 'chill', this gives us more options and will make things so much easier for us.

Local residents are also very happy to hear that we are upgrading our beautiful Port Noarlunga jetty, which sits within our Mid Coast Surfing Reserve, one of only three surfing reserves in Australia. Existing jetty stairs will be replaced and a new landing platform constructed to provide all-tide, safe and practical access to the reef for swimmers and recreational divers. As the other lovely work experience student with me this week, Harrison Hobart-Hards, also a very active lifesaver in our southern community, said to me this morning, 'Every time I go across the platform, I get splinters in my feet. It definitely needed to be redone.'

The jetty is next to our stunning Port Noarlunga reef. Upgrading the jetty will help support our local businesses, grow tourism in our community and enable members of our community to better enjoy swimming, diving, kayaking and fishing at our Port Noarlunga beach. This funding comes as part of a \$9.3 million investment into jetties across our state. With more and more people visiting our iconic beaches, these upgrades will ensure that visitors and local residents are safe and enjoy their visit.

Together with the member for Kurna, we continue to support our community members in their fight to secure funding for the Witton Bluff base track project, a project which will ensure connection between the Christies and Port Noarlunga communities and beaches. This is so important to our community, and the upgrading of our jetty alongside this work will see the whole of this area become more accessible.

Our local area, as well as communities across our state, will also greatly benefit from major infrastructure investment. Our South Australian Labor government has made a record infrastructure commitment of \$9.5 billion over four years in this budget. These projects will create thousands of jobs in South Australia and will drive economic growth. Capital investment will support the health, safety, education, housing and transport needs of future generations of South Australians.

Our southern community will benefit from the \$305 million duplication of Main South Road from Seaford to Sellicks Beach, with work starting in 2019. With approximately 17,000 vehicles using Main South Road daily, duplicating the road will make travelling to, from and within our southern communities safer and easier. Just last weekend, I was at the Aldinga Football Club watching a local SFL game. I chatted with the president of the club, Danny Wilde, and others about this upgrade, and they are so pleased. They worry about their loved ones and visiting teams travelling from and to the ground and the club and their community on the existing road, and they are very pleased that this step is being taken.

Thank you to the many community members who brought this matter to our attention, and a very big well done to the member for Mawson and the member for Kurna on their extraordinary efforts in advocating for this upgrade. To ensure that local residents benefit from this project, we

have created the Main South Road Jobs Task Force, headed by my colleague the member for Kaurna. Crucially, this task force will ensure that at least half of the 165 jobs a year during construction will go to people living in our southern suburbs. Local people often tell me that they want more local jobs on local construction projects, that they want a job close to home or that they want local opportunities for their kids and grandkids. I am proud that we have listened and that this is exactly what we are delivering.

I am also delighted that our South Australian Labor government is standing by our commitment to ending gender inequality in sport by providing more funding to assist women and girls to fully and equally participate in the sports they love. About 150,000 women and girls are registered with sporting clubs in South Australia. We have delivered a further \$14 million for the Female Facilities Program, which provides funding for local clubs to build or refurbish female change rooms and other programs to end gender inequality in sport.

For too long, female facilities have been an afterthought when designing sports grounds. This funding will ensure that women and girls have equal access to change at local clubs and incentivise their participation. I was thrilled to see the first round of the female facilities program overwhelmed with applications. I know that women and girls at these clubs will benefit from new change rooms, from receiving the message that they are welcome to equally and actively participate in every aspect of club life.

Local clubs provide such an important place to bring people together, to keep people active, to get them into teams into great community family environments. As such, they should and must be exemplars in terms of being inclusive places, and this funding enables them to be that. This funding is also a demonstration that our South Australian government is committed to moving beyond words and to real action to support the journey of girls and women in sport and to end gender inequality in every aspect of sport.

Another example of this commitment is our government's investment in netball facilities. I am thrilled that Wikaparntu Wirra, the long-term home to 20 netball courts in our south-west Parklands, the home that has seen generations of girls take to the court week in, week out will see an upgrade to their courts, an installation of seating, community courts, lawn and play space through a \$3.2 million Planning and Development Fund grant to revitalise the precinct. Our South Australian Labor government knows the role that netball plays in the lives of many young people, particularly girls, and our further \$4.5 million budget investment into an upgrade to Priceline Stadium, the home of netball in South Australia and the home of our beloved Thunderbirds, will ensure that netball and netballers continue to thrive in South Australia.

This iconic South Australian sporting facility is home to 34,000 members and 360 clubs and hosts over 350,000 visitors per year. I recently had the opportunity to help open the country netball championships at Priceline, and it was absolutely heartwarming to see girls and young women from every corner of South Australia gathered, very excited and very ready to take to the court at this much loved home of netball. This funding will ensure that Priceline Stadium continues to provide participation and development opportunities from grassroots netball training and competitions through to the elite.

We are investing in netball facilities so that more women and girls have better facilities in which to participate and excel. This investment will mean that South Australian girls and women have facilities that better enable them to reach for their sporting dreams. This investment again also demonstrates our commitment to advancing girls and women in sport and to achieving gender equality in sport, and it demonstrates our preparedness to take action that makes real and positive change for girls and women. We can all be proud of South Australia's leadership around equality in sport.

For men's and women's sport, we have created a new grant for artificial playing surfaces. Local sporting clubs will now be able to access funds to establish or replace playing surfaces through our investment of \$20 million to increase participation in local sports clubs. This funding will help our community clubs thrive. As mentioned, our local clubs are often at the heart of our community. They are vital to the health and wellbeing of so many South Australians in every corner of our state, and

we want these clubs to have the very best facilities. This funding is available for sports using synthetic surfaces and wooden or hardcourt surfaces.

I am also proud that our government has delivered a budget with a massive \$1.1 billion commitment to health care. When South Australians are sick or injured, we must look after them well. All South Australians deserve access to the best possible hospital care, which we are continuing to deliver. South Australian women will be able to access a new world-class Adelaide women's hospital. This \$528 million investment in our women's health will provide tertiary level maternity, neonatal and gynaecological services as well as perinatal infant mental health and access for women to an on-site adult intensive care unit located at the new RAH.

The new Adelaide women's hospital will be a purpose-built facility that will ensure that mothers and babies have access to modern facilities and the best care possible. Giving life is one of the greatest gifts. It also can be a time of intense emotion, sometimes physical and mental stress. It is crucial that we give mothers and babies every opportunity to be supported well in the best possible environment and to thrive. This is just part of our ongoing commitment to our healthcare system, with investments in so many of our hospitals, including our \$185.5 million upgrade to our Flinders Medical Centre and \$12 million upgrade to our Noarlunga Hospital.

I had the opportunity to visit our new theatres at Noarlunga recently, and they are state-of-the-art facilities. Whilst we could never say that anyone looks forward to using them, I am confident that those who need to use these facilities will be reassured by their excellent standard. These upgrades provide for South Australians when they are most in need, and it is important that at those times great facilities are available.

Our 2017-18 budget is undoubtedly a jobs budget. Our South Australian Labor government is committed to creating employment, to providing crucial pathways for young people to training and work, to supporting workers and their families. We want to do everything we can to create opportunities and to create new and decent jobs—decent jobs with decent wages. I say 'decent' in recognition of our government's long and proud history of supporting the lowest paid workers to receive the penalty rates they deserve—a position that demonstrates our government's support for South Australian workers, particularly those who give up precious time with their families to serve us, look after us, provide vital community and emergency support, to drive us and to be there for us in so many other ways. That is a position that stands in stark contrast to those opposite and their federal government counterparts in Canberra.

We have created a new \$200 million Future Jobs Fund to drive employment in key growth industries, including \$50 million to be distributed in grants and \$70 million in low-interest loans to be available to support job creation. The fund will build on measures in recent budgets that have underpinned jobs growth in shipbuilding and defence, renewable energy and mining, tourism, food and wine, health and biomedical research, and IT and advanced manufacturing. We are committed to building sustainable South Australian industries that will become the jobs of the future.

Through our budget last year, through our extraordinary investment in STEM facilities at 139 schools, we supported our young people who will take on those jobs of the future that we are creating to be ready for them. On this side, we call on the federal Liberal government to match our \$200 million commitment to the Future Jobs Fund and to support South Australians, not to support more cuts that hurt South Australian families.

Our South Australian Labor government is also boosting the Jobs Accelerator Grants. We have seen over the past 12 months that these grants have encouraged job creation across South Australian communities with almost 10,000 positions having been registered with the scheme. In this budget, we have provided a larger payment for apprentices and trainees to support employment for our young people.

The expansion of this program will crucially mean more job creation and, importantly, more apprentice and trainee opportunities to upskill young South Australians and to connect them with work. From the many conversations with young people in our southern community, with students thinking about their next steps, the sort of work they want to engage in, I am sure that these new opportunities will give them more to dream about, to aim for and to plan their future around.

We are also continuing to support the successful I Choose SA awareness campaign, extending the project for another 12 months to support local businesses to grow and expand, with a further \$2 million grant to double the duration of I Choose SA. The program uses advertising and branding to inform consumers that when they purchase from South Australian companies they are supporting local jobs, they are supporting other South Australian families. As of the start of June, almost 3,000 retailers and supporters had registered with the I Choose SA directory. I encourage all South Australians to get behind the I Choose SA campaign and to keep putting our people first.

Our Labor government understands the dignity that work provides and the security of a regular income. We will always fight for South Australian workers and provide incentives for job creation in our state. To fund these new job measures and to ensure we can support essential services for South Australians, we have introduced a new major bank levy, as has been spoken about many times in this house, expected to raise about \$370 million over the forward estimates. This bank levy will apply only to the banks liable for the commonwealth major bank levy, so smaller financial institutions will not be affected.

We all know that banks receive huge profits on the backs of hardworking South Australians. Last year, the five banks made collective profits of \$30 billion after tax. We also know companies in the financial services industry are not liable to pay GST. Our South Australian Labor government is applying this levy to ensure that banks are paying their fair share, a share that will ensure those South Australians who are contributing to this extraordinary profit are empowered to access those decent jobs that I spoke about and are able to access the supports and services that they need when they need them most. Big banks must pay their fair share. It is the right thing to do and I absolutely applaud our Treasurer for this measure.

Our South Australian Labor government is also proud to support vulnerable members of our community and in this budget we have invested in the Changing Places program to provide more accessible public toilets to assist people with a disability and their carers. We will campaign for facilities with more special features and more space. Changing Places bathrooms will have a height adjustable changing bench capable of supporting adults.

We will partner with local government and non-government community organisations to make this change a reality. I strongly believe that parents and carers deserve hygienic and dignified facilities to care for their loved ones, and it is our responsibility to make shared spaces more inclusive of people living with a disability. This is an important initiative that will have a meaningful impact on the lives of South Australians living with a disability.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

Ms HILDYARD: Mr Acting Speaker, could you please deal with the member for Newland? To close, I extend my congratulations to the Treasurer and to his staff for his wisdom and their efforts in creating and delivering this budget, as well as his dedication to our shared Labor values.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (17:06): The budget process is demanding and there are many pressures and needs to meet within it. I commend all the hardworking public servants for their efforts and thank the Treasurer and departmental officers for preparing what I know they believe is the most advantageous direction and plan for the future of this state.

We all love South Australia, which is why we are here. There are so many good things happening here so, to keep it that way, it would be foolish to avoid confronting the obvious issues facing the state as it restructures and repositions itself in many areas as we look towards the future and the still elusive better times ahead. The excitement and vibrancy we hear about and we are beginning to see, which were part of the Dunstan years when I first came to South Australia, prove that we can again create the atmosphere and the settings that lead to prosperity, because we still have that vital component of amazing people who really do punch above their weight in innovation and creativity.

I want to make a few observations in laywoman's terms. For a budget to be judged a success, it has to have bold vision and rigour and then deliver. It is important to have surpluses, but not at the expense of basic services, because we live in a community, not just an economy. That is what I have always said since I first came here as a kindy mum and community activist. I still believe the same

things are as important today as they were then. Jobs, safe and secure accommodation and access to good health and education services are still the basics.

From a kindy mum, now a grandparent and long-serving MP's perspective, I want to consider some of the important aspects of this budget. Firstly, how will it stimulate employment? The amounts listed in the Budget Overview, pages 2 and 3, while obviously welcome, seem small when compared with the outlays in other budget areas. Every job is important, as each represents a person and their connections to family and community. We have close scrutiny of jobs in many sectors, such as tourism, food and wine to name a few. Do we have the same watching brief on the jobs that keep our manufacturing, large enterprises and the small to medium ones on the move? Can we really afford to lose one such job?

Infrastructure and construction are certainly keeping many people employed, but it remains a constant challenge to find continuing employment for them and our skilled manufacturing workforce whenever a factory closes or a business folds—and they do, with resulting impacts on the families who not only work in them but also run them. Their struggle is replicated by those of the many primary producing and regional families who face the same daily struggles to make ends meet, while also having to factor in the vagaries of things like weather and water management.

At the end, the banks are there, too, and failure is undoubtedly one of the sad ways they accumulate huge profits, which makes them, not without good reason, the obvious target for budget repair nationally and now at the state level in a romantic Robin Hood sort of way, but there is the rub: hastily thought-out tax grabs, no matter how innovative, eventually affect every single South Australian.

The state proposal, similar to the recently announced federal bank proposal, may be modest and attractive, but it has brought the combined wrath and might of the biggest national companies on us in the most unhelpful and perhaps sustained way. I understand the concept of bullying all too well and the problems associated with a perceived capitulation, but the many people in Florey I have spoken with do not believe that the state government is able to protect them from costs being recovered in some way. They are not too sure about the federal example either.

There must be more than one way to achieve the desired end, and people want those with the know-how and in the right places to apply their skills and come up with a better solution. Levying the same sort of tax twice is not the answer and comes across as though we do not have any original ideas in this state, limited though our options might be in raising revenue, but we could concentrate on ways to make the cake bigger rather than cutting the slices ever more thinly. It has been suggested to me that the proposed state-based bank tax morally dishonours the agreement not to reintroduce bank taxes that was made by all states when the GST was introduced. A technicality on what it applies to will not change the fundamental principle at heart.

Going it alone is a calculated risk that I am not sure the public wants taken. That does not mean giving up but, rather, pursuing a different option to achieve the same end. This is where good relationships with the commonwealth are imperative, from the Murray River to electricity and even taxation. It is a difficult and, in the world of politics we find ourselves today, almost insurmountable situation for a small state. Even so, I repeat that good relationships are essential, and even in politics trust is an important part of that.

Federation needs a major overhaul and we need a credible plan to fix it. Now is not the time to create further distrust and confusion but to work with the commonwealth and other states to somehow identify and provide concrete solutions. It does seem like it is every state or territory for itself. In the end, though, it is a commonwealth, and people want it to work and they look to us to make it work. Let's see a bold South Australian plan and leadership that makes that happen.

Health continues to be a major focus in the Florey area, largely around the continuing life of Modbury Hospital, most lately centred on its place in Transforming Health and into the future, whatever its next incarnation will be called. No longer called a 'general' hospital, Modbury Hospital is now a 'suburban' hospital, linked inextricably to the Lyell McEwin health service. I have watched and fought even before entering parliament, to keep Modbury Hospital the important local centre of health care it remains, although in ever-changing guises.

Over the years, the dedicated staff have put their hearts and souls into defending and keeping the reputation of the hospital's care of the community, and each of us has happy and sad memories of important events it has played in our lives. Modbury Hospital is the living heart of our community's health services, not something people can fund or defund at whim to balance out a bottom line. They can be patient patients, to a point, but they are close to not believing anything they hear. No glossy brochure or letter can change what has happened in our lived experiences.

Luckily, most people seem to find the health service works when they need it and, although adverse outcomes cannot be eliminated, I believe our front-line health professionals do a marvellous job. The perception, though, in the community is that the front-line services people actually need and use are suffering. There are reports that it is taking longer to be seen by a GP or by a doctor in our hospitals in the event of an emergency. Some patients are definitely waiting longer to get the life-altering surgery they need, creating further complications.

People are cynical about good news funding announcements just before an election. This budget sees The Queen Elizabeth Hospital the big health winner, and rightly so—\$250.6 million over four years. The Lyell McEwin health service gets a much-needed emergency department upgrade—\$52.5 million over four years. Modbury Hospital receives its long needed, much asked-for extended care unit—\$9.2 million over three years. I thank and salute the Modbury Hospital emergency department staff for their work and SASMOA, who have also worked very hard to represent their members' interests. No-one underestimates the importance of this investment in our state's acute system. We recognise the health budget, by its very nature, is hard to deliver as promised.

At Modbury Hospital breast cancer treatment and better day surgery are some of the service improvements, but they have come after long periods of uncertainty. Just as we think we have reached a satisfactory outcome for Modbury Hospital or its place in the ever-changing health system seems secure, there is another often unnecessary round of destabilising rumours and changes. This does have to end. No-one believes what is being said anymore. They believe the results. Having a new rehab centre here is fantastic, but not at the cost of other services or funding to areas like palliative care, which does so much at Modbury Hospital and is recognised as a centre of excellence.

People have to be able to trust government and the people in charge, which means they have to be told the truth. Those in authority have to lose the spin and explain what they want or hope to achieve, and how they are going to implement the changes to get there. It is not helpful, no matter how hard the changes will be, to point us in one direction and then hope to pull us back with a reversal plan and an announcement of pots of money to half address the issues raised by long suffering healthcare providers and consumers.

The Transforming Health blueprint and whatever comes from it now is dependent on the paramedics in our ambulance service, and that particular part of the highly trained and skilled health workforce needs to be fully staffed and operational to save lives and move people smoothly through the acute health system. Without help arriving swiftly and treatment coming as quickly as possible, our health system cannot be best practice. For ambulances to be that cornerstone, we need to have universal emergency ambulance cover. If other states can do it, then we must too.

Sick people or those individuals involved in life-threatening accidents not in the ambulance subscription scheme can be charged more to get from Valley View to the Lyell McEwin Hospital in an ambulance than it costs to fly to a holiday destination like China, and 60 per cent of people transport themselves to hospital during a healthcare crisis, for whatever reason, and that is just not safe for anyone. There is nothing in this budget to address either of these situations.

Education sees our teachers remain the vital link between children and their preparedness for life and the jobs of the future. This is a huge area of importance and teachers do their best to provide the best outcomes and safe places to learn. Schools are also a vital link between successful family life and are often a first point where trouble signs can be spotted and supports put in place to prevent family breakdown.

Non-government agencies are more and more a part of the solutions needed to help with issues from child protection to homelessness as governments step back from providing many front-line services and running anything at all. Public ownership is still something people speak with me about wistfully. The LTO is the latest thing we no longer maintain. It is a worry and it is hard to

see where it will all end. Selling of South Australia's assets to private operators makes the budget bottom line look attractive but comes at a cost.

Hardworking people like the residents in Florey face increases, albeit modest, in things like the cost of registering and driving a car and catching the bus. They face them stoically and really welcome the additional park-and-ride that is going to be erected at Modbury but are still anticipating the changes to the concourse, which were asked for many years ago.

Getting back to public ownership, the loss of the lotteries, forest rotations and MAC, among other things, means we no longer have their revenue streams. Someone once said to me that it was too risky to keep electricity generation, which leads me to the biggest issue constituents raise, the ever constant household budget issue of power bills.

As with a lot of other everyday essential contracts like mobile phones and NBN access, you really need to be on top of all the fine print, and even if you are it still means that it is a constant struggle to make sure you get the best possible deal. Power contracts are a jungle. Power security is essential and lots is being spent on that in this budget and the transition to sustainable, secure power, and that is very welcome. With regard to contracts, here is where I long for the good old days when you could rely on calling someone in consumer affairs and being set straight fairly quickly, particularly about building homes and issues like private certification. Buyer beware truly remains a golden rule.

There is spending on the arts especially, the Centre of Democracy for school students and adults alike, and sports—which is great and has positive health outcomes too—along with connecting communities, which is where so many great ideas begin. People know what affects them and usually have suggestions on how to put things right.

Volunteering is the backbone of the community. Without volunteers, it is hard to know how we could keep things going. It is a good way to get into employment for those starting out and a great way to stay connected for those at the other end looking at retirement, and I will speak more about aged care later. However, volunteering cannot sustain a person or a family. We have to look at ways of making all their valuable work truly valued in a tangible way while still recognising the donation of time and the important part it plays in so many people's lives. Volunteering is most rewarding to the volunteer and is often the only reason and thanks they need.

Most of the things we need and count on for our lives have funding components from more than one source. Federation comes in here again. It is the maximisation of these funding arrangements that is the key to making sure our communities operate in a cohesive way, keeping jobs and services in harmony so that we can live happy and productive lives. The struggles in day-to-day living can often have detrimental effects on us, and the mental health of our communities is another issue that must be given greater focus. Addictive behaviours are part of the complex needs so many seem to be battling, and the impacts on families are hidden unless you are close to a person confronting the enormous problems associated with that. Disability needs are beginning to be addressed through the NDIS and so this area has started to change many lives.

Another area of great social need similar to disability, child protection and child care that has come sharply into focus is aged care. I refer to remarks in an earlier grievance on places like Oakden in our national aged-care system that we ignore at our peril. As the member for Heysen said yesterday, many of us will live beyond 100, and staying home as long as possible is the aim, but some of us will eventually find ourselves in care.

There is good work being done. The member for Fisher has a committee, and I know there is a Senate committee nationally as well, and work is being done by private providers to look to the future. People are working hard, but it will need funding and a national framework. People trust parliament to look after their best interests in aged care and in every other matter. They want clear direction, and if things go wrong or change they want to know and they want to know how it will be fixed and then they want to see something happen in a timely manner.

Aged care, like retirement villages, needs national oversight. South Australia made good amendments to the Retirement Villages Act recently, and that was led by the member for Ashford, and the member for Colton was involved in that as well, but the changes could not be made

retrospectively. Contracts do need to be simplified and in plain English, not traps for unsuspecting people.

As in today's debate in lieu of question time, I find myself having to weigh the merits of propositions and debate within the budget and the adversarial system within which we work—which often means the answer is somewhere in between. I truly believe in the participatory democratic system and the value of the vote. We work with the system that we have and the parliament that we were delivered at the last election, and each of us here who have the honour to speak for our communities do so in good faith.

There are some good measures in the budget and, as we all want to see South Australia great, it would be good to know in advance if everything in the budget will work as planned. However, our challenge is to ensure that we have the inbuilt resilience to see off the dip in the cycle and to make sure our state returns to prosperity. We can all work together to achieve this. Let's hope that is what happens.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): The member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (17:21): Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. May I say what a fine job you are doing in that auspicious role. I think you are bringing distinction to the chair in a way that we have been waiting for years. The nation casts its lonely heart, hoping to see someone to look up to in that chair and now they do, if only for this brief period, so congratulations.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Order!

Mr GARDNER: This bill is to appropriate money for public servants to be paid to enable the government to undergo its business, and it will be supported by the opposition so that supply may continue and government may go on. However, the budget papers contain many things that are worthy of some comment, some of which have already received a goodly amount of comment today, but there are a few things left to say about the government's state bank tax.

I commence my remarks by putting some extra concerns in addition to those I put on the record earlier today about why I think this measure is dangerous, damaging to South Australia, damaging to South Australians who are seeking jobs, and is not in the best interests of the South Australian community or, indeed, any South Australian, in any way. It is a bad tax, and that is why we plan to oppose that aspect of the Budget Measures Bill.

The key factor that determines interest rates is risk, and the riskier the environment the higher the interest rate will be. This is of concern to anybody with a mortgage in South Australia or anybody who plans to have a mortgage in South Australia, anyone who wants to buy a house, anyone who wants to take on a loan to start a small business, anyone seeking to get a job with somebody who has a business or with a business that has a loan, or someone who is hoping to attract investment. All these people—which is pretty much just about everybody, particularly young South Australians hoping to have a better future—will be impacted negatively by this state bank tax.

One component of the risk for South Australians in South Australia that has not existed before is sovereign risk. We have a state government right now that will make policy decisions that will frighten investors. A government that springs a new tax on a sector with no warning will simply mean that investors will require a higher return on the debt they lent because of the fear that the goalposts could change at any moment.

The Treasurer himself said in question time that he did not speak to any of the business groups, that he did not speak to any of the business leaders and that he did not speak to any of the government's own hand-picked economic advisers. He did not speak to any of the 145,000 small businesses in South Australia. This is a tax of the Premier's and the Treasurer's devising that is going to have extraordinarily bad impacts across the South Australian community and is going to create this risk.

This means that there is a real risk in South Australia that our home loans, our car loans, our credit cards and our business overdrafts could all have higher interest rates than those in other states because those state governments are not perceived to be reckless like South Australia is. It would

be an outrage if any South Australian were effectively treated as a second-class citizen within Australia, paying more for a home loan than someone in Victoria or Queensland because of the actions of this government, because this government has increased the cost of borrowing thanks to erratic and risky policymaking.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Treasurer, the member is on his feet and he is entitled to be heard in silence.

Mr Pederick: He has had three warnings.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Hammond, I will be alright thank you. If I need you, I will let you know.

Mr Pederick: Always happy to help out.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I know you are. Member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: This is a Treasurer who has done what very few treasurers have done before, all of them of course Labor treasurers. They have taken a policy decision that will damage—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order.

Mr GARDNER: —the people of South Australia by having a differential tax that differentiates South Australia from other states.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Stop the clock. Sit down. It does not appear you were sent out, Treasurer, but you have been warned twice. It would be good to be able to hear the member for Morialta's points, and I am sure that at some point you will get up and refute them, won't you, but it will not be during his speech. Member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. Of course, there is one other person who has done something similar to this to the South Australian people, and that fellow was John Bannon—

Mr Picton interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Kaurana!

Mr Picton interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Stop it! I am on my feet. It is very disrespectful to speak loudly on your phone in the chamber, Treasurer. Treasurer, please do not speak loudly on your phone. I am reminding the member for Kaurana that he is out of order.

Mr GARDNER: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. We have a Treasurer who cannot even remember his own talking points and needs to be on the phone to outside the chamber while he is in here so that he can prepare his response—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no need for that to happen. Let's all try to behave, though.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sit down.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: It's juvenile, John.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think 'juvenile' is listed, but we can try to see if you can have it incorporated somehow later on. I am asking the members—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Stop the clock. No, listen, you have all been pretty good so far. I am not going to accept the interjections. Please do not interject. Give the member the respect he deserves. You can have a time to speak again later on in grievances tonight. We will be here all day if there are interjections. I do not intend to let it happen.

Mr GARDNER: There was an interesting word used seven times in question time yesterday by the Treasurer in relation to answering questions about this bank tax, and that was about his entitlement. I think what we have just seen demonstrates the entitlement that the members of the front bench—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, no need for that. Back to the speech.

Mr GARDNER: —demonstrated in their budget—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sit down. Sit down. Back to your speech.

Mr GARDNER: —demonstrated in their budget—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Back to your speech.

Mr GARDNER: In the bill ahead of us, they do feel entitled to do whatever they want to the people of South Australia and indeed to introduce this tax, which is of course a different situation from the federal tax, where the federal tax is in response to the guarantee the federal government provides the banks. This state government does not do that. All this state government does in relation to a guarantee is guarantee that South Australians are going to be kicked in the teeth when it comes to their financial arrangements. They have form. It is not enough for them to have ruined South Australia once with a state bank disaster; they are now seeking to do it again.

I was at school when the State Bank went into difficulties. However, I am still old enough to remember how it worked, and I am familiar in a very personal way with some of the impacts of the State Bank disaster and what it did to business confidence in South Australia. I am 38 years old. I was—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: Sorry, what was that, Treasurer? You were interjecting.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, you both know that it is unparliamentary to interject or respond to interjections.

Mr GARDNER: I was 12 years old in 1989.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Ignore him.

Mr GARDNER: I grew up in a small family business environment, manufacturing water treatment equipment. It was my father's company, as he started it, and it was owned by my mother and my father and another investor who worked in the company. It was a small business that employed between nine and 16 people from year to year depending on how it went. After the State Bank disaster, after the calamitous subsequent recession we had to have at a federal level, I well remember that every few months we would have the company's accountant sitting at the dinner table because that is what happens in a small family business. The accountant is a family friend and he sits there and gives us advice on what is going forward.

I remember the lack of confidence that we had going forward at the time. I remember the way that businesses respond to these sorts of calamitous issues. The fact is that if you go back to that period in 1991 there was a loss of \$3.15 billion in state government guaranteed funds. It cost hundreds of millions of dollars per year for the state government to cover the bank's bad debts. Samuel Jacobs QC, the commissioner, said:

John Bannon failed to listen to the messages of doom, ignored the warnings—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order: relevance.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sorry, I was talking to the Clerk. We are going to have to listen to you very carefully, member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: He continued:

shut down debate in the Assembly and refused to listen to the people who had insight into the impact of what was happening in the State Bank would have to the people of South Australia.

That is what we see again here today in this bill. In this bill, the Appropriation Bill and the consequent budget papers that go with it, we see a tax that is going to have an extraordinary impact on the people of South Australia. It is not that the Treasurer has ignored the warnings of what will happen before introducing this measure; he did not even talk to anybody, certainly nobody who remembers the consequences of the State Bank disaster that a previous Labor government committed on the people of South Australia. It is utterly destructive to confidence.

But of course we did have insight into where the Premier gets his advice and support from. He read an article into the parliament's *Hansard* from The Australia Institute, a group led by a nice fellow called Ben Oquist, most well known of course for working as chief of staff and adviser to Bob Brown for many years. It is perhaps not surprising that this is a government that is focused on receiving financial advice and support from people who are running mates with the Australian Greens.

The other media outlet that is supporting the government's measures is the government's own version of *Pravda*, *The Express*, a newspaper paid for in funds out of this budget by the people of South Australia's tax dollars and handed out by ministers on street corners. It is the only publication in town that actually says that any of these measures are a good thing and that any of these measures are going to have good consequences for the people of South Australia.

Frankly, I heard the minister talking in his speech on this bill about advertising campaigns which he accused as being designed to mislead people. The government is spending money, taxpayers' hard-earned dollars, taking their taxes into the state government coffers, spending money printing newspapers to hand back to them and telling them that the government is in fact doing a good job. What do the people who understand how economies work say about this budget? They say that it is not a jobs budget. In fact, even the Treasury papers suggest that it is not a jobs budget, the Treasury papers which show that jobs growth will be less than half that of Victoria and half the national average.

It defies belief almost that Labor would just dismiss the legitimate concerns of South Australian employers and fail to commission economic modelling about the impacts of a state bank tax and then seek to impose it on the South Australian people. It is a tax that will break South Australia's economy, and therefore it is necessary that it be opposed. The importance at this stage in particular of not undertaking measures that will hurt South Australia's economy cannot be overstated.

We have a seasonally adjusted unemployment rate of 6.9 per cent in May, which is the highest in the nation, and a trend figure of 7.1 per cent—that is the steady figure—which has been the highest in the nation for 30 consecutive months. The youth unemployment rate is 17.2 per cent—the highest in the nation. Tasmania is beating us, Western Australia is beating us and so are Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria. There are 60,300 people unemployed and another 85,900 people underemployed, seeking extra hours. They are in a situation where, in many cases as the result of policies enacted by this government, they are not able to work to the extent that they would like.

We need to be doing everything we can to create a state in which every South Australian knows that they can achieve their full potential, that they can get a good day's pay for a good day's work and that their work will be rewarded. That is not what this state government delivers or what they have delivered. Commonwealth Treasury forecasts that there will be a 1.5 per cent employment growth in 2017-18 nationally, and our state Treasury forecast is 1 per cent. The fact of the matter is that, at a time when unemployment is in such a significant crisis, we can little afford to take measures that will damage it even further.

In relation to my portfolio of education, multicultural affairs and the arts, there are a number of measures in this budget, some of which are welcomed and some we have some questions about. For the benefit of the bevy of advisers who may come with the education minister to the estimates procedures in the next couple of weeks, I will put a couple of those questions on the record at this point. Hopefully, when we are in estimates, we might be able to get some quick answers and we will not have to spend all the allocated time going back and forth, looking up documents that really should be quite easy to find.

On Budget Paper 5, page 31, we see \$7 million pledged over four years for two new super schools. These are at Munno Para and Sellicks Beach, although I note that some of the materials talk about Sellicks Beach/Aldinga. I am interested to know from the government what their plan is there. They are to be built as public-private partnerships and the funding in the budget, the \$7 million, is to manage those public-private partnerships. It is suggested that there are going to be 1,400 R to 12 students, 100 special-school students and a 55-place children's centre in each of them.

We do not have any details in that budget announcement as to the location of the school, whether it is Sellicks Beach or Aldinga. If it is to be both, I suspect that would be quite a piece of land. What schools are going to be impacted? What modelling has been done on whether the government is expecting other schools to close as a result of these schools being built?

We understand that there is a demographic increase in these areas and there is some level of need for new school infrastructure, which is supported, but we need to know a lot more detail about the government's expectations. When these schools open, what year levels are they going to contain? What local schools are going to be impacted? Where does the government model that these 3,000 new students across both sites are going to be drawn from? They are not just going to be coming out of thin air. A number of those students are currently attending other schools.

We note that there is no funding in this budget for the Magill school. Four years ago, at a similar point on the time line as these new Munno Para and Sellicks Beach schools being announced in the last electoral cycle, the member for Wright—education minister as she was then, and representative of the Speaker at a presiding officers' conference as she is now—as education minister promised that there would be a birth to 12 school at Magill.

When it came down to it, that was in the election promise and the subsequent 2014 budget. That was taken down into what was, in effect, a business case or a scoping study, and we got hung up on the jargon, but several hundred thousand dollars were spent. Aurecon worked with the department and built up what that school might look like. It was 2014 when that money was subsequently committed. UniSA have been working on the project, as well as the Norwood Morialta High School governing council joined by other governing councils, the Magill Primary School and the Magill Kindergarten. An awful lot of work has been happening in recent years.

In particular, I note that a lot of volunteer work has been happening because a number of people in the working groups have been working in good faith with the government because it promised before the last election that there would be a new school at Magill. They have been giving up enormous amounts of their time. They are people with jobs, people who are raising a family and people who do not just happen to have a lot of spare time. However, because they are on the governing council and because they want to support their child's education by doing everything they can and by giving their expertise and energy, they work with the government to find a best outcome that suits all the needs of the different stakeholders of new facilities at Magill.

Frankly, the facilities at Rostrevor, which I identify are in my own electorate, are inadequate. The current 10 to 12 campus at Norwood Morialta needs quite a lot of work if there is not to be a new school at Magill. The minister has been there and knows what I am talking about. The government has not put any money in the budget to provide the work necessary to bring Rostrevor up to scratch, and it has not put any money in the budget after four years to develop the new school at Magill.

I have questions for the education minister at estimates or the Treasurer, and if he knows the answers he can answer them. What is the government planning to do at Magill? When will the work of the parents and the endeavour that they have put into helping the government develop this project come to fruition? These parents, by the way, know that their children will not see this school completed while they are still at the school. They know it is a longer term project, but they want the best for the school community and, therefore, they are taking whatever steps they can to support its development. I commend them for that.

I hope the government identifies a time line for an answer. Hopefully, there will be support for it before the end of the year and hopefully some of the Treasurer's several hundreds of millions of dollars worth of contingencies will go towards supporting it, but at the very least we need a time line and answers for those schools. There are several schools involved, as well as the University of South Australia, and there are more than 1,000 future students.

Going to the education minister's future potential responses in estimates, I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, pages 14 and 15. I have identified at least seven examples of delays to school infrastructure works compared with last year's budget papers. They are the Christies Beach High School Disability Unit, Evanston Gardens Primary School, Le Fevre High School, Playford International College, the Preschool Relocation Program, Swallowcliffe Primary School and Yalata Anangu School. Some of those delays are as short as three months and some are over a year. I hope the education minister will take the opportunity, when I ask this question in estimates, to answer quickly and concisely, having had several weeks, from my raising it here, to identify the answers.

Whilst she is at it, she can also identify the staff fluctuations and what they are about in Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 20. Since the 2014-15 budget, staff numbers have dropped by 300 in 2016-17 only to increase by 200 in 2017-18. There is also \$608,000 over two years for the Right Bite pilot program. I would like the minister to explain why we are spending that money. What is that giving us in addition to what Foodbank and KickStart For Kids already give? Which schools will benefit and how will they benefit more than they already do from other charity programs? I will be supporting this part of the budget through the Appropriation Bill.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (17:43): I rise to speak on the Appropriation Bill 2017. The 2017-18 state budget is a budget—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Ms WORTLEY: —that is innovative and that looks to the future, putting South Australians first. It is a budget that invests in our children's schools, in our hospitals, in the neighbourhoods we live in and in our state's infrastructure. Importantly, it is a budget that has as its aim supporting existing jobs and creating new opportunities right here in South Australia. It is a budget that funds Our Energy Plan to secure the state's power supply and to put downward pressure on prices.

It is a budget that shows that, as a government, we are listening to and hearing what the community is saying, one that focuses and delivers on the core values of jobs, health, education and community neighbourhoods. It is a budget that affirms the government's strong economic management with estimates putting us on track to deliver surpluses every year from 2015-16 through to 2020-21.

On the jobs front, disappointingly and sadly, in a little less than four months' time more than 50 years of automotive manufacturing history will end as Holden closes its factory at Elizabeth. It is not for the want of trying by our state Labor government, but the federal Liberal government and the state Liberal members opposite failed to see the significance and its importance to families in our state. I have witnessed the impact the closure is having on workers and their families. As a government, we are working hard to protect existing jobs while trying to help our traditional manufacturers through these very tough times.

This state budget delivers a new \$200 million Future Jobs Fund to drive employment in key growth industries in our state. It will deliver grants and low-interest loans to support job creation in the growth industries of shipbuilding and defence, renewable energy, mining and tourism, food and wine, health and biomedical research, and IT and advanced manufacturing. The very successful and popular I Choose SA campaign will be extended. There will be support for the automotive supply chain ahead of the closure of Holden and the end of automotive manufacturing in SA, and that will be a sad day.

In addition, there is an allocation to support bids to secure major events and conventions to further drive growth in the visitor economy and to further support and secure new investment in the state through low-interest loans and grants. The state government has also established an SA Jobs Today website to act as a portal for information for job seekers and businesses. This budget will also see the Job Accelerator Grants increase by up to \$5,000 for each new apprentice and trainee hired. Coupled with the already existing grant, the benefit increases up to \$15,000 and supports an estimated 2,000 positions. I know that many young people in my electorate, some of whom I have spoken to, will benefit from this initiative.

The state government will upgrade our transport with safer and more efficient roads and better, more frequent public transport. These new infrastructure projects are a boost for local jobs and contractors. Over the past 15 years, the government has almost doubled park-and-ride vehicle capacity for public transport users across Adelaide. Now, with the O-Bahn's extension to the CBD via the City Access Project nearing completion, it makes sense to augment current facilities to make accessing the upgraded services as easy and convenient as possible.

We want to encourage more people to use public transport as their preferred mode of transport, and that is why we have invested in the O-Bahn City Access Project which, when completed, will transport more than 31,000 commuters each working day. This transport option certainly lives up to its reputation as the most popular public transport network in Adelaide.

This budget has allocated \$50 million over two years for additional parking facilities at the Klemzig O-Bahn interchange and the park-and-ride at Tea Tree Plaza, delivering an additional 500 car park spaces. An extra 200 places will be created at the Klemzig O-Bahn interchange, including additional accessible car parks, with building work set to start next year. This will take the available car parking spaces at the Klemzig interchange to 430. The new facilities at Klemzig and Tea Tree Plaza will comply fully with access standards and will feature security lighting and CCTV coverage to enhance user security, and we will clearly delineate pathways to the platforms.

Having spoken with residents in Klemzig and Windsor Gardens, I have advocated on their behalf for additional parking at the Klemzig O-Bahn interchange. I know how pleased residents will be having their streets free of congestion from commuters who park their cars in their streets and out the front of their houses and also the commuters with having additional car parking spaces made available.

These upgrades will build on the success of the current sites. It is a great outcome for O-Bahn commuters and nearby residents. Of course, I will continue to advocate for upgraded facilities for residents who live closer to the Paradise O-Bahn interchange. I understand the government is still committed to working with the City of Campbelltown to find the best solutions for the Paradise interchange. Having spoken with residents in Klemzig and Windsor Gardens, I know that they are particularly pleased about this outcome.

As a government, we are supporting industries that are growing today to create the jobs of tomorrow for this generation and for future generations. The state government is determined to deliver a modern cutting-edge health system, despite the federal government's cuts to health funding in 2014, which will cost South Australia \$1.5 billion. Some of the 2017-18 state budget investment in health infrastructure includes a new eight-bed emergency extended care unit at Modbury Hospital; the expansion of the Lyell McEwin Hospital's emergency department; the redevelopment of The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, including a new emergency department—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members on my left.

Ms WORTLEY: —a new Adelaide Women's Hospital, physically connected to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, to provide world-class care for women and newborn babies; a major upgrade of the Women's and Children's Hospital site; additional operating theatres at Flinders Medical Centre; and the development of a new older person's mental health facility.

Mr Bell: Where are the country ones?

Ms WORTLEY: In addition, the state budget also commits funding to redevelop—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Torrens, just sit down. Stop the clock. You are on two warnings, member for Mount Gambier. You will leave us if you need to say another word. The member for Hammond is not in his seat and he is on one warning.

Mr Bell: Can I ask how many warnings the Treasurer is on?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That has nothing to do with it. Come and speak with me here if you want to ask a question. The member for Torrens.

Ms WORTLEY: —the higher courts precinct, including an additional two jury rooms for the Sir Samuel Way Building; upgrade Her Majesty's Theatre; provide grants to sporting clubs for facilities for women, which I know is very welcome, and for artificial playing surfaces; improve jetties at Henley Beach, Port Noarlunga, Whyalla and Port Bonython; stage 1 development of the Priceline netball stadium; the extension of GigCity, offering new precincts access to ultrafast internet; and initiatives to reduce the supply of crystal meth in our communities.

On education, the government continues to invest in public education, honouring the full six years of the original Gonski agreement, and rolling out the STEM program, redeveloping 139 schools to deliver science, technology, engineering and maths. Under a public-private partnership, two birth to year 12 schools, one in the north in the Munno Para region and one in the south in the Sellicks Beach-Aldinga region, will be built. Of course, construction has already begun on the new Adelaide Botanic High School in the city.

Our government is continuing to work hard to further improve hospitals, public transport, education, roads and public housing to create a dynamic, livable, vibrant and safe place to live now and into the future. In the words of the Premier, 'We're supporting industries that are growing today to create the jobs of tomorrow.' I commend the budget to the house.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (17:52): Can I pass on my thanks to the House of Assembly, all the members of the government, Independents and opposition who have made their remarks. When it comes to the budget, it is my very strong view that budgets are a reflection of government values, whoever that government is. All members come to this place with high ideals. All members come to this place with the very best intentions. All members want to do the very best for their constituents and, of course, their political movements.

Every side thinks that they are right. Every side thinks that they have justice on their side, but the constitution of our great state recognises that not everyone is going to agree with everything everyone does. The constitution, which was drafted by our founding fathers, decided that, to have responsible representative government in this state, it would set down some precedents, and those precedents have been held in this state since 1857.

The Constitution Act is pretty explicit in providing that the benefits of the House of Commons and the practices of the houses of parliament would flow on to these parliaments. The constitution made it very clear what the founding fathers wanted for the budget process because they foresaw what could occur if governments were not allowed to govern, that is, that they were not allowed to pass their budget measures.

Members opposite have taken this budget as an opportunity to express their dissatisfaction with those precedents since 1857. That is fine. I assume that this will be now the last budget this House of Assembly will ever debate without the traditions of those 170 or so budgets that have been passed. That is all the doing of the Leader of the Opposition. To be frank and fair, every parliament is the master of its own destiny, and every parliament can choose to keep or smash those traditions. Every parliament, from Playford, Dunstan, Bannon, Brown, Olsen, Rann and Weatherill have kept those precedents. They are now gone.

It is a sad day for our parliament, and it is a sad day for our state, because what it will mean is the ultimate politicisation of every single decision and government will grind to a halt. But that is the government that members opposite want and aspire to have, and that is fine because, if they are successful at the next election, those are the terms under which they will govern from now on.

Mr Picton: It's radical.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is radical, but it is a decision that they have made. Apparently, it was a unanimous decision in their party room. And good luck to them. Finally, after all these years they are unified on one issue—that is, trashing 170 years of tradition. Congratulations.

As was said on a number of circumstances, the major bank levy, in my mind, is a very elegant solution to a very difficult problem. States need revenue and that revenue has to come from somewhere. We have decided that that revenue should come from the most profitable undertaxed part of the economy. Members opposite think that that revenue should come from mums and dads

because, when they knock off this revenue measure, they are not at the same time suggesting any pullback in expenditure.

They are not offering any solutions. In fact, in all the budget speeches that I have just heard they have all called for more expenditure, whether it is for more regional roads or more in the regional economy. I just saw the shadow minister talking about wanting to have a new campus at Magill. Again, it is a call for more expenditure. I also note that members opposite say that we are on the eve of an election and are still calling the government to do more, yet make no commitments of their own.

We are heading into a new era. Whatever happens at the election, last year was the last budget when budget bills go through unmolested. That will never occur again, ever. That is something that members opposite have voted for unanimously. It is a shame because, even in the heights of the Olsen-Brown feuds, the opposition never took advantage of that through the budget process. But every opposition makes its own decisions. It is interesting that this opposition is following this leader off this cliff, but maybe that is an experiment that they have to have. Maybe they have to go through this to realise the error of their ways. However, it is a shame that last year was the last budget to have that level of cooperation.

Mr Picton: At least the banks will be happy.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: At least the banks will be happy. I would have thought that the appropriate measure, the honest measure, would be to say, 'It's a budget measure. We'll let the government's measure pass. If we are successful at the election, we will revoke it.' I would have thought that would be something that this government would have respected as a position. It would have been in keeping with the traditions. It would have kept in line with their position, but as I said today, my judgement on this is that the opposition thinks that this election is a fifty-fifty call. Given the polls, I think they are right. If they were serious about winning, that is the path they would have gone down. I think this obstructionist view is very dangerous because they are not actually psychologically imagining themselves to govern. It is a sad day, but that is the way the cookie crumbles, as they say.

I do look forward to the debate on the budget bills. I thank members for passing appropriation unmolested. I thank members for passing it and maintaining that tradition. But of course the budget is not just about appropriation; the budget is multiple measures. We are now down this new path and I do not know where we will come out at the other end. Thank you, and I look forward to the grievances remarks. I will not keep the house any longer so members can enjoy their dinner break.

Bill read a second time.

Estimates Committees

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (17:59): I move:

That this bill be referred to estimates committees.

Motion carried.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (17:59): 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. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (18:00): I move:

That the house note grievances.

Sitting suspended from 18:00 to 19:30.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (19:30): I will continue my remarks. The South Australian Liberal approach to export growth will include a focus on export training, marketing, and export funding support initiatives to attract more international students and a targeted policy to grow population and attract more skilled and business migrants. The state budget has provided just a \$737,000 increase from the 2016-17 estimated result for the 2017-18 budget for international engagement, trade, migration and international education programs. These are key pillars and drivers of our economy, yet the total budget for this totals less than \$20 million.

We have seen industry growth in a number of export sectors in South Australia, particularly in service exports such as international education, but we can and we need to do better. Our share of merchandise and service exports on a national stage is nowhere near where it should be. The Department of the Premier and Cabinet's economic brief on merchandise exports, available online for the public to view, summarises that in the 12 months to April 2017 the value of South Australia's overseas goods exports totalled \$11.1 billion. This was down 5.2 per cent on the previous 12 months in original terms. Nationally, the value of overseas goods exports was up 15 per cent in original terms over that same period.

The Department of the Premier and Cabinet's economic brief goes on to say that increases in the value of overseas goods exports in the year to April 2017 were recorded in Queensland up 27 per cent; Western Australia, up 19 per cent; New South Wales, up 15 per cent; the Northern Territory, up 0.8 per cent; and Victoria up 0.6 per cent, while decreases were recorded in Tasmania, down 8.1 per cent, and in South Australia it was down 5.2 per cent. The figures can be spun all they like to suit the argument, but the state government's own figures from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet are as clear as day. If the minister wants to dispute those figures, he needs to go and argue them with the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Simply, we believe that South Australia can do much better. We can continue to build on the fantastic work of our food and beverage exporters in particular who are tapping into premium overseas markets. Those overseas markets are new, they are markets looking for value-add and they are markets that can hugely increase the value of that product. The Labor government here in South Australia created a target to reach \$25 billion in goods and services exports by 2014. They missed that by a country mile. We are still well behind the newly established \$18 billion target by the end of this year, which the Minister for Trade is on record saying will be achieved, so we are significantly behind that target.

There were initiatives in the state budget for Labor to achieve that target. Where was the funding to try to achieve that target? So is it a target or is it an aspiration? That is the question. We here in the Liberal Party want to fulfil those aspirations. We want to fulfil those targets because there is huge potential, as export international engagement will be the number one economic driver. Labor also missed the 45,000 international student target by 2014. This is the same Labor government that promised a staggering 100,000 jobs to the people of South Australia in the lead-up to the 2010 election and fell 80,000 short.

Recently, ABS figures relating to the number of businesses exporting were released, and it was great to see the total goods exported numbers have increased, from 2,354 to 2,556 between the 2014-15 and 2015-16 years. However, of the total goods exporters in the nation South Australia has less than 5 per cent. In comparison, New South Wales has 29 per cent of Australia's goods exporters and Victoria has almost 25 per cent. Again, I believe there is an opportunity for South Australian exporters to have better government support.

It is not just about handouts. It is about the state government having a strategic approach. It is about customising that approach. It is about using all the wonderful work that our SMEs are doing here in South Australia as exporters to the world, and it is about utilising the investment that those businesses here in South Australia are putting into their product and putting into their marketing. It is about a government that utilises that investment and is putting it to the world.

South Australia also has the opportunity to capitalise on the free trade agreements, including with China, Japan and Korea. There are many free trade agreements currently underway, and I know that in the Riverland the citrus industry is at the moment experiencing a boom with those free trade agreements in place. The stone fruit industry has seen biosecurity measures that have been adapted, and they are benefiting as well, as is horticulture right across the board, including all sorts of products,

such as almonds and wine. The high value plus the marketing strategy with that value-add is of huge benefit and is bringing home great reward at the moment.

In regard to population growth, over the last 12 months South Australia has lost 6,903 people interstate in net terms. Back in December 2003, South Australia's share of population was 7.7 per cent. In December 2016, South Australia's share of population was 7.1 per cent. What is going on? What part of the strategy does the government not get? Headline numbers here in South Australia revealed that the population grew 0.6 per cent in the 12 months ending December 2016, down from 0.7 per cent growth in the previous 12 months. Nationally, Australia's population grew 1.6 per cent in the 12 months ending September 2016, up from 1.4 per cent in the preceding 12 months. In terms of net interstate migration, South Australia lost 2,184 people interstate in the December 2016 quarter, up 82.6 per cent on the previous quarter over the last 12 months. We do have a serious issue with population decline.

I would like to talk about the Riverland for the couple of minutes I have left. A point of concern is the neglect of the regions of South Australia. Today, we heard the Treasurer say, 'Well, if they want more money spent in the budget, what do they want? Do they want more taxes to get more money to spend in the region?' The answer is, no, we do not. We want more investment in the region, and we want government to get out of the way so that the regions can actually benefit and be a major player on the national stage. That is one on the list of regional issues spruiked as being part of the budget on a number of projects already underway. Many of these projects are commonwealth funded, yet the government will stand front and centre and take credit for those projects. That is great, but I hope that the Riverland continues to see that commonwealth funding come to our region.

The Riverland is the premium food bowl of South Australia with more than 4,000 SMEs, yet we barely saw this important region mentioned in the budget. There was a commitment of \$3.3 million of joint funding between federal and state funding that went to the Riverland storm recovery assistance in 2016-17. I am interested to find out just how much of that \$3.3 million has been spent on the people who really matter. How much of that \$3.3 million actually hit the ground? As I understand it, 80 applicants have put in for a \$10,000 grant so, if you do your sums, there is a lot of money left over. How much money went into administration? How much money has the state government prospered from that joint federal and state funding?

There are key transport freight routes across the regions. We are seeing more and more heavy vehicles on our roads, and the roads are now more important than ever. We have seen the cessation of rail out of the Mallee, out of the Riverland, and we are not seeing the equivalent amount of money invested into the region by way of productive infrastructure.

In conclusion, at a time when South Australia needed a budget to boost the economy to grow jobs, this budget delivers little. The blame game with the commonwealth by the state government continues, despite the fact that the federal government has continued to provide well over 50 per cent of the total budget revenue this state government receives. On the other hand, the state Liberals have already announced several positive policy initiatives, including comprehensive programs to improve literacy and numeracy outcomes for all school students, the decentralisation of the public health system to provide fresh leadership and which engages the community and backs the front-line professionals who shape our services. We are working hard to deliver relief for families, opportunities for businesses and more jobs for South Australians. This budget has failed South Australia yet again.

Time expired.

Ms COOK (Fisher) (19:40): I rise tonight to make a grievance contribution to the Appropriation Bill debate. Over the past few years I have heard a lot of criticism hurled from those opposite accusing SA Health of not consulting clinicians in respect of the delivery of critical health reforms. As a clinician, I have been involved in many forms of consultation prior to, during and after the implementation of change at both the local and statewide level.

Consultations continue to take place as our government delivers some of the cornerstones of our health reform. One in particular is the work being done in preparation for the move to our new Royal Adelaide Hospital and changes to practice and patient experience owing to the transition to a hospital made up entirely of single rooms.

I was invited to chair the external oversight group regarding the impact of a single-room environment in the new Royal Adelaide Hospital by Adjunct Associate Professor Elizabeth Dabars, CEO/Secretary of the SA branch of the ANMF, an invitation I was honoured to receive and gladly accepted. The group was tasked with the oversight of an ANMF-funded case study to review the care delivery, working practices and experiences of nursing staff, as well as the experiences of patients in multibed rooms.

Why is this important piece of work even necessary? In the UK and Netherlands (a replicated UK study), the evaluation of single room accommodation in hospitals has led to a call for further research in this important area to build on the evidence of the significant hospital design change from the traditional Nightingale multibed wards, with shared toilets, to single rooms with ensuites. Dr Jill Maben from the National Nursing Research Unit at Kings College led the first evaluation of the Pembury Hospital (Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells NHS Trust), which has been subsequently replicated in the Netherlands. Importantly, this research study evaluation examined patient outcomes, privacy, social interactions, communication, nursing practices and risks such as patient falls.

Internationally and nationally, there is a gap in the research about the impact from a patient and nurse perspective of single room accommodation. Are the potential advantages realised and are the potential disadvantages real? It has been argued that the potential disadvantage of single room accommodation could include less surveillance by staff, increased falls, reduced social interaction with patients, increased time to travel, and concern that nurses will be working in more isolation.

It is worth noting, however, that private hospitals and newer wards in our public hospitals currently run with single patient rooms under clearly established models of care. The advantages of single rooms include an increase in patient privacy, greater dignity, enhanced sleep, enhanced contact with families, better communication with staff, increased patient satisfaction, improved patient outcomes, fewer medication errors, reduced infection rates and faster patient recovery rates; and, for nursing staff, more personalised patient contact and fewer interruptions.

The purpose of the research was to build on the evidence of patient and nurse experience, satisfaction and patient outcomes moving to single room accommodation in hospitals, therefore addressing a known gap in research, as the new Royal Adelaide Hospital will be the first 100 per cent single room accommodation for tertiary-level care in South Australia.

This first phase of a three-year study will provide a baseline for the evaluation of impact of longitudinal study of single room accommodation at the new RAH by observing, interviewing and measuring different metrics, such as patient and nurse satisfaction and experience, as well as analysing the perceptions of the impacts of single room accommodation at the new RAH, from both patient and nursing staff points of view. Importantly, phase 1 provides the base for subsequent evaluation to occur after a period of 12 months, in September 2018, and a further two years later, in September 2020, of the impact of single room accommodation on staff and patients and health outcomes.

The external oversight group and the Adelaide University research team are working in conjunction with Dr Jill Maben, replicating the study and utilising the validated research methodology and tools. The funding and research of the project consists of the first phase, which is research funded by the ANMF (South Australian Branch); the research governance, external oversight group, which considered and advised on the broader implications of the research findings for the healthcare system in South Australia; and the Adelaide University that partnered with the ANMF (SA Branch) and the Central Adelaide Local Health Network (Royal Adelaide Hospital patients and nursing staff) research team.

The findings from the first phase of the research have shown us that it is time to move. Though the nurses in the study think very fondly of the RAH, many have worked there for a long time and recognise that it is time to go. Patients who have also had a long relationship with the hospital are looking forward to the new lighter, brighter and quieter environment. The current environment was described as having limitations, of being tired, cramped and with a need for more modern equipment. The new environment, though with some challenges particularly related to orientating care to a new space and new technology, will provide many positive opportunities for delivering care in single rooms.

Across the five components of the study, the researchers found that the two most common important issues over any environmental factors for nurses and patients were concepts around being cared for and the staff relationships with the patients. A number of potential benefits and problems arising from moving from multibed bays to single-bedded rooms were identified by nurses and patients. These findings will be used to help inform the move to the NRAH and as a baseline for comparison with the proposed stage 2 research project that compares the care delivery and work practices of nurses and perspectives of patients 12 months after the NRAH is open.

A question we should ask is: has the recently released research findings influenced the nursing practice and the move to the NRAH? There are three examples that show that this is the case. In response, a nursing intentional rounding initiative, led by Jackie Wood, the Executive Director of Nursing, Central Adelaide Local Health Network, will be implemented through July at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. This new initiative is being implemented using the internationally successful RNAO Best Practice Spotlight Organisation Program working in partnership with the ANMF (SA Branch), the Australian hosts.

This nurse-led initiative will support nurses to provide safe, quality care by focusing on the early recognition of clinical deterioration, falls risk, improved communication—handover and referrals—privacy, and the reduction in medication errors and pressure injuries. This initiative is nurse-led and being implemented in partnership with the ANMF (SA Branch).

In response to the nursing staff feedback regarding a lack of education or training to support the move to the New Royal Adelaide Hospital, a comprehensive education, training and orientation program to support nurses in the new work environment—including EPAS, the phone system, medications and call bells—and site visits to their new wing have been successfully implemented and are ongoing. In response to workflow concerns, changed workflows within the different areas of the NRAH have supported nurses to transition to new work practices such as the buddy nurse system, that is, two nurses working together to care for the allocated patients.

The next steps are vital, that is, secure funding for the replication of the study 12 months after the move to the NRAH in September 2018, and then in 2020 working with the broader research team (the UK and the Netherlands) overseeing the development of a longitudinal study that explores broader aspects of the effects of single rooms on both patient care and the nursing workforce. Importantly, the research findings from the UK, Netherlands and now SA, will provide a bridge to fill the known gap and will support the National Safety and Quality Standards and improve patient outcomes, satisfaction, safety and nurse staff satisfaction.

Furthermore, this has the potential to influence and inform new hospital designs and builds across the world. Thank you to the ANMF, the University of Adelaide and the Central Adelaide Local Health Network, and particularly the staff of the Royal Adelaide Hospital for leading, supporting and facilitating this work. I commend the work of the research team, headed up by principal investigator, Dr Lynette Cusack, and co-investigators, Dr Rick Wiechula, Dr Tim Schultz, Dr Joanne Dollard, Ms Jyothi Jadhav, Professor Alison Kitson, Mr Rob Bonner, Ms Jennifer Hurley and Ms Fiona Mackenzie.

I thank the members of the oversight group, including researchers Lynette Cusack, Alison Kitson and Rob Bonner, as well as our chief nurse and midwifery officer, Adjunct Associate Professor Lydia Dennett and Jenny Hurley. This great work will be followed up with a symposium coming up at the beginning of August. I will also be there and I am looking forward to it. Lydia Dennett, the chief nurse, summarised this work best to our group recently when she said:

Whilst there has been significant work undertaken over the last year or two in the planning and preparation for new models of care and different ways of working, the research has enabled a targeted focus in a number of areas, to ensure that the care that patients receive in the new Royal Adelaide Hospital is contemporary and tailored to the very different environment.

It has been an absolute privilege to work with this amazing group of nursing leaders. I look forward in anticipation as the work continues into its next phase during and post the move to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. This consultation is a great example of the type of engagement required and being undertaken that we often do not hear about as we transition our healthcare system. This good work, launched and overseen by this government, can be summarised very succinctly by borrowing a quote from Premier Weatherill: 'If the question is health care, the answer is never Liberal.'

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (19:50): I would like to spend some time this evening reflecting on the government's recent budget and its impact on the portfolios I am fortunate enough to be able to shadow. I had the opportunity to enter shadow cabinet at the beginning of 2017 as the state shadow minister for the environment. This portfolio covers areas which I have a lifelong passion for and which I have pursued since my youngest memories growing up on the land in rural Scotland.

In fact, it was my interest in Hallett Cove's coastal environment, and in particular the restoration of the lower Field River, that led me into public life, first running for council and then entering state parliament in 2014. It was great to spend a couple of hours last Saturday down at the Field River at Hallett Cove during a planting day and to continue the great environmental restoration work there. It was also great to see the fruits of 11 years of labour where trees once planted as tiny saplings now tower over the river, a great example of grassroots community action delivering for our natural environment.

By way of introduction to my remarks about the impact of the 2017-18 budget on the portfolios I shadow, I acknowledge that governing is not an easy task. Balancing the multiple competing interests between multiple competing portfolios is part of the art of governing. Ministers must strike the right position between funding the day-to-day operations of their departments and their statutory obligations that must occur by law while evolving their projects, programs and initiatives to meet the ever-changing needs of an evolving society.

They must also go about the business of pleasing to an extent, or at least trying to please, a cacophony of stakeholders and interest groups who will energetically and rightfully advocate for their sector. Since becoming shadow minister for the environment, I have met with an incredible number of stakeholders, interest groups, businesses, passionate individuals and peak bodies keen to build a relationship with me and tell me about their work and why it should be supported. This is part of the political process, a necessary part of it and a good part of it. It has been the way in which I have learned about the portfolio areas, building an initial personal interest into a deeper knowledge and understanding of the environment and water sectors.

The balancing of many interests is a difficult task for any government or minister regardless of their political persuasion, and I acknowledge publicly that this is the case. While there are parts of the budget I disagree with, there are equally many components I think are worthy, whether they be new or existing activities. That is the case across the entire budget as well as in the environment and water portfolios. My time as shadow minister has taken me around our beautiful state, although I have plenty more places to go and people to meet, and into discussions with informed, interesting, interested and engaging people. I have also been appointed to the state parliament's Environment, Resources and Development Committee.

In all my activities, I have been struck by the fact that the government does not have a lot of goodwill left amongst environmental stakeholders. Even groups and bodies that would traditionally be regarded as left wing or leaning towards the Labor Party feel that the environment is not the priority of a 15-year Labor administration. The environment department has endured cuts at every budget for the last decade. This year is no exception to this sorry situation, with a further 43 full-time equivalent positions disappearing from the department as the agency contracts even more.

To take a more historical look at this, if we go back less than a decade to the 2008-09 budget we find that the environment department had 2,236.6 FTE positions. That is now 1,505.1 FTE positions. That is a catastrophic decline in this department. While I am and always will be a proponent of smaller, leaner, less intrusive, more effective government, I also believe that there are areas like the environment that require government to step in and help facilitate positive action. I want to see an environment department which builds capacity in communities and which forges relationships between landowners, land managers, volunteer groups, local government and which leverages activity for multiple sectors to benefit our environment. That is why I believe it is so devastating that our state's front-line environmental workers have borne such significant cuts.

When the Liberal Party was last in power in 2002, there were more than 300 park rangers working in the state. Today, that figure is a mere 93. That is why I am delighted that, if a Liberal government is elected in March 2018, we will increase this figure by 20, which I believe will be an excellent start to rebuilding our front-line environmental workforce. As mentioned, the 2017-18

budget sees a further decline in the number of staff in the environment department in what I can only characterise as an underwhelming budget for South Australia's amazing natural world.

The budget's high-level overview document did not even contain a stand-alone section for the environment, instead rather strangely co-locating environment in a section called Environment and Neighbourhoods. It is apparent that that this co-location occurred because the budget does not include many significant environmental highlights and so had to be beefed up with some other projects more suited to a community development-style category.

The environmental highlights the government has chosen to showcase include \$13.5 million over three years for the River Murray, in partnership with the commonwealth, to restore natural flow patterns in key SA tributaries of the River Murray. It is a commendable project, which I will certainly not criticise. It was a pleasure to be able to visit the Riverland last week with my colleague the member for Chaffey and to be able to meet with many people who rely on that precious river environment for both their lifestyle and economic livelihood. It is an important part of the state, and I have said on a number of occasions that the Murray-Darling Basin Plan should be delivered on time and in full. I believe that politics needs to be taken out of the debate when it comes to dealing with that river.

The government's budget also includes \$2.7 million over three years to address environmental issues from the previous closure of the Dry Creek salt fields. We have \$200,000 for the construction of a dedicated new pedestrian bridge within the Brownhill Creek Recreation Park. I know this is a project that my colleague the member for Davenport has raised with me on a number of occasions. It was a pleasure to meet with Ron Bellchambers from the Brownhill Creek Association a few weeks ago in a meeting facilitated by the member for Davenport. I am pleased to see that the government saw fit to fund that project.

The budget contains \$4.2 million to extend the Community Wastewater Management Systems funding agreement with local councils, \$1 million over two years to kickstart the carbon offset industry in South Australia, \$2.5 million for the creation of a comprehensive master plan for Cleland Wildlife Park and there is also funding of \$12.7 million over two years to repair assets, particularly in national parks, damaged by severe weather in September 2016. There is also money to deal with the development of a dog and cat management database in partnership with local government.

Those projects are all worthy, but it is disappointing that there are no real reformist or exciting projects being offered up by our state's environment department. Unfortunately, that does appear to be characteristic of the environment department under its current bureaucratic and ministerial leadership. I am very disappointed with the budget's lack of innovation and creativity in what I think is an incredibly important and exciting area for our state.

Often I am asked: what would the Liberal Party do differently if they were elected to government next year? That is a very fair question. I think we have a very strong suite of environmental policies that we can be proud of, a suite of environmental policies that we will build on as we approach the election. I am certainly committed to working with my colleagues to build that sturdy and exciting range of environmental policies.

We have put a clear line in the sand when it comes to our environment and said that we will not support a nuclear waste dump taking international waste for South Australia. I think that is just a step too far for this state. We are also saying that we will put in place a moratorium on fracking in the state's South-East, protecting precious water resources there. I have already said that we will increase the number of park rangers by 20. We of course have the exciting vision for Glenthorne National Park in the southern suburbs of Adelaide, a transformational project which will preserve and revitalise open space there.

We are also committed to reforming our state's natural resources management system. When I became shadow minister, it quickly became apparent that many people, particularly those in regional communities, feel disengaged and disillusioned by a centralised natural resources management structure that is now in place. NRM boards are disempowered and, again, goodwill towards that bureaucracy has really drained away.

We are certainly committed to building the partnerships with rural communities and reforming that natural resources management process. With that, I commend the budget to the house and in particular draw attention to those environmental initiatives.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (20:00): I raise today the state Labor government's proposal to move the Dardanelles obelisk memorial from its present South Terrace site to the new memorial walk. As the member for Unley, I have a particular interest because it was the Unley residents who largely funded what is recognised as the world's first memorial to the fallen of the First World War. Unfortunately, this could be the second time in its existence that it has been threatened with relocation.

In early 1915, the disastrous Gallipoli campaign was only a few months old. Shocked and saddened by the heavy death toll among the troops of the Adelaide and Unley battalions, the 10th and 27th, the Wattle Day League approached Adelaide city council for the siting of a memorial to the casualties. Their request was approved and the Dardanelles obelisk, surrounded by a grove of wattle trees, was erected in the south Parklands, halfway between the City of Adelaide and the City of Unley on what is now Sir Lewis Cohen Avenue, to symbolise their shared sacrifice.

The memorial was funded entirely by public donations, so not a single cent of ratepayers' or taxpayers' money was used. The money was collected by the Wattle Day League from members of the public. In approving this memorial, the Adelaide city council insisted that it should be done at no cost to the council, so it could be fairly argued that the obelisk was and still is public property and not that of the Adelaide city council or the state government to do with as they wish.

Despite this, in 1940, the Adelaide city council unilaterally decided to adapt and move the memorial to its present site at the junction of South Terrace and West Terrace. The move destroyed the significance of the original siting as a joint tribute to the fallen of both the City of Adelaide and the City of Unley. They removed it from where it had been placed, deliberately close to the Repatriation Hospital on the now site of the Keswick Barracks.

Seventy-seven years after the first re-siting, the state government, supported by the Adelaide city council, propose a second shift to the memorial walk on Kintore Avenue. Not only that, there is talk again of it being altered, possibly to fit in with its new location. In my view, that would be disrespectful and unacceptable. One dubious tampering with a remembrance monument is bad enough, but to relocate and tamper with it a second time is certainly disrespectful.

At worst, the obelisk should be left at its present South Terrace site. At best, the wattle grove memorial on Sir Lewis Cohen Avenue should be replanted and reinstated. This memorial and the sacrifice and remembrance it represents are not the playthings of governments and councils. By all means, add to the memorial walk, but not at the cost of demolishing and dishonouring part of our and the world's military heritage.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (20:03): I would like tonight to say a few words about a wonderful South Australian, an astute businessman, a great husband, father and grandfather who sadly died in the Angel Flight crash last week in Mount Gambier. That man was Grant Gilbert of Mount Barker. He was born on 13 October 1938 and, very sadly, passed away on 26 June this past week. Grant was an institution in Mount Barker and around South Australia. His generosity knew no bounds. He was an astute businessman and, as a matter of interest, from 1963 until last week he was a member of some 30-odd organisations.

From 1976 until now, he was managing director of Gilbert Motors Ltd Automotive group. Some of the organisations that Grant was involved in and some of the awards he received included Citizen of the Year Local Government: Australia Day Award for Mount Barker in 1987. From 1956 to 1979, he was a life member of the Association of Apex Clubs. In 1997, he received the James D. Richardson Honour Award for Hahndorf Lions. From 1981 to 1985 he was a councillor and deputy mayor on the Mount Barker District Council.

From 1995 to 2003, he was deputy chair to me, after the former chair, Grant Petras, left for Queensland. He was my deputy for a number of years on the Hills Mallee Southern Regional Health Association. From 1986 to 2001, he was Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Mount Barker District Soldiers Memorial Hospital. From 1999 to 2005, he was the South Australian government

appointed member of the Nurses Board of South Australia on which he served two terms. He had an amazing life.

From 2006 to 2012, he was a council member of SHINE. He was a member of the Mount Barker Concert Band and German Band. He loved playing the trumpet. The list goes on. I will not read it all out, but the contribution that Grant made to South Australia, and Australia more so, was profound. He was one of the most generous people I have ever met. He was acutely and intensely loyal to everybody he had dealings with, and I can only speak highly of that from a personal point of view.

He was loyal to the extreme to his wife, Margaret, and his family, and that was borne out at a large gathering at Auchendarroch at Mount Barker yesterday where a number of people spoke in a tribute to Grant. His dear wife, Margaret—who he referred to as Lady Margaret, I might add—said that Grant did not want a funeral if anything happened to him. They were just to do what they had to do and that was it, and he did not want any speeches. But as Margaret reminded us at the gathering yesterday, he did not put that in writing, so we had an hour to an hour and a half of a lot of comments about Grant.

I specifically wanted to talk about the time I worked with him on the Hills Mallee Southern Regional Health board. That was a regional board that worked extremely well, and in my view was the most successful regional board in the state ever brought into place by the former Liberal government. We did an enormous amount of work with Grant Gilbert and, I might add, Kevin Eglington who was the regional general manager. We achieve lots of things across the country from out as far as Pinnaroo and Lameroo down to Kangaroo Island and Meningie.

Grant had a huge amount of respect for humanity and he always did what he could for people. It did not matter who they were. If he thought he could do something for people, he would. It was added yesterday that he did not suffer fools well. He and I got on particularly well on that score because it is a failing of mine, I am afraid. But be that as it may, Grant's legacy to the state is profound, particularly his legacy to Mount Barker where the Gilbert family are well known in business.

He and his brother, Rob, took over the business from their father, the late Roy Gilbert, and they run it in a highly successful manner to this day. They have branched out into other things. Grant was known for his capacity for work, along with his friendly and funny nature, but behind that sense of humour lurked an astute brain. His family were always at the forefront. Grant liked nothing more than to be able to have people at his and Margaret's home at Mount Barker and have functions there.

Grant was still giving until his untimely death in the tragic airplane crash at Mount Gambier. He was doing an Angel Flight. The CEO of Angel Flight spoke yesterday. Grant came to Angel Flight at the end of last year. This year has been his great contribution. In less than six months this year he had done around 40 Angel Flights to all parts of the state. This is at his cost and his time. He was a very special man. I know he had flown into Kingscote Airport regularly.

As I indicated yesterday, he had been to Port Lincoln and Mount Gambier numerous times and everywhere else. That was Grant: he just gave and gave and never stopped giving. I am sure his family will strive to do exactly what Grant did. They are a very proactive family. They are a great family, a lovely family. I had all the respect in the world for Margaret when she got up and spoke yesterday. She was just wonderful. Of course, his nephew, Tom, spoke as well along with other people. The world is a far better place for having had Grant Gilbert in it. He will be very sadly missed.

Can I also say that tragically there were two others who perished in the accident. The other family are known to me, not directly through the ones who were sadly killed but through the Redding family, who are originally from Kangaroo Island. It really was a terrible day. Grant was just so meticulous. He was an absolute perfectionist in everything he did. What happens, happens. In closing, I wish to record again my deep admiration and respect for the late Grant Gilbert of Mount Barker. May he rest in peace.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (20:12): I rise this evening to speak about some of the portfolio areas impacted by the budget. I did speak at length earlier today about the overarching position of the budget and why we do need to change this horrendous Labor government.

Tonight, we want to look at what the Treasurer entitled a 'jobs budget' because that is important to everyone in South Australia but in particular to the industry portfolio that I cover. The Treasurer said this was a jobs budget; it is his third jobs budget. When we look deeper, what we see is a tax budget. We see a \$370 million state bank tax which will not deliver jobs, will not help industry, will not help business and will not help struggling households with the cost of living. That is what has been delivered by this state Labor government and the Treasurer just the other day.

When we look at how South Australia is travelling and we go out and speak to people in our communities, to small business operators, people in the industry, people who are wanting to get ahead and make a go, we ask them, 'How is our state going?' Sadly, the response is, 'We are not going good. We are going poorly.' We are travelling very poorly on the spectrum when we look across all the states and South Australia. It is because of the budget and the taxation measures that this Treasurer wants to put in our state. That is a very key reason, and we have seen it in this budget as well.

We know we have had the highest unemployment rate in the nation for 30 months in a row. That should set alarm bells ringing right across the board. We need to get people working. We have very high youth unemployment in and around my community as well. That is a real issue. I think it is a real issue right across the state, and people are very conscious of that. In fact, if we go back to Labor's promise in February 2010, they promised 100,000 jobs. We know that by the deadline that they set for themselves at the time that they had produced only 17,200 jobs.

The state Labor government has form in this area, and it really is not very good. We know South Australia's economic growth has been at 1.9 per cent of gross state product compared with the national growth, which has been at 2.8 per cent, so again we have struggled there. Only Tasmania and Western Australia grew slower than our state, so we are sixth out of eight on that measure, again towards the bottom of the table. I mentioned jobs, and when we look at this budget we know industry right across the board is very interested in jobs.

The government's own budget paper shows that they are predicting just 1 per cent jobs growth for South Australia, half of Victoria and below Tasmania. It is incredibly disappointing to see South Australia struggling so much. The South Australian Centre for Economic Studies, an independent body, gave their assessment of the 1 per cent target that has come from the Treasurer's budget. They think that that is overly ambitious, and they do not think that South Australia will even get to that 1 per cent jobs growth target.

That is alarming right across the board. We look at industry and say, 'How is industry going to help? How are small businesses going to help?' particularly when we have a high-taxing budget as has been brought down here with the state bank tax, which we know is going to hurt families, hurt businesses, and hurt growth opportunities right across this state, so that we will again be languishing at the bottom. The government does roll out and say that they have jobs creation programs. I think the newest one is the Future Jobs Fund, which is a rehashing of some old money, but that is what they are saying is going to help grow jobs in South Australia.

Yet again I mention the Treasurer with his jobs budget. He has had three of these before and we have been at the bottom of the unemployment table ever since he started this project. A number of other programs have come into place with this Treasurer. We have had Manufacturing Works, Our Jobs Plan and the Northern Economic Plan. The list goes on and on and, unfortunately, none of them have returned jobs outcomes. That is what we keep asking in estimates and through the other place of the minister there. We keep asking: of these programs, what are the job outcomes? The response we get back is, 'We don't measure that. We can't tell.'

Manufacturing Works is a 10-year program, and a couple of years ago a report was done. Taxpayers' money was spent on the Frost and Sullivan report, and the big outcome from that report was that there were no job outcomes from Manufacturing Works. So, it really is quite incongruous that these programs that the Treasurer keeps putting in place to grow jobs are failing and are not working. It is hard to trust any program that he puts forward now because of the history of failure by this government, and industry probably has every reason to be doubtful and scratching their head. We know industry development is one of the major requirements of any state to grow its economy; however, in this year's budget, Labor has cut industry and innovation by \$20 million.

The estimated result from 2016-17 in the budget was \$52.325 million and the budgeted figure for 2017-18 is \$32.896 million. Here we are wanting to grow industry and the government is cutting \$20 million from its industry and innovation budget, and that is disappointing for South Australians. The budget for industry development has been cut by \$10.26 million. Funnily, it used to be called industry manufacturing and it is now called industry development, and they have taken the term 'manufacturing' out of this budget line.

Again, the estimated result in 2016-17 was a \$19.379 million spend and the budget for 2017-18 is an \$8.755 million spend, so there has been quite a dramatic cut in industry development. Again, the government will say it is putting investment into its Future Jobs Fund but, as I have pointed out, we will inquire further about this because a lot of these funds and programs that the government has put in place in the past have not produced jobs outcomes.

Regarding automotive transformation, Holden will close its doors for the last time on Friday 20 October 2017, so again more job losses are coming to South Australia. With that closure coming, and the state government has known about this since December 2013, they have had a poorly run range of automotive assistance programs that have failed to manage that transition in the automotive manufacturing components supply industry into developing industries in South Australia.

They have underspent this program for a number of years. They could not get it working, they could not get outcomes, as I have mentioned. They had underspent by \$10 million up to last year. They loaded a heap of money in last year and did not get the results but, this year, as we see Holden about to close, let's have a look at the budget lines and see what is being spent: the estimated spend in 2016-17 was \$18.285 million, and in 2017-18, the year that Holden is going to close, we have been given a budget of \$10.438. That is an \$8 million cut, and Holden workers and the supply chain workers deserve a whole lot better. This government has failed to do that transition. They have talked about transitioning workers, but they have failed to deliver. Of course, we will be keeping them to account on that in estimates.

The government will talk up sport and rec as well, and I will brief because I only have a couple of minutes left. The government has talked about injecting money into sport and rec. For a long time, they have really turned their back on grassroots sport and recreation funding, and on this side of the chamber we know our communities. Our electorate candidates and members who live in their electorates know how much this is needed for local community clubs in their local regions.

Between 2011 and 2015, the government underspent their budget by \$16.2 million. They ignored the community grassroots recreation and sporting clubs and facilities for a long time. The state Labor government underspent by \$16.2 million between 2011 and 2015 and then all of a sudden, because of badgering by good local members, mostly on this side of the chamber, the government realised this was where they needed to start investing money. They listened to what we had to say and they started investing money at the grassroots in community clubs, coincidentally just before an election, but we take it whenever we can get it. The government is starting to do some work.

Since early this year, we have had the SA Sports Survey, which has been listening to community groups. Really, it is just a formalisation of what each member on our side of the chamber does in their local community. They listen to what their local communities need and want as far as this is concerned. We will be keeping the government to account. We will be making sure they know of all the projects that need doing in our electorates and in our communities, and I know that it is very prevalent in my community as well.

I have recently been out at Tea Tree Gully and Golden Grove, up in the Adelaide Hills as well as around Mount Barker. I know that down at Reynella and Morphett Vale and also in the Marion vicinity and Glenelg that we have some good people working very hard in those areas making sure that the government knows about community facilities that need upgrades. For too long—those years that I mentioned before, between 2011 and 2015—there was a \$16.2 million underspend in this area. We are making sure that our communities are looked after at grassroots sport and rec, which the Marshall Liberal team knows so much about and does so much to support. We will ensure that these community groups are looked after well into the future.

They are just a couple of things, but there will be more, of course, in estimates, and I look forward to going through those matters with the ministers associated with these portfolio areas and making sure that South Australian taxpayers are getting good bang for their buck and not having more money ripped out of their pockets.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (20:22): I rise to make a few comments on the Appropriation Bill 2017, the budget. If only it was as easy as carrying around the budget or the energy plan like the Premier and the Treasurer do from time to time. In fact, it is almost becoming a bit of a joke, and I am sure that in some diehard Young Labor or even probably in Young Liberal gatherings there would be drinking games going on around how many times you can see the Premier and the Treasurer with their plan tucked under their arm. I am sure that some focus group, expert marketing group or well-paid government flunky group indicated that all you have to do is carry it around, make sure the cameras get it so that it is in full view and then people will believe that you actually have a plan.

It does not matter what is in the booklet, as long as it is carried around in your arms you will be okay. Quite frankly, that is all we see—lots of photo shots with these comical looks on their face. I am sure that they are even embarrassed by the fact that they are posing for the cameras with the budget or the energy plan neatly tucked under their arm. That is all you have to do because the people of South Australia will know you have a plan and then vote for you at the next election.

I want to give the government a few ideas for the Lower South-East that are sadly lacking from this budget. However, they would have been quite welcome inclusions because, as I have stated before, this is not a South Australian budget, this is not a South Australian plan: this is an Adelaide budget and this is an Adelaide plan. You only have to go through this so-called Adelaide budget to know that I am telling the truth. There is a record spend on infrastructure, record spend on hospitals, but very, very little—in fact, almost zip—in country areas.

Here are a few ideas for them. The reinstatement of community mental health beds: people may not know that 10 beds were cut from Mount Gambier and 10 beds were signalled to be cut from Whyalla or the seat of Giles. Then, all of a sudden, there was a complete backflip by the Minister for Mental Health and she reinstated the 10 community mental health beds in Whyalla due to the uncertainty of the Arrium steelworks and the hardship that it put on the community. I have absolutely no issue with that at all. But, of course, in the seat of Mount Gambier those beds were cut and have not been reinstated. I would have liked to see something in the budget around mental health for the people of the South-East.

The reinstatement of the South East Community Legal Service's funding: a service that provides legal advice to our most vulnerable has been consolidated back into Adelaide and will be run by a teleconference-type facility, that is, of course, until you start talking to these people and work through the process. If you have a pressing legal issue, you need to ring up, fill in the paperwork, send in your bank statements, prove that you are of low income and then perhaps in two to three weeks somebody will get back in touch with you and let you know whether you are in receipt of legal assistance.

The impracticality of this, when people are facing legal issues at their most stressful time, is quite outrageous. I can guarantee that if I were Premier and ripped all these services out of metropolitan Adelaide there would be outrage, and quite rightly so. I am standing here fighting for the South-East because so many services have been ripped out and so little is being put back in in terms of this Adelaide budget.

Renal dialysis: try sitting in the living room of a family who is going through renal dialysis in Mount Gambier, with eight hours in a chair in basically a disused storage facility at the Mount Gambier hospital with three other people, where the infection control is a yellow line on the floor. The people of Adelaide would be outraged if that were the service provided to them by this so-called state government. This is not a state government: it is a government of Adelaide.

Road upgrades: we talk about fatalities on roads, and many of these fatalities are due obviously to compounding factors, but some of the factors are the poor state of our country roads, the lack of overtaking lanes and the lack of clearing of native vegetation away from the verges of roads. I have seen nothing in terms of road infrastructure in this Adelaide budget.

Drug rehab: we need to tell the people of Mount Gambier and the South-East that if you have a problem with ice, and if you have a problem with substances, you need to come to Adelaide because that is where the rehab facilities are. Again, it is completely outrageous and there is not even a hint at what services will be provided to regional South Australia. The Minister for Corrections in the other house, who actually set up a South Australian ice task force, and I give him credit for that, has promised 15 beds for regional South Australia.

Where are these beds? We are yet to know. I find it quite interesting that the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, who sits in this chamber, neither chairs that task force nor seems to want to have anything to do with it. Those are a few suggestions for this Adelaide budget on how it could truly become a budget for South Australia instead of an election budget, which is basically pork-barrelling marginal Labor seats.

I will now come to a more pressing issue, and that is the experimentation with the people of South Australia. Basically, we have a Premier who is experimenting with this state as if it is his own private plaything, his own thing to tinker around with. Unfortunately, I was in the education department in 2011 when the merger of Families SA and the education department was put together by this—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr BELL: I was one of the very few liberal-minded people in that department. Everybody you spoke to in the department said that this was an out and out disaster and that it will not work, it cannot work. We have taken our eye off education and now the entire education department is focused on child protection. Again, there is a place for that, but in terms of turning a department inside out, it was a disaster. It is with regret that I read the following words because, quite later in the piece, once a lot of damage had been done, the royal commissioner, Margaret Nyland, said she felt compelled to release interim recommendations on a system now in crisis so that the government could take 'immediate steps to begin setting up a new child protection department'.

The Premier himself conceded that merging Families SA with the wider education department in late 2011 was a wrong decision. The Premier said: 'It was my idea, I put it in place and it hasn't worked, so I have to take responsibility for that.' Well, knock me down with a feather! All you had to do was go and talk to people on the front line in the departments and they would have told you that this was a disaster from start to finish.

Then, of course, we have the renewable energy experiment, an experiment about which the Premier himself said at the Paris compact, 'We are running a big international experiment right now.' What was that experiment? We are going to go to 40 per cent renewables, 50 per cent renewables and, ideally, 100 per cent renewables, but we have no idea how we are going to get there. We are not going to transition smoothly to that end. We are just going to do it and to hell with the consequences: higher prices for electricity, lower reliability in terms of electricity, and here we are—businesses absolutely suffering.

Now he wants to experiment with a state-based bank tax, a bank tax that would be applied in no other state but South Australia. Quite frankly, Premier, your past record on experimenting with the people of South Australia has been an unmitigated disaster and we do not trust you to get it right in the future.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (20:32): As have many members at this time of year, I have been greatly appreciative of the opportunity to join with a number of local service clubs in my electorate in recent weeks as they have had their changeover and handover dinners, celebrating years of successful hard work for their communities where volunteers have made an extraordinary impact in the community, and looking forward to the year ahead.

Particularly at this time of the year, the Rotary clubs and Lions clubs have their changeover and handover dinners and lunches and brunches respectively. The Kiwanis are still to come and, of course, we look forward to those as well. In the electorate of Morialta, the contribution made by service clubs is profound, and I am grateful to all the service clubs in the electorate of Morialta. This year, I have also particularly appreciated the opportunity to get to know some of the new service clubs, in the new areas of Morialta, which previously had been in neighbouring districts.

The stories they tell have been fascinating to hear. Every service club is different. They have some of the same forms that cross over from one to the other, but they all have their own unique culture and they have terrific camaraderie and fellowship but, importantly, they make an enormous difference in our community.

Lions, Rotarians and Kiwanians and other service clubs do the jobs that so many other people do not necessarily want to do themselves. Volunteers in both service organisations that I have been visiting in recent weeks—Lions and Rotary—join together with over one million volunteers in each organisation around the world.

Their achievements have been profound, particularly those of Lions in the area of eye health and the development of widely available canes for blind people, international eye banks and vaccinations against river blindness fever. Lions around the world have accomplished a wide range of achievements over what is now, as of this year, a 100-year history since they were founded by Melvin Jones. They celebrate that 100 years in style at their handover lunches, brunches and dinners this year.

Rotarians, in the last 32 years in particular, have been particularly associated with the fight to end polio in conjunction with partners from governments and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. In the mid-1980s, one Rotarian in Australia came up with the idea that a group of people of like mind, will, purpose and goodwill could band together to end a vicious disease that at the time was consuming hundreds of thousands of people around the world and destroying their lives. To date, it was reported at the last Rotary meeting that I think just six cases of polio have been uncovered in the whole world this year.

It is an extraordinary achievement, and it would not have happened without a whole world of partners and other people contributing towards it. I do not think that we would be anywhere near this situation without the contributions of more than a million Rotarians around the world who each constantly put in their money at their dinners. Many of them put in their efforts. Many of them spend time helping in other countries by volunteering their efforts, and that is an extraordinary achievement.

I was not able to get to all the events, unfortunately. There were a couple I missed and there are a couple where I am still looking forward to the opportunity to get to know the members in the years ahead. I want to particularly acknowledge the outgoing and incoming presidents at the service clubs in the Morialta district whom I have so far been able to make contact with or whom, on a number of occasions, I have been in touch with for many years. Beginning with the Rotarians, I congratulate the Rotary Club of Morialta on a tremendous changeover dinner at the Naval, Military and Air Force Club, where outgoing president, Brenton Summers, was replaced by the new president, Judi Brown. We are certainly grateful for all their support for the community.

The Magill Sunrise Rotary Club had a tremendous changeover brunch at the Wholly Belly cafe on Magill Road. Outgoing president, filmmaker Kirsty Stark, celebrated a terrific year. I am sure that the new president, Ian Coat, will do a wonderful job. The Rotary Club of Campbelltown is a club that I was an active member of for a number of years. I am very privileged that I maintain an honorary membership through the generosity of the Rotary Club of Campbelltown. It is the largest club in the district, and without the efforts of the Rotary Club of Campbelltown, I think the Campbelltown community would be very different.

President Bryan Schell did a terrific job over the last 12 months, and I am sure that the new president, Elizabeth Gagliardi, will equally uphold the extremely high standards that that club has always expected of its presidents. I know it will be an interesting year. I was not able to go to the changeover dinner for the Rotary Club of Tea Tree Gully this year, but I am looking forward to getting along next year. I appreciated the opportunity to go to a dinner that they hosted a couple of months ago, where the Governor was able to speak about the important role that multiculturalism is going to have in helping service clubs grow in the years ahead.

Of course, the Governor was able to identify his migrant story and the story that is shared by so many migrants and refugees, people who come to Australia for whatever reason. One thing they often have in common is a desire to show their support and gratitude to their new communities. I think he compellingly put the case for service clubs to reach out to those communities, where they are going to find many new members who will serve them well, I am sure. Presiding over that dinner

was the previous president of the Rotary Club of Tea Tree Gully, Ray Whalley, and we congratulate the new president, Ynyr Hughes. I am sure that she will do a terrific job as well.

In relation to Lions, I particularly want to pay tribute to past district governor, Paddy McKay. Paddy, of the Lions Club of Athelstone in my electorate, finished up her role as district governor of Lions about four hours ago. Having just spoken to her, I can tell you that she is enjoying her retirement from the role and is already missing it a little bit. Paddy has done a tremendous job and has grown the Lions membership in the last year and has had new clubs start. In the 100th year of Lions, it is tremendous to see the reinvigoration of Lions International in South Australia.

The Athelstone Lions' old president, Mike Cook, at Cafe Va Bene handed over to the new president, Lloyd Nelson; it was a terrific night. I was not able to get to the Rostrevor Lions' handover, where Cameron Wyers continues his role as president. He has done that job several times in the past. He is a remarkable contributor to the community and the club, and they are grateful for that support. I am looking forward to getting along to the Black Hill Challenge, a running race they hold later in the year to raise money for The Royal Flying Doctor Service. I am pleased to sponsor the trophies.

The Onkaparinga Lions Club met at Lobethal. Although I was not able to be there, the member for Kavel was able to attend his last event as their local member. Their previous president, Brenton Heinrich, was replaced by John Wenham. I know that they will do a terrific job. Malcolm Storry of the East Torrens Lions Club has been replaced by Daryl Golding. Both Malcolm and Daryl have done the job on a number of occasions. The club continues to power on and, despite lower numbers than they have had in the past, their contribution is still substantial.

The Torrens Valley Lions Club president, Dave Richards, handed over to the club's first female president at its handover this year. In the 100th year of Lions, the new president of the Torrens Valley Lions Club is Pauline North. She has a lot of energy, and she will work very hard and do a terrific job. A lot of people came to see Pauline take up the reins at the handover at the Birdwood Lutheran Church Hall. I think that club will do very well this year and continue to make a tremendous contribution to the Torrens Valley communities.

Tea Tree Gully Lions Club past president, Jack Rogers, has been replaced by Maurice Stone. Now that the Morialta electorate is heading far north of the river, I am looking forward to also spending a lot more time with that club. To finish, I particularly pay tribute to the newest Lions Club in the Morialta electorate, which is the Lions Against Violence group, a special-purpose Lions club set up to do work to support the prevention of violence against women. Councillor Jill Whittaker of the Campbelltown council is its inaugural president. The club had its first meeting, and I am looking forward to getting along to future meetings and seeing the tremendous work they will do in the future.

As the member for Morialta, I am sure I am joined by all members in this house when I say that it has been an honour to work with these fine volunteers in our community. I look forward to doing so in the future, and I am sure they will have a terrific year. I thank the past presidents for their service to their clubs and to the community.

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (20:42): I rise to remark on one of the very important initiatives in the state budget for the southern suburbs, and that is the duplication of Main South Road—

An honourable member: Hear, hear!

Mr PICTON: —hear, hear!—which has been funded for \$305 million for stage 1 of that project. This is a project that both the member for Mawson, the Minister for Tourism, and I have been campaigning on for some time. It is something that we have been working on with the local community because it is a very much needed project in the growing southern suburbs of Adelaide. These are areas in which more and more houses are being built and in which more and more developments are occurring. Also, more and more tourist opportunities are opening up in the Fleurieu all the way down to Kangaroo Island; hence, the traffic on this road is increasing all the time.

The latest estimates are that at least 17,000 vehicles a day use Main South Road between Seaford and Sellicks, which is a very large volume of vehicles for a road that has only one lane in each direction. The government has committed to—and I congratulate the Treasurer, the Premier and the Minister for Transport for this initiative—duplicating that road, to add an additional two lanes

of traffic to ensure that it is easier for people to get to the southern suburbs and all the way down to the Fleurieu and onto the ferry to Kangaroo Island.

So \$305 million has been funded for stage 1, which will be from Griffiths Drive at Seaford down to Aldinga Beach. Then, in the Mid-Year Budget Review, stage 2 will be funded, which will go from Aldinga down to Sellicks Beach. Construction will occur between 2019 and 2022. Of course, in their most recent survey, this road was listed by the RAA as the riskiest road across South Australia, so this is a high priority for safety reasons.

We know that between 2012 and 2016 there were 77 crashes on this stretch of road, which resulted in 126 serious injuries to people from South Australia and, unfortunately, just last year there was one fatality on the road just outside Aldinga. Safety is a very important reason for proceeding with this road upgrade project, but another reason is the capacity of the road. We know that traffic is increasing all the time and is only going to increase more as there is more development in the southern suburbs and as there is more tourism development in the southern suburbs. The third issue that does absolutely get raised about this road is the road surface quality. We know that the road has reactive soils underneath it, so it can be quite bumpy. An upgrade of this magnitude will also help to address that issue.

As members would be aware, there is a smaller upgrade around the Aldinga district which has been planned to address some safety issues and which has been funded via funds from the Motor Accident Commission through their road safety funds. That will still proceed and it will be incorporated into the larger development, which will start in two years' time. It is important that that road upgrade proceeds in the short term because we know that there is such a safety risk at the moment around the Aldinga township and the Aldinga suburb. We need to make sure that, to the best extent possible, we can address those safety issues in the meantime while the larger duplication works are planned and then proceeded with.

A number of my residents who live next to the road corridor are very keen to know lots of the details in terms of what the exact route will be and what the exact construction of the Pedler Creek Bridge will be, which is a very significant bridge involved in this road. A second bridge will need to be built. Of course, we need to do a lot more planning work before we are ready to release all the detailed plans. I know the minister and the department are very keen to ensure that there is good community consultation as that work proceeds to ensure that we are talking to the communities affected.

The second issue that does get raised by members of the community is the need for a future rail extension down to Aldinga, which is something that both the member for Mawson and I are very keen to promote in the future. That is certainly something that we will continue to lobby for in the future. A key aspect as part of this project is to make sure that we are appropriately planning to ensure that that corridor is protected for the rail line to go in in the future so that we will have enough room for both four lanes of traffic and the rail line down to Aldinga in the future.

Of course, this builds upon our work in the southern suburbs in terms of not only extending of the rail line and the electrification of the rail line to Seaford but also fixing the hideous mess that we were left with from the previous government in terms of the nation's most embarrassing road, the one-way expressway. I think we are now three years into having a two-way expressway and I think everybody in the south thanks their lucky stars every day that we did fix that problem. So now, through this project as well, we will have a proper road corridor for the entire length of the Adelaide metropolitan area, from Sellicks in the south through to Gawler in the north. There will be an appropriate road corridor right through the spine of Adelaide, which is very important.

Another very important aspect of this project is the jobs that it will deliver. We know that we are investing hugely in infrastructure across the state, even just in the next financial year, to the tune of \$2.2 billion across the state. We want to make sure that as many of those jobs as possible are being delivered for South Australians. That is why we have an Industry Participation Policy for the government which is aimed at doing that, as well as the Industry Advocate about which the other place will be debating legislation to strengthen its powers soon.

Out of this project, we estimate that there are going to be 165 jobs every year that the construction work is underway, so that is going to be very positive for jobs in the south. We will make

sure, as part of the contracting for this work, that at least half of those jobs come from the southern suburbs of Adelaide and the Fleurieu Peninsula. We have nominated Onkaparinga, Victor Harbor, Alexandrina and Yankalilla council areas to receive at least 50 per cent of the jobs going to this project.

The minister has established a jobs taskforce to be set up to work with this project, to work with whoever eventually gets the contract for this, as well as the Industry Advocate to ensure that takes place. He has asked me to chair that taskforce and I am looking forward to working with him and the department to ensure that we get the best economic benefit for the southern suburbs as possible, which we have also done. The member for Mawson was the head of that taskforce for the southern suburbs which had excellent success, and I know the member for Little Para is the head of that taskforce for the Northern Connector which is having some amazing success in getting jobs for the northern suburbs out of that project. We are hoping to achieve exactly the same thing with this Main South Road duplication project as well.

The plans are being considered and worked on right now. We are looking forward to consulting with the community. I have to say, unfortunately, we have seen some people knocking this. In fact, it was only in parliament the other day that we saw the member for Finnis refer to this project as pork-barrelling. I think it is really unfortunate to see that level of criticism from the Liberal Party about this project because I do not think anyone in the southern suburbs of Adelaide thinks that this is a pork barrelling project. They think this is a very much-needed project for the south. They think it is something that will save lives. It will make their lives easier, but it will also encourage more tourism and more visitors to the southern suburbs.

To hear words like that being used about pork-barrelling is unfortunate, and I encourage the member for Finnis to consider withdrawing that sort of statement because I think it is quite offensive to people who live in the southern suburbs who need to use this road every day. I have been inundated with people saying how much they are supportive of this project. They think this is long overdue and necessary. There is a lot of excitement for it. We want to make sure that we deliver it in consultation with the community, that we deliver it in an efficient manner and that we deliver it achieving the best jobs outcome that we possibly can for people in the south, as well as the broader South Australian economy.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I advise members of the presence in the gallery earlier of constituents of the member for Finnis. They were from the Fleurieu Bargaining Group, who were guests of the Hon. Robert Brokenshire from another place. We will let them know that we missed them.

Bills

APPROPRIATION BILL 2017

Appropriation Grievances

Debate resumed.

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (20:53): I rise to speak predominantly about the banking tax that the government is planning to implement that the Liberal Party is planning to block. I put a post up on Facebook to give the constituents and the people of Adelaide the right to have a say on this terrible banking tax, unlike the government which has not actually consulted with anyone—not the businesses, not the people. Not even their own advisers were consulted on this terrible and very damaging tax. I will read out a few comments, including this from one of my constituents:

It is very rare for me to comment or get involved in political or policy issues with the one obvious exception being the O-Bahn. However, I do feel strongly about the bank tax and believe it is essential that the Liberal Party moves to block it in the upper house. I understand the convention about passing budgets but don't believe there is any reason that precludes voting against one specific budget measure. This tax is simply wrong and will make South Australia a laughing stock.

A further comment is:

I support any action against the banking tax. We already have one at a federal level and the banks have already said they will pass it on to customers. Doing it at a state level, too, is just hitting people twice. Banks are only ever going to look after their own profit margins and shareholders won't accept a loss that would impact their share prices. People who can ill afford it will once again be hardest hit.

Further comments are:

Banks are owned by super funds, and super funds managed funds for every worker in the land. Bank tax will affect dividends into super funds. Whether you vote or right or anywhere in between, the proposed bank tax affects everybody. It will no doubt affect investment and lost job opportunities in the South Australian economy that is already the worst performing in the nation.

Here are some further comments:

This extra bank tax is very bad for the state as it will be passed on to all, including the poor. The banks pay \$12 billion in tax and 85 per cent of their profits to shareholders, which are lots of super funds and small investors like mum and dads. If anyone thinks this is good, they need their head read. I highly recommend you vote against this decision. Vote no.

This is a shortsighted, desperate and mischievous tax. It has been said many times these tax will impact thousands of personal and business clients and shareholders and ward off potential South Australian investors. The proposed tax is a declaration that this current government does not reward success. The comments about this tax from the Labor government are mischievous because they prey on the ignorance of the general public who don't understand the business of banking in relation to the balance sheet profit generation and redistribution of funds. I hope the opposition opposes this tax.

This is just a tax on success. What business comes next? Insurance? Adding a new state-based tax to banking is totally insane and misguided. It's a cash grab iron from an out of touch and totally out of control government clique of clowns. South Australia is in deep, deep trouble and only a totally new government has any chance of saving us from hell.

I am dead against the tax. I am no longer an employee of a bank, so I'm not fighting for my job, but this tax is merely game playing. The real damage will be what it will do to this state, to the shareholders, to the day-to-day employees trying to keep a job, allowing for growth in the state via jobs in this industry, having flow-on effects to the customers, to businesses and to competitiveness. Do you remember the FIDs and BADs tax? Well, I have been in the finance industry for a long time and one was a federal tax and the other a state tax. Well, at the time, South Australian customers would open accounts interstate—for example, Central Queensland—to avoid the tax for the pleasure of depositing or withdrawing their own cash. Please, Rachel, be the voice of reason and tell Labor they are on a real loser here. Their mismanagement has led to the loss of jobs and they are being desperate, so of course the banks are an obvious target as they make good profits to keep our supers, shareholders and bank jobs going.

No economy ever taxed itself into prosperity. Desperate acts of desperate men. No, I am not in favour.

The profits the banks make get passed on to the shareholders. Virtually everyone has a superannuation fund that has bank shares, so basically it's just another poorly thought-out and ill-conceived tax on the general public.

Against any measure that makes us less competitive, we need to be the cheapest state in everything and especially making this state the cheapest to do business and employ people. It's time to slash government waste. It's time to have our finances independently audited. It's time to cut regulation. It's time to make WorkCover the cheapest in the country. It's time to have less government think-tanks and consultants. Stop telling a store owner when it can open. Stop local councils having rules making it difficult to run a business.

It's pure and simple, Rachel. A state-based bank tax is a recipe for a failed economy. Reject this or face the electoral consequences. Everyone knows the banks will pass this impost on to their customers and/or shareholders and, hey, that's us. Reject Labor's insane economic logic, please.

More taxes, too many taxes. Many are immoral. This is just another tax, but there will be a flow-on to bank customers. You can bet on it. The banks and their shareholders won't wear the extra costs themselves. It's not in their nature.

There were just so many, many comments on Facebook, and those are just some of the comments that were against this absolutely toxic tax. The reason that Labor is putting in this toxic tax is that they are completely unable to run within their own budget. Their overruns are causing them these issues so that they have to find money. We know that they have already sold the lotteries and the Motor Accident Commission. They are selling the Lands Titles Office, and many of my constituents are very concerned about their data and personal information being sold off to overseas companies.

Let me talk about the sale of the forests in the South-East that was recently in the paper. In 2012, treasurer Snelling at the time, despite pre-2010 stating that there would no sale of any assets, sold 100 years of forward rotations of the South-East forests for only \$670 million. At the time, the Liberal opposition claimed that it was worth between \$950 million and \$1.2 billion. The forestry

experts said it was being sold for at least \$500 million below its value. At the time, the forests contributed around \$30 million per annum to state revenue and to our budget, which over 100 years is around \$3 billion.

Five years later, we see in the paper that the purchaser has posted a \$125.5 million profit in one year with their plantation earnings, and it will likely have paid the whole asset off by mid-2019, only seven years after purchasing it. You can see that we are in this pickle because this government undersells things, does not know how to run the economy, has never run a business in its life and has no idea how to run the state. At the time of the sale of the forests, there were hundreds of job losses and property prices in the South-East dropped. I even had people contacting me in Adelaide saying that they were wanting to move into a retirement village; however, the bottom had dropped out of the market so they could not sell their homes, so they could not move.

There are now high levels of unemployment, and we know that in the South-East there are high levels of drug use, domestic violence and crime, which we all know come as a result of job losses and downturns in the economy. This was instigated by the Labor government's desperation in selling off the forward rotations. We also see now that the government is trying to sell off the administration building and the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site. We should have had an announcement by 30 June, which we are still waiting to hear.

This government likes building shiny things and tries to convince people, by splashing money around, to vote for them, but we need consistent economic growth, not project by project, shiny new thing by shiny new thing, and then we have a valley of death in the middle where we lose all our workers and jobs. We need to spend money on creating jobs and opportunities not buildings. We need to focus on service not buildings. We have new hospitals, but we have no doctors, nurses and specialists. We heard recently of people who died because we did not have specialists in the right areas, so we need to stop only building shiny new buildings and worry about servicing our community.

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (21:03): 'Sam Duluk, he works for a big bank.' That was the literature that the ALP put out on polling day in my by-election. They did a precis of me and my opponent, and my crime was that I worked for a big bank. At the time, I was just a humble business bank manager at the ANZ bank, a bank that employs thousands of South Australians and tens of thousands of Australians, as all the big banks do in South Australia and Australia. They employ thousands of South Australians. They employ part-time—

The Hon. J.J. Snelling interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr DULUK: They employ part-time mum-and-dad tellers in suburban branches, they employ hardworking people in the community who work for these banks, and they spend and donate tens of millions of dollars per annum to the community. I am sure the Westpac helipad will be at the NRAH as part of the health minister's new project. The banks are an important part of the community, but the Labor Party hate the banks.

They hated the banks in the eighties and nineties and that is why we had the State Bank, and of course today they hate the banks in this state budget as well, and they hate people who work for banks. They hated me on my election day, and they tried to defame me for working for a big bank, but that did not work. The people of my electorate saw that there is actually nothing wrong with working for a big bank.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling interjecting:

Mr DULUK: There is nothing wrong with working for a big bank. Of course, in the context of this debate, and in the state budget, this is not about me defending the big banks, or about the Liberal Party being friends with the bank. It is not about the bank tax that will actually hurt investment in South Australia. It is just about tax. It is about tax, it is about jobs and, of course, it is about this state budget.

Those opposite have sold almost all that they can sell in order to prop up their budget. They sold the Motor Accident Commission, they sold the rotations in the forests, they have done what they can where they can. They have this big hole to plug in their pre-election state budget, and who do

they go to? Instead of making hard decisions, instead of making the right structural decisions over the last 15 or 16 years that have been required for South Australia, they go after the big bad banks, and it is an absolute disgrace by those opposite. It completely misunderstands what tax is about, how an economy works, and what the main drivers of an economic system are. If we do not have a strong banking sector, we do not have a strong economy, and that is absolutely what we need in South Australia.

Taxing those engines of investment, of decision-making, is not where we need to be at all, and it is not going to solve the problem that we are facing in South Australia, with this job crisis that we have. The headline budget is all very sexy and it all seems to add up nicely. There is a nice surplus there and there is a tax on the bank, which everyone opposite loves, but when you delve into those budget numbers, which we will a bit more as estimates come on, you actually see the real numbers in this budget after 16 years of hard Labor.

I digress for a moment because, on the way back to the chamber, I called into FIVEaa this evening. I was talking to Ted from Salisbury who was calling in. He was saying that you cannot trust the Liberals and give Labor one more go. This was with Andrew Reimer about an hour ago. I said, 'Ted, Labor have put in 16 years of hard Labor. It's actually time to give the Liberals a go because we have the right policy settings that will benefit South Australia. We have the policy settings that will change and decrease unemployment in South Australia.'

At the moment, unemployment is trending at 7.1 per cent—the highest in the nation. That is the legacy of those opposite. That is the legacy of 16 years of Labor. In relation to underutilisation, 16.6 per cent of the labour force is either unemployed or underemployed. That is the legacy of 16 years of hard Labor. Jobs growth has been about 1.9 per cent since 2015. Nationally, it is 3.7 per cent. That is the legacy of 16 years of hard Labor. Jobs growth predicted in this year's budget is 1 per cent. So, we have this huge \$19 billion state budget.

This is the jobs budget that is going to save South Australia for the third year in a row but, of course, this huge jobs budget can only provide 1 per cent job growth over the next 12 months, whereas jobs growth nationally is chugging along at a very respectable 3.7 per cent, which is testament to a lot of the good work of the federal government. Jobs growth predicted by the SA Centre for Economic Studies is 0.75 per cent in 2017-18, and again 0.75 per cent in 2018-19. Net interstate migration is 6,484 people lost interstate in the last year of 2016.

This evening, before coming back to the house, I had the opportunity to attend a citizenship ceremony in Blackwood, right in the heart of my electorate and the new electorate of Waite, and it was fantastic to see so many people becoming new citizens and choosing my community to live in. There was one person with whom I spoke after the ceremony. He told me that he lives in Adelaide, but his daughter has gone to Melbourne to study. So, we even have new Australians who have been here for four or five years, who want to stay in South Australia but the children are already leaving and going to Melbourne and Sydney. They are part of that exodus. We cannot even keep new migrants in South Australia and new Australian citizens in our community at the moment.

As I said before, in relation to economic growth, 1.9 per cent is our gross state product. It is 2.8 per cent nationally. That is the result of 16 years of hard Labor. Net debt is \$13.8 billion in 2017-18 and expected to peak at almost \$15 billion in 2019-20. That net debt is costing us about \$717 million per year to service that debt. That is \$717 million of interest that we pay on that debt that cannot be spent on hospitals, roads, schools and public transport because we are servicing Labor's debt that they have racked up after 16 years of hard Labor.

One of those big, bad banks put out the CommSec report, which ranks South Australia seventh out of eight jurisdictions in terms of economic performance. I assume we cannot trust the report because, of course, it has been put out by a big, bad bank that does not like South Australia, if you are to believe what the Treasurer and the Premier were saying today. Property rates and charges are going up another 2.9 per cent. SA's share of Australian economic output was only 6 per cent. Our population sits at about 7 per cent. This is the sober reality of what we are seeing at the moment. This is the sober reality of the Treasurer's hard work.

We have seen private capital expenditure in SA remaining restrained and even stagnant, and of course we know that private investment is the stimulus for employment and growth. Private

investment generates jobs and it generates economic activity. A disincentive to investment in any business—and anyone will tell you and the member for Flinders will tell you—would be high rates of tax. A bank tax would be a disincentive to do business in South Australia. High energy costs are a huge disincentive, especially if you are a manufacturer or you are running a pub, or even if you are running a local sandwich shop on a main strip anywhere in South Australia it is a huge disincentive to investment.

We have some of the worst education outcomes at the moment in South Australia. In the long run, that means we are going to see an exodus of people, and of course that is a disincentive to investment. Our population growth has fallen to its lowest level in more than a decade. Low population growth in turn becomes a disincentive for investment. But something like the bank tax, as we know, is a huge disincentive, especially in a jurisdiction such as South Australia. So not a federal bank tax but a state bank tax imposed only in South Australia is a disincentive to investment because it allows capital outflow. Of course, we know that capital is most important.

As I was driving this evening, I was listening to the Premier on 729 ABC and he was talking about the wonderful investment from the UK and overseas conglomerate to bail out Arrium, and rightly so, as it is fantastic. Foreign investment is most important, and it is foreign investment and all types of investment that help our industry grow, so we should welcome foreign investment and we should welcome all types of investment in South Australia in South Australian jobs. By having a bank tax, it is actually a tax on investment.

If we want to turn around our fortunes, if we want to increase economic activity, if we want to keep South Australians in South Australia, having their families and buying houses and enjoying the beautiful lifestyle we have, then we have to do everything we can not to have those disincentives on investment. This is not about us on this side of the house being great friends with the banks and these big scary people, as the Treasurer and the Premier would have us believe. This is about doing all we can to ensure that we have fantastic investment in South Australia. And bad taxes are bad for investment.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (21:13): Well, what a week it has been. We had the budget handed down—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It's not over yet.

Mr TRELOAR: It is not over yet; no, it is not. The debate on the budget continues with the grievance debate this evening and many more excellent contributions in regard to this. The budget was handed down and the Labor government promised a jobs budget yet again. I think every time I have spoken to this Appropriation Bill in the eight years that I have been sitting here, the Labor government have delivered what they have called a jobs budget. Of course, calling it something does not necessarily make it happen.

Unfortunately, I am remembering back to 2010 when the Labor government promised 100,000 new jobs as part of their election platform, and they have fallen, by our calculations, about 80,000 short—nowhere near what they were anticipating, expecting or promising the people of South Australia. Instead, the government has delivered new taxes and higher charges which, of course, is the last thing South Australia needs. There is no doubt that our state economy is struggling, but the \$370 million state bank tax will not deliver jobs—not one job—or relief for households struggling with the cost of living. That is why we as an opposition have taken a position to oppose the state bank tax.

As much as the government would have you believe otherwise, this tax and our position on this tax is not about the banks. The government would have you believe that it was the lobbying efforts and a close association with the banks and the business community that have led us to take our position. That is actually not so. It is not about the banks; it is about the tax. South Australians do not need any more tax. They do not need one more tax. It is not going to deliver one more new job.

We see the government in yet another taxpayer-funded advertising campaign that the South Australian economy is transitioning. There is no doubt that it is transitioning—we are moving away from our traditional manufacturing base. Once upon a time, South Australia and Adelaide were the

home of whitegoods manufacturing in Australia. Those days have gone, and of course Holden is about to close. Come October this year, there will be yet another business closed. This time a significant stalwart of the South Australian manufacturing industry will be closing and there will be much unemployment as a result. So transitioning to what? Who knows?

Fifteen per cent of this state's workforce is engaged and employed by the government. I fully understand that we all need nurses, schoolteachers and policeman; in fact, my wife is a nurse and one of that 15 per cent. Another 15 per cent of South Australia's population relies on welfare in some form or another, so 30 per cent of Australia's working age population rely on the government either for their employment or their support.

It is hard to remain positive about this budget. There is nothing really in the budget to drive economic recovery, and there is certainly not too much in it for regional South Australia. I will come to that shortly. You cannot tax your way to prosperity, but it seems to me that this government thinks that that is what you can do. It is a high taxing, high spending government. We have seen it time after time after time, budget after budget after budget, with things such as the emergency services levy, high stamp duty, high water rates and high electricity rates feeding into an extraordinarily high cost of living and going towards making our state uncompetitive.

I have said in this place before that if we are going to compete on the world market—which we do and, in essence, our state has reverted to a primary production base with our wheat, wool, meat and wine grapes all exported—and compete with other exporters on the world market, the global market, we need to be competitive. Anything that stands in the way of that competitiveness has an impact on those producers who are driving production in this state and, in fact, through exports bringing in new money to our economy.

I mentioned unemployment, which remains stubbornly high at 6.9 per cent, I understand, and 7.1 per cent seasonally adjusted, and continues to remain the highest unemployment rate in this state. There are parts of this state and parts of this city where generational unemployment has become ingrained. It is a sad fact, and unfortunately these people do not have a lot of prospects in the years to come. There can be nothing more insidious than generational unemployment and what it does to families, communities, etc.

The government would have you believe that the Liberal Party is bereft of policies. That is not so. We have already released 40 policies in the prelude to the March 2018 election and we have certainly seen some lines drawn in the sand this week. We have Globe Link and Infrastructure SA, whereby that board will set strategies and priorities in relation to infrastructure spending in this state. It is so critical that infrastructure be judged on its merits and not just on which particular marginal electorate might benefit from expenditure on infrastructure.

Certainly, in relation to infrastructure, we have had a bit of a hiccup this week in the electorate of Flinders in relation to the port at Thevenard. I will talk more about that tomorrow in my grievance, but it is a prime example of what can happen when infrastructure is neglected in this state. I understand that it is not always the responsibility of government, but private companies, as well as government, have neglected strategic investment into infrastructure. We will be establishing a productivity commission and we will be releasing many more policies before the March 2018 election.

Regional South Australia faces major challenges, such as high unemployment and population loss, and this supposed jobs budget fails to deliver for families and businesses. Much of the state's prosperity comes from regional South Australia, and this state budget does very little to assist businesses to address the economic issues our communities are facing. There are key transport freight routes across our regions, and yet there is no extra funding in this budget for regional roads despite a \$1 billion road maintenance backlog in South Australia. According to the RAA, anything up to \$400 million of that backlog is estimated to be in regional South Australia.

On the upside, I am pleased to see that there is money in the budget for the wastewater treatment plant in Port Lincoln. By my calculations, I combine two budget lines: the Port Lincoln wastewater treatment plant sludge treatment upgrade, at a total cost of \$16.1 million in the out years, and the Port Lincoln wastewater network upgrade project, at a total cost of \$5.144 million. That is a total of just over \$21 million. These lines both appear under SA Water major projects and are estimated in the out years.

My concerns regarding this facility were around the capacity of the wastewater treatment plant in the long term, in particular to effectively accommodate large volumes of salty wastewater from fish processing. As we know, Port Lincoln is the home of the tuna industry in Australia. I am led to believe that it is home to the largest fishing fleet in the Southern Hemisphere. As a result, many of the fish caught are processed locally in Port Lincoln, and so they should be. There is a big demand on electricity—electricity costs are rising for these processors—but an ongoing issue has been the treatment and disposal of the wastewater coming from not only the town itself but from the fish processing plants.

By definition, fish processors dispose of salty water, and that has to be managed, treated and brought to a point where it can be let go into the ocean proper or reused across bowling greens and golf clubs. I am pleased to see that. Other things I noticed in the budget are that there is ongoing budget support for the New Horizons soil program and also a \$50 million five-year bilateral agreement between the GRDC and the South Australian Research and Development Institute, which all should go towards increasing productivity for our primary producers.

Time expired.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (21:23): I would like to say a few things in concluding this debate about the budget and the various budget measures and perhaps provide some reflection on what has been said. I would also like to provide some insights into one of the key things I think is part of this debate on how taxes, used responsibly, can actually be used to create new activity and also new jobs and support business.

I completely reject the view that taxes are in and of themselves an evil thing and that we are a high-taxing state, which, by international standards, we are not. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition in his debate earlier today talked about the falling receipts of payroll tax. There are falling receipts of a whole range of stamp duties, etc. On the one hand, we are the state with the fastest increasing taxes, and yet all these other taxes are reducing. They are reducing because already as a state we have reduced the rates of taxation in a number of areas. We are making sure that the burden of taxation falls on those who can most afford it. We are moving taxes away from small business and onto big businesses, especially the big banks.

The Liberal Party's defence of big banks is, quite frankly, nothing short of embarrassing. What the big banks have done in this debate in some way says a lot about what is wrong with corporate governance in this country in the sense that, in the culture of a lot of organisations and despite their super profits, their contribution to society is minimal. Where does this contribution go, all the super profits? To senior executives. Boards of directors are making enormous amounts of money quite disproportionate to ordinary South Australians.

The other thing that has been interesting to note throughout the debate is that, without fail, members of the Liberal Party opposite have all said, 'We want fewer taxes,' but at the same time they have all said, 'We want this spent on this as well.' When you add up 'this bit as well', it is hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars more, if not billions of dollars more. I am not sure where they are going to get the money to pay for those projects. What are they going to cut out? Are they going to cut out schools? Are they going to close schools? Are they going to cut funding to hospitals? What will they save on in order to spend on all the other things they want to do, because they say that they are not going to increase taxes? It is interesting that the whole debate has been quite inconsistent.

There are some examples of taxes that work in my electorate. I would like the Liberal Party to say whether they will cancel these projects, but they will not do this because this is taxation moneys at work. For example, are they going to cancel the electrification of the Gawler railway line? Are they going to cancel the new communication tower at Wasleys in my community? Are they going to cancel the new school in Munno Para? Are they going to cancel the Gawler East Link Road? These are all things that we are using taxes to spend on. If you are going to reduce taxes, you need to either cut expenditure or not do the things you want to do.

Another issue they raised includes the lack of consultation about the big bank tax. I am reminded of Globe Link—the Liberal Party's response to all the state's transport issues. Industry associations criticised it for their lack of consultation, saying that it would not work. On a more positive

note, I would like to talk about a couple of projects that are funded by the state government, which are supporting small business and will make businesses more profitable.

One of the projects that I have been involved in personally is a co-worker project as part of the northern economic growth projects. It involves the Stretton Centre, in partnership with Business SA and the City of Playford. We have a building inspector, a plumber, an energy efficiency consultant, a make-up artist and a native food business.

The one thing they have in common is that they are all small businesses. The other thing they have in common is that they have all been successful in obtaining what they call a co-worker place at the Stretton Centre. What are co-worker spaces? Basically, they are spaces at a business enterprise centre where small businesses can lease a small space and get mentoring support, business advice and networks, etc.

The purpose of these co-worker spaces is to support small businesses in their early days so that they become successful and grow. They are funded by taxation. As a result of this business project, these small businesses include Johnson Plumbing and Gas, Red Centre Enterprises, Quality Building Inspections, Down to Earth Sustainable Solutions and Sapherra's Beauty. These are businesses in my electorate that will grow to employ additional people.

The other project I have been involved in, which was announced recently—again, our taxes at work—is a grant of \$100,000 from the state government to the Barossa Collaboration. The collaboration involves The Barossa Council, the Light Regional Council, Barossa Food, Tourism Barossa, the Barossa Grape and Wine Association and the RDA. This project is designed to support and grow small artisan businesses in the Barossa. There is a whole range of projects that have been undertaken.

The project will be chaired by Jan Angas and will explore ways of unshackling small businesses from the various regulations, licensing requirements, etc., to enable these businesses to flourish and to enable value-adding opportunities in these small businesses. These small businesses will be supported through taxation. Again, this is taxation at work to support small business, to grow small business and to grow new jobs. The assertion that taxation cannot work for or help to grow jobs is just a nonsense. It is certainly true that you need to spend your tax dollars wisely and it is certainly true that you need to spend them in a way that actually promotes jobs.

For example, with the Barossa Collaboration, the moneys will be spent to review planning and licensing regulations applicable to artisan food production; further develop the Barossa Trust Mark to protect the integrity of the Barossa brand to help with exports; develop a Barossa prospectus to attract investment in small and start-up food ventures and creative arts ventures; assess and further develop the forthcoming Be Consumed event in Melbourne, where the Barossa will be on expo; and investigate the establishment of a project of culinary excellence to build not only on the Barossa's wine experience but also on the Barossa's food experience.

There is a whole range of examples where our taxes can be used to promote and support businesses and new work. With those comments, I end the debate.

Motion carried.

Estimates Committees

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (21:32): I move:

That the proposed expenditures for the departments and services contained in the Appropriation Bill be referred to Estimates Committees A and B for examination and report by Wednesday 2 August, in accordance with the following timetables:

APPROPRIATION BILL 2017

TIMETABLE FOR ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A

WEDNESDAY 26 JULY AT 9.00 AM

Treasurer

Minister for Finance

Minister for State Development

Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy

Legislative Council

House of Assembly

Joint Parliamentary Services

Administered Items for Joint Parliamentary Services

State Governor's Establishment

Auditor-General's Department

Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)

Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)

Department of State Development (part)

Administered Items for the Department of State Development (part)

Department of Treasury and Finance (part)

Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)

THURSDAY 27 JULY AT 9.00 AM

Minister for Transport and Infrastructure

Minister for Housing and Urban Development

Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)

Administered Items for the Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)

Department of Treasury and Finance (part)

Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)

FRIDAY 28 JULY AT 9.00 AM

Minister for Education and Childhood Development

Minister for Higher Education and Skills

Department of Education and Child Development

Administered Items for the Department of Education and Child Development

Department for Child Protection

Department of State Development (part)

Administered Items for the Department of State Development (part)

MONDAY 31 JULY AT 9.00 AM

Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries

Minister for Forests

Minister for Tourism

Minister for Recreation and Sport

Minister for Racing

Department of Primary Industries and Regions (part)

Administered Items for the Department of Primary Industries and Regions (part)

South Australian Tourism Commission

Minister for Tourism

Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)

Administered Items for the Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)

TUESDAY 1 AUGUST AT 9.00 AM

Minister for Health

Minister for Health Industries

Minister for Arts

Minister for Investment and Trade

Minister for Small Business

Minister for Defence Industries

Minister for Veteran's Affairs

Department for Health and Ageing (part)

Department of State Development (part)

Administered Items for the Department of State Development (part)

Defence SA

Department of Treasury and Finance (part)

Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

WEDNESDAY 26 JULY AT 9.00 AM

Attorney-General

Minister for Justice Reform

Minister for Planning

Minister for the City of Adelaide

Minister for Public Sector

Minister for Industrial Relations

Minister for Consumer and Business Services

Courts Administration Authority

Attorney-General's Department (part)

Administered Items for the Attorney-General's Department (part)

Electoral Commission SA

Administered Items for the Electoral Commission SA

Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)

Administered Items for the Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)

Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)

Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)

Department of Treasury and Finance (part)

Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)

Independent Gambling Authority

THURSDAY 27 JULY AT 9.00 AM

Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion

Minister for Social Housing

Minister for the Status of Women

Minister for Ageing

Minister for Youth

Minister for Multicultural Affairs

Minister for Volunteers

Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (part)

Administered Items for the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (part)

Department for Health and Ageing (part)

FRIDAY 28 JULY AT 9.00 AM

Minister for Police

Minister for Correctional Services

Minister for Emergency Services

Minister for Road Safety

Minister for Disabilities

Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse

South Australia Police

Administered Items for South Australia Police

Department for Correctional Services

Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)

Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)

Administered Items for the Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)

Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (part)

Administered Items for the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (part)

Department for Health and Ageing (part)

South Australian Mental Health Commission

MONDAY 31 JULY AT 9.00 AM

Minister for Employment

Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation

Minister for Automotive Transformation

Minister for Science and Information Economy

Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation

Department of State Development (part)

Administered Items for the Department of State Development (part)

TUESDAY 1 AUGUST AT 9.00 AM

Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation

Minister for Water and the River Murray

Minister for Climate Change

Minister for Regional Development

Minister for Local Government

Department for Environment, Water and Natural Resources

Administered Items for the Department for Environment, Water and Natural Resources

Department of Primary Industries and Regions

Administered Items for the Department of Primary Industries and Regions

Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)

Administered Items for the Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (part)

Local Government Grants Commission.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (21:32): I move:

That Estimates Committee A be appointed, consisting of Ms Bedford, Ms Cook, Mr Hughes, Hon. S.W. Key, Mr Knoll, Mr Marshall and Mr Speirs.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (21:32): I move:

That Estimates Committee B be appointed, consisting of Mr Odenwalder, Ms Chapman, Mr Gee, Mr Griffiths, Hon. A. Piccolo, Ms Wortley and Mr Tarzia.

Motion carried.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION (SERIOUS OR SYSTEMIC MISCONDUCT OR MALADMINISTRATION) AMENDMENT (NO 2) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

At 21:33 the house adjourned until Thursday 6 July 2017 at 10:30.