

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

### Tuesday, 18 September 2018

The **SPEAKER (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)** took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

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

#### *Matter of Privilege*

#### **PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (11:01):** Mr Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege. Four months ago, on Thursday 17 May, I asked the Minister for Environment (Hon. David Speirs) the following question:

My question is to the Minister for the Environment. Did the minister or any member of his staff request the names of public sector employees from his agencies who had worked in the previous environment minister's ministerial offices over the last five years and who are currently employed in his agency or the public sector?

The Hon. D.J. Speirs, Minister for Environment and Water, replied at 2.38pm, 'No, not that I am aware of.' Yesterday, the Acting Chief Executive of Department for Environment and Water, Mr John Schutz, gave evidence to the Budget and Finance Committee. The Chairperson asked Mr Schutz:

Since the change of government, has the minister you're responsible for, or his office or any other office, requested lists of staff who worked in the former minister's office—that is, minister Hunter?

Mr Schutz replied, 'Yes.' The Chairperson then asked Mr Schutz who made these requests to him. Mr Schutz then replied, 'The minister's current Chief of Staff.' Mr Schutz continued on to say:

The request was to provide a list of staff and the various roles they may have performed in the previous minister's office to assist them to establish an interim structure for the minister and understand what roles the minister's office required to perform its functions.

The Chairperson of the Budget and Finance Committee then asked, 'Was the request just about the titles or was it about who the individuals were?' Mr Schutz replied to the Budget and Finance Committee, 'It was about the individuals who had performed those roles.' The Chairperson of Budget and Finance then asked if Mr Schutz had sought or received any advice about whether that was appropriate to give to an incoming minister. Mr Schutz replied to the committee, 'Yes, I did.'

The Chairperson of the Budget and Finance Committee then asked, 'What was the advice that was given to you about the appropriateness or otherwise of doing that?' The acting chief executive then replied to the Budget and Finance Committee:

That there needed to be care in regard to what information was being provided and how that information might be used in regard to public servants.

The Chairperson of the Budget and Finance Committee then asked, 'In relation to what? Care given in relation to what?' Mr Schutz replied to the committee, 'The separation of the minister's role and the public sector's role.' This line of questioning in the Budget and Finance Committee culminated in this piece of evidence being given by Mr Schutz to the committee. The Chairperson asked:

So, no-one from the department made anyone from the minister's office aware that, in fact...this was discussed and that it might not have been a correct answer that was given on 17 May—

to the House of Assembly. Mr Schutz replied to the committee:

I advised the minister's Chief of Staff that the minister had given that answer and that he would need to consider whether he spoke to the minister about that matter.

The Chairperson then asked:

When did you advise the Chief of Staff, approximately—very soon after that 17 May question?

Mr Schutz replied to the committee:

Very soon after that statement was made.

It is important to note that the Premier stated only a week ago, on 11 September, that the buck stops with ministers. In a speech to the Institute of Public Administration he stated:

I have told my ministers that they cannot expect to remain in cabinet if they see nothing, hear nothing and question nothing. Ministers have to be inquisitive, inquiring and challenging. Responsibility ends on the minister's desk, not at the departmental door.

Four months ago, this house was told that the minister or anyone in his office had not requested a list of staff and the previous roles they had performed in the former minister's office. That is false.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Point of order: this is now repetition and debate rather than information for the purpose of a motion on privilege.

**The SPEAKER:** I have the point of order. Member for West Torrens, I imagine you are starting to wind up.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes, I am. Four months ago, this house was told that the minister was asked—

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Point of order: again, this is exactly what the member opened on in this privilege matter, that is, the statement of the minister at the time. He is now repeating it for the second time.

**The SPEAKER:** The point of order is for tedious repetition. I have that point of order, Deputy Premier. I believe the member for West Torrens is coming to a close.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I am, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** I will listen carefully to ensure that he does not repeat what has already been said. In any event, I will be obviously deferring any decision because it is a matter of privilege with quite an amount of background fact, but I will listen carefully. Please do not repeat matters that have already been repeated.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** This house was told that there was not a requested list of staff. That is false.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Point of order: this member is defying your indication in relation to repetition. He is again repeating and trying to put—

**The SPEAKER:** Deputy Premier, I do have the point of order. I believe what is being attempted here is a summary of the information. The member for West Torrens, I believe, is drawing to a close. If he does not draw to a close relatively soon, I may have a different ruling, but at this stage I will hear him summarise his argument thus far for this matter of privilege. In any event, I will be deferring the matter and I will be requesting these background facts.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The house has been misled. We know the minister's Chief of Staff, Mr Cullen Bailey, was informed by the acting chief executive of the department, John Schutz—

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Point of order—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Point of order—sit down!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Members on my left, please, one moment.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Mr Speaker, I ask you to hear my point of order. This is not a matter for debate. This is a matter that the member is bringing to the attention of you, sir, on a question of privilege. He is bound to put to you the facts as he asserts them, not to have an argument about the debate.

**The SPEAKER:** I appreciate the point of order. I believe the member for West Torrens is drawing this matter to a close. I will ask the member for West Torrens to please summarise his argument.

*The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The minister has had four months to correct the record that his Chief of Staff, Cullen Bailey, did indeed request the acting chief executive to provide a list of staff and the previous roles they had performed in the former minister's office. It is inconceivable to believe the Chief of Staff, Cullen Bailey—

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Point of order: again, the member is raising debate about his interpretation of what is inconceivable and what is not. The matter of privilege has been raised for your consideration. I ask him either be seated unless he has any other facts to put before you for the purpose of consideration.

**The SPEAKER:** With all respect to the Deputy Premier, I understand the point than has been made. I will listen to the member for West Torrens. He is drawing to a close. We have heard him thus far. I am going to allow him to finish this and then I am going to defer the decision on whether there is a prima facie case for a matter of privilege.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It is inconceivable to believe that the Chief of Staff, Mr Cullen Bailey, did not raise with the minister the acting chief executive's concerns about the minister's incorrect statement to the house on 17 May. Mr Speaker, the Minister for Environment has deliberately and intentionally misled the House of Assembly. I ask that you give consideration to my matter of privilege and rule if a motion to establish a privileges committee should be given precedence over other business in the House of Assembly.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, member for West Torrens. I understand the matter that has been raised. I will defer my decision on whether there exists a prima facie case for a matter of privilege. I will defer my decision. I respectfully ask the member for West Torrens to please provide to myself all relevant background information.

#### *Bills*

### **APPROPRIATION BILL 2018**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 September 2018.)

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Industry and Skills.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills) (11:10):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. May I say how refreshed you look this morning. As you were coming down the aisle, opening the parliament session today, did that bring back memories from last week, sir?

**The SPEAKER:** It did. Thank you, minister. I will get your advice later.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** You are beaming, sir. I am pleased to be able to speak about the first Liberal budget in 17 years. The budget that was delivered on 4 September surprised everybody. I think there is no doubt that everybody was surprised by the detail in the budget and the fact that it delivered on election commitments, including a return to surplus in the budgets in the forward estimates. Most importantly, in my area of responsibility as the Minister for Industry and Skills it provides additional money for apprenticeships and traineeships here in South Australia.

The budget provides \$235.9 million of new initiatives over the forward estimates. Our investment focus includes a skilled workforce to meet the future demands of industry in South Australia. This is important because we have been given a tremendous opportunity from Canberra, starting with the offshore patrol vessels that will start production in November down at Osborne,

followed a couple of years later by the submarines and the ships. These will demand enormous skills in South Australia.

There are two ways we can treat this opportunity. One is that we can simply be an assembly plant based at Osborne, putting big components together that have been shipped in from overseas and across the world. Alternatively, we can use the opportunity we have here—which is around about \$2 billion a year over the next 50 years, an incredible opportunity—to do as much of that work as possible, to have as much of that money that has been provided for this continuous build of ships and submarines as possible and to have that work done in South Australia to provide those jobs. In order to do that, we need to have a skilled workforce.

One of the key changes in the machinery of government that the Premier instigated immediately after being sworn in to office was the setting up of the Department for Industry and Skills. This is the first time we have seen so much collaboration between industry and the business sector—the engine room, if you like, of the South Australian economy—connected with the provision of skills in South Australia. Over the last six months, my department has been actively working with both industry and the training sector to establish what their needs are and where the skills gaps are. They have been talking to industry about the barriers that have evolved that stop businesses from taking on apprentices and trainees.

It is an important question to ask because under the previous Labor government, from 2012 to 2017, year by year we saw a dramatic drop in the number of apprentices and trainees commencing in South Australia. Over that period, there was a 66 per cent drop from about 25,000 commencements of apprentices and trainees in 2012 down to about 8,500 in 2017, a shocking indictment of the performance—and the interest, if you like—of the previous government in providing industry with the skills it needs to grow here in South Australia.

This is a very strong indication of difference in policy, difference in emphasis, with this government compared to the previous government. We believe a very strong and growing private sector, a strong industry base in South Australia, is the way to deliver real jobs, real careers, increased salaries, increased wages. That is how you pay for the services South Australians require that are delivered through state government, whether they be schools or hospitals, by making sure you have a strong and competitive private sector in this state. In order for that to happen, in order to grow their businesses, they need the skills base; without that skills base they will not be able to find the staff they need to do that.

On Friday 7 September, the Premier and I launched our Skilling South Australia initiative. Skilling South Australia is funded by \$202.6 million in the budget—\$100 million from the state Treasury and \$102.6 million from Canberra—and I am very pleased that South Australia was the first state to sign. We worked very cooperatively with then minister Karen Andrews, who was managing the training and skills portfolio for the federal government in Canberra; her department and my department worked together to establish the guidelines, establish the outcomes, the measuring points, the baseline measurements of where we are starting from and where we are heading with the Skilling South Australia fund.

A lot of people asked where the 20,800 number came from. That number is actually South Australia's share of the 300,000 that the federal government has committed to delivering through this policy over the next four years. We have \$202.6 million; in round numbers we are looking at about \$1 million a week extra funding for the next four years to spend on trainees and apprentices in South Australia.

We were very quick off the mark. The revised subsidised training list was released in May this year, and the first thing we did was go out to industry to consult on where that money should be spent and how it should be provided. We expanded the number of courses available for funding to the non-government sector and, with the same amount of money being spent, with that revised list we were able to deliver an additional 4,000 training places over the period. We are providing training opportunities in line with industry requirements, and our reforms will ensure real career options and real career outcomes for South Australians.

The Marshall Liberal government is leading the way. We were, in fact, the first state to sign the National Partnership Agreement on the Skilling Australians Fund. Other states are looking at

what we have done and even the Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry has written to other states asking them to look at the South Australian model before completing their agreements with the federal government.

They were very pleased with the industry engagement, which is a key plank of the policy and the implementation of the Skilling Australians and the Skilling South Australia partnership, and they would like other governments around Australia to model their rollout on the South Australian rollout. Why would that not be a good idea? Why reinvent the wheel? They have identified that the South Australian plan was a very good plan for industry engagement and they understand how important it is for industry to be engaged in the process.

We took to the March election a commitment to create jobs and boost training opportunities for all South Australians and this is exactly what we are delivering. Incentives for employers and learners under the Skilling South Australia fund include support for first-time employers to take on an apprentice or a trainee. This is important as there are 94,000 businesses here in South Australia that do not have a single employee. Many of them have been trading for decades. Certainly, in my own instance, the very first employee I took on in my business was an apprentice. For a lot of businesses, understanding what the responsibilities are and removing some of the barriers or perceptions of barriers that there might be for employers is important. We are offering support for first-time employers in that area.

We are also providing additional funding for Group Training to encourage growth, including in industries that have not traditionally used this model. The beauty of Group Training, of course, is that it removes the risk for many of the smaller employers in particular. They do not need to commit to an apprentice for four years, or a trainee for 12 months: they can be a host employer of a trainee or an apprentice who is actually employed by the Group Training organisation. They simply require a monthly arrangement with a group training organisation. It is also great for apprentices and trainees who are engaged or employed by a group training body because they can actually move around.

We are seeing some businesses that are very specialised in one particular area of a trade, so for that apprentice to get a full, rounded training, it may very well be that they might do six months, 12 months or 18 months at one particular employer that specialises in one particular skill related to that trade and then they may do another period of time at a business that might specialise in a different area of that trade, delivering broader skill sets. We see Group Training as being valuable. Traditionally, they get better completion rates as well, so we are very keen to work with Group Training and offer them incentives to expand their usage to employers throughout South Australia.

Through the delivery of a contestable funding model, non-government providers can access more funding and far more courses under the subsidised training list. This is important, of course. We saw that damning review of TAFE that was handed down by the Minister for Education in the last sitting week. It is a very difficult situation for South Australia to deal with now. Unfortunately, the previous government just kicked the can along and did not take any action.

They charged the former chair, Peter Vaughan, with one task only, which was to sack people—and that is what he did—without any plan in place to change the model, to modernise and update TAFE so it was responsive to industry needs. It was a government business that was able to do what it had set out to do, and that was to provide vocational training for jobs so that people have the skills they need for jobs in the broader workforce.

Through a statewide advisory service, we will support employers from the first contact right through until the apprentice or trainee's first day on the job. This is about preparing employers, getting them ready to take on those employees, because we want employers to feel good about what they are doing. We want them to feel confident so that they become engaged in the process.

Employers will be able to access tailored project funding and additional support, where required, on a case-by-case basis. We are taking advantage of the fact that we are a small state. We are offering almost a bespoke service to businesses out there. It is not one size fits all, not like previous models from the previous government, where business had to change to try to fit in with the criteria that were laid down by the government. Actually, the department is changing and the programs are changing to suit the businesses, because the businesses are the customer.

This is a new phenomenon for government in South Australia. We are actually here to serve. We are here to do what we can for those who pay the taxes in the state. My department is very keen to participate in that process and deliver the services that industry needs to participate in the government's program of increasing the number of apprentices and trainees in South Australia, to prepare South Australians for the tsunami of opportunities that are coming here in the defence and related sectors over the coming years.

We will be introducing our flexible apprenticeships for school students, making it possible for them to start an apprenticeship at a younger age, earn while they are learning and still complete their high school certificate. It will be possible for them to still gain their SACE while they are doing their apprenticeship. It is very exciting stuff, particularly for old tradies like me, who were very keen to get into the workforce early and start an apprenticeship. This is an option that will now be there for South Australian students to take up.

We have a lot of work to do in that space. We need to lift the profile and the prestige of the apprenticeship and take it to where it was 20 or 30 years ago, when it was seen as being a pathway into a career equal to a white-collar job or going to university; it was just another pathway into a career. There is more and more research telling us that for the first 10 years somebody with a trade background is earning more money than somebody who has gone through the further education system, who has a bachelor's degree. The Training and Skills Commission has recently released a report that was able to establish that of the top 50 most in-demand vocations in the future, 84 per cent will not require a bachelor's degree.

The Skilling Australia group released a report last year identifying that five years out from completion, the average salary is \$56,000 for those with a graduate bachelor's qualification compared with \$58,000 for those with a trade qualification. We need to remember that. There was a great article in the paper at the weekend, 'Wealthy tradies are the new middle class'. I have news for the author of that article: tradies have been middle class in Australia for a very long time, particularly those who have gone on to start their own businesses, where the bulk of the businesses come from.

I will just finish off quickly on some of the exciting things that we are doing, as part of my department, on the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site that has been renamed Lot Fourteen. We have \$30 million in the forward estimates for the establishment of the hospitality and tourism international school of culinary excellence, which is basically a new site, a new school, for the Regency Park Centre that has been operating since the 1980s. We have Le Cordon Bleu, we have the International College of Hotel Management and we have TAFE, with the three of them sharing that facility and working together. We will be moving that into the city.

We have seen, around Australia, the city-based schools that are similar to this and that have been able to attract more foreign students, who are a big part of their business. We will see a dramatic increase in the number of foreign students attending this college when we have this open during the forward estimates. A scoping study is underway, and of course we will start to get some runs on the board as that continues to grow. Expressions of interest are now sought for anchor tenants for the new innovation, incubator, start-up and growth hub on that site as well. So things are very exciting in the Department for Industry and Skills, and we are very pleased that we have a budget allocation to deliver on those promises.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (11:30):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. Can I commence my remarks by congratulating you on your recent nuptials. That is wonderful news. I was told it was pronounced 'nuptials' because it is the last time you get to say 'nup'. I am sure I will not be the only other person in this chamber who wishes you a long and happy marriage. While I am at it, can I also thank the member for Unley for warming up the crowd in the way that he did with his contribution on the Appropriation Bill.

Budgets are a reflection of a government's priorities—a demonstration of their values. We certainly have that in this budget. We see what is important to this new Liberal government, who they support and who they choose to leave behind. Budgets are also, ideally, an opportunity for a government to set out a strategy to improve the services that a government provides to the community; set out a strategy for the state to develop its key industries, and of course the economy; and develop a strategy for the state's finances for the consolidation and improvement of the state's

fiscal position. Unfortunately, on those last three measures, we do not have that in this state budget. This state budget is a massive missed opportunity for our state.

There is no strategy to improve services, only a strategy to cut, close and privatise them. There is no strategy to improve the state's economy, to foster its key industries and to grow more jobs. Indeed, the only contribution of this state budget is to slow the rate at which jobs growth occurs in our economy. There is no strategy to strengthen and improve the state's finances; in fact, this budget does much to weaken them. It only takes the briefest glance at this budget to see how the Premier and his Treasurer, Rob Lucas, have run up the white flag on financial management.

The fiscal targets of government have been weakened in this budget, in particular fiscal target 3 regarding debt. There is no longer a net debt to revenue ratio target set in the state budget. The former government set and kept under a target of 35 per cent. That target has vanished. In fact, any target has vanished. We see debt balloon as a result: up an extra \$3.32 billion over the forward estimates. In this budget, spending is up and debt is up. This budget will be in worse shape in four years' time than it is now. It puts some focus on the lie that sits at the centre of the government's big sell of this budget: that they are allegedly fixing a mess. Indeed, what they are doing is creating a mess.

Central to this complete about-face and complete and utter broken promise made at the election is how the budget is to be managed by the new government. We were promised by Rob Lucas that the Liberals would introduce modest savings to pay for their election commitments. This commitment of course still sits up there, on their pre-election websites, available for all to see. We were then told, after the swearing in of the Premier and the Treasurer, that there would be no blaming of circumstance or of the former government for the situation—and the task and responsibility of government—that those two now find themselves in.

They told us that they would not be crafting some excuse of 'finding a mess and having to introduce cuts and closures and privatisations as a result'. But that, of course, is exactly what they have done. This is a budget of cuts, of closures and privatisations. Central to this fundamental change, this about-face, is the dawning realisation upon coming to government that the state is being flooded with extra and unbudgeted additional revenues: extra GST and payroll tax pouring in through the door in the 2017-18 financial year, and becoming a flood for GST revenue in 2018-19—\$1 billion extra over forward estimates.

It presented a conundrum for the new government, that is, 'How do we say that things are dreadful in the state when indeed things have never been so good?' So on federal budget day, Rob Lucas made his political strategy clear: run the books into the ground as well as you can, create a massive deficit in the three months left to you in the 2017-18 financial year and blame the former government.' We are now told, contrary to what was promised in the election campaign, that the cost of new election commitments would not be delivered through modest savings but they would be delivered through the unexpected deluge of extra revenue, and that the savings that they are introducing are required because of the aforementioned, manufactured budget mess created by the Liberals.

It starts with a decision to run the 2017-18 financial year into the ground. It is caused by two things: the decision to spend nearly \$270 million extra in the three months they had of government in that financial year, as well as completely taking their hands off the wheel of financial management across the general government sector for the remainder of that year. The impact of creating a nearly \$400 million deficit is to ramp up debt and increase interest repayments.

The transfer of \$146.4 million from the Attorney-General's portfolio to the South Australian Government Financing Authority was a deliberate and calculated move to worsen the finances of the 2017-18 financial year, prepaying \$150 million out of the general government sector to prove a political point. It is outrageous. It is deliberate and it costs the budget and taxpayers real money. And, yet, from those opposite, it passes without comment or judgement or, if they do pass comment or judgement, comment is passed with endorsement and acclamation.

This is from the so-called party of fiscal rectitude. We also have the repeated and deliberately misleading references by the Premier and Treasurer to the budget position of the health portfolio. At every opportunity, the Premier and Treasurer avoided talking about the health portfolio and its budget

position and instead chose to focus on one component within the health portfolio: the overspend in the Central Adelaide Local Health Network. They both described the health budget as being in trouble, and they both described it as being in trouble to the tune of \$244 million, referencing the financial position allegedly of the Central Adelaide Local Health Network. Yet documents released to me under freedom of information show advice from the Under Treasurer to the Treasurer that says, quote:

The CALHN deficit is overstated for a number of reasons when you look at the health portfolio position as a whole.

Firstly it does not factor in its share of the \$132 million in additional resourcing that was provided to SA Health in the Mid-Year Budget Review.

SA Health has taken the decision to hold that funding centrally at this time. Also, the projection includes \$18 million in 'intra portfolio' pressures, which CALHN has flagged as pressures to its budget, but for which offsets reside within the Department that mitigate the impact at a whole of portfolio level.

Also, the whole of portfolio projection includes other reserves that are held...and benefits that LHNs do not see, for example the additional Commonwealth revenue in 2017-18...

Oh, dear. The Under Treasurer told the Treasurer on 20 April that the \$244 million figure is 'overstated', yet the Treasurer and the Premier repeatedly use that figure in public to try to justify the budget strategy that they were delivering. What we still do not know, of course, is how much additional commonwealth revenue is coming on top of the \$150 million in benefits I have just walked through.

It should be no surprise, though, that Rob Lucas has manufactured a deficit. Of course, it is the position he is most comfortable with. He has never delivered a budget surplus in his time as Treasurer in this state. Even while he was selling ETSA for \$3.4 billion, he was racking up operating deficits of more than \$1 billion and net lending deficits of more than \$1.3 billion. He was running up the debt while he was selling off our electricity assets, allegedly to pay down that debt, and now he is at it again. He is racking up debt while he is selling off assets and telling us he is allegedly fixing a mess. Well, as I have already said, he is creating a mess.

Even though surpluses are forecast in this budget, in the 2018-19 financial year and across the forward estimates, these are fake surpluses. No-one can have confidence that, despite the extra \$300 million of unbudgeted revenue being delivered to this budget from additional GST and other state revenues, the surplus of \$48 million can be delivered. Not only is that \$48 million surplus built on more than \$50 million of extra dividends extracted from government businesses—half of that, of course, coming from SA Water—but it is also built on \$134 million of unidentified savings required in the same financial year across general government sector agencies.

This is the flimsiest, most poorly manufactured surplus you could imagine—at least until you look at the following year. A forecast \$108 million surplus in the 2019-20 financial year is built on over \$125 million of extra dividends extracted from government businesses—principally, SA Water. More than \$60 million will be extracted out of SA Water. Just like the current budget year, the 2019-20 financial year has a massive task in meeting unidentified savings across general government sector agencies. The sum of \$269 million of unidentified savings in that financial year has to be found even to get close to the budget forecasts. It goes on and on in the out years, with \$376 million of unidentified savings in 2020-21 and \$481 million of unidentified savings in the last financial year of the out years.

Of course, we are told by the Premier and his Treasurer, Rob Lucas, that there were no more salami-slice savings—'We have done the hard work to identify all the savings'—and that they have taken a zero-based budgeting approach. None of that is true—not one iota. There is \$1.25 billion of unidentified savings that need to be delivered by this government over the next four years above and beyond all the cuts, the closures and the privatisations that the South Australian community is now learning about.

It is surprising that, given the rollcall of people this government has chosen to punish in this state budget, they still have so much farther to go. Surely this is already, without these additional cuts, the most mean-spirited, uncaring and punitive budget for the way it targets the most vulnerable



people in the South Australian community. Let's have a look at those people the Liberals have felt like punishing in this document.

They include Housing Trust tenants, AIDS sufferers, women playing sport, local community groups, public school children, health consumers, Crime Stoppers, bus and train commuters, people trying to pay government bills at Service SA centres, prison officers, police, TAFE students, TAFE teachers, people parking at the Klemzig and Tea Tree Gully park-and-ride facilities, agricultural researchers, publicans, the waste industry, regional communities, firearms owners—and they are even going after doctors. After doing over all of them, there is still over \$1¼ billion of savings to be delivered over the next four years.

I will not use the term that many people in the community have used when describing to me how they felt they had been done over by this government, but it seems that the cabinet has run out of vigour while they were enjoying a post-coital cigarette as a result of their budget. It raises the question of who is going to be targeted next, and they have done zero work to find the savings.

However, it is a fair bet that we can bank on a further round of outsourcing and privatisations. Rob Lucas wears his record like a badge of honour. ETSA, the Ports Corp, SGIC, the Central Linen Service, even the TAB, sold for less than one year of profits, and now we have prisons and SA Pathology, if they do not deliver \$105 million of savings over three years.

This is despite South Australians repeatedly being told by the Premier that there would be no privatisations under his watch. Before the election he said, 'We do not have a privatisation agenda.' He also said, 'We have ruled out privatisations,' and he also said after the state election, 'We made it clear in the lead-up to the election that we have had no plans for asset sales or privatisations here in South Australia.' Not two weeks after the state election he said that, but it sounds familiar from a Liberal, does it not?

Indeed, it was the Premier's mentor, Liberal Party president, former premier John Olsen, who said before the 1997 election, 'We are not pursuing a privatisation course with ETSA.' Well, of course, actions speak louder than words. Just as John Olsen went on to break his election promise to South Australians, so does his protégé, the member for Dunstan, the Premier, break his election commitment to South Australians, with the privatisation of the Adelaide Remand Centre and the impending doom of SA Pathology.

They also, of course, have a chief spruiker for outsourcing and privatisation. We have a new chief executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet who is quite up-front about it. 'If it's the right solution, if it's the right answer, then do it,' he says. 'If the business case stacks up and you can execute, do it.' Well, they have got their man, and I can tell you, Mr Speaker, Rob cannot wait. I am sure they have a long list of candidates ready to send off to the private sector. It is no coincidence that the government is packaging up all the public transport services and public transport assets ready for such a move. I wonder if the Productivity Commission or Infrastructure South Australia, also outsourced entities relying on people external to government to do this government's hard thinking, are going to recommend that. We will wait and see.

The other thing we are waiting for is the 'more jobs' that we were promised at the last election. According to the state budget, there will be fewer jobs going around in the future. Jobs growth actually slows under this budget. Last financial year, jobs growth was 2.1 per cent across the state economy, yet that falls to only 1 per cent within two years. They are pulling the handbrake on the state's economy. They are cutting the programs which were delivering extra jobs and growth to our state's economy.

After staying quiet while their federal mates chased Holden out of South Australia, they have cut the programs helping former Holden and car industry workers find new jobs. They have cut the programs helping component manufacturers diversify and keep their businesses going. They have cut 29 job creation programs, and the results are now baked in to the economic forecasts of the state budget. State final demand slows from 3 per cent last year to 2¼ per cent. This is all while we see the federal budget predicting the national economy speeding up over the coming years.

But that is not the only thing they are slowing down. Let's have a look at how the budget targets regions. The Liberals trumpet, 'Oh, but we've got our Regional Growth Fund,' except the

budget papers make it clear these are redirected existing funds from PIRSA and the state budget. Then of course they spruik their regional roads and infrastructure funding, but it is actually a reduction of what was previously being spent on regional road maintenance and upgrades. Worse, new projects like the Port Wakefield overpass, is to further reduce regional road maintenance funding from this pool. They are taxing new mines harder, and the Minister for Environment jacked up NRM levies by 5 per cent, of course conveniently just before he introduces a new cap on our NRM levy increases.

Speaking of unexpected tax increases, this budget also unleashes a raft of new fees, charges, taxes and rent increases. Pubs, clubs, small bars and hotels—all hit with over \$3 million a year in higher liquor licensing fees. Real estate property managers are being asked to fork out for a new licensing fee. Opal miners are being hit. New mines are being hit with higher royalties. Service stations are being hit with new fees. Firearm fees are being hit. The South Australian Research and Development Institute is being hit with higher costs. Those paying court fees are being hit for more money and, of course, the Liberal's coup de grace: the outrageous hit on Housing Trust tenants.

While the member for Chaffey—and I am glad to see him in here laughing as I raise that—was riding around Texas in the back of a \$1,600 a day limo, and the member for Gibson sitting next to him is claiming back Woolies receipts for packets of chips, Trust tenants, who can barely afford to feed themselves, are being hit with rent increases.

This is a dreadful budget. This is a budget that damages the state's finances, that racks up debt, that squanders windfall revenues, that privatises public institutions, that closes vocational training centres and closes off access to training, that manufactures pretend surpluses based on massive unidentified savings and pilfering from government businesses, that increases taxes and charges to a range of industries and business groups and that punishes vulnerable South Australians. If it were not for our collective understanding of how feeble and how incapable the Liberal Party of South Australia is, it would be beyond belief that this budget was the culmination of 16 years of wandering in the wilderness, planning how to do things better. What a massive missed opportunity.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (11:50):** I rise to speak on the Appropriation Bill—and proudly so. The rhetoric we have just heard from the shadow minister really does pale into insignificance. He must have a very, very short memory: 16 years of government I would say have put South Australia into a considerably darker place than it has been for many decades.

I am standing here today to look at where this budget has promoted and put in place what we consider is a good economic stimulus, creating an environment that South Australia has been yearning for over such a long period of time. It is really important to understand that this budget has been firm but fair. It is a budget that I think has put the regions back on the map with \$773 million over the five-year period. We will look at ways that we can create an environment in our regions; 28 per cent of the state's population is in regional South Australia. It is really important to understand that they are the economic powerhouse of South Australia's economy, generating \$22.5 billion of our merchandise exports. It is very important that 55 per cent of the merchandise exports comes out of the primary industry sector.

It is also important to note that, of the \$773 million in the budget invested in regional South Australia, there have been significant programs upheld. Coming into government, we set ourselves a very ambitious target to introduce measures within our first 100 days, which have all been kept—the first six months. Yesterday was six months to the day when we have had the opportunity, the pleasure and the privilege of being the elected government here in South Australia.

After 16 years of neglect under Labor, particularly within regional South Australia, what we are now seeing is a change, a shift in focus on regions and on just how we are going to support them. Gone are the days of picking favourites. Gone are the days of a government that had no real interest in programs. It was about splashing cash and making sure that some of it stuck—not all of it, but just some of it.

In many of those programs money was awarded to individuals and to businesses and a large amount of that money was actually given back. The due diligence was not there. There was a large amount of funding through these investment programs, but all of a sudden these businesses were

unable to match the dollar for dollar or were unable to secure bank finance. What sort of a government gives taxpayers' money to institutions and businesses that cannot stump up the business case or the business plan to justify taxpayers investing in their business?

Over some of our election commitments, particularly during the budget, we have seen \$15 million per annum into our Regional Growth Fund, and that is a long-term investment—we are going to invest for 10 years. It is also part of our Royalties for Regions, another 10-year commitment of \$314 million over the four-year forward estimates period. This is about giving surety to our regions that we are going to invest in productive infrastructure, and we are going to put money where we promised and pledged to the regions.

Of course, we will talk about the \$10 million blackspot program, which is allocated over three years. Have blackspots not been a bone of contention for the poor people of regional South Australia? The previous government said, 'There are no blackspots. We're not putting any money up-front. We're not going to be a part of this program.' It was a \$225 million commonwealth government initiative that was to reconnect regional South Australia with the business world; it was about connecting regional South Australia with the global marketplace, yet we squandered it here in South Australia.

Of the over 860 base stations that the nation proudly has approved, 20 were approved in South Australia. It is an absolute disgrace that we were put at that competitive disadvantage. We were put on the backburner by a government that had pet projects and election cycles. They were electioneering in marginal seats. I can say that we are going to govern for all of South Australia. Of that \$10 million into the blackspot funding, we are also going to use that to leverage round 4 of the commonwealth's blackspot program, which is \$25 million.

It is also about collaboration. It is about working with industry, local government and the telcos to come together to put a support package in place. It is almost a package of economic prosperity when it comes to being competitive in a marketplace. If we are going to sell product, if we are going to be part of a market or trade process, we need to make sure that we are competitive and that we can have connection to those institutions.

It is also good to understand that the \$12 million over four years has bolstered the RDA boards, making sure that they can get on with the job of developing our regional economy, making sure that we can highlight the importance of what regional programs and businesses need, and that is certainty. The RDAs now have that certainty to get on with the job.

It is also important to waive the \$1.6 million of oyster industry fees over two years to recover from the impact of POMS. I will admit that the previous government acknowledged that there was a problem in the oyster industry and that, yes, they were going to put support there, but there was no money in their budget. There was no money allocated to an industry that was on its knees due to the Pacific oyster mortality syndrome. It was absolutely all care and no responsibility when it came to the oyster industry.

This government has stood tall through negotiations with Treasury and PIRSA, working together. We have found the funds. We have actually put the money on the table to support an industry that never, ever had the support of the previous government. Yes, they talked about it, but it was all talk and all spin. Again, that was something that really was smoke and mirrors—it really was.

The \$260,000 funding for Rural Business Support to continue rural financial counselling services until June 2020 is another very important service. I note in particular that some of our primary producers, farmers in certain parts of the state, are doing it tough. This is where the Rural Business Support team comes into play to give people the support that they know is needed.

The budget is also delivering on key election commitments. The wild dog trappers program has been rolled out and is proving very successful. That is looking after a \$4.5 billion livestock industry in South Australia. It is a simple measure of a coordinated approach—baiting and traps being installed—to a program that is not only looking after a very valuable industry in South Australia but also supporting those pastoralists and primary producers who are being attacked by the scourge of those wild dogs that are also heading south.

My call today is to all those pastoralists: remember to keep in contact with the department so we know where the pressure is on, particularly with wild dog numbers on the increase, making sure that the government, the pastoralists and the industry work together for a coordinated approach in putting the wild dogs out of business. We know that is very important.

It is also really important to understand not only that the red meat industry in South Australia is one of our key economic drivers but that alongside that sits the great work that Food South Australia do. We have provided \$1 million per annum of funding to support a great organisation that promotes not only the great work our primary producers do but also the value-adding we put into that product. This is making sure that they assist those businesses, those exporters, those value adders or the vertically integrated businesses that are so reliant on Food SA's great work.

We are enhancing our biosecurity measures. Again, we are addressing the issues with fruit fly here in South Australia, making sure that South Australia is the only state in Australia that is fruit fly free, making sure that the Riverland continues on its march to global glory when it comes to supporting a \$1.2 billion horticulture industry that is so reliant on its market advantage, particularly going into some of these new markets and particularly with free trade agreements. It also should be noted that we have just recently announced with industry a partnership that is going to move forward. I will talk about that shortly when I talk about some of the initiatives that the government have supported in Chaffey.

There is no doubt about it: this government is cleaning up the previous government's mess, and it is a mess. In every drawer that ministers are opening up, they are finding some of the stench that has been left there by a government that had all care and no responsibility. It really is absolutely outrageous.

I read with interest my local paper, *The Murray Pioneer*, and some of the outrageous comments of the shadow treasurer and the opposition leader when it comes to the cuts we had installed. Let me assure the house that we will expose what those cuts have meant. If we talk about cuts to PIRSA, if we talk about cuts to the people who produce our food, I note that since 2010—not 2002—under the previous government there have been \$87.58 million in cuts.

It really does give you a little bit of a chuckle when you get an opposition leader who rarely finds his way out of his own backyard, let alone into regional South Australia, who has gone up there to say that I presided over more than \$30 million worth of cuts in PIRSA yet forgets to tell the good people of Chaffey that in the forward estimates the government of the parliamentary party he now leads presided over pushing \$28.6 million worth of cuts. It really does make a mockery of what they are all about. They are all smoke and mirrors.

Despite this, with our government and with me as Minister for Primary Industries, I have found ways to implement and increase policy to enhance our regions, to enhance primary industries and to make sure that we do not have cuts in SARDI and we do not have a decreased program in biosecurity, which we know is very, very important to our food producers in South Australia.

We talk about wine and food programs discontinuing. Let me tell you, Deputy Speaker, I chose people over programs. There are a number of programs that were cut, yes, but when we talk about jobs and about people within the departments, one of their strongest assets is their workforce. We continued and prioritised what we could. Yes, we did cut some of the programs in PIRSA. We cut some of the communication programs because we are not going to continue with the spin and the lack of substance within any of our departments. We are going to cut these communication programs so that we do not have all these big, glossy, full-page ads about promoting a government. They are not about promoting the regions or the primary producers. It is all about the individual ministers and the government, not understanding how important it is to promote our primary sector.

I turn to enhancing our infrastructure spend and making sure that the facts are on the table, noting that when we talk about government support for road maintenance programs, community safety funds or the highway funds, we are actually talking about apples with apples, whilst the opposition is, as I said, full of spin and no substance.

I want to touch on the regional infrastructure which we know is very important, namely, the Regional Roads and Infrastructure Fund at \$315 million over the forward estimates. There is \$200 million for the Joy Baluch AM Bridge; \$88.5 million for the Port Wakefield overpass and the

Augusta Highway widening; \$14.6 million for the Penola bypass. Finally, we have a government that is committed to finishing the Penola bypass. For too long we have had a government that continued to start it, stop it, fund it, defund it, and this has been an ongoing saga for the people of the South-East for far too long. It is important that we talk about that, and the \$5 million to the Nairne intersection upgrade.

There are 20,800 additional apprenticeships and traineeships. We are abolishing payroll tax for small businesses and returning \$360 million to South Australians through cheaper ESL bills. All of this will assist regional businesses and families as well as every South Australian because, as we said, this is about governing for all of South Australia, not just for the pet projects and the pet seats.

In delivering on our election commitments to create those jobs, I note that the shadow treasurer was asking where our jobs policy is. The \$203 million is what I think is the centrepiece of our government's growing more jobs or creating more jobs policy. It is about upskilling and making sure that we can keep our young people in the regions, making sure that we have a workforce that is capable of undertaking the skills and upskilling we need that workforce to do, particularly with our red meat sector and horticulture sector. We know that there are many jobs which need to be found for which we need to upskill the current workforce, so it is laying a strong foundation for the future and delivering what I consider to be vital economic reform.

As to the government's position, particularly for some of these pre-election cuts, the previous government left me \$28.6 million in the forward estimates to deal with. As I said, I chose people over programs, and that is why we have seen a number of these programs that have ceased. There are some programs that will continue and they are the programs that we can justify that will be a clustering or collaboration of being able to build and further promote our communities, particularly in the regions. So, there has been an increase in staff numbers in biosecurity by 3.9 FTEs, and that is reflecting a commitment to all of the biosecurity issues here, whether we are dealing with fisheries or horticulture or, sadly, the issues at the moment with the strawberry saga making its way into South Australia. That is also something we will be talking about a little later.

I think what we should talk about, particularly with the small amount of time that I have left, is that in Chaffey I am delivering on election commitments with the \$600,000 to open a community legal service. This is actually to re-open a community legal service that the previous government deemed would be more appropriate to run—a Riverland-Mallee legal service—from the southern suburbs of Adelaide. They were reprioritising money that should have been left in the regions to provide a vital service to regional Murraylands and Riverland, but they shipped it on down to the southern suburbs. I think that was outrageous.

I would also say that there is no reduction in compliance activities in fisheries and aquaculture and no change to the staffing at SARDI. I want that on the record so that we can stop the nonsense and the scaremongering that I continue to hear from those opposite in talking about reductions in every corner of the department. Again, the wine and food centre has \$200,000 over two years.

There is \$160,000 to undertake a Riverland matrix pilot program for the crystal methamphetamine addiction. It is a very sad situation. The issue of drug addiction, particularly in our regions, has been very well documented with the analysis of our wastewater. What we are seeing now is that with the scourge that addiction has on our society and the impact it is having on our small regional communities, it is really taking its toll, not only on individuals, not only on families and the small communities that present themselves as part of the support for these people because what they are encountering is not just a social drug.

It is not a drug of choice. It is a drug that is mind-altering. It is a drug that alters the mind. It makes people's personality change immediately, and it is something that is very sad in today's society. It is something that all governments should work together to stamp out and to make sure that regional South Australia, as well as all South Australia, addresses the issue. That pilot program will be very important.

We talked about extra awareness programs, particularly with biosecurity and fruit fly. We have put a fruit fly coordinator in place as well as on-ground staff to liaise with growers and packers. We are making sure that we have bin hygiene and that we have a quick response with any concerns. We will have a turnaround policy at the border. If trucks come to the border with contaminated bins,

those trucks will be turned around. That is a warning to not only the growers but the industry that there will be no tolerance when it comes to noncompliant freight logistics. We are seeing greater pressures on our borders. We are seeing more biosecurity programs needed. I will continue my remarks during the next griever.

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:11):** I appreciate the opportunity to speak about this budget on behalf of my electorate, as well as on behalf of the portfolios for which I have responsibility on this side of the chamber. I note that we are at an interesting stage in the maturity of the government, which undisputedly won the last election and has duly formed government, where they have maintained an opposition-like obsession with us.

I was amused but concerned to hear the number of times the Treasurer referred to Labor during his speech and the comparatively few times he talked about jobs, for example. It reminds me of being at university and the young adults who think that they are terribly mature and have everything sorted and understand how difficult life can be, but spend most of their time obsessing about their parents and all the failings that their parents visited upon them in their childhood. It is a phase that people go through. I am hopeful that this government will emerge, having delivered this budget, and cease to be quite as obsessed with talking about us and truly assume the responsibility with which the people of South Australia have entrusted them.

I would like to talk about the impact on the seat of Port Adelaide first. Port Adelaide is not a wealthy area, although it has some pockets of great privilege and wealth, particularly along the seafront. It has a reasonable degree of multiculturalism, although not as much as with the boundaries I had before the election. A reasonably high proportion of Aboriginal people live in the Port and trace their very deep history all the way back in the Port. Quite a lot of people live in Housing Trust homes, are retired or are on fixed incomes. We have a number of public schools and a smaller number of non-government schools.

It is, in many ways, representative of the nature of South Australia: not overtly wealthy, such as the showy wealth of Sydney or the ancient wealth of Melbourne, but lots of decent people who have worked hard all their lives who are trying to make something for their future and their children's future, or are trying to settle into retirement and not be anxious about what government might choose to do to them. I describe it that way because I think this government has been particularly cruel to people who live in Port Adelaide and others who share their characteristics.

Port Adelaide is an area that is on its way up with Port Adelaide itself, the inner harbour, the developments that are about to start springing up on both sides of the harbour and the incredible effort that has been made, led by the state government starting about six years ago in intensity, having the area become renewed and revitalised, with some contributions also from the local council. But that is not completed, and I am concerned that in this budget there are some signs that it may not be given sufficient priority.

Although the train spur, which the member for Lee initiated—and for which I believe he signed contracts—is listed in the budget, I continually hear rumours and concerns from people who have meetings with the relevant department (DPTI) that there may be a delay, or it may be put off forever. I trust that is not true; that train spur is absolutely essential to the development of Port Adelaide.

I am deeply concerned about bus services. We know that bus services are going to be cut if they do not have high patronage. Guess what happens when you are on the end of the line—when you are on the Lefevre Peninsula and there is no further to go than Outer Harbor? You have fewer people the further up you go. A bus line that may well have had good patronage earlier in its journey from the city will have far fewer by the time you reach the end of the Lefevre Peninsula. I am deeply concerned that the government and the department will see fit to curtail the service earlier than the extent of the Lefevre Peninsula, and redirect those resources elsewhere. That would be a terrible tragedy and I will fight that tooth and nail.

The TAFE campus has been identified as one to be closed. As has been discussed to quite a degree in this chamber before and since the election, there were a number of TAFE campus closures in the last three years, I think, of the previous government. A review was undertaken, which identified all of those campuses that could be closed, given the changes in the way in which courses

are being presented, such as the blended learning using digital approaches. It also took into account that people were increasingly taught on farm and in other locations, and the making over of campuses to schools in order to make sure that equipment is still available and able to be used.

During that review, at no point were the seven campuses identified as the minimum to be closed under this budget flagged as being appropriate or reasonable for closure. My question is: why these campuses? Has the Port Adelaide campus been chosen because it is in Port Adelaide and because the government does not care? I would hate to think that politics has infested this decision. It is baffling to me that the north-east is losing a TAFE campus, because it makes sense neither for the delivery of the service nor politically. These poor new members must be feeling horrible about what has happened to them in the north-east, and about the needs of their constituents being overlooked.

I know that my people in Port Adelaide are outraged by the loss of the Port Adelaide campus, particularly at a time when we have the need to provide a decent education for more people from disadvantaged backgrounds. We have the ASC and Future frigates and this incredible opportunity for jobs growth, yet we are walking away from a campus that is ideally located to expand, not to shrink. I will be very interested to hear more about that.

Returning to the question of Port Adelaide proper and its revitalisation, the previous government made an arrangement for the creation of a government building that would house 500 public servants who would come from the city. This would ensure that the businesses in Port Adelaide had the day-to-day traffic they needed to be stable and to thrive. The Public Service Association complained about that through the newspaper, and I am sure that some chief executives were not thrilled about the idea of having to make the journey to Port Adelaide every day.

I did not expect a Liberal government to come in and bow to those demands; I expected a Liberal government to be a little tougher with the Public Service. I was astonished and disappointed to discover that the 500 had shrunk to 200. There was an idea that defence companies would take that place, yet the campus is being advertised for lease on a website. They are now actively hunting for other people to come and take those leases, which are the obligation of the government. It was the foundation of creating that building. That is an appalling dereliction of duty in the obligation to revitalise Port Adelaide and in an existing obligation to fill that building.

As I understand it, tall ships have been cut: the *One and All* and the *Falio*. The heart of Port Adelaide is its maritime history, and no longer to fund the maintenance of those two ships or support volunteers in the work they do is an absolute disgrace. I will be looking to understand more about that in the process of estimates.

We know already that the government has been very slow to do anything about the report that came out in March from the Museum about the death of dolphins due to boat strike and the fact that the minister, although he expressed some time ago that he would definitely be meeting with Dr Bossley, has only just arranged to have that meeting. It is hard not to assume that that is somehow related to the public outrage that has been expressed very clearly in over 20,000 signatures in the Messenger press's petition.

When we have the privilege of having a dolphin sanctuary that houses a resident population that is nearer to a CBD than anywhere else in the world and the tourism potential that that brings, it is an absolute disgrace to overlook the terrible negative publicity that will occur as a result of those dolphins dying and the concern that people very genuinely have for the suffering of those animals. The political or financial imperative that is preventing the government from solving that problem baffles me.

Women's sporting facilities are being cut. I am now involved with Woodville-West Torrens Football Club because their women's team, which will be starting next year, has a zone all the way through my electorate as well as elsewhere. They have suddenly been halted in their progress to make the Ottoway oval come alive, as the funding has been taken from them. They were expecting every day to have that funding, only to be told that it was suddenly going to be yanked from them. There is this bizarre obligation that the money will only be made available over two years, not this year, if there is concomitant money coming from the council. So they are having to start right from scratch to get that funding.

It is not only Woodville-West Torrens at the SANFL level but North Haven Football Club. The Lady Ravens, of which I am a proud patron, have been going for a couple of years now with huge enthusiasm from the local community. They are suddenly losing the funding they thought they would have access to.

Poor old Port Adelaide baseball club not only have lost the funding in this round but do not have access to the next round because their sport is not regarded as worthy of having female facilities. Even if they should be so lucky as to get the shrunken amount of money, even if they should be so lucky to have council support, they are not even eligible because they are baseball and it is not on the list. That is deeply disappointing for that community.

Finally, on my local community issues, I found the decision that has been made about the Housing Trust breathtaking. I know that the Liberal side of politics tends not to pay attention to people from impoverished backgrounds as much. I know that tends to be the case, but I did not expect that people who live in bedsits would have to find up to \$2,000 more a year. That is absolutely breathtakingly cruel. It will affect a number of people in my electorate. It will affect a number of people across this state. To think that that was the only place that the government could scrape out such little additional money is beyond me.

I will turn to some of my portfolio areas. In the context of Port Adelaide TAFE, I have already raised questions to understand about TAFE's future. In an environment where we need more people trained not fewer, in an environment where we need better quality of training, to have booked that TAFE will be earning less money in the future, to have put more money in but to have balanced it by removing more money so that the amount in and out is almost identical over the four years, suggests a mixed message about the future of TAFE under this government.

The review that I initiated has now reported and made recommendations that campuses should be opened up for more community use, more non-TAFE providers should be offering training and that more employers should have access and localised decision-making, yet the first decision about campuses is to simply summarily close at least seven campuses. It is deeply concerning. Regarding education, the only real differentiator in policy between all of the policy that we had initiated and took to the election—apart from the baffling reversal of the idea that kids in public schools, once they hit year 10, should have a free laptop—was over year 7.

I understand why the government want to move year 7 into a secondary setting. Every other state and the other two sectors in this state have done it, and it takes some guts to say, 'No, we're not going to invest our money in that.' Coming in, being new, not being convinced by the complete lack of evidence that it makes any educational difference, but probably being persuaded by the logistical complexities of moving between sectors and the embarrassment of being a stand-out, I understand why they decided to do that. What I do not understand is why they have not funded it properly.

They have put money in for the first half of the school year in 2022, which is the second half of the financial year, because it costs more to educate year 7s in a secondary setting. It costs about \$40 million more every single year, and they have put the \$20-odd million in there, but what they have not funded is the infrastructure cost. They have said, 'There's a pot of money that has already been identified for school infrastructure,' which is all about the growth in demography. Schools need to get bigger because there are more people with kids living in the area and/or there is an absolute need to fix up the facilities at these schools, particularly high schools, because they did not get the benefit from Building the Education Revolution funding that primary schools did.

Some of the secondary public schools look like my school did when I was there. My children's school, a public school of course, looks as it did 30 years ago. The local high school very near our house is exactly the same as it looked 30 years ago. These schools need funding to improve their aspect, to improve their capacity to teach well with the changing curriculum demands and the integrated curriculum demands and also so that local parents have a look and say, 'I wouldn't mind sending my kid to that school.'

What has happened? That money is being taken away to build classrooms for 12 year olds who currently have classrooms down the road. If you are going to have a policy to move 12 year olds, at least you can fund it. There is also the question of these new programs presented in the



education budget as being exciting and new. All of them are labelled in the detail as being funded from existing departmental resources, which means either we had already committed to do it—languages, literacy—or they are taking money away from somewhere else in order to fund it. I want to understand where they are taking that from.

As promised many times by the Treasurer, the environment has taken a pretty deep cut, and it is a cut that I do not find easy to understand. I do not understand why you would cut the environment. Sure, it is easy to do.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Continue, deputy leader.

**The Hon. D.J. Speirs:** Just providing the member with some guidance.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Minister, the deputy leader will be heard in silence.

**Dr CLOSE:** There is no accompanying explanation for why one would cut \$11 million out of climate change, for example, or why one would cut over 200 staff out of the environment department. I note that one of the great commitments that was made by the Liberal government—

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Point of order: the figure of 200 staff being cut from the environment department was grossly inaccurate, and I ask that the deputy leader withdraw that and correct the record.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Your figures have been challenged by the minister, deputy leader.

**Dr CLOSE:** If I may, I would rather go and confirm my figures than assume that is correct. Are we able to take this up later? I have made an assertion and the minister has made an assertion. I am happy to correct it if I have that wrong. I would like to confirm it.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** If you are able to come back and either confirm that your figures are correct or provide the correct figures, that would be much appreciated.

**Dr CLOSE:** Thank you. I appreciate that so that we are able to keep moving.

*The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell interjecting:*

**Dr CLOSE:** Well, no. I am very happy to look into it. I just do not want to have an interjection be assumed to be accurate. One of the election commitments that was made was that there would be additional rangers, which is a worthy goal, but in the budget papers it is very clear that those additional rangers are listed as coming from existing resources. My question is: what is being cut in order to fund an election commitment? Election commitments ought to be clearly understood by the public of South Australia as something that will be given to the public of South Australia, that is, an additional effort that is being made. To have that come out of existing resources makes me question what is not happening in order to fund that election commitment.

I am interested in the reform in NRM, and I would like to be as constructive as possible about making the new NRM legislation a useful piece of legislation. As members may be aware, I am on the Natural Resources Committee of parliament, and I see that there is a great ambition to have a landscape act. I am concerned about the language currently in the discussion paper that appears to regard landscape-scale restoration, revegetation, threatened species work and biodiversity conservation as being optional extras in managing natural resources.

I am concerned that the idea of having a cap on the amount of money that can be raised for and spent on NRM may result in going backwards in our capacity to really support a healthy ecosystem, a network of healthy ecosystems, particularly in the context of climate change putting tremendous pressure on the way in which ecosystems are able to function. These are the issues I will be exploring further in the committee stage of this bill.

I return to my initial point: this budget is quite a cruel budget for people who do not have a lot already, and my people in Port Adelaide will be expecting me to pay very careful attention to how it is rolled out.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (12:31):** It is my pleasure to rise on behalf of the people of Stuart to discuss the budget. I am incredibly pleased with the fact that in our budget we did exactly what we said we would do back in opposition. Back in opposition, we made election commitments. We said to the entire state that if we were elected to govern we would do these things, and this budget has funded all the things we said we would do. That is a very important foundation because not only is it a foundation of our budget it is also a foundation of our principles and of how our government intends to operate moving forward.

We all accept, that in budgets there are people who go away happier and people who go away less happy. We all understand that it is impossible for any government, Liberal or Labor, to provide all the funding for all the programs and services, the capital spends, that all the people in the state would like. We know that; everybody in this chamber knows that. We have decided that what we will do is start by funding our election commitments, and we have done exactly that. I think that is very important.

I will not go through all of them, but as well as infrastructure and capital spending, as well as program spending, as well as cost-of-living reductions—emergency services levy, NRM levies, council rate capping—all those sorts of things that we have taken to the election, we have tried to deliver through the budget or through legislation or they are still to come. We are setting a platform of reliability.

I understand that part of reliability, unfortunately, is that it can sometimes be clear that you are not going to be able to deliver something people would like to have delivered. However, at least people will know that we will deliver the things we said we will deliver and the budget cuts—for lack of a better word—will be in the other areas. From my perspective, that is a very important principle.

In my portfolio as Minister for Energy and Mining, we took a lot of energy commitments to the election and they have all been funded in this budget. We have \$100 million set aside for the home battery scheme that we launched about a week and a half ago, which will be very beneficial for the people who directly participate.

More importantly, it will be beneficial for those people who cannot participate because that program has been crafted very deliberately to be there not only for the people who invest in the panels and the batteries but very deliberately so that when those people, when 40,000 of them have invested in the panels and the batteries, there will be a positive impact on the rest of the electricity market. It will push prices down and improve reliability in the rest of the electricity market so that all other South Australian electricity consumers benefit.

The \$50 million grid-scale storage fund is in the budget. We will announce more details about that in the not too distant future, but let me say again that is about investing taxpayers' money to create benefits for taxpayers. In government, we know it is not our money: it belongs to all South Australians. We need to invest that money in ways that all South Australians will benefit. Our grid-scale storage program may well include pumped hydro, solar thermal, big batteries like the one at Hornsdale in my electorate of Stuart, potentially biomass, potentially hydrogen. A whole range of different things could be involved. It is about storage as opposed to necessarily being about a battery that will also improve reliability and push down the price of electricity.

We have allocated \$30 million to a range of programs. We will invest that money to prove up demand response, demand aggregation, supply integration programs. Let me say right here, very openly, that 'prove up' may well mean funding a trial and finding that that trial does not work. That will not be as good as if we find that a trial does work, but that will still be beneficial because we will know not to push down that path anymore. This is very clearly money that is set aside with partners, with universities, with industry and with other bodies to trial ways of managing demand, giving consumers voluntary ways to manage demand for their benefit and also for the benefit of the grid, and as well as for individual consumers, demand aggregation and supply integration as well, which is very important.

In the lead-up to the election, we committed \$200 million towards an interconnector fund. We always hoped that the interconnector would be able to get up as a regulated asset. It is looking very positive. We will not know until the middle of the 2019 year, but it is looking positive. We put forward the proposal of an interconnector between South Australia and New South Wales for very

clear reasons because we know that we need to be able to match supply and demand in as many states as possible and to connect supply and demand as well as possible to gain efficiencies.

We need to connect with New South Wales. We are already connected with Victoria, and we are very glad to be, but we are at the end of the line. We need to connect with New South Wales as well so that we become part of the loop, as opposed to being at the end of the line. We need to broaden the opportunities for South Australia not only to import electricity when we need it but, probably more importantly, to export our often overabundant renewable energy when we have it to two states instead of one.

Importantly, New South Wales has different weather from South Australia than Victoria does compared with South Australia. Weather has always gone directly to affecting demand, but these days, with renewable energy from wind and sun, it also goes directly to the supply of electricity. To get the benefits of being able to swap both supply and demand, essentially, or of being able to help each other with supply and demand, you need to be connected to a state that has different weather patterns from yours. We are pushing very hard into that. We know that there will be savings for consumers.

The ElectraNet draft RIT-T report and others that have come out, including AEMO's Integrated System Plan, have all pointed to the fact that this is a good plan. On the strength of that, we have \$14 million in the budget to commit towards the underwriting and/or up-front loans for early works to bring that interconnector forward, to have that interconnector built and operational as quickly as possible.

If, by chance, the interconnector does not get up as a regulated asset then we will have put that money at risk, but it will not be wasted, because we will still pursue that work through a different pathway. The early work on route selection and engagement with landholders, with environmental clearances and others, will not be wasted. It just means that we will have paid for it up-front. The other \$186 million of the \$200 million is currently sitting in the Treasurer's contingency, as opposed to being a line item, because we do not expect it to be needed in that way, but if it is, it will be brought back from Treasurer's contingency into a line item specifically for this work.

We are determined to get the price of electricity back to an affordable level, to stop the increases that we have had over the last decade or so under the previous government, to make electricity more reliable from the supply side and, importantly, to continue to make sure that it is green and clean and environmentally responsible.

The previous government pushed enormously hard into additional renewable energy. Renewable energy, on the face of it, is fantastic, but they forgot about how to manage that energy. They forgot about how to harness that energy. They forgot about the fact that consumers were being punished with higher prices and more blackouts. We will correct those problems. We will show how renewable energy can be harnessed and how it can be managed, for the benefit of consumers as well as the environment. By consumers, I mean all consumers, from the smallest household through to the largest corporate employers in the nation.

We have committed money to the Joy Baluch Bridge duplication, something we said that we would do before the election. This is a very important commitment, requested by many organisations and many people, not the least of whom are the people of Port Augusta. This is a local, a statewide and a national project. This bridge carries road freight between Sydney and Darwin, Adelaide and Perth. It was the South Australian Chamber of Mines and Energy's highest infrastructure request before the election. We delivered on that with a commitment before the election and also with money, partnering with the federal government, in the budget just released.

We also committed to the Strzelecki Track sealing before the election, but that commitment was very clearly and very publicly with the proviso that, if the then state government had money in its budget for it, its budget going towards the election, we would match it. Unfortunately, the previous Labor government did not have that money in its pre-election budget or in its election costings, so we were not able to deliver on that, but the commitment was very clearly made subject to the previous Labor government having it in their budget. Unfortunately, it did not.

As I mentioned before, there are always, unfortunately, cuts in budgets as well. We have had savings tasks across entire government. A percentage target in a small department has the same impact on that workplace and on the productivity of that organisation as the same percentage in a large department. We have all battled with the same obligations to make savings on behalf of taxpayers. In my department, the Department for Energy and Mining, one of the most prominent areas of savings was a cut to the PACE program. There is no more funding at the moment to PACE, the plan for accelerating exploration, either in the minerals or the petroleum side.

PACE is a very good program, but PACE is a program that is government taxpayer-funded support for exploration in the downturns in the resources price cycle. We have been going through those, and the previous government, to its credit, had PACE funding throughout that downtime, but we are now coming out of that downtime. We are coming out of it. This is not the time when PACE funding is needed. Yes, it would be nice, but it is not needed. Now is the time to build on the benefits of the previous PACE funding that was done, and that is exactly what this government will do.

Another important area of savings is the removal of the concession on royalties for new mines. That is a program that has been very helpful for mining and resources projects through the downtime so that if a new mine got up it would be eligible to apply for a 60 per cent reduction in the mining royalty that it would otherwise have paid in the early years of that mine. It is a lovely program, terrific, but again, very clearly, it is a program that you deliver when you are in the bottom of the mining cycle and it is hard to get projects up.

Just like PACE, you need extra support for exploration, and on the mining side you need extra support to actually get mines up and running. We are now coming out of that cycle and we are on an upturn, so that extra support is not necessary. Mr Speaker, let me also share with you and the house the fact that mines have got up in South Australia for decades and decades without this mining royalty reduction being on offer.

In fact, even over the last several years, while the mining royalty reduction for new mines has been in place, nine new projects have got up that did not actually receive the royalty reduction. So this removal of the royalty reduction for new mines is not expected in any way to slow down the development of new mines. Mines have got up in previous years without that support. Mines have got up in recent years while that support was in place, but those mines did not qualify for that support because they might have been too small or had too short a time line for the mines, but they got up and got running and started producing anyway.

Very importantly, the timing in the budget for the removal of the royalty reduction for new mines is such that any project that gets its application in before 30 June 2020 would still be eligible for consideration. If the application were successful, based on the same criteria that have been in place for the last several years, those new mines would still qualify. So it is quite conceivable that a new mine could get their application in for the mining royalty reduction before 30 June 2020 but might not actually be operating for one, two or three years, maybe longer, after the application date, yet could still be eligible for the reduction in royalties. It is very important for people to understand that.

Of course, while it is unfortunate that this has had to be a cut in our budget, I think it will have absolutely minimal impact on any new mine that may or may not get up. In fact, the advice to me is that, while the reduction in royalties is very welcomed by industry and greatly appreciated by industry, it is not actually the thing that has made the difference between mines getting up or not getting up. I accept that any new mine, or any company starting up a new mine, would of course like to have it rather than not to have it but, as I said, we do need to get the budget back in balance after 16 years of Labor's financial mismanagement.

Our government supports the resources industry incredibly strongly. We are very in tune with the fact that it is one of our most important industries in South Australia. It contributes enormously to our economy, and it contributes enormously to our economy in regional areas. We understand that exploration and mining must be done with strong majority local host community support. We want to work with local communities, the agriculture sector and other sectors that operate in regional areas, because of course agriculture is not the only one that does that, as well as with the resources sector, to find ways that local communities can have a strong majority of people welcoming in new mining projects.

Whether they be petroleum projects in the South-East or the far north-east or whether they be minerals projects in other parts of the state, we are also very focused on ensuring that we bring in a much tighter, much stronger and much higher compliance regime. We want resources companies, whether they be in exploration or mining, to be completely committed to high operational standards with regard to what they do on site with both people's safety and environmental safety and other high priorities.

We want to be a government that is not ashamed at all to wield a fairly large stick to ensure that the operational standards that are expected and agreed upon up-front are adhered to and delivered for the benefit of not only local communities but also those operations. They cannot continue if they do not operate properly.

There has been much said in this place and others about the potential for offshore petroleum in the Bight. We have had BP come along and say that they were going to undertake deepwater offshore exploration and then change their mind. We have had Chevron come along and say that they were going to do the same, and then they have changed their mind as well. Equinor from Norway are now saying that they are going to undertake deepwater offshore petroleum exploration in the Great Australian Bight. I hope that they do continue to do that. It is no accident that I make these comments immediately after talking about high compliance standards and high compliance expectations from the government with regard to the way that Equinor would go about that.

We will only approve exploration in the Great Australian Bight if meets the highest compliance standards possible; otherwise, we will not have a bar of it. But if Equinor can put together a program that will meet those standards, that can be safe with regard to people and the environment, then we will be strong supporters of them proceeding with that because there are thousands and thousands of jobs in this state that are likely to benefit from it, but that will only be acceptable if they do no harm to people and the environment. We have communities and people at the front of our mind all the time, but we want industries to have opportunities to succeed with the support of our state.

**Mr GEE (Taylor) (12:51):** I rise today to speak about the recent state budget, which is, again, a budget of cuts and privatisation, fee and rent increases, and promises really lacking any detail. It really does not matter which area of the budget that you look at, there have been cuts or privatisations in just about every area. The Treasurer's latest budget is just a continuation of his last budget 17 years ago. There will be TAFE campus closures, Service SA closures, privatisation of the Adelaide Remand Centre, the possible privatisation of SA Medical Imaging services and Pathology SA, and up to 4,000 public servants are being axed.

I will look at the budget now and how it affects the state and my electorate. I will start with road safety. This budget delivers nothing for the road safety projects needing attention in my electorate. I speak of course about the Curtis Road duplication; roundabouts at the intersection of Curtis Road and Heaslip Road, and Stebonheath Road and Womma Road; and further about safety upgrades at Andrews Road and Womma Road, Angle Vale Road and Baker Road, and Gawler Road and Robert Road, better known as the five-road intersection.

I understand that there is not only no action on these projects but that overall rural road funding is being cut. Recently, in the last week of sitting, the minister talked about attending a community event at the intersection of Curtis Road and Angle Vale Road. In fact, that was not the case: he did attend briefly a meeting at the intersection of Heaslip Road and Curtis Road, and he referred to his concerns in my electorate about the intersection of Womma Road and Curtis Road. Of course, that intersection does not even exist.

I was pleased in my last term to deliver a \$3.5 million roundabout at One Tree Hill that the local community had been looking for for 20 years. Under Labor that was delivered, and I think the praise for that from all the people, especially our emergency services up in that area, is still ongoing. The intersection of Yorktown Road and Blair Park Drive, outside the Craigmere Village Shopping Centre, was another project delivered under Labor. Also, improvements to Peachey Road and Black Top Road and resurfacing Womma Road occurred over the last four years.

My community hopes that the minister will listen to their concerns about the dangerous intersections in my electorate and will deliver these projects soon. Plans are being drawn up for the

delivery of a lot of these projects, so we just need the funding so that we can get local workers on the ground and prevent further serious injuries and fatalities.

One of the targets for cost recovery in this budget is Housing SA tenants. Around 4,000 Housing SA tenants will be subjected to rent rises of up to \$50 a week, as the Liberal government increases Housing SA rents for some tenants between now and the end of 2021. At the same time the government is reducing funding to Housing SA and cutting 125 staff in an agency that is already struggling.

There has been a shortage of Housing SA staff across the north, with staff informing my office that there is only one private rental liaison officer across four Housing SA offices. It is shocking because with long lists, any assistance that people can receive to secure a private rental property is crucial so that other people who cannot afford private rental can take up those houses that these people will be moving out of. There is one person for four offices to cover the entire north.

Housing SA tenants have a right to be concerned as some rents will rise and staff numbers will fall. We need to ensure that we have quality affordable housing for our seniors, disabled and most vulnerable in our community and do not just look at efficiency and cost recovery. We need to consider people, not just dollars. Taking money from the most vulnerable members of our community just does not pass the fairness test.

Treasurer Rob Lucas from the other place said that this state government will not pick winners and will review, reposition and reprioritise funding. The Liberal budget axed 29 programs supporting workers or job creation mostly in the north, including the jobs accelerator program, the Future Jobs Fund, the Automotive Supplier Diversification Program, the retrenched workers program, the Jobs First Employment Projects program, the career services program, the Unlocking Capital for Jobs fund, the Small Business Development Fund, the Food Park tenant attraction grant program and the Advanced Food Manufacturing program.

Sadly, the list goes on and, just as my community was starting to turn the corner towards a future of new jobs being created, the budget has slammed the brakes on in the north. The Food Park that was starting to fill under Labor has stalled. There is no new business investment in Edinburgh Parks or Edinburgh North. The government has had to reannounce the commitment by Sonnen to move into the Holden site, now named Lionsgate Business Park, just to present some good news.

The axing of the Automotive Supplier Diversification Program will impact our economy, which is still in transition, as this important program is helping smaller businesses to adapt and diversify. The government has abandoned those businesses and the people who work for them. The Liberal government clearly does not care about those companies that are still transitioning.

Last week, I was pleased to catch up with several hundred of the former automotive workers at the Holden site on R U OK? Day. I have to say that emotions were running pretty high on the day. Because of that transition centre and because of the funding that went into skills training, many of those workers gained full-time work. They are financially secure, which is a good thing. A lot of them have started their own businesses and franchises. A lot of them are working in small business with one or two people, and a lot of people have retired. Those people are very grateful for the actual programs that gave them the skills, the confidence and the know-how, after many years of working on production lines, to move into those jobs. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

#### VISITORS

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before I ring the bells, I welcome year 7s from the Rosary School in Prospect. You are guests of the member for Adelaide, the Minister for Child Protection. I hope you enjoy your visit.

*Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.*

*Petitions***SERVICE SA MODBURY**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey):** Presented a petition signed by 200 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government not to proceed with the proposed closure of the Service SA Modbury branch announced as a cost saving measure in the 2018-19 state budget.

*Parliamentary Procedure***PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Parliament of South Australia—

Joint Parliamentary Service, The Administration of Annual Report 2017-18  
Members, House of Assembly—Register of Members' Interests—Registrar's  
Statement—June 2018 [Ordered to be published]

By the Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Distribution Lessor Corporation—Charter 11 September 2018  
Generation Lessor Corporation—Charter 11 September 2018  
Transmission Lessor Corporation—Charter 11 September 2018

By the Attorney-General (Hon. V.A. Chapman)—

Evidence Act 1929—Suppression Orders Annual Report 2017-18  
Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005—Preventative Detention Orders Annual  
Report 2017-18  
Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Disability Inclusion—Transitional Arrangements—General  
Liquor Licensing—Minors and other matters  
Security and Investigation Industry—Liquor review

By the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services (Hon. C.L. Wingard)—

Witness Protection Act 1996—Annual Report 2017-18

By the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government (Hon. S.K. Knoll)—

Local Council By-Laws—

The City of Burnside—

- No. 1—Permits and Penalties
- No. 2—Moveable Signs
- No. 3—Local Government Land
- No. 4—Roads
- No. 5—Dogs
- No. 6—Waste Management
- No. 7—Lodging Houses

*Ministerial Statement***ISLAMIC STATE STUDENT CONVICTION**

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:03):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Yesterday, a jury of the South Australian Supreme Court found Zainab Abdirahman-Khalif guilty of membership of a terrorist organisation, namely Islamic State. Ms Abdirahman-Khalif is a 23-year-old student who has been prosecuted by the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions under a commonwealth terrorism offence. The student is the first terror suspect to be charged and held in South Australia. The Commonwealth DPP has alleged that Ms Khalif was a member of a terrorist organisation between 2016 and 2017, a charge which she pleaded not guilty to.

Since being arrested by Australian Federal Police in May 2017, Ms Abdirahman-Khalif has been held in custody, having been refused bail. She will continue to be held in custody awaiting her sentence later this year, although it has been reported that she has instructed her defence counsel to file an appeal against the jury's verdict. I want to take this opportunity to reiterate to parliament the need to get laws prosecuting terrorist suspects absolutely right. South Australia has a zero tolerance for these offences. This case demonstrates that it is absolutely critical to ensure that the commonwealth and state laws operate to successfully sentence those who are chosen to participate in terrorist activities and ensure the protection of those who are innocent.

The government is prioritising community safety and responses to terror incidents through the passage of the Terrorism (Police Powers) (Use of Force) Amendment Bill to ensure that police are able to use force in terror incidents without criminal penalty by tasking 48 sworn officers with new rapid response capabilities to prevent and respond to terrorism-related incidents.

On a national level, last year the South Australian parliament passed the Statutes Amendment (Terror Suspect Detention) Act 2017 to give effect to the Council of Australian Governments' agreement that there be a presumption against bail and parole for persons with terrorism backgrounds who are charged with or convicted of general state offences.

The Council of Attorneys-General continues to work on strengthening terror-related legislation on a national level, but I reiterate: it is the government's priority to successfully prosecute those who are guilty and protect those who are innocent.

### **STRAWBERRY INDUSTRY**

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:06):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** On 14 September 2018, SA Health was notified that a brand of Queensland strawberries sold in South Australia was linked to contamination which impacted Eastern States last week. Contamination of strawberries with sewing needles have since been reported in multiple states across Australia involving four brands. Reports indicate there have been at least two cases of needles being found in strawberries in South Australia in recent days sold through local retail outlets.

SAPOL is the lead government agency for the case in South Australia and is working with SA Health to coordinate product recalls and public health messages. The Bi-National Food Safety Network has been activated across Australia for this national incident. This network enables governments to work together to coordinate their response when there is a food incident, and this network is made up of Food Standards Australia New Zealand, the food enforcement agencies of all Australian states and territories and New Zealand and the commonwealth departments of health and of agriculture and water resources.

The National Biosecurity Committee is also meeting today regarding the incident, and I can advise the house that PIRSA officers will be in attendance. Contamination of our food supplies is a very serious criminal matter. The strawberry industry here in South Australia is putting safeguards in place to address these most concerning criminal acts. The Adelaide Produce Market in Pooraka has advised PIRSA and SA Health that it is installing a metal detector to provide a level of reassurance and protection for customers, producers and the market stallholders. The industry is also looking into providing tamper-proof packaging.

The strawberry industry plays an important role in South Australia's premium food economy, producing more than six million kilograms with a farmgate value of \$42 million. The South Australian



strawberry season is just three weeks away from commencing, and this coincides with the Queensland and Western Australian seasons coming to an end. Already this week the SA produce market has been forced to throw out more than two tonnes of strawberries, valued at \$17,000, following the discovery of sewing needles in local strawberries.

These incidents have the ability to have a profound impact on our strawberry producers. As proud South Australians who support our food industry, we must not let these actions put us off buying local strawberries. SAPOL and SA Health continue to reinforce the message that people need to slice their fruit prior to consumption, and I urge South Australians to continue buying strawberries in South Australia.

If we do not stand up and support South Australian strawberry growers during this difficult time, innocent businesses and families will be negatively impacted. South Australians are well known for supporting each other during extremely tough times. I encourage all South Australians to spread the message and support our strawberry producers in their time of need.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens is interjecting. He is called to order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Question Time*

#### **HOSPITAL OVERCROWDING**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10):** Mr Speaker, congratulations on your recent marriage.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, sir.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier himself meet with the state's Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation after it today called for an immediate crisis meeting as:

Nursing staff have reached crisis point over the government's failure to address hospital overcrowding six months after the election.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:11):** Thank you—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my right!

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hammond is called to order. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Thank you very much, sir, and I, too, would like to offer my congratulations to you on your recent marriage.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, sir.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** As they say, the honeymoon is over and it's good to have you back in the chair, sir, so welcome back and congratulations.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** The question from the Leader of the Opposition is whether I will meet with the union on this matter. I will consult with the Minister for Health on this matter. It has only just been brought to my attention. Of course, the Leader of the Opposition is quite right in identifying that there is real concern around our hospital system in South Australia, and the reason for that concern is the absolute shambles that this system was in when we came to power on 17 March.

It's interesting to note, of course, that the Leader of the Opposition himself would probably know more about the shambles of the health system than just about anybody else in this chamber and that is because, of course, he was the minister for health—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —right up until 17 March. He was the minister.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** He was the one who was responsible.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** He was the one who knew unequivocally—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —exactly how dire—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —the situation was, and the question that the people of South Australia really want answered is why he didn't come clean with the people of South Australia about the mess in the health system prior to the election. Now, sir—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** There is a point of order by the member for West Torrens.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The minister is debating the question.

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier has had a cacophony of noise that has come from my left, so it's a bit rich for members to claim debate. I will listen carefully. I believe the Premier was on a relevant tangent—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** —but I will be listening carefully to ensure that he sticks to the substance of the question.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Thank you very much, sir—

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the Premier, I also call to order—

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —because the Leader of the Opposition was—

**The SPEAKER:** Premier, one moment. I must intervene, unfortunately. I call to order the leader and the member for Kaurna, and I remind the member for West Torrens that he has been called to order. The Premier will be heard in silence.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Thank you very much, sir. I'm glad that I'm going to be heard in silence because this is an important issue. The Leader of the Opposition raises a question in parliament today about the new government meeting with the nurses' union here in South Australia to hear their concerns about the state of the health system in South Australia and, of course, there are grave concerns about the state of the health system in South Australia.

Most people would have been very concerned that the former government didn't make it clear to the people of South Australia about the blowout in the Central Adelaide Local Health Network.

According to those opposite, the new Royal Adelaide Hospital was just a fantastic new institution. They loved marvelling at the wide corridors and the fantastic—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order: the question was about whether the Premier would meet with representatives. He is now debating the question.

**The SPEAKER:** Another point of order.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order: there was a very lengthy explanation, which gave wide scope for the Premier to talk about.

**The SPEAKER:** The minister will be seated. I have given the Premier some scope. I do respectfully ask the Premier to please return to the substance of the question.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** The substance of the question, sir, of course was the state of the health system and the reason why the nurses' union—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —wanted to meet with the government. That was the question.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I'm listening. Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** That was the question. The question wasn't black and white; the question was detailing lots of comment from the Leader of the Opposition and I am addressing the specific content raised by the Leader of the Opposition in his question. He might choose to go to whoever is writing questions in future and get them tightened up a bit. Maybe because of some of the problems they have had with their questions lately, they're going to have a review—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order, sir: the question was: will the Premier meet with the state's Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I have the question. I believe that—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** He is now debating the question.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I believe the Premier is winding up, or has wound up. He's finished his answer?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** As I said, sir, I'll meet with the Minister for Health and determine what action we'll take.

#### HOSPITAL OVERCROWDING

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15):** My question is again to the Premier. Why did the Premier's state budget cut 880 staff from SA Health at a time when nurses and midwives are calling for crisis meetings over this government's failure to address hospital overcrowding?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:15):** I'm so glad to have this question. As you would appreciate, sir, this wasn't a yes or no question.

**The SPEAKER:** No, it was not.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** There was a lot of scope put in this question, and again I say to the Leader of the Opposition that he might like to think about who he gets to write his questions.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Knowing the Australian Labor Party, knowing the failure that they've had in question time over such a long period of time, they've probably got a new mechanism.

They've probably got a new caucus meeting to decide who is going to be answering the questions. There's probably 40 of them. They will all be fighting to see who is going to be chair of that committee, to find out who is going to be answering the questions because they are getting more and more—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Premier, be seated for one moment. The Premier will be seated for one moment, please. The member for West Torrens on a point of order.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Sir, the Premier, unprovoked, began to debate the question immediately.

**The SPEAKER:** Premier, I ask you to please stick to the substance of the question.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** And the question, sir, was about the alleged cuts—

**The SPEAKER:** I'll listen carefully in silence, please. Premier.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —that the new government put into the budget for health. We will be going through the health budget in a lot of detail when estimates starts here in our parliament. In fact, health estimates is next week. I really hope that the Leader of the Opposition attends those estimates committees and listens to the state of the health system that he left for the people of South Australia. What he will learn is that in fact the new government has put money back into the health system in South Australia.

We have put \$800 million back in to do away with many of the cuts that were put in place by the former minister, the now Leader of the Opposition, in terms of health cuts in South Australia. The cuts—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —that they had in the Mid-Year Budget Review—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my right!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —the cuts that the former government had in the Mid-Year Budget Review were of such an extraordinary magnitude that the new government had to put an additional \$800 million into the budget to have a more sustainable budget for the health system in South Australia. And we do that proudly. We do that proudly, but it's a pity that those opposite couldn't come clean with the people of South Australia in the lead-up to the election.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Is the Premier finished? The Premier is finished. Before I call the member for Kurna, I call the following members to order: the Minister for Child Protection, the member for Elizabeth, the member for Lee, the member for Reynell and the Minister for Transport. The member for Kurna has the call.

#### HIV SERVICES

**Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:18):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Why has the Premier singled out cuts to HIV services? What does the Premier have against people who are HIV positive?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order, sir: standing order 97 doesn't allow that sort of statement to be made.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I uphold that point of order, and the member for Kurna knows better. I will move to the government and I will come back to the opposition.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Waite is waiting patiently.

### STATE BUDGET

**Mr DULUK (Waite) (14:18):** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. My question—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr DULUK:** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier please update the house on the 2018-19 state budget and how that budget is delivering economic reform for South Australia?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:19):** It's with great pleasure that I rise and answer the question from the member for Waite, and I thank him for his interest in our state budget. He and the people of Waite are very interested in economic reform, economic growth, more jobs in South Australia. As you would know, sir, in the March election—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —the people of South Australia voted for a change in government. Some haven't accepted this yet. The reality is they voted for change. They voted for a strong plan to get our state back on track, and that's precisely what was delivered in the budget that was handed down only a few weeks ago. I think one of the things—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee is warned.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —that the people of South Australia really were surprised about when they read the budget was the size of the black hole left by those opposite: a deficit, projected by the former treasurer to be a \$12 million surplus. Guess what? They missed it by that much. It was almost \$400 million. But, let me tell you—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —the government is not using that as an excuse to break promises to the people of South Australia. In fact, we are very proud not to use that as an excuse not to get on and deliver every single one of the reforms, every single one of the commitments that we talked about in the lead-up to the election. That's exactly what we are going to do. We are very proud that the new budget actually projects surpluses across each year of the forward estimates, something that was completely and utterly unachievable by those opposite—seven deficits in the last 10 years. Of course, what we are also doing—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —is addressing the completely unsustainable budget position which was left by the former government. Importantly, in the lead-up to the election we all spoke about the most important thing facing the people of South Australia, which was creating more jobs for the next generation. That's something we feel very strongly about. That was why we were very pleased when the budget came out that the projection for the jobs growth this year is 1.5 per cent, a 50 per cent increase in the projection—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —that was handed down in the Mid-Year Budget Review just six months earlier. So Treasury's projection is for a 50 per cent increase in that employment growth, and that is something that everybody on this side of the house is very, very proud of.

Not only are we proud of it, sir, we are acting on it. That's why, as you would be aware, the budget provides the delivery of the commitment that we made in the lead-up to the election, and that was to put through the payroll tax cuts for 1 January next year.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Those opposite hate it. They hate relinquishing any tax. They hate it. They don't like to look after those people who are out there employing people, but we want to. We want to grow the size of our economy. We want more people employed in South Australia. We want more young people staying in our state. That's why we did everything we could to take that burden away from businesses in South Australia.

More than that, we have had a record \$11.3 billion investment in infrastructure in the budget that we have put forward. Those opposite, of course, prior to the budget, were out there scaremongering, saying that there was going to be this massive, big black hole in terms of infrastructure. We didn't hear any congratulations from those opposite saying, 'Well, congratulations, a record spend.' Not a word.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** We know that by making that investment we will not only create more jobs in South Australia but, of course, we will have the productive infrastructure that we so desperately need to grow our state. We've also got a big spend in skills.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Skills investment, infrastructure investment, returning the budget to surplus and, of course, tax cuts—a good budget which is going to set up our state for future years to come.

**The SPEAKER:** I call to order the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Premier, and I warn the following members for a first time: the member for Reynell, the member for West Torrens, the member for Lee, and I call to order the member for Playford for exclaiming, 'Big spender!' during the Premier's answer. Member for Kaurna.

#### HIV SERVICES

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:23):** My question is to the Premier. Why are you closing the Centacare Cheltenham house HIV service, which saves the government twice as much money as it costs through reduction in ED visits?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members on my left, the member for Kaurna has asked a question. The minister responsible in this house has an opportunity to answer that question in silence. Minister.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:23):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am happy to take this question on behalf of the Minister for Health in the other place. This is a serious question. There wouldn't be anybody in this chamber, certainly not on this side of the house, who doesn't want care for people who need it. But we are going about delivering health care differently from the way that the previous government did. Let me share some information with the shadow minister for health on exactly this topic. Following the McCann review between 2011 and 2017, the health promotion budget in SA Health was cut by two-thirds.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Programs for blood-borne viruses, STIs and HIV were largely insulated from cuts, with budgets remaining relatively stable throughout the period.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Funding will be removed entirely from one HIV program provided by Centacare—

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** Just because it's in the western suburbs.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee is warned for a second and final time.

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Waite is called to order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The minister has the call.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —as it does not reflect contemporary models of care. Other funding reductions reflect the prevalence of the condition, changes in appropriate care and treatment, and the ability to deliver services using Medicare funding.

#### HIV SERVICES

**Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (14:25):** Supplementary question to the minister representing the Minister for Health: does the minister think it's fair to close that program, saving \$400,000, at the same time as spending an additional \$400,000 on the health minister's office expenses?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister has the call.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** A \$400,000 upgrade, \$2.5 million to a murderer—

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens can depart for half an hour under standing order 137A.

*The honourable member for West Torrens having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The SPEAKER:** The minister has the call.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:26):** The shadow minister will have every opportunity he wants in estimates to quiz the Minister for Health about expenditure on his office. Let me just say, in answer to the question: this government has put nearly \$800 million of additional money in the last budget into health care. We take health care very, very seriously. We will not be pursuing the previous government's Transforming Health disaster. We are putting more money in. We will get better results.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Newland.

#### GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS MORATORIUM

**Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:27):** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members on my left will allow the member for Newland to ask a question in silence. Member for Newland.

**Dr HARVEY:** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister inform the house—

**Mr Malinauskas:** What about Service SA?

**The SPEAKER:** The leader will not interject. Member for Newland.

**Dr HARVEY:** Can the minister inform the house how the state government is delivering on an election commitment for an independent review of the GM moratorium?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:27):** I certainly can, and I thank the member for Newland for his important question—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister has the call.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** —and I know he welcomes this state government's commitment to an independent review into the GM moratorium. The GM debate has festered on for long enough and this government is putting action into place. As a pre-election commitment, we have installed, and promised to install, a full independent review to the GM moratorium here in South Australia. At the Growing SA conference on Friday in Hahndorf, hosted by Livestock SA and Grain Producers SA, I announced that the state government has commissioned Emeritus Professor Kym Anderson AC to undertake an independent review of the genetically modified food crops moratorium here in South Australia.

Emeritus Professor Kym Anderson AC has significant experience and expertise and is globally recognised as an applied policy analyst in the economics, agriculture, food and wine sectors. Under the policy principles established within the Gene Technology Act in 2001, the current moratorium on the commercial growing of GM food crops in South Australia exists for trade and market access purposes. The former Labor government put the GM food crops moratorium in place to 2019 and then somehow sneakily extended it to 2025.

The terms of reference outlining what the review will entail have now been released. The review will include assessing the available evidence on the market benefits of South Australia's moratorium and the awareness of South Australia's moratorium by key trading partners and food production businesses operating here in South Australia and other Australian states.

Once completed, the review will enable better informed policy decisions regarding GM food crops here in South Australia. Matters of human health, safety and environmental impacts are not within the scope of this review, as the regulation of these aspects of gene technology are covered under the commonwealth legislation. Under the Genetically Modified Crops Management Act 2004 and regulations, the current moratorium on the commercial cultivation of GM food crops is in place until 2025.

This is an independent review, and I want to reaffirm that there is no predetermined outcome. I encourage everyone who wants to have their say to put forward a submission. Written submissions are due by Friday 26 October 2018 via email: [pinsa.gmreview@sa.gov.au](mailto:pinsa.gmreview@sa.gov.au). It is expected that the review will be completed by the first quarter of 2019. Hashtag #RegionsMatter.

#### SA PATHOLOGY

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:30):** My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health. Will the minister rule out that complex South Australian blood tests and specimens will have to be flown interstate or overseas if the government privatises SA Pathology?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:30):** Apart from that question being hypothetical, it is a—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —very specific question. I would be happy to get an answer from the Minister for Health and bring it back to the chamber.



### SA PATHOLOGY

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:31):** My question is again to the minister representing the Minister for Health. Is there any evidence that the privatisation of SA Pathology will result in higher community costs or longer delays for testing? If there is such evidence, will the government abandon the planned privatisation?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister has the call.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:31):** Mr Speaker, apart from—

*The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Transport will not interject.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —that question also being hypothetical, let me give the very, very obvious answer, which connects to answers given on a similar topic over previous parliamentary weeks: the government is going to look into the pros and cons and the benefits or otherwise of doing this. So for me to answer a question about the potential outcomes of the investigation into going down that path, which hasn't happened yet, would be ridiculous. So it makes it a ridiculous question.

### HOME BATTERY SCHEME

**Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:32):** My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister update the house on the state government's plans to help South Australians access more affordable and reliable energy through its Home Battery Scheme?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:32):** Yes, I can. Again, I thank the member for Morphett, who has a very genuine interest not only in this topic but also in his constituents receiving cheaper electricity under the new Marshall Liberal government. We announced before the election that, if elected, we would deliver subsidies—\$2,500 on average for 40,000 homes over four years—to help them purchase batteries for their houses to go with solar panels so that they can reduce their electricity costs. We have delivered on that.

We announced very recently that in fact not only will it be \$2,500 on average for 40,000 households but that some households will be able to get up to a \$6,000 subsidy towards the purchase of a household battery. This will be very important for those households so that they can manage their electricity consumption and supply, so that they can work on their own premises to their own benefit, so that they can reduce their costs—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order. The minister will be seated for one moment.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** As loath as I am to raise a point of order against the Minister for Energy, all of this information is currently published on his own website and has been the subject of a media release last week.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If the member for Lee can furnish me with the page in reference, I will have a look at it and ensure that the minister is providing information other than that already in the public forum.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Mr Speaker, I can assure you that I didn't memorise the release. This is very important information, and if the opposition is not interested in how households across the state can get cheaper electricity then no wonder they are the opposition.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** What we did with the support of very, very capable people in the newly formed Department for Energy and Mining was create the subsidy so that the subsidy level per household increased with the size of the battery. We also offered a higher subsidy for low-income families, understanding that this is taxpayers' money being used to help households purchase these batteries. We want households on lower incomes—and we have defined them as people who hold an energy concession already—to be able to have greater support to meet the cost of the battery. We have also capped it at \$6,000. That means that households can receive the subsidy for up to a 10, 11 or 12 kilowatt hour capacity battery before they actually hit the cap. This is a very sensible use of taxpayers' money.

But the most important thing about this is that on the one hand the households that invest in these batteries will get a very clear benefit for themselves, of course—and we want them to have that—but more importantly, far more importantly, by connecting peak generation from solar early afternoon with peak electricity demand early evening for 40,000 plus households we will take the top off peak demand statewide early evening. You only have to take a thin sliver off the top of peak electricity demand to actually have a very significant impact on the wholesale price across the state.

That is why this program is so important—because not only the people who make the investment and who have the capacity to purchase the battery will benefit but all other South Australian electricity consumers will benefit as well by having these 40,000 plus with solar and batteries and reducing the wholesale price which then, 12 months after that, flows through to all other electricity consumers. We are on the side of electricity consumers across the state, from the smallest households to the largest employers.

#### SA PATHOLOGY

**Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (14:36):** My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health. Why did the government breach its commitment to consult with staff about the future of SA Pathology? With your leave, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr PICTON:** On the ABC on 8 August 2017, the now Minister for Health said, and I quote, 'We'll have a totally different approach to reform and we'll be engaging our staff.'

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my right!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my right and left! I would expect quite a broad answer given the background or facts introduced into that question. The minister has the call.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:37):** Apart from the fact that that question violates standing order 97 and includes argument, there is a very obvious answer.

**The SPEAKER:** No, I think there was leave of the house, minister. Please continue the answer, though.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** There is a very obvious answer to that question, which I have to say has been provided here, I think, on about half a dozen different occasions. We will consult with SA Pathology. We will consult. The very last question that the member opposite asked me included in the answer that we are going to investigate, we are going to look at the pros and cons, we are going to see where it may be sensible, where it may not be sensible. We are going to investigate, and we are going to consult with everybody the Minister for Health considers it appropriate to consult with, and I would be amazed if the Minister for Health did not include SA Pathology in that list of people.

### SA PATHOLOGY

**Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:38):** Supplementary question to the minister—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Kurna, supplementary.

**Mr PICTON:** If that is the case, why have the staff who are here today told the Leader of the Opposition and I that they haven't been consulted with, that they haven't heard from the minister about your \$105 million cuts to SA Pathology?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Minister.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:39):** Just to be really careful, I will check with the Minister for Health, but let me say—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —I think the reason that members from SA Pathology may not have been consulted on this issue yet is that the review hasn't started yet, but let me get that confirmed. Let me get that confirmed from the Minister for Health and I will bring an answer back to the house, but I'm sure that will be the answer.

### HOME BATTERY SCHEME

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:40):** My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister update the house on how it's giving South Australians who don't currently have solar panels access to the Home Battery Scheme?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:40):** Thank you very much to the member for Narungga. There's lots of sunshine on Yorke Peninsula, where he comes from, so it is a very important question from him.

I have already today outlined to the house the subsidy program for household batteries. The member for Narungga asks me about solar panels. As I explained before, under the current pricing regime we don't have differential time-of-day pricing, so to get value out of a household battery you need to have household generation, which is almost always about rooftop solar panels. They are fantastic and have been around for a long time. Some people who got in early have some pretty extraordinary feed-in tariffs. Good luck to them.

What we wanted to do, to get the best value that we possibly could for households and the rest of this state with our battery subsidy program, was to enable households that don't already have panels to be able to access panels as well. This program wouldn't only be available to households that already have panels to retrofit if they were on a lower feed-in tariff and saw it beneficial to do so, and we didn't only also want it to be available to households that could afford the balance of the purchase price and the panels themselves as well. We want as many South Australians as possible to be able to access this program.

We have partnered with Clean Energy Finance Corporation. They have contributed \$100 million towards loan funding, which is in addition to our \$100 million of subsidy funding, so that households that want to participate can access concessional loans. Of course, they have to be assessed as being creditworthy, and if they are they can access concessional loans so that on the one hand they are going to get a new battery with a subsidy of up to \$6,000 from the state government. They can apply to borrow money for the balance of the purchase price of that battery. In addition—coming to the member for Narungga's question—they can also apply to borrow at a concessional interest rate money for the purchase price of the solar panels as well. A South Australian household can get up to a \$6,000 subsidy and a cheap loan—no money whatsoever up-front to get new panels and a new battery for their home.

I say again, as I did before, that this is a terrific opportunity for households, but more importantly it's beneficial to the rest of the state. We want to make this program as easy as possible to access and as beneficial for the rest of the state as possible. This is a truly outstanding program, which the then Liberal opposition put together in government. Let me say very clearly that the staff in the newly formed Department for Energy and Mining have done a tremendous job to add the detail to what was already a very good policy position. Clean Energy Finance Corporation has come on board.

Let me also share with the house that the \$100 million is there. Clean Energy Finance Corporation have said that they would be very pleased to consider putting more money towards this program. If we are working through the 40,000 households but the loans have all been taken up, they will look to add more money to the loan. This is a truly outstanding program. One last piece of information for the house is that we expect that the subsidies will be adjusted over time, and I say very clearly that they are especially generous at the moment, and I encourage households to get on board quickly.

*Ms Cook interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I call to order the member for Hurtle Vale.

#### HEALTH CONSUMERS ALLIANCE

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:44):** My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health. Why does this government think that South Australia should be the only state in the country without an independent organisation, providing the voice of patients and consumers, funded by the government?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:44):** Again, the question contravenes standing order 97: it contains argument. Let me say very clearly—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —that the member's argument is incorrect. The member's argument is completely incorrect. We have said again, we have said many times, that this issue will be investigated and will be dealt with thoroughly. We will look at the pros and cons, we will look at where it may be sensible—

*Ms Hildyard interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Reynell is warned for a second and final time.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** We will look at where it may be sensible and where it may not be sensible to do this. We will look at it very thoroughly and, as soon as the results are available, people will know about them. People will know. If the member opposite asks the same or a very similar question again, he will get the same or a very similar answer again.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the member for Kaurna, I call to order the member for Ramsay. I warn the Leader of the Opposition. I call to order and I warn the member for Elizabeth. Member for Kaurna.

#### HEALTH CONSUMERS ALLIANCE

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:46):** Supplementary: if, as the minister says, this is only something the government is investigating, why have you cut every single dollar to that organisation in your budget?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:46):** The government has put nearly \$800 million of additional—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** The government has put—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** The government has put nearly \$800 million of additional money into the health budget over the forward estimates. We understand what we need to do to get the health system working again as well as it can on behalf of all South Australians. We will undertake—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** We will—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** We will undertake these investigations very thoroughly, very genuinely, and we will take the decisions that come from those investigations when it's necessary to do that. I can't tell you anything else.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

#### VISITORS

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the member for MacKillop, I welcome to parliament today members of the Poonindie Community Learning Centre, guests of the member for Flinders. Welcome to parliament. Member for MacKillop.

*Question Time*

#### HOME BATTERY SCHEME

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:47):** My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister inform the house how the South Australian government is maximising the job benefits to South Australia from its Home Battery Scheme?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:47):** I can—a very sensible question from a very sensible member of parliament. This is a truly outstanding scheme. Members opposite pretend they don't like it, but I know that they think this is a fantastic scheme. Not only have we got the subsidy for the battery, not only have we got cheap loans for households to be able to finance the balance of the purchase price of the battery and new solar if they want to, not only are we doing these things for them and for all electricity—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** There is a point of order, minister.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** This third—

**The Hon. S.K. Knoll:** You still haven't got one done properly, have you, Stevo?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, yes, we'll all pay attention—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —to you shortly.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Lee, point of order.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Will that salve your ego?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Is there a point of order, member for Lee?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, Mr Speaker.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** My point of order is that this third government question will make it 12 minutes and 20 per cent of question time, which the Minister for Energy—

**The SPEAKER:** This is a speech.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —is using—

**The SPEAKER:** This is a speech and, member for Lee, if you don't—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —to repeat information which has already been published in a press release.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee will be seated. Member for Lee, you've made your point; I have taken your point. I have the minister's press release of 8 September on my phone, and I will be listening very carefully to this answer. Minister.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Thank you, Speaker. Not only—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Not only are we allowing South Australian households, 40,000 of them, to access this fantastic program, not only are we going to deliver cheaper electricity for all South Australians—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** The benefits don't stop there. We are going to create more jobs in this state as well. We are going to create more jobs through the delivery of this program. There are installers and battery suppliers lining up to get on board. They know that their businesses will also benefit along with the households and the rest of the electricity consumers.

We are deliberately making as many benefits for as many people as possible accessible through this program. So not only existing battery suppliers, not only existing battery installers and solar installers as well, but the icing on the cake has been the commitment from a world-renowned battery manufacturing company, Sonnen, to come to South Australia—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —and establish a manufacturing hub at Elizabeth.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Point of order, Mr Speaker: not only—

**The SPEAKER:** What is the point of the order?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —has this information—

**The SPEAKER:** What is the point of order?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —been previously provided to the house and to the public—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —it was done so by the previous government.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee can depart under 137A for the remainder of question time. Raising points of order is not an opportunity to make an impromptu speech.

*Members interjecting:*

*Members*

**MEMBER FOR LEE, NAMING**

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee is named. The member for Lee has been named. The member for Lee has an opportunity to explain himself.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:51):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. My points of order today have been raised after six months of behaviour in this chamber overseen by you, Mr Speaker, where we see a tactic by this government not only to take government questions, which of course they would not be Robinson Crusoe in doing so in taking government questions during question time, but they do so on information which has previously been reported to the house, published in the media and released by the government in their own press releases. Previously, Speakers have ruled—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I have a right to explain myself without interruption.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Not only have previous Speakers ruled on this matter but when they have done so they have sat the minister down at the time and moved on to another question until the issue can be resolved, and the reason why is to stop the government of the day running down the one hour of scrutiny which the opposition is afforded in question time from being erroneously used. And—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I will listen to the member for Lee. He has a right to be heard in explanation, or to make an apology, but I don't think it's coming. The member for Lee.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. So I raised that point of order not once, not twice but three times, and we have had previous rulings during question time by previous speakers which were to prevent the wasting—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members on my right will be quiet.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —of time to enable the house to move on. Now, Mr Speaker, I absolutely respect your right to rule on these matters, and I absolutely respect your right to rule in accordance with the sessional orders and remove members from this house for infringements of the standing orders so deemed by you, Mr Speaker. I also accept—

**The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner:** That gives you the right to yell at the Speaker on your way out?

**The SPEAKER:** Minister for Education, you are called to order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Indeed, Mr Speaker, the member for Morialta's interjection goes to the nub of this because he accuses me of yelling at you on the way out, and indeed I wasn't.

**The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner:** You were yelling at everybody.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I was yelling at the member for Morialta and I was also yelling at the Premier, and the reason why—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my right!

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —is because, while I was departing the chamber, they were giving me what in cricket terms would be called a 'send off'. Now I understand, Mr Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I understand, Mr Speaker, that is wholly unparliamentary and not provided by the standing orders. I should not have done it and I unreservedly apologise.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee has apologised. The Minister for Education.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Sir, that was a rant at great length. It was not an apology, in my view.

**The SPEAKER:** Are you moving one way or another, sir?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:55):** I move:

That the member's apology not be accepted.

**The SPEAKER:** There is an opportunity for a 10-minute debate either side, I am advised. Minister.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Sir, I have no intention of using the 10 minutes. I would like to give the opposition an opportunity to build on the 10 questions they have so far had to ask the government questions. The member was yelling across the chamber as he left. That is disorderly and it was appropriate that he be named. He was given many, many opportunities to raise the points of order in an orderly fashion. When he refused to do so, you gave the opportunity, under the relevant standing order, for him to withdraw from the chamber. On doing so, he was seeking to undermine the good order of the house and you used the relevant standing order to name him.

When given an opportunity to explain or apologise, he attempted to justify his behaviour for a full three or five minutes, and it was not a sincere apology. A sincere apology, in the order of which namings have not been acted on in the past, starts with 'I apologise to the house', potentially contains some clarifying material and then involves a sit down. What we just saw was a rant. It was a predetermined speech from a member who clearly is seeking to gain some relevance in the house. It does not merit the house granting an acceptance of the apology because it was not presented as a real apology. I therefore encourage the house to indeed not accept the apology.

**The SPEAKER:** The Leader of the Opposition has the call. He is the final speaker on this matter.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:56):** I am not too sure if those opposite have become unaccustomed to listening. It would certainly be evident from the government's budget that listening is not something they have decided to do too much of very recently. Indeed, their incapacity to listen has been demonstrated by the member for Morialta, the Minister for Education, because clearly the member for Lee in his response to being named made an unequivocal—in fact, I think he used the word 'unreserved'—apology for what was being referred to.

I am not too sure how much clearer the member for Lee could have been in offering an apology as a result of being named, so the suggestion by those opposite that somehow the member for Lee had not apologised when he did so unreservedly clearly demonstrates a complete and total level of incompetence in terms of the member for Morialta's capacity to indeed listen. There is no way that any rational judgement on behalf of this house could conclude that the member for Lee has not apologised and this motion should be voted down accordingly.

Motion carried.

#### **MEMBER FOR LEE, SUSPENSION**

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:58):** I move:



That the member be suspended from the service of the house.

Motion carried.

**The SPEAKER:** The member must withdraw now, per the standing order.

*The honourable member for Lee having withdrawn from the chamber:*

*Question Time*

### HOME BATTERY SCHEME

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:58):** I rise to finish my answer to that very important question that was asked. Not only do we want to get the benefits that I have mentioned before but we also want to get employment. We want to raise employment in our state: one of the most important jobs that any government can do. We wanted participants in the program to have some surety and some knowledge that there is going to be a four-year program that was rolled out upon which they could make investments, they could hire people, they could grow their businesses and ideally take on trainees and apprenticeships as well.

The icing on the cake was when Sonnen agreed to come and set up a manufacturing business here in South Australia at the Elizabeth site, the old Holden site: 430 to 450 new jobs here in South Australia, in the north of the city, which I think is equally as important. The previous government, before the last election, made an announcement that they were going to try to do the same thing. Unfortunately, they were not able to do that. They said they would try, but they didn't; we said we would try and we did. We have delivered this.

While the terms of the agreement must remain confidential, let me share with the house the fact that the agreement that we have done on behalf of the people of South Australia with Sonnen is actually better for the people of South Australia than the agreement that the previous government said that they were going to try to do. So nice try; good on them. Good idea—fantastic—but we have delivered this. We have made it happen. We have worked very closely with Sonnen—a fantastic company that will bring a fantastic product to add to all of the other products that are already available on the market.

It might interest the house, and it might particularly interest those opposite, that in the press conference in which we released this part of our program to the public the worldwide CEO of Sonnen, who came from Germany to participate in this very, very important announcement, Mr Christoph Ostermann, said that this agreement would not have been possible if it were not for the Marshall government. That is exactly what he said publicly at the time. It is exactly what is true.

Let me say again: good on the previous government for saying that they were going to try to do it. Shame they didn't. Good on the Marshall Liberal government for actually doing it, for delivering for the people of South Australia.

### SERVICE SA

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:02):** My question is to the Minister for Transport. What process was undertaken to determine the Modbury branch of Service SA was to be earmarked for closure? With your leave and that of the house—

Leave granted.

**Ms BEDFORD:** There are 20 Service SA branches in South Australia, 10 of which are in metropolitan Adelaide. The Modbury branch services the entire area of the Tea Tree Gully council, with a population of 100,000-plus, the adjacent part of the Adelaide Hills and half of the Salisbury council. It is always busy, with queues frequently out the door, and no-one in that office would ever say it could be considered surplus to requirement.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:02):** It's wonderful to get this question from the member for Florey so that I can actually update her on exactly why it is that we have had to take these very difficult decisions. In a very short way, the reason that we chose those centres was done on a spatial basis. So the idea that if I look at—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left! Order! The member for Florey has asked a question; the minister is entitled to be heard in silence. The Minister for Primary Industries will not interject, please. The minister has the call.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** In relation to the people that are currently accessing the Mitcham centre, they would be able to go down to the Marion or the Tranmere centres. In relation to Modbury, the people from Modbury—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** The people at Modbury would be able to still access the Tranmere, Regency Park and Elizabeth centres—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I'm trying to listen to the minister's answer.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —and for those who use the Prospect centre, they will be able to use Regency Park—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Waite is warned. The minister will be seated.

**The Hon. T.J. Whetstone:** If the shoe fits, wear it.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Primary Industries is warned. The Minister for Transport has the call.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Mr Speaker, this is not an easy decision. Member for Florey, this is not an easy decision. There are a number of other alternatives that we're currently looking at putting in place, and we're working with those alternate service delivery partners at the moment to provide that solution.

Can I say that these centres are not going to close tomorrow. They are going to close after we have an alternative arrangement that has been put in place to make sure that there still is the ability to provide these transactions. It's just that as the budget stands we need to make those announcements as part of the budget process and then work from there.

The reason that these difficult decisions have had to be taken is largely because this is the legacy that we inherited. Can I say that prior to this budget, in the Mid-Year Budget Review, it was envisaged that Service SA would have to cut \$11.68 million from their budget over this corresponding four-year period. Now, as a result of the tough decisions that we have had to make, we have had to increase that savings task to about \$16 million over the same period, but three-quarters of the savings tasks was already in the Mid-Year Budget Review before our budget was even handed down. That is the legacy that we were left by the former government, and they are the difficult decisions that we have had to take.

There is a lot more work that will be done over the coming months to make sure that there are alternative arrangements put in place. We are not trying to hide from the fact that this is a tough and difficult decision that we have had to take. This is what happens when you try to balance the books. This is what happens when you are a responsible government that realises that you can only spend what you raise in tax revenue. This is what happens when you actually make good on what your budget says.

I think it is extremely clear that three-quarters of this savings task we inherited from the former government. If the former government didn't have that savings task in the budget, these decisions that we have made with this budget would have been very, very different. But, as prudent and strong financial managers on this side of the house, these are the difficult decisions that we have had to take. I say to the people of the north-east, the people of the south and the people in the inner north: we are working to make sure that we can provide these transactions in an alternative way.

There are a huge number of options already available now, either online or using Australia Post. We are seeking to expand those opportunities, and we will be communicating very thoroughly with those affected communities when those decisions are made.

**Ms BEDFORD:** Supplementary.

**The SPEAKER:** Supplementary, and then the member for Hurtle Vale.

#### SERVICE SA

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:06):** How many spatial dollars do you spend now keeping the Modbury office open each year?

**An honourable member:** Like Bitcoins.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:07):** S-p-a-t-i-a-l. I don't have the exact figure on me, but the savings task over the 2018-19 year is \$2.15 million that we need to save from across the network.

**Ms Bedford:** So you will be able to give me the answer?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Sure. There are estimates going on next week and we discuss those things in detail. There's about half an hour, as I understand it, for Service SA. No doubt I am going to get these questions. But, member for Florey, these are not easy decisions to make at all, and we are not shying away from that, but this is what happens. This is how you put a budget back in the black.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Hurtle Vale.

#### VOLUNTEER SCREENING FEES

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (15:07):** My question is to the Premier. Why has the government broken its election promise to abolish all volunteer screening fees, with the state budget showing that the fee waiver applies only after 1 January and to two out of five screenings for volunteer organisations, which will now be left to foot the bill?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:08):** I thank the member for her question. We have delivered exactly and precisely what we said in the lead-up to the election. We are very grateful—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left! You have asked the question.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —for the volunteers who contribute so massively to our economy here in South Australia. They are significantly better off because of the commitment that we made in the lead-up to the election. It's a bit rich for those opposite now to be saying that they value volunteers. We know exactly and precisely how they treated volunteers—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —over an extended period of time. We value the people who contribute more broadly to our economy. We are very proud of the commitments, each and every single one of the commitments, that we made in the lead-up to the election. We are very happy that we have been able to deliver on each and every single one of them. Can I just say—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —by way of proof on this issue—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —I have been overwhelmed by comments from people who work in organisations that will be the beneficiaries of these cuts to the screening tests that were imposed by the previous government. They are very grateful because this will be a big improvement to their bottom line. It will enable them to put money within those organisations to better use to serve the people of South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hurtle Vale is warned. The Minister for Transport is warned.

*Ms Cook interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hurtle Vale is warned for a second and final time. The member for West Torrens.

#### **BAILEY, MR C.**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:09):** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Does the minister have confidence in his Chief of Staff, Cullen Bailey?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:09):** Absolutely.

#### **WASTE MANAGEMENT**

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:09):** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Why did the minister make public statements supporting consideration of fortnightly rubbish collections, only to backflip a few hours later?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left! The minister will be heard in silence. Interjections between the time of a question and an answer eat into the time available for question time—they do. It eats into the time available for question time. The minister has the call.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:10):** I thank the deputy leader for her question. I was asked a question in the media as to what I would do to support the waste industry to develop and continue to drive a sense of leadership and innovation across the nation. I said that I was open to any ideas that were put to me—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —and I remain open to working with that industry.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** However, the sort of hysteria that is put forward by the Labor Party around fortnightly rubbish collections was never something that was canvassed broadly—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The minister has the call.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** It was never something that was canvassed specifically, and it was certainly something that I was—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** So I was simply—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Mr Speaker, I will wait to be heard in silence.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members on my left will cease interjecting. The Minister for Environment has the call and is attempting to answer the question. I am listening.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** As I was saying, I am always more than happy to sit down and work with local councils and the waste management sector and discuss ways in which they can innovate and grow their industry, become more efficient and provide a good service to South Australians. I have made very clear that we are in a situation in South Australia at the moment where we are not ready to move to fortnightly waste collections for a range of reasons, and I said publicly at a press conference yesterday that I did not see us being in a situation where we could transition to that for the foreseeable future. I remain completely confident to make that statement publicly because South Australians just aren't ready for that situation at the moment.

#### WASTE MANAGEMENT

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:12):** My question is again to the Minister for Environment and Water. Was the minister instructed to make public statements to change his position on his public statement supporting the consideration of fortnightly rubbish collection?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order: that question contains argument and assumes—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I have the point of order. I am going to allow the point of order. Minister.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my right!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my right! The minister has the call. Minister.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:12):** I was not instructed by anyone to take that position.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** It was a position that I reached after consideration. I will always be open, as I have said many times, to working with the waste management industry. We are a party that is very keen—a government that is keen—to provide that industry with the resources, the strategies and the support to grow. We did so with our recent \$12 million assistance package, which will be provided directly to the waste management industry to help them innovate in the face of the China sword problems that are being faced by that industry. There is absolutely no question that this government is right behind that industry but, as I have said a number of times, we are not in a situation in South Australia where we can move to fortnightly rubbish collections at this stage.

#### PREMIER'S CLIMATE CHANGE COUNCIL

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:13):** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister outline to the house how the government is using the Premier's Climate Change Council to drive forward practical actions to combat the change in climate?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Environment has the call.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:14):** It is always good to be able to update the house on our government's practical response to dealing with the challenges that climate change—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —results in this state facing. We know that we have just handed down a budget which was the biggest spending budget in this state's history on climate change mitigation and adaptation—an energy plan delivered by the Minister for Energy and Mining, which didn't have a dirty diesel generator in sight, an energy plan centred around renewables that will take this state to its target of 100 per cent renewable energy by 2025, only seven years away. What a great story that is to be able to tell South Australians, the nation and the world.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** It has been great, since I became the minister, to work with the Premier's Climate Change Council, headed by Mr Bruce Carter. The council is providing great advice to both myself and the Premier on how we can position South Australia as a leader in climate change adaptation and mitigation and taking that story across the nation and the world. I have met with Mr Carter and the council on a number of occasions since becoming the minister and have been working closely with them to develop a practical work plan, which the council can feed into and drive forward.

One of the strategies that we are looking at is having the council develop a cross-government climate adaptation strategy, working with all government agencies to identify where they can position themselves to reduce emissions and—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens is called to order. Member for Reynell, you are on two warnings. Member for Kaurna, you are on two warnings. Minister, you have the call.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** We have the situation where the Premier's Climate Change Council will be working with each government agency to find strategies and initiatives which will help them reduce their emissions and drive leadership in regard to climate adaptation.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Why are we getting government to do this? Because we are in a position where we can direct government: we can control the actions of government and we can have a very immediate impact on climate strategy. I have also asked the climate council to look at a blue carbon strategy for this state. That is looking at seagrass restoration, the development of mangroves and ways to create sequestration opportunities using our marine environment. Not only is this good for the natural habitat—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order, sir: the minister's time has expired.

**The Hon. S.K. Knoll:** No, it hasn't.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** No, it hasn't, actually. It hasn't.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members on my right! No, member for West Torrens, he has another minute and a bit left.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I have already kicked him out once today. Order! The minister has the call.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I move that a further minute be allowed to answer this question.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I will grant the minister an extra minute. The minister has an extra minute.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I might not require that full extra minute, Mr Speaker.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The minister has the call.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** If members continue to interject, they will be leaving.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** It must be very hard for the Labor Party to see our shift away from gesture politics and virtue signalling when it comes to climate policy. All the slogans, all the icons and all the gimmicks are ending and being replaced by practical—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —climate change action. Their master of dirty diesel generators screams me down, but at the end of the day it is this party which is providing leadership on climate change in this state.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The question before the house is that the house notes grievances. The member for Badcoe will be heard in silence.

#### *Grievance Debate*

#### **BADCOE ELECTORATE**

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (15:19):** For the last three weekends, I have had the great joy of attending the Edwardstown Football Club's junior presentations.

*Ms Cook interjecting:*

**Ms STINSON:** Thank you very much, member for Hurtle Vale. You will be delighted to know that there are two more to go—so come along; it is great fun. They make a mean schnitty down there as well.

The 1960s clubrooms, which are soon to be replaced, have been heaving with proud parents watching their under-6s gleefully accept their medals. The committed coaches talk about each boy and girl, reflecting on their year on the field and off it, encouraging them not only on the development of their sporting skills but on their leadership, teamwork and team spirit. I would like to acknowledge the member for Reynell, who I know is a big supporter of the Edwardstown Football Club and who has been down there a few times as well.

**Ms Hildyard:** That's lovely. I used to play for them.

**Ms STINSON:** There you go! It has been lovely to shake every little hand and applaud the efforts of parents who volunteer as first aid officers and team managers or who referee the rules on the field. It is great to chat with families and to learn of the great pride they have in their own club and how they feel like they are part of something bigger, part of our community and part of bringing up great kids.

It was not too long ago that the club was struggling for numbers, but to see it now you would never guess. Now the club's members hail from more than 50 schools. Looking around, there is a cultural diversity that was not a feature a decade ago. Probably the best thing has been seeing the junior girls' teams grow. As each girl shook hands and got her trophy, the coaches reflected on the girls' toughness, their determination, their leadership, their care for each other and their skills with the ball. This year, there are three girls' teams, and three more will join next season; that is a doubling. There are also girls playing with boys in the younger leagues.

These girls are getting a chance that many before them did not. Although we were very sporty, my sisters and I were never encouraged to play footy, cricket or baseball, which is kind of funny because dad coached boys' sports teams, including baseball. We played netball and volleyball, did swimming and athletics and were in the girls' touch football team, but it just was not the done

thing for girls to play so-called rough boys' sports. But these girls are going to be able to enjoy female change rooms in their new clubrooms, and they will not feel like they are shoving the blokes out when it is their time to play. They will know that they are entitled to be there, just like the boys. In fact, they probably will not even question it, which is great.

The Edwardstown Football Club is pretty lucky. It can expect its ranks, especially among girls, to grow when it gets its new multimillion-dollar sports club, along with other sports like bowls and cycling, which are also based at the Edwardstown Memorial Oval. It will be a great new facility. Today's juniors will provide the talent needed in future for the club's senior playing ranks as well as the volunteer workforce to drive the club forward.

But what is really sad is that not all clubs in my area will be as lucky. The women at the highly successful Southern Suburbs Rugby Union Club were hoping for upgraded women's change rooms, but thanks to the axing of the Female Facilities Fund—

**An honourable member:** Shame!

**Ms STINSON:** —shame!—that is now unlikely. And because they are not netball, cricket or footy, they will not even be able to access the Liberals' sporting infrastructure fund either, which replaces a more generous scheme that Labor had established.

Women and girls are now playing team sports in greater numbers thanks to the investment and effort put into growing female participation, especially by the previous Labor government but also across the sporting sector. It is one of the best things we can do for our health system: develop healthy, active habits early in life and continue them throughout life. This is the best preventative measure we have in terms of relieving pressure on our health system.

In terms of encouraging equality and cohesion in our society, sport is a great vessel for educating our community that women are equal with men and should be treated as such. It is short-sighted to limit sports funding to just a few popular codes and of course to axe the Female Facilities Fund. We will be paying for it in the years to come in terms of the continued growth of local sporting clubs, the participation and equality of women and in poorer health outcomes.

On behalf of my community of Badcoe, I urge the new Liberal government to get serious about grassroots sport—all grassroots sport—and have a long, hard think about the funding decisions they are making and how they impact communities like mine.

#### **DOWRY ABUSE**

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:23):** On 31 August of this year, an article was published in *The Advertiser* regarding the prevalence of dowries—these are payments usually made by a bride's family in contemplation of marriage—and the inherent risks they pose, particularly to migrant women. Currently, the Senate Standing Committees on Legal and Constitutional Affairs is undertaking an inquiry into dowry abuse. The Legal Services Commission of South Australia, among others, presented a submission outlining the rising number of requests for legal assistance from women from countries where dowries have been traditionally practised. The committee is due to hand down their report on 6 December.

The consequence of purchasing a bride is that a woman is traded off as property. Dowry abuse can take many forms, including demanding further money from the bride's family, denying these women access to money or treating them as slaves. I want to reassure the house that the government takes these concerns seriously and regards them as nothing less than domestic and family violence.

Currently, dowry abuse can be captured, depending on the nature of conduct, under offences such as unlawful threats, blackmail, assault, causing harm or serious harm (including psychological harm), acts endangering life or sexual offences. In addition, the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009 would enable the victim of dowry abuse to seek an intervention order. I also note that the Victorian government has recently passed legislation to explicitly ban dowry abuse. This government will carefully consider the wording of this legislation and whether such changes are required in South Australia that would be of assistance to victims.



Since coming into office, this government has prioritised domestic and family violence prevention. Last year, there were 23 convictions for murder in South Australia, of which 10 also featured domestic violence. It is a staggering statistic and the highest in the country, and it needs to be addressed. Our government's commitment provides for nearly \$12 million in funding in respect of new crisis accommodation. An app has been announced that will provide a quick way for women who are unable to make a phone call to notify police or trusted individuals. Of course, there is a significant area of reform in relation to intervention orders and, in particular, the enforcement of them, and we have recently announced a 12-month statewide trial in domestic violence disclosure, colloquially known as Clare's Law.

We are proud of these initiatives, and we have further opened up consultation for proposed reforms to our current laws. This includes introducing a new offence for non-fatal strangulation—as we now know, hands are the weapon of choice—and allowing video evidence from SAPOL to be used in court. Importantly, we are committed to keeping victims of domestic violence informed when there are changes or changes to be considered to bail or parole conditions by the perpetrators.

Members, I would ask you to inform yourselves about the concern that this government has in respect of this significant area of abuse in the community. This side of the house had previously presented legislation to try to ensure that protection was given to children who were removed from the jurisdiction and who might have been the subject of genital mutilation in respect of a cultural practice. It took some time to encourage the opposition to support the legislation to amend that and have that protection including, as an expansion, the confiscation of passports to facilitate that type of practice.

We must act in relation to this matter. We will look at the legislation, and we hope that the whole of the parliament will be with us in supporting it. With new and emerging ways in which people can treat each other disrespectfully, shamefully and illegally, we hope that the whole of the parliament will be with us to ensure that we protect women and children in these circumstances.

### **SALISBURY PLAYS**

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (15:28):** I am very pleased to speak today about a wonderful event that was held in my electorate on Sunday, that is, the Salisbury Plays event at Bridgestone Reserve.

Salisbury Plays is an initiative of the City of Salisbury. It encourages families to head outside and discover the many play spaces in parks in the local community. It is a free family event and the theme was 'Families that play together stay together'. This was the second time the event has been held. We were very lucky with the weather, given that the previous day was showery and cold. It was a little bit cool, but there was a fantastic turnout of people.

There was face painting, food and coffee, come-and-try activities, live music, a petting zoo and giant kids' activities. There were also some exciting sports hosted by our wonderful local athletics and sports teams. Can I make a big shout out to the Northern Districts Athletics Club and the Salisbury Little Athletics Club for the exciting races on the day.

This year, the event was held at the Bridgestone Reserve, which is a significant new parkland, a recreation and fitness play space for all ages. This reserve was officially opened on 31 March 2017 by Mayor Gillian Aldridge and Bridgestone Australia and New Zealand managing director, Andrew Moffatt. The 6.8-hectare site was donated to the Salisbury community by Bridgestone following the closure of their local manufacturing operations in 2010. It has two spacious parkland areas, plenty of playground equipment (including a flying fox), a fitness loop, sheltered barbecues, a sheltered picnic area, toilet facilities, ample car parking, footpaths and lighting.

The Bridgestone Reserve is irrigated via stormwater management, something for which the City of Salisbury has built an international reputation of excellence. Most excitingly—and I see the former minister for sport is here—it received funding of \$1 million in round 1 of the Sporting Surfaces Program for the installation of a synthetic athletics track. That was a very exciting announcement, a true commitment to our northern suburbs. This project will transform the local reserve into a regional athletics destination. The project will install on site an eight-lane (10-lane main straight), 400-metre synthetic athletics track and a large single D area for jump activities, steeplechase, triple jump

facilities and throw events. I understand that this will be only the second location for a synthetic athletics track in South Australia.

In addition to assisting the local community at a club level, it will also be a well-suited position for local and regional school and interschool competitions, and it might act as a secondary or overflow state facility when the SA Athletics Stadium undergoes maintenance or repair. The track will be certified to meet the technical requirements for use in all international athletics competitions by the International Association of Athletics Federation. It will be fantastic.

This was the second time I went along to the Salisbury Plays event. I have to say that it is an event that my son looks forward to. He was there with the member for King and her son and, of course, the member for Wright, whose electorate it is now in; mine is on one side of the street and his is the other. He brought along his wonderful twins and his eldest daughter. It has been very well received and engages with lots of different community groups. There were probably more than 500 people there on Sunday, which has built up from the event that was held the year before. What I really like, when we hold an event in Salisbury, is the number and diversity of stallholders and organisations.

The Northern Districts Baseball Club was there, as were the Mawson Lakes Lions Club and the South Australian Parkour Association. Parkour is very interesting. You jump around all sorts of outside things. My son, who likes jumping on our lounge, had a good experience putting that to good use. The Para Hills Knights Soccer Club, the Salisbury rowing club, GKR Karate, the Rotary Club of Salisbury and the 1<sup>st</sup> Salisbury Scouts Group also attended.

I thank everyone who contributed, and the next Salisbury Plays event, which is partnered with Nature Play South Australia, will be held at St Kilda playground on Sunday 14 October.

#### **ROYAL COMMISSION INTO AGED CARE QUALITY AND SAFETY**

**Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (15:33):** I rise to welcome the Prime Minister's announcement on Sunday regarding the establishment of an aged-care royal commission. Residents in aged-care systems, their families and service providers should stay informed about the progress and be ready and prepared to have their say. I will be encouraging those in my electorate of Finniss to get engaged and make sure they are part of the process and make sure, if they have concerns they would like to raise, they do so.

Anyone can provide an email address at the Australian government's aged-care website to stay in touch with developments and also to have some input into the terms of reference. For those who do not have email in my electorate I am more than happy to help them through my electoral office if they wish to do so. I am very keen to keep everyone in the Finniss electorate informed. This is very important for my electorate. There are many people in the electorate and in my community who are retired, spending their latter years in the community; some of them, as they become more frail, end up in nursing homes in the community. We need to make sure that we do everything we can to protect them as we go forward.

One thing we have to be very careful about, though, is understanding that the royal commission will not solve everything. It might highlight some issues and we will need to look for solutions, but we need to make sure that we do everything we can to get the right recommendations out of the commission and to make sure that the more serious cases are referred to the courts. There certainly will not be a silver bullet, I am sure, out of this royal commission; if there were, I am sure others would have fixed this a long time ago to make sure that we do not see mistreatment in our retirement homes.

It will be a combination of many solutions and implementing the resources and oversight to make sure that we lift up to the standard the community expects. The royal commission will enable the government to determine the scope of the problem and the necessary response. It will be the government's response that matters the most in the process. This week marks the anniversary of the closure of Oakden—a shameful chapter in our state's history, which has nevertheless resulted in significant reviews of aged care nationally and a more robust compliance regime. Requirements of stricter compliance have seen about a dozen facilities across Australia shut down in the past year and many others on notice to improve their performance.

Clearly, the Morrison government wants to make sure that it is not missing anything. The Australian government spent about \$18.6 billion on aged care in the previous financial year, and spending is projected to increase over the next five years to \$23.6 billion. Demand for aged care is only going to increase in coming years, as people are living longer and staying at home longer. Once they move from their homes into the care that is required, we are going to have to make sure that they are cared for.

The ratio of people working to older people requiring their support is falling. We need to make sure that the levels are those needed to make sure that people are cared for. We need a long-term plan and a strong and healthy economy to ensure that Australia has the resources to meet the aged-care demand in the future, and I am pleased that this point was so strongly made by the Prime Minister's announcement. We will need significant resources to meet increased demand and a strong, healthy economy to pay for it.

While the royal commission will provide an opportunity for people to air their concerns or grievances about the current substandard care, it is extremely important that everyone keeps an eye firmly on the future of aged care in Australia. It is important that if anyone has immediate concerns about substandard care they understand that they can contact the Aged Care Complaints Commissioner or lodge complaints online. Do not wait for the royal commission.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mawson.

#### **MAYO BY-ELECTION**

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:38):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I congratulate you on your recent wedding as well. Well done.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I am a bit sad because the footy season is coming to an end, and I have had a great winter out there at the country footy. Down in Kangaroo Island, there are five clubs, so a population of 4,500 people spread over 4,500 square kilometres sustains five clubs that have three footy teams plus a whole heap of netball teams going out every week.

I think that Kangaroo Island has one of the highest ratios of sport participation anywhere in Australia. It was terrific to be over there on the weekend for the grand finals in the footy and the netball. Well done the Hounds from Kingscote. They were up for three grand finals on Saturday and took out all three. The colts have kids aged between 10 and 16 with some girls and some boys, so there was a fair bit of height disparity in that game. The smaller kids had plenty of ticker, took plenty of good marks and displayed plenty of wonderful skills.

The Colts won the B-grade and the A-grade, both against Western Districts, or Wonks as they are known. Last year, it was Western Districts, who had risen from the bottom of the ladder to take out the premiership in both the A-grade and the B-grade. This time, Kingscote, which had had a long drought in getting premiership flags, took out that honour. It was the first time since 1974—in fact, only the second time in history—that Kingscote won all three games on the one day.

I must also congratulate Dudley United Netball Club, which beat Wisanger in the final of the A-grade netball. Well done to a team that has had a lot of success. They have won 11 of the past 13 A-grade grand finals on Kangaroo Island.

This week, we will turn out for the Great Southern Football League grand finals at Mount Compass. It is going to be a pretty early start with the Junior Colts heading out there at about 9.15am. Willunga is playing in the Junior Colts and also in the Senior Colts. In the B-grade, it is Willunga versus Myponga-Sellicks, so I am going to have split duties. I will probably just have to wear some neutral colours because both of those wonderful teams are in my electorate. I think I am leaning a little bit towards Myponga because they have had a long drought.

Nick Hutchinson, who is the head of Fleurieu Milk and also a very handy footballer, has played 227 games, but until two weeks ago he had never played in a winning final so, to Nick and all the Mudlarks, all the very best for Saturday. Of course, I hope Willunga go very well also. The Demons have been a very successful powerhouse club for many years in the Great Southern Football League.

In the A-grade, what a Cinderella story this is. After three wooden spoons in a row, a new coach has come back home to McLaren and taken over the reins. Gianni Petrucci has taken them from three-time wooden spooners to grand finalists in one year. Two weeks ago, they knocked off Willunga down at Encounter Bay and what a thrilling game that was. Only a couple of points were in it in the end. Last Saturday, they beat Mount Compass to go through to the grand final against Langhorne Creek, so it has been a real lift for the people of McLaren Vale and McLaren Flat, who came together to form the McLaren Eagles a couple of decades ago. Country footy and country netball are tremendous activities that bring people together right around our state each and every weekend during the winter months.

I want to again mention Gianni Petrucci. He left McLaren Eagles and his first coaching role was at the Reynella Wineflies, where he took them to two flags. He went on to Sturt's B-grade and took them to two flags and was then offered the job back down at McLaren to come and coach. He wanted to be around his kids. I have to say that the culture change that has happened in that club this year has been absolutely outstanding. I saw him in the rooms after the win against Willunga two weeks ago. He had his young son on his hip and his daughter holding his hand in the room after the game as he addressed the players.

All that is in stark contrast to what happened in the SANFL over the weekend. The SANFL need to get their act into gear and make sure that never happens again. Like a lot of people, I was delighted to see North get into the grand final after a long drought of premiership success, but you cannot have more than the required 18 people on the field. I think the SANFL need to make some changes to make sure that this never ever happens again. I feel very sorry for the Eagles. They probably deserve to be there up against Norwood on Sunday in the SANFL grand final.

#### REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

**Mrs POWER (Elder) (15:43):** I rise today to talk about an issue that I, along with many of my parliamentary colleagues, including the members for Waite, Black and Gibson and the federal member for Boothby, fought very hard for during the state election campaign and one that I am proud to have been able to deliver for the residents living not only in my electorate but across southern Adelaide, and that is reactivating the Repat.

The Repatriation General Hospital, affectionally known as the Repat, resides within my seat of Elder, and its closure was a big blow to our local community. The former Labor government announced the closure of the Repat in 2015. What followed this announcement was outrage by medical staff, veterans and the community at large and such outrage was, without a doubt, justified.

The Repat Hospital had been gifted to the state government by the federal government. It was a special place with significant meaning to many South Australians. Further, the Labor government had promised it would never, ever close the Repat. So, in the face of such betrayal, supporters across the state rallied together to protest against the Labor government's decision to close and sell the Repat site.

In opposition, the Liberal Party recognised the previous Labor government's failings and we sought an alternative way forward. We formed a dedicated 'renew the Repat' working committee, which included the now Minister for Health and Wellbeing, members of the local community, health professionals and experts, and representatives of the veteran community. The committee met almost every single fortnight.

We worked extremely hard to find alternative ways forward in light of Labor's reckless decisions. We hosted three community forums prior to the election, as well as setting up information booths at Mitcham Shopping Centre and Castle Plaza Shopping Centre. We letterboxed our electorates with information on Labor's plans and what could be done to stop the development at the Repat site. We did indeed fight hard on this issue alongside the community, listening to what the community wanted and responding to what was needed with our policy to revive the Repat.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the many volunteers who gave up their time to help revive the Repat and drive this change for our community. Thank you to Gary Owens, Augustinus Krikke and Jock McCowan, and all those who slept on the steps of Parliament House for those 161 cold nights; Professor Warren Jones, Elizabeth Hobbin, Christine Doerr, John Besanko, Neil and Carla Baron and Dr Robert Black, who together formed the committee that continues to

meet today; the late Guy Bowering; and every single individual who signed the petition or attended one of my community forums.

We promised that, if elected, we would save the Repat from Labor's wrecking ball known as Transforming Health and ensure the site was used as a genuine health precinct. We are delivering on our promise. In last week's budget, we revealed \$20 million forgone in revenue to stop Labor's sale of the Repat and allow the site to be reactivated as a genuine health precinct. The Repat is a big site and there is much room on the site outside of us delivering on our commitments. Unlike the previous government, we are consulting with the local community, health experts and professionals to collectively determine the best use of the site.

Last month, we held our fifth community forum regarding the Repat. This was our second since we won the election. The latest community forum had an incredible turnout, with approximately 170 people coming together to hear from the Minister for Health and Wellbeing and the expert panel, which included Professor Warren Jones, Elizabeth Hobbin and Christine Doerr about the possibilities for the site. Community consultation closed just a few days ago, and I have been advised that there have been over 1,000 submissions. Again, this shows how passionate our community is about the Repat.

The feedback from my local community has been overwhelmingly positive and helped place our new Marshall Liberal government as a driver of positive change for our community. I am very proud to have been part of this change. As we begin to see the site reactivated as a health precinct, I would like to thank the community for their overwhelming support and dedication to this issue. We have shown that there is great power in people coming together for a common and good cause. Together we can create positive change for our community, and together that is exactly what we are doing now.

#### *Bills*

### **APPROPRIATION BILL 2018**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

**Mr GEE (Taylor) (15:49):** I will continue my remarks. I left off before the break talking about R U OK? Day, with all the former auto industry workers who were invited back to the old Holden site.

One of the concerns with the cuts to these programs is that we are going to leave behind a number of these workers and their families, as well as a number of the participants who were benefiting from the support of the team at the Northern Connections or from different programs run by Gail and her former team at the Northern Futures. Gail's team was assisting jobseekers with crucial skills. They were also assisting employers to access skilled and work-ready jobseekers, as well as unemployed and underemployed people to develop the skills and abilities that they need to access work or to obtain additional hours of work.

The funding for these programs will be axed, resulting in job losses. The message is that, unless these people want a traineeship or an apprenticeship, they are really not worthy of help. In fact, unless you want to be a trainee or an apprentice, this is a bad budget as far as training and education goes. Across the state, seven TAFE campuses will close and savings will be sought at those that remain open.

It is a dark time for TAFE. When we have the Victorian state government and the federal opposition ready to invest heavily in TAFE with fully funded places, our institutions are being devalued. We need real investment in TAFE so that it can continue to deliver for all South Australians who want to access higher education through TAFE.

Regarding schooling, we know that upgrades are being delayed or reprioritised across primary and secondary schools, with funds being moved to fund the transition of year 7 to high school and away from the projects that school communities need. In the north, the new birth to 12 school announced by the previous government—and I want to give credit to the new government—is going to be brought forward by a year. However, the problem we have now is that we do not have any

details on the location, the catchment zone or anything else, and that school is going to open in just over three years.

The principals of the John Hartley School and Mark Oliphant College, the last two schools built in my area, were already on board long before the schools opened—in fact, when the schools were being discussed. Of course, that made it very beneficial. We need decisions and actions to be taken. Everybody in the north is talking about the new school, because the schools are so overcrowded, and the fact that this government is bringing that school forward a whole year. So it is a very positive measure, and a lot of families are moving into Virginia, Angle Vale, Munno Para and the back of Andrews Farm.

On the other side, though, it is disappointing to hear that the \$5 million upgrade of Elizabeth North Primary School has been delayed—that should have already been implemented—denying the students the opportunity to use the state-of-the-art facilities for drama and music. This school really needs some modern facilities, which is essential for the students at that school.

Last week, with the Minister for Education, I visited the Burton Primary School, and I look forward to heading to Swallowcliffe and the Two Wells primary schools, where we are going to open their new STEM facilities. It is good news that those upgrades have gone ahead. Our school leaders, teachers and SSOs are obviously doing a great job. Hopefully, we are not going to see any cuts to those people. In fact, we need more teachers and more SSOs.

Slashing bus routes and the delivery of the Gawler rail electrification are two good things that this government is doing. Perhaps the highlights of the entire transport announcements in this budget are those two things really: slashing bus routes and the electrification of the Gawler rail line. It is pretty good to see this. It is a lot of money. It does not really create any ongoing jobs. I am not sure how many extra people are going to be transported on these trains.

I am not sure how much extra industry is going to be created by these trains and this electrification, but at this time it is something that we are happy to have. The people in the north want it. It is a thing that will probably see us good in the future, at a time like this when what we really need is schools, so this school has to be delivered. The timing of this will be just before the next state election.

One of the things that I will say—and I do not think there would be too many people who are currently sitting in the house here who have ever been on the Adelaide to Gawler train—

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Pederick):** Absolutely!

**Mr GEE:** —but one thing we need is more carriages. You cannot get on that train unless you are standing up. By the time it has visited a few stops it is chock-a-block. Sorry, Acting Speaker, were you saying you wanted to join me on the train one day? One of the things we do really need on there is more transit officers, especially on the city to Gawler line.

In terms of the slashing of bus routes, the community is asking why you would not look at different service options, such as smaller buses. Some of the communities I look after, including Angle Vale, Virginia and Two Wells, do not have many buses now and the buses they do have do not have a lot of people on them, but they might just be people who are shift workers working in the food industry and things like that. A lot of those people do not need a full-size bus or an articulated bus. There are different options to cutting bus routes by using different types of vehicles.

I really think that most of the public transport systems do not run at a profit. The only one I am aware of that does, probably anywhere in the world—I will have to look into this—is the Queensland public transport system. As far as I know, it is one of the only ones in the world that actually runs at a profit. If you have ever used those buses, trains and the river system they have there with public transport, you know that those services have not just drivers but also guards and ticket people. It is very secure, very safe, and a lot of people use them because they feel safe, and that drops the price of the system as well. The profit they make more than covers all of that.

My local residents probably find it quite interesting to read in the budget papers that the government is planning on spending \$150,000 on a feasibility study to extend the Adelaide Metro bus service to Murray Bridge, while we are cutting out other routes. In a letter from minister Knoll to me last week regarding more services for Angle Vale, Virginia and also extending services to Two

Wells, which locals really want, the minister advises that the introduction of a new service would require either additional funding or reallocating existing public transport resources from other areas across the metropolitan network into those areas. You cannot have both or different: it either has to be one or the other.

The closure of Service SA offices in the budget is really short-sighted. The Service SA centres at Modbury, Mitcham and Prospect will close, while a new Service SA will open at Mount Barker. The Treasurer says that the reason three centres should close is reduced client numbers, with more people accessing the services online. Why close three centres and then open a new centre? It does not make sense. I have used this service a couple of times online but, even while I have been waiting, after a week or two I will call in to the service centre and get the same papers, the same papers I have been waiting for online for a couple of weeks.

Premier Marshall promised better services, yet this is the opposite: now he is closing Service SA centres. Most South Australians rely on Service SA centres to access essential services, such as to renew their driver's licences and car rego. Obviously, in those Service SA centres that are not closing the queues are going to be out the door because people are not going to use the online services. Most people who use Service SA go there in their lunchtime or their smoko. They just rush in and rush out; they are not going to be there for a long time.

We know that, on top of closing TAFE campuses and Service SA sites, the Liberal government are looking to privatise the Adelaide Remand Centre, a maximum security prison facility in the Adelaide CBD, and have flagged potential privatisation of SA Medical Imaging services and SA Pathology. It is a very concerning start to the first budget, when we know that the government, when they were last on the treasury bench, privatised ETSA and so much else. That is why I am saying that this budget seems like a continuation of the Treasurer's last budget 17 years ago.

The government are also off and running with their privatisation agenda in health. The last time they were government, they privatised Modbury Hospital. This time, they are looking to start their privatisation of health by privatising patient transfers between Modbury Hospital and the Lyell McEwin. I will wrap up there, and I look forward to making some further comments as we move through the Appropriation Bill.

**Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (16:02):** I rise to support the state budget of 2018-19—the first, in my view, in the reform and repair era of the Marshall Liberal government. In doing so, I want to report that I cannot help but reflect on the palpable disappointment that the budget has caused, principally of course to those opposite: Labor and its associated cheerleaders. There has been lots of confected outrage and lots of stunts, but in its core, and in their souls, Labor is disappointed in this budget for a variety of reasons. The first is that they knew how parlous the state's financial situation was that they left behind. It was laughably bad. The result and their attempts to hide it were even more laughable, and I will speak further on that shortly.

Labor clearly hoped that this government would respond in much the same way as they would have, which, historically, has been to flog more assets and, if there were any left, to grab the cash from those assets and then just make the rest of it up. When we are being lectured by those opposite about asset sales, etc., let's just remember that it was they who sold our forests and they who sold the Motor Accident Commission. They even tried to sell the Repat and SA Pathology, but they were beaten to the punch on both of those by the imminent election.

They secretly sold the rights to the motor registration data and the driver's licence data of all South Australians for \$80 million. Again, this was done secretly—a cash grab. Under that agreement, the state is contractually obliged to use its best endeavours to commercialise the motor registration and driver licensing registry within three years, or repay the \$80 million or grant a seven-year extension to the 40-year term of the land services agreement, which is already in place. Again, this is completely secret, flogging not just the asset itself but also the data, the information that pertains to South Australians' motor vehicle registrations and their driver's licences.

This budget, in contrast with Labor's spectacular failures and their world-record deceit, is about growing jobs. It is about \$11.3 billion in infrastructure spending and commitments to South Australia, South Australians and South Australian jobs. This budget is, importantly, about lowering

costs for South Australian households and small businesses. It is about an incoming government delivering on all its election commitments—over 300 of them. No wonder Labor are disappointed.

To be fair, they are not called the opposition for nothing. They reckon we cut some programs. We certainly did, and I am going to use one of those programs—a personal favourite of mine—by way of comparison because to me it says so much about what is wrong with Labor and their stifling, stale, Stalinist views and methods. We cut the Dob in a Litterer program. This program was a Stasi-style, Stalinist program; it looked like a refugee from the Stalinist state. It was designed to enable the community to dob in people they saw littering. To that end, a website was provided, and there were also phone apps, both Android and Apple iOS apps, designed to enable South Australians to dob each other in to the government.

I happened upon a little treasure trove of what, as I said, is something out of the Stasi files and provides some data on this particularly important—certainly from Labor's point of view—program. Since its inception in February 2017, there have been a grand total of 1,937 reports of people littering received. The details enable us to ascertain that 1,505 of those were able to progress, and unfortunately—certainly in the view of the authors—432 could not progress.

What was also interesting was that in the first three months of the program a series of warning letters—there was a separate table entry for warning letters—were sent out. I was very interested to learn that in the first three months—that is, February, March and April of 2017—a total of about 310 letters were sent out warning people and that for the balance of the program there were 10. In other words, there were no more warning letters. Why were there no more warning letters? Because they were making money from it—not a great deal of money, it should be said.

The interesting thing is that about \$350,000 has been made by the program over the course of its sad little life, and I am able to ascertain that, notwithstanding that in classic Labor style the spreadsheet did not add up. But with a little bit of work and a little bit of patience, I was able to correct the errors, and I am delighted to report to all and sundry that the late unlamented Dob in a Litterer program did produce, as I said, about 350 grand.

What is also interesting is that the vast majority of those fines—about 78 per cent—were for cigarette butts. There is also an interesting split: north-south, east-west, central etc., and I can inform those people who are resident in the south of Adelaide that they accounted for some 24 per cent of this particular little program. In other words, the gouge of people from the south by the Dob in a Litterer program was about 90-odd grand. As I said, that has been cut. That is a personal favourite insofar as what, to me at least, were the warped priorities under the budgets put in place by those opposite.

By way of contrast, I move to recite and look at what, to me at least, are some of the statewide highlights of the budget, not the least of which being a \$30 million allocation of additional funds to help with the additional needs of children in care. Again, that is a recognition by this government of the parlous state of that part of our collective social responsibility when we came into government.

It has been well remarked, but it is worthwhile reiterating, that we have put \$360 million over the next four years back into the hands of South Australians and lowered their household costs by virtue of reinstating the emergency services levy remission. South Australians are now commenting, and the Premier has made the point, as have many people in my electorate of Davenport, that they are delighted to see the tangible benefit of the effective halving, is how it has been put to me, of their emergency services levy, and that is the delivery of a fundamental election promise made by this government.

I am also particularly taken by some of the developments insofar as the education system is concerned. Again, it is no wonder that Labor is disappointed. I refer to the fact that we have made a record investment in education, and that is a hallmark of the Marshall Liberal government's first budget. We are investing more than \$1 billion in capital projects. Recurrent annual funding to schools will also increase by \$515 million from 2017-18 to 2021-22 under the Marshall Liberal government. That is a record investment.

Additional education-based measures include \$21 million over four years to support the government's Literacy Guarantee, which is an important initiative designed to give the young in our state the best possible opportunities in a globally competitive environment in which they are growing



up. I was particularly happy to see \$12.2 million over four years supporting the government's Languages in Schools initiative, which includes enabling four new public schools to offer the highly regarded International Baccalaureate as well as expanding the Languages Alive holiday program for primary schools.

I commend the Minister for Education and this government for its investment in the International Baccalaureate and for giving high schools the opportunity to avail themselves of the benefits it brings to not just students and teachers but the means by which those schools can go about educating the youth. With record spending, record capital and record recurrent spending in our education budget, no wonder Labor is disappointed—though it is good news for South Australians.

As a government, we brought about relief, as promised, in the election for people committing the crime of endeavouring to employ South Australians. We have wound back the payroll tax take in this state by \$157 million, and that will result in some 3,200 businesses being exempt from having to pay payroll tax from the start of January next year. I have spoken to businesses in my electorate of Davenport that will be some \$40,000 or thereabouts better off as a direct result of that initiative. It is designed to enable them to employ more people and particularly more young people. Lowering costs and growing jobs is what this budget does.

Additionally, we have reduced land tax by around \$96 million over the course of the forward estimates and invested \$43 million in cutting elective surgery waiting times. I will speak some more about that shortly. We have invested \$1 million to establish a dedicated paediatric eating disorder service. We have spent just under \$30 million doubling the value of school sports vouchers, from \$50 under the previous government to \$100, as a demonstrable, tangible, very real and in particular grassroots-based means to enable students, families and young people to access sports. It also helps establish sports clubs to provide services to our communities.

We have spent and will continue to spend \$1.4 million per annum, with effect from the start of January, removing the \$59.40 charge that is levied at present for DCSI clearances on sporting volunteers. Labor charged individuals in question full retail for those clearances. For someone involved in a sporting club who utilises those, we spent many thousands of dollars as a volunteer organisation paying for clearances which, arguably, should have been provided free of charge, given the work those volunteers are doing. I am delighted to reinforce the fact that this government, in this budget, has delivered \$1.4 million in ongoing reductions by making these clearances available free of charge.

We have additionally spent \$203 million in conjunction with the federal government on skills and training proposals. Fulfilling an election commitment, we have allocated \$1 million for an independent inquiry into water pricing, which has been a quiet but nonetheless prevalent part of the cost of South Australian households, having increased considerably over the rate of inflation over the course of the previous government.

I move now to consider my seat of Davenport and the south of Adelaide in particular. My view is that the south has always been ignored by Labor unless they were looking to make cuts in services. Basic infrastructure was ignored and/or cut under Labor, especially roads, health and recreational facilities. Did Labor provide funding for roads, hospitals and recreation? No, they did not in my electorate and in the south. They certainly funded and they certainly took money, as I described, with the Dob in a Litterer program.

I first of all want to talk about health. We inherited a situation at Flinders Medical Centre, which is in my electorate of Davenport, where, as a result of an intensive and very interesting tour that I was fortunate to be given by the people at Flinders, I was provided with some numbers that I think adequately describe the completely disgraceful state of our health system generally and in particular what has been foisted upon Flinders as a result of the Transforming Health debacle.

In 2011, the Flinders emergency department pushed 60,000 people through a facility designed to enable 70,000 people to be treated. In 2018, seven years later, it has been forced to push 90,000 people through that same facility—an increase of 50 per cent in seven years. I do not think the spike in presentations to the facility is surprising.

On the subject of health, in 2010, then premier Mike Rann, standing in front of the Repatriation Hospital, said 'never ever' would that be closed under a Labor government. In 2011, they closed its emergency department. I invite you, Mr Speaker, to consider the numbers I have just quoted to see whether in fact that had some impact. I suggest that clearly it has. In November 2017, they shut the entire hospital at great cost to the 675 staff and 200 volunteers who worked there.

What this government has done in this budget is stop the Repat being flogged off to developers, as was the plan under Labor. To show just how close they got, we have forgone \$19.725 million in revenue from the proposed sale, by Labor, of that site to developers. That was in 2017, after they stood in front of it in 2010 and said, 'We will never ever close it.'

Continuing on the subject of health, we are restoring and reactivating the Repat. We face a tenfold increase in elective surgery, which took off from November 2017. I wonder why. Maybe it had something to do with the closure of the Repat. That will be addressed by the \$43 million in funding specifically directed to rectifying that.

Insofar as roads are concerned, I first move to consider the work we have done fixing the very short-sighted—some would say cheap and shoddy—means by which the Southern Expressway was completed under Labor, in particular the fact that no—I repeat, no—preventative measures were employed to address rock throwing, despite there being clear evidence that it was necessary.

We have funded a total of \$15 million to put throw screens on 10 bridges, implement 12 security cameras and improve fencing to limit access to rocks. That will be completed by the first quarter of 2019. Whilst we are on the subject, I would like to commend South Australia Police on its Operation Watercolour and its recent successes in that regard and, on behalf of everyone in the south, I make it clear that we certainly do not mind the helicopters flying around keeping people on that road safe.

In Davenport, we have allocated \$6.4 million to fix Flagstaff Road. The Liberals are going to fix the road. It has allocated the cash. That is precisely \$6.4 million more than Labor ever did, and it is worthwhile recapping or reiterating the fact that I noted with great interest that our newly installed federal Labor member is seeking to muddy the water in that regard. Just to be clear, the only thing that Labor has done in the past is to vote against fixing Flagstaff Road. So we will fix it to the tune of \$6.4 million.

We have allocated \$5.2 million to Candy Road. Again, previously the Labor Party allocated precisely zero dollars to fixing that road. We have allocated, from a recreational perspective, \$10 million to Glenthorne national park, part of which is centred in or around my seat of Davenport with the Happy Valley Reservoir. We have already delivered \$500,000 in funding for female-friendly change rooms and an upgrade to the Flagstaff Community Centre.

I will close by making the point that the era of fake surpluses and Labor financial ineptitude is now over. The deliberate neglect and pillaging of Adelaide's south is now over. This budget delivers for South Australians and it delivers on our election promises, including those that I made regarding Flagstaff Road, Candy Road, Glenthorne national park and the Flagstaff Community Centre. This is a budget that delivers roads, recreation and health for my community, and I commend it to the house.

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (16:22):** What an eventful fortnight we have had in South Australia. How exciting has the 2018 budget been—incredible! As a former prime minister turned upper east sider once said not so long ago, 'There's never been a more exciting time to be an Australian,' but for our purposes I am sure we can change the copy to read 'South Australian'.

It was all good news. The government had prevailed. It had won the election. The Liberal Party had figured it out finally and now, after 16 cold years in the wilderness, they were here. The band was finally back together. Now, on this side of the house, we have heard this song before. We know how it goes, but those opposite tried their best to deceive the people of South Australia beyond March.

They swore to us black and blue that the line-up had changed, that they had cleaned up their act and that they had a whole new catalogue of hits to unveil come budget night. Anyone understands that no matter how hard you try to reinvent yourself you always return to the classics and, just like

Barnsey and Farnsey, that is what we saw in this place two weeks ago. The band was ready for its comeback performance.

Sadly, it did not go according to plan. In fact, it went so badly that the lead singer, the Premier himself, went missing. He went to ground in the last two weeks. Where has he been? Is he in witness protection from his own budget? I for one would like to hear more from the Premier about this budget, to explain to the South Australian people the backflips and the broken promises—the greatest hits of the South Australian Liberal Party.

Of course, I admit that I am partial to the one hit that the Premier likes to roll out from time to time. I have heard his hit song 'Vote Labor', and I like to replay it when I am having a party. However, we have also had the entire band seemingly forget how to play their instruments. What should have been their greatest masterpiece was just a cacophonous mess. This was not going well at all, but what to do? Sadly for all South Australians, they fired up the DeLorean and, as the flux capacitor began pulsating more rapidly, it was 'back to the future' for the South Australian Liberal Party.

The Premier, having lost his voice, blew out the cobwebs from the Treasurer's seat in the other place and invited him over here to lead the band, and what a performance it was. It was just like the good old days, as if no time had passed at all. It was as if they were all transported back in time to an era when the state government was at war with the unions and the public sector, when any state asset that was not nailed down was divvied up and sold off and when those doing it hardest were unfairly targeted with higher costs and fewer services. The Crows were on top and on track to win their second grand final, *MMMBop* was on the radio and ETSA was on the chopping block. It was good times for them.

Of course, I make light of the Marshall-Lucas 2018 budget because if we did not laugh we would cry, and many have. Many more will as the true impact of this budget is felt around our communities and throughout the regions in the weeks and months ahead. It truly is a budget of blatant broken promises and bolshie backflips.

I have heard interjections in this place and in the media that at least this budget is not as bad as the car crash Abbott-Hockey 2014 budget, given that it was prime minister Abbott's first budget, just as this is the first for Premier Marshall. But I have to say that, if you use the 2014 federal budget as your unit of measurement, you are setting yourself a pretty low bar. This is a government that went to the people of South Australia, hand on heart and cap in hand, promising an antiprivatisation agenda. Only months later, the Premier has broken faith with the people of South Australia with his plan to sell, to privatise and to cut.

I will start with one of the biggest issues in my portfolio space, and indeed the entire budget document, and that is Premier Marshall's cruel and unusual fascination with going after South Australia's most vulnerable. This time it is in the form of a spike in the rents of South Australia's most vulnerable Housing Trust tenants in one-bedroom cottages and bedsits. These accommodations are very basic, hence they attract a lower percentage of the tenant's income or entitlement and always have done, that is, around 18 to 21 per cent and not the 25 per cent that is usual.

For many who are unable to find work or unable to work for a number of social or health-related reasons, this increase in rent, as much as \$10 per week for some tenants, is not even the difference between treating themselves once a fortnight to a finger bun or a coffee at the local cafe or going without; it is the difference between running a car, buying medicine to stay out of hospital, having a hot meal or going to bed with a heater on and staying warm.

Those opposite are always banging on about getting government out of the way, improving the bottom line of small businesses and encouraging more people to spend their money on goods and services in our local economy, but they have their hands in the pockets of the most vulnerable. By denying them access to any form of disposable income at all—and, yes, Housing Trust tenants are entitled to have some disposable income—Premier Marshall is locking people out of the South Australian economy. These vulnerable South Australians rarely make extra trips to the supermarket or buy coffees. They can rarely afford fish and chips on a hot night by the beach in warmer months. They just dream about not being cold and about getting a fair go.

It hurts many of South Australia's most disadvantaged Housing Trust tenants, including elderly pensioners and those living with a disability, but it also hurts small local businesses who rely on their very occasional purchases to cover their bottom line. It is a double whammy by a government that spent 16 years rehearsing their sound bites but neglecting proper policy development.

I have spent the past two weeks meeting with Housing Trust tenants and many, many providers. None were aware of the Premier's secret plan to hike up the rents on South Australians living on the margins. It is cruel and it is unfair. Under these new arrangements, many Housing Trust tenants are likely to be facing not only one \$10 per week increase in their rent but, overall, this could be up to \$50 come 2021. Not only will many Housing Trust tenants be forced to find an additional \$520 this year to cover their rent but by 2021 some could be looking at paying an extra \$2,600 in annual rent for their same property, be that a cottage, a bedsit or a unit. This is nothing short of highway robbery.

I have done my research. I have gone through the government's pre-election material. I brewed a pot of coffee and I thumbed through not only the Premier's 'Our First 100 Days' but also the critically panned tome '2036', and can I say, 'What a read.' But it probably will not surprise anyone in the house today or watching from afar that there was no mention of Housing Trust rent hikes before the election. Nothing on our most disadvantaged paying anywhere between an extra \$10 and \$50 a week in rent. Nothing, zero, zilch, nada. Nothing about the elderly and those living with a disability being forced to pay an extra \$520 to \$2,600 in rent each year.

Who in this place was thankful for their reduction in their ESL bill because they could afford groceries? This reduction for many, and for most of us, was equivalent to the rise in rent for Housing Trust tenants. It is a disgrace. We do not need that reduction; the Housing Trust tenants need that money. It will make the difference between them being able to drive their car to their appointments, buy their medication so that they stay out of hospital and meet the basics and live a decent life. It is a disgrace.

The land tax reductions that you are all spruiking to your rich mates—your rich mates own multimillion-dollar parcels of land and get tens of thousands of dollars in reductions in land tax, which is more than any one of these people will get every year on their benefits—are another disgrace. The public loathe governments that promise one thing before an election and deliver exactly the opposite after it. They also loathe governments that do not tell people what they are going to deliver afterwards and then deliver cruel cuts and shut the doors of Service SA so that they cannot even get there to renew their licences.

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms COOK:** I sat and listened quietly to the rubbish coming out from those opposite; I expect the same. It discredits the legitimacy of government and casts a pall over our profession as parliamentarians and community leaders. A broken promise is as bad as an omission. It is our duty to serve our constituencies with honour—to mean what we say and to work hard every day to deliver it. Sadly, the Premier has chosen to say one thing to get himself elected and then do another once behind the desk. It is an indictment on everyone on that side of the house, and the South Australian public will not easily forget this breach of faith.

Of course, while the Premier has jacked up the rent on our vulnerable Housing Trust tenants on one hand, he is busy jacking up the take-home pay of his handpicked chair of the new Housing Authority board. While the chair of the former Housing Trust board was remunerated at around \$33,000 a year, the Premier has decided to jack up the pay for the new chair to \$70,700 a year—nearly double. Thanks, Premier Marshall. That is around \$6,500 per meeting every time the board meets on their schedule. The extravagance on display, while those doing it the hardest are asked to do more and more with less and less, is breathtaking. It is a clear sign of where this government's priorities lie.

I would also like to draw attention to the government's decision to initiate the free volunteer screening checks through the Department of Human Services from 1 January 2019. Of course I welcome this decision; it is a great announcement for volunteers who give so much to our community. But I know, after having met with over 150 organisations, these organisations expected those screening checks to come in this year. They have not budgeted for them and they are struggling. It

is thousands and thousands of dollars in screenings that they had not budgeted to pay for between 1 July and 31 December this year. It is news to them that there is no relief on the screening until next year.

Organisations that live a hand-to-mouth existence are doing it tough. I have spoken with them. They welcome the decision, but they urge the government to change its mind and bring those volunteer screenings forward so that they can get on with doing what they do best: providing services to vulnerable people in our state. It is just not good enough. According to the Office for Volunteers, the volunteering economy in South Australia is worth \$5 billion per annum.

Approximately 920,000 South Australians volunteer an estimated 1.76 million hours every week. It is quite incredible, so why this could be put at risk by the government is beyond me. The minister in the other place needs to shake off her cloak of invisibility around the cabinet table and fight for the volunteers, fight for those who already deliver so much for South Australia, fight for those who are being forced to scrap programs to meet their costs because they have been misled.

I also remain concerned that, despite the pre-election commitment to make volunteer screening free for all applicants, there lacks clarity around this. The budget papers talk only about volunteer screening for those volunteers who are working with children or with vulnerable people, but there are three other sections of volunteer screening, and there is no clarity about whether they are going to be delivered. I have taken a number of phone calls on that. That needs to be clarified by this government, otherwise it is a mealy-mouthed attempt to sidestep their commitment, and I am going to be holding them to account over the coming weeks and months.

Like everyone on this side of the house, I am dismayed at the raft of cuts and broken promises that extend beyond the human services portfolio, including the closure of three Service SA centres across Adelaide, a really short-sighted decision that will only increase travel and waiting times for clients and the workload and stress on the remaining staff. Service SA centres are designed to assist those who cannot access online services themselves. It is not good enough just to say, 'Use an online service.'

Thousands of people in South Australia are unable to do this, predominantly the elderly, disabled or very young people getting their driver's licence for the first time. These closures will flow on to all other offices, and the members in the north-eastern suburbs, like the member for King and the member for Newland, will be hearing about it in the years to come, I am sure. I hope that they will join our call on a reversal of that decision.

We have the privatisation of key public assets that were not announced prior to the election. It seems to be in the DNA of the Liberal Party. What is this Americanisation of our prison system that we are looking at? Premier Marshall's plan to privatise the Adelaide Remand Centre really does put profits before jobs. The environment in the Remand Centre is very different from the environment in the Mount Gambier Prison. As to jobs and safety, it is a disgraceful backflip from a Premier who, in February this year, claimed not to have a privatisation agenda. Along with this, we see cuts to the Crime Stoppers program, money that was committed gone.

We see cuts to the surveillance grants. Cameras do not stop crime, but they can deter people and they can also catch offenders. Other things that were cut include the crime prevention and community safety grants from the Attorney-General's Department. Over the years, millions of dollars have been invested in grassroots community organisations, providing grassroots decision-making and solutions to problems in their own communities. Many of these programs were also picked up by the government and went into broader program delivery. This should be rethought as well. It removes capacity from the community to work in their own backyard.

There are more plans to privatise SA Pathology, leading to more cuts and more job losses, and we cannot forget the sword of Damocles hanging over the public transport network, with essential bus services on the chopping block. Sadly, we have already seen the doubt around the Footy Express. Public transport is not solely just the domain of commuters opting for the ease of public transport into and out of the city. It is the only option travelling between suburbs for many young, older, disabled and other people who cannot afford to buy a car or run their own car, let alone the shift workers and those in service industries.

Well, I suggest to those opposite, when you attend your early morning breakfasts, if the staff are not there, there might be a reason. It is because there are no more buses. Sadly, Premier Marshall has used this budget to again go after the most vulnerable in our community by axing these bus services that are relied upon by many. It will be up to those opposite to explain to their constituencies why these vital public transport services have been slashed. If I am getting emails about it, I bet they are.

We have public sector job losses. Around 4,000 public servants will be given their marching orders under Premier Marshall's budget of cuts and broken promises. The truth is that the Premier has never come across a public asset he did not want to sell or a public servant he did not want to sack, I am sure, but I am also as concerned about what is not in the budget as what is.

Youth and youth justice are completely ignored in the budget. There are no announcements, no policy, nothing to say, no changes around youth, nothing except for the closure of seven TAFE campuses, of course, which will make it harder for young people, particularly in our regions, to get the culture and vocational support they need to help them set up for the world of work. TAFEs do not just offer lessons; they offer a community.

Also missing from the budget is any talk about much-needed support for people living with a disability who do not qualify for the NDIS. What about the thousands of people who have not qualified? What happens to them this year? There is a small amount for transition. What is going to happen? Where is the plan? What plan does the Premier have for these people? There is no financial commitment towards the much-discussed disability advocate and no broader commitment towards this at all. What plan is there? If there is a plan, it must be communicated because the sector needs to be given some confidence moving forward that they will have a voice.

Premier Marshall has again failed to deliver certainty for both providers and consumers when it comes to the disability community. It is pushed out into the never-never. The Premier's half-hearted commitment towards disabilities is evident throughout the budget. The budget shows that South Australia is the only state without a named minister dedicated to disabilities or disability service in their title.

While I have deep reservations about much of the budget, as I discussed in the last couple of minutes, I will mention a couple of community projects that have been given the green light and that will benefit the electors of Hurtle Vale. I have worked and consulted with many in our community in the months ahead of the state election and we have secured the installation of wayfinding lights across the expressway exit at Happy Valley, Old Reynella. That will be much appreciated by not just by local residents but new people travelling to the area. It is a difficult intersection to navigate, so that will be helpful. It will improve safety for both locals and tourists. I am proud to see that delivered for our community.

I am also proud to have seen the commitment to the transformation of the meeting of Candy and South roads. That came to my attention at the 2014 by-election. I have doorknocked hundreds and hundreds of people on that issue and, when we were in government, I talked to our treasurer about that and now I see that it is being delivered. I, along with the members for Black and Davenport, I am sure, am very pleased that that is happening.

In closing, why are those opposite of the opinion that there are votes in targeting the most vulnerable in our society? It is a mystery to me. Every single member opposite who votes for the budget is voting against the most vulnerable people. They are voting for rent rises. They are voting for backflips. They are voting for broken promises. They are voting for cuts to services and the closure of Service SA centres and TAFE campuses. They are voting for Housing Trust rent increases and the sacking of public sector workers. Shame!

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (16:42):** Thank you for the opportunity to speak directly to you and my King community about our government's first budget and the good news in this budget for King and for South Australia. The Marshall Liberal government has delivered a strong budget to deliver on our election commitments and to secure South Australia's future. After 16 years of financial mismanagement, we are returning the state's budget to a sustainable position. This budget achieves a return to surplus and projects surpluses across each year of the forward estimates. I am so proud

that we are not only cleaning up a mess that we were left for our state but also, most importantly, delivering on our election promises.

Our Marshall Liberal government is taking our state forward through a budget that is fair, responsible and lays a strong foundation for the future. I am so pleased to be able to tell people living in King, with the help of my colleagues on this side of the house, that I am delivering on what they told me was most important locally and in the state. Today, I take the opportunity to share the good news for King constituents and provide accurate information for people living in King.

I have been disappointed—but, I must say, not surprised—by the inaccurate and misleading information the opposition is sharing in relation to the budget. It is a shame that constituents have to read fake news and then use their valuable time to raise concerns to get the most accurate information from me. Thanks to every community member who has contacted me with questions about the budget.

In a way, I am actually really grateful to the opposition, as each conversation on this budget has given me one-on-one time with my constituents to discuss how we on this side are getting our state back on track, lowering the cost of living, fixing up and improving our healthcare system and creating jobs in South Australia. I am pleased with this budget because I still remember the great sadness I felt when I knocked on doors where for sale signs were up in yards. These people in King told me that they were moving their family interstate because they had to find a job. This fuelled my passion even further to fight for jobs and investment in South Australia and to support a government that would implement real change for South Australia.

It is my hope that in the future the opposition will also realise that people in the north and north-east want our parties to work together to create more jobs, better services and affordable living. I urge those on the other side to cease their scare campaigns and spend more time reading and understanding how this budget will help make South Australia the best place in which to live, raise a family and work. It is my intention to work with all members of the house. It is time now to work together to achieve what is in the local community members' best interests. Let's work together to create a better future for South Australia.

I will now highlight areas of the budget that deliver on so many opportunities that people told me were important. First of all is the cost of living: the Marshall Liberal government is delivering on its key election promise to lower costs for families and businesses, with \$613.1 million in tax cuts provided in this state budget across the emergency services levy, land tax and payroll tax to create jobs and grow the economy. The 2018-19 state budget provides for a \$360 million reduction in emergency services levy bills over the next four years—a saving of more than 50 per cent for a median value household in metropolitan Adelaide, or around \$145.

The 2018-19 state budget also delivers on this government's commitment to abolish payroll tax for small businesses from 1 January next year by exempting businesses with annual taxable wages below \$1.5 million from paying payroll tax—saving businesses up to \$44,550 a year. Around 3,200 businesses will be exempt from payroll tax as a result of this measure. A further 400 businesses with payrolls between \$1.5 million and \$1.7 million will receive a reduction in the amount of payroll tax they are required to pay. I have been talking to accountants and they think this is good for businesses. I do, too.

Health was one of the most important things people raised with me when I was campaigning. The state government is investing \$1.2 billion over the next four years in the key front-line service delivery portfolios of health and wellbeing; human services, including domestic violence assistance; child protection; police; and emergency services. This is in line with the commitments that South Australians endorsed at the state election. The government has had to commit an extra \$730 million to health because of the unrealistically high levels of savings the former government had factored into the health budget's estimates.

Specific key health service commitments that King residents will be interested in are \$45 million over four years to reduce elective surgery and colonoscopy waiting lists in South Australia's public hospitals; \$23 million over four years to reinstate the high dependency unit at the Modbury Hospital; reopening the Repat as a genuine health precinct (this was raised in King); \$16 million over four years to increase palliative care support; and \$2.6 million over four years to

establish an adult safeguarding unit to protect our most vulnerable citizens (again, this was raised with me today by King residents).

Key mental health service commitments include \$2.5 million over four years for additional suicide prevention services and \$10 million over four years for a new specialist borderline personality disorder service. I will speak a bit more on aged care, which was a key concern. In the wake of the Oakden scandal, presided over by the former government, we are establishing an adult safeguarding unit that will have statutory responsibility for responding to reports of abuse, neglect or mistreatment of vulnerable adults.

Can I take this opportunity again to remind people who have concerns about aged-care quality that they can also raise concerns with the Aged Care Complaints Commissioner. They can assist with concerns about the quality of care or services provided by Australian government-funded aged-care providers.

On child protection, I am so pleased to communicate that children in state care are further supported, with an extra \$30.9 million for child protection over the next two years. In addition, there will be \$3.3 million over four years to establish a dedicated paediatric eating disorders service. I will now take the opportunity to share a factual account of the proposed approach to the northern interhospital transfers.

As part of the recent state budget, the Marshall Liberal government announced that it will go to market to see if it can find a more cost-effective way of delivering the dedicated transport service that operates between the Modbury and Lyell McEwin hospitals. The service currently uses SAAS ambulances and operates between 6.30am and 2pm, seven days a week. This service, which is only used to transfer non-acute patients between the hospitals, has been operating since 2016. It was established around the time the previous government downgraded Modbury Hospital as part of its controversial Transforming Health changes.

The cost of providing this service has risen as the number of transfers between the Modbury and Lyell McEwin hospitals has grown. In the 2017-18 year, it cost around \$1.2 million to run this shuttle service. That cost is projected to increase to \$1.5 million this year, a 25 per cent increase in one year. Other local health networks and the SA Ambulance Service itself already use private providers to transfer patients. The service will only involve the transfer of non-acute patients. Acute patients will continue to be transported by ambulance. The investigation of potential alternative suppliers will ensure that South Australian taxpayers are getting value for money while ensuring the service continues to operate safely.

On education, there is a huge, good news story: record funding for education is a hallmark of the Marshall Liberal government's first state budget. We are committed to delivering better services to South Australians, and we recognise that investment in our children and young people is a key driver for South Australia's prosperity. The minister has personally guaranteed that the Golden Grove Primary School, Greenwith Primary School and Golden Grove High School will receive many millions of dollars promised under the Building Better Schools infrastructure program.

Our government proposes to deliver this Building Better Schools project in line with the funding commitments made before the election. I have heard the opposition talking some nonsense about plans that have changed; however, the illustrations and lists of desired improvements submitted for schools in the program clearly stated, 'These initial plans are subject to further planning and may change.' This statement was placed under the illustrations when the former government was in power, as the funding allocation to each school was determined before the scoping documents were commenced.

Neither the former government nor the Department for Education ever provided any guarantee that each school's aspirations or wish lists could be met in total. The work currently being undertaken by the Department for Education in collaboration with our schools will determine the detail of the final projects that will go ahead. The guiding principles for the work, developed under the former government, remain the removal of old relocatable or modular classrooms; the creation of new buildings for schools with growing student numbers; the refurbishment of classrooms and buildings, transforming them into modern learning areas; and landscaping and upgrades of the street frontage.



The 2018-19 state budget initiatives also provide \$20.9 million over four years to deliver the government's promised Literacy Guarantee package of measures designed to give students the best possible start to their education. Central to the program is the education department's Literacy Guarantee Unit, established this year, which will hire 13 new literacy coaches to support our schools. Coaches will have experience and expertise in literacy instruction, including in phonics and teaching students with dyslexia and other learning difficulties.

We want our students to be the beneficiaries of the best education system in Australia, and a strong start in literacy is an essential foundation upon which a student's subsequent educational success will be built. The sum of \$7.5 billion has been provided over the next three years to assist with planning the transition of year 7 students into a secondary school setting by 2022.

The other night, I was given a really good example at the Golden Grove governing council meeting by a teacher about why this is so important. Currently, the Australian Curriculum needs us to teach students in a certain way that cannot be accommodated by all our primary schools right now. A teacher gave the example that, in science subjects, we do not have the science labs, Bunsen burners and that sort of thing to teach the curriculum that needs to be taught. That is why it is so important for this transition to take place.

The government is also committed to ensuring a fresh start for TAFE, providing \$109.8 million over five years in additional resources to support continued service delivery to implement a new quality system and ensure compliance with the national vocational education training standards. The significant investment in entrepreneurial and vocational education also ensures that training will be connected to the needs of the broader economy to lead to real jobs and better investment outcomes. This is in keeping with our government's focus on increasing numbers of trainees and apprentices, backed up by over \$202.6 million in the Skilling South Australia investment through the Department for Industry and Skills. The Marshall Liberal government is investing now to build the skilled workforce that will result in thousands of jobs in the future in South Australia.

There is great news for energy, which was the other key topic raised at doors. There will be a \$1.5 billion interconnector with New South Wales to help fix our power crisis in South Australia. This was a promise we made, and it is currently being delivered. There is also Tesla's virtual power plant. With the support of the South Australian government, Tesla is developing a network of up to 50,000 home energy systems, comprising solar panels and a Tesla Powerwall battery across South Australia, all working together to form a virtual 250 megawatt power plant—the largest in the world.

A virtual power plant is created by a network of home energy systems all working together to generate, store and feed energy back into the grid. Energy from the home energy systems installed as part of this virtual power plant will provide electricity for the house on which they are installed. Any excess energy generated by the system will be dispatched to meet the needs of the grid, providing additional energy to the rest of the state when it is required.

We are funding South Australia's Home Battery Scheme. The South Australian government's Home Battery Scheme will give 40,000 households access to home battery systems through a \$100 million investment in state government subsidies and \$100 million in commonwealth finance. While the subsidy will be applied to the battery storage component only, finance will be available for households to purchase new solar panels as well as the battery system as part of the scheme. South Australia's Home Battery Scheme will begin in October 2018.

I am also really excited to share that we are building an infrastructure pipeline. The Marshall Liberal government will deliver a record level of general government infrastructure spending in our budget, building a significant pipeline of infrastructure works to grow the economy and create more jobs. Contrary to alarmist claims by the Labor Party, there will be a \$576 million increase this year compared with what the former Labor government spent last year. The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure will deliver \$3.4 billion in capital works, with projects to include fixing Golden Grove Road. This is a promise we made.

I thank the community again for getting behind the petition with which I stood out on Golden Grove Road with my colleague the member for Newland. The community had been waiting 20 years for the previous state member to fix this. Finally, after our community pressure, we are delivering this

upgrade. Both the Premier and the minister have been there with me to look at the road since being elected to see the issues. Everyone wants this to happen.

In addition, we will be delivering the Skyline Drive slip lane. Over \$300,000 has been allocated to upgrade the Skyline Drive turnoff from Blacktop Road at Hillbank to add in a slip lane. This was an issue that local residents raised, a promise I made, and it is being delivered. The O-Bahn feasibility report is budgeted, and the study is already well advanced. Those of us living in the north are so pleased by what we are seeing: the Gawler line electrification, expanding park-and-rides, the O-Bahn park-and-rides, \$33.5 million, prioritising Golden Grove and Paradise.

I just want to make it clear, so that no one misunderstands this on the other side, that this is an additional \$18.5 million above the budget promised by the previous government: four park-and-ride upgrades planned and budgeted for. You told me that the upgrade to the Golden Grove park-and-ride was important, and this project is being delivered. I have so much more information to share, but I am running out of time.

In summary, the former government left a mess in key areas, but this state government is working responsibly to clean up this mess and invest in South Australians. We will lower costs, we will create more jobs and we will deliver better services, and there is a lot more good news to share. I will wrap up here, though, and invite people living in King, people living in the north, people living in the north-east, to contact me if they want to find out what is really in the budget. I encourage everyone to ask questions to find out about the good news for King and for South Australia.

Debate adjourned.

*Personal Explanation*

**APPROPRIATION BILL 2018**

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:02):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Dr CLOSE:** This morning, there was a bit of a disagreement raised as a point of order about the numbers I was using about loss of staff or FTEs in the environment and water department. I seek to clarify the position in the budget papers, subject to finding more information, of course, through the estimates process. The particular line to which I was referring was organisational reform.

There are 115 FTEs that are lost in the three-year period of the budget. My reference to over 200 was in reference to effort that is lost to the work in the environment over the three-year period because the 115 positions are not all taken in the final year. They are taken over a three-year period, which means that, having lost 22 people in the 2019-20 year, the effort by those 22 FTEs is also absent the following year and the year after that. By calculating it in that sense, there is something like 246 FTEs in effort missing, but I absolutely accept that it is 115 FTEs.

*Matter of Privilege*

**PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES**

**The SPEAKER (17:03):** I can advise members that I rise with regard to the matter of privilege that was raised earlier today. I make the following statement with regard to the matter of privilege raised by the member for West Torrens in the house earlier this morning. Before addressing the matter, I wish to outline the significance of privilege as it relates to the house and its members.

As we have heard in the past, privilege is not a device by which members or any other person can seek to pursue matters that can be addressed by debate or settled by a vote of the house on a substantive motion. We have a test in McGee, in *Parliamentary Practice in New Zealand*, which in my view makes the test for whether or not a matter is a matter of privilege by defining it as a matter that can genuinely be regarded as tending to impede or obstruct the house in the discharge of its duties.

Generally speaking, any act or omission which obstructs or impedes the house in the performance of its functions, or which obstructs or impedes any member or officer of such house in the discharge of his duty, or which has a tendency directly or indirectly to produce such a result, may

be treated as a contempt and therefore be considered a matter of privilege even though there is no precedence of the offence.

I refer to the matter raised by the member for West Torrens in relation to an answer given by the Minister for Environment and Water to a question in the house on 17 May 201—more specifically, in response to the question asked by the member for West Torrens:

Did the minister or any member of his staff request the names of public sector employees from his agencies who had worked in the previous environment minister's ministerial offices over the last five years and who are currently employed in his agency or the public sector?

The Minister for Environment and Water replied by saying, 'No, not that I am aware of.' The member of West Torrens has advised the house that, at a meeting held yesterday of the Budget and Finance Committee, the Acting Chief Executive of the Department for Environment and Water advised the committee that he had been requested by the minister's current Chief of Staff for lists of staff who had worked in the former minister's office. Further, the acting chief executive in response to the question:

So, no-one from the department made anyone from the minister's office aware that, in fact, yes, this was discussed and that it might not have been a correct answer that was given on 17 May?

To which the acting chief executive replied:

I advised the minister's Chief of Staff that the minister had given an answer and that he would need to consider whether he spoke to the minister about that matter.

The acting chief executive was then asked, 'When did you advise the Chief of Staff approximately very soon after that 17 May?' The acting chief executive answered by saying, 'Very soon after that statement was made.'

The member for West Torrens alleges that the Minister for Environment and Water has misled the house as his answer to a question on 17 May is inconsistent with information presented to the Budget and Finance Committee. Further, he implies that the minister should have corrected the record on the matter being brought to his attention by his Chief of Staff. The acting chief executive's answer that 'I advised the minister's Chief of Staff that the minister had given that answer and that he would need to consider whether he spoke to the minister about that matter' suggests that the interaction between the acting chief executive of the department and the minister's Chief of Staff, both in terms of the request for a staff list and need to correct the record, were not known to the minister.

In the Chair's opinion, this is not a matter of privilege for the reason I set out above. In the Chair's view, the matter could not generally be regarded as tending to impede or obstruct the house in the discharge of its duties. Therefore, I also decline to give the matter the precedence that would allow the member for West Torrens to immediately pursue the matter. However, my opinion does not prevent any member in this house from pursuing the matter by way of substantive motion.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (17:07):** I move without notice:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith to establish a privileges committee to inquire into a matter of privilege related to an answer given on 17 May 2018 to the House of Assembly by the Minister for Environment and Water.

**The SPEAKER:** An absolute majority not being present, ring the bells.

*An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:*

**The SPEAKER:** Does the member for West Torrens wish to speak to the motion?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes, sir, I do, Mr Speaker. It is a matter of urgency that this matter be debated immediately. It is a matter of urgency that this be debated now. Our democracy, our parliament, our Westminster system of government, cannot tolerate the idea that a chief of staff was told that a minister may have given information incorrectly to the house by his chief executive under an inquiry by the Budget and Finance Committee. That minister must now immediately answer

to a privileges committee. It cannot wait for private members' time. It must be debated now. We cannot wait.

We rely on ministers to give accurate information to the parliament. We rely on everything they tell us to be true and accurate. Why? Because the people of South Australia have entrusted all 47 of us to their care, to their work and to their endeavour, and we can only do that if we are given information that is accurate.

We know from the Budget and Finance Committee that the minister's Chief of Staff was told that the information he gave to the house was incorrect and that his office asked the agency to provide a list of names to the minister of everyone who had been employed by the former Labor government in the minister's office.

There are other matters by other agencies to investigate here, but it is important that we sort this out now. That is why this motion to suspend standing orders to establish this privileges committee must be done immediately. If this suspension is successful, I will move that this house establishes a privileges committee to examine allegations set out in *Hansard* by me on 18 September in this house regarding the Minister for Environment and Water and investigates whether the minister deliberately and intentionally misled the house as therein alleged. They are serious allegations that cannot wait for private members' time.

The opposition is attempting to suspend standing orders because the people of South Australia deserve to know whether their ministers are telling the truth. They deserve to know whether or not the information they are giving us is accurate. The government would have us believe that the Chief of Staff did not tell the minister that he gave the wrong answer to parliament. The government would have us believe that a chief of staff has acted independently of their minister. It is unprecedented to believe—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —in any way possible that a minister—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for West Torrens, this is not debate. We are moving a motion for standing orders to be so suspended to enable yourself to move a motion to establish a privileges committee.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes, sir. Thank you very much for your guidance, sir. Wisdom comes with marriage, in my experience.

**The Hon. S.K. Knoll:** So does suffering.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Spoken like a married man. I am not sure what you are talking about.

**The SPEAKER:** Let's get back to it.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** These allegations were set out four months ago. The reason this needs to be debated immediately is that the acting chief executive told a committee of this parliament that he informed the minister's office immediately—four months ago when the minister gave that answer—that it was not accurate. There can be no more serious allegation of a minister. There can be no more serious allegation.

Other bodies will investigate the lawfulness of asking for such a list. Our responsibility here is to understand why it is that the minister gave that answer, and the only way we can find that out is to have a successful motion. If the Premier is serious about openness and accountability and that the buck stops with the minister's desk and not the department's door, then they will allow the suspension of standing orders to proceed.

They will establish a privileges committee, be open and transparent and allow this house to inquire into whether or not the minister deliberately and intentionally misled the house and whether it is feasible and passes the pub test that the minister's Chief of Staff did not tell him and that the minister did not know his Chief of Staff ordered the agency for the names of public servants employed by the former Labor government in the minister's office.

Quite frankly, if the government really want people to believe that, go out and say so in the electorate. Go out and tell the people of South Australia that it is feasible that the Chief of Staff, who has his office next door to the minister's, did not tell him or that the minister did not know. It is untenable that this house could have that standing on the *Hansard* without it being rectified. The minister knew this morning at 10.30am that the information he gave to the house was not accurate. He gave comment to the media twice, but has not told the house that the information he gave us was wrong. His Chief of Staff was told by the department that the information the minister gave to the house was wrong and he still does not come in here to correct the record.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** He is laughing at us.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** He is laughing at us.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens, I believe you are debating the motion.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** No, sir; what I am attempting to do is argue on the urgency of the suspension of standing orders—

**The SPEAKER:** Okay, please wind it up.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —because, Mr Speaker, unless we suspend standing orders, we will not get to the bottom of the truth. Did the minister know? Did the minister instruct his Chief of Staff to ask for names and lists of all the people who were employed in the former minister's office, and if he did, why did he do so?

He told the parliament that he did no such thing and that he was not aware of any requests. What do we know? There was a request made by the minister's Chief of Staff—not exactly someone unknown to the minister. The Premier gave a speech not three days ago where he said the buck stops with the minister, not at the department's door. Well, the department has lobbed this onto the minister's desk.

**Mr Malinauskas:** Straight there.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Straight there, Mr Speaker. That is why this suspension must be carried. If it is not carried, the government is not serious about openness and accountability; they are using their numbers to protect a minister who should be accountable to the parliament. In the end, if he has done nothing wrong, what does he have to be afraid of?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (17:15):** I rise to make a contribution to this charade to this extent. What is disappointing is that the member for West Torrens has raised a matter of privilege and you, Mr Speaker, have determined how that will progress. Clearly, he is unhappy with that. He wants to relitigate this matter based on that worthy authority of the pub test and other standards he wants to impose. It sounded like some rendition out of *The Castle*, with whatever the vibe was—

**Honourable members:** 'It's the vibe.'

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —but the reality is that it is actually an insult to this parliament and to you, sir, that we are being asked to deal with this. That is in the first instance. Secondly, the matter has been—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The matter has been dealt with. We could go into a list of circumstances relating to previous ministers—a former premier particularly springs to mind, in relation to the DeBelle inquiry—about what chief executives or chiefs of staff do or do not tell their ministers before they attend a local school. A whole inquiry was given royal commission status of investigation. We could go through those things, but that does not actually resolve the matter. You,

sir, have resolved the matter, and it is a disgraceful waste of this parliament's time to have this issue relitigated based on that charade.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 17  
Noes ..... 23  
Majority ..... 6

AYES

Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.	Boyer, B.I.
Brown, M.E.	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Gee, J.P.	Hildyard, K.A.	Hughes, E.J.
Koutsantonis, A. (teller)	Malinauskas, P.	Odenwalder, L.K.
Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.	Rau, J.R.
Stinson, J.M.	Wortley, D.	

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Cregan, D.	Duluk, S.	Ellis, F.J.
Harvey, R.M. (teller)	Knoll, S.K.	Luethen, P.
Marshall, S.S.	McBride, N.	Murray, S.
Patterson, S.J.R.	Pederick, A.S.	Pisoni, D.G.
Power, C.	Sanderson, R.	Speirs, D.J.
Teague, J.B.	Treloar, P.A.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.
Whetstone, T.J.	Wingard, C.L.	

PAIRS

Gardner, J.A.W.	Weatherill, J.W.
-----------------	------------------

Motion thus negatived.

*Bills*

**APPROPRIATION BILL 2018**

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed.

**Mr BROWN (Playford) (17:22):** There is no other way to put it: this is a terrible budget for the people of South Australia. It is terrible in that it delivers cuts, closures and privatisation for essential government services, while simultaneously increasing debt and deficit. It is a rare feat to accomplish both, yet this government now holds that dubious honour.

The Treasurer has brought forward spending in order to deliberately balloon out the deficit of the previous government's last year in office by hundreds of millions of dollars. We hear about the need to 'balance the books' and 'fix up Labor's mess', yet this is a budget that leaves the state with more debt than the last time the Treasurer inflicted his radical economic agenda on South Australia and sold ETSA.

The Treasurer has spent decades on the red benches yelling about fiscal responsibility and prudent financial management, yet he insists on sending our state into an unsustainable cycle of debt and budget disrepair. As the Treasurer once said himself, 'The deficit is up, the debt is up and it's not testimony to good financial management at all.'

This is also a terrible budget for jobs. We already knew that the government had adopted a heartless approach to South Australian workers when they refused to provide assistance packages

for workers impacted by closures at York Civil and New Castalloy, despite rhetoric to the contrary prior to the election. However, now the government has chosen to cut a raft of job-creating grants and agencies that have delivered real results for South Australian workers. Many of these jobs have been delivered in my electorate.

Before the election, I was lucky enough to accompany the member for Ramsay as she delivered a grant to a local firm in Mawson Lakes, which was planning to expand in the defence sector, commercialising locally produced technology and building export potential. This was as a direct result of a program developed in consultation with industry by the previous government. This was an example of how government and industry can work together to deliver better outcomes for South Australia. This is something that we on this side of the house believe should be built on. We would even be happy to have the government attempt to improve on it. Instead, what has happened? These programs have been cut.

The Treasurer has come into this place and proudly boasted about all the programs that he was cutting that had the audacity to try to create jobs in this state. One by one, he mentioned them in his speech as members opposite looked on approvingly. They include: the Economic Development Board, the Investment Attraction Advisory Board, the Unlocking Capital For Jobs fund, the Economic Investment Fund, the Small Business Development Fund, the Automotive Supplier Diversification Program, northern and southern connections, the SA Early Commercialisation Fund, the Future Jobs Fund and the Jobs First Employment Projects fund. These programs were all victims of the Treasurer's brand of economic purity, where you cut back and hope that something else grows in its place.

We have heard from members opposite how this budget is supposed to grow jobs in our state, yet the budget economic outlook shows that the forecast for employment growth is just 1.5 per cent in 2018-19 and 1 per cent annually in the following years. Similar figures in the past have led the Liberal Party to declare at the time that a dangerous jobs crisis existed in South Australia, yet the now Liberal government has chosen to cut thousands of jobs across the public sector, which will increase pressure on the unemployment rate whilst simultaneously reducing services for those who need it most.

What is more, exporters will be impacted as funding to the new SA Export Accelerator is half that of the previous Export Partnership Program. For all the rhetoric of the then Liberal opposition on the need to increase our exports, the now Liberal government has walked away from South Australian businesses. The cuts in this budget come on top of the worrying trend of the government refusing to assist workers when businesses in South Australia face financial difficulty. With challenges to our manufacturing industries, South Australia is experiencing a period of transition when both businesses and employees need our full support.

This is also a terrible budget for people in the north. When Holden closed, the Labor government stepped in and provided numerous forms of assistance to reskill workers and transition our manufacturing base into other opportunities and markets. Despite the challenges, northern Adelaide remains a growing, vibrant area that will require leadership and vision to continue to provide opportunities for its residents yet, bizarrely, this government has walked away from South Australians living in the northern suburbs. The closure of the Small Business Development Fund and Northern Connections has ripped the heart out of the Northern Economic Plan. Development in the northern suburbs is now a rudderless shambles under this government.

TAFE cuts will result in the closure of the Parafield, Tea Tree Gully, Port Adelaide, Urrbrae, Wudinna, Roxby Downs and Coober Pedy campuses. The Parafield TAFE, in my electorate, specialises in aviation courses, including practical skills such as aircraft engineering. At a time when South Australia has established itself as the defence capital of Australia, the Liberals are ripping out vital skills training from our state.

Members have heard me speak in this place about the importance of South Australia being the home to our new national Space Agency. Indeed, I am proud that we on this side of the house not only support the agency being based in our state but that the industry hub of the agency should be in the northern suburbs where we have decades of the experienced industry and technical expertise required.

The Premier has spoken about how he would like the support of Labor in our state putting forward a compelling case for the hosting of the new agency—support we have been happy to give. That is why it is so disappointing that there is no new money allocated to bring the Space Agency to South Australia. Building a space industry in South Australia is a massive opportunity, and any failure to bring the agency to SA will fall squarely on the Liberal government.

In June 2018, in relation to the upcoming budget, the Premier said, 'You won't be seeing any nasty surprises from us,' yet Housing Trust tenants are set to suffer, with people in single-bedroom cottages and bedsits set to suffer up to \$50 per week in increased rents. It is no wonder that a number of people have already contacted me to say that they will have difficulty in buying groceries or spending money on transport because of the decisions of this government. This can only be characterised as a nasty surprise. It is a nasty surprise that no-one asked for and does little for the budget bottom line.

South Australians living in those properties tend to be pensioners and other vulnerable people, so this cruel rent increase impacts those who can least afford it. In addition, over 100 FTEs will be slashed from the Housing Trust, which can only lengthen waiting times, slow maintenance and cause more angst for those already doing it tough. Ultimately, these cuts will only serve to increase pressure upon social services in the north, and so in the long term will do nothing to improve the government's finances. They are a false economy.

Bus and train services are set to be slashed in the north, in a region that will only require increased transport services in the future. Within my own electorate, it can already take more than an hour to walk from one suburb to another, and public transport is a necessity for those who do not have access to a car. To reduce public transport services is to make it difficult for people to attend schools, go to work, volunteer or care for others.

For people in my electorate, education is one of the most essential services that the state government can deliver. With more and more families moving into the electorate, South Australians want to know how the state government will provide opportunities and deliver learning outcomes for our children. Yet, alarmingly, the state government has chosen to cut the laptop in secondary schools program, denying opportunities for students in the north to learn and thrive in an electronic age. The program was set to provide every year 10 student with a laptop they could use during their high school years and then keep with them as they continued on to higher education.

This cut is completely unjustified. I have also been contacted by a number of parents in local schools who are very concerned that the funds allocated to their schools by the previous government will now be used for different purposes by the new government. There is talk of halls being cancelled and money instead being spent on classrooms to cater for the government's promise to take year 7 into high school. This is also unjustified.

Health care for people in the north is also set to take a hit in the budget, with the government apparently planning to privatise essential healthcare services, including pathology and radiology services. Prior to the election, the Liberal Party made no mention of privatising these key health services. The government has ambushed South Australians with privatisations that will only increase costs and waiting times for patients.

The Liberal Party has always talked tough on crime, but this budget turns a blind eye to community safety. Funding for Crime Stoppers has been slashed, putting South Australians at risk and leaving the future of Crime Stoppers on shaky ground. Funding for CCTV cameras has been cut—a critical program that allowed councils to identify the key areas of crime in the neighbourhood and install cameras for the purposes of deterring, recording and responding to violent crime, theft and vandalism on our streets. My constituents know that CCTV helps to keep us safe. It not only assists in responding to crime but is also invaluable in investigations and targeting crime hotspots, yet somehow this government feels that installing extra CCTV is some sort of Labor extravagance that needs to be curtailed.

Further, the crime prevention and community safety grants programs have been cut. These grants provided vital funding to community groups that run programs to deter youths from crime, particularly those at risk of offending. The program also provided a number of grants towards combating the spread of graffiti in our neighbourhoods. It is for the government to explain why it feels



that putting our communities at risk, by reducing funding for crime prevention, is an economy worth pursuing. This government has failed people in the north, and South Australians in my own electorate are rightly appalled by the decisions of this government.

The Premier promised fiscal responsibility, jobs creation and economic growth, but this budget will deliver none of those. The Premier has instead imposed savage and cruel cuts on those who can least afford it. The Premier, under the guidance of a treasurer whose economic policies belong to the last century, has chosen to implement a traditional Liberal budget that simply cuts, closes and privatises essential services and programs right across government.

Last month, the Deputy Premier said that South Australians would say thank you for this budget. No-one is going to be saying thank you for this budget—not the community and, in the end, not even those opposite. This budget stands condemned as a cruel budget that takes South Australia backwards at a time when we need to look forward, transition our economy and continue to provide economic prosperity for all South Australians.

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (17:34):** I rise today to speak in emphatic support of the Appropriation Bill and the state budget handed down by Premier Marshall oh-so recently, the Marshall Liberal government's first state government—and what a success it was.

I described it in the local media of the Narungga electorate as a 'gale of fresh air' after 16 years of city-centric Labor governments—and that it is, with plenty in it for the regions, which makes being a regional MP a particularly enjoyable task at this very moment. Importantly, too, it is a budget that makes the tough decisions that are necessary to ensure we return to living within our means, which is a concept that those opposite would appreciate only in some parallel universe.

Similarly, it is a budget that delivers the promises made during the election, which is also very important to the state and its constituents and gives them the feeling of living in a parallel universe of their own because finally they have a government that delivers and does what it said it was going to. It is not a moment too soon, either, and a welcome sight for those living in South Australia.

I was immensely pleased with the investments which were announced for the seat of Narungga during the budget and throughout the election campaign and which were delivered, including the \$88.5 million for the Port Wakefield Road overpass and four-lane highway duplication, which is over and above what was promised during the campaign and an example of the Marshall Liberal government underpromising and overdelivering, providing the people of Port Wakefield and the people of the state at large exactly what they were asking for—that is, a safer crash corner and a more easy traffic flow through Port Wakefield to ensure that tourists get to their destination quicker and that those visiting the wonderful Yorke Peninsula can get there quicker and safer and enjoy more time and spend more tourism dollars where they intended to, rather than spending too much time in their car or en route.

That was a wonderful announcement, an announcement that has been 30 years in the making, and I was pleased to be in Port Wakefield with the Deputy Prime Minister, the Premier and the member for Gray, Rowan Ramsey, to make that announcement relatively recently, much to the delight of local residents of Port Wakefield.

Similarly, I was pleased to announce two special hospital funding initiatives that the Marshall Liberal government has provided: \$720,000 for the Ardrossan hospital to ensure continuance of vital accident and emergency services and palliative care and subacute care services and \$605,000 for the Yorketown hospital to upgrade surgical facilities and to employ more skilled staff.

Other highlights are the \$12 million for additional chemotherapy services in regional areas, the \$150 million for a Regional Growth Fund and \$10 million to address the terrible situation we find ourselves in with blackspots in regional South Australia and for mobile phone towers to go up and to leverage more federal money to make sure we fix some of the proliferation of blackspots around regional South Australia.

We had a \$315 million Regional Roads and Infrastructure Fund, a \$20 million Rural Health Workforce Strategy and \$10 million for grassroots community sports clubs. Finally, in addition, there was \$613 million in tax relief over four years, being reductions in the emergency services levy, payroll

tax and land tax, which is money back in the pockets of normal South Australians, who so desperately need it after 16 years of skyrocketing prices and costs.

Having now been the member for Narungga for six months, I can confirm that the overriding concerns of the constituents who have come through my office in Maitland are regarding health services, cost of living and roads, so the investments in the Narungga electorate and the policies actioned to deliver reductions in taxes and levies have been very well received indeed. They have gone over overwhelmingly well with the people I have had the pleasure of interacting with since the budget was handed down on 5 September.

I have spoken in this place before about the importance of the Port Wakefield traffic solution, which has waited for 30 years and was finally delivered in the 2018-19 budget, a genuine state-building project which was not of any interest to members opposite, due to the electoral imperatives of the previous premier, who only prioritised projects in marginal seats and pork-barrelling situations and thus had no interest in investing in the seat of Narungga. So we were well pleased to make sure that that announcement of almost \$90 million was sent our way, and I thank the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government for being agreeable to that request.

The Premier, Mr Marshall, visited Port Wakefield and crash corner last week, on 9 September, and heard firsthand from residents how well plans have been received and about the general optimism around securing the future of Port Wakefield as a town and ensuring it continues to offer great services for people travelling through that town on their way to Yorke Peninsula, Eyre Peninsula or farther west or north—a wonderful project indeed. Meeting with RAA representatives last week also cemented the overpass project as a welcome inclusion in the budget and one that will offer increased safety and traffic flow going forward.

Aside from the significant investment in Yorketown and Ardrossan hospitals, measures in the budget to re-establish regional health boards are equally as important. There will be \$6.8 million over four years allocated to establish local health network governing boards, including six boards in country South Australia, that will put decision-making closer to the people who deliver and receive health care.

At a recent meeting, the Friends of Yorketown Hospital expressed particular upset about not knowing where their hard-earned fundraising moneys had gone under the previous government. They had raised approximately \$20,000 or so by hard work, making sauces, and holding barbecues, accepting huge donations from the town's op shop knowing full well what specific resources hospital staff were lacking but having no ability to request funds to be used for those specific needs. By re-establishing the regional health boards, this decision-making will be returned to the local communities affected by those decisions.

As if operating in some sort of parallel universe, the previous government thought that the centralisation of health would achieve better outcomes but, predictably, Transforming Health just managed to transform health into a disaster. Yorketown and Ardrossan are great examples of the negligence shown by the previous government, and those opposite have no credibility to question this government as we get to work fixing their mess in the health sector. Yorketown and Ardrossan are also good examples of this new government beginning to fix that mess.

I also particularly welcome the \$20 million for the Rural Health Workforce Strategy, which aims to address a shortage of health practitioners in country areas. We can have all the services in the world placed in country areas, but we cannot deliver anything without the staff who are trained for the job. They are in dire need and drastic shortage, so it is pleasing to see that being addressed in this budget. It is being addressed by increasing rural interns in support of pathways for rural generalists and GPs and is just one measure in the pipeline to address the drastic shortage of doctors and nursing staff in country towns.

I am lucky to be involved in the Wallaroo Health Services Planning Steering Group, looking at the framework for identifying and evaluating potential future service options, and staff retention and recruitment is a huge issue as we work together to ensure that Wallaroo Hospital can meet projected demand on its services. There is current significant concern around the Wallaroo Hospital, with the Moonta Medical Centre and Wallaroo Owen Terrace practice already withdrawing its doctors from the hospital roster, which in the last two years has placed considerable individual stress on

doctors at the Kadina Medical Associates. They cannot possibly be expected to continue to run 24/7. It costs a lot of money to secure locums in regional areas.

Other valuable and vital health initiatives in the budget include \$45 million to reduce elective surgery and colonoscopy waiting lists in public hospitals, \$16 million to increase palliative care support and \$2.5 million for additional suicide prevention services. I would like to take this opportunity to note the wonderful contribution of the local Stamp Out Suicide (SOS) networks that we have operating in Narungga. I have talked previously about their contribution.

I was lucky recently to attend a viewing of *The Ripple Effect* with the Hon. John Dawkins from the other place. It was put on by the SOS Yorkes group, which is a wonderful initiative, and it certainly educated me and approximately 100 or so people in the room about the troubles faced by people who suffer from this terrible ailment. I look forward to continuing to support them as they continue to offer that vital volunteer service in our electorate.

There was \$4 million allocated for more domestic violence accommodation beds and \$1 million for the Healthy Towns initiative to encourage rural and remote communities to come up with creative ways to improve local health, which is another good scheme implemented by this new government.

Finally, there is the provision of \$140 million over 10 years to address backlog maintenance in country hospitals. That \$140 million will go a long way to restoring the backlog that has built up over the past 16 years by a government that did not have the electoral imperatives to invest in regional hospitals and ensure that they would continue to be up to a satisfactory standard for surgical services and the like. I look forward to seeing that money being spent where it is most needed. I will be advocating strongly for some of it to make its way to Wallaroo.

I heard so much about cuts in rural public health services under the previous Labor government, including from local doctors lamenting the role of country hospitals, having been diminished by stealth, threatening the economic liability of rural doctors and, by extension, service delivery to patients. So many public forums filled town halls, and petitions with thousands of signatures fell on deaf ears. The loss of surgical services at Yorketown in 2017 was a huge blow to the residents of the southern Yorke Peninsula community. The reasoning was that too few procedures were being done to ensure safety standards were met.

And why were they not being done? Because the operating theatre was not being properly maintained and money was not being spent to ensure that it had the proper facilities and equipment. Air conditioning maintenance was cut, no sterilisers were replaced, and money locally raised and held in Adelaide was not allowed to be used on staff. Health advisory boards were silenced so it would not get out that the decisions being made at places such as at Yorketown were not about reduced demand or not having the skilled and willing staff to provide the services but about the unwillingness of the city to not allocate money they needed to properly maintain facilities. It is a shame that that was the decision made by the previous government.

How absurd was it to stop 300 surgery procedures at Yorketown and transfer them to the already overstretched, bursting at the seams Wallaroo Hospital, a two-hour drive away along one of the worst roads in the state? At a Quorn town meeting, attended by hundreds of people and eight HAC regions, seven council regions and reps from some 40 country hospitals around the state, so much was spoken about the erosion of services, the sustainability of health services and GP practices, consistent and constant battles for communities by HACs and GPs, with the hierarchy wasting everyone's time and resources.

The Kingston community was mentioned as having to use a \$900,000 donation from a community member to replace its hospital roof, such was the reluctance of Country Health SA and other bureaucracies to front the money to fund its replacement. One would have thought that having a roof on your hospital would be considered a vital need, but, no, they had to rely on the donation of a private community member to replace it. Waikerie resorted to using bequests to keep its operating theatre open because the state government failed to pay \$140,000 for a new air conditioner and doors. Cummins, as you would well know, Mr Deputy Speaker, could not replace its blood fridge. Booleroo Centre was without essential anaesthetist machinery, and Wudinna's closest X-ray machine was 250 kilometres away.

This budget puts respect for country areas back into the equation, and not a moment too soon. How disingenuous it is to insist services will be continued only where it is safe to do so and then deny essential maintenance required to keep facilities up to standard. Thankfully, Premier Marshall visited Ardrossan hospital with me on 9 September and felt firsthand the great relief of director of nursing, Jodie Luke, with the delivery of \$720,000 over four years in this budget to cover its accident and emergency services, to deliver additional palliative and hospice care and to provide more staff training.

The Ardrossan hospital, which is a wonderful community-owned hospital run exclusively on private contributions and donations from the public, lost its state government funding in 2011 and has been under constant financial strain ever since, with the public accident and emergency service costing the local community about \$200,000 per year to run. It is wonderful to see that funding returned, and I look forward to continuing to work with the Ardrossan hospital going forward to make sure they have a continued stream of funding.

With regard to sports funding, I must mention the \$10 million over two years for grassroots community sports clubs, with a focus on female and family-friendly infrastructure, to build on the success of recent sport and rec funding within the Narungga electorate. We were lucky enough to receive, through the Active Club grants, \$20,000 for the Artherton Basketball Club; \$25,000 for the Coobowie Tennis Club for the Save the Tennis Club program, which was in response to the savaging of its finances by hurricane Kathy; \$5,000 for Curramulka bowls equipment; \$20,000 for the Curramulka Community Club to upgrade its courts and another \$5,000 for equipment; \$3,500 for the Kadina Basketball Club; \$3,000 for the Port Wakefield bowls club; \$20,000 to upgrade lighting at the Wallaroo oval, with the aim to make it suitable for night games in the future; and \$3,500 for equipment for the Wallaroo Golf Club.

We were able to double the value of sports vouchers to assist families to pay their subs, to make sure that their kids can have an active and healthy lifestyle, so that they can pay their registration fees and buy uniforms for their kids to play sport, which is another important feature of this wonderful success of a budget. Playing sport in rural areas is important for health and social benefits, providing participants with a connection to the town they represent. Hopefully, we get a few good footballers come through Kadina as a result of this initiative.

I also welcome the \$30 million allocated for the \$100 sports vouchers, which under the previous government were \$50 vouchers, which did not go far given that subs for junior sport can be as much as \$200 per child. In support of the volunteers who do so much in rural communities providing services that would otherwise be out of reach for many, I welcome the \$5 million in the budget to make free of charge volunteer screening checks. From 1 January next year, community service volunteers—and rightly so—will not have to pay the \$59.40 fee for the screening checks that they need to serve their community. The government will cover this cost. This will be very welcome to many who should not be left out of pocket to perform the good deeds that they do without payment.

There is much to be done, but this budget is a good start for Narungga and, importantly, we have delivered on every one of our pre-election commitments. It is with great pride that I commend this bill to the house and look forward to continuing the great work that this Marshall Liberal government has started and set with this platform going forward.

**Mr BOYER (Wright) (17:51):** I, too, rise to speak to this Appropriation Bill. There is a peculiar phenomenon in politics that everyone in this chamber will be very familiar with and that is the 'it's time' factor. Once it takes hold, surely it is one of the most difficult mindsets to combat. It is impervious to rational debate. It is immune to facts and, once it takes hold, it is nigh on impossible to stop.

There is no doubt that the 'it's time' factor was at play during the most recent state election. After 16 years, it is true that some South Australians had decided that it was time to change government. One of the reasons that this mood was so difficult to shift was that the performance of the alternative government when last in power was such a distant memory. There were people voting at this election who were just two years old when the Hon. Rob Lucas was last treasurer. Indeed, I was just one year old when he first entered this parliament.

**Mr Duluk:** I wasn't even born.

**Mr BOYER:** The member for Waite was not born. There was no context for explanations about the performance of the last Liberal government. Nonetheless, my comment to those voters who told me that they believed it was time for a change of government was that they will soon see what it is like having a Liberal government and that a leopard does not change its spots.

I think I speak for all on this side of the chamber when I say that even we have been shocked by the speed with which this Liberal government has reverted to its old ways and reminded people just what it is like to have a Liberal government in South Australia. We were shocked at how quickly they were provided with a very potent and, I think it is fair to say, devastating reminder of what South Australian Liberal governments do, and that is to cut, close and privatise.

Even more surprising to me was where these cuts, closures and privatisations have been delivered, and that is the north-eastern suburbs, the very suburbs where this government made the biggest gains at the March election. In fact, earlier this year, the Premier crowed in this place that there were no Labor-held seats in the north-east anymore. Notwithstanding the fact that he completely forgot about the residents of Wright, it perhaps shows a willingness on this government's behalf to take advantage of the two new Liberal members of parliament in that area who quite simply have not yet had the intestinal fortitude to stand up and fight these cuts.

If a Labor government had put these cuts on the previous members for Wright and Newland, they would have stopped right there. Indeed, such were the reputations—

**Dr Harvey:** Like Transforming Health.

**Mr BOYER:** The member for Newland has found his tongue about these cuts for the first time. Excellent. You should have a bit more to say, member for Newland.

**Dr Harvey:** I have lots to say, don't you worry.

**Mr BOYER:** Good, excellent. I am looking forward to it because no-one has seen you for weeks out there. Indeed, such were the reputations of Tom Kenyon and Jennifer Rankine that a Labor treasurer would not have been so reckless as to their own welfare even to raise such a prospect.

Clearly, this Treasurer and this Premier think that the stars have aligned: a South Australian voting public for whom the wreckage of the previous Liberal government is a distant memory; the first budget early in the political cycle, and an opportunity to cut deep in the hope that people will again forget; two inexperienced members of parliament without the knowhow or the desire to stand up for their area against these cuts; and a Treasurer who prefaced this budget by announcing that he would retire at the next state election, no doubt offering himself up as a human shield behind which this cabinet can slash and burn until a new face fills the role before the next state election—perhaps a face in this chamber now.

I must say it is cold comfort for South Australians that the Treasurer announced before the budget that this would be his final term in parliament. I think it is akin to the hangman walking out onto the gallows, patting the condemned on the back and saying, 'Don't worry, mate. This is my last one.' What did this alignment of the stars deliver us in the budget? It delivered the closure of Service SA at Modbury.

Anyone who has used that Service SA branch—and I am one of those people—knows that it is always busy. Indeed, I have spent many hours outside that Service SA since this announcement was made, and there is almost always a queue. The anger of residents, many of them elderly people who have no inclination or desire to use the internet, is palpable. They will now be forced to travel to Elizabeth or Tranmere to use a Service SA branch.

We also saw the closure of the Tea Tree Gully TAFE. Most jarring about this announcement, I think, was the rhetoric of the government in the lead-up to the election. The then opposition's policy document—I think it is 'A strong plan for real change' or, 'A real plan for strong change'; it is easy to get them confused—pontificated about skills shortages and the need for government to invest more in training. The first thing they do is close seven TAFE campuses.

So, too, did this government, when in opposition, reinvent itself as the champion of Modbury Hospital. At any hint or mere suggestion that a Liberal government might again privatise that hospital,

those opposite were very quick to denounce such claims as scandalous. But here we are, 185 days after the election, and this budget has revealed plans to privatise patient transfers from Modbury Hospital to the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

**Dr Harvey:** Why are there so many transfers?

**Mr BOYER:** Is that justification for privatising it, is it?

**Dr Harvey:** Why are there so many transfers?

**Mr BOYER:** It is amazing how you have found your voice in here. If only you had the courage to find your voice outside, where it really matters.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Continue on, member for Wright—in silence, thank you, from the government benches.

**Mr BOYER:** Very little detail has been provided as to why this is even needed, as the information I have seen shows that current arrangements are working effectively. At present, around 80 to 90 per cent of patient transfers between Modbury and Lyell McEwin are priority 2 to priority 5 and therefore require medical observation. Only 10 to 15 per cent of patients are classified as priority 8. It looks very much like patient safety will be put at risk in order to make a very small saving.

There was, however, \$5 million provided for capital works in the budget under the government's plan to return a four-bed high dependency unit to Modbury Hospital. Operating expenses for the HDU are set at around \$5 million per year over the forward estimates, with \$2.5 million budgeted for this year. I think it is safe to say that the government plans to have the HDU operational by the end of this year.

On the face of it, this might sound like good news for the residents of the north-east, who I know all support more services into their local hospital. However, it is somewhat concerning, given that the clinical advice is still that a standalone HDU is not safe and that a high-observation unit would be more appropriate.

The reintroduction of a stand-alone HDU will mean that patients with higher acuity will be treated at Modbury; however, with no ICU, when a patient deteriorates to the point that they need access to a bed in an ICU, the patient will need to be transferred to Lyell McEwin Hospital. Under this government's plan, not only will patients be forced to transfer at a critical time in their care but they may no longer be transferred in an ambulance by a paramedic and an ambulance officer, as is currently the arrangement.

Instead, we could see very unwell patients who attended the Modbury Hospital in good faith for treatment, under the impression that it would provide the health care they needed, transferred to a different hospital in the back of a private vehicle with crew who may not have the skills needed to treat them should their condition deteriorate during that transfer.

The other notable cut in this budget insofar as the north-eastern suburbs are concerned is the indefinite postponement of the expansion of the Tea Tree Plaza park-and-ride. It is good news that the government has kept its promise to match Labor's commitment to expand the Golden Grove park-and-ride. This is certainly needed and will be welcomed by commuters who use the O-Bahn every day to get into the city. But to indefinitely postpone the expansion of the biggest park-and-ride along the O-Bahn busway—a park-and-ride that is full before 9am every weekday—defies all logic.

There was some good news, however, in the electorate of Wright, with \$679,000 over the next four years to establish new bus stops and to provide a new bus service for the residents of Gulfview Heights.

*Sitting suspended from 18:00 to 19:30.*

**Mr BOYER:** I will continue where I left off before the dinner break. There was some good news, however, for the residents of Wright in the most recent budget. As I was saying earlier, \$679,000 spent over the next four years will be spent to establish a new bus route in Gulfview Heights. As a resident of Gulfview Heights, I am very familiar with the issues around access to public transport at the moment, particularly for those residents of Gulfview Heights who live halfway up

Wynn Vale Drive and who have no choice at the moment but to walk down the hill to Salisbury East or walk up the hill to Wynn Vale to catch a bus.

There is, in fact, quite a good backstory to this election commitment. An announcement was made by the then opposition and the candidate for the seat of Wright for a bus stop, I believe, on Wynn Vale Drive in Gulfview Heights. On the face of it, it sounded like a very good idea, but I think the new minister, when he took on the role of Minister for Transport, realised that there were, in fact, no buses servicing that part of Wynn Vale Drive. I commend him for making good on that commitment and providing funding in this budget not just for a bus stop but also for a bus route to service that area, which will be welcomed by all residents of Gulfview Heights, including me.

I also intend to provide feedback to the minister about the opportunities that this announcement presents to provide public transport to other residents in the area who currently are not as well serviced by public transport as they could be. I think those opportunities include, but are not limited to, connecting the Golden Grove Village with Mawson Lakes. This could be done by establishing a bus route along the Golden Way on to Wynn Vale Drive, along Bridge Road via Maxwell Road, on to Elder Smith Road and then on to Main Street in Mawson Lakes.

This service would allow students of the north-east to access the University of South Australia campus and the defence industries that have been established within Mawson Lakes. It would also provide a direct service from Salisbury East to the Golden Grove Village, whilst meeting the government's commitment to provide bus access to residents of Gulfview Heights. The government has also kept its promise to match Labor's commitment to upgrade the section of Golden Grove Road between Surrey Downs and Golden Grove. These works are genuinely needed.

The intersection of Hancock and Golden Grove roads has become increasingly dangerous as traffic flows have grown over the years. The proposal, as I understand it, is for a roundabout to be built at this intersection; however, I would offer a small word of warning to the new government. Given that council has purchased the large block of land adjacent to that intersection, with a view to developing it into a major sporting hub, it might be that traffic lights are more suitable than a roundabout, especially given that the flow of traffic on match days will be immense if council gets its wish and is able to build six or seven synthetic pitches at that site.

I must say that the good news in the north-east and the north is very thin on the ground. Last week, a concerned parent and I joined the leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition at Golden Grove High School to call on this government to stop siphoning money away from Labor's Building Better Schools program to prop up the unfunded election commitment to move year 7 into high school. Golden Grove High School is set to lose as much as 70 per cent of the \$10 million grant provided by the Labor government, which it was intending to use to build a performing arts centre.

Where will this money go? It will be spent on building new classrooms for year 7 students who already have classrooms just down the road. I feel that it was somewhat dishonest of this government to say that it was going to honour those Building Better Schools grants in full, only to siphon money off into an election commitment that had not been funded as it should have been. The rhetoric from the government since the budget was handed down has been that it has honoured all its election commitments, but this is actually not true.

There was one very important election commitment made by those opposite when they were in opposition that it is still refusing to honour, and that is matching Labor's election commitment to the Modbury Vista Soccer Club of \$1 million for a new synthetic pitch. Still the Minister for Recreation and Sport refuses to acknowledge that this promise was made, even though the then president of the club, the person to whom that promise was made, has now signed a stat dec stating that the commitment was made, when it was made and the terms on which it was made.

It is incredible that after all this time the minister has still not bothered to speak to the club in question to get its side of the story, nor has the minister, at least to my knowledge, spoken to the Liberal candidate who made that commitment. The broad question that must be asked is this: if the electors of Newland and King knew that these cuts, closures and privatisations were coming, would they have still voted for this Liberal government? The answer, of course, is no.

If those opposite think that the anger over this budget will quickly subside, I can tell them that they have greatly misread the mood of the north-east. Today, in question time, we heard the Minister for Transport answer a question about what the savings from the closure of the three Service SA branches would be, and the figure we were given was \$2.15 million. What does this say about the government's priorities that it was prepared to rush through a \$2.5 million payout to Henry Keogh but not prepared to keep essential services, like Service SA, open?

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Basham.

### **LIMITATION OF ACTIONS (CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Final Stages*

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

- No. 1. Clause 1, page 2, line 4—Delete 'Sexual'
- No. 2. Clause 4, page 2, line 14 [clause 4, heading to inserted Part 1A]—Delete 'sexual'
- No. 3. Clause 4, page 2, line 15 [clause 4, heading to inserted section 3A]—Delete 'sexual'
- No. 4. Clause 4, page 2, line 17 [clause 4, inserted section 3A(1)]—Delete 'sexual'
- No. 5. Clause 4, page 3, after line 20 [clause 4, inserted section 3A]—After inserted subsection (4) insert:
  - (5) In this section—

*abuse* includes any of the following:

    - (a) sexual abuse;
    - (b) serious physical abuse;
    - (c) psychological abuse related to sexual abuse or serious physical abuse.

Consideration in committee.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I want to say, with joy in my heart, that we receive this bill back. There have been five amendments in the Legislative Council, which will essentially extend the limitation of actions reforms to serious physical abuse, as well as child sexual abuse, and psychological abuse in relation to sexual abuse and serious physical abuse. We are thrilled that we have had support in the Legislative Council for this bill. These amendments will expand it even further, so it is with pleasure that we accept the same. I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Motion carried.

### **APPROPRIATION BILL 2018**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

**Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (19:39):** It is a pleasure to rise on behalf the people of Morphett to speak to this Appropriation Bill, which is the first budget for this newly formed government. On 17 March this year, the people of South Australia overwhelmingly voted for a new government to implement a well-articulated reform agenda based on lower costs, more jobs and better services for all South Australians, whether they are based in Adelaide or throughout the regions in South Australia.

Like all my colleagues on this side of the house, I connected at a grassroots level with our local communities and listened to them. Out of this came the bigger policy reform that will put this state on a better footing. Additionally, we heard at a local level where the state government could assist, and from this came our plan for lower costs, more jobs and better services that incorporate a range of statewide and local commitments.

The 2018-19 budget is a strong budget that not only puts in place this plan for the 2018-19 budget year but also works towards the next four years of this government, which will secure South



Australia's future. It is the first Liberal budget for 16 years and comes with new priorities. On coming to government, the incoming Treasurer was presented with reports from Treasury about the real state of the former government's budget situation. In the early days of this government, the Treasurer received the monthly financial reporting prepared by Treasury for January of 2018, which included this summary:

Projected total deterioration in the net operating budget of \$193.7 million means that the budget is clearly in deficit in 2017-18.

Compare this to the Mid-Year Budget Review in December 2017, which claimed a \$12 million surplus for the 2017-18 year on the part of the former government. We have previously heard in this chamber the member for Lee saying that the Liberals manufactured a deficit in 2017-18. This could not be further from the truth. As the January report outlined, this was a paper surplus propped up by budgeted savings targets or efficiency dividends which in addition included a dividend from the privatisation of the Motor Accident Commission.

We have heard the cry from the other side of those opposite about privatisation, which is the height of hypocrisy. The MAC dividends are estimated at \$1.7 billion over eight years from 2014-15, and in 2017-18 the MAC dividends were approximately \$340 million. Once these eight years are over, it dries up. Taking out the arguments about claiming a surplus by cashing in an asset via the privatisation of the MAC, what the report from Treasury clearly identifies is that the budget savings and efficiency dividends that were to be relied upon to create a surplus on paper were not going to eventuate.

In 2017-18, these savings were budgeted in the Mid-Year Budget Review to be \$248 million, increasing to \$715 million by 2021-22, despite the fact that over the preceding years the former government failed to deliver on budget savings targets but, rather, oversaw budget blowouts. In health, for example, which made up a large percentage of this \$248 million of savings, during 2017-18 SA Health was given \$267 million in total to compensate for budget blowouts or overspending.

The proposed future surpluses of the former Labor government were also highly unlikely ever to have been achieved. After 16 years of financial mismanagement, we are cleaning up Labor's mess and returning the budget to a sustainable position. The 2018-19 budget not only achieves a return to surplus this year but also projects surpluses across the years of the forward estimates.

We heard the Treasurer outline how some governments in the past have used the discovery of a financial mess as an excuse not to keep their election promises. During the lead-up to the election, when I was out doorknocking or at listening posts or shopping centres, I often heard the feedback, 'If the Liberals get into government and find the mess you've been left, you won't keep your promises.' Unfortunately, that is what the South Australian public has been conditioned to. After 16 years of the former government, the state has been left with a financial mess and broken promises. This government will accept the responsibility of cleaning up.

Importantly, the state budget keeps the government's election promises. At the same time, I hear those opposite asking, 'What is the vision of this budget?' This budget is about restoring faith with the people of South Australia—that the commitments we made to them prior to the election will be fulfilled. This budget is also about securing South Australia's future. The budget is a fair and responsible budget that delivers the reform South Australia needs and lays a strong foundation for the future. It delivers on the government's commitment to create more jobs, lower costs and better services. The budget contains \$738 million over four years to create jobs and grow the economy.

In the lead-up to the election, the vision of the people of South Australia was to reverse the exodus of young people leaving our state to get work. This budget sets out to turn this around. One area in which the Marshall government is investing is to drive defence jobs, capitalising on the federal government's \$90 billion investment in naval shipbuilding based here in South Australia. This focus on growing job opportunities in the defence sector will have a lasting effect for decades to come.

The 2018-19 state budget will also deliver on election commitments to establish a defence export program and veterans' employment initiative. At the same time, we are also investing \$1.5 million over the next four years to support defence industry opportunities for South Australian businesses, helping to create more local jobs. This includes the establishment of a defence industries scholarships fund in partnership with universities and industry. The government is investing to build

the skilled workforce that will result in thousands of jobs into the future as we take full advantage of the naval shipbuilding contracts.

In addition to these measures, the new state government is partnering with the federal government to deliver skills funding of \$202.6 million to help create 20,800 new apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia over the next four years. This highlights how the Marshall government is investing now to build the skilled workforce that will result in thousands of jobs into the future. The funding of these 20,800 new apprenticeships and traineeships is one aspect of the budget that provides new initiatives, totalling \$235.9 million over the forward estimates for the industry and skills portfolio.

Other areas include establishing an international school of culinary excellence, hospitality and tourism on Lot Fourteen at the former Royal Adelaide Hospital site. The government has also established a research commercialisation and start-up fund, which includes support for the new Office of the Chief Entrepreneur. It is critical that as a government we do everything we possibly can to boost our state's export performance, to grow our economy and create more jobs.

In 2002, South Australia's share of national merchandise exports was 7.4 per cent. However, after 16 years the state's export performance has fallen behind the rest of Australia, with our current share at 4 per cent. Previously, I spoke of our plans to lift defence exports. Other ways we can assist in growing exports is by investing significantly in new trade offices in key regions in North America, Asia and the Middle East to support our exporters in accessing these markets. We are helping South Australian exporters to grow by investing \$12.7 million over four years for five new trade offices in the US, Tokyo, Kuala Lumpur, Dubai and Shanghai. Growing our trade with China will remain a focus to further grow export opportunities, particularly in food and wine.

One of the key planks of building a skilled workforce for the future is recognising the investment required in our children and young people as a key driver for South Australia's future prosperity. More than \$1 billion is being invested into capital projects, including two brand-new birth to year 12 schools for the metropolitan area. The current annual funding for schools will also increase by \$515 million, from 2017-18 to 2021-22, under the Marshall government. This is the biggest investment in schools by any state government in the state's history.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** That wasn't you: it was us.

**Mr PATTERSON:** The \$515 million was put in by the Treasurer. Measures include \$20.9 million over four years to support the government's Literacy Guarantee package of measures, which includes 13 new literacy coaches, phonics screen checks for all year 1 students, and literacy and numeracy professional learning programs for teachers. The Literacy Guarantee gives all students the best possible foundation on which to build their educational success.

An amount of \$7.5 million is also provided to assist planning to transition year 7 students into secondary school by 2022. These year 7 students will soon benefit from specialist teaching in a high school setting as designated in the national curriculum, ensuring our students are not behind other states. We are also commencing the designation of four entrepreneurial schools, in addition to supporting four schools that wish to offer the International Baccalaureate Diploma.

Tourism is a key contributor to not only the South Australian economy but the local economy of Morphett. We are committed to growing event tourism in South Australia by investing an extra \$21.5 million over four years to the event bid fund to secure more lucrative major events and conventions to increase visitation, create employment and drive economic growth. Attracting international and interstate visitors, teams and associated spectators and convention audiences to South Australia keeps our restaurants and shops busy, increases occupancy in hotels and provides business for tourism operators across the entire state, including the regions.

One feature that attracts visitors to Morphett is the coastline along Glenelg, Glenelg South and Somerton Park. Over the next three years, \$5.2 million will be dedicated to protecting our pristine coastline and beaches by investing in sand replenishment on metropolitan beaches and research associated with sand retention. These beaches are constantly battling the northward littoral drift of sand up the Adelaide coastline.

Seagrass is an important element in inhibiting this sand drift below the water, and seagrass meadow restoration will be a focus, as well as stormwater harnessing schemes that prevent nutrient-rich stormwater from entering the gulf, which also impacts on seagrass. Because of this coastline, Glenelg is a destination for tourists visiting Adelaide, with approximately 80 per cent of visitors who come to Adelaide taking a trip down to Glenelg. This has led to over 1.3 million visitations per year into the precinct.

Residents and tourists alike want to feel safe and enjoy our vibrant community. A premier seaside destination like Glenelg needs a strong police presence, and that includes a physical police shopfront that is open for more than just business hours during the peak holiday season, so I am pleased that this budget dedicates \$12.9 million to implement a new staffing model in all metropolitan police stations, enabling more sworn police to be available for patrols and to enable police stations at Henley Beach, Norwood and Glenelg to open when the community needs them.

Sworn officers will still be maintained at these police stations. It was a key election commitment that I fought for on behalf of my local community and emphasises that this budget again fulfils the commitments the government made to South Australians at the election. It would also enable sworn police officers to be redirected to a new rapid response capability to prevent and respond to terrorism-related incidents, domestic high-risk taskings and to safely manage major events in South Australia, including in Morphett.

The Marshall Liberal government is also building a strong pipeline of productive infrastructure projects that will help grow our economy and create more local jobs. The 2018-19 state budget establishes an \$11.3 billion pipeline of projects over the period of 2018-19 to 2021-22 and delivers a record level of general government infrastructure spending in 2018-19.

By working collaboratively with the federal government, we have been able to secure \$1.8 billion of new infrastructure funding. Amongst these key projects are the Pym to Regency section of the north-south corridor along South Road, the Joy Baluch Bridge, the Port Wakefield overpass and road widening, and the Gawler line electrification project. This government recognises the importance of our road corridors for commuter and freight traffic to support the efficient movement of local, interstate and international freight.

In addition to creating better infrastructure, the budget provides for better services, with over \$1.2 billion in health spending, including investing in regional hospitals and making vital upgrades to The Queen Elizabeth, Modbury and Noarlunga hospitals. At the same time, we are reactivating the Repat site to ensure that it remains a vital health precinct in the southern suburbs. The Repat site is an important part of South Australia's health infrastructure and the community will play a vital part in its reactivation. With Somerton Park, Glengowrie, Morphettville and Parkholme bordered by Oaklands Road, which becomes Daws Road, the site is very accessible to the people who live in these suburbs.

At the same time, this budget sees the introduction of the removal of payroll tax for all small businesses with annual taxable payrolls below \$1.5 million. This will come into effect from 1 January 2019. Approximately 3,200 businesses will become exempt from payroll tax, with a saving of up to \$44,550 per year. These reforms help grow the economy. It is about creating a level playing field for business that does not rely on politicians picking winners in business.

At the same time, all South Australians will benefit from the reduction in their emergency services levy, \$360 million over four years. The first of those bills arrived in South Australian letterboxes recently, and the savings South Australians are now experiencing are well felt and well received. It is money they can elect to spend however they see fit, providing a \$90-million boost to the South Australian economy this financial year.

The government is committed to making South Australia an affordable place to live, and affordable water prices are important in helping South Australians manage cost-of-living pressures. Funding of \$1 million in 2018-19 has been allocated for the establishment and operation of an independent inquiry into water pricing in South Australia. This will inform the government if the methodology used to determine SA Water bills is reasonable.

The budget is also squarely focused on reducing the cost of energy for households and businesses and delivering the government's energy solution. It provides \$184 million in expenditure to ensure more clean, reliable and affordable power for South Australians. The budget delivers on our election commitment for \$100 million for the Home Battery Scheme to provide subsidies for home owners to purchase batteries. This scheme is a key component of the government's plan to deliver cheaper electricity to South Australian households and businesses.

An amount of \$50 million for grid-scale storage is set aside to aid the development of new storage technologies to back up our abundant renewable energy and help stabilise South Australia's electricity network. Further, \$30 million is set aside to better manage demand and help consumers benefit from helping to reduce peak demand to lower system costs. At the same time, the budget also seeks to accelerate delivery of an interconnector to New South Wales by supporting early works, with ElectraNet's modelling suggesting it will reduce bills by \$30 per annum when operational. Of this, \$4 million dollars is being provided as direct support in the budget and \$10 million as underwriting to support early works.

The Marshall Liberal government has delivered a strong budget that delivers the reform South Australia needs and lays a strong foundation for the future. The budget achieves a return to surplus and projects surpluses across each year of the forward estimates while at the same time lowering taxes and investing in skills and infrastructure. It is a budget that is fair and responsible, that fulfils the commitments made to South Australians at the March 2018 election to lower costs, create jobs and provide better services.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (19:57):** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. Belatedly, congratulations on your nuptials. Long may your wife have her way over you, get her way. Get used to it; that is what happens in my house.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I am very disappointed with the budget, but not because I begrudge the Hon. Rob Lucas delivering his first budget after waiting 16 years. I am disappointed because he has not continued some of the work that I thought was a bipartisan commitment by parliament.

It is interesting that in all the remarks I have heard from members opposite there is one word Liberals do not mention—debt, the thing that we borrow from the bonds market; we go out and we borrow it and we promise to pay it back. The Liberals are very proud of saying that it is not their money, that it is taxpayers' money, and they are right. The money that members opposite are using is borrowed money. Not only is it borrowed money but it also increases each and every year across the forward estimates.

Think of this, Mr Speaker: the Liberals are actually saying with a straight face, actually claiming, that they are fixing a financial mess by increasing debt. My father ran a chicken shop. He is not a financial genius like members opposite, but if I said to him, 'I'm fixing a financial mess by borrowing more,' I know exactly what he would tell me—and I think members opposite know what he would say as well. You do not borrow your way out of trouble. If there was a financial mess that the government inherited, why increase debt?

The beauty of this budget for the opposition is that erstwhile government backbenchers who had absolutely zero say in the formulation of the budget will vote for it unanimously and go out and endorse it like the member for Newland. He is borrowing an extra \$3.3 billion and will tell his community, 'By the way, for the privilege, I am privatising services at the Modbury Hospital. You are not getting the park-and-ride that you were promised, and I am closing a Service SA centre, and I can do nothing about it.' That is the member for Newland's new mantra.

I have to say, what he has not learnt, which he will learn, is that the squeaky wheel gets the oil. Did he notice that the member for Morialta's Service SA is just fine? Did he notice that the Premier's Service SA centre that services his electorate is just fine? Could this be a cabinet looking after themselves rather than looking after the marginal seats that they need to win? I am sure the member for Newland and the member King realise all this.

I think the other piece of genius work by the cabinet is to come out and flag over \$40 million in cuts to bus routes and not say which bus routes they are. That takes a special kind of stupid because every potential bus route in the state is up for grabs, and members opposite will have absolutely no say in which ones are saved and which ones will go. Why? Because the government is outsourcing that decision-making process to an independent board, apparently, called the public transport board, which has not been established yet.

There is a word for this. It is called subjugation. Members opposite, the backbench, are watching a Treasurer who has snapped the elastic band that connects them to him. This is a man who is not running again. This is a man who spent over 40 years in parliament and will not face the people again and is making decisions that are impacting members opposite now, and he will not face the people in judgement in four years' time, but they will.

Members opposite, in their blissful ignorance, are letting him do it. Why? I thought that the Liberal Party was a party of individuals, that every vote was a conscience matter, that every decision was up for grabs. There is no solidarity in the Liberal Party. They do not force members, apparently, in Liberal caucuses to toe the line. The member for Morphett, the member for Newland and the member for King have accepted all these cuts in their local communities completely and without objection. Not one person has spoken out about any of the cuts to their local community.

If I was the member for Newland and I saw a Service SA centre being left open in what could be called a safe Liberal seat, and being closed in a marginal Liberal seat, what do you think Tom Kenyon would have said to me as Treasurer if I tried to do that to him? As I said, it takes a special kind of stupid to make these kinds of mistakes. But, then again, if you are not running again, what do you care? There is arrogance in the language: 'There is a new sheriff in town. There is a new government in town.' Is that not a great way to ingratiate yourself with the people of South Australia, especially since you do not have to face them again and you are superannuated to within an inch of your life?

Younger members, who have no such safety nets, are being forced to go out and sell this rubbish to the people of South Australia. I say to the backbench of the South Australian government: exert your influence, use your authority, use your numbers. There is a very simple rule, and the former prime minister of Australia used it well. It is the iron laws of arithmetic: there are more of you than there are of them. How is it that they are doing this to you? How is it that this is occurring?

What genius says they are fixing a financial mess while increasing debt in the last financial year by \$417 million? That will go down well with 'the base', whatever the Liberal Party base is. It takes a special kind of genius in the 2018-19 financial year to increase debt by nearly half a billion dollars—\$415 million—and tell the base that you are fixing a financial mess. How? By borrowing it. You are borrowing money to fix a financial mess.

It gets better. The Treasurer, who is retiring at the next election and not facing the people again, has committed the Liberal Party to borrow in 2019-20—indeed, the people of South Australia to borrow—a further \$761 million from the MYBR, apparently in order to fix a financial mess. It gets better. He leaves the smoking turd on the table as he walks out the door. In 2020-21, he commits members opposite to borrowing over \$1 billion, but apparently they are fixing a financial mess. There have only been, I think, two treasurers in the history of the federation and this state who have taken the state to zero debt. Peter Costello took the federal books to zero debt while he was treasurer and Kevin Foley took this state to zero debt.

Across the forward estimates in the MYBR, the last one that I delivered before the election, debt peaked at \$6.63 billion. Under the financial genius of Rob Lucas, debt peaks at \$7.749 billion. He takes total government debt, including the non-financial public sector debt, to \$16 billion. In terms of the raw numbers, this Treasurer who is out there calling himself a financial genius as he sails off into the sunset is taking our debt levels to a higher watermark than when the State Bank collapsed, and members opposite are looking their branch members and constituents in the eye saying, 'We are fixing a financial mess,' because they are pointing to a surplus.

With the surpluses they point to, they point to a surplus estimate that gets to \$211 million. What percentage is that of the entire state budget? Can anyone tell me opposite? Does the financial genius, when he is explaining to the caucus their decisions to borrow this extra \$3.3 billion, tell them

what percentage of the budget that is? Did he tell the member for Newland that for all his hard work during the campaign, for all that doorknocking, his reward is fewer bus routes, no park-and-ride and, of course, the closure of the Service SA centre, let alone the TAFE closures that were genius as well in his local area? Does he say that \$211 million out of a potential \$19 billion budget is not that much?

*Mr McBride interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** That's right. The member for MacKillop points out it is minuscule. But members opposite say this is financially responsible. How is it financially responsible to borrow money to pay for tax cuts? No, I tell you it is important to note that this budget is a fraud. What this budget does is spend, and members opposite are borrowing money to pay for their futures at the expense of the people of South Australia. But it is only a select few.

The borrowing does not benefit the members in marginal seats: it benefits those in safe seats. I cannot imagine what Tom Kenyon would have said to me if, as treasurer, I said to him, 'Mate, I've got great news. I'm fixing a financial mess. I'm borrowing \$3.3 billion, cutting land tax and payroll tax, but you, member for Newland, have to cop the closure of a TAFE, no park-and-ride, \$40 million in bus route closures, no new buses being bought and a Service SA being closed.'

**Mr Picton:** And ambulances privatised.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** And of course, privatisation of the ambulance service between Modbury and Lyell McEwin. I think the honourable former member for Newland might have had a word or two to say to me, let alone what my colleagues around the cabinet table might have said. But of course, having a treasurer disconnect from reality, because they are not running again, is how you get budgets like this document.

There is a term that people use about blindness when it comes to surgery and being able to deal with the blood and the guts, being able to dissociate yourself from being a person, that surgeons use. It looks like the Treasurer has electoral blindness, and members opposite carry that burden for him—but what can they do? They are just the majority. What could they possibly do? It is not as if they are in a party where independence is somehow valued, where independence can be used to get an outcome, where you vote with your conscience rather than the party line.

It is not as if you are in some sort of liberal party, where these values that Menzies and Playford espoused are somehow the norm. Instead, they toe the line: they make cuts to health, they make cuts to education, they make cuts to public transport and they increase costs to the most vulnerable in our community in an unfair and cruel way.

Today, the shadow minister for health asked a question of the Premier: what does he have against people with HIV? How can you cut services to homeless people with HIV? How? What kind of political process did they go through to close key services in marginal seats? The members opposite, like good little sheep, nod their heads, not realising the power that they have. That is okay; let them get away with it. It suits us just fine.

We will go out and talk to the electorate. Whatever you do, members opposite, do not fight back. Be good backbenchers and do exactly what you are told and go and put out the rubbish that they are preparing for you, and tell the people of South Australia that you think that this is a good budget. It will suit us just fine, because this budget is not the beginning of a blueprint for long-term economic success or electoral success, this is a blueprint for electoral failure and financial mess.

Find me a Liberal anywhere in the country who thinks that increasing debt unsustainably is a good idea. The Premier apparently told the house that debt has never, ever, ever ever been cheaper in the history of humanity. They were his words, and then three days later, three of the four banks lifted interest rates and the bond market went up. Genius. The man is a genius. This Treasurer has flagged to the bonds market, 'We're borrowing an extra \$3.3 billion,' in case they did not know.

The other kind of special genius is to put in place a mining minister who hates the mining industry. This is also a special kind of stupid. For the life of me, I did not understand some of the decisions made in the mining sector within the budget process. There were dramatic cuts made to the department. Okay, there is cost-cutting across all agencies and mining wears the same shoes as everyone else, but I go back to my original point: but they are increasing debt, so what is the use?

The other point is that they talk about it being a low cost for business. The third largest employer in this state is the mining industry, and what has the Liberal Party done in this budget? It has increased their taxes by abolishing the new mine rate. Not only did it do that but it said to them, 'You're not welcome in South Australia if you do this type of behaviour.' I have to say that I think it is the most anti-mining, anti-resources budget I have ever seen. There are people across the country who are shocked at what the Liberal Party is doing to this industry in South Australia. We have the potential in this state not only to overtake Queensland and New South Wales but to rival Western Australia in mining activity, whether it is in oil and gas, copper, gold or uranium.

The Liberal Party has just said to any new prospective miners in South Australia, 'Come here at your peril. We are abolishing the new mine rate, and we arbitrarily impose moratoriums not based on science or regulatory processes but based on votes. Not only that, we will flip our decision on an administrative ban on unconventional gas in the South-East to a legislative ban without any consultation.' What a great investment signal that is for people in the mining industry. They then say, quite proudly, that they will not pick winners, unless of course you are a battery manufacturer, in which case we will pick winners. Then they say, 'We've got four subsidies,' of course that is unless you are a battery manufacturer, in which case we will subsidise you.

Consistency is important in politics. Why? Because then you are not exposed for hypocrisy, like pretending that you are cleaning up a financial mess while increasing debt, while imposing harsher punishment on marginal seat holders and their communities, while enriching those in safer Liberal seats. I just wonder whether the member for Newland had the ticker to get up in caucus and say to the Treasurer, 'Why are you leaving SA Service centres open in safe Liberal seats and closing mine? Why are you closing my TAFE? Why aren't you building my park-and-ride? Why aren't you giving me extra bus services? Why have you cancelled \$100 million worth of new buses on the most patronised and well-used public transport route in the state, the O-Bahn?'

Personally, I think the member for Newland and the member for King kicked a cat or broke a mirror before they entered parliament because they have been, without a doubt, since their election, the two unluckiest members of parliament in this place. I can only surmise that the 40-year-plus veteran Treasurer just thinks that they will not be here after the election and that they do not matter. That is all I can think of—all I can think it is. I cannot think of any other reason you would make cuts to those communities in the way he has made them.

It was my great honour and pleasure to be the Treasurer of South Australia. It will be one of the greatest honours of my life; being entrusted with the state's finances is a very serious privilege. But what I think is not appropriate is to have someone as Treasurer who is not facing the people again. The people need to sit in judgement of the people who handle the finances, the people who administer their state. They need to be held accountable.

Unfortunately, in the Westminster system, in a majority parliament, it is very difficult—and I do not mean this in any disrespectful way to the Speaker—to keep ministers to account, because majority rules. They have the numbers and it is very difficult to hold ministers to account. What we do have, though, that equalises all of us every four years is elections. Rob Lucas faces no such accountability because the Liberal Party think it is appropriate to have a Treasurer in place who is increasing debt by \$3.3 billion, making up stories about a financial mess, but who will not face the people again. That is inappropriate. The Liberal Party should tell the people of South Australia who will be the next Treasurer and do that immediately.

I also believe that, in the area of transport, the junior minister has let down the people of South Australia terribly. Again, we still do not have a tram to go up North Terrace after it was 'set in stone'. If you cannot get that right, how can you get anything else right?

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (20:18):** It gives me great pleasure to rise today and speak in support of the Liberal Marshall government's first budget. Unlike what we have heard from the other side—all negativity and gloom—there has been a good story in South Australia, particularly regional South Australia. It is refreshing that our government has seen fit to hand down a budget that is focused on supporting regional communities, businesses and families rather than one that does not consider people beyond the tollgate, like those on the other side.

This is a welcome change from budgets handed down by the previous Labor governments. It is a budget for the whole state, a budget which is fair and responsible and which will stand the state in good stead for economic growth over the coming years. It is a budget that has recognised that regional communities require investment in infrastructure and health services. The government, by delivering on its election promises, through this budget is creating a climate that has targeted investment to support regional communities and businesses to see them thrive.

It is lifting the regions, their roads, their hospitals and aged-care facilities from the funding abyss created by the previous Labor government and is seeking to help make up for the backlog of neglected roads, CFS fire stations, hospitals and other infrastructure and services required for our regions to flourish. The budget delivers for regions through the \$15 million per year Regional Growth Fund. This program is targeted at unlocking new economic activity and will act to strengthen our regional communities. I look forward to seeing the opportunities of innovation and economic drive that will spring from this initiative.

The \$10 million delivered through the budget to address mobile phone blackspots will act to improve mobile phone coverage—another stark area of neglect in regional communities that is a legacy of the previous Labor government. The mobile phone blackspot fund will provide opportunities to leverage funding from a range of sources, including the commonwealth government. Mobile blackspots are all too prevalent in regional communities, impacting on people's ability to do business, impacting on families and critically impacting on the ability of our emergency services to respond and manage emergency incidents.

The improvement of regional health services is targeted in the budget, with \$140 million over 10 years committed to country hospital capital works and, importantly, \$20 million over four years identified to develop and implement a rural workforce strategy. This investment will assist in addressing the dire shortage of health practitioners in regional areas and start to address the backlog of capital works in hospitals that have been operating under difficult conditions, brought on by inaction and neglect by the former government.

In my own electorate, the investment of \$1 million this year to upgrade the fire protection system at the Lighthouse Lodge aged-care home in Kingston is much needed to ensure the safety of its residents. In the adjacent electorate of Mount Gambier, there is an investment of \$2.1 million to expand and upgrade the renal dialysis unit at the Mount Gambier hospital. This is a benefit to my electorate because it is a major health precinct at Mount Gambier, and we will have constituents use these facilities. Two renal dialysis unit chairs will be added, enabling eight more patients to receive treatment in Mount Gambier every week. This is a great outcome for both electorates.

I cannot talk to the budget measures without recognising the delivery of a significant election promise for my own electorate of MacKillop, which will see the completion of the Penola bypass within two years. This project is an important collaboration between the state, federal and local governments. On this point, I would like to acknowledge the hard work of my commonwealth counterpart, the member for Barker, Tony Pasin, who has continued to be a strong advocate for the bypass, along with the Wattle Range Council. It must be highlighted that the Penola bypass has been 60 years in the making—or waiting—as it was first suggested 60-odd years ago.

Giving credit where it may be due in some slight shape or form, the previous government did build half a bypass at Penola, but then it just walked away from the rest of the construction and completing it. It is a bit like the way they looked after regional areas: they only half did the job. The investment of \$14½ million will realise the investment of the commonwealth's contribution of \$9 million that until now has been unspent by the former Labor government, who lacked the drive and commitment to finalise this project, the Penola bypass.

With this funding commitment, the Liberal Marshall government will be able to finish off the final section of this important roadway. The construction of the bypass will ensure that all heavy vehicle traffic will be diverted around the Penola main street, making the township safer and more appealing to the many thousands of visitors who stop to enjoy, shop or eat at one of the fine cafes, or who pause to take in the historic sites of this beautiful historic town. I have been a strong advocate for the Penola bypass, and it is great to see the Marshall government deliver for the MacKillop electorate to enable the completion of this significant infrastructure project.



The budget shows that we are listening to the people of regional South Australia. The recent Business SA regional business survey highlighted that in MacKillop both skilled and unskilled workers are in short supply. I am pleased to see our government addressing the issue of skilled workers in regions and across the state on a number of fronts through the creation of more than 20,000 new apprenticeships and traineeships to ensure that people are job ready. There is a reinvigoration of TAFE SA, which will be given a fresh start, to ensure the continuation of service delivery, that quality standards are met and that there is compliance with national vocational education training standards.

The flexible apprenticeships program, enabling students to complete their SACE while commencing an apprenticeship, is absolutely another positive aspect to address the issue of training and skills shortages. I highlight that there are many places in my region where we are short on workers and we are short on skills. These apprenticeships can only go in some shape or fashion to actually addressing these issues.

We have just heard from the member for West Torrens. Before I finish, I just cannot let it go unsaid: the member has, I would say in the nicest possible way, just rambled on. He highlighted 'a financial mess' at least 20 times. Ironically, he is responsible for exactly that. He is critical of the government taking the debt, which, in what I have seen of the figures, I understand is \$14½ billion to \$16 billion. In my terms, it does not amount to \$3 billion but does add \$1½ billion.

The point is that we are acknowledging—and I think the member for West Torrens is, too—that there is \$14½ billion of debt that they have left to us with no means or idea of how to pay it back, where we go from here and how we address this situation. All he can do is throw stones at us. If he goes back to the nineties—and maybe his memory does go back that far—when the Liberal Party came to government after the State Bank debacle, the Labor Party left an \$8 billion debt and the Liberal Party did its absolute uttermost to bring the financial situation under control.

It tried to get the debts down and took the responsibility upon itself, just to be ousted from government for doing exactly that. Maybe that is what you on the other side are most disappointed about: the fact that we are not going to come and fix your mess up straightaway, that we are not going to unravel the mess that you have created. Of all the things I have seen, I want us first of all to fix up what you have neglected. As I highlighted in my speech, regional areas such as my electorate have missed out. I cannot see why we should miss out on another four years of funding so that we can fix up where you have spent all the money on what I would call mismanagement.

The member for West Torrens talked about how he was really disappointed about bipartisan spending on projects. He thought that the Liberal government might just be part of what they had been part of for 16 years. I think this highlights that, when you have been in government for 16 years, perhaps you have blinkers on, perhaps you become complacent, perhaps you become deaf.

Whatever the case, I do not think that you have really understood that, when the Liberal Party were on the other side of the chamber where you are today, we did not actually agree with what you were doing to this state. We had another plan to put in place. I think that is what is important about what we have done in this first budget. Although I do not think that it is going to meet all the criteria we would like as a party, for how you have left it is the best we can do at the start. That is what is most important.

The previous speaker, the member for West Torrens, talked about borrowed money in regard to fixing up a mess. Well, some businesses actually borrow more money to fix a problem. He may have never done that in his life, but I belong to a business where we have a debt level and we actually increase it to increase our prosperity. That is not unheard of. If your business is running well, and you have a great cash flow and good returns because commodity prices are strong, you can borrow more money to perhaps fix a mess. I would not rule that out.

He talked about cabinet looking after themselves. Yes, we have a cabinet. We have a strong leadership group that has been in power for at least one term and more. We will be guided by them, we will take their wise counsel and we will act as a party. He asked why we are doing this and why we would not cause an uproar. Well, we do not have to do that. We can actually operate as a party. We will be led by the front bench that we believe, that is running our finances. I believe that, in all shapes and fashions, we are being looked after.

I highlight to you the seat of MacKillop. It has absolutely had a very good budget. We have been looked after better than we were under a Labor government—surprise, surprise. The Liberal Party is talking about bus routes, that we might close some in the city, and the member for West Torrens is critical of the member for Newland for accepting this. I have bus routes that are closed in my electorate. I have schoolchildren who cannot get on the buses because there is no bus that they will fit on to. That was left over by the previous government.

To me, that is not a very sustainable situation at all. I have a township in MacKillop that had to go and buy their own bus and pay for their own driver to have their own South Australian students picked up, yet you say that we are closing bus routes. Maybe if they need closing, they do not have anyone on them. My buses do have people on them. My buses have children who need education. That did not worry you over there, though, did it?

The member talked about the mining outcomes. He thinks that we have a budget that is absolutely bad for mining. It could not be more to the contrary. My understanding is that we are breaking down the rules, we are breaking down the regulations, to allow mining. We know that when we—

**Mr Picton:** Not in the South-East.

**Mr McBRIDE:** I am glad you brought that up over there.

**An honourable member:** In the wilderness.

**Mr McBRIDE:** In the wilderness over there, correct. We have a ministerial directive over 10 years not to allow fracking to take place on the Limestone Coast. We have just legislated, or attempted to legislate, through this parliament, when it gets through the upper house, and it will not change. Nothing changes if we stay in power.

We still have mining companies coming into our region wanting to drill a well. There is a well called Haselgrove-3, which I reminded the parliament about last time I spoke on this. I thought it only had the highest flow rate in South Australia's history; it turns out to be the highest flow rate in Australian history. It is so huge that the potential is unknown.

There is another business down that way that wants to drill a well conventionally, and hopefully it will find the same prosperity as Haselgrove-3. What are we going to try to do with that? We want to put it towards electricity or put it towards business. Why would we want to do that? Because we want to fix up the mess that the other government left behind. We want to actually lower power prices. That is one of the things that you have not said anything about in this budget. The power prices that the government has put on to this state over the last 10 years—

**Mr Pederick:** Former government.

**Mr McBRIDE:** Former government, thank you—the former government put on to this state are nothing like the damage that you are talking about in this budget. You should hang your heads in shame for what you have done to power prices. We can only get the power prices down by 10 or 20 per cent, but we know that the power prices have over doubled—200 per cent in 10 years. It is out of control.

Then you talk about the most vulnerable in society being hurt by our rental on public housing and the most vulnerable being at risk of our budget. Power prices did a lot more damage than our rental ever did, or ever will do, and those on the other side of the chamber know this. You know they cannot keep warm, you know they cannot keep cool, you know they cannot turn the power points on, because power is too expensive for them. In 16 years, you only made it worse, not better.

I will wrap up and say that I look forward to implementing this Liberal Marshall government's first budget. We know that many of our state's issues will not be fixed overnight. However, this budget provides a strong foundation for the state to invest in priorities that will grow businesses, industry and the economy. The previous Labor government conveniently forgot about regional South Australia. I am proud to be part of a government that is putting the regions firmly back on the map. I commend the bill to members.

**Mr PICTON (Kaurana) (20:31):** I am sure the member for Newland is reassured by that speech from the member for MacKillop, that despite all the cuts, all the privatisations happening out

in the north-east, in the very marginal seat that he is going to try to defend, things are fine in the seat of MacKillop. This is a good budget for the seat of MacKillop, where probably nine out of 10 people vote for the Liberal Party and they take lists of the people who vote for Labor in some of those towns.

It is fine that there is a whole raft of pain being inflicted upon the people of Newland because the member for Newland can go and doorknock in that area and say, 'Don't worry. Things are going to be fine in the South-East because that's what the member there has told me, despite the fact that TAFEs are closing in the north-east, despite the fact that we are privatising ambulances and putting patients at risk in the north-east, despite the fact that we are closing the Service SA branch and telling people they have to go all the way to Tranmere and a massive line to get any type of service in Service SA.'

Despite all those things, things are going to be fine in the South-East. That shows some of the perverse logic that we are seeing in this budget. It is certainly something that we will be highlighting every single day leading up to the next election because the Liberal Party, after having been in the wilderness for 16 years, has been elected largely on the basis of support in the north-eastern suburbs, in those marginal seats. What have they done? Within months of getting to power, they have betrayed the trust that those people put in them and have inflicted the most savage cuts of this budget on those people in the north-eastern suburbs.

Whether you are a public transport user, a hospital user, a Service SA user, a Housing Trust tenant or somebody who wants to go to TAFE, you are copping the brunt of this budget. The member for King and the member for Newland are going to have us telling people in that area about the pain that is being inflicted by this Liberal government every single day leading up to the next election.

I would particularly like to highlight tonight what we have seen in this budget in terms of health. Obviously, as the shadow minister for health, it is the key area of interest for me in terms of this budget. What we have seen in health is yet again the same cuts, the same privatisations, the same closures, and a complete disregard in so many areas of what was promised before the election. We had very clear promises from the Premier, from the now health minister before the election, saying that they were going to invest significantly in health, saying that they were going to fix problems in health. There was nothing in health that they could not do, that they could not fix, that they did not have an easy answer to.

There was no talk of inflicting any pain in health services whatsoever from the Liberal Party. It was only going to be rosier, happier and better under their management. Now we see the truth of the matter in their budget documents, where we see cuts. We see very significant cuts to the health budget; we see very significant cuts to doctors and nurses and also to other important workers across the health system; and we see privatisations. We see the privatisation of SA Pathology, SA Medical Imaging and ambulance transfers.

We also see closures. We see the closure of the independent voice for health consumers in this state and we see the closure of HIV services. People you would think we would want to be supporting the most are getting their services ripped away from them by the Liberal Party in this budget, which is an absolute disgrace. What did they promise before the election? Firstly, of course, the now Premier very clearly said, 'We do not have a privatisation agenda.' He said that in the PSA debate. That was a solemn promise from the Premier before the election. It has been completely broken in this budget.

We had the now health minister going around saying, 'A Treasury-driven health cuts plan is no way to deliver better health outcomes,' and, 'You can't improve health outcomes by reducing health services.' What we are now seeing is that we do have a Treasury-driven cuts agenda in health. In fact, we have heard from a number of people that the health minister's office was not even involved in discussions about many of these cuts and that they were surprised about many of these cuts. It was all driven by the Treasurer, Rob Lucas, and his office, and the health minister and his department were not involved at all. So this is a completely Treasury-driven health cuts agenda that is being inflicted upon the state.

Just look at what they are projecting for the next year. For the next year, they are projecting to have fewer staff, to the tune of 884 fewer across our health system. For whatever reason you think that there are issues in the health system—and no-one is doubting that there have been a number

of different health issues; even the minister is acknowledging that he is confronting a number of health issues at the moment in our hospitals and outside—no-one would tell you that reducing the number of staff in our health system by 900 people is going to solve any issue in our health system.

People want to see more doctors and nurses, more people working in our health system, but this budget projects to reduce the number of staff by up to 900 within the next nine months. That is very highly focused in two areas. One is the Department for Health, where they are projecting that 300 people will go, and the other is the Central Adelaide Local Health Network, which covers the Royal Adelaide Hospital, The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, SA Pathology, SA Dental Services and other services, where they are projecting that 850 staff will have to go.

Of course, we know that the Liberal Party, in one of their first moves, have brought on board the liquidators and administrators KordaMentha, an organisation with no experience in terms of health policy or in running health services. This is a company that comes in if a business is going bad and basically works out what to sell. They have been brought in to try to cut those hundreds of staff, to cut significant funding from the budget of the Central Adelaide Local Health Network. We know that some diagnostic reports have been given to the government already from KordaMentha. They have not been released.

The minister said that he has not received their final report and that that is apparently coming in the next couple of weeks. But, even then, he said that he is not necessarily going to release that report immediately. We think that absolutely needs to be in the public eye, and we know that staff across the health system are very concerned about what this is going to mean. Patients should be very concerned about what this is going to mean because these cuts are going to hit very hard in terms of our hospital services. Hospital services that are already under the pump are going to get much worse because of the actions of this government in bringing in KordaMentha to slash and burn the Central Adelaide Local Health Network. While they have been saying, 'We are investing extra money in health,' they are giving with one hand but taking with the other. They have added another \$700 million worth of cuts to health across the forward estimates. So, while they have injected more with one hand, they have taken it away with the other.

Of course, nothing shows the lack of foresight and the significant broken promises than what has been decided in this budget for SA Pathology and SA Medical Imaging. Over the past four years, clearly these areas were looked at in detail and we decided we were not going to cut these significantly and we were not going to look at privatising them. What is the first step the Liberals took when they came in? They cut SA Pathology to the tune of \$105 million over three years and they cut SA Medical Imaging by \$18 million over three or four years. They are very significant cuts being imposed.

While that might not be what you think of when you go through the front doors of a hospital, those pathology and imaging services are absolutely essential to the running of a hospital. They are absolutely essential to making sure that patients are seen to on time, quickly and get good results. We have some expert people working in our pathology and imaging services in South Australia. If we go down the path the Liberal Party is proposing of, firstly, significantly cutting those services by over \$100 million and then saying, 'After this we are probably going to put them all up for privatisation,' and the local health networks go with the lowest bidder, then we will see the death of SA Pathology, something which started through the IMVS, a renowned institute for a very long period of South Australia's history, and which then turned into SA Pathology.

That would be the end of it. That would be the end of the teaching and research that happened there. That would be the end of the professional, expert care we get through the clinicians there, who are able to do very complex work on behalf of patients in the health system, and also on behalf of patients in the primary healthcare sector. If you go to your GP and a complex piece of work needs to be done, it is likely that it will be sent to SA Pathology, not to a private contractor, because we have the biggest labs in our public system because we are running them not for profit, we are running them for the people of South Australia.

Without SA Pathology, what we are going to see is private labs sending samples interstate. As I was told today, potentially some private labs are sending samples overseas to be tested. That is the future that the Liberal Party is proposing in its privatisation agenda for our public hospital

system. We do not believe that clinicians who work in our public hospital system should be there for profit. They should be there as public employees for the good of South Australians.

Of course, this was not something that was talked about before the election. In fact, the minister went out of his way to criticise previous attempts and consideration of reforms in this area. He went out of his way to say things such as he would be consulting with staff before any reform in SA Pathology was considered. None of that occurred. This came as a complete surprise to all the workforce in SA Pathology and SA Medical Imaging. They have not had any notification from the minister, and their representatives have not had any phone calls from the minister to discuss this.

They had to take the unprecedented step of coming to parliament today to listen to question time—when we were unfortunately unenlightened by the answers given—because they are completely in the dark about how this came about, why promises were broken, why privatisation promises were broken and what this is going to mean for their services, their jobs and the work they do on behalf of patients in South Australia.

We also know that this is something that various key members of the government have previously opposed when they were in opposition. Members of the government, on the front bench, went out of their way in opposition to say that privatisation of SA Pathology would be very bad for their communities. The Minister for Energy, who represents the Minister for Health in this house, said to his local newspaper that privatising SA Pathology in Port Augusta would be a very poor move. Absolutely. We agree. Why does he now not agree with that? We think that there will be an impact upon regional communities.

SA Pathology, as it is there for the public good and not to turn a profit, has a huge network through regional South Australia. The privatisation and significant cuts to that service are only going to have adverse impacts on country people, country hospitals and country primary health care through their GPs. It is something that the Liberal Party should be opposing, not putting forward as a measure in this year's budget.

Another element of this is that, potentially, we are going to see higher costs for people in the community because of the competition that the public provider, through SA Pathology, provides to the community sector. It means that the very large percentage of tests, blood tests and other samples that are done in South Australia are bulk billed. Without public provider competition, we are likely to see bulk billing rates drop and patients facing more out-of-pocket costs. This supposed saving that the government is trying to achieve, and also their ideologically driven privatisation agenda, is not only going to cause bad impacts on our public patients but is also going to cause bad impacts on patients in their GP rooms across South Australia.

In the parliament today, we also discussed a very cruel cut, a cut where the government has pulled the entire funding available to a key service for people with HIV in South Australia. It is a service called Cheltenham Place. It is run by Centacare, and it is highly respected and well utilised by people who have HIV. The government have not said, 'We think there is an issue here; we need to reform it.' They have not said, 'We want to put this out for tender for another provider.' They have just said, 'We are going to cut this funding entirely. We are not going to have a specialised HIV service in this state anymore. People with HIV will not have that specialised outpatient support available to them.' That is an absolutely cruel cut.

Of course, this is not something that was discussed at all before the election, I do not think it is something the people of South Australia support and it is not something that even saves very much money. In fact, Centacare, who run the service, have examples and evidence to show that the running of their service for a relatively small amount of money—to the tune of about \$400,000—saves at least double that in terms of emergency admissions and admissions to hospital that we would otherwise see. So this is a short-sighted cut that is going to end up actually costing the health system more money in the end. It is completely indefensible. It is completely a surprise to everybody in the sector.

In fact, it is pretty clear that the Liberal Party did not even know what they were doing when they cut this funding because in minister Wade's press release, which he put out with the Orwellian title of 'Sustainable, efficient health services', which was his release where he dumped all the cuts that he was making, he called it a focus on 'homeless individuals with HIV'. This infuriated Centacare

because it showed that they did not have a basic understanding of the service that was being provided before they went around cutting it. Of course, they did not discuss it with them at all.

We have also seen a very cruel and short-sighted cut in terms of completely closing and removing all funding from the Health Consumers Alliance. This is the body that represents patients in South Australia. This is the body that independently stands up to hospitals and the health administration and goes in to bat for patients. Of course, we have the AMA that represents doctors, the ANMF that represents nurses and a whole range of other organisations that represent different perspectives on the health system, but this is the body that represents patients.

This is absolutely important to making sure that we have a patient-led and consumer-led health service that cares about people. It is absolutely important to be able to have a body that can independently stand up to government and that can go around and train up consumers to stand up on their own behalf at hospitals across the whole state. We know it is important because every single other state has one. Every single other state has central government funding that goes in to provide that service because who else is going to do it? You are not going to rattle the can around in the emergency department. It needs a government hand there supporting it.

That is why we were very glad to support it over our term of government, and we think it is absolutely short-sighted to cut it. We know that this was a very rushed job because there was no discussion with them beforehand. In fact, the body was sitting in the stakeholders' lockup and somebody knocked on their shoulder and said, 'Isn't this your body having all its funding cut?' That is the way communication happens under the Marshall government at the moment. That is how they found out that all their funding was going to be cut and the voice of consumers was going to end in South Australia.

There are a whole range of other, different cuts that are happening, particularly in areas such as sexual health services in Shine SA, areas that particularly keep people out of hospital, reduce admissions to emergency departments, reduce other admissions to hospital and save the government money overall. We had minister Wade, before he was elected, running around saying he wanted to invest more in prevention. This was his first chance, and he has cut this money. He has cut preventative money across the board in these important areas, which is going to cost the budget more overall.

We are seeing more privatisation, sadly, in terms of our ambulance services. At the moment we have ambulance services running between Modbury Hospital and Lyell McEwin Hospital, sometimes looking after quite unwell people who need to have paramedics or other trained ambulance officers there to support them. The government is going to put that out for contract, for tender, and the level of care that will be provided to those patients will be less. Patients who potentially could be seriously ill could be at risk due to this privatisation.

People at Modbury know all about what privatisation means because they saw their hospital privatised under the previous government. Now they are seeing their local ambulance services privatised under this government. It was not promised before the election; it was not discussed before the election. It has been pulled out of the Treasury drawer and imposed upon the people of the north-east. We will be highlighting for the electors of King and the electors of Newland this broken promise on privatisation that is being inflicted upon them.

We are also seeing money being put into boards, money being put into setting up extra bureaucracies to the tune of \$15 million over the forward estimates. This is money that could be going into health services, that could be going into helping patients and that could be going into addressing these HIV cuts and other cuts but is going into extra bureaucracy, extra duplication, extra fragmentation across the system. None of that is going to help any patients. All this shows the wrong priorities: cuts, closures, privatisations and broken promises.

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (20:52):** I rise to commend the Marshall Liberal government for a firm yet fair state budget. Treasurer Rob Lucas promised the budget will not 'end at the tollgate', and I am pleased to finally see a focus on the regions, which contribute so much to the state's economy. In my electorate of Mount Gambier, a city of more than 27,000 people, residents want to see tangible investment in their region from the state government. They want to see funds directed towards areas such as health services, education, mobile blackspots, roads and infrastructure.

The 2018 budget has delivered in many of those areas. Probably the biggest win for my electorate was the \$2.1 million to upgrade and expand the Mount Gambier hospital's renal dialysis unit. This funding will bring about a major and lifesaving change for local patients undergoing renal dialysis and, importantly, bring Mount Gambier hospital's renal dialysis services in line with other regional hospitals in the state.

The funding of the statewide meningococcal B vaccination program is also great news, and this began as a grassroots campaign in my electorate. In March, Mount Gambier resident Alli Schleef started a petition calling on the state Liberal government to fund the B strain vaccine for children across the state. That petition was signed by 4,600 people from my electorate, and thanks to their voices this vaccination program will help prevent more unnecessary deaths from this disease.

Funding to complete the Penola bypass was also very well received in my community. It is hard to believe, but the idea for the bypass first began in the 1950s, showing just how patient regional residents are in waiting for major projects to be funded. Two years ago, the bypass was dubbed 'the road to nowhere' after work ground to a halt with just the first stage completed. It was quite unbelievable that you would drive halfway around this bypass, then hit a T-junction and have to come back into the township of Penola and then continue on the main road.

The road that will now be completed will allow up to 500 heavy vehicles a day to bypass Penola's main street and allow this small South-East town to flourish without having B-double trucks shake the buildings when they pass. It will also allow tourists using the Southern Ocean Drive touring route to visit Penola and our internationally renowned Coonawarra wine region without having to deal with cattle and log trucks. However, I would like to see part of the \$315 million of the regional roads and infrastructure fund allocated to specific regional projects in the area of Mount Gambier. Billions of dollars have been spent upgrading and maintaining city roads; however, the regions have to wait to see extra highway lanes, shoulder sealing and even the fixing of potholes.

The injection of \$10 million towards addressing some of the state's biggest mobile blackspots is also welcome, and this is an issue that I have ranked as one of my main priorities. In the city, it is taken for granted that you can get mobile phone service everywhere, but in my region the service drops out and is unreliable in many areas. Even at the Glenburnie saleyards, a multimillion dollar livestock centre, there is no tower, and it is a standing joke that agents have to climb the fences to get service. I have nominated several priority sites in my electorate as a matter of urgency and look forward to this work commencing.

As a former educator, I was pleased to see a record spend in this year's state budget on education—the biggest in the state's history. This investment is good news for the next generation of South Australians and will help develop and prepare them for their future. Along with the big ticket items, including \$27.7 million to transition year 7 students into high school, it was good to see smaller yet no less important additions, such as a review of school bus services in regional areas.

I was also pleased to see that all graduating teachers will have to pass a numeracy and literacy test. This is one area where we need an increase in focus. The quality of our teachers is paramount. In fact, in many studies it has been shown that the level of a student will not overtake the level of a teacher. So, if we have teachers who are barely passing year 12 graduating as teachers, unfortunately the level of attainment for those students will not surpass the level of their teacher.

Increasing sporting vouchers from \$50 to \$100 for primary school children is another budget measure that I welcome. Sport is important for getting children outside, active, participating in a team environment and having fun. It develops positive self-esteem, teamwork and cooperation skills that continue well into adulthood. Many talented players from my region have gone on to become sporting stars at a national level. Many families have children playing multiple sports, and this increase will help those families that may be struggling with household bills to continue with their children's sporting commitments.

On that point, the rising cost of living and the subsequent impact on household budgets is an issue my office hears about every day. The \$360 million reduction in the emergency services levy will mean a saving of around \$145 for the average South Australian household per year. Measures such as these will have a positive impact upon household budgets as will the Home Battery Scheme, which will allow 40,000 homes to invest in battery storage systems. The reliability and security of the

state's power supply is an issue affecting every South Australian, and the \$184 million energy solution is a good start towards addressing our energy concerns now and into the future.

I have often stated that I believe that renewable energy is the way forward. Mount Gambier is home to one of Australia's most significant forestry regions. It has been stated that renewable energy from timber waste products could supply more than 5 per cent of South Australia's entire electricity needs. My region is well placed to lead the way in renewable technologies, such as wood biomass. All it needs is support and investment.

While it was good to see \$192 million invested in regional health services, our region has two very specific needs that were not addressed in this year's state budget: drug rehabilitation and mental health services. Our region needs drug rehabilitation centres that offer ongoing support and treatment options for those in the crisis of addiction rather than short-term populist measures. Methamphetamine (ice) is having a devastating effect in regional communities, particularly Mount Gambier. People are losing their jobs, families and livelihoods because of this insidious drug.

Regional families with an addicted family member have an additional problem: the tyranny of distance to access treatment and facilities. In Mount Gambier, the largest regional city in South Australia, there are no dedicated drug rehabilitation beds. Six rehabilitation beds for Mount Gambier were announced in October last year as part of the state government's 'Stop the Hurt' strategy. They were supposed to be operational by early 2018, but here we are in September and still no beds.

People needing detox facilities or long-term rehabilitation have to go across the border or to Adelaide five hours away. The waitlist for counselling and support services is often months long. I am heartened to see the state government has pledged to run a trial of the intensive outpatient Matrix drug program in the Riverland region after being launched in Adelaide earlier this year.

The results of this program, which takes a vastly different approach to traditional drug treatment programs, have seen significant reductions in methamphetamine use and relapse. More than 75 per cent of participants use drugs for five days or less during the program and 48 per cent did not use at all. It is obviously early days and more work and research needs to be completed to determine the long-term results; however, I would like to state on the record right now that I would like to see Mount Gambier become one of those regional trial sites.

In the area of mental health, the same issues are occurring for those in regional communities: long waitlists and not enough services or ongoing support. They are issues that require long-term solutions, not stopgap measures, and I will continue to lobby strongly for more funding, resources and facilities in these areas.

The area of regional tourism deserves a notable mention, as I come from a region gifted with incredible assets that merit greater recognition on the state's tourism agenda. In the South-East, we are lucky enough to have some of Australia's most incredible natural features: volcanoes, sinkholes and cave systems, which are internationally renowned and attract thousands of tourists each year. Seeing Mount Gambier's Blue Lake in summertime, when it has undergone its spectacular natural colour change, has to be seen to be believed.

The activation of these natural assets in developing a master plan to guide our city's future tourism projects is a priority during my time as the member for Mount Gambier. Although it is good to see an increased focus on attracting major events to South Australia with the \$40 million event bid fund, there needs to be regional inclusion.

It was announced that Mount Gambier's Sir Robert Helpmann Theatre will share in \$1 million with three other regional theatres for substantial sustainment works. I would like to see more dedicated funding towards arts events and projects for the regions. A case in point is the Mount Gambier Fringe festival. Run in conjunction with the successful Adelaide Fringe, the event has gone from strength to strength since it was first run in 2017, and this year attracted more than 12,000 people to the event. Next year's event is going ahead with approximately \$20,000 less in the kitty from the state government. By comparison, the 2019 Adelaide Festival received \$1.3 million in this year's state budget, bringing total government funding to more than \$9 million.

But let's end on a good note. In regional areas, 60 per cent of the population engage in volunteer work, whether it is running a barbecue at Bunnings for a sports club or donating their time



to the local animal shelter. These people are the backbone of our community—those who actively donate their time for a good cause. The removal of the \$60 volunteer screening fee is a small gesture but one that will reward our volunteers and benefit many regional organisations and events that depend heavily on volunteers to run. One of these is our famous Generations in Jazz festival, which has grown exponentially over 30 years thanks to the valuable contribution of volunteers, some of whom return year after year. I commend the government for rewarding our hardworking volunteers.

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (21:04):** I am proud to rise in support of the state budget 2018-19. This is the first budget of the new Marshall Liberal government. I am mindful of the substantial challenge that we face after 16 years in opposition. The former Labor government's financial mismanagement of our state during that time has given us an enormous task, one we are well aware of. We must return the budget to a sustainable position and restore confidence to the state. It is a challenge we relish and an opportunity we have taken up with both hands. I commend the Treasurer for his decisive action and determined economic leadership—safe hands indeed.

The Marshall Liberal government is committed to its election promises: creating jobs, lowering the cost of doing business, reducing the cost of living and providing better services for South Australians. We have made good on each and every one of our election commitments. That is important because we are committed to building, in our communities across the state, confidence in the way we go about our work. We want a respectful dialogue and we want to be known for doing as we say we will do. We must restore credibility in government.

The former Labor government told us, in its last budget, that it would achieve a \$12 million surplus for the last financial year. The fact was a crushing \$397 million deficit. We will not shy away from cleaning up the mess, but we recognise the reality. If we are to build confidence in government within the community, then we must take responsibility, we must do as we say we will do and we must get on with doing the job in a professional way.

This requires a pragmatic and disciplined approach. We cannot change what we have inherited, but we can shape a better future for the state by making hard decisions and delivering on our commitments. As evidenced over the last 16 years, not a single job is created by sitting back and putting a hand out.

At the very core of all we are doing in the new Marshall Liberal government is a strong focus on delivering a future in this state that we and our children can be proud of, opportunities for them to stay here and thrive. We want to excite and inspire the next generation by giving them the opportunity to find secure employment, and that means proper training for jobs for the future and the opportunities we intend to create. To do this, we must compete with the other states, and we must ensure that our budget is one that will ensure growth in the economy.

We are lowering the cost of doing business in South Australia by removing payroll tax for small business. The new threshold will mean that we are effectively abolishing payroll tax, that insidious tax, for all small business in this state. We are sending a clear message that the state is genuinely open for business, for investment, and that the door is open for the employment of more South Australians. We are going to spend over \$150 million on reducing payroll tax and we are going to spend a further \$95 million on land tax relief.

The challenge is also to lower the cost of doing government business. Government revenue exceeded \$19 billion in the last year, and we must ensure that we do all we can to reduce excessive government spending so that we can return the budget to sustainable surplus. Cost-of-living pressures affect all South Australians. We have cut the ESL. We promised to do that. We campaigned on it and it is a policy of longstanding.

Over the four years ahead, we will be putting back \$360 million into the pockets of South Australians. As the recipient, recently, of my ESL bill, like many South Australians I noticed immediately the effect of that change—a commitment that we have made good on. We are also moving to cap increases in levies, including the natural resources management levy from 1 July next year.

I am pleased and proud to see the significant investment we are making in health and education. Let there be no doubt about it: health and education, those portions of this state budget,

occupy the lion's share of spending in our budget, and it is so important that we return to a situation in which we have confidence in the administration of health and education in this state. In health, we will spend more than \$1.2 billion improving the health service. I am proud to say that more than \$190 million will be spent on regional health to upgrade hospitals to address rural GP shortages and to extend rural chemotherapy services.

We are going to fulfil our election commitment to increase paediatric services at Mount Barker hospital by providing \$79,000 per year, indexed, from this year. This is all about improving regional health services in the Adelaide Hills. We have committed more than \$8.5 million to be spent over three years on the construction of a new aged-care facility at Strathalbyn and for the future fit-out of the Kalimna Hostel.

I am pleased to acknowledge that an additional \$3.9 million has been committed, the result of the excellent work of Georgina Downer during the recent by-election campaign and the result of teamwork between the state and federal governments, to ensure that that very meritorious investment will be done right, will be done fully and will be set on the course for completion over the coming years. I am proud to say that the business case is underway on the process to determine how the \$1.1 million investment we have set aside specifically for Kalimna ought be used for the purpose of refitting the site for aged-care accommodation or other purposes the community may decide.

I want to talk about our commitment to aged care at Strathalbyn because it exemplifies so much of what is at the heart of this new Marshall Liberal government. It exemplifies what is at the heart of so much of what I am proud about as a new member in this place and the way that we intend to go about governing in this state. Not only is it just one of the Marshall Liberal government's making good on an election commitment but, moreover, it is an indication that we are committed to ensuring that as a state we benefit, we grow, we thrive and we succeed as a whole state, not just as a city-state. Regional South Australia, and all of South Australia, is part of what we are investing in as a government to ensure that we succeed as a state.

Delighted as the people of Strathalbyn were at the commitment that was made in the course of the election campaign—effectively, the result of a year's work—on building a case, on setting out the evidence as to why it was necessary, on understanding the degree of neglect in regional health services that had preceded the making of that commitment, they often told me that they doubted that this could be done because it was such a large commitment. Over the last 16 years, the people of Strathalbyn had almost forgotten what it is like to have a government that is committed to them as much as a first priority as to anyone else in the state.

In the context of the state's health budget of more than \$4 billion, our commitment to Strathalbyn is certainly affordable, responsible and evidence based, but what it represents in a larger way is a turnaround in approach. It is a turnaround in approach that is about responding to, supporting and investing in community and strengthening community throughout the state. This is a commitment of which I am particularly proud. I will keep working to ensure that our Hills, along with all the regions in South Australia, are central to our state's recovery under the new Marshall Liberal government.

In education, I am very proud that \$692 million has been allocated to upgrade and modernise school infrastructure. I have already had the opportunity to visit several of the more than 20 schools located in Heysen together with the new Minister for Education. It is obvious in the regional Hills that this commitment will be well allocated where it is needed in regions that have been neglected for far too long. There will be a further increase of \$515 million in education spending, so it is great news for Heysen, and I commend those budget measures.

The new government is delivering on our GlobeLink vision; \$20 million has been allocated in the budget for the GlobeLink master plan. As we know on this side, the state is dependent upon exports and we need to ensure that our export industries are thriving and able to deliver our first class produce to the world. GlobeLink will ensure that there is a much-needed revolution in our rail/road freight network. It will create efficiencies and it will deliver freight to the rest of the country and around the world.

We are investing significantly in our regions in this budget. Regional communities, including those in Heysen, will benefit from \$773 million over five years, tackling issues such as mobile

blackspots, CFS station upgrades and the built infrastructure, services and facilities that regional South Australia needs in order to produce at its best. The amount of \$5 million has been specifically allocated to upgrade CFS stations over the next two years. As we approach the fire season this year, and as a member with many CFS brigades throughout the Hills, I know that that investment will be readily and well deployed.

Planning, transport and infrastructure are at the centre of our investments throughout the state. I am proud to say that \$470,000 has been allocated in 2018-19, and \$480,000 a year thereafter to establish a Service SA centre at Mount Barker—again, a rational approach to the delivery of services throughout our state. It will ensure access to services for those in the Adelaide Hills community and for a town that has experienced rapid growth but to date is without the services support that should have been provided over that time to go with it.

Volunteers at the grassroots level and volunteers involved in community initiatives are at the centre of all that we wish to encourage and support. In the short time available to me, I wish to further highlight that many small regional communities throughout Heysen rely very much on the volunteer efforts that are provided by those in the communities, whether it be in sporting clubs or community groups. We are abolishing volunteer screening check fees for South Australians and that recognises the importance of that contribution.

Grassroots community sports clubs will continue to enjoy financial support. There will be an ongoing focus on female and family-friendly infrastructure, with \$7.7 million, including \$3.1 million from the Female Facilities Program and the Sporting Surfaces Program allocated. In particular, I am proud to see that the Bridgewater Oval will receive \$50,000 for lighting upgrades. Again, that is a very practical measure that will ensure that all in the community can get much better use from that very beautiful facility. I look forward to continuing to work with all clubs throughout Heysen in securing future financial support.

There are further commitments, community-based commitments, through the budget. I single out our \$10,000 commitment to the Macclesfield community, again to ensure that we are building a strong local community and looking for every opportunity to do so. We are committed to the environment and recreation. I am pleased to see that that will include the unlocking of the Mount Bold Reservoir for recreational use and for all the wonderful pursuits that may be allowed through that opportunity. I welcome the fact that the budget achieves a return to surplus and projects further surpluses across the forward estimates. It is a strong budget and it will secure the future for South Australia.

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (21:24):** I have read a few press releases in my time, and sometimes they do, of course, overdo it a touch, much like a newspaper headline, desperately trying to draw in some busy readers and get their attention. There is sometimes a bit of gilding the lily, a bit of sexing things up that goes on. But possibly the most—

**The Hon. D.G. Pisoni:** Like those outrageous comments you made about the member for Adelaide—it will cost you a lot of money.

**Ms STINSON:** We'll see about that, won't we? But possibly the most galling title I have seen on a government press release was on budget day, and it was this one from the Minister for Child Protection, which states, 'State government makes child protection a priority'. I know that that is what we have been long promised by the Liberals; in fact, it was quite a mantra of the last election campaign, so one would have thought that that rhetoric would have been matched with some new initiatives, some investment or maybe even a vision and a plan—

**The Hon. R. Sanderson:** Foster care to age 21.

**Ms STINSON:** And a plan—

**The Hon. R. Sanderson:** Audit of children, broadening of the qualifications.

**Ms STINSON:** I'm getting there—you just hang on a second there.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

*The Hon. R. Sanderson interjecting:*

**Ms STINSON:** Hang on; I am happy to have a good read through it and explain to you what is going on.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Badcoe will continue and not respond to interjections.

*The Hon. R. Sanderson interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Badcoe will be heard in silence.

**Ms STINSON:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. So one would have thought there would be some initiatives or some new ideas. We have heard a lot of ideas from that side of the chamber over the last four years—here's the opportunity to actually do it. We might see some investment, we might see a vision or a plan for child protection.

The budget is, of course, a statement of the government's priorities. But, sadly, it seems that child protection really is not a priority at all. Yes, there is money for extending payments to foster carers for children in their care up to the age of 21. I have said here and I have said at many public events, which the minister and I have enjoyed going to together, that that is a great thing and I absolutely commend the government for that.

The government's headline figure in this budget was that there was \$30.9 million in extra funds going to kids in care. You would think, 'Wow, that will be great for kids in the future.' Well, no, the vast majority of that has been shoved back into last year's budget, no doubt in an attempt to make the previous government's books look bad. There is only \$7.2 million going in this financial year, and no extra funds in the years after that as extra child protection money.

What has been a priority is cutting this so-called priority area: \$3.9 million for new residential care facilities axed. Of course we do not want to see more and more kids in care, especially in residential care, but I bet that the numbers of children in care have not gone backwards under this minister—

*The Hon. R. Sanderson interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Adelaide!

**Ms STINSON:** —in the last six months. I bet that they have not gone backwards in the last six months, but it would be really hard to know this because this new minister is not even updating monthly the numbers of children in care, as the previous government did. For a government that talks about openness and transparency, it is pretty amazing that it gets to June and then this minister just decides that she is not going to update the figures each month, as everyone else has for quite some years.

She has not updated the website, which used to be updated monthly, since June. But something tells me that, if the number of kids in care were falling, we would definitely know about it.

**The Hon. R. Sanderson:** They're falling.

**Ms STINSON:** Well, maybe you should put it on the website. Maybe you should account for that openness and that transparency that your government goes on and on about, and maybe you can put them on your website so that everyone can see what is going on. But you are not, and I think that speaks a huge volume.

At June this year, there were 3,672 children in some form of care. We all support moves that will reduce the number of children in care, as long as of course they are being well cared for in their families instead or are not in need of state protection, but with no articulated plan to reduce the number of children in care, or boost the number of foster carers or increase the number of kinship placements, on top of what Labor was already doing, and with the legislation that Labor already championed, it is hard to see why the decision was taken to axe new residential care facilities and 12 full-time equivalents in residential care roles.

Surely, it would be sensible to reduce the number of children in care who need accommodation before axing the accommodation. This whole thing just smacks of an accounting exercise, and it does not seem that properly housing children in need of state protection is a priority at all, certainly not when you are taking money out of child protection accommodation.

Next, we have the slashing of 59 full-time equivalent positions that make up the financial counselling service within the Department for Child Protection. It is a complete shame. These staff work both on the prevention end and on the crisis end. They do preventative work with vulnerable families who have come into contact with the Department for Child Protection to try to make sure they can get on top of their finances and that they can be good parents and good families and capably look after their kids.

These guys are essentially the canary in the coalmine. They are the ones who, when they go in and provide people with the financial help they need, often observe other things and they report that back to the department, because they are part of the department. They can inform other people working in the department about what a family needs and if they are in a crisis situation. They are really raising these red flags every time they are interacting with vulnerable clients.

Aside from that, they are also working with children who are leaving care, helping them learn how to budget, how to survive in the community, how to manage their limited funds and to get on in the world. That is a really important thing. Without that, a lot of young people would find it a lot more difficult to make new lives for themselves outside of state care.

This service is getting outsourced. Of course, we know that Liberal governments love a bit of outsourcing and love a bit of privatisation, but this certainly is not the service that you want to outsource. The budget allocation for that new service is a paltry \$10 million. That is probably 10 counsellors, if you are lucky. Ten people are now going to do the work that 59 full-time equivalents used to do. It is absolutely ridiculous to think that the standard of service and the quality of care given to these families in providing financial services are going to be anything like 59 workers can do.

So much for that other slogan of 'Better services'—not for people who are trying to get their families together under financial strain and not for children who are leaving care. There will be no better services for them. As for 'more jobs', try telling that to the 60-odd financial counsellors who will now be joining the dole queue. It is another hollow slogan that is not actually carried out in the numbers in the budget papers.

There has been scant detail about how the government plans to achieve these savings while also delivering quality financial assistance to people in need. There seems to be very little, if any, planning at all as to how this outsourcing is going to work, how it is going to operate and how it is going to deliver services to people. There seems to be this idea, a thread running through the child protection budget papers, that in this financial year the number of children in care will dramatically drop, that these cuts can be made because—hallelujah—the Liberals have fixed the pressures in child protection in just a few months. It is amazing! But, of course, that is simply and obviously ridiculous.

Considering that there have been no major reforms by the new Liberal government in the last six months, it is hard to see how massive reductions in the number of kids in care and massive increases in the number of foster carers are going to be achieved in this financial year. And there is no significant change to staffing levels. It is an amazing amount that will be achieved, which means that we do not need this other spending. It is just completely baseless. Certainly, we have not seen any sort of data that accords with the cuts that are actually being implemented here.

Do you know what there is room for in the budget? There is room for fitting out the department's offices to the tune of \$6.4 million, and there is a whopping \$1.6 million to fund setting up the stand-alone ministry. Then there is \$2.2 million each year after that to fund ministerial staff. That is what the real priorities are for this Liberal government: not for somewhere for vulnerable children to rest their heads, not money for the people who care for them, not more staff or better recompensed staff, but nice offices for the minister and her staff to work in. It is an absolute joke. This shows exactly how much priority this new government actually puts on child protection.

My other shadow portfolio is arts. It is fair to say that the arts community is simply shocked at the severe budget cuts inflicted on it by this government. We have always known that the Liberals are no friends of the arts community, but this is a new low. There are total cuts over four years of \$16.5 million. Arts SA has been slashed. They will be down to as few as eight to 10 staff the sector has been told this week. That is a huge reduction from the 98-odd staff who were budgeted for in the

last financial year. It is 98-odd staff down to eight to 10, they are being told. There will be only eight to 10 staff left in Arts SA.

We all know, of course, that the executive director was sacked. He was not needed anymore. In fact, his whole role was removed, so it is leaderless at the moment. Parts of the arts portfolio have been picked off and sent to other portfolios like education and industry and skills. The children's theatre bodies that have been sent over to education were barely even told before the budget was released. There was not a skerrick of consultation. It is a divide and conquer approach to the arts.

I know that the arts sector asked for a whole-of-government approach, but this is not what they meant. Cutting it up and throwing chunks of it to different ministers is not a whole-of-government approach: it is the dismantling of the arts sector, and it is no secret. The arts sector know it. They know what is happening, they are not happy about it, and I think you have to watch this space. It is not a good outcome at all.

Many in the arts thought it was excellent when Premier Steven Marshall claimed the arts portfolio. They thought that maybe it would bring some esteem to their area of industry. They thought that it might even bring them some protection from severe budget cuts and it might bring them some extra respect, that government might actually respect what they do. They are jobs generators, but they are also building the fabric of our society.

What would we be without the cultural pursuits that we are lucky enough to have in Adelaide? There is a massive range of them. We like to call ourselves the festival state and claim that as part of our identity as a state, and so we should. Unfortunately, the arts sector certainly does not think that Steven Marshall is a champion of theirs now.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** Point of order, sir.

**Ms STINSON:** The Premier has been refusing to meet with major and minor arts organisations since his—

**The SPEAKER:** A point of order by the Minister for Industry.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** Previous speakers have insisted that members are addressed by their title, not by their name.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, that is the case. The Minister for Industry is correct in this instance. I ask the member for Badcoe to please refer to members by their title or their electorate name.

**Ms STINSON:** Sure. Certainly, the arts sector does not think that the Premier is their champion now. The Premier has been refusing to meet with both major and minor arts organisations since his election. You could say, 'Look, he is a busy bloke.' Obviously, the Premier's gig is the busiest one in the state. Of course, he has quite a lot of portfolios. He probably would not have time to meet them or at least not all of them. It is a big role and we all accept that, but now we know, looking at the budget, that he just did not want to face the music. He knew that he was going to hack into the arts budget, or at least that Rob Lucas was going to do it. Who knows how much sway the Premier actually has over the Treasurer?

He could not face the people in the arts sector to tell them that. He could not face them and say, 'Look, unfortunately, we are going to cut your budgets.' He could not sit in a room with them and do that; therefore, he just did not meet them at all. The Liberal government promised a vision for the arts, but this is simply short-sighted. Here is an idea about coming up with an arts plan: maybe come up with a plan first and then decide what funding is needed. That is the sensible way to go about things: figure out what you are going to do, then figure out how much money it is going to cost, not the other way around.

At the end of the day, what this government's budget shows is that they just say anything during the election. They made all sorts of lofty promises but then, in government, they knew they were not going to carry those things out. The crumbs that have been given to the arts are massively overshadowed by the damage to be wrought by the cuts it is dishing out. Budgets are a statement of a government's priorities and, unfortunately, like child protection, the arts are simply not a priority.

**Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (21:38):** I rise to commend the Appropriation Bill 2018. In particular, I would like to talk about some of the fantastic announcements of funding in the seat of Finniss. The

largest commitment of funding in Finniss is \$940,000 in the 2018-19 financial year towards the construction of a roundabout at the intersection of Torrens and Crozier roads. For those who might know Victor Harbor, that is the corner where the CWA, the Salvation Army, Veg Out and Woolworths converge. It is a very busy intersection, and at the moment it is very difficult to get out of Crozier Road from either side onto Torrens Street, particularly during the busy tourist times of the year.

This work is something that the City of Victor Harbor has been trying to get funded and put in place for over 10 years. They are very grateful that the Marshall government has decided to fund this project going forward, and they are currently working on the design. I met with the CEO of the council last week to discuss the project. They are quite excited and are now working with the department to work out the best time to start work, to make sure that there is limited impact on businesses and the community. The council is looking to do a major upgrade in Ocean Street sometime in the same period of time, over the next 12 months, and we need to make sure that these two works do not occur at the same time; otherwise, it will cause gridlock in the town.

Another of the commitments that has been honoured in Finniss is \$300,000 towards the creation of a recreational park in Mount Compass. This wonderful community, which I have been part of for over 40 years, is made up of volunteers and fundraisers who do things for themselves. It is probably one of the rare communities where they own all their own sporting facilities as a community, rather than the council. They have gone out, invested and borrowed at different times to increase their facilities. They built a second oval about 15 or 20 years ago. They have made those commitments themselves.

Over the 40-odd years and many years before, there has been very little input from government or from council to these facilities. It is a great thing for the community to have this sort of money being put forward, along with nearly \$400,000 from the Alexandrina Council to construct the new playground, which will benefit not only those living in the town and in the community but also tourists, etc. travelling down to the south coast, who can stop and have their lunch, go to the playground and have a rest and enjoy the community of Mount Compass. It is certainly going to be a wonderful thing for the community.

Another part of the investment made in Finniss was a small donation of \$45,000 towards the Whalers Peninsula Community Association. This is a wonderful charity that exists in Goolwa and also has some emporium shops in Victor Harbor. They fund themselves to deliver housing to the homeless and also to assist domestic violence victims. They go out of their way to help those less fortunate than themselves in the community.

They were in difficult circumstances, particularly after a very large water bill for what was suspected to be a leak, but they were never able to identify it. This has enabled them to get back on their feet and work with the people who need assistance, accommodation and education, distributing food and doing drug rehabilitation work.

There have also been additional benefits to Finniss. They were the ones made as election commitments, but there are others that have also benefited Finniss. We are looking at the drones for the Port Elliot and Chiton Rocks surf lifesaving clubs. We have also seen in round 45 of the Active Clubs Grants in Finniss that \$30,000 has been given to the Victor Harbor RSL and Football Club, \$25,000 to the Port Elliot Tennis Club, \$17,000 to Back Valley Tennis Club and \$5,000 to the Southern Breakers Soccer Club. These are great commitments to the community and it is a credit to those organisations to go through and see the improvements that we will see from this sort of investment.

Budget highlights include \$773 million worth of investment in regional South Australia, \$11.3 billion for infrastructure, \$1.2 billion in health and a \$515 million boost for education. Another important part of the budget is the funding that has been made available to set up the South Australian productivity commission and Infrastructure SA. This is particularly important for a seat like Finniss, which is looking at different projects that may need to be done for the long-term future of the community.

One thing that comes to mind, that was raised at a meeting this morning when the minister for regions was down in Victor Harbor meeting with the community, was looking at the road from the Southern Expressway through to Willunga and then on to Victor Harbor. These are the sorts of

infrastructure projects that we need to look at to see what sort of productivity gains we can get by investing in these spaces.

It is also really important that the Marshall government is committed to running an open and transparent government, keeping South Australians safer. There is \$14.5 million provided in this budget for additional resources to support the operations of the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption and to enable the ICAC to hold public hearings. This includes \$7 million over four years for the ICAC and the Office for Public Integrity to support its operations with a further \$7.5 million of investment expenditure over four years for IT system upgrades, office accommodation fit-out space currently used by the Ombudsman, and establishment of a public hearings facility.

I think one of the great investments is in education. The record funding for education is a hallmark of the Marshall Liberal government's first state budget. We are committed to delivering better services for South Australians and recognise the investment in our children and young people as a key driver for South Australia's prosperity well into the future. More than \$1 billion is being invested in capital projects, including two brand-new birth to year 12 schools to be built under a private-public partnership model, and a new \$100 million school in Whyalla funded by the state government.

The Marshall government is delivering on its education commitments by delivering a Literacy Guarantee package of measures including 13 new literacy coaches, phonics screening checks for all year 1 students and literacy and numeracy professional learning programs for teachers. A package of measures will address bullying, truancy, and substance abuse in our schools; providing for an expansion of Languages in Schools programs, increasing the focus on South Australian children learning a second language; and building a new technical college in Adelaide's western suburbs which specialises in preparing for South Australia's future defence needs. The government will ensure that the education department is efficiently structured to support schools and preschools while providing a much more targeted approach to assisting leaders and teachers with professional development.

Another key space is tourism, particularly for the area of Finnis. We are committed to growing event tourism in South Australia. The government is investing an extra \$21.5 million over four years to the events bid fund to secure more lucrative major events. We are progressing investigations into the Great Southern Bike Trail by investing \$100,000 to commission a feasibility study for a cycling trail from Adelaide to Melbourne. The minister has even approached me with the possibility of hopping on a bike and riding through the section where the bike track will go through Finnis—

**The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell:** That's cruelty to bikes.

**Mr BASHAM:** That is cruelty to bikes, maybe. His thoughts are that if two middle-aged, overweight men can ride pushbikes, then anyone can. I think it is a challenge I will take up if he wishes to do that. The sum of \$4.9 million has been provided to support the hosting of major events in South Australia, in addition to the increased funding provided for the major events fund, including the NRL's State of Origin in 2020 and five national swimming events through Swimming Australia.

Trade and investment are also very important, particularly to the agriculture sector of South Australia, and we are helping our exporters to grow by investing \$12.7 million over four years in new trade offices. The five new trade offices will be established to grow South Australia's international trade and support our exporters in accessing markets. This is a great space that we need to invest in. In the dairy industry I have seen firsthand how much better you do when you have people in the country actually helping with projects.

Another key space where the Marshall Liberal government is investing is regional health. Regional health outcomes need to be improved for those living outside the metropolitan area. The Marshall Liberal government has deep connections and commitments to regional South Australians and their ability to access quality health care and services closer to home. Health funding initiatives for regional South Australia contained in the budget include:

- \$140 million over 10 years for country health capital works to significantly improve our regional hospitals and health infrastructure, which has denigrated following 16 years of Labor Party neglect;



- \$20 million over four years to develop and implement a rural workforce strategy to address the shortage of health practitioners in regional areas;
- \$6.9 million over four years to deliver additional chemotherapy services in regional areas, allowing patients to receive lifesaving treatment closer to home;
- A further \$5 million for the implementation of a single statewide chemotherapy prescribing system to reduce the risk of an underdosing fiasco that we saw under the former Labor government; and
- \$1 million over four years for the South Australian Healthy Towns Challenge to enable rural and regional communities to apply for a grant of up to \$50,000 to help improve the health and wellbeing of their communities.

It is also really important that we see the introduction of the six new boards in country South Australia. There is \$3.6 million annually funding those boards to allow for decisions to be made closer to the people who are receiving the care.

Another really important space, and certainly something I am quite passionate about, is making sure that we have reliable, low-cost power for South Australians. The one thing I really want to see is the interconnector going into New South Wales. That would have saved the problem that we suffered back in 2016. On my dairy farm, we have only missed three milkings in the 42 years that we have been on that farm, and all were in 2016 due to power outages. Unfortunately, those costs are incurred by dairy farmers.

I am one of those who has not invested in a generator on my farm, but many have. What is really concerning me about where the power situation is currently is that the dairy industry is actually advising that during the peak periods of power use over the summer, and particularly the afternoon milking, if farmers have smart meters on their farms, economically they would be much better off running their generator rather than using the mains power to run their dairies. It seems counterintuitive that we should be using backup generators to run our businesses.

What is important to me is the investment that we are seeing in the primary industries and regional development space. It is really important that the budget is investing in growing South Australia's primary industries. The commitment to installing new quarantine bins for disposal of fruit to strengthen the defences against fruit fly and the boosting of staff resources at PIRSA Biosecurity are also important parts and something I have been involved in in my roles in the dairy industry to understand the risks that we face from incursion, and the effects it could have on our industry are immense. We need to make sure that we have the resources to try to stop the incursions in the first place, but also to respond if they do occur.

I also think it is really important that we have seen an additional \$260,000 of funds go into Rural Business Support to help them with financial counselling services through to June 2020—helping farmers manage their books and fill out applications for assistance programs—particularly in view of the fact of the dry conditions that we are facing in some of our regional areas at the moment.

We are also seeing an investment in a strong future with the primary production industries by maintaining the workforce commitment at the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI). The government is supporting South Australia's vibrant food manufacturing sector, providing \$1 million to support Food SA. All these things are there to help our primary industries.

In the regional development space, it is also really important that we note the \$10 million investment we are making into the Mobile Black Spot Program to improve mobile access to our regional communities. We are also seeing investment in regional roads and other infrastructure through the Royalties for Regions program. We are seeing the securing of funds for South Australian Regional Development Australia boards through providing \$12 million over four years to encourage strong and effective rural leadership.

This area of the rural regions has been neglected and underinvested over the past 16 years, and I am pleased to see the commitment not only in funds but also in the fact that we are seeing ministerial visits in the regions. I am really pleased to have had seven ministerial visits in the last six months, and another two in the next few weeks, coming into my region and talking to my

community—having one-on-one or group sessions with community members to hear their concerns. It will take time to clean up the mess and turn it around from the 16 years of neglect, but we are delivering on our election commitments, and the budget is back on track for the regions.

Another key thing that we see in the budget is the investment in the CFS space for the regions. We are seeing the establishment of new CFS aircraft based up in the Mid North, and we are also seeing a significant increase in the number of firefighting aircraft to support ground-based volunteers. We have gone from 18 to 26 aircraft. We are also seeing \$5 million going towards upgrading CFS stations over the next two years.

Something that I think is really important is the money we are putting towards getting the Alert SA app back up and running. This is something that I have personally missed—being able to be away from my farm yet understanding what is happening nearby. Not having that available to me makes it very difficult to understand how my business is operating under threat of fire. Only last summer we had a fire only four kilometres away. I was home at the time but happened to be inside. We were directly downwind from it, and we did not know for half an hour. That half an hour could have been crucial. Luckily, this time it was not. I think this is a great investment and I think this is a great budget.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (21:58):** I would like to provide some observations on the state budget. I say 'observations' because I think the state budget is a bit like beauty: it is in the eyes of the beholder. People can see the same document in quite clearly different ways, and that reflects our personal values. The budget is more than an economic statement. The budget is a reflection of the values of the government of the day. Throughout this budget process, we have heard ad nauseam that tough decisions had to be made for a whole range of reasons.

My concern is that such commentary just masks the fact that, in my opinion, this budget lacks any moral foundation. How tough is it to rip an additional \$2,500 in rent from poor people living in the most basic housing while giving those who own \$5 million-plus in property a tax cut of up to \$3,500? That is not a tough decision. That, in my opinion, is an immoral decision.

This budget not only lacks a moral foundation but, when you look at it in detail, it also lacks a sound economic foundation. I will try a quick analysis of what I think are some of the key issues. In this budget revenue is at an all-time high. Revenues are expected to rise by \$1.8 billion over four years. The driver for this revenue increase is predominantly an increase in the GST revenue, which is expected to rise by \$1 billion over four years. Budget surpluses are estimated at \$48 million and \$105 million in 2018-19 and 2019-20 respectively.

When looked at in detail, these surpluses are propped up by extra dividends from government businesses, mainly from SA Water. Despite this increase in revenue over the forward estimates, the budget position worsens overall. Expenditure is up, and that is to fund a whole range of election commitments, most of them unfunded. That probably explains why budget debt is going up. Debt is up: general government sector net debt is expected to rise by \$3.3 billion over the next four years.

When you look at the debt ratios, you see that they paint an even darker picture. Debt to revenue ratio increases from 27 per cent to 41 per cent over four years and, despite nearly 40 consecutive months of jobs growth, employment growth will go down from 2.1 per cent in 2017-18 to 1 per cent in 2019-20. State final demand growth drops from 3.3 per cent in 2017-18 to 3 per cent and then 2.5 per cent. So we are going to have a worsening budget position and less employment, despite what we have been told. This is from the budget papers. These are not my figures but the figures that appear in the budget papers.

Then there are a number of cuts, closures and privatisations in this budget. There are cuts to police, health, corrections, primary industries and tourism and to 29 job creation programs, which I will talk about a bit more. Closures include Service SA centres, seven TAFE campuses and bus and train services. It is interesting, as government members try to defend some of these cuts, to hear the language that has been used.

When you look at the Service SA centres, the response by the government has shown clear indifference to the plight of some people in our community, those who for whatever reason cannot access the internet, whether they lack the skills to do so or lack the financial resources. It makes the

divide between those in our community even greater, particularly affecting older people, who rely on that face-to-face contact at Service SA centres.

I refer to the closure of TAFE. I was in Wudinna only a few weeks ago, and I can tell you that the people in regional South Australia were not happy about the cuts and the proposed closure of the Wudinna TAFE. They were also not happy about some of the proposed cuts to health on their peninsula. In fact, the chair of the Eyre Peninsula health advisory council—I think it is Eyre west—actually resigned in protest at this new government's indifference to health care on Eyre Peninsula.

There are cost increases, like the ones I mentioned to South Australian Housing Trust rents, liquor licensing fees, mining royalties, petrol station licences, real estate agent fees and agricultural research costs, yet despite that we still have an increase in debt in this state. As to the cuts to SA Pathology, its proposed privatisation, as I understand the budget, unless SA Pathology delivers up to \$100 million in savings it will be put out to pasture.

I have two concerns about that. During this period of trying to make these savings SA Pathology will be required to reduce its service levels, which makes it ripe for the government to then sell off because it is reducing its service level. Importantly, selling off SA Pathology reduces the amount of competition in that market, and in the end lack of competition means that we will be paying more for pathology services. That means that all the government have done is shift the cost from their budget to the individual budgets of ordinary South Australians. It may also mean the difference between having the tests and not having the tests.

When you look at the economics of this budget, there will be less job growth over time, more debt over time and less growth over time. This is a budget that members of this government are proud of. In terms of jobs, which is very important particularly in the northern suburbs and Gawler, Job Accelerator grants have been cut—I understand that program created about 4,200 new jobs across the state and in my region—and \$50 million in grants and \$35 million in loans for businesses to expand and grow operations have also been cut.

The unemployment rate, which was at 5.7 per cent at the time that Holden closed, was expected to increase. However, because of the intervention of the previous Labor government, that did not occur. We helped the whole industry transition through a range of programs for individuals who were losing their jobs, and who had to find new jobs, and also for those businesses that had to re-engineer themselves into new markets.

The jobs creation program has been axed as a result of this budget, which includes the Future Jobs Fund, the Economic Investment Fund, the Unlocking Capital for Jobs fund, the Investment Attraction Advisory Board, the renewable energy technology fund, the Economic Development Board and the Small Business Development Fund. I know that small businesses in my area were very successful in getting grants that helped them grow. There was the Digital Game Development Program and, while I am no expert in this area, there were a number of young people in my community who would try to get funds through this program. The high technology of digital games is one of those industries of the future. The Automotive Supplier Diversification Program was also cut, and there were a whole range of other cuts as well.

What should also be highlighted in this budget is that the Marshall Liberal budget has abandoned a program that assisted manufacturers impacted by the closure of Holden's Elizabeth site. The Automotive Supplier Diversification Program, which was initiated by the Labor government, has been axed. That program was designed to support firms operating in the automotive supply chain to ensure a smooth transition due to the Holden closure. To date, it has been very successful. There have also been other cuts mentioned in this budget.

The Marshall Liberal government have cut more than \$4 million in grants that helped fund the installation and maintenance of CCTV cameras across South Australia. Cuts also include \$3.9 million in crime prevention grants, which helped to fund new CCTV cameras, and a further \$229,000 from the Safe City grant scheme, which helped fund the maintenance of the city's CCTV network. They have also cut \$38 million from SAPOL with no details on exactly where those cuts will be made. Given that SAPOL's bulk costs are in staff, how they are going to find \$38 million without affecting staffing levels in police is beyond me. The government have also cut \$960,000 from funding Crime Stoppers and all \$190,000 in funding for a monitored taxi rank service.

The Marshall Liberal government's first budget is also imposing on South Australians an additional \$87 million in fees, charges and rents. Over the next four years, hoteliers will pay \$9.7 million in additional costs; real estate agents, \$3.7 million; miners, \$4.7 million; and industrial and waste operators, \$6.1 million. They will all be hit with higher fees and costs by government regulators.

The Liberal government is also putting their hands in the pockets of the South Australian Research and Development Institute to the tune of \$5.1 million. Firearms owners—and I would have thought that some of the country members might have highlighted this—will be hit with an additional cost of \$1.75 million. There will be an additional \$4 million for people paying court fees, and an additional \$48.8 million for people in Housing Trust tenancies.

In addition, there is an extra \$3 million this year from the natural resources management levy, which has been increased by 5 per cent, and there is a 15 per cent increase in the hard waste levy. That is interesting because the government made a promise not to cost shift to local government, yet they are doing exactly that, not only in this way—by increasing charges—but also through the sports program, where they have actually cut one of the programs and reinstated part of the program with the balance of funding to be provided by local government. It is actually shifting the expenditure from the state government to local councils.

With the Housing Trust increases, there will be an increase of \$50 over the next few years, which means that some tenants will be paying up to \$50 more a week by 2021. About 3,000 low-income tenants who live in bedsits or one-bedroom cottage flats will actually be paying an extra \$50 a week, or \$2,500 a year, yet those people who own properties worth \$5 million or more will be paying \$3,500 less.

But it gets worse. While we are making sure that the cost of living for the poorest in our community is increased, what does the government do? It actually increases the new Housing Authority board chair's payment by \$33,000, or up to \$70,700 or \$6,000 per board meeting. The increase will be \$33,000 more than was paid to the former South Australian Housing Trust chair, who received \$37,000.

Public schools will be hit through this budget by forcing many schools to reallocate funds that we provide for better facilities in those schools, to reinvest in those schools and to renovate those schools. We now have to shift some of that funding to building new classrooms for the shift of the year 7 group to those schools. The sad part is that we will have a whole range of primary schools that will have underutilised classes, yet we will have brand-new classes in other schools. The Building Better Schools program unfortunately has been cut by—

**Dr Close:** Has been raided.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** It has been raided, even though the government promised it would not do that. When it comes to schools, the free laptop program was a well-received decision by public schools in my area. The program makes sure that each child has an equal chance to get the best possible education. Again, it is a bit like the Service SA centre closing. You will have those who are technology rich and those who are technology poor, and this government is clearly determined to make sure that that gap gets bigger and bigger and those who are poor get poorer.

Regarding the Service SA closures, there was Modbury today and a few others. Given that the minister today has indicated that it is based on his spatial assessment, this spatial assessment, I am sure, will one day come to Gawler and he will close the Gawler Service SA centre. I have used that centre. Every time I use that centre I have to queue up as a lot of people use it.

It is interesting that it is said that it is somehow improving service delivery by cutting a service that is actually overwhelmingly used by people. In fact, there are 11 million transactions at Service SA every year. For some reason, the government believes that it is okay for people to travel 10, 15 or 20 kilometres to get to the next centre if they wish, but they probably will not because they will be cutting bus services as well. This government has said that not only are they going to cut the service but they are going to make you pay more to get to the next Service SA delivery point.

Regarding the cuts to PIRSA, they are cutting the South Australian Premium Food and Wine Credentials Grant Program by \$6.6 million, the Economic Sustainability Grant Program by

\$10.6 million, the Food Innovation Taskforce and Advanced Food Manufacturing Grant Program by \$8.8 million and the Food Park Tenant Attraction Program by \$5.5 million.

The Food Park attraction program was designed to make sure that we attract the right sort of business to make the Food Park a very successful location and also to build on food manufacturing, which is, if you like, the manufacturing of the future in that area, particularly around the food bowl areas that go around my electorate.

However, it does not stop there. The government has also hit SARDI with \$5 million in additional costs over the next four years during a time when the primary industries sector is in most need of support. As I mentioned earlier, there have been cuts to TAFE in Port Adelaide, Tea Tree Gully, Urrbrae, Parafield, Roxby Downs, Coober Pedy and Wudinna. For a lot of young people and other people, face-to-face contact is the only way people can actually learn. By insisting that you go online, or only go through online programs, effectively means that some people will not take up post secondary education. That was certainly the message I got in Wudinna when I was talking to people there, people who said their concern was that there would be fewer young people entering post secondary education because of the closure of the service centre.

It is interesting to note that this government does not like people being critical of it, and what is the best way to make sure there is no criticism of what it does? It is to cut funding to those not-for-profit organisations that require government funding to do their work. As a government, we introduced legislation to protect the independence of those not-for-profit organisations because we did not mind being critiqued as a government.

This government, despite saying it is going to improve accountability and transparency, actually punishes organisations by cutting their funds to make sure they cannot be critical of it. It is no accident that the Health Consumer Alliance has had its funding cut, because that is one area in which the government would be most vulnerable in the future. I would like to turn to some things a little closer to home, and issues in my electorate of Light.

Despite campaigning heavily on improvement to Curtis Road by the Liberal Party—particularly by their Liberal candidate, who actually made a video and put it on Facebook, saying that an incoming Liberal government would do the right thing by people in the Light electorate and improve Curtis Road—there was no money in the budget. In fact, when I asked a question about this a few weeks ago in this place the minister was unsure what I was talking about, and kept referring to other roads rather than to the intersections of Curtis and Stebonheath, Curtis and Coventry, and other roads in this area.

The new school has been mentioned, which is actually an existing commitment by the previous Labor government. In fact, two commitments in this budget for my electorate, big commitments, are essentially recycled Labor government commitments. They were the electrification to Gawler, which we had budgeted for and all we needed—

*The Hon. R. Sanderson interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** The member for Adelaide is not sure what she is talking about. Perhaps she should listen because she does not display much knowledge. Slogans are no substitute for understanding the issues before you.

The reality was that in the last state budget we made money available for the electrification; all we needed was the partnering with the federal government. They have now come on board. However, that said, the new special relationship the state Liberal government has with the federal government does not deliver everything the previous government would have delivered. For example, the electrification of the Gawler rail project does not include upgraded stations: the Gawler central station will be left in the condition it is in now, and it has not had any improvements for some years.

Not only that, the redevelopment of the Gawler Central station, the actual electrification work, will not take into account the possible extension of the line to Concordia when the Concordia development goes ahead. We are going to have this electrification and then in about five or 10 years' time we will have to dig it all up again because they are not actually doing the work required to do it properly this time—and I will remind this government of their decision.

It also does not involve any expansion of the car parks. Anybody who uses the stations in my electorate knows that by 9 o'clock all the car parks are full. It is great that people are using trains, it is great that people are parking there and using the park-and-ride, but the reality is that people are now starting to park in all the side streets. We also need investment in the car parks to make sure we have a viable public transport system.

There is also the road extension, the Gawler East Link Road project. Despite campaigning on extending Tiver Road it is not in the budget. The Gawler Health Service gets no extra money, and the Fund My Neighbourhood program, which is very popular in my community, has also been axed. Tourism has been cut by \$11 million. In short, the north has been abandoned. For a party in government, it is a party that acts in opposition because it refuses to accept responsibility for its budget. We on this side will make sure, and the people in my electorate will make sure, they are held accountable for their budget.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, member for Light. The member for Torrens.

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (22:19):** Thank you, Mr Speaker, and congratulations on your recent marriage. I rise to make comment on the Appropriation Bill 2018, and in doing so I want to highlight some of what I think is so wrong with the state budget. It did not take long to read through to find the cuts, the closures and the privatisations.

Firstly, I want to raise the issue of the rise in rent for Housing SA tenants. Thousands of our low-income Housing Trust tenants are facing rent hikes of up to \$50 per week. Some of these tenants are among the most vulnerable in our community, including pensioners and the elderly, and those who can least afford an increase in their rent. For many, it will be the difference between putting fresh food on the table and affording basic necessities. I have heard from a number of these residents in my electorate who are saying that it is causing them sleepless nights. They just cannot afford this increase.

The impact will be so significant in some cases that it will be the difference between a family being able to afford registration fees for their children to be able to play local sport, including netball and football, or to take calisthenics lessons, or to pay for school uniforms. Taking money from the most vulnerable members of our community just does not pass the fairness test. One must wonder what the Liberal members for King and Newland are telling their Housing SA residents, who would also be facing these same challenges.

The budget also reveals the privatising of vital health services, including SA Pathology, which South Australians rely on. We have already heard from the shadow minister that privatisation of SA Pathology will mean fewer clinicians, fewer labs and longer processing times, which experts tell us could lead to life-threatening delays. Privatisation also means higher out-of-pocket expenses for patients. We do not want a health system that puts profits before patients.

Before the election, the Liberal leader told the people of South Australia, 'We don't have a privatisation agenda.' Well, now we can see clearly that that was just another one of what has become a broken promise. Also hit by the Liberal agenda of privatisation is the ambulance transfer of patients from Modbury Hospital to the Lyell McEwin, and residents in the north-east are not happy about this.

A further area that has been hit that will impact on thousands of families is the announcement by the Liberal government to close three Service SA centres: Modbury, Prospect and Mitcham—all very busy centres. Two, in particular, that service the north-east, including the Torrens electorate, are the nearby Prospect and Modbury centres. I attended both these centres just over a week ago with the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Croydon, and the member for Wright. We met many locals who were quick to tell us what a bad decision it is by the government to close these centres. We could not hand over the pen quickly enough for them to sign the petition. Negative feedback about this decision has been overwhelming.

Most South Australians rely on Service SA centres to access essential services such as change of address for vehicle registration or driver's licences, renewing a driver's licence, replacing a licence, renewing a learner's permit, applying for a learner's permit, applying for a South Australian licence for overseas licence holders, transferring an interstate licence, ordering motor vehicle special

plates and replacing motor vehicle plates, cancelling vehicle registration, and transferring vehicle registration. Then there is recreational boating licence registrations, and the list goes on.

Currently, some of these can only be done in person, while others are able to be done online or by phone. But there are so many in our community, particularly seniors, who have not been carried along with the digital revolution. They are not computer literate and many do not even own a computer. Also, using a credit card or a savings card to make an online payment is not a consideration for them. The impact on these members of our community will be significant if the government chooses to go ahead with the closures of the Service SA centres. I know that many residents in my electorate have already contacted us to see if they would be able to come in to our office and access an iPad so that we can help them through it. It is going to have a significant impact on those people.

We all know the waiting times at some Service SA centres are long enough already. Closures of the Modbury, Prospect and Mitcham centres will mean longer travel times, longer queues at the remaining centres and poorer services for everyday South Australians, and it just does not make sense. Before the election, those opposite did not say anything about closing Service SA centres, and I am yet to speak to anyone who thinks this is a good idea.

Also impacting on families in the north-east is the intended closure by the government of the Strathmont swimming pool. This pool is used extensively by around 1,500 children and adults for swimming lessons, including children with autism spectrum disorder, intellectual and physical disabilities; new migrants from landlocked states, often challenged by fear of water; young babies; and some more senior members of our community requiring the heated pool. I have received representation from providers and many families who access the pool on a weekly basis who are devastated by this notification, as are members of some of my school communities whose children access them in special needs classes.

I have in this place asked the minister and the Premier: what price is put on the quality of life of those who access the Strathmont pool—those with a disability, both young children and those more advanced in their years, also the new arrivals for whom learning to swim can be a challenge and ordeal, and the impact it will also have on surrounding hydrotherapy facilities and pools that are already at or near capacity by trying to make room for the soon to be displaced users?

It is a documented fact that we need more, not fewer, heated and hydrotherapy swimming pools for rehabilitation, for those with a disability who benefit through water therapy and those who form part of our ageing population to assist them in keeping mobile and in their homes. The benefit far outweighs the cost socially and economically. So, on behalf of the users of the Strathmont swimming pool and the nearby hydrotherapy pools that would be negatively impacted, I have asked the Marshall Liberal government to reconsider their decision to close the Strathmont swimming pool. We have a petition circulating in the community and many people have called into my office just to register their opposition to the closure.

The casualty list of this budget goes on. Another is the Klemzig O-Bahn interchange and the Tea Tree Plaza park-and-ride. Although budgeted for by Labor, they have been put on hold indefinitely. I know that my residents in Klemzig are particularly keen for these works to progress because their streets are congested throughout the working day with the cars of people who are parking there. The Labor government's commitment to increase the number of these car parks would have seen that congestion on the roads removed and provided appropriate parking for commuters.

Labor also committed to additional car parks at the Paradise park-and-ride, increasing the number of car parks by 350 spaces, as well as an upgrade to the intersection at Darley Road. The Golden Grove park-and-ride was also to benefit from additional car parks under Labor. For local residents, this budget fails to deliver on the solution to fix Fosters Road. It is a broken promise by the Liberals that was misleading from the beginning and that is how we called it in the lead-up to the March election. Labor's commitment to the upgrade of Fosters Road, which is a road that runs between Grand Junction Road and North East Road in the suburbs of Northgate, Oakden, Lightsvue, Hillcrest and Greenacres, was significant.

With the major Lightsvue development and older houses in some of the other areas being demolished and new houses being replaced on these blocks, it means we have a lot more traffic in

the area, so Fosters Road has become particularly busy. It is an issue about which I have consulted widely with the community, including holding a very well-attended public meeting, following which the department delivered a draft management plan. The Labor government's \$7.3 million costed commitment included road resurfacing; upgrades to signage and line marking; upgrading to pedestrian facilities, including new pedestrian refuges; improved lighting at the intersection; and, importantly, the installation of new signalised intersections at the North East Road-Fosters Road junction, including fully controlled right-hand turns from Fosters Road.

In comparison, the Liberal commitment was \$1.3 million for lights at the North East Road and Fosters Road junction. The costing was way off the mark, but they still had election posters lining Fosters Road and North East Road saying they had the solution and that it would be fixed by the \$1.3 million investment in traffic lights. It was never going to happen. The Liberal candidate for Torrens circulated DLs that said:

A Marshall Liberal government will improve safety for residents and commuters at the busy and dangerous intersection of Fosters Road and North East Road by providing \$1.3 million to install traffic lights at this location.

We knew that this would never cover the fix for Fosters Road, and so did the Liberals, but they were prepared to tell residents that this is all it would take. Now, instead, we have some minor works taking place—just another broken promise. In addition, the promised traffic lights at the Dernancourt shopping centre, Lower North East Road junction, promised by the Liberals in the lead-up to the election, have failed to materialise in this budget.

Another consequence of this budget will be the impact on female change facilities. Tens of thousands of girls and women registered to play sport across our state and numbers playing traditionally male-dominated sports are rapidly growing. Through our South Australian Women in Sports Taskforce, the Labor government led the way on ensuring that girls and women are equal participants in all aspects of sport in South Australia, and we had significant momentum towards achieving gender equality in sport.

With the increase in participation by women and girls came the need for suitable facilities. In government, Labor recognised and responded to this increasing need and delivered opportunities across the state for local clubs to build such facilities, enabling grassroots sports to flourish. We boosted participation, providing more sports changing rooms for girls and women. This is because Labor believes that girls and women who play sport in South Australia should have access to the same level of facilities as boys and men.

Recent years have seen great progress, with women and girls playing Aussie Rules at a local, state and national level. Australian Rules football is a name synonymous with Australian culture and our national identity. It is men who have traditionally played the sport that so many women and men hold dear, the sport that rules and divides our workplaces and our lounge rooms nationally. At the Gaza Sports and Community Club in Klemzig, the Gaza Women's football team, only in its second year, fought their way to the top of the ladder taking out the holy grail, the premiership, last year and were runners-up this year. The number of women on the players list has grown considerably, with the vision of adding another women's football team.

At the junior level, Gaza currently has two girls' teams in the competition and the club is also exploring a women's cricket team and a girls' Twenty20 cricket team. Having female change rooms and other facilities at our sporting clubs sends a very important message to women and girls that they are welcome in the sport and that their club's culture is one that will facilitate their participation.

Labor made an election commitment of \$500,000 towards female change facilities at the Gaza Sports and Community Club for the women and girls. The Liberal candidate for Torrens met with Gaza's committee and made a commitment that a Liberal government would match Labor's commitment for women's change facilities, and some months back committee members signed a statutory declaration to this effect.

Along with the Gaza club members, I am still waiting for the minister to respond to my question, asked in question time, about when that commitment will be honoured. They have been silent on this promise made by their candidate in the lead-up to the March election. This type of investment in women's sporting success will pay dividends for our South Australian community into



the future, setting young girls and women up for sporting success, and I look forward to getting a positive response back from the minister.

The cuts and privatisation in this budget add up to a real threat to community safety. It is not what we were promised by the government in the lead-up to the election. It is not the promise of 'a strong police presence', which includes a physical shopfront open beyond daytime hours. The government has found itself in a corner by promising something that the police never wanted and they say we do not need, so when you get to the bottom of it, what does it deliver? Police stations are mostly staffed by civilian staff who do not have any authority or training in front-line policing.

Still on community safety funding, Crime Stoppers has been cut, putting this valuable crime fighting resource at real risk. In January this year, the Labor government committed \$960,000 from the Attorney-General's Department to ensure Crime Stoppers continued to provide their valuable service to South Australia. Why those opposite have chosen not to honour this commitment and secure funding for this vital crime-fighting service is puzzling.

This means that South Australia is the only state not to provide government funding for Crime Stoppers. Over the past two decades, Crime Stoppers has helped solved almost 30,000 crimes, including some of South Australia's most heinous cases. What does this do for the public safety of South Australians?

Crime Stoppers is an important link between the public and the police, providing our law enforcement officers with invaluable information about all sorts of serious crime. It does not make sense. We have a government that claims it is waging a war on drugs yet cutting funding for a program that does so much towards detecting drugs in our community.

Every day people in our state will be hurt by these cuts, closures and privatisations that form such a significant part of this budget: Klemzig residents will see their streets blocked by O-Bahn commuters who cannot find a car park at the park-and-ride; 1,500 users of the Strathmont swimming pool, including children with special needs, will be displaced; residents in Torrens and surrounding areas will not get the promised solution to the Fosters Road-North East Road intersection; and public schools are now discovering that previously planned projects from the Building Better Schools programs have been cut.

Up to 44 secondary schools and 18 birth to year 12 schools are waiting to see if their planned projects are affected. Some have been told that money is being diverted to pay for the Liberal Party's promise of moving students to year 7. We need to be investing in our schools: instead, the Liberals are cutting much needed projects.

TAFE students are being impacted. This is the worst possible time to be closing TAFE campuses. In places like Port Adelaide, we are on the cusp of a jobs boom, with billions of dollars worth of defence contracts. At a time when we should be expanding, investing in training and jobs for our young people, those opposite are closing TAFEs and cutting job opportunities for South Australians. Impacting on those in the north-east and in my electorate is the closure of the Tea Tree Gully TAFE.

The cuts go on and on and on, with the cutting of 4,000 public servants and the announcement that bus services, with routes in the north, south, east and west, are on the government's hit list to be cut. This will impact on commuters who rely on public transport for their everyday lives. Before the election, the Liberals did not say anything about cutting these bus services. The cuts continue, with the loss of 30 job creation, transition and support services, and the closure of a further five TAFE campuses. We might well ask why.

The Liberal government inherited a growing economy, a budget in surplus and a falling unemployment rate. Now, in their first budget, they have plunged the budget into deficit, increased debt and unleashed cuts, closures and privatisations that will impact on our communities. We need to be investing in jobs, not cutting training and jobs. One must ask why closures and privatisations are occurring, with the government set to receive an extra \$1 billion in GST.

When we see the impact of the budget on our local communities it proves what so many South Australians already knew in the lead-up to the election and what others have now come to

realise: that the Liberal slogan, 'We're going to govern for all South Australians,' is just that—it is a slogan, it is empty words and it is hollow promises.

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (22:38):** The first budget of the Marshall government has been handed down and, as this is the first time I will speak on a budget as an Independent and grandmother of the house, I find myself able to say a little more a little differently than I may have done in the past.

Like all budgets, it contains good news and bad news. The populist phrases of 'more jobs, lower costs and better services' is only part of the story of this budget and, as with all budgets, the politics of this budget, the bad news, has taken a little while to trickle out into reality and the consciousness of those it will affect: the electors of South Australia.

There is a real difference between democracy and politics. Democracy is not easily explained these days, especially when people see federal leaders they have voted for being regularly rotated between election cycles and topics like the participation of women in parliament becoming such a damaging and damning indictment of those trying to make a contribution at the highest end of our participatory democracy.

I believe candidate selection is one of the most important parts of any democratic system and hope it never relies on the wealth of a person or the number of promises that a candidate has had to make. Like diversity and dissent, candidate selection is an integral part of democracy where politics often has undue influence.

Politics is the activity and action used to gain and hold power and influence. Politics has a hand in every decision of every person and every committee—and parliament is, after all, the mother of all committees. It means decisions are not always made for the right reasons but by weighing up the pros and cons, and there is politics in every decision and every promise and every reprioritisation.

It is admirable to want to keep promises, especially election promises, as a first step in restoring trust in both the political system that runs our democracy and us, the elected representatives of the people of this state. Election promises are the impetus for decision-making on polling day. It is important to keep promises, but it is more important not to make them if you have your fingers crossed behind your back.

State campaigns come every four years. They have become marketing cycles—duels with glossy brochures snugly positioned under arms at 60 paces. The underlying problem, though, is people no longer believe much of what is said anymore, especially in campaigns. There are good reasons for this. The old 'we have inherited a mess' carries some weight but does not really wash anymore. What could often be decoded from this line and what should be really said is, 'We have other priorities.'

People feel betrayed when they are ambushed by a loss of services not mentioned in campaigns. The further betrayal of finding that promises they heard matched in a campaign are being 'reprioritised' along electorate lines makes it much harder to regain trust. We need to be honest. As the famous line goes in the movie which this evening we shall call 'A Few Good Marines', we can handle the truth.

I want to take a look at a few issues in the budget that will hit close to home for the electors of Florey. Re-establishing the role of Modbury Hospital became a non-negotiable issue for me and the people of the north-east. As part of the suite of the now discredited measures in the Transforming Health initiative, we saw Modbury Hospital brought to its knees again. The hardworking health professionals and hospital volunteers continue to do all they can to provide good services to the residents of the north-east but, like the rest of us, they are getting a little tired of waiting to see the promises kept.

When will the money earmarked for an extended stay area in the emergency department be spent and the work finally begin on this much-needed and long-promised service? When will Modbury be properly resourced to allow the return of level 1 intensive care, allowing additional services to be performed and removing the pressure from emergency staff currently called upon to provide a service of sorts upstairs while leaving the patients downstairs to fend for themselves?

When will money be spent on infrastructure outside, where bricks on the facade of the building are falling off and, more importantly, inside where palliative care waits for much-needed upgrade? That is not to mention a much-needed upgrade to the mental health area of Woodleigh House, which is still waiting for prioritisation.

Lyell McEwin Hospital has seen enormous changes and does great work but, without a fully functioning Modbury Hospital, people living in NALHN will never be in the same position as the people of the south, living in SALHN, who can access all the services at the Flinders Medical Centre. Moving patients between the Lyell McEwin and Modbury hospitals remains a problem without the upgrade to services. Outsourcing of patient transfers is an issue. While it might seem acceptable to say only non-urgent patients will be privately transferred, it is illogical when you consider it is mostly urgent patients who are transferred.

There is lots more to say about health, and that is why I proposed a parliamentary review of Transforming Health. Why was the motion I proposed bogged down here in the House of Assembly and adjourned on a vote of 41-2 on the Thursday before KordaMentha were called in to examine CALHN?

No-one I have spoken with believes health expenditure can be reined in in three years without an impact on patient care. I believe lots of people must have known KordaMentha were being called in on the Monday after my motion was voted down. Our health future now seems to be in the hands of bean counters rather than of health professionals. Let's hope it does not end in some sort of rationing or reprioritising of access to health care.

Pathology services are under threat. Here, I must declare a conflict of interest in that a close family member works for SA Pathology. This means I know that it is a service already working hard, not an area that can necessarily be run leaner and meaner, seeing a loss of services and training opportunities and creating an atmosphere for the outsourcing or privatisation of the service.

Electors were given matched promises about an extension to the O-Bahn car park at the Modbury-TTP interchange, servicing the state's most used public transport route—not anymore. Reprioritisation strikes again and, while other O-Bahn stations will benefit, I am told that more commuters board at the Modbury interchange. Without extra car parking, the north-east will feel the impact of this budget measure.

No new buses are being purchased and bus routes are being closed, also spelling trouble and uncertainty about the future of public transport. People need new bus routes, but not at the expense of already poor services in other areas with needs. No-one is advocating poor management of public dollars, but we do need public services, and good public transport is vital, particularly for people relying on fixed low incomes.

Changes have been made to policing, too. The closure of the Holden Hill courthouse had a big impact on the north-east. I know that there are moves afoot to try to have that courthouse reopened, and I hope that may still be the case. Housing SA rent increases are probably necessary for some tenants and probably possible for them to pay, and some tenants might need to move on to private rental, but social housing is and remains something really needed. Private rental, if you can get it, is not always an answer. For those in the least attractive Housing SA properties, a \$5 increase means a decision between food, medicine or trying to keep up with energy costs.

The cost of living is a consideration for everyone but, when we get the promised reduction in the emergency services levy on one hand and lose much more in often other hidden cost increases, then it could be said that people have not been given the opportunity to compare impacts. Increases here and there all add up, and soon we see that we are shouldering more of the burden than we expected—or maybe we did expect it after all.

The closure of Service SA offices in Modbury, Prospect and Mitcham is a case in point. The as yet undisclosed cost of running these offices and the criteria for the decision is a cost shift to us. In my area, we can no longer do our business close to home. We face a longer trip to either the city, Tranmere or Elizabeth. The last time I looked, there was no direct public transport route to Tranmere and there probably are none to the Elizabeth office or Lyell McEwin Hospital, for that matter. Not only is this a problem for those unable to access services online, it will impact on the prospective learner

drivers and their parents in the nine schools in our area who use this office for P-plates. Their ability to make a quick trip after school becomes a much longer exercise.

Education promises are an issue, too. Funding is now being reprioritised for local high schools eager to make the much-needed changes that they thought would be possible but that are now uncertain. TAFE closures are a real blow. At the Tea Tree Gully campus, we have been on the end of reduction of services since the closure of Celia's, our hospitality school that integrated with Regency Park. Luckily, jobs are being created at our old TAFE site through Datacom, but the training opportunities that have been lost to remaining TAFE campuses mean that our people must travel further—if they can—at a cost to them.

Training may end up being privatised, too, much like the Remand Centre. This particular budget measure will finally be all about cutting wages. Instead of picking on a particular group of workers, let's have the debate about wages. If we are living beyond our means, that is one thing; share the load evenly and fairly. But where some groups do better than others, it is dishonest to start with workers. Look after workers, whether childcare workers, aged-care workers or those who work with the NDIS. These are also job growth areas, and we need to make sure that training in these areas is readily available. That is where TAFE, and the cuts to TAFE and its training, will have an impact.

Aged-care planning needs to come up to speed very quickly. We are all going to be old and, if we are not already old, we are looking after a loved one who is. Oakden-style situations are all over Australia and can no longer be ignored or tolerated. We have tough decisions to make, and we need to consider the expectations of people who use aged care. If we cannot meet the expectation of decent, affordable care, then we need to do something about it. What is not acceptable anymore will be saying that it is a federal issue and then doing nothing about the South Australians doing it really tough while they wait for better care or the often long-off relief of a job, not an underemployment situation.

This budget grapples with some issues but leaves others out. We can have just and fair budget policies while making changes. We have good people in the Public Service. Let's hope the cut to Public Service employment leaves us with the public servants able to provide good advice and give us the ability to make good informed decisions.

Governments should never shy away from admitting mistakes have been made and should be honest in their analysis of the measures they plan to take when changing policy priorities. South Australia has led the way before and I believe can do it again. Irrespective of the party that forms government, we are charged with doing the best we can to make life as good as possible for all South Australians. Big issues need to be addressed but not at the expense of looking after the vulnerable. In the quest to get the right priorities, let's not leave anyone behind.

Bill read a second time.

*Estimates Committees*

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (22:50):** I move:

That this bill be referred to estimates committees.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (22:51):** By leave, I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas), the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment (Hon. D.W. Ridgway), the Minister for Human Services (Hon. J.M.A. Lensink), and the Minister for Health and Wellbeing (Hon. S.G. Wade), members of the Legislative Council, be permitted to attend and give evidence before the estimates committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill.

Motion carried.

*Appropriation Grievances*

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (22:51):** I move:

That the house note grievances.

Debate adjourned on motion of Dr Close.

At 22:52 the house adjourned until Wednesday 19 September 2018 at 10:30.