

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**Wednesday, 3 April 2019****The SPEAKER (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)** took the chair at 10:30 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.*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS****The SPEAKER:** I welcome to parliament today members of the Rotary Club of Campbelltown and a group study exchange team from the USA. Welcome to South Australia; welcome to state parliament.*Bills***PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES (PETITIONS) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 March 2019.)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (10:32): The government is looking into this bill in some depth. It is a very serious proposition that the member for Florey has brought on behalf of her constituents, and I commend her for the work she has done in preparing the bill. We look forward to hopefully having a position from the government and, I imagine, the opposition in the not too distant future. Hopefully, we should be able to manage this in the coming weeks. I thank the member for Florey for bringing the suggestion to the parliament's attention. We hope we will be able to work with her on a satisfactory resolution.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES (DRUG OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 December 2018.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:33): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes	24
Noes	19
Majority	5

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.
 Cregan, D.
 Gardner, J.A.W.
 Luethen, P.
 Murray, S.
 Pisoni, D.G.
 Speirs, D.J.
 van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Chapman, V.A.
 Duluk, S.
 Harvey, R.M. (teller)
 Marshall, S.S.
 Patterson, S.J.R.
 Power, C.
 Teague, J.B.
 Whetstone, T.J.

Cowdrey, M.J.
 Ellis, F.J.
 Knoll, S.K.
 McBride, N.
 Pederick, A.S.
 Sanderson, R.
 Treloar, P.A.
 Wingard, C.L.

NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brock, G.G.	Brown, M.E. (teller)
Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.	Gee, J.P.
Hildyard, K.A.	Hughes, E.J.	Koutsantonis, A.
Michaels, A.	Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.
Picton, C.J.	Stinson, J.M.	Szakacs, J.K.
Wortley, D.		

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

SENTENCING (HOME DETENTION) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 December 2018.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:38): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes	24
Noes	20
Majority.....	4

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Cregan, D.	Duluk, S.	Ellis, F.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.	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.

NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brock, G.G.	Brown, M.E. (teller)
Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.	Gee, J.P.
Hildyard, K.A.	Hughes, E.J.	Koutsantonis, A.
Malinauskas, P.	Michaels, A.	Odenwalder, L.K.
Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.	Stinson, J.M.
Szakacs, J.K.	Wortley, D.	

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

MOTOR VEHICLES (OFFENSIVE ADVERTISING) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 March 2019.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:43): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 24

Noes 20

Majority 4

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Cregan, D.	Duluk, S.	Ellis, F.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.	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.

NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brock, G.G.	Brown, M.E. (teller)
Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.	Gee, J.P.
Hildyard, K.A.	Hughes, E.J.	Koutsantonis, A.
Malinauskas, P.	Michaels, A.	Odenwalder, L.K.
Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.	Stinson, J.M.
Szakacs, J.K.	Wortley, D.	

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

The SPEAKER: Is the member for Elder consuming coffee in the chamber? If so, I would like a macchiato. It should not be done, for future reference. Thank you.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PUBLIC HEALTH (IMMUNISATION AND EARLY CHILDHOOD SERVICES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 July 2018.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:49): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

Mr Picton: Shame.

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurana can leave for one hour for saying 'shame' when I called the member for Hammond.

Mr PICTON: No, I said 'shame' because he moved—

The SPEAKER: Thank you. In silence.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: You can come back for a division, as the father of the house points out. He is correct.

The honourable member for Kaurua having withdrawn from the chamber:

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 24
Noes 20
Majority 4

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Cregan, D.	Duluk, S.	Ellis, F.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.	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.

NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brock, G.G.	Brown, M.E. (teller)
Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.	Gee, J.P.
Hildyard, K.A.	Hughes, E.J.	Koutsantonis, A.
Malinauskas, P.	Michaels, A.	Odenwalder, L.K.
Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.	Stinson, J.M.
Szakacs, J.K.	Wortley, D.	

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

The SPEAKER: I have reversed my decision on the member for Kaurua. He can stay.

ROAD TRAFFIC (DRUG TESTING) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 July 2018.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:55): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 24
Noes 20
Majority 4

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Cregan, D.	Duluk, S.	Ellis, F.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.	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.

AYES

van Holst Pellekaan, D.C. Whetstone, T.J. Wingard, C.L.

NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brock, G.G.	Brown, M.E. (teller)
Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.	Gee, J.P.
Hildyard, K.A.	Hughes, E.J.	Koutsantonis, A.
Malinauskas, P.	Michaels, A.	Odenwalder, L.K.
Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.	Stinson, J.M.
Szakacs, J.K.	Wortley, D.	

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 November 2018.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:00): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 24
 Noes 20
 Majority 4

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Cregan, D.	Duluk, S.	Ellis, F.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.	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.

NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brock, G.G.	Brown, M.E. (teller)
Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.	Gee, J.P.
Hildyard, K.A.	Hughes, E.J.	Koutsantonis, A.
Malinauskas, P.	Michaels, A.	Odenwalder, L.K.
Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.	Stinson, J.M.
Szakacs, J.K.	Wortley, D.	

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT (RATEPAYER PROTECTION AND RELATED MEASURES)
AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 March 2019.)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:05): I am very pleased to be able to continue my remarks from the last sitting week. When we left off, I was explaining my deep concern about some of the measures that are not contained in this bill—in particular, rate capping.

I thought I might touch on at least one concern I have with the nature of what is contained within this bill. I am going to start with the title: Local Government (Ratepayer Protection and Related Measures) Amendment Bill. This is the local government (Labor Party) protection bill, because they are embarrassed that they took an opposition to rate capping to the last election. They needed to find something to say in this space, where the overwhelming majority of the community are on the side of governments that support rate capping.

The Labor Party needed to have something to say when they were asked at the doorsteps, when they were doorknocking, and when they were asked by their communities, 'Why are you opposing the Liberal Party's rate capping policy, which is supported by an overwhelming majority of the people of South Australia?' At every opportunity we have put forward, this has been opposed by the Labor Party. They are embarrassed by this.

The Labor Party are embarrassed about their own position on this matter, so they came up with this ragtag set of unworkable ideas. They called it a piece of legislation, they brought it to this parliament and they brought it to this house. It is time for us to strike it from the record and to strike it from the house.

I urge all those opposite to spend some time over the coming months, as they recover from what I hope and pray will today be a heavy defeat of this tawdry bill, and talk to their constituents about rate capping. I urge them to ask their constituents whether they would like rate capping introduced in South Australia—as the Liberal Party took to the election, and as we had a mandate from the people of South Australia to introduce—and support the government's legislation, which I hope and pray will one day come back to this place to be debated again.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: He didn't even talk about this bill.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (11:07): I think I can provide that service to the house. Can I say, in agreeing with the comments made by the member for Morialta, that this bill is a little fig leaf to cover the fact that the Labor Party are not willing to support what the overwhelming majority of South Australians wanted and voted for: a rate capping system in South Australia.

Interestingly, you can actually trace the origins of each clause within this bill not back to evidence, not back to some sort of structured process, but back to a media story. The shadow minister (member for Light) got out some press clippings and said, 'Hang on, there's been a story on this; we can do something about this.' They have simply grabbed a ragtag bunch of measures, which they cobbled together, as a fig leaf to cover the fact that they are thwarting the will of the South Australian people. It is a disgrace.

It is also a disgrace that we see the SA Greens and SA-Best being complicit in this bill. This is not reform. This is not moving the debate forward. This is not helping to improve the local government sector. This is merely an exercise in covering something that is unmentionable in this parliament, and covering it very poorly.

The reasons this bill will not work are many and varied. Firstly, this bill seeks to hive over a whole heap of new power to the Local Government Grants Commission. The Local Government Grants Commission doles out the financial grants from the federal government. From 1 January this year, it also performs the functions of the Boundaries Commission, which will look at taking council

submissions about potential boundary changes, assessing them and then making a determination on whether it is appropriate for that boundary to change. That is all they do.

It is a three-member panel: one appointed by me as the minister, one appointed by the LGA, and one chair that is essentially agreed to between the two of us. That is it. The Labor Party wanted to vest in this body the ability to be judge, jury and executioner, with no resources, no skill set and no history in being able to adjudicate on the matters that the Labor Party wanted them to take on. That is absolutely and fundamentally ridiculous. In fact, it goes against what a lot of the councils were telling us, which is that they do not want to see the state government regulating them further. They would like to look after themselves, yet the Labor Party's bill basically hands over decision-making power to the Local Government Grants Commission, which is fundamentally ridiculous and flawed.

This bill wants to give the Local Government Grants Commission the ability to suspend or disqualify a member of a council if the LGGC considers the designated behaviour of the member involves a serious failure to observe a prescribed provision of the Code of Conduct for Council Members. This leap is giving power to somebody with no history in this area, which does not exist anywhere currently. This leap is completely out of step with considered policy and considered process and hands over responsibility to a body that is fundamentally unqualified to make those decisions.

This bill also proposes limitations in relation to remuneration of chief executive officers of councils. That is fair enough; people do not like to see excessive executive pay packets. But what is interesting here is that, if you are a council CEO in a regional area, a lot of the time, to attract good quality talent councils will make sure that their package, over and above base salary, includes housing and rental subsidies, which are not provided for in this bill. Such a method would lessen the transparency for ratepayers and communities about how their CEO is being remunerated. It actually reduces the level of transparency. Again, it is a very ill thought-through part of this bill. Clause 20(2)—

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: You will have your chance to respond, member for Light. I think the LGA has also provided some comments that might disagree with you.

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Clause 20(2) of the bill relating to annual business plans and budgets represents a duplication of the existing statutory requirements. I do not know in what universe duplicating an existing requirement is reform. It is just more red tape, which is endemic in the way the Labor Party likes to go about things. It is ridiculous and it shows that this simply has not been thought through. This was a grab bag of newspaper clippings that was turned into a bill.

Some of the underlying reasons for clause 20(3) appear to be conceptually flawed, as it is assumed that all new products and services will be funded only from rate revenue. In practice, we know that councils take a holistic approach to such funding decisions and consider estimates of total available revenue from all sources—that is, from rates but also from grants, user charges, fees and interest receipts—before committing to these projects.

Also, councils fund new products and services, especially around infrastructure, by debt, which all responsible councils should do. They should responsibly use debt to make sure that they are growing productive infrastructure. It is something that state, federal and local governments have been doing since time immemorial, but obviously it is something that the Labor Party, the former government that also borrowed money via debt to fund infrastructure projects, have failed to understand. Again, it is a fundamental flaw, conceptually, in this bill.

Clause 21 proposes that council audit committees be completely independent, featuring neither council members nor council staff. My department has been unable to discover any audit committee in the private sector, a federal or a state government agency where all members of an audit committee are independent. It is absolutely ridiculous and fundamentally flawed. Again, it shows that someone has not sat down and thought through the idea. It is just a bunch of newspaper clippings that have been put together into a bill.

The comments from the member for Light are that this bill is going to help crack down on poor behaviour within councils. It will not. It will actually incentivise poor and factional behaviour within elected member bodies. For example, one of the amendments in this bill—clause 8, new section 62(2a) of the act—will make it a breach of a council member's general duties if a prescribed authority determines that a complaint lodged by a council member is frivolous or vexatious. The bill proposes that a council and a chief executive officer of a council be a prescribed authority.

Basically, what the member has not thought through is that the person making the complaint now needs to hand over that complaint to a chief executive officer who is, by their very nature, conflicted because their employment is based on an elected member body putting them back in and saying, 'You now have to make this decision against your own elected members.'

That is fundamentally ridiculous and again shows that somebody has not thought this through; somebody has just grabbed some newspaper clippings and chucked them together to form a bill. I have spoken to many council CEOs who are fundamentally uncomfortable with having to make these kinds of decisions over their own elected member body. It does not make sense; it does not make sense in any universe any mortal human being lives in and maybe potentially suggests there is some other multidimensional plane this bill works in.

Further, clause 7 of the bill proposes to empower a majority faction of a council to trigger a general election if they are unhappy with or disagree with the democratically elected principal member by passing a resolution of no confidence. It is not something we do in this place, otherwise Ian Hunter would have been booted out a long time ago. Essentially, they want to give a majority of elected members the ability to sack their directly, democratically elected mayor. That will encourage and incentivise factionalism within councils and lead to unnecessary elections and a thwarting of the democratic will of the South Australian ratepayer. It will cause chaos.

Once again, this is not a thought-through reform bill but a grab bag of poorly thought-through ideas. I have spoken to so many councils—mayors, CEOs and elected member bodies alike—who are fundamentally uncomfortable with what is being proposed here. Clearly, the member for Light did not actually consult anybody within local government before doing this. Before putting their bill through the upper house, after saying they were the champion of the Local Government Association and the industry, did they allow the Local Government Association to actually provide any constructive feedback on their bill? No, they jammed it through the upper house because they were looking for a political headline.

This is not a reform bill. This is a poorly thought-through grab bag of ideas designed to cover the backside of the Labor Party for thwarting the will of the South Australian people. We on this side of the house will not stand for it. We will vote down this bill and we will do so gladly, and we will undertake a reform process that discusses these ideas contextually, comprehensively and in conjunction with the local government sector that it is supposed to be helping.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (11:17): I also rise to speak briefly on this bill. Last year, I spoke on the Local Government (Rate Oversight) Amendment Bill moved by the Minister for Local Government, which sought to amend the Local Government Act and introduce rate capping for the people of South Australia to relieve them of the rising cost of living that is putting undue pressure on their households and businesses. We know that reducing the cost of living is a key focus of this government, and we know that council rates are one of the biggest taxes home owners have to pay on an annual basis.

In recent years, we have seen council rates increase well above inflation, and in some council areas rates have risen up to three times that of the CPI rate. In every level of government there is a duty to ensure that service delivery is as efficient and as effective as possible to contain costs to taxpayers and ratepayers but also to ease those cost-of-living pressures. While local government does provide valuable service to its local—

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Point of order: at some point the speaker actually has to address this bill, not a previous bill that was defeated.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. I will listen carefully to the member for Morphett, thank you.

Mr PATTERSON: I was about to talk about the work of my local council—

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Light will have his opportunity.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right, be quiet; you will get your chance. Thank you.

Mr PATTERSON: In Morphett, there are three local councils: the City of West Torrens, the City of Marion and the City of Holdfast Bay. They are significant going concerns.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PATTERSON: Holdfast Bay has a municipal budget of \$57 million and controls assets worth \$600 million, West Torrens has \$65.5 million and controls assets worth \$700 million, Marion council has \$88 million in revenue and assets of over \$1.1 billion. So you can see—

The Hon. A. Piccolo: Did your council support rate capping?

Mr PATTERSON: Absolutely, yes. Marion council supported rate capping—

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Light will not interject the member for Morphett. I am trying to listen.

Mr PATTERSON: What these councils require with such big budgets are elected members who have strong financial competency and who listen to their ratepayers. The challenge with all levels of government is to balance the services that they provide with the ability to pay for it.

In the case of local government, general rates revenue is the principal source of income for councils and is arrived at by each council to provide their services. Being a monopoly, where ratepayers cannot shop around for a better deal, the councils really have a large responsibility to their community that the general rates revenue they raise to provide services to their community is supported by that community.

We understand that there are cost pressures on all organisations' budgets, but over the last 10 years council rates have increased at a rate, as I said before, that is three times the level of inflation. In those 10 years, local government rate revenue has increased by 67 per cent. Where previously we had rate oversight, which would have provided for the establishment and operation—

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Point of order: at some point, let's actually debate this bill, not the previous bill which was defeated.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. I believe the content of the member for Morphett's speech thus far has been germane to the bill, but I will continue to monitor that closely.

Mr PATTERSON: Thank you for your guidance, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: You might want to skip a few paragraphs and then get to the point of the bill.

Mr PATTERSON: We can do that, certainly.

The SPEAKER: Member for Light, you have had your go.

Mr PATTERSON: Councils need to carefully consider the decisions they make around their own operations, and they need to seek efficiencies ahead of greater revenue, in other words, shift their focus from expansion to analysing the services they provide. Certainly, while I was out doorknocking in the election, and even now at shopping centre visits, I was continually listening to ratepayers. They are concerned about cost-of-living pressures, and I received good support for the Liberal plan for rate capping.

Rate capping would have guaranteed lower rates. Unfortunately, it was disappointing then to see that this bill was blocked in the other place, not only by the opposition but by SA-Best and the Greens. They had their chance to help South Australians reduce their cost of living and they did not take it. They did not listen to the will of the people. Therefore, in its place we have before us the opposition's attempt to appease the vast majority of South Australians who wanted rate capping, the ratepayer protection bill. They have not consulted with the LGA at all. They pandered to the LGA and then did not consult with them.

The effect of this bill is that it attempts to achieve purported ratepayer protection in a way that would actually create undue administrative burden and increase red tape for councils while narrowly focusing on specific issues that, as we heard before in other members' contributions, have received media attention in recent times, which is effectively a fig leaf to cover up.

The bill has the effect of significantly extending the role of the Local Government Grants Commission by signing three new substantial and disparate functions to the commission. It is essential that the performance, and any other functions assigned to the Local Government Grants Commission, does not compromise the commission's important current and imminent functions.

I will move to other clauses in the bill. Clause 20(2), relating to annual business plans and budgets, represents a duplication of existing statutory requirements.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: In what way?

Mr PATTERSON: I will tell you. Essentially, the amendment proposed in the bill would result in figures that are already published in the council's long-term financial plan—

The Hon. A. Piccolo: No.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will start calling members to order shortly if this continues.

Mr PATTERSON: —now being duplicated in the annual business plan. The proposed amendment makes no provision for meaningful explanatory material to be included in those figures. Effectively, it just puts more red tape on councils. There are also a number of amendments proposed in the bill that will have the potential to increase factional disputes within the council and increase incidents of bullying and harassment, which this bill is purporting to address.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: You have not even read the bill.

Mr PATTERSON: We have. We heard the minister before talking about the proposal to make it a breach of a council member's general duties if a prescribed authority determines that a complaint lodged by a council member is a frivolous or vexatious complaint. The bill proposes that a council or a chief executive of a council be a prescribed authority.

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

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

Mr PATTERSON: Here we have the CEO, who is meant to be building relationships with elected members and who is employed by elected members—it is the only position in council that can be employed by the elected member body—now is to rule on them. There is certainly a conflict of interest, and you can see there is massive opportunity for pressure to be put on the CEO or council members to try to support or to make a frivolous complaint go away.

Further, clause 7 of the bill proposes to empower a majority faction of a council to trigger a general election if they are unhappy with or disagree with the democratically elected principal member by passing a resolution of no confidence. It is outrageous to think that the ratepayers of a community could elect a mayor, the mayor is out there working hard, and then a small faction of the council body, many of whom might not turn up to functions and might only talk to a ratepayer when they look at themselves in a mirror, could band together, throw out a mayor and force the whole ratepayer community to go to another election. I cannot see any support in my community in asking for more elections for local government members.

We have talked before about consulting with the LGA. Their comments on this bill are that the costs of implementing these new requirements will have a direct impact on the rates in those

communities. Again, instead of our bill, which was going to bring down costs and cap rates, we now have red tape, which will put up rates for communities.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: What was the cap?

Mr PATTERSON: A rate cap.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Waite and member for Light, I have a duty to prevent quarrels. If I must, I will ask you to leave.

Mr PATTERSON: I thought you did not want me to talk about rate capping. I do not know what—

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Light, please cease interjecting.

Mr PATTERSON: The LGA also noted that a more comprehensive review process is required to develop evidence-based reform proposals that create a more efficient, sustainable and integrated system of local government—there you go, instead of reading what is in the paper, actually consulting with the community and doing a good job. Therefore, unlike Labor, who are in such a rush to get something together, the Marshall government is undertaking a comprehensive reform program this year to restore confidence in the damaged local government sector.

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

Mr DULUK: Point of order, sir: the member for Light keeps interjecting. It is unparliamentary under 141 and I ask you to bring him to order.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I have warned the member for Light. The member for Waite is correct. If he continues down this path, I doubt he will be speaking to this bill.

Mr PATTERSON: Our main priority will be better outcomes for ratepayers, which includes keeping their rates low and improving their service delivery. To achieve this, we will look at lowering the cost to ratepayers, with more council financial responsibility, and providing better conduct by councils and their members alongside stronger council member capacity, more efficiency and transparency in the sector and simpler regulations. Therefore, I vote down the bill before us and look forward to the introduction of a much more positive bill that will bring down costs to all ratepayers and bring confidence back to the local government sector.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (11:27): It is interesting that members opposite—and I thank them for their contribution, as misguided as most of it was—actually did not want to talk about the bill itself but tried to talk about a bill that has gone through this place and was approved by this place. It has not gone to a vote in the upper house because they do not want it to go to a vote in the upper house, though we are not sure why.

They have also spoken about the councils. It is interesting that they are pursuing a policy of rate capping that only four councils that I am aware of actually support—four out of 68 councils. Here they are, trying to explain that they are actually on the side of local government and trying to support local government, and the member for Morphet—

Mr Patterson: On the side of the ratepayers.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: —you can interject; that is okay, I do not mind—talked about his three councils, not one of which I am aware actually supported rate capping.

Mr Patterson interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Actually, they had no position on it. It was also qualified to capping government charges, etc., which I do not think the bill incorporates. You should get your story right.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I will talk to my bill. Do not worry, I am happy to talk to my bill. It is interesting that, in terms of rate capping, etc., not one of them could actually tell this place what the rate cap is. Not one of them could tell what the rate cap is, and that is what local government said. It was a bit of a fraud on the community, the rate capping bill, because it pretended to give powers to another unelected body. The Minister for Local Government said that it is not really a good idea in my bill but that it is a good idea for his bill to give the powers to another unelected body to set people's rates because they have no confidence in local government to set their own rates.

What they are saying is that all 68 councils in this state are incapable of managing their budgets, yet the member for Morphett talks about his council having this budget and the right people. He does not believe so because he does not want to give them the power to set their own rates; he wants to take it away from them. You cannot have it both ways, member for Morphett.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: Do you want to seek leave to continue?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Yes, I will seek leave to continue my remarks. I have only started! Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Motions

NEGATIVE GEARING

Mr DULUK (Waite) (11:30): I move:

That this house opposes Bill Shorten and Labor's plans to abolish negative gearing and increase capital gains tax by 50 per cent, which would damage Australia's housing market and destroy equity in people's homes.

This is the party that supported and endorsed Mark Latham to become prime minister of Australia. Of course, Mark Latham has just been elected as a One Nation candidate in New South Wales. When I was in New South Wales on election day in the seat where I was handing out how-to-vote cards, the Independent member was preferencing One Nation and Labor ahead of the very good Liberal candidate. Obviously, the Labor Party was happy to do deals in New South Wales in relation to One Nation. This is the party of Bill Shorten and the party the member for Light supports—

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr DULUK: —and is very happy to do so. As I said, it is only the Labor Party and the brains trust behind it that could bring in and advocate for a policy that will destroy households, increase rents and devalue the family home, punish the elderly, the housing sector, the economy, job creation, punish investors and hardworking Australians who want to invest in their own homes and in the economy and, at the same time, actually punish federal Treasury coffers as well. This is what the Labor Party is renowned for, and God help us if there should ever be a future Labor government.

Bill Shorten and Labor plan to abolish negative gearing and increase capital gains tax. What does this mean? What does it look like? Negative gearing, in a nutshell, is a common investment strategy, one that is completely transparent and has been in practice for many years. Negative gearing is an investment strategy adopted by many Australians, many mum-and-dad Australians, hardworking nurses, police officers, teachers—

An honourable member: Firies.

Mr DULUK: Firies. I bet even some members of the opposition are negative gearing investors as well, so I wonder if they declared all that conflict when they were at the national conference when this policy was passed. Negatively gearing a rental property, sir, as you may be aware yourself, is an opportunity to invest in the housing market. The housing market and the construction industry provide tens of thousands of jobs for Australians and, indeed, South Australians.

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Light has had his Weet-Bix this morning, I can tell.

Mr DULUK: The member for Light should actually support negative gearing because, as he knows, there is so much important development in his own community and his own representation—

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr DULUK: —that is benefiting from the housing industry. It would be interesting to see what effect Bill Shorten's proposed policy may have on construction jobs in his own electorate. Of course, he will have to go to his electorate to defend why there has been a downturn in the economy and the housing market because of any potential Bill Shorten Labor government. Of course, all those members opposite—

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Light! The member for Waite has the call.

Mr DULUK: All those members opposite, as they go to vote with their red ticket on polling day, vote Labor with their union mates, GetUp!, the AEU and the CFMEU—the most misogynistic union of all unions in Australia. The CFMEU is going to call the shots for the Labor Party should there ever be a Labor Party, God forbid, elected in Australia. It is a union that loves standover tactics and loves picking on women in the workplace—some of the most derogatory things you can see. That is going to be the future of the Labor Party. That is what the member for Light is voting for at some point, come May.

All the Labor members opposite, as well as the Labor candidates and the federal Labor members, are going to have to go to the electorate and justify why their policy is going to hurt hardworking mum-and-dad Australians. That is ultimately what we are here to debate today. This side of the house knows that it is important to support mums and dads and mum-and-dad investments and, more critically, the housing market.

As I said, negative gearing is when someone buys an investment property and has offsets and deductions in relation to that rental income. Of course, another part of the Labor proposal is to remove the 50 per cent capital gains concession. These are some of the big issues. It is not just me who has great concerns with the Labor Party's approach and Bill Shorten's approach; it is also the Morgan Stanley rating agency. Morgan Stanley have come out and said that house prices will fall if this proposed policy is brought into effect and that will feed into negative consumer sentiment and flow into reduced consumer consumption.

We have obviously just seen the federal budget handed down last night. I congratulate the federal Treasurer on a very good and fair budget. For me, it is one that certainly strikes at the heart of the key Howard-Costello budgets, and it is one that looks after SMEs. The SME concessions and the instant asset write-off are so important for a lot of tradies who run their own business, such as tradies who work in the construction industry.

There are some fantastic tax cuts in the budget for low and middle-income earners across the nation, which is so important. It is fantastic that it is only a Liberal government that can deliver a surplus budget and tax cuts at the same time. Labor have not been able to do that since 1989, and they will not be able to do that if they are elected at the forthcoming election.

If you look at the underlying figures in the budget, it is interesting that consumers' confidence across Australia is down slightly at the moment. House prices are falling in many of our cities. New construction dwellings and approvals are down. Credit has been tightened. Lending institutions have tightened credit lending. There is less capital flowing into markets at the moment. All of this has a negative effect on housing, house consumption and house purchasing.

The last thing the Australian economy and the housing market need right now is something as fundamental as a change in policy that has been around since Hawke-Keating, the doyens of the Labor Party. Hawke and Keating tried to reform this back in the eighties and nineties. They knew that they should not, and they did not, to their credit.

Right now, the housing industry does not need any shock or uncertainty. Bill Shorten, the federal Leader of the Opposition, is proposing to implement his negative gearing policy by 1 January.

Already that has created uncertainty in the market. Well, it is double uncertainty: the uncertainty of a Bill Shorten Labor government and, God forbid that he ever gets in, what that implementation will look like from 1 January. Of course, this bit of Labor legislation, should they actually win, has to be negotiated through the Senate. So much for consultation with industry stakeholders. There was a lot of—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: Negotiating with the Greens and the Shooters.

Mr DULUK: Well, the Greens and the Shooters, and of course we know that the Greens will be preferencing the Labor Party at this coming election. As the education minister so rightly confirms, they want to bring in death duties. They want to destroy the US alliance. I would like to see what the federal Labor Party think about that. They are going to take Greens preferences to try to win the marginal seats because the Labor Party have destroyed their traditional base.

BIS Shrapnel have also come out and modelled the ALP's negative gearing policy. The report modelled limiting negative gearing and grandfathering pre-existing investment—that is what they looked at in their modelling. The report found that the policy could see rents jump by as much as 10 per cent. BIS Shrapnel, a very independent and certainly not partisan modelling agency, have modelled and said that rents will increase by 10 per cent under the Labor Party's policies. Rents will go up for uni students who are living in share housing, perhaps, on the edge of Adelaide. Rents will go up for perhaps single mums and their families living in rental accommodation in my community.

Rents will go up for older South Australians. There are so many older South Australians, as you know, sir, who rent their homes. They may have downsized from an existing family property on a larger allotment and are now in rental accommodation as they enjoy their retirement years. They are going to have a rent increase of, on average, 10 per cent. These people are on fixed incomes, and all because of some ideological partisan decision of the federal ALP to perhaps deal with some perception issues in the western suburbs of Sydney they are going to punish renters here in South Australia, which is an absolute disgrace.

Even the Grattan Institute, which is certainly no think tank of the Liberal Party or of the centre right, said that there will be 'a sting in the tail' of the property and investment sector should the ALP win office. To quote the Grattan Institute:

We think it is unfair that people can work all their lives, pay taxes, work hard to leave a nest egg for their children only to be driven out of their homes so the ALP can achieve some arbitrary number of new homeowners.

Those are not my words, but the words of the Grattan Institute. What will this actually look like for Australians? According to federal Treasury, in 2012-13 nearly 70 per cent of all people who negatively geared their property had a taxable income of less than \$80,000 per year. So the mantra from federal Labor is that negatively geared properties are in the domain of the rich and wealthy in Sydney and perhaps the people living in Hartley who have many multiple investment properties. Actually, it is not: it is quite the opposite. It is suburban mums and dads who see property as a sustainable, long-term gradual investment.

I raised this many times in this debate because it is one that is of interest to me. A lot of people invest in property against the equity market, including people of multicultural backgrounds, people of Polish backgrounds, like me, and, dare I say, people of Italian ethnicity as well who have come to Australia and who choose housing as a form of investment rather than the equity market, and they should be able to.

What is interesting about federal Labor's policy is that it punishes people who have invested in property, vis-a-vis those who have invested in the equity market. So, if Labor felt that it was good enough to remove the capital gains concession on investment properties, why not remove that same capital gains concession from the equity market as well for those who invest in shares and equities and derivatives, as I know many people in the member for Kavel's electorate probably do, which is so important?

Another anomaly in this whole debate is, of course, that if you invest in investment properties via your superannuation fund you are exempt as well. It is very interesting that in the whole shake-up of Labor's policies—whether it be negative gearing or franking credits—there seems to be a bias towards Industry SuperFunds. Industry SuperFunds are not going to be affected by the franking tax

changes like, perhaps, a superannuant through a Triple S scheme or a self-managed superannuation scheme, and it is the same when it comes to investing in housing. I wonder why Industry SuperFunds will not be affected? Because, of course, they are controlled by the union movement. That is how the Labor Party get their union mates on funded board positions—via Industry SuperFunds. That is what they do so well and, lo and behold, the way they create their policy platform is to exempt anything to do with the union movement.

RiskWise and WargentAdvisory also undertook some analysis on negative gearing CGT in Australia's residential property markets to June 2018, and it is suggested that the ALP's policy could lead to a reduction in new dwellings and drive down property prices. What does a 6.9 per cent reduction look like? First, it will change a borrowers LVR (loan to valuation rating) with their lender, and, of course, a reduction in property prices. There is a correlation with a reduction in consumer sentiment that goes with that and confidence in the market. It is confidence in the market that drives investment, which we so greatly need.

Other modelling by Property Investment Professionals of Australia has found that we could see a reduction in collected stamp duties over 10 years, between \$10 billion and \$32 billion across all jurisdictions, as there will be fewer investment properties and a lower turnover of properties being purchased and sold, which of course will have an effect on our state and federal treasuries, which then has a detrimental effect on rents.

In conclusion, Bill Shorten plans to abolish negative gearing and consumers and taxpayers will miss out. Mum-and-dad investors will be worse off if Labor continue with their current war on households and on Australians. It is important that we have a strong housing market to ensure stable prices and rent for all consumers and investors. Most importantly, voters should think twice before voting Labor at this coming federal election, as it will see their home prices plummet and rents go up.

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (11:46): I rise to wholeheartedly support the motion from the member for Waite to oppose Bill Shorten and Labor's plan to abolish negative gearing and increase capital gains tax by 50 per cent. There is no doubt that this policy will severely impact Australia's housing market, including this state's market, and it has been predicted that as a result investment property owners may decide to give up on their investments altogether and that those considering investing in something will not, which in terms of the wider economy will have serious repercussions.

Already, investor home loans reportedly have plummeted by 18 per cent over the past 12 months to October 2018—a startling fall indeed. Lending to property investors is at its lowest since July 2013, and that has been attributed to a very slow rise in rental prices and stronger restrictions, according to the Australian Prudential Regulation Authority. Over the year to September 2018, according to ABS data, rental prices increased by just 0.6 on average—the slowest rise in 25 years.

The banking royal commission has also made lenders jittery, and it was put in November 2018 that the Master Builders' modelling showed that more restrictive policies around negative gearing and the capital gains tax discount would result in between 10,000 and 42,000 fewer new dwellings being built across Australia, which would be incredibly damaging to our construction industry. The conclusion was that, with investor demand already in retreat due to the banking royal commission, any policy changes at this time would be extremely detrimental to Australia's home building sector, a vital sector that continues to provide significant employment to a number of people across our state, and any harm done to that sector could be incredibly detrimental to our state economy.

The Real Estate Institute of Australia has also voiced similar concerns, and the Property Investors Council of Australia has described Labor's proposed negative gearing restrictions as absurd policy at a time when the national economy is showing signs of flatlining due to a number of poor indicators, including significant property price falls in Sydney and Melbourne. Just the threat of home values falling due to Bill Shorten's plans is impacting the economy, and Aussie Home Loans founder, John Symond, publicly has gone one step further, saying that Mr Shorten's negative gearing policy could tip Australia into recession.

The intent of this Labor policy is that it would give first-home buyers more opportunity to get into the housing market, putting the great Australian dream back within reach. However, the conclusion from so many across a number of different sectors is that making such a change to the tax policy at the same time that banks are tightening their lending is fraught with danger and could have a disastrous impact.

The bottom line appears to be that, if you own a property, under Labor's plan it will be worth less; if you are renting, your payments will increase. Almost 1.3 million Australians own a negatively geared investment property and more than half of those who negative gear earn less than \$80,000. Those who can least afford to have less money in their pocket will be the hardest hit by this terrible policy of Bill Shorten's federal Labor team.

More than half of negative gearers, who earn less than \$80,000, negatively gear so they can get ahead a bit, so they can buy a property or spend money in other areas, contributing to our economy. We all know the valuable impact of spending in our economy: more disposable income and more money going through our economy, which multiplies and has a wonderful effect. The Shorten policy will severely impact consumer spending and investment.

The Real Estate Institute South Australia is also concerned, citing that Labor's plans, if enacted, will see mum-and-dad investors not investing in property. Home owners in this state, in the metropolitan area and in regional areas, will see additional downward pressure on home prices in an already falling market. Renters will see their rents rise, builders and tradies will build fewer houses, and stamp duty revenues will significantly reduce, affecting infrastructure spend.

In 2016, highly regarded economic forecaster BIS Shrapnel modelled limited negative gearing and grandfathering pre-existing investment. Their report found that the policy could see rents rise by as much as 10 per cent, a scary thing for those who are living with limited means and struggling to pay weekly bills. The tight line they walk will be tightened even further under this plan. In support of the member for Waite's motion, I too oppose Bill Shorten's and Labor's plans to abolish negative gearing and increase capital gains tax by 50 per cent, as the evidence is clear to me that there will be damage to our housing market and a loss of equity in people's homes.

That being the case, I commend the motion to the house and congratulate the member for Waite on bringing it to the attention of this chamber. I hope that all South Australians strongly consider not voting Labor at the upcoming federal election in order to preserve their home values and limit the rise in rent costs that could be created by these disastrous policies.

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (11:52): I rise this morning to support the motion of the member for Waite. It is important that this house places on record its opposition to Bill Shorten and Labor's plans to abolish negative gearing and increase capital gains tax. It is important because nearly 90,000 South Australians stand to lose as a result of Labor's negative gearing tax grab, and there are approximately 900,000 individuals across Australia who will be hit by Labor's brutal increases in capital gains tax.

Labor's policy to abolish negative gearing will hurt those who negatively gear, most of whom are not real-life versions of Rich Uncle Pennybags, as those in Labor would have us believe. In fact, two-thirds of those who negatively gear have a taxable income of less than \$80,000 a year, and they certainly are not buying up streets and streets of houses. They own one investment property. They worked hard to save and make an investment in their future and their families' future. These people are regular everyday Australians: teachers, nurses, farmers, tradies and all sorts.

Labor's tax grab will also hurt those who do not negatively gear. House prices across South Australia could fall nearly 7 per cent, construction of new houses would fall, leading to fewer jobs in the construction industry, and it does not stop there. People who negatively gear tend to charge lower rents. It does not take a genius to figure out that, if negative gearing were to be abolished, rents would also increase. Nobody wins out of this irresponsible policy.

If abolishing negative gearing was not enough for Bill Shorten and Labor, they also want to increase capital gains tax by 50 per cent. The negative impacts of this policy are endless. An increase of 50 per cent would see Australia's capital gains tax rate being higher than comparable nations such as New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Canada, South Africa and Japan.

We know that Labor does not like competition—those who struggle to compete on substance rarely do—but to wilfully place Australia at a disadvantage relative to other countries is really something that the optimist in me says should be surprising. Unfortunately, though, as someone who has lived in South Australia for the 16 years of Labor government, which happily is now at an end, I stopped being surprised at the dismal economic management skills of those in the Labor Party a long time ago.

Independent analysis of the impact that Labor's capital gains tax hike would have on our economy shows that Australia's GDP would fall by nearly \$4 billion a year, wages would fall by about \$600 a year for an average full-time earner, construction activity would fall, rents would rise and state budgets would be directly damaged as GST and property tax collections would fall. These policies are typical of the Labor Party. Labor does not respect regular Australians who work hard, save and invest. Labor has no issue punishing hardworking Australians by reaching into and damaging household budgets to pay for its own budget mismanagement.

Contrast Bill Shorten's and Labor's plan to hurt hardworking Australians with the positive and responsible budget that the federal government handed down last night. It was a budget that finally returned Australia to surplus. Because of the responsible economic management of the federal Coalition over the past six years, 10 million Australians and three million small businesses get a tax cut. I will repeat that so that the contrast is clear: the federal Coalition is delivering tax cuts; Bill Shorten and Labor want tax hikes.

The good news does not just end there with the very welcome tax cuts. Getting the budget back under control allows the government to make significant infrastructure investments, like the investment to complete the north-south corridor, investment in our regional roads and other congestion-busting projects within the Adelaide metropolitan area, as well as making record investments in our schools and hospitals.

Good economic management does not mean taking somebody else's hard-earned money. The federal Coalition has demonstrated that you can repair a Labor budget mess and return to surplus without increasing taxes. The contrast cannot be clearer: where those of us in the Liberal Party believe that hard work and aspiration are good things that should be encouraged, Labor believes that any benefits derived from hard work that are beyond the minimum standard are undeserved and therefore up for grabs.

Labor wants us all to be at the lowest common denominator, whereas we know that hard work deserves to be rewarded and that aspiration is not a dirty word. A Shorten Labor government poses just as much threat to our prosperity as those who sit opposite. I commend this motion to the house.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (11:57): I rise to speak in support of the member of Waite's motion:

That this house opposes Bill Shorten and Labor's plans to abolish negative gearing and increase capital gains tax by 50 per cent, which would damage Australia's housing market and destroy equity in people's homes.

The federal Labor Party's policy to make changes to negative gearing and increase the capital gains tax is coming at the worst possible time for the property market. We have seen that property prices are already on the decline in the Eastern States. Fortunately, property prices are still quite strong in South Australia, thanks to the policies and practices of the Marshall Liberal government, but Labor's planned changes are ringing alarm bells at every corner.

Labor thinks that this policy will impact the top end of town and bring more money back to the economy, but I can tell you that this housing tax will hurt everyday Australians the most. Everyday Australians are the backbone of our state and our communities. This policy has the potential to impact the property prices of around 1.3 million property owners across Australia. Approximately two-thirds of these people earn less than \$80,000 a year and many are mum-and-dad investors.

This policy will hurt not just those who negatively gear investments but every property owner who has worked long and hard to build equity in their assets—assets they may have been building for their retirement. Independent analysis conducted by the Master Builders Association has shown

that Labor's higher taxes will also lead to less building and investment, which will result in fewer jobs. Not only is the Labor Party determined to hurt everyday Australian families but this policy will also harm the construction industry and the other sectors that flow on from this industry—again, that means it will hurt jobs. The Marshall Liberal government is putting the cranes into the sky and Bill Shorten and a potential Labor government want to take them down.

A report conducted by RiskWise warned that median house prices could fall by a staggering 9 per cent. Reports by BIS Shrapnel show that this policy could see rents rise by as much as 10 per cent. This policy will be devastating for people—whether students, families or retirees—at all levels of the property market, whether renting, owning or investing. In turn, this policy will also see increases in the cost of living for many people, with effects on family businesses and family incomes. Renters will also have to spend much more on rent each week, instead of putting their money aside so they can one day achieve their own goal of owning a home.

We know that Labor does not care about the economy. The federal Liberal Party has worked extremely hard to fix up the mess of previous Labor governments and turn our economy around. Last night, we finally saw the federal Treasurer, Josh Frydenberg, forecast a budget surplus for the first time in 10 years. Unlike those opposite and their federal Labor colleagues, the Liberal Party do their research. We talk to the people that these policies affect. We look at the statistics and read the reports produced by the experts. We know that this Shorten Labor policy will not work. By introducing such a short-sighted and ridiculous policy, the Labor Party will hurt everyday Australians. They will hurt families and jobs and they will hurt our state.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:01): I rise to support the motion moved by the member for Waite:

That this house opposes Bill Shorten and Labor's plans to abolish negative gearing and increase capital gains tax by 50 per cent, which would damage Australia's housing market and destroy equity in people's homes.

This is a very typical, short-sighted Labor policy. The Labor Party, both in this state and this country, are seen as a party who hate success. They hate employers, but they expect people to be employed. They hate people owning assets, but they still think that economic growth is going to come from somewhere. They think that things are going to roll along smoothly, they will suck tax out of people and everything will be rosy. That is not how it works.

There are a lot of battlers—hundreds of thousands of battlers—right across the market who have negatively geared property. They are the workers at the coalface, whether they be nurses, police, factory workers or farmhands—people having a fair crack to make a great future for themselves and who see the potential in negative gearing property.

We must remember that we are dealing with the Labor Party, who hate success at all levels. They may not say it publicly, but I think they do in some areas. They want to tax inheritance and death duties. They think that people who leave this earth should not pass on their success and that that money should be whittled away to everyone. I do not agree with that. Someone has worked hard, a family has worked hard or a couple has worked hard and they have created success. Why should they not enjoy that success?

With success come challenges. There are always challenges. People have a go and do not always win; sometimes they lose out. That happens too many times. If we do not have those risk-takers, those achievers, at all levels of society we will run into real trouble. If we do not have people investing in the housing market because they cannot see room for growth, where are some people going to live? We have already heard from other members on this side of the house that housing prices will decrease by 9 per cent and rents will go up by 10 per cent. I would have thought that some people who rent are Labor voters and some are Liberal voters.

We should be looking after the people who rent houses and make sure that housing is not just affordable but available. The housing market has definitely slowed, not so much here in this state but we have seen some massive slowdowns in the Eastern States, particularly in Sydney in New South Wales, and in Melbourne in Victoria. Prices have fallen for 12 consecutive months and property values in Sydney are down more than 6 per cent, and in Melbourne more than 4 per cent, from last year's peaks.

These movements followed intervention by the Australian Prudential Regulation Authority which sought to strengthen residential lending standards following an upsurge in lending to property investors. The decision by APRA to place a 10 per cent benchmark limit on the growth in bank lending to investors and clamp down on interest-only loans has had an impact. From a high of 10.8 per cent in mid-2015, growth in housing loans to investors has slowed to 1.5 per cent today. This has not come at the expense of lending to owner-occupiers, but credit growth has remained relatively stable at around 7.5 per cent over the last couple of years.

This has created a huge, changing dynamic away from investors driving much of the growth in the housing market to one where owner-occupiers are back playing the predominant role. This is particularly good news for people getting into the market for the first time. In the last 12 months, more than 100,000 first-home buyers received a loan approval, and that was the highest number since 2009. Their share of the overall number of owner-occupier loans was 18 per cent. This was significantly up from 12.9 per cent in early 2016. Acknowledging that the heat has come out of the housing market, the Reserve Bank said in its monetary policy statement:

Conditions in the Sydney and Melbourne housing markets have continued to ease and nationwide measures of rent inflation remain low.

This 'pull-back is a welcome development', said RBA governor, Philip Lowe, and is putting the market 'on a more sustainable footing'. One of the world's leading rating agencies, Standard & Poor's, recently reaffirmed Australia's AAA credit rating and has commented positively on the orderly unwind in the housing market, which it says 'won't weigh heavily on consumer spending and the financial system's asset quality'.

But—and this is the big but—all the benefits now flowing from this managed transition housing market are at risk from the Labor Party's and Bill Shorten's reckless attack on negative gearing and the capital gains tax discount. In their determination to drive property prices further down, Labor and Bill Shorten are taking to the next election a policy to limit negative gearing to only newly constructed housing and to cut the capital gains tax discount on assets that are held for longer than 12 months from 50 to 25 per cent.

This will punish not only the 1.3 million people with negatively geared properties across Australia but everyone with equity in their home because when they eventually sell their property they will do so in a market with fewer potential buyers. This is exactly what will happen if this Labor government is elected next month. What is more, many of those accessing negative gearing are people the public would not consider rich. Of course they do not. As I explained earlier in my contribution, there are many people just trying to make life better for themselves into the future, better for their family, better for their children, so that they have something to pass on to the next generations.

They are prepared to fight for it, they are prepared to battle for it, they are prepared to give up social events on weekends or going out for dinner and even to give up holidays so that they can build that base. You see and hear stories of people who have even gone for 10 or 20 years without a holiday because they are making a better life for themselves, yet here we have the Labor opposition federally and Bill Shorten wanting to belt all these people—good taxpaying citizens of this country—who are trying to make a better life.

These people are part of the workforce. About two-thirds of those with negatively geared properties have a taxable income of less than \$80,000. Of everyone claiming a net rental loss, 70 per cent do so with only one property and 72 per cent claim a net loss of \$10,000 or less. As I have indicated, these people who negatively gear property are among the 58,000 teachers, 41,000 nurses and 19,000 police and emergency service workers who look after us. A report by RiskWise warned of the unintended consequences. Property prices could fall about 9 per cent and rents could go up 10 per cent. Other published research suggests that Bill Shorten's Labor policy could accelerate the cyclical weaknesses in housing prices by further limiting housing demand, with spillover to consumer spending.

Australia is enjoying its 27th consecutive year of economic growth, a AAA credit rating from the three leading agencies and a budget deficit that is the lowest in a decade, and a budget was brought down yesterday by the federal Liberal and National government that will bring the budget

into surplus. This is not the time to give Labor a chance to roll the dice with its reckless and punitive taxation policy that puts at risk our economic strength.

Mr DULUK (Waite) (12:11): I thank the members for Narungga and Newland, the minister for emergency services, recreation and sport (member for Gibson) and, of course, the member for Hammond for their contributions. We know that at least on this side of the house we care about mum-and-dad investors. We care about construction jobs in the housing industry. Most importantly, we fundamentally know that a Bill Shorten Labor government would be bad for Australia. Obviously, those opposite clearly support this policy, even though they know it is going to hurt their constituents and their voters. I urge the house to support the motion.

Motion carried.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Waite, the ayes have it. The motion is agreed to.

COUNTRY CABINET

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:12): I move:

That this house introduces a country cabinet schedule for regional South Australians.

There is a catchphrase I hear thrown around a lot in this room, and that is #RegionsMatter. Well, you are right—they do. Mount Gambier and the Limestone Coast matter. The Riverland matters. The Murraylands matter. Eyre Peninsula matters, the Barossa matters, Clare Valley matters. Yorke Peninsula, Flinders Ranges, Kangaroo Island and Fleurieu Peninsula matter.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: The Adelaide Hills?

Mr BELL: This is where the debate comes in, doesn't it—what is country and what is peri-urban? However, for the sake of not engaging in debate, which is unparliamentary, the Adelaide Hills matter. I have been the member for Mount Gambier, South Australia's largest regional city, for over five years.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: And for many more years.

Mr BELL: Thank you. It is home to 26,000 people, the famous Blue Lake and major farming and forestry industries, and it is a region that chips in more than its fair share to the coffers of government. Combined, South Australia's regions contribute more than \$20 billion towards our state's economy. Over 400,000 people choose to live in our regions, and they deserve to have their voice heard. I see country cabinet as a way for South Australians to proactively play a role in government decision-making and to feel that their issues, challenges and voices matter.

As elected members, it is essential for us to be accountable to the people of South Australia. We make decisions in this place that affect the entire state. Country cabinet is a chance to meet state ministers. I accept that the government will probably argue that out of the 12 'truly regional seats', the Liberal Party represents all but four. But what I put forward is that there are only three regional ministers out of a cabinet of 14. It is one thing to say our backbench represents regions, but, of course, to have the cabinet attend regional areas is a vastly different scenario and, in my opinion, a sign of respect to regional communities.

My concern—and I have seen it, although I need to point out that this is not always the case—is that some ministers fly down to Mount Gambier, conduct department-crafted meetings, get on a plane and fly out the same day. Of course, that does not always occur, but it is a worrying trend that I see. I believe the Minister for Regional Development will be down in my area next week, and he has pointed out that he will be staying overnight, so I commend minister Whetstone for that. My recollection of the country cabinet—

Members interjecting:

Mr BELL: Can I have a bit of protection, Deputy Speaker?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order in the house! The member for Mount Gambier—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mount Gambier is speaking. He is speaking to his motion.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister for Education will listen in silence. Member for Mount Gambier, continue. Do not respond to interjections; charge on regardless.

Mr BELL: My recollection of Labor's country cabinet in Mount Gambier was a series of meetings held with different stakeholders. Ministers would go out to different groups on the same day. But the important part was the gathering at Mount Gambier High School, where the community came together for a barbecue lunch and informal chats with state ministers and then proceeded into a forum where the Premier spoke to my community and addressed questions from the floor. There was a sense of the government of the day listening to residents' concerns, with departmental staff following up genuine inquiries subsequent to that meeting.

Of course, country cabinet is not new. There is a famous picture hanging in the corridor just outside the Premier's office, where Speaker Peter Lewis went one step further than country cabinet and sought to hold parliament outside our Parliament House. That was held at the Sir Robert Helpmann Theatre down in Mount Gambier. Whilst I am reliably informed that the cost of such an exercise was enormous, I am not advocating for that level of engagement with regions. However, country cabinets, I think, are an important factor in our state's democracy and I would encourage this current government to look at them.

In 2014, it was the member for Frome who was the instigator of the Labor Party bringing back country cabinets, saying, 'We need to get parliament back to the people.' In this day and age, I could not agree more. I am not reflecting on Labor or Liberal in this case, but I am reflecting on the community's disconnect with the democratic process and the cynicism that is creeping into the psyche of voters. I think that they can certainly be addressed by more direct contact from ministers, and I am not just talking about MPs.

Through Labor's process, more than 6,000 people attended country cabinets in regional South Australia. Country cabinet also led to the YourSAy initiative by using the feedback gathered throughout the visit to form an issues paper, which then gave the community further opportunity to have their say. Government agencies had to provide a response to the issues they were responsible for, making the state government further accountable to people in regional areas who wanted their ideas heard. The Fund My Idea grant program also came from country cabinet, allowing communities to vote for projects in their region.

In November 2015, country cabinet came to Mount Gambier, as I have mentioned before. Some of the issues that were addressed were fracking, health care, natural resources and mobile phone blackspots. I think this is a wonderful opportunity for the current state government—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: What was the response from the government then?

Mr BELL: This is a wonderful opportunity for the—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mount Gambier, I am going to ask you to stop for a moment. The Minister for Education continues to interject out of his place, so could we cease interjections. The member for Mount Gambier is doing a good job speaking to his motion.

Mr BELL: Can I start again, sir?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, you cannot.

Mr BELL: I think this is a wonderful opportunity for the current government to share positive stories with our community because, if we look at most of those issues—fracking, health care, natural resources management and mobile phone blackspots—they are issues that have been addressed with funding attached to them, and I think it is a missed opportunity.

It is true that at the time I spoke on local media about country cabinet and during that interview I was quite critical of the response to country cabinet by the department. I need to be clear, and I will quote from that interview:

Mr Bell did say the State Government's focus on opening up new export markets to China was to be commended.

'The China focus is certainly a good one and I commend the State [Labor] Government for initiating these China delegations...A number of our producers are already in China that are export ready, but, I agree, it is good to open it up to other producers and industries.'

The State Government's Fund My Idea project which recently benefitted two Limestone Coast recipients was also to be commended, he said.

But Mr Bell said many issues...residents were concerned about, such as fracking...the south east drainage network, had simply been glossed over in the response from State Government.

When asked what score he would give the cabinet, Mr Bell replied, 'Two out of 10'.

'One point for making the effort to travel to the region and...another one for recognising the issues...Congratulations for coming down here, congratulations for working out the issues, but the...response section is very, very disappointing.'

I want to put on record that I was not critical of country cabinet; in fact, I support country cabinets. I gave credit to the government for attending Mount Gambier for country cabinet, but the report that was generated out of that by the department was very, very disappointing because it did not address the issues that were raised and couched on that day.

In closing, I would like to re-emphasise the catchphrase that 'regions matter' and that ministers addressing and attending country cabinets is a good way for this government to be seen to be listening and to respect those who live more than two or three hours from Adelaide by having their voices and concerns heard. I am calling on this government to reintroduce a country cabinet schedule, and I invite the cabinet to Mount Gambier to launch the country cabinet schedule.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (12:24): I would like to rise and move an amendment to the member for Mount Gambier's motion. He knows that this government is very careful and considered about regional South Australia. I move to amend the motion as follows:

Delete all the words after 'this house' and substitute:

- (a) recognises the importance of regional South Australia and its communities;
- (b) acknowledges South Australia's regions underpin the state's economy, contributing more than \$20 billion;
- (c) highlights this government's \$773 million investment over four years, as allocated in the 2018-19 state budget; and
- (d) notes the Marshall Liberal government is committed to growing our regions.

I have taken on board what the member for Mount Gambier had to say; he raised some point that I will take on notice. This government is going to govern for all South Australia—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, I would like to ask you to stop for a moment. We need to see a signed copy of that proposed amendment for you to speak to, please.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: Indeed, sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I remind the minister that the amendment he is proposing really needs to relate back to the original motion. It may or may not. I will view it when he brings it up.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: I thank the Minister for Education for ripping up my notes. It will be much easier to read out. As a regional MP, the member for Mount Gambier knows all too well how important the regions are to South Australia. His electorate is a key region to the state's economic growth, and his region needs a constant stream of visiting ministers to understand the issues and hear the fantastic stories.

Over the past 12 months, under the Marshall Liberal government, that is exactly what he has had. He has had a constant stream of ministers visiting the Mount Gambier electorate, including me.

As he said, I will be there again next week. There are some details we would like to clarify. I think I have made five visits to Mount Gambier in the past 12 months, and of those times—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister for Primary Industries, I am going to interrupt you. I have a copy of your amendment to the original motion and, from what I can see, it does not actually mention country cabinet at all. The original motion was specifically about country cabinet. I will let the Manager of Government Business work on that while you continue to speak.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: Thank you. Yes, I will continue to speak. 'Country' is code for regions. I would say to the member for Mount Gambier that, yes, I have been down on a number of occasions and have stayed overnight to look at a large part of his electorate and that of the member for MacKillop while I was down there.

If we are going to talk about country cabinet and question the validity of what country cabinets achieve, other than being a couple of days out of town, I ask the member for Mount Gambier: how many times did country cabinet visit Mount Gambier? I would ask the opposition: how many times did the country cabinet visit regional South Australia annually?

Mr Hughes: We visited every region.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: You have your chance to make your contribution. I would like to hear this. What I want to know is: does it compare? We have a steady stream of our ministers—the cabinet—out in the regions very regularly. We also have all the government members out in the regions. They understand the importance of regions. The majority of our regional MPs live and breathe regional South Australia; they live and breathe the country air that it offers. We saw country cabinets visiting—I think they were doing two country cabinets a year—

The Hon. G.G. Brock: No, three.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: Three? That is really rocking it. Of the \$800,000 that it cost taxpayers over that two years, let's compare. In its first 12 months this government has visited regional South Australia 255 times. Do you hear that? There have been 255 visits. They are cabinet ministers visiting regional South Australia. As the Minister for Regional Development, I am proud to say that I have made 56 regional visits to South Australia. Nothing warms the cockles of my heart more—other than one of the greatest electorates in the state, which is Chaffey, and everyone knows that—than getting out into the regions.

It gives me some form of constipation when I hear that we are looking for country cabinets to be reintroduced to visit the regions twice a year—knock yourself out, guys—when the current government in its first 12 months has been there 250 times. It really does beggar belief that country members would not be getting the benefit of those ministers visiting the regions. I have said that one-third of the members of our parliamentary team live in the regions. There are four ministers who sit at the cabinet table who come from regional South Australia. Arguably, there are five, but there is always a bit of a blurry line about the urban fringe and what differentiates metropolitan and regional South Australia.

But we have to remember that the cabinet meets twice a week to understand just exactly what regional South Australia means to the South Australian economy and the importance of the regions being buoyant, producing food and fibre for the state's economy. It also should be noted that the Premier—are we listening over there?—has made 40 regional visits in his first 12 months as Premier. He is the Premier of South Australia, the most powerful person in South Australia. He has been out to the regions 40 times—not two, 40 times. I hope that everyone can hear that in their offices. It shows his dedication to regional South Australia, just like this government's dedication.

Again, we know regional South Australia contributes about \$25 billion to the state's economy and contains 29 per cent of the state's population. For too long we have seen a previous government centralise services. We have seen the previous government centralise the mentality, the budget bottom lines, in metropolitan Adelaide by and large. We know Adelaide is a one-city state, but the importance of regional South Australia cannot be understated not only as an economy, not only as a driver, but also because it feeds the world.

I would also like to say that this government is committed to investing wisely. In the last 12 months, we have seen some fantastic projects and programs going out to regional South Australia through the Regional Growth Fund. We are going to see the economic business fund that is going to put money into our regions. We are going to see budget bottom lines that are putting money into our regions.

We do not need any excuse to have a Regional Growth Fund or what the previous government had, which was a regional development fund. That is pretty much where it stopped. We noticed that a lot of that money went to certain electorates and a lot did not go to a lot of electorates. It was duly noted. The 10-year commitment of the growth fund is critically important. It is important we have a long-term commitment.

We talk about blackspot funding. That has been a bone of contention for probably 16 years. The digital connection for regional South Australia has been amiss. Sadly, we have seen the regions of South Australia miss out on \$220 million of federal government money through rounds 1, 2 and 3. That digital connection went amiss, so we have put a commitment of \$10 million on the table and it is now being leveraged. We have announced the 29 blackspot towers that are about to be rolled out. It is great news for regional South Australia.

Again, we look at supporting our RDA boards. They have now been given some certainty. The \$12 million over four years means they can get on with the job of developing our regions rather than looking at the next grant stream. It is so they can actually keep an allocation of money to support their job. There is \$192 million over 10 years for country health services; for education—and a fine education minister we have—\$194.7 million over four years to modernise our education facilities; and, as I said, we talked about the mobile blackspot programs. There are also the trade offices, and it is about understanding how we vertically integrate some of our businesses, about putting our produce into our trade market so that we can grow our economy and create more jobs.

Regional South Australia is important and this side of the house, this government, understands just exactly how important it is. That is why we have made over 250 visits to regional South Australia, that is why the Premier has been out there 40 times and that is why I, as regional development minister, have been out there 55 times. Regional South Australia matters.

Time expired.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker, I inform the Minister for Primary Industries that having viewed his amendment I am actually going to rule it out of order, due to the fact that it did not relate nearly well enough to the original motion. Having said that, I understand there is possibly a further amendment coming when the Minister for Education makes his contribution. However, I am going to call first somebody from the other side if they wish to speak. Member for Giles.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:36): Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I commend this motion from the member for Mount Gambier. He knew the value of country cabinet meetings, as did lots of other people from regional South Australia.

Members interjecting:

Mr HUGHES: There is always room for improvement. In the Marshall government, the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, in particular, often ends his speeches in parliament by saying '#RegionsMatter'. All the time we hear it, '#RegionsMatter'. This has been happening for a year now, but hashtags do not help people, hashtags do not listen to people and hashtags do not visit the state's regions in a way that is open to all residents.

Instead of spruiking his catchphrase, the minister should spend more time encouraging his leader, the Premier, to follow Labor's lead and hold regular country cabinet meetings. Refusing to do so is a slap in the face for people in the regions who voted for a Liberal government and who expected to see that Liberal government in their regional town or city. They expected to be able to speak to cabinet ministers who visited them collectively, not the other way around.

The Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, who is also a local MP in a regional area, will tell you time and time again that his government's ministers do visit the regions—and I am sure they do. However, the answer to that is plain and simple: absolutely no money was

allocated in the 2018 slash and cut budget for country cabinet meetings. In very simple terms, that means the Marshall government does not care about regions and what people living in those regions have to say. Ministers do not want to take the time to get in their car or catch a flight to listen, as an entire team, to the needs and concerns of people in every corner of South Australia.

Mr Pederick: Just say thank you before we rip up the cheque.

Mr HUGHES: When I need to say thank you, as the Premier knows, I am more than happy to say thank you on public media—and I have done so. It is been a year of disappointment for the state's regions, which have been dealt a series of blows by the Marshall Liberal government. Regional communities have been duded by this government's broken promises, undelivered policies and lack of funding, including cutting funds to Primary Industries and Regions SA and the South Australian Research and Development Institute, and failing to adhere—

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Giles, one moment. The member for Giles deserves to be heard in silence. Minister for Primary Industries, you have had your opportunity and you were listened to. The member for Giles has that same opportunity.

Mr HUGHES: —thank you, Deputy Speaker—to its promise to increase rural road speeds to 110 km/h. Come on, where are we? You have had a year to do that. You have cut \$26 million from regional road funding. There is no direct tangible significant support for producers affected by the drought in parts of the state, especially in comparison to the work that has been done in other states to assist drought-affected farmers and pastoralists.

You have cut the female change room funding, which has impacted on a number of regional communities, including one of mine at Roxby Downs. You have ignored the state's 277,000 recreational fishers and are in fact looking to remove funding from the independent body that has ably represented recreational fishers in RecFish SA. You have closed TAFE facilities in Roxby Downs and Coober Pedy. You have threatened to privatise SA Pathology, undermining the important work this service provides in regional communities. You were given the opportunity to rule out the privatisation of SA Pathology and you did not choose to rule that out.

You have refused to fund the PACE program (the Plan for Accelerating Exploration) an incredibly important program for regional South Australia. This is a program that led directly to the discovery of Carrapateena, the 500 jobs that are being developed there and the additional jobs that are going to come with the additional investment that OZ Minerals has flagged, a very important program for regional South Australia.

Then we have the courts under threat—the courts in Port Pirie and Whyalla—and the impact that will have on regional communities. You talk about the Regional Growth Fund and the \$150 million in that fund. That is just a substitute for the \$150 million program over 10 years that we had, except yours will actually entail a cut over time because as yet there has been no CPI adjustment flagged for that particular program.

And of course you have cut country cabinet meetings. The Marshall government has proven time and time again that regional communities are not a priority. The year 2019 is the fifth anniversary of country cabinet meetings. They first began under a Labor government. Over four of those years, premier Weatherill and his entire team listened to the concerns of 6,200 people who attended country cabinet meetings in regional South Australia. There were no gatekeepers there. Everyone from a community that was visited—and there are often multiple communities in an electorate—could turn up. Anyone could ask questions of all the ministers there, and those ministers were accompanied by senior members of the departments. That was an incredibly important initiative.

As a regional member, I would be one of the first people to acknowledge that there is a metro-centric culture in this state. It is a pervasive metro-centric culture in this state, and it has run through governments past and present. Because I am old enough, I remember the record of the previous Liberal government and what they did in regional South Australia, and it was not an attractive picture. They ignored regional South Australia and concentrated on the city.

Country cabinet meetings were held in every region in South Australia. The public forums were very popular and gave all members of the community the opportunity to directly question ministers in a very open way. Also throughout that time, more than 22,000 votes were cast in the Fund My Idea initiative. It defies logic that the Liberal government, which continuously claims that regions matter, would scrap this very worthwhile initiative—and it was a worthwhile initiative. I will not go on about Fund My Idea, but initiatives from many electorates were funded through that particular participatory program. It was a very worthwhile program that we subsequently built on to assist our regional communities.

One thing that I suggest the current cabinet does is go to some of those areas that have been affected by drought because some of those people are questioning the commitment of this government to drought-affected farmers and pastoralists in parts of our state. Look at what has happened interstate. I acknowledge that the drought interstate has been more extensive and longer lasting, but when we look at the incredible amount of tangible assistance provided interstate we know that some of the assistance that has been provided has had a knock-on effect in this state in a number of different ways.

I urge this government to reinstate country cabinet visits because it was a very important initiative. When ministers go out and meet with select people who are not, generally speaking, in open forums, it is just a minister or it might be two ministers. This is an opportunity for the whole of the cabinet to go out. It is an opportunity for the whole of the cabinet to meet with different communities out in regional South Australia and receive feedback and questions without any gatekeepers there.

The fact so many people did participate indicates that people in regional South Australia thought it was a worthwhile initiative. There is sometimes a degree of amnesia amongst those opposite when it comes to the record of the previous Labor government on regional South Australia. There was incredibly significant investment in the upgrade of many of our regional hospitals, and it is good to see the Minister for Education and the cabinet committing to the school in Whyalla.

Time expired.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (12:46): It is a great pleasure to be able to speak after the member for Giles. While I was disappointed that the member for Mount Gambier, a man whose political judgement I have some regard for on most occasions, moved the motion, I am absolutely chuffed to be able to respond to the member for Giles and the Labor Party's point of view on their lack of service to regional South Australia in the last 16 years. Their failure, over 16 years of Labor government, to deliver a new high school for the people of Whyalla is a case in point, as is the failure of the Labor government to deliver new entrepreneurial education in Mount Gambier and the failure of the Labor government in so many ways.

I seek to move an amendment to the motion. I move:

Delete everything after 'this house' and substitute:

- (a) recognises the importance of regional South Australia and its communities;
- (b) acknowledges South Australia's regions underpin the state's economy, contributing more than \$20 billion;
- (c) highlights this government's \$773 million investment over four years, as allocated in the 2018-19 state budget;
- (d) notes the Marshall Liberal government is committed to growing our regions; and
- (e) notes that the former Labor government's country cabinet schedule did not see meaningful improvements to Labor policies and prefers the Liberal government's method of meaningfully engaging with regional South Australia.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, given that you have mentioned country cabinet, I will accept the amendment.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Thank you, sir. There were hundreds of visits from cabinet ministers within the first year. The member for Mount Gambier and the member for Giles talk about how on three occasions a year—or maybe two; it is not entirely clear, but certainly on fewer occasions

than can be counted on one hand—members of the former Labor government's cabinet visited country South Australia.

They had the member for Frome, who would drive to his electorate, obviously as a member of the cabinet. However, the Labor members of cabinet had to get out their GPS to find out where the schedule was for the country cabinet and then they would go and visit somewhere they had never been before. They would turn up to a meeting—if they turned up; I am not sure that all members of the cabinet turned up to every single one of those country cabinet meetings—and then all of them would be available at once. So, if you had two ministers you wanted to meet with or two issues you were concerned about with the government, then over the course of four years, if you were lucky to be in town on the day that they happened to turn up, you could choose one of the issues that was concerning to you and raise it with them.

Those opposite talk about the cutting of the budget for country cabinets and the opportunity to apply for \$50,000 worth of projects as if that was in fact the priority for regional South Australia. Those opposite want us to fund country cabinet. We want to fund country priorities. We want to fund service delivery in the country. We want to fund new schools in the country. We want to fund entrepreneurial programs, such as that which I was happy to announce at the Mount Gambier High School with the member for Mount Gambier, just before I bought him lunch and just before we went on to a series of other visits in his electorate of Mount Gambier to have meaningful discussions with a range of people. The member for Mount Gambier should know about that because he was there and he was watching. There was not a departmental official in sight, other than when we were there to ask department officials questions.

The fact is this is a government that has genuine engagement with our regions. This is a government that will continue to have genuine engagement with our regions. One of the reasons I know that is possible is that the member for Giles was so proud of the fact that 22,000 people had voted on their Fund My Idea country cabinet website.

Around the cabinet table today, there are ministers who, combined, have received far more than 22,000 votes. There are far more South Australians in the country who have input into every decision made by this government as a result of the fact that we actually have regional MPs in the cabinet. We have more cabinet members who are from the regions originally, and I can tell you that you can take David Ridgway out of Bordertown but you cannot take Bordertown out of David Ridgway.

The fact is that the members of the Liberal Party who form this government and the members of the Liberal Party who form this cabinet are of the country. They are in the country. They are regularly engaged with the country. Most importantly, we are delivering for the country. It is a prime objective of this government to ensure that, for example, in education, every child in every classroom in every school in every town in every region in this state will be supported to fulfil their potential. It is a policy of this government that we want country South Australians to prosper, to thrive, to succeed, to continue to contribute, as they do, to our successful economy because #RegionsMatter.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (12:51): My goodness! I have heard some really wonderful statements here this morning. It intrigues me; it really does. When the country cabinet was introduced in 2014, as part of my discussions with the previous government, there was no idea in my mind as to the success that would come from this move. Sometimes we in this house may think we are getting the message through to the general public, but in reality I do not think we are getting to the grassroots of our communities.

During the four years the country cabinet was held across all regions, there was firstly the opportunity for the whole of cabinet to hear the presentations. I take on board what the Minister for Regional Development said, that it is about the number of visits by various individual ministers, and I congratulate them on doing that. However, it was the whole cabinet going out there together, hearing the issues all in one hit. When the current ministers go out, and I will just leave my notes there, they have to come back, explain it to the other cabinet members and try to get their voice and explanation across.

I congratulate the new government on getting out there. As the Minister for Regional Development said, there were 255 visits by various ministers, 56 of which were by the Minister for

Regional Development and the Premier. I say that is great, but we are missing one thing in this discussion here. This is about the people of our communities, of the regions, being able to talk to a minister or the Premier and all the ministers understanding what the issues are for that particular location.

We can have this argy-bargy argument in this house but the issue is: let's bring it back to the people. We are here to represent the people and the people have a right to be able to talk to a minister directly and to the Premier. As one of the ministers in this current government indicated on radio some time ago, if somebody wanted to talk to the Premier or a minister from the country, that particular minister would make an arrangement for that person from the country to see the minister in Adelaide when they came to Adelaide. I ask members in this house: are we here for people to come to see us or are we here to go to see them?

An honourable member: Both.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I hear from the member for Narungga, I think it was—no?—or over here somewhere. Yes, it is both ways. What I do as a local member, and I note that there are a couple of other members of parliament doing the same thing, is have what I call listening posts where I go out. I do not ask them to come to my office in the electorate of Frome in Port Pirie. I go out. I travel the 170 kilometres or the 200 kilometres to see those people on a regular basis. That is all country cabinet was: it was going out there to talk to the people and for people to be able to come back in to see the ministers and local governments and put their visions and their priorities to the full cabinet. I repeat: the full cabinet.

I endorsed the member for Mount Gambier in his motion, but I am disappointed that the government has to change it to take away the importance of country cabinets. I have heard lots of discussion here today and I have heard lots of ridicule, and it frustrates me that we are not thinking of the people in the regions, the grassroots people who make up all the constituencies out there. I ask everybody in this house to support the original motion of the member for Mount Gambier and not the amendment.

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (12:55): I rise to support the amended motion. I experienced a country cabinet during my time as the preselected candidate for Finniss when, from memory, they came to Finniss late in 2017. It was an interesting visit, and it seemed very orchestrated, very planned and very managed. I do not think the community received much out of it at all.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: Did you say that at the time?

Mr BASHAM: Did I say that at the time? I have been absolutely stoked by the engagement our new cabinet has had since the election. It is not something just from the election day itself; the shadow cabinet made many, many visits to the area of Finniss. They were often there in the 12 months prior to the election in which I was a candidate, and that has continued. In the seat of Finniss, since the start of the term of the Marshall government I have had 21 visits to my electorate by members of the cabinet. I have had nearly every single member of the cabinet visit in that time. Of the less than a handful who have not been, two are actually scheduled to come in the next few weeks or months. It is fantastic to have that engagement right down to my electorate.

I will run through some of the visits I have had to my electorate. Interestingly, the first visit was from the Premier. He made a very impromptu visit—he actually came on Easter Sunday—and it started with him dropping in to our place at the time, on the farm. He was staying down in Victor Harbor, having a few days off over Easter, and he decided that he wanted to do some things in the electorate and engage with some of the community, so he popped in for a chat before going off to do so. Being Easter Sunday, when my at the time nine-year-old daughter got up and knew that the Premier was coming for breakfast—and she had not yet done her Easter egg hunt—she said, 'If he eats any of my Easter eggs, I'm never voting Liberal.' Thankfully, he did not and so the opportunity is still there that she might vote Liberal.

Following the Premier's visit, in June the Minister for Trade and Tourism, David Ridgway, came. David hosted a breakfast in Victor Harbor on a very important topic for the region, that is, tourism. Tourism is a really important part of our electorate, and he came down and had a breakfast with operators in the region, listening to their concerns in a very public way, and it was great to see the minister engaging directly with those people of the community.

The next minister who arrived was the Minister for Environment and Water. He has by far been the most regular visitor to the electorate of Finnis. His first visit was on the day of the Mayo by-election, when he came down to help out on the campaign. Only a short time later, he came down again and visited the region. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Petitions

SCHOOL ZONING

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Presented a petition signed by 250 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to immediately reverse its decision to exclude from the Adelaide High School and Adelaide Botanic High School zone the children of the families residing in Torrensville, Mile End, Hilton, Richmond, Marleston, Kurralta Park, Black Forest, Glandore and Clarence Park, and to recognise the immediate and adverse impact of its decision on families, students, educational outcomes and property values in the impacted suburbs.

SERVICE SA MODBURY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Presented a petition signed by 100 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

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I am informed today that in parliament we have the Hon. Lea Stevens, the former member for Elizabeth (or Little Para, as it was known) and former minister for health with us in the chamber. Welcome to you today.

Ministerial Statement

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:01): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

The SPEAKER: Leave is sought. Is leave granted? Leave is not granted, Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I table a ministerial statement.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:02): I bring up the 16th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Question Time

CITY DEAL FUNDING

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:02): My question is to the Premier. Why has Geelong been able to secure more funding for its City Deal over the forward estimates than Adelaide?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:03): We are absolutely delighted with the City Deal that we have signed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It seems like the only people in the entire state who are upset about the City Deal are those opposite. In fact, people are saying to us on an ongoing basis how transformative it is to finally have a plan for the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site. Let me tell you, sir—and I am sure you are interested to know this—those opposite decided to leave that site back in 2007. Fast-forward a decade and they still didn't have a plan. Despite multiple public competitions to come up with a plan, the best they could conjure up was 1,300 flats on our Parklands in South Australia.

Well, we have had a much grander vision for our state focused on the future industries, and it was with much pride that the Prime Minister came to Adelaide last year and announced that South Australia—in fact, Adelaide—would host the national headquarters for the Australian Space Agency. Those opposite, of course, said that they were working in a bipartisan way. I would love them to come in here and put forward an agenda list of all those meetings that they had advocated, or maybe even a letter or a scribble or maybe a text, that they had sent to the Prime Minister or the minister. They wanted to photobomb our success.

The reality is that this is great news for the people of South Australia, and what is lost on those opposite is the detail which has been put in place for our City Deal. Yes, there is more money going into a national space headquarters on our site. Recently, the federal government announced that Mission Control would be coming to South Australia and that the Space Discovery Centre would be coming onto Lot Fourteen.

I was only down there this morning with Inovor Technologies; they are moving onto this site. They will be manufacturing satellites. Satellites will be manufactured on Lot Fourteen—but there's more. Part of our City Deal, of course, will be a globally significant Indigenous art and cultures gallery. Those opposite scoff about the significance of this piece of infrastructure. It will drive huge interstate and overseas visitation to South Australia. It will also be able to house the new culinary school of excellence, the relocation of that facility onto Lot Fourteen, and we do that because we don't accept those very low numbers—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —of international students that those opposite presided over. We want more international students to come to South Australia, but we've got to create the right environment for that to happen, and we know that is going to happen on Lot Fourteen. It might have been lost on those opposite who always want to talk down Adelaide and South Australia as a destination for migrants to come. We had the Deputy Leader of the Opposition out recently saying, 'Why would people want to come here to South Australia?'

The reality is that they want to be coming here to South Australia because this place has a central uplifting theme. The Leader of the Opposition often talks about central uplifting themes. Well, our central uplifting theme is a transformed old Royal Adelaide Hospital site, Lot Fourteen, which will capture the essence of what we stand for: more jobs in future industries linked to the new Designated Area Migration Agreements (DAMAs), which were covered off into our City Deal—750 people for regional South Australia. Those opposite are always talking down our regions: we are talking up our regions and, more than that, 300 people coming to South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —coming to Adelaide to fill those skill shortages. We welcome people. We welcome people from interstate and overseas to make Adelaide their home.

The SPEAKER: Geelong also got Patrick Dangerfield. I think they have had enough. Before I call the Leader of the Opposition, I call to order the following members: the member for Playford, and I warn him; the member for Cheltenham; the member for West Torrens; the Minister for Primary Industries; the members for Lee, Morphett, Badcoe, Giles, the deputy leader and the member for Wright. The Leader of the Opposition.

CITY DEAL FUNDING

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Why has Townsville been able to secure more funding for its City Deal over the forward estimates in comparison to Adelaide?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:07): I tell you what Townsville don't have: they don't have \$90 billion—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —worth of defence building in its state. For some reason the opposition want to go back to their tried and failed strategies of talking down the relationship with Canberra. The reality is that we have a new relationship with Canberra, and it is a relationship with Canberra that is delivering an unprecedented level of defence projects, a new space agency for South Australia and significant investment in infrastructure, and that infrastructure, which is covered off in last night's budget, will be transformative for our state.

Let me tell you, sir, in the lead-up to the budget, which was handed down in September last year, those opposite were out there with their fearmongering, telling people there was going to be this massive infrastructure black hole—an infrastructure black hole that would carry through for years and thousands of people would be out of work. They were so disappointed—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —when the budget came down because it showed a record investment in infrastructure.

The SPEAKER: I believe the question was about Townsville and relating it to money here, and the point of order is for debate?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir, and, of course, protecting the heritage infrastructure of this building with the Premier thumping the table hysterically.

The SPEAKER: I see much thumping on my left as well. That is definitely not a point of order, but the first one is meritorious. I ask the Premier to, please, come back to the substance of the question. Thank you.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: South Australia has done extraordinarily well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: My argument, which is supported by evidence, demonstrates unequivocally that South Australia has done incredibly well with its negotiations with the federal government since we came to power. The negotiations that we have concluded with the federal government will have—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —very significant effects on our state for generations to come. I would particularly like to acknowledge the contribution of the minister for planning, transport and infrastructure. He didn't get to have a Christmas break. He didn't get to have a Christmas break because he had his nose down, his tail up, working as hard as he could to secure as much money—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —as possible for South Australia.

Mr Picton interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This incredible infrastructure, above the odds compared to any other jurisdiction in Australia, will have incredible effects here in metropolitan Adelaide, with great congestion-busting projects for South Australia. We want to get ahead of the game. We do want to increase population in South Australia, but we don't want the problems that have been seen and experienced in other jurisdictions, where they have not kept up in terms of infrastructure.

We are getting ahead of the game, and I want to congratulate the minister on that, but I most importantly want to thank him for the work that he and other members on our side have done, lobbying and arguing in a cogent way with the federal government for more money for regional South Australia. They talk about Townsville. Those opposite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —were in for 16 years, and we saw over a long period of time a decline in population in many of our regional centres.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, we do not accept that. We want to be building our regional population in South Australia, but we know to do that we've got to give them the roads that they deserve, the hospitals that they deserve, the health system that they deserve, the mobile phone coverage that they deserve, the schools that they deserve, and the involvement in decision-making that they were denied by those opposite over 16 years. We are here for all South Australians, and yesterday's budget provided plenty for regional South Australia.

The SPEAKER: I warn for a second and final time the member for Wright. I call the member for Reynell and the Leader of the Opposition to order. The leader has the call.

FEDERAL BUDGET

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): My question is to the Premier again. Does the Premier agree with Coalition finance minister, Mathias Cormann, that South Australia is \$1.3 billion better off despite a revision in GST over the forward estimates?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:12): I haven't seen the comments that have been made by Mathias Cormann, but what I do know is that the GST projections are down compared to where they were at this time last year and where they were as part of the Mid-Year Economic and Fiscal Outlook. This is not a matter of policy from the federal government, so I don't know whether the Leader of the Opposition has had a chance to get a briefing yet—maybe Kevin Naughton can organise it—to find out how the GST is actually derived and delivered.

This is not a federal government determination. The GST pool has shrunk. This is a statement of fact. It's pretty tough for us here in South Australia and it will be challenging for us with the budget, which is coming up in June this year, but we will deliver a surplus this year. It will be challenging for next financial year, and we will have more to say about that in the lead-up to our budget here in South Australia. One thing is for sure: the Liberal Party in South Australia is always the best to manage our economy, always the best to manage our budget and always puts the people of South Australia first.

INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:13): My question is for the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister please inform the house on how last night's federal budget infrastructure spend will benefit road users in metropolitan Adelaide?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Before I call the minister, I warn the member for Playford and the member for Reynell. Minister.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:13): I would like to thank the member for Morphett for his question and certainly note his advocacy, especially in relation to one project down on Brighton Road that I know he has been a strong advocate for, even before he was in this place, advocating for his local community. I would like to set a bit of a scene here and talk about—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —what happened when we came to government last year. We had the comments in 2017 from the then treasurer, who said that the 2017 federal budget did not deliver anything in infrastructure for South Australia. In 2018, we saw a pretty empty cupboard. The cupboard was extremely bare, and in the first few months we moved to secure funding for four major projects: the Port Wakefield overpass and duplication, the Joy Baluch Bridge in Port Augusta, the Pym Street to Regency Road section and the Gawler line electrification.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The difficulty is they say they are their projects, but there is one element that was missing: the money to complete them. In the budget last year, they said, 'You've only got \$120 million inside the forward estimates. This is a disaster. There's a valley of death.' Guess what? We were able to negotiate to bring all \$600 million forward into the forward estimates. Did we hear anything about that straw man having been knocked over from those opposite? No, not one word.

We move forward and, after their first valley of death claim has been refuted, in the last few weeks they have mentioned the same thing over and over again. As of last night, there is no more valley of death. In fact, we have the opposite. We now have an infrastructure pipeline—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —that is going to secure—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —civil construction jobs for over the next decade. Let me enunciate to you the ways in which this pipeline has been built. We moved quickly. By the end of this year we will see diggers in the ground on the Regency Road to Pym Street section. We will see the Joy Baluch Bridge get underway next year. We will see the Port Wakefield overpass get underway next year and the Gawler line electrification stage 2 also continue as of next year.

What we need to do is build the pipeline beyond that because 12, 18 or even 24 months doesn't provide certainty for civil construction workers, which is why the nine metropolitan intersections that we got funding for out of last night's budget—which is all in the forward estimates—actually delivers for the South Australian public.

Whether that be the grade separation at the Brighton/Hove crossing, whether that be Scotty's Corner, whether that be the Fullarton Road and Glen Osmond Road intersection, whether that be the three intersections we have announced over the previous weeks, whether that be the Torrens Road overpass at Ovingham, as well as a number of other projects, we have delivered and especially for the 2021-22 financial year have put money on the table with projects that are ready to go, that are able to be delivered by local construction workers to give them certainty that they have jobs. The reason we have done that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier and the member for West Torrens!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —is because there is this big thing called the north-south corridor. It's a pretty big project. It takes a few years to get off the ground. To dispel the myth, there is actually a \$252 million bucket of money that is inside the forward estimates, contributed equally by the state and federal governments, to do the early work to get this project off the ground—\$252 million to make sure that we can do the planning, the geotechnical work and the early land acquisition to make sure that this project gets off the ground.

Every single project that was funded last night starts in the forward estimates. These projects are going ahead. The only risk to any of these projects is a Bill Shorten government, who I notice today has not committed to the extra \$1½ billion that the federal government put on the table.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: South Australians have to know that, unless they get a commitment from Bill Shorten, this pipeline of projects is at risk.

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned and he has the call.

INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:18): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the house why South Australia has failed to secure its population share of national infrastructure funding in last night's budget?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order: the question contains argument and assumed fact and is therefore out of order.

The SPEAKER: 'Failed to secure'. I am going to allow the question. I do accept that it is on the border. I am going to allow that question. Minister.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:18): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I think we can all agree as an accepted fact that about 7 per cent of the population of this country resides in South Australia.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: So the question is: did we get 4, 5 or 6 per cent in last night's budget? No. Did we get 7 per cent in last night's budget? No. Did we get 8 or 9 or 10? We got 11½ per cent of the national share of new road funding in last night's budget. Now, 11½ per cent is more than 7 per cent. You were right, Minister for Education: there was a lack of fact in that question.

Last night's budget is the answer: 11½ per cent of new money being spent is coming to South Australia. We could not be more proud of the fact that we have delivered a pipeline of civil construction work that is not only going to deliver certainty for the civil construction sector but also get us ready for what is to come, and that is that these projects are about busting congestion to support population growth.

There are also a number of other factors that we have weighed into this. We talked yesterday about the outer ring route, but we also need to get ready for the north-south corridor being built, which is why the Goody Road/Springbank Road/Daws Road intersection is so important. It is why, down on Brighton Road, doing the Hove crossing is so important. It is why, for instance, the Torrens Road Ovingham overpass grade separation is important because, once the Regency Road to Pym Street section is completed, we are going to see traffic change.

No longer will we see tens of thousands of cars go down Port Wakefield Road and Main North Road into the city via O'Connell: we are actually going to see those people come down the Northern Connector, get onto the superway, get onto the Pym Street to Regency Road section and come up Port Road and Torrens Road. We have thought ahead, and we realised that we need to proactively deal with bottlenecks before they occur. It is why putting money into the Ovingham grade separation is an extremely important project.

There is a strong strategy about busting congestions at key pinch points across the network. The north-south corridor is a big project. It will take a lot of South Australia's focus when it comes to

infrastructure effort and civil construction effort, which is why we got in first with these metropolitan projects. It was important to do the work beforehand and get ready to build this big behemoth, which is the final 10½ kilometres of the north-south corridor. There is a plan. There is a strategy, and it is in the forward estimates.

Ms Stinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: It is ready to go. I am so proud and excited to be part of a Marshall Liberal government that sat down with the federal government and delivered well over the odds of our population share on new infrastructure investment that's going to deliver for the people of South Australia. We see across so many spheres of this new Marshall Liberal government what a proactive and cooperative relationship delivers you, and that is money into our state. We are no longer throwing banana skins around the place or jumping up and down. We are having—

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurana is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —adult, strategic conversations that deliver. It has taken 12 months in this instance to fix up the black hole and the mess that was left to us by the former government, but we have done it and we will continue to do it.

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier is called to order.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Our message to South Australians and everybody who works in the civil construction industry is that they finally have a government that's got their back.

RAIL INFRASTRUCTURE

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:22): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the house why South Australia will receive only 1.8 per cent of the national rail investment component fund over the forward estimates?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:22): Because we're not building new rail lines. This is fairly straightforward.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: I thought you were doing level crossing upgrades. What about the Gawler electrification?

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

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

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson said something about Aldinga. He is called to order.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Last year, we did get \$220 million towards a \$615 million project that the former guys butchered so badly that the feds had to pull their money out.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I know that they tried to rewrite history for so many years—

The Hon. R. Sanderson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Child Protection is called to order.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —about this project, but the truth is that the former premier, Jay Weatherill, pulled this project. It was only a Marshall Liberal government getting across to Canberra and sitting down with Paul Fletcher that delivered the \$220 million that meant that we could get on and finish this project. For the members opposite whose electorates the Gawler line runs through,

maybe a bit of a thankyou would be in order but, in the absence of that, at least have the good sense to keep your mouth shut—

Mr Brown: It was already being upgraded in my electorate.

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —while the adults sit down and deliver this pipeline.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: The Gawler line to Salisbury.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is also called to order. The member for Lee has one more, then the member for Flinders.

REGIONAL ROADS

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:23): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the house why South Australia will receive only 3.1 per cent of the \$1.54 billion of the Roads of Strategic Importance fund across the forward estimates?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:23): This almost reads like a Dixier. Last night's budget—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: It seemed a bit far off 11 per cent.

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee can leave for 20 minutes under 137A.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You know he's asking questions—

The SPEAKER: And the member for West Torrens will join him for 20 minutes under 137A.

The honourable members for Lee and West Torrens having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I was having this discussion over the past 48 hours about what the significance is of the regional roads funding package that we have been able to secure for South Australia. In the minds of the department—and I am waiting for this to be confirmed for the house—this is the largest injection of money into regional South Australian roads in our state's history.

Not only did we get what we asked for—and that is \$360-odd million worth of projects to do Horrocks Highway, a road that I know has been in my heart and also the member for Frome's heart for a long period of time—we are also duplicating the Victor Harbor Road down to McLaren Vale, again, a project that has been talked about for decades. These were the two highest priorities of the RAA in the lead-up to the state election—delivered within the first 12 months of the Marshall Liberal government.

More than that, there are simple things that we need to do. So far this year, we have seen over 30 people die on our roads, most of whom were in our regions, and unfortunately too many of them were motorcyclists. This money will save lives. It is now a package not only of the \$360 million that we asked for—an extra \$260 million for the Barrier Highway, Eyre and Lincoln Highways and for the Sturt Highway—but, on top of that, in last night's budget they gave us \$200 million towards the Princes Highway, a road that runs from the border right up to the Bald Hills Interchange where it stops, starts again at Virginia, heads all the way north on the Augusta Highway, and then across.

This money will save regional people's lives and I could not be more proud to be part of a government that has delivered. For those regional people in South Australia who have been waiting 16 years to finally have their voice heard, that voice has been heard, and this government, in conjunction with Michael McCormack and the federal government, has delivered.

These projects start in the forward estimates, but there are more conversations that we need to have with each of those communities about priorities within those buckets of money. That money is there. That money will be spent, but we are going to have a conversation with the community about

what the priorities are for those projects. This won't be sexy work. This isn't some big ribbon-cutting exercise. This is overtaking lanes. This is shoulder sealing. This is pavement correction and resealing work. This is about upgrading priority intersections not just for road safety but also for productivity for the trucks and the exports that we need to get out of this state in an efficient manner. We finally have the money on the table to do that.

For those opposite to suggest that somehow we got duded is absolutely ridiculous and it just shows up the fact that they don't understand what's going on. The glib way—

Mr Duluk interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —in which they treat the people of regional South Australia is disgusting. What we have put on the table in this budget is actually going to save lives in regional South Australia. I am so proud to be part of a Marshall Liberal government that has done just that.

REGIONAL ROADS

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:27): My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister inform the house on last night's federal budget infrastructure spend in regional South Australia?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:27): I thank the member for Flinders for his question. I do note the issue in his electorate. Keep in mind that, in our first budget, we handed down \$315 million for regional roads in South Australia, of which about \$10 million to \$12 million was in conjunction with the federal government. It was initially to deliver money into his electorate. There was money for the Lincoln Highway. There was money for curve correction for about 20 corners on the Tod Highway and there was also money for the Birdseye Highway.

But last night's budget put on the table \$125 million for Eyre Peninsula roads—\$125 million. That was for the Eyre Highway, which forms part of the National Land Transport Network. For the 800 to 1,000-odd trucks that use that road every day to get across to Perth, we want to make sure that road is up to scratch so that we can send more trucks that way, exporting our goods and services to Perth. It's also about upgrading works on the Lincoln Highway, which we know is extremely important, especially in the context of the railway line closing on Eyre Peninsula.

There have been those who have suggested that somehow we should have propped up the rail on EP. I know that the member for Flinders has had a lot of people talk to him about that very fact, but the truth is—

Mr Hughes: Release the report.

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —that the rail no longer stacked up, and that wasn't me saying it; that was Viterra—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —as the customer, saying that. At the end of the day, the people on EP just want to get their grain to port as quickly, cheaply and efficiently as possible. Here is a fact: over the past few decades, 70 per cent of all grain going to the Port Lincoln port gets taken by road and the reason is that road trains are becoming a lot more efficient than rail. The answer is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —that we need to invest in the roads to support that.

Mr Malinauskas: In the report that you won't release.

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: But the beautiful thing about that is that not only does it actually help to improve freight productivity and make sure that those roads are safe but it also delivers a benefit for the people who live on EP who use their roads for passenger vehicles every day. I see this as a great opportunity to really deliver dual outcomes not only for freight productivity on the EP but also for the people who live there and who have had to put up with some of the worst roads in this state for a long period of time.

There is \$125 million for roads on Eyre Peninsula, and that is in conjunction with the money that we have been able to secure: \$88½ million to go for Gawler to Renmark. I know that there are a number of very specific issues that the federal member for Barker, the state member for Chaffey and myself are looking at dealing with with that money. We also have money—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —for Cockburn to Burra. Again, there is \$62.5 million there, and I know, speaking to the member for Stuart, to talk about the priorities for that road. Again, it's not necessarily going to be that exciting work—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left and right!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —but it's going to be shoulder sealing, road widening—

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister for Primary Industries, do not taunt the opposition.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —pavement correction and resurfacing, the kind of good work that actually keeps people on our roads and keeps them alive. This is what happens when you have these mature conversations. Can I say this to members opposite: there is a process and a planning process that we go through.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: You essentially need to plan for the works that you want to undertake, but you also need to get the money. The beautiful thing is that last night's budget brought home the bacon for regional roads in South Australia. We now are going to get on and do that work to actually fix these roads, which have been left stranded for a long time.

REGIONAL ROADS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): Supplementary question: can the minister confirm that the commonwealth in 2019 only allocates \$48.2 million over the forward estimates—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader, please be seated for one moment. Member for Waite, you can leave for the rest of question time under 137A. The minister for Primary Industries can also leave for 20 minutes.

The honourable members for Waite and Chaffey having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Point of order: the Leader of the Opposition does need to identify who he is directing the question to.

The SPEAKER: I believe it was a supplementary question and I anticipate that he was asking it to the Minister for Infrastructure, but I will hear the question again. The reason why I couldn't hear the question is that members on my right were interjecting. The Leader of the Opposition has the call. The Minister for Infrastructure can't wait to answer; I can see it in his eyes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Rather than be a supplementary question—

The SPEAKER: New question, Leader of the Opposition.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister confirm that the commonwealth budget handed down last night only allocates \$48.2 million over the forward estimates to the three projects in regional SA, being the Port Augusta to Perth corridor, Renmark to Gawler and the Cockburn to Burra corridor, costing a combined \$220 million?

The SPEAKER: A fair bit in that question. I will not be taking points of order for debate. The minister has the call. I would like to hear his answer.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:32): Obviously—

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Premier!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —there was never a country cabinet in Cockburn. The beautiful thing about last night's budget is that it has over \$600 million inside the forward estimates for roads in South Australia, but we actually—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: No, it's not, and do you know why? Because you can't build a \$5 billion road two weeks after you get the money without doing the work.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford can leave for the rest of question time.

The honourable member for Playford having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Once again, let me explain it to you.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: At the moment, there are a number of projects that are going on. There is the Northern Connector, there is Darlington, we finished the Torrens to Torrens and the Oaklands Crossing is getting pretty close. That's four major projects. They are being completed.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Started under the former government; there you go. After those projects will now come Pym to Regency, the Gawler Line electrification, Joy Baluch and Port Wakefield. After that will come the nine metropolitan intersections that we secured funding for in last night's budget, and then we will also augment that with this regional roads funding. What is interesting here is that we want to deliver a consistent pipeline. We don't want to go through this boom-bust—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I did—over \$600 million. You don't want this boom-bust cycle that we have had. The defence industry realised—

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order and warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —that it wasted billions of dollars by going through boom-bust, which is why having a continuous shipbuilding program makes a lot of sense. The same actually works with roads, where what you need to have is a series of projects. Again, this is what made it more difficult: because the former government bunched everything up together, they set a real peak that we have had to try to smooth out and manage. So it's actually providing a consistent pipeline of work that makes sure—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Could the minister be seated for one moment. Stop the clock. If this continues, members will be departing. The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: You want to provide a consistent pipeline of work because we need to make sure that the skills that are developed in these projects jump from project to project. Boom-bust does not provide certainty for workers. It also sees workers exit the industry because they don't have that level of certainty. We have been very clear, and one of the objectives of the last 12 months has been to actually smooth out that profile, which is why we have taken an orderly approach.

In relation to a number of these regional roads, and in relation to the north-south corridor, there is an opportunity for us to bring those projects forward. For those opposite who may be cynical about that, it's exactly what we did last year—exactly what we did last year. What we can do now is make sure that we have given ourselves enough time. Again, we are not talking about next year or the year after. We are actually talking about a 10 to 12-year pipeline that we are developing here. The opportunity is for us to do the planning work, discuss with Infrastructure South Australia to make sure that these projects are done in the right way and then to fit them into the program—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —of works so that we can provide that continuous pipeline. We know it works in defence and we know it needs to work in civil construction. The reason we need to do this is that around the country more is being spent now on infrastructure than we have ever seen before in our lives. New South Wales alone is spending \$90 billion. That means that we compete for talent. What I want to make sure of is that when we spend this money we spend it wisely and prudently and we get the best price. The best way that we can do that is to provide a consistent pipeline—

Mr Malinauskas: The money is not there. It's all talk.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —and use as much local procurement as possible. There are a lot of tier 2 contractors in South Australia who are looking for a government that will actually provide them with that consistent pipeline, and that's just what we have done. All these projects start inside the forward estimates. There is a whole heap of them that start and finish inside the forward estimates. The budget—

Mr Malinauskas: Right, the ones that we signed off.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —is over four years, but the pipeline we are delivering is over a 10 to 12-year period, which is why, naturally, some of that money does exist outside the forward estimates.

GLOBELINK

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. How much money is being allocated in the 2019 commonwealth budget for the Premier's signature infrastructure plan, GlobeLink?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:37): If they want to keep asking Dixers, I will keep answering.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Do not provoke the opposition, minister.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: We took to the election a commitment to explore a visionary idea to change the way that freight moves around our state and our city—an idea of bringing together modes of transport in a way that delivers freight productivity efficiency because we have, as the

Premier says, a higher ambition for our state. We want to grow our exports, and dealing with freight constraints is one of the key ways that a state government can help to do that, hence the idea for GlobeLink.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: What we said last year is that we would undertake the business case. In our first budget, we put \$20 million aside do that. We awarded that project after the budget last year; it's been awarded to KPMG. We are currently undertaking that work at the moment. I think I have said 15, 20 or 30 times to questions having been asked about when will that be delivered that it will be delivered in the middle of the year.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: It will be delivered in the middle of the year. This is what we committed to doing before the election—that is, doing the business case development and homework to make sure that we are delivering the right projects, the best projects, and we stick to that.

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Ramsay is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Again, the internal logical inconsistency in the questioning and the heckling from the opposition show that they actually don't understand how this works.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Once again, we will try again: you need to undertake the business case development. We are undertaking the stage 1 and stage 2 business cases at the moment. We will then see what that says, and then we will look at the next steps. That is the prudent and important thing to do, and that is precisely what we are getting on and doing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The Leader of the Opposition talks about the right-hand turn. Well, guess what?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms Stinson interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: We commissioned a report to look at the issues surrounding that right-hand turn. We got the report, we listened to the expert advice, and then we made a decision that didn't waste taxpayers' money.

Mr Picton interjecting:

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

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member Ramsay is also warned for a second and final time.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: What the opposition would prefer us to do is do the business case development, ignore the advice, waste money, and ruin taxpayers' money. I don't understand the logic.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Once again—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: If the Minister for Education and the leader want to continue this, they can do it outside.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Either way, I think we have been entirely transparent every single step of the way with this, and we will continue to be so. South Australians are coming to realise, and will come to see in the future, that this is a government that does its homework—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member Ramsay can leave for the rest of question time, thank you.

The honourable member for Ramsay having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —and makes rational infrastructure decisions, and it has set up an independent body to make sure that it checks our rational decisions based on expert advice so that we can get the best, highest priority infrastructure delivered for South Australians.

GLOBELINK

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. How much money was allocated over the forward estimates in last night's budget for the GlobeLink corridor that will sweep behind the Adelaide Hills, from Murray Bridge to Truro and then down from the north of the Barossa Valley, to join road freight to the—

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order: the Leader of the Opposition is using the question time period to make speeches, and that is out of order.

The SPEAKER: When he says 'that will sweep behind', I take that to be argument or commentary. I have the point of order. I will allow the leader—because he may not have written the question—to perhaps rephrase. I will allow him to rephrase, and if that is still unacceptable I will move to my right. Leader.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I will paraphrase the question: how much money was allocated in last night's budget in the forward estimates to the GlobeLink project?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:42): You have repeated the question, so please see my previous answer.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:42): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney please update the house about the steps being taken—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: If the Leader of the Opposition keeps talking while a question is being asked, he will also be ejected, and I know how much his party members dislike that. Member for Elder.

Mrs POWER: Can the Attorney please update the house about the steps being taken by the federal government to address domestic violence, and how this adds to the work the Marshall Liberal government is already doing?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:42): I thank the member for Elder, as Assistant Minister for Domestic and Family Violence Prevention, for the extraordinary work she has already done in the first year of this new government in working with us to deal with this shocking situation.

I was immensely pleased to hear the federal Treasurer last night announce that all Australians have a right to feel safe in their community and, in particular, in their homes. The significance of his understanding was to place money on the table; that is, the federal government is prepared to put its money where its mouth is and add a package of funds of \$328 million, bringing a total of \$840 million under their government to deal with the protection of women in relation to this scourge on our community. The commitment specifically includes \$60 million to build crisis accommodation and \$18 million to support women's safety packages to keep them safely in their homes.

These are important aspects at the other end, but prevention, response and recovery are key initiatives for this important milestone funding and align with the work that the Marshall Liberal government has already begun delivering. I welcome, as Attorney-General, the focus on prevention and early intervention seen in this federal budget, this work to stop the scourge of domestic violence and to start protecting victims and family sooner rather than later.

There is \$62 million being provided over three years to support and expand the 1800RESPECT helpline to assist the timely response to domestic violence incidences. This helpline adds to the Marshall government's work on expanding our own local domestic violence hotline to a 24-hour, seven-day-a-week service, and I know that the assistant minister has played a continuing role in the rollout of that initiative.

In many circumstances, victims utilise our legal systems to seek support for themselves and their children, and this budget last night announced \$11 million over three years to protect at-risk people by providing greater cohesion between our family law, family violence and child protection systems in our federal courts. Beyond these commitments, the changing attitudes and the insistence by our own community that we stop violence are absolutely critical, and I appreciate the federal government's contribution in this regard.

If members in this house have any doubt about the need for this to occur, I invite them to read state Coroner Mark Johns' report from last week on the death of Serina Amos. She was a 34-year-old woman who was bashed to her death, with 56 injuries to her body, over a prolonged period—suspected several days—in 2015.

The person who perpetrated this has been brought to account, has been charged, has been convicted and is in custody, as he should be. But what is important is that every one of us in this house recognises the importance of not just the legal protection that is necessary but the support for people who are in a vulnerable circumstance, particularly women and children, not to have this situation repeated. I urge every member to read that report.

RAIL INFRASTRUCTURE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Why is the state government upgrading and grade separating freight lines costing over \$230 million through Adelaide that his Premier's signature infrastructure policy, GlobeLink, will remove?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:47): Sorry, I could be wrong, but isn't that also where the Gawler train line goes? It's also a passenger transport corridor. It's also actually the busiest train line in South Australia from a passenger transport perspective.

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: And what's interesting is that that project which—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Ministers on my right, be quiet!

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader! The member for West Torrens has asked the question.

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier does not have the call. The minister has the call. I would like to hear the answer, please.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I thought the Labor Party liked grade separations, so I—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister will be seated for one moment.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: We are out of control.

The SPEAKER: Yes, member for Lee. The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The interesting thing about this project is that the major beneficiaries of this are people who live in the electorates of Croydon and Port Adelaide, and everybody who's going to come up from the north-western suburbs. It's also going to help everybody from the northern suburbs, and especially last week, I was extremely proud to open the Waterloo Corner interchange on the Northern Connector. At the moment it only gets you to St Kilda but—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: There's a point of order. Minister, please be seated for one moment.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, the minister is debating the merits of his proposal. I'm asking why is he upgrading—

The SPEAKER: Okay, I have the point of order.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is warned for a second and final time. I have the point of order. In fairness to the minister, he has been heckled somewhat during the answer. I will be listening carefully. I have the point of order. I would like to hear the answer. If this continues, members on my left and right will be leaving. Minister.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I am trying to explain the merits of why the Ovingham overpass is actually extremely important. I thought that that was pertinent to the question; in fact, I thought that was the question. The Northern Connector is going to see about 50,000 vehicles a day go down it. These are cars that currently go down Main North and Port Wakefield roads. We are going to see a reorientation of traffic. Now, again, the former government is the one that commissioned the Northern Connector project. I would have thought that, maybe, they would have thought that next step ahead and said, 'Well, what happens when we build it? Where are the cars going to go?'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: They are going to go—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have the question.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —to the Port Road, and they are going to go to Torrens Road to come into town. Port Road is a three-lane, each-way road and takes about 70,000 cars a day by Bonython Park, but really it is a high-capacity route.

Doing that work for those cars that are going to want to get off early and go up Torrens Road, I would have thought, is an extremely good idea. Again, it is about this government thinking that bit further ahead. The Northern Connector is actually going to spark quite a lot of new residential growth, we think, north of the city, whether that be Buckland Park, Two Wells or all of those areas around Angle Vale. All those people are going to be able to get to town 10 minutes quicker each way.

We would have thought that thinking that little bit further ahead and putting traffic treatments in place to deal with that issue before it occurs was a prudent use of taxpayers' money. We are in the process of electrifying the Gawler line, which I think is a fairly clear indication that we want it to stay there and move the people that it moves every single day. In fact, I have actually had correspondence from the member for Light, for instance, whose constituents actually want us to increase the capacity on that line—which electrification will do—so that they can get to town more quickly, but grade separating that.

It also grade separates Churchill Road and the rail line, which is a very prudent thing to do to make sure that we think that far ahead so that we can support the population growth that we want to bring to South Australia. We reject the premise completely. I think those opposite are just trying to be grinchy and find the smallest bit of bad news they can think of in last night's budget. The reality is that there isn't any—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —\$2.6 billion of new money, and South Australians are the ones who are going to be the beneficiaries.

RAIL INFRASTRUCTURE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Will the minister release a cost-benefit analysis of his plan to grade separate a freight line on Torrens Road at Ovingham at a cost-of over \$230 million while his government is planning to remove that very same freight line and construct a new freight line bypassing Adelaide?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:52): Again, it is a fairly repetitive question, so I will point the shadow minister to my previous answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Newland. I will come back to the member for West Torrens.

TRAINING AND SKILLS FUNDING

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:52): Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Can the minister update the house about how measures in last night's federal budget further support the state government's—

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell can leave for the rest of question time. I have asked members on my left not to provide commentary when a question is asked. The member for Reynell can leave for the rest of question time, thank you.

The honourable member for Reynell having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: Can I please have the question again?

Dr HARVEY: Yes, thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Can the minister update the house about how measures in last night's federal budget further support the state government's training initiatives to create new careers?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (14:52): Yes, I can, and I thank the member for Newland for his question. I know how committed he is to seeing more

young South Australians trained for the skills that industry needs here in South Australia. The member for Newland knows that a trained and skilled workforce is vital for our economy. The more skilled workers there are, the better educated and trained—

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

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson is warned.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —and experienced they are, the greater our income and wealth as an economy here in South Australia, and, of course, the better our standard of living. The Marshall Liberal government is revitalising South Australia's training system to provide more opportunities for more South Australians.

In addition, there is our partnership with the federal government to deliver \$203 million for the Skilling South Australia program. The federal government's budget provides additional funding for training through a comprehensive package. In last night's budget, the Morrison government announced the Delivering Skills for Today and Tomorrow package. The package responds to a number of recommendations from the expert review of Australia's Vocational, Education and Training (VET) system conducted by the Hon. Steven Joyce, providing \$525 million nationally from the next financial year.

This consists of several components: \$220 million nationally to subsidise 80,000 apprentices in areas of identified skills needs. There are additional subsidies of \$4,000 to employers and \$2,000 to apprentices. That now takes the employer subsidy of an apprentice to \$8,000. There's no doubt that the Joyce review has identified one of the major barriers for employers for taking on apprentices.

There is \$67.5 million for 10 national training hubs in regions of high youth unemployment, and we are expecting to have at least one of those in South Australia. There is \$132 million to establish a new national skills commission, and we will pilot two new skills organisations and a national career institute, again in response to the Joyce review.

I will continue to work closely with the federal government to ensure that South Australia benefits from these initiatives. The new budget initiatives will greatly assist us to achieve Skilling South Australia's target of 20,800 additional apprentices and trainees over the next four years. In many ways, the findings of the Joyce review confirm what employers in the regions and in the suburbs have been telling the government through the consultation process over the last 12 months, and that is that they want to employ apprentices but they are frustrated by the barriers. I congratulate the Morrison government on removing some of those barriers in last night's budget.

APPRENTICESHIPS

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:55): A supplementary to the minister: given that the budget papers last night revised down the number of apprenticeship places from 300,000 to 80,000—as he said, the 80,000—will he now be forced to revise his target of 20,000 for South Australia?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (14:55): Absolutely not.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I just can't believe the gall of the deputy leader.

Ms Stinson: Answer the question.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I have answered the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: You weren't listening.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: You were too busy trying to think of a smart remark. I've answered the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The deputy leader, as education minister, cut \$11.8 million from the vocational education budget in her last budget—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —tore down the TAFE system here and reduced the staff indiscriminately by a third. I was up at the Kadina TAFE on Tuesday with the member for Narungga. In the whole TAFE complex there—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —one course was being conducted: fashion design. Fashion design was the only course that was being taught at TAFE at Kadina. They have a lot to answer for. The gall of the deputy leader to challenge the enormous efforts and the enormous program that the Marshall government is rolling out to skill South Australians—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —for the opportunities that are here right now and coming in the future for South Australia!

NORTH-SOUTH CORRIDOR

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Is the minister aware the state Treasurer confirmed today that there is not \$2.7 billion in the forward estimates of the 2019 commonwealth budget for the north-south corridor?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:57): Well, no, there's not. There's a state and federal contribution of \$252 million. This is bizarre questioning—

Mr Pederick: You've got to pay Kevin more money.

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —that attacks what we thought was a bipartisan approach to infrastructure development in South Australia. For infrastructure to be delivered across the election cycles, you need to have bipartisan commitment. I was really excited, for instance, when Oaklands crossing got announced, that everybody wanted to take credit for getting the job done. The member for Boothby getting \$95 million out of the federal government I think hit it, but, still, there was a state contribution towards it. Out of everything in last night's budget, I thought the grade separations were the things that were going to receive bipartisan support. The reason I thought that is that it is what Labor promised at the last election. So in February 2018—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —the Ovingham grade separation was a good idea, the Brighton Road, Hove, crossing grade separation was a good idea, but it is not okay—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —in April 2019.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: It just shows that those opposite have settled into being those opposite a little too well. The glass is half empty. I actually sat down in the last week to watch *The Grinch* with my children, the new animated version. It just seems that maybe there are some who have watched that movie a few too many times. There is good news in last night's budget: \$2.6 billion of new money, new projects, a 12-year pipeline, including what should be otherwise bipartisan commitment towards the grade separations at Ovingham and the Brighton Road, Hove, crossing. If those opposite don't want it delivered, that's fine. The money is in the forward estimates—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —and it will be delivered by this government, and I look forward very much to the opening of these projects and to commuters, who will use those roads every single day, saying thank you.

NORTH-SOUTH CORRIDOR

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. When will the remaining 95 per cent of the \$2.7 billion, promised by the commonwealth government for the north-south corridor, be delivered?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:00): Let's try this again. At the moment, we are delivering—and it will be in construction by the end of the year—the Regency Road to Pym Street section of the north-south corridor (\$340-odd million) and we are in tender phase at the moment. What happened was that Labor put \$177 million in their 2017-18 budget. They just didn't get any money from the feds. I am sure they could have built half the road, but just not the other half. That's what we did.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: We have now put those four projects, another nine major intersection upgrades, within that 2021 to 2023 time frame. This gives us enough time to get ready for what is going to be the largest infrastructure project this state has ever undertaken—has ever undertaken. We need to get ready because we are still working through the process, doing the business case development work, to understand what is to be built. Depending on which end design we go with will actually dictate what the funding profile needs to look like.

For instance, if we go with the upgrade solution, we can actually stage those works because you can break those projects off into bite-size pieces and you can do them progressively. If we decide, though, to go down one of the tunnelling options—the long tunnelling option, for instance—once you buy one of those tunnel-boring machines, stick it in the ground and it starts digging, it doesn't stop digging. What will happen in that instance is you will actually compress the construction time frame.

If we go down the hybrid tunnel option, obviously we can then stage the middle section of the works with the tunnels at either end and decide what is the best staging of that works. Each one of those different designs has a different construction profile time frame about it. Again, that work will start in earnest in 2022-23. We said it on Monday—in fact, we have been saying it consistently. In fact, I think I actually put the entire fact sheet into *The Advertiser* two months ago.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: We have been extremely transparent about this the entire way along the corridor. Also, here's the other thing we need to get right. I get a lot of people who write to me and there is a high degree of angst for those people who have businesses and houses along South Road. They have known forever that this project is going to happen, but what they haven't had is certainty over whether or not they are going to be acquired and when. The good thing about extending the lead-in time frame is that it gives us years to have conversations and acquire the properties that we need to.

Firstly, we need to work out which design. That will dictate the time frame of the profile but also dictate which properties need to be acquired. We then can go in a methodical and orderly way—having got \$252 million in a bucket that's inside the forward estimates that gives us the money to do this—and not be rushed when having those very sensitive conversations with people and allow businesses the time to plan to relocate, allow residents the time to plan to relocate and do it in a way that is sensitive and respectful for the disruption that is going to be caused during the construction time frame.

We are taking the entirely responsible course of action. We don't apologise for it. We have now built a pipeline that stretches out beyond the horizon, out to 2029-30. We are extremely proud of it. South Australians who live on the north-south corridor or who live in metropolitan and regional South Australia—in fact, everybody who lives in South Australia—are going to be the beneficiaries of it.

Grievance Debate

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:04): Today, I would like to speak about community engagement, the process of community engagement and why I think that effective and meaningful community engagement is important if we are to properly understand the needs of the community. There are a couple of elements; one is a particular example at a local level. I would like to raise an issue where my local council of Gawler decided that effective community engagement was to give some communities two weeks during the holiday period to give feedback on some major changes to parking arrangements in their local streets.

On behalf of some residents who complained to me about this, I said, 'I don't think that's very fair.' They decided to extend the period of time, which was good; that was a tick. Then I said, 'You might want to have a meeting with residents so that you can collaborate on some possible solutions to your problem.' So they called a meeting for 8.30am on a Friday, which is an interesting time to engage with your community. Either people were at work or they were driving their children to school, etc. Inevitably not a huge number of people were there; there were some, but not a huge number. But, again, it was a tick; they were doing community engagement.

Ms Stinson: Tick.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: That's right. Talking about community engagement, on the other side, Gawler council decided that it would not engage with local residents because it would breach some sort of legislative provision if they actually engaged with the community. It was about the future character of the southern Gawler rural areas. On this point, I must commend the minister for infrastructure and development, who wrote back to the council and said, 'This is not good enough. Before I approve any statement of intent to change the character of the area, I expect you to engage with your communities.'

Another important point, which gets back to a discussion we had earlier today and which I will elaborate on a bit later, is about effective engagement. We heard from the government how many times ministers have gone to regional areas. That sounds fine when we just look at the raw numbers, but what is the impact and effect of those visits? That is why engagement has to be tailored to individual communities and has to be quite meaningful.

One of the most important parts of engagement is the process that is now in the new provision of the infrastructure and development plan. Councils, or any agency seeking to amend their development plans or the code, have to go through a process of community engagement. I must confess that the new community engagement charter is an improvement on what we have had in the

past. Certainly, it emphasises to the relevant planning authority the steps that must be gone through, but it also makes it very clear that the steps have to be flexible in regard to making sure that engagement is not about just going through a process, that is, 'Yes, do this, do that.'

The process is assessed by the effect or outcomes of that process; in other words, how many people turn up to meetings, how many more people think they have been heard, how many people think they have understood the process, etc., so there is a performance element. However, one of the concerns I have about this process, which will lead to the new development code next year, is that the government has now decided to delay the release of a discussion paper on people and neighbourhoods.

This discussion paper will be very important to inform what the new development code will be about, in other words, what the new policies in our communities are. This neighbourhood and people discussion paper will talk about the character of our suburbs and our future suburbs. Next to heritage, it is probably one of the more contentious documents to be put out in this process because there are a number of issues we need to address in our suburbs and communities regarding infill, consolidation, new suburbs, etc., to make sure that we get it right. It is concerning that, by delaying this document, the community and the various community organisations will have less time to interact with and influence the process. I think that we may get a lesser product as a result.

I have heard from my own colleagues, and I am sure that it is true across the chamber, that there are a number of planning issues that arise in their communities. People raised a number of issues with them when they were campaigning, and certainly they brought them to my attention. This neighbourhood and people discussion paper is critical input into the process of coming up with a code. I would have thought that the government would give the people as much time as possible to engage in this process, to have their say, to make sure that we have a product that meets community expectations.

WOMEN IN BUSINESS

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (15:09): I rise to say a few brief words about the Women in Business forum that I was very proud to host at Stirling on 25 March. The Women in Business forum at Stirling was an honour to be part of and, I might say, tremendous to participate in as the member for Heysen. One of my priorities in the early days of my representation of the Hills was to shine a light on some of the magnificent work that is done by businesspeople throughout the Hills, particularly some of the leading example-setting women in business.

This was a forum that was attended by a full house of about 70 women in business throughout the Hills. It was nearly all women. I was very pleased to attend and I was very glad that my neighbour the member for Finniss and his wife, Kate, were able to attend as well. As so many of those present observed, this was an occasion to hear from leaders in their field not just about what brought them to be participating in business but also about what they reflect on in terms of the challenges and opportunities in their lives. It was a really tremendous forum.

I want to recognise, in particular, Helen Edwards, who led our panel. Helen Edwards will be known to many of us in this house. Her present role is head of Adelaide Hills Tourism. She comes to that role against the background of being an owner and pioneer in Adelaide Hills wine, particularly through The Lane Vineyard. She is an incredibly accomplished businesswoman after many decades of leadership in the health space, having originally had a background in nursing. She has been a leader for our state in so many areas.

Helen brought her tremendous spark to the leadership of a forum that included our Deputy Premier and Attorney-General, Vickie Chapman. The forum also included Kate Laurie from Deviation Road, who I am tempted to say is the world's, but will perhaps keep it as Australia's, greatest and increasingly most recognised sparkling winemaker, and Sarah Burchell, the proprietor of Cleveland Nursery at Stirling.

I want to thank Vickie for her leadership. It was an opportunity for those gathered to see another side of our Deputy Premier, and I think many people came away thinking, 'Wow, what an impressive leader we have in Vickie Chapman and what an impressive human being.' But I particularly want to shine a light on and recognise the wonderful contribution of both Kate Laurie and Sarah Burchell because, unlike our Deputy Premier, who is used to being in the spotlight and is a

well-known public figure, Kate and Sarah are examples of leaders in business who are not daily in the public spotlight. They just get on with doing what they do brilliantly well.

Kate made a number of very important observations about the sort of journey that business people everywhere go through and the sorts of things that they have to deal with. Those of us who know Kate will be quick to say that she is someone who wants to maintain the very highest of standards. She said that she is petrified daily about what each day is going to bring, but just gets through it. She maintains this wonderful standard and a tremendous product. Sarah Burchell, who has done a tremendous job with Cleveland Nursery, also offered the most personal of insights into what keeps her on track.

I want to thank my own mother who joined me. She is an inspiration to me. I also particularly want to thank my team at the Heysen electorate office. They are another great example of leaders and leading women, particularly. They are a team that I could not be more proud of. I commend the forum and look forward to many future such occasions.

Mr BOYER: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house:

A quorum having been formed:

WRIGHT ELECTORATE OFFICE

Mr BOYER (Wright) (15:15): It has been 12 months now since the electorate office for the seat of Wright was unceremoniously booted from the Golden Grove Village. What has occurred in the year since must surely go down as the most blatant display of political interference in the location of an electorate office ever seen in South Australia. Make no mistake, the decision to exile the office 25 kilometres away from the seat of Wright was political. Yes, it is true that the old electorate office for the seat of Wright was no longer within the boundaries after the redistribution; it was out of those boundaries by all of about 370 metres.

Nonetheless, I fully expected to be told after the election that the member for King would take over the office at Golden Grove Village, but a few days after the election I received an unexpected call from the member for King in which she said that she did not want to take the office at the village but instead wanted an office that was more visible. Those are her exact words. I said I would be very happy to keep the office for Wright where it had been.

Ms LUETHEN: Point of order: I have heard inaccurate information being presented and personal reflection.

The SPEAKER: That is definitely not a point of order, but I will allow the member to perhaps make a personal explanation a bit later. The member for Wright.

Mr BOYER: On that basis, I met with electorate services to discuss these arrangements. Electorate services informed me that they had had similar conversations with the member for King in which she expressed a desire to find a different office. For that reason, they gave me the keys to the office at the Golden Grove Village and we were moved in.

These conversations are borne out in freedom of information documents that we obtained last year that show the member for King called the Savills Retail Leasing company on Tuesday 20 March to inquire about new office locations at the Highland Village in Greenwith and The Packing Shed shops in Golden Grove. It was clear as day that the member for King wanted out of the village, but those plans hit a snag. The member for King could not find a lease and she quickly realised that her only option was the existing office for Wright at the Golden Grove Village.

You would think, of course, that the member for King might have had the courtesy to contact me again, explain her predicament and politely inform me that she was left with no choice but to move into the office at the village, but no. Instead, she got the Hon. Rob Lucas in the other place to do her dirty work and he had his public servants call to tell us we would be leaving the village.

The SPEAKER: I ask the member for Wright to withdraw the statement 'asking the Hon. Rob Lucas to do her dirty work', please.

Mr BOYER: I withdraw, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, continue.

Mr BOYER: The choice was between my existing office at Parliament House or the old electorate office for the seat of Taylor in Virginia as our next location. I can tell you that the irony was not lost on us. When we asked why we could not stay at the village, we were told it was because the office was 370 metres out of the seat of Wright, but there was no issue moving us 25 kilometres away to Virginia. The rationale at the time was that there was an existing lease at Virginia that would present a savings to the taxpayer. Forget the disenfranchisement—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right!

Mr BOYER: —of the electors of Wright, the government can save a few dollars at their expense, so before we knew it the removal trucks had arrived and we were off. But that budget saving the Treasurer used as justification for sending us to Virginia was a red herring. In November, the lease for the office in Virginia had to be extended, which begs the question: why at that point was the office for Wright not moved into or closer to the seat of Wright? Indeed, was the Treasurer given advice by his public servants that this is what should have happened?

When we were given our marching orders just after last year's election, there was office space at the village that could have accommodated us. In fact, it is still empty and available right now, but instead, in July last year, the Treasurer issued a media release crowing about finding an office in Salisbury East.

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone: It's not even in your electorate.

Mr BOYER: Neither is Virginia. What do you not understand about this? Get a map. You are #RegionsMatter. You are Mr Regions Matter. Do you know where any of them are?

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone: Don't you like Virginia?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BOYER: Have a look at a map. How embarrassing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BOYER: Aren't you the minister for primary production?

Mr Patterson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morphett! He's been doing it all day out there on the wing.

Mr BOYER: But instead, in July last year, the Treasurer issued a media release crowing about finding an office in Salisbury East and how that office would be ready by October. You would think that, after almost 40 years in parliament, he would have realised that it is not a good idea to over-egg the pudding. Here we are, six months later, and that office is still not ready. In fact, the assurances given by the Treasurer about when it would be ready have been wrong on so many occasions that electorate services will no longer even give me a date.

Last week, the office for Wright moved to its third temporary location in 12 months, to share accommodation with the member for Ramsay. Nobody can tell me how long we are going to be there, and nobody can provide me with evidence that any work has started at Salisbury East, but everybody in the north-east is going to remember the treatment they have received from this Liberal government.

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

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Wright!

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Yes, the minister is correct. Member for King.

Personal Explanation

WRIGHT ELECTORATE OFFICE

Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:21): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Ms LUETHEN: I heard the member for Wright say that I told him I wanted another office other than the current King electorate office. I wish to advise this house that I made a call to the member for Wright to ask him, out of courtesy, what his plans and preferences might be for us to be able to work with him, not to say that I did not want the office in King. I will take this moment to reiterate that the office allocation decisions belong to the Treasurer and were not my decision anyway.

Mr Boyer interjecting:

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

Mr Teague: You are a sook.

The SPEAKER: I am not a sook, member for Heysen. Member for Finniss.

Grievance Debate

VICTOR HARBOR ROAD INTERSECTION

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (15:22): I have the privilege of rising today to draw attention to an item in last night's federal budget coverage. Although it is not in my electorate, it is an important item for my electorate because it links the electorate to the City of Adelaide. It is the duplication of the Victor Harbor Road between Old Noarlunga and McLaren Vale. This is an important piece of work that needs to be done for many reasons.

I have travelled on that piece of road all my life. My earliest memory—it had been upgraded when I was very young, so that would be at least 45 years ago—is that they had decided that it was not big enough, and they used the sealed verges as an extra lane. They put in overtaking lanes using the sealed verges, and that was 45 years ago. The traffic volume on that section of the road is now up to nearly 25,000 movements a day. In this state, there are not many roads that are unduplicated that actually have that volume.

This is such an important piece of infrastructure that gives a better gateway into the region, not just for my electorate but for the whole of the Fleurieu. I had the privilege yesterday of going down there with the Minister for Transport from the South Australian parliament and the candidate for Mayo, Georgina Downer, to do some media on the announcement and to talk about how desperately it is needed for that region.

We met on the corner of Seaview Road, which is right at the top of the hill where a lot of quarry trucks come out. It was actually quite scary just standing there on the side of the road as those trucks went around that corner. They look for a gap, often a gap that would not be a big enough opportunity for me, in my car, to seize, but if they do not seize that opportunity when they can, or when they think they can, they would be sitting there all day.

It is such an important part of this work that these issues are also going to be addressed in the widening and duplication of the road, intersections where there are large traffic movements, where we see quarry trucks, in particular, coming out. It will significantly improve safety. Unfortunately, only recently there was a fatality on this piece of road, involving a truck and a car. We need to try to do what we can to improve the safety of this road.

There will be many in my electorate who will have wished for more, but this is certainly the most important and most stressed part of the Victor Harbor Road at this time. As I said, it has about

25,000 traffic movements a day. When you move further south between McLaren Vale and Willunga, it drops down quite dramatically to around 15,000 movements a day, so there is not quite the same stress on that piece of road. Again, when you go on from Willunga through to Mount Compass it drops down to about 6,000 to 8,000 movements a day, and further on it continues to decline as you get towards Victor. So the pressure certainly has been on that piece of the road.

Yes, there are tragic accidents elsewhere, and there have been for many years, and we still require extra work to be done. We still need to see extra spending on this road going forward, perhaps more overtaking lanes or a wider strip through the centre to separate the two directions of traffic. It is an important piece of infrastructure, and it is very important to the businesses that operate on the Fleurieu, to farming and tourism. It is the lifeline of the region of Finniss.

I very much commend the efforts of the minister in lobbying for this and also thank Georgina Downer for her advocacy. I am thrilled that this has been able to be delivered for our region, and I continue to see great improvement in the working relationship between the Marshall government and the Morrison government to achieve great outcomes.

RAU, HON. J.R.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:27): I rise today to pay tribute to a former colleague of ours who left this place in December, a week after the last sitting. We never really got to say goodbye to John Rau, the former member for Enfield and former deputy premier and attorney-general, and I want to put on the record my thanks for the work he did in the electorate of Mawson as planning minister, in particular.

He came up with some great, very practical solutions for Kangaroo Island, in particular, with the development of the Commissioner for Kangaroo Island. He took a great interest in how a place with 4½ thousand square kilometres and a population of just 4½ thousand people could get the sort of representation it needed within government, within all three spheres of government. He had great foresight there and got a great group of people together who worked for quite some time to come up with the model which was the Commissioner for Kangaroo Island.

He also fought really hard to get the Kangaroo Island airport upgrade, which was jointly funded by the federal and state governments for a combined \$20 million contribution. I want to thank him for those things, but as planning minister he also took an idea we came up with in the local McLaren Vale area to bring in Australia-first legislation to protect the agricultural lands around McLaren Vale and the Barossa Valley.

It was really important, as the march of urban sprawl rattled towards McLaren Vale and the wonderful agricultural lands we have there, that John, as planning minister, took a real interest in this matter. He jumped in and put lines around the towns of McLaren Vale, McLaren Flat, Kangarilla and Willunga so that there could be no subdivision and gutter-to-gutter housing between the towns. That is something that the people of Mawson, particularly around the McLaren Vale wine region, will be forever grateful for.

As Attorney-General, John took a tough line on bikies. He helped make South Australia a safer place with his pursuit of good legislation. He was the busiest person in our government by a country mile when it came to bringing legislation through this place, and as Attorney-General he oversaw many reforms. He reformed the return-to-work laws in South Australia and made them fairer for workers and better for workers, while also taking on board the views of employers.

John was in this place from 2002 through to December 2018. Before he made it onto the front bench, he was busy working on reform in the real estate industry in South Australia. From 2004 until 2010, he was Chair of the Natural Resources Committee. Whenever these committees hand down their findings, they always have a title, which are usually fairly boring—for example, 'The 23rd report of the committee'. John Rau thought it was a good idea to come up with some memorable names that might help people searching for relevant information on certain titles.

The Marine Scalegfish Fishery Summary of Evidence 2014-17 did not just become 'The 125th report of the Natural Resources Committee'. It was titled 'Good things come to those who bait'. An inquiry into prawn fisheries management became 'Trawling through the evidence', and a report into foxes was 'Hunting for the right solutions'. The first inquiry on Deep Creek was called 'Deep

Creek: a search for water', but when the public servants were not giving them the right answers they did a supplementary report: 'Deep Creek revisited: a search for straight answers'. There is a trilogy that might look a little familiar on water resources management in the Murray-Darling Basin. Volume 1 was called 'The fellowship of the river'; the second edition was 'The two rivers'; and the third instalment was 'The return of the water'.

I want to thank John for all his efforts in here, but I also pay tribute to him as a great father to Jack, Olivia and Stella. As we all know, our time in parliament is very important, but our time with our family is even more important, and they are with us forever. So thank you, John, for all your efforts.

NEWLAND ELECTORATE SPORTS CLUBS

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (15:32): I am pleased today to rise to speak about a number of recent visits I have made to sports clubs in my local electorate. There are many very wonderful sports clubs within the electorate of Newland, and I have been very pleased to see that the state government is supporting many of them in a number of different ways. In particular, over the last 12 months \$52,250 in Active Club Grants has been awarded to a whole bunch of different and very deserving clubs. We are also delivering on our commitment of \$350,000 for the construction of six new tennis and netball courts in Banksia Park as part of the Tea Tree Gully sports hub to increase the capacity for tennis and netball, which will particularly benefit the Tea Tree Gully Tennis Club, the Banksia Park Netball Club and the Tea Tree Gully Netball Club.

Of course, we have also delivered \$320,000 towards the South Australian District Netball Association courts car parks, an enormous facility out in Golden Fields in the member for King's electorate—and the member for King is a big advocate for this project as well—and \$20,000 for the Tea Tree Gully Gymsports' new sprung floor, which was an election commitment I saw delivered firsthand. In fact, at the AGM I went to last Friday they did a showcase of some floor routines on that floor, and what they were doing was quite incredible. In any case, it made me feel very inadequate, but it was a very impressive performance by those athletes.

At that AGM, I was also very humbled to have the opportunity to present an award to the Male International Trampoline Athlete of the Year, Isaac Eakin, who had done a fantastic job in his discipline. I was also joined by my friend and parliamentary colleague the member for King, who presented the Female International Trampoline Athlete of the Year, which was awarded to Natasha Giles.

There were many other award winners, too, which I would just like to run through: the Men's Artistic Gymnastics Athlete of the Year, Tyson Sammells; the Phil Randell Trophy for the Women's Artistic Gymnastics Athlete of the Year was awarded to Savannah Crompton; the Male Age Trampoline Athlete of the Year, Ethan Ey; the Female Age Trampoline Athlete of the Year, Jessica Tibbets; the Dorothy Kotz Trophy for the Most Valuable Club Member went to Jane Harper; and new Life Member awards for 2018, Steve Crompton and Alannah Bolton.

I would certainly like to congratulate the board and all the supporters of that very successful club, a club with over 50 years of history. It was started from very humble beginnings by Peter Ross many years ago, and it is now one of the largest gymnastic clubs in Australia with the largest kindergym in Australia.

I recently had the pleasure of attending the annual presentation night at the Hope Valley Bowling Club. It was a great night, with pizza beforehand, which is always fantastic. Quite a number of awards were presented, and I would like to congratulate the events committee that organised the evening. I was also fortunate to have the opportunity to present a number of awards there along with fellow co-patron, the member for Florey.

I would particularly like to congratulate not only the men's champion, Brian Leaney and the women's champion Bev Murdoch, but also all the other award winners that night: Jim Terrington, Raylene Heitman, Peter Hurt, Paul Heath, Peter Kollosche, Chris Parry and Dianne Paddock on their success. The Hope Valley Bowling Club is very much a fantastic local club and a very successful local club. I would like to congratulate all the members of the club, and in particular the members of

the club's board, chaired by Roslyn Blakeney. They volunteer so much of their time to help support this important club in our local community.

Last weekend, I attended the Tea Tree Gully Little Athletics Club annual Trophy and Presentation Night, which was held at Bulkana Reserve. It was a great evening, with a great turnout by all the athletes and parents on what was a wet evening. I would in particular like to congratulate the Little Athletics Club president, Jane Sternagel, on her work in managing the club, and all the athletes and coaches and volunteers on their part in the club's success over the 2018-19 season. I would also like to acknowledge Don Robertson, who is the President of the Centre Management Committee that looks after the facility as a whole.

I had the great privilege of presenting the Seven Year Service Award to a number of athletes: Taryl Borgas, Chelsea Hussell, Kiara Geesing, Alyssa Lienert and Tahlia Lienert. It is a very successful club. There were many award winners, and I would like to congratulate all of them. It is fantastic to see so many young people in our community keeping active.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:37): I move:

That standing and sessional orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable Private Members Business, Other Motions, Notices of Motion, set down on the *Notice Paper* for Wednesday 3 April, to take precedence over government business for two hours, forthwith.

Motion carried.

Motions

COUNTRY CABINET

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Bell (resumed on motion).

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (15:38): It is my pleasure to resume on this particular topic. Just prior to lunch, I was speaking about the Minister for Environment and Water and his visit to my electorate back on 13 August, which was his second visit to the electorate.

The Hon. D.J. Speirs: The second time I told you about.

Mr BASHAM: The second time you told me about. He often pops into the electorate and he doesn't tell me about it. I had the great pleasure of being involved in the consultation around the Landscape South Australia Bill that is coming forward.

We also had the opportunity visit Granite Island to look at the work being done on the cafe that reopened for business just after Christmas. It is a thriving success because it is open for very long hours. Early-morning runners and walkers to the island are able to enjoy a coffee at the cafe. They also serve wonderful food—seafood mainly. It is a wonderful place, and I encourage everyone to visit. We then went across to Goolwa to visit the Goolwa wharf to look at some of the issues facing that piece of infrastructure which has been neglected and which needs investment to make sure that it lasts going forward.

It is great to be able to have ministers visit and look at problems that are occurring at the time. If we are going to schedule cabinet visits, often these events will not occur because, on the previous government's timetable, it was once every four years that they came to the electorate, and there are many things that happen outside that time frame. This has been a very responsive cabinet, particularly in my electorate. I have had 21 visits from ministers to my electorate, which they have told me about. The 22nd visit was when the Minister for Education rang me to ask for a recommendation for somewhere to have coffee. He told me that the place I told him about was a bit hipster for his liking.

An honourable member: What was it?

Mr BASHAM: Qahwa. I will have to find something more reserved—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: It wasn't a ministerial visit.

Mr BASHAM: It wasn't; it was just a visit to a wonderful part of Victor Harbor. I thank very much the Minister for Environment and Water for his visit. The next minister to visit only a couple of days later was the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. He came with me to visit PipiCo, which is a wonderful business that operates in the township of Port Elliot. They have a great working relationship with fishers who operate along the Coorong on the beach and out to sea harvesting pipis, or cockles, as we have known them for many years.

They do wonderful work in that space, and it was very pleasing to be able to show it to the minister. The minister also met with farmers, who I was able to bring together from right around the electorate, from many different aspects of agriculture, to discuss the different issues facing our area. Again, I was able to bring my community to the minister when he was in the electorate.

If we had a cabinet visit, I would not be able to do that to the same extent because it is all happening at the same time. It is very much harder to operate in that sort of environment. I believe this is the best way to serve our electorates: to have cabinet visit on a needs basis, on an availability basis, on an issues basis to address the needs of my electorate and other regional electorates. I am very pleased that we are operating in this space.

Following the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development was the Deputy Premier, the Attorney-General. She came to a function at the Encounter Centre, which is an organisation that helps the disabled in the area work on different projects, including making toys and other things for children in the area, to put their skills to use in a wonderful way and help in the process of making sure that fundraising for that business is going well.

Not long after that, the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development again came back to my electorate. This time, it was for the regional budget breakfast. We had a great gathering at the McCracken resort, where many came together for a breakfast and to hear about how the budget is helping the regions and the support this government is giving to the regions. What a wonderful morning that was.

This has been a very proactive cabinet. They were proactive before they were in government, as a shadow cabinet, and that has continued upon taking office. I commend them for their work and I will expect the 2½ weekly visits from ministers that I have been receiving to this point going forward.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (15:44): I, too, want to support the amendments brought forward by the Minister for Primary Industries on the motion. I do that because this government really is all about action rather than an illusion of action. I do not recall a single country cabinet event put on by the previous government that was not a media event on Adelaide television.

You knew they were in the country because the Labor cabinet ministers had their RMs and camel trousers on and no tie. They were there in the country. They did not quite know how it felt to be out there in the country, but they wanted to make sure they looked the part just in case there was a glimpse of them on the television and people would see them dressed like that and say, 'Maybe they are in the country.' Maybe that was what that was all about.

I like to wear my full suit and tie when I go to the country as a sign of respect because I am working, and I am working for those members of regional South Australia. I do not want them to feel that I am dressing down because it is not a business event. That is why I am there. I do that because a message I got very early as a minister was that people did feel, under the previous government, that things were wound down for those visits to—

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Colton is interjecting out of his seat.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —the regions and that things were not quite as important, 'So we will let our hair down. We will relax a bit while we are here, we will try to blend in a little bit, but hope that we are seen on the Adelaide media.'

I would like to talk about some of the visits that I have had. Just recently, I kicked off another round of regional visits. When I was first appointed as Minister for Industry and Skills, it was very important that I had an understanding of what industry was looking for in the regions. We saw

14 TAFEs shut down in regional South Australia under the previous government—a number of them were sold—despite the fact that in some instances they were almost brand-new buildings. There was certainly no activity at those buildings after the 16 years of Labor. It was extraordinary.

The double whammy is that not only were they recovering or in a position of diminishing effect because of the substantial cuts that were implemented by the politically chosen TAFE board that indiscriminately cut I think close to 400 staff out of TAFE over four years—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: It was way more than that.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Yes. I think it was one-third of the staff and millions and millions of dollars in redundancies.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Six hundred, says the Minister for Education, who now has the job of fixing the mess left by the previous government. It is so important that we make sure we have strong vocational operations in regional South Australia because that is where we need the skills. We need those skills in regional South Australia. We need to make sure that, for those industries that cannot get the staff, there is a training program in place for the young people who are looking for those jobs. We want as much of that training as possible to be in regional South Australia.

I just want to share a terrific story from when I visited SJ Cheesman engineering in Port Pirie. Stephen Richter has been in the business all his life. It is a family business; his son is also working there. I met an English migrant who moved to Port Pirie from Britain 20 years ago and absolutely loves it there. I asked him, 'What is it about the regions?' He said, 'I have my house on the beach. It's about an hour's drive, but I love every minute I'm here.' He has some children here in Australia and others in the UK. He is in his late 60s and still working. He has no interest in retiring. He loves the work he does as a welder and fitter on the engineering site. He is a great advocate for migrants coming to regional South Australia.

Also in Port Pirie, I popped in to an organisation called Yourtown. It is a social enterprise that acts as a group training organisation for apprentices. They are recipients of Skilling South Australia funding. I was very pleased to meet Matt Coates, who was running it. Matt worked in my factory close to 15 or 16 years ago, so I was very pleased to see his progression from a tradesperson to a management role in this social enterprise. They were doing a very large job in Port Pirie building 200 church pews in jarrah for a Vietnamese church in Adelaide. It was an amazing job and very high-quality work. It was terrific to see that sort of activity happening and those opportunities being delivered to young people in South Australia.

Of course, my tour did not end in Port Pirie. Last week, I was with the member for Narungga in Kadina and met with a number of businesses. We had a business round table talking about skills in particular. Again, skills are what the industry needs. They want them via apprenticeships and traineeships, and they also need them through targeted migration. There are jobs that are not done, product left unpicked and animals not slaughtered because the skills simply are not there in the regions to do that. When I go out into the regions, the very clear message is how important it is to revitalise those regions through a growth in population.

On Friday, I was down in Mount Gambier, another very important visit, where we launched the Regional Accelerator Music Program (RAMP), which I spoke about in this place yesterday. Of course, Mount Gambier is known for its music. It has the James Morrison music academy. The old gaol is a concert site, and I think it was last weekend that there was a very big concert in that space. There are regular large concerts. It really is a music mecca for regional South Australia.

They were very excited about the music accelerator program. This is an example of how we have designed a specific program for regional South Australia. People in Adelaide share a vibrant music nightlife and musicians share opportunities to participate in that in Adelaide. Of course, we are now working to expand those opportunities in regional South Australia. We did not need a country cabinet to do that. We have active members in our party who actually live in the regions.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:54): I will make a small contribution to this matter. I will not recite all the arguments that have been put forward today so far. I would like to commend both

the mover of the motion and the member for Frome, who have spoken very eloquently about this proposal, and also my colleague the member for Giles, who covered the matter very well.

It is no accident that this motion has been moved by a regional member of this parliament. It is also no accident that it has been supported by two other regional members, both the member for Frome and the member for Giles. It is no accident that Independent members of this parliament have, on previous occasions, decided to join a Labor government rather than a Liberal government. That is no accident at all because those regional members know who looks after the regions better. They were smart enough to leave the Liberal Party.

It is also very interesting that both the mover of this motion and the member for Frome hold seats that were previously held by the Liberal Party. That is no accident at all. The unfortunate thing about the members opposite is that they cannot see what is clearly obvious. People in the regions understand that they get a lot of lip service from the Liberal Party. They get a lot of fly-in fly-out ministers, people who fly—

The Hon. D.J. Speirs: No, most of us live there.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: You live there, so what? The ones who do not live there fly in and fly out, so let's not have that crap. Sorry, I withdraw that term.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Dr Harvey): Thank you.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: That might be a bit unparliamentary. The Liberal Party quite clearly take the regions for granted. They just assume that people in the regions will vote for them and that is why it is no accident that the Liberal Party have cancelled the country cabinet program. One thing they do fear is being held accountable as a government. It is much easier to send an individual minister on a tight program to the regions than send a whole cabinet to the general public and make them accountable.

It is interesting that, in their discussions so far, they have tried very hard to conflate two things. It is interesting that, as both the mover and the member for Frome have pointed out, this is not about ministers visiting the regions—all governments and ministers do that—it is actually about bringing the whole government out there to be accountable as a whole. You promote the fact that you are going out there and you promote ordinary committee members coming to see you and speak to you. It is, essentially, democracy at a grassroots level.

Clearly, members of the Liberal Party are a bit concerned. I can understand why the government may want to hide some ministers. I am sure that some of the backbenchers understand why the government want to hide some of their ministers on very fixed visits to the regions.

Importantly, these visits are an opportunity for ordinary people, who do not normally engage with government, to meet with ministers outside a visit to a school, etc., or some departmental thing. Country cabinets are very productive, but do not take my word for it. I will quote what some people in the regions have said. These are people who live and work in the regions. I will quote from some reputable newspapers.

This is what was said in the *Yorke Peninsula Country Times*—a very reputable paper, I understand, and I am sure they would not print stuff that is not truthful or accurate. This is what they actually reported in the paper—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Let me finish. It is coming; do not worry.

Mr Pederick: I want whatever you had for breakfast.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: That's fine; you can have it. You would probably have two serves.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Dr Harvey): Order!

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: This is what a local council representative said, and it was reported in the *Yorke Peninsula Country Times*—as I said, that reputable newspaper and the record of

important happenings in those communities. This is what council CEO, Andrew Cameron, said at the time:

I will be attending the local government presentation to Country Cabinet today (Tuesday) in Clare and then the community function in Balaklava...

He says—and I am happy to table this, if you need it—

It is a great opportunity for the premier and our cabinet ministers—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Mr Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: There was an interjection that this is not what the paper says, but I was actually quoting what somebody else said. I will read from the editorial of the *Yorke Peninsula Country Times*, the editorial that speaks on behalf of the newspaper. There is a really good quote here:

Our region finally had its turn at hosting a Country Cabinet during the weekend.

Not only was it an opportunity for state government ministers to hear about local issues, they also announced \$1.2million of funding for three local infrastructure projects.

Thanks Country Cabinet, you're welcome back any time!

This is what the editor of the paper said and what the paper said itself. This is a paper that actually values and understands its community.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: You may want to see it. This is in the *Flinders News*. Councillor Heaslip, from the District Council of Mount Remarkable, talked about our visit in the north:

Cr Heaslip said it was pleasing to see a state minister take time to visit the small town and construction site.

'It is good that they are interested enough in their expenditure to come and check out the works being undertaken.'

He was talking about the country cabinet, so he clearly saw value in the country cabinet. The *Plains Producer*, another very reputable newspaper in the region, talks about what the acting CEO says about the whole process:

'It adds a bit of rigour and meaning to those Country Cabinet meetings,' he said.

'We're pleased with the outcomes and look forward to working with the local member for the benefit of the community and the region...

There is more to come, though. The mayor of Victor Harbor council said:

The Country Cabinet was an opportunity for us to showcase Victor Harbor and to elevate local issues to the attention of ministers.

It is interesting that all these regional communities think that country cabinet is important and that a number of local country members think it is important. The only people who do not think it is important are the Liberal Party. Clearly, the community values country cabinet, and it is a pity that the Liberal Party do not.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:04): Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker, and what a fine job you are doing. I rise to support the amended motion and to acknowledge the hundreds of trips that our ministers and our Premier do between them. They not only come out to our electorates but obviously some of our ministers live in our electorates. In fact, you would think that the Minister for Water had a second house down at the Coorong, judging by the number of times he is in my electorate or in the electorate of Finniss or in the electorate of MacKillop.

After the member for Light's revelations about how well Labor did in the regions, I have to say that I know that some of their ministers had to ask some of our regional members where certain places were. I will leave them unnamed, but I understand that one of them asked one of our members where Pinnaroo was because they did not know. Not only that, but they could not pronounce the

names and did not know where they were going. Allingtons had a huge sale because all of a sudden they needed to buy some Akubra hats, some RM boots and some moleskins so that they could put on the look to come out to the regions.

When these country cabinets were organised, I saw that they took a very conflicted and very stage-managed approach, making sure that things were in line so that no-one got embarrassed, because the Labor Party knew that they were heading into hostile territory—hostile territory because members on this side of the chamber live in those regions and look after the regions.

We had that scintillating display from the member for Light, who used to be the emergency services spokesman when the Labor Party were in government.

Mr Odenwalder: The minister.

Mr PEDERICK: What did I call him?

Mr Odenwalder: Spokesman.

Mr PEDERICK: Okay, he was the minister.

Mr Duluk: He wasn't very good. They sacked him.

Mr PEDERICK: Well, he wasn't very good because he went out in a farcical display of trying to merge the Country Fire Service, the State Emergency Service and the Metropolitan Fire Service. It was another case of attempted unionisation, which went badly wrong and ended up costing him his job. Obviously, there was not enough consultation and it was never going to work, and he lost his job because of it, apart from probably other failures.

The issue is that we live in the regions and we understand the regions. I know that there was some conjecture earlier today about where the regions are and whether or not they are in the Adelaide Hills. I want to talk about the Adelaide Hills for a moment. I was connected to this issue because I used to look after Strathalbyn, but it is now in the member for Heysen's electorate and has been for many years now. I looked after Strathalbyn in my first term, between 2006 and 2010.

On the issue of Kalimna Hostel, not only did the Liberal Party back that in but it stopped it from being closed. The member for Heysen fought valiantly. He had minister Wade connected straight into that community to make sure that we had the right outcome for those residents of Strathalbyn and surrounding areas, instead of what the Labor Party did to those good regional people, farming them out all over South Australia. They had people moved from Kalimna to Gumeracha and a whole range of other places because of their flawed policy plan and not listening to the community—the community that donated that land when Kalimna was built, back in the eighties I think it was. That is just some of that good advocacy. People know who really cares for the regions.

We also had some comments from the member for Light that we take our regional seats for granted—I can tell members that I have never taken one vote for granted, and I have been elected four times—and that we do not get anything for our electorates. Back in 2014, I managed to round up \$20 million for a racetrack proposal at Murray Bridge, which will be opening this year. We had a \$5 million grant from the federal government, a \$5 million grant from us if we had won the election in 2014 and a \$10 million loan from us on this side of the house if we had won that election.

That was no mean feat in a so-called safe seat. I have never taken it as safe. Thankfully, after a few years we are getting that racetrack up and going, and I had the good fortune to go through it the other day to have a look at the venue. It is going to have seating in there for 650 people for meals and is going to be a great asset not just for Murray Bridge but for the whole Hammond electorate.

I look at how good we are as a party to this state—right across the state and right across the regions, not only what we are spending in city Labor seats—regarding what we want to do for the people of South Australia because we are the Marshall Liberal government for the whole state of South Australia. One thing that really stands out in the regions is the \$100 million we are putting towards the new high school in Whyalla in the member for Giles' electorate. There are people on my side of the house who question that commitment, because we could all do with money in our

electorates for other proposals, whether they be for health or education. That just goes to show: it is a safe Labor seat, and all Eddie has to do is say 'thanks'. We are putting \$100 million into that school.

Another election commitment I got for our electorate, working with minister Wade again, who does great work across the whole state, is \$7 million for the new emergency department at Murray Bridge. That will be a great emergency department to bring the Murray Bridge hospital right up to speed into the future.

The member for Mount Gambier has brought this motion. I class the member for Mount Gambier as a good friend of mine, but I note that in 2016, when asked what score he would give Labor's country cabinet when it visited Mount Gambier, Mr Bell replied, 'Two out of 10.' He also made the comment that country cabinet was lightweight and lacking detail.

That really reflects what I saw with the confected way the Labor Party, when it was in power, arranged country cabinet. It was all very structured, who was invited, how they would speak to people—apart from the rushed trip out to Allingtons or RM Williams to load up with country gear so that they could fit in, or allegedly fit in. It did not work. Country people were not fooled.

I am not part of cabinet, but I see ministers coming through my electorate or neighbouring electorates and then hear the stories about where they are travelling right across the state. Whether they are the Minister for Health, the Minister for Education, the Minister for Industry and Skills, the Minister for Tourism, or the Minister for Water, etc., they are constantly coming through our electorates and the people in our electorates know they are accessible.

The great thing about being in government is that you can contact your ministers, catch up with them while you are in here, or talk to their chiefs of staff or other staff, and know that you can get things done. I commend the work all our ministers are doing across the state, and I commend the many visits the Premier continues to make across the state. He gets great feedback wherever he goes. Certainly, through the regions during the drought visits people were very appreciative when the Premier got around at Karoonda, Pinnaroo and Mannahill, over on the West Coast. Country people acknowledge that the Liberal Party is the party for regional South Australia.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (16:14): I rise to support the member for Mount Gambier in his quest:

That this house introduces a country cabinet schedule for regional South Australians.

I went on the first country cabinet back in 2002 as a media adviser to then emergency services and energy minister, Pat Conlon. It was something that was borne out of the agreement with Peter Lewis, a former member for Hammond, in his role of picking Labor to form government after the 2002 election. The first country cabinet was held in Murray Bridge and Tailem Bend, and we went on many more after that time. I always found them to be extremely useful, and I think their value depends on what the local member puts in and how open the local member is with ministers coming into their patch.

I always really appreciated, as the minister for agriculture, food, fisheries, forests, tourism, recreation, sport and racing—those sorts of areas that covered so many important parts of South Australia—the relationships I had with people such as the member for Flinders, the member for Mount Gambier, the member for Stuart and the member for Hammond. When we would go down, we would get on well, say nice things about each other and try to get the job done.

Sometimes it depends on the personalities involved as to how much you get out of these things. I was someone who went down as a media adviser then as a chief of staff. There was an end to the country cabinets after the 2010 election under Mike Rann, and they were reintroduced by Jay Weatherill when he became premier and rejigged a little bit. I think they were better in the second edition of what we aimed to do.

As a minister, I found them really good because, while I was out in the regions all the time, some of my colleagues were not out there so much. It gave them a great chance to go out and see things. Again, you can only do as much as the local community have asked you to do. Questions were always put out through local government and other local sources. They would say, 'Country cabinet is coming to town. If you want to have a meeting one on one with the minister, you can do that. We will find a timeslot.' So we would sit down one on one. Sometimes it was with individuals,

sometimes it was with industry groups and sometimes it was with other associations or businesses. I found that a really good opportunity.

We would then have the community forum where there were no Dorothy Dixers. We were in the local town hall, school gymnasium or community centre and we sat at a big, long table, all 14 ministers, and the premier was behind us. He would act as MC, do the introductions and hand out some awards to local volunteers and local leaders, and then it was open slather. We did not know where the questions were going to come from or what the issues would be. Most of the time we were across the big issues.

Mr Duluk: Probably your Labor sub-branch members.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: There is an interjection from across saying it was Labor sub-branch members. We do not even have sub-branch members out in many parts of regional South Australia. There are places on the West Coast where I think some booths get one Labor vote.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Yes. We were not out there on a popularity drive to get people to join the Labor Party. We were out there in the regions to listen to people and do the very best. It was the same when we went to Port Lincoln after the Wangary bushfires in 2005. When we turned up there en masse, we guaranteed that we would have a minister on the ground for those first six weeks, and we did. We worked with the local councils, local communities and government departments there.

People in and around Port Lincoln would say, 'What are you doing here? We're not ever going to vote Labor.' We said, 'We're not here to get your vote. We're here to do the right thing and get you back on your feet as soon as you can.' Regional South Australia is the engine room of South Australia, and when people are being productive in regional South Australia everyone in this state benefits, whether they live in the metropolitan area or in regional South Australia.

We were out there with the best of intentions. We were out there to listen to people and to get a broad understanding across all the portfolios of what was happening in the different regions. I can assure the member for Hammond that we all knew where Pinnaroo was, because we were there in the—

Mr Pederick: No, not all of you. You did.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: No, we all did because we had a forum there, and after the forum we ducked into the pub—not the Pinnaroo Hotel where we had those schnitties that time when we were there. We went to the Golden Grain Hotel, not the Pinnaroo pub. It was about two in the afternoon and, as we turned up there, the B-graders turned up because they were runners-up in the grand final against Lameroo. We were in there, and guys were drinking butchers of beer with a raw egg in it. They wanted to get Jay on those and all the other guys. We had a really good half an hour, 45 minutes with those fellows while we waited until the next appointment.

That night we got to Lameroo and we had a forum there. The Lameroo guys, who were actually the premiers in the B-grade that year, turned up, so we were having beers with them. The member for Lee may have skulked off to bed because he could see some danger on the horizon. It ended with Kyam Maher from another place and having some boat races with the boys and some staffers. There were five on their team, but we only had four on our team, so Kyam had to be the first drinker and the last drinker, and we beat them because Kyam has some exceptional beer-scuttling skills. That is what it was. We were not tucked away and not talking to people. We were out there getting involved with the local community.

One of the good things that happens, too, is that, when you are in the cabinet, it does not matter what side of politics you are from; you are flat out seven days a week. Apart from coming together at cabinet each week you are largely out and around the state doing your things in your portfolio. I think that the country cabinets were very good for collaboration in cabinet and for throwing around ideas.

Long after a visit to Peterborough, or to Mount Gambier, or to Glencoe—we did have an afternoon tea at Glencoe at the opening of its wonderful new viewing platform a few years ago—or

to Kangaroo Island, or to the Riverland, as a group, as a collective, as people who came together each week to make decisions on behalf of all of the people in the state, in all the regions in the state, we had a much better understanding.

We also built up a lot of contacts. People would ring us from time to time, whether they were oyster growers from over on the West Coast, timber millers from down in the South-East, fishers from Kangaroo Island, or tourism operators from the Flinders Ranges. We would form these contacts where we had people on the ground who could feed directly into ministers and into the cabinet process.

I think that it was an unbelievably important part of the Rann and Weatherill cabinets that we did that. I know that members opposite think that they are the only people who understand the regions. Well, that is not the truth, and I think it is a bit unfair on people to say that, and it is a bit disrespectful to people in country areas as well.

We all need to get along. There are 47 of us in here. Some are on the government benches, some are on the opposition benches and some are on the Independent benches, and we all need to work together to understand what it is all about. While we may have regional members of parliament who are around the cabinet table, things are a bit different in each of the different regions of South Australia. I do not think you can just say that just because we have a lot of regional MPs we do not need to go out into the regions and have these country cabinets.

My advice to you would be to give it a go, because I actually think it is very beneficial for the collective, for the cabinet, to do it. You will build some team spirit, you will listen to people out in the country areas and you might even learn a few things. That is an important part, because none of us knows everything, even though some people think they do. No-one knows everything. Every day in this job, every day as a cabinet minister, you learn more and more things.

I want to congratulate the member for Mount Gambier on bringing this motion to the house. He has my wholehearted support, as a member in this place who represents a fair chunk of regional South Australia.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (16:24): I rise today to contribute to this debate. We have certainly had a good opportunity to discuss this particular motion and the amendment to it. There is nothing like having private members' time extended throughout the day. I think it is important that we all have the opportunity to talk about the things that are important to us.

The member for Mount Gambier brought the original motion to this place, and being a country or regional member—I suppose 'regional' in the true sense of the word, given that Mount Gambier is, I think, our second biggest city; it might be the biggest, so will I stand corrected—it is always a bit of a—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr TRELOAR: No, a regional centre. It is the biggest country town. I was right. Murray Bridge is growing. Whyalla possibly will have an increase in population in the coming years, given the exciting things that could potentially happen because of the arrival of Gupta, who could well reinvigorate the steelworks. That would be exciting for Whyalla and the state more generally. The original motion has been amended by Minister for Education and now reads:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the importance of regional South Australia and its communities;
- (b) acknowledges South Australian's regions underpin the state's economy, contributing more than \$20 billion;
- (c) highlights this government's \$773 million investment over four years, as allocated in the 2018-19 state budget;
- (d) notes that the Marshall Liberal government is committed to growing our regions; and
- (e) notes that the former Labor government's country cabinet schedule did not see meaningful improvements to Labor policies and prefers the Liberal government's method of meaningfully engaging with regional South Australia.

I think I got that, as it was written by hand by the Minister for Education. I am speaking today in support of the amendment. I attended two country cabinet meetings, one in Port Lincoln and one in Ceduna, during the life of the previous government.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: As an observer.

Mr TRELOAR: As an observer and as the local member. What I detected was very much a smoke and mirrors sort of arrangement. Certainly, the Labor government were trying to give the impression that they cared about country people when they were there. What they needed to do was be there all the time, as we are, as sitting members, as representatives of country people in South Australia. The majority of country representatives are on this side of the chamber, in the government now. I acknowledge the member for Giles and the member for Mount Gambier, who sit on the other side but represent their constituents as well as they can from outside of government, which is always a challenge.

As has been said on a number of occasions already in contributions, ministers often regularly visit our country areas. People have been quoting numbers. I am not familiar with the numbers. I have lost count of the number of times that ministers have visited country seats and visited the electorate of Flinders, including the Premier. It is always a pleasure to have the Premier in your electorate. We had a particularly difficult situation recently on eastern Eyre Peninsula in relation to dry conditions and the drought.

We were privileged to have the Minister for Primary Industries visit twice in recent times, and the Premier visited both Cowell and Cleve recently. That is the sort of action we are seeing from this government, and I expect that to continue. In relation to the ministers in this current government, I have been impressed by their willingness to visit country areas and their availability to talk with the people whenever they are there and whenever it is required.

In the lead-up to the 2018 election, in January there suddenly appeared a huge bus in the seat of Flinders, and it was premier Weatherill's bus. I had never seen a bus so big.

An honourable member: The Jay Bus

Mr TRELOAR: It was the Jay bus, exactly. I think I met it in Arno Bay or Cowell just to keep an eye on things and to ensure that things did not get out of hand. What intrigued me was that when the bus doors opened a whole host of young, well-groomed people wearing red T-shirts hopped out, but no sign of the premier. With all due respect to the premier, he did arrive in Port Lincoln and I shared a table with him at the Tunarama dinner. It was interesting, and it is all about perception and illusion to a certain degree.

I have spoken about our being able to best represent country people from this side of the government because we live and work amongst our people: we make our homes there, we run our businesses there and we raise our families there. Often, we were born there, went to school there and are longtime residents there. We are not people who have been parachuted into seats. We are not party apparatchiks and we are not career politicians necessarily; we are representing the people we live and work with because we want to.

The significant exports that come from our regional areas drive the state's economy, as the member for Mawson quite rightly pointed out. Exports such as mining products are mostly from the Far North of the state, but we occasionally see a mine pop up in the more closely settled areas. Agriculture, of course, has been the mainstay of the state's economy since settlement, since the first good harvest in 1841—there were a couple of failures before that, but we managed to get through—together with the pastoral pursuits, the viticulture, the horticulture and, of course, in my electorate particularly, the seafood sector, the fishing and the growing aquaculture sector.

I admire the perseverance, the dedication and the risk-taking of country people to see their businesses succeed, to bring exports to the port and to bring new money into the state. Prior to the last election, our current Premier was often heard to say, 'We're not going to get rich selling lattes to ourselves.' It is more than about money going around and around within a relatively small state economy; it is about bringing in new export dollars, and certainly our regional areas are able to do that.

Last night's federal budget was particularly exciting for country areas, especially in relation to roads. I know that everybody wants their roads fixed, and there are many hundreds of millions of dollars that will be committed to the state's roads; some of that, I can assure people, will be going to Eyre Peninsula. Some would say that it is probably long overdue, but we have Liberal state and federal governments, so there is no better time to achieve good results through negotiations.

There are challenges for government in providing services to far-flung country South Australia, particularly those things that state governments are ultimately responsible for, such as health, education, communication to a lesser extent because it overlaps with the federal government, and water utilities. It is a real challenge, and it is a cost, and we as a government have to determine how best to provide those essential services to people who do not live in the metropolitan area but who deserve an equitable share of the services that governments can provide—and all of this in a state with a highly centralised population and Adelaide being the focus, with more than a million people. People who live in country areas certainly are punching above their weight, and I congratulate them on all their efforts in relation to producing export income for this state.

As I said, it has been a pleasure to be a part of this debate. It is a good opportunity for everybody to flesh out a few ideas and work out where everybody sits in relation to country cabinets. I think it is probably a cost we can do without. On this side of the house, we certainly feel that we are more than willing and able to represent our country constituencies capably. We have the ear of the ministers. We have ministers regularly visiting and making themselves available, and we also have a Premier who well and truly realises the importance of the country areas of South Australia.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (16:34): It gives me great pleasure to rise to speak in favour of the member for Mount Gambier's motion in support of the country cabinet initiative, which, if we are perfectly honest, we would admit happened on an ad hoc basis leading up to 2014. After the 2014 election, it became a much more rigorous and scheduled event, thanks principally to the input to the cabinet from the member for Frome. I think it is instructive that a regional member of parliament, the member for Mount Gambier, formerly a member of the Liberal Party, is moving this motion, seeing the value of this initiative because it does deliver value.

I want to speak about my reflections on what country cabinet meetings meant to me. I am the first to admit that, unlike many of my colleagues, particularly those three I see before me conversing on the crossbench, I have had less experience in the course of my life spending time in the regions than they certainly have. I am the first to admit, especially after hearing a contribution from the member for Hammond, that I certainly have had less experience spending time in the regions than he has.

By happenstance, I found myself in the position of not only being a cabinet minister after the 2014 election but also thrust into a portfolio where, physically speaking, the vast majority of the responsibilities occur outside the metropolitan area of Adelaide, out in the regions of South Australia, where the majority of the road network is. The country cabinet regime was a great opportunity for me to become more familiar with parts of the state that I had never visited before, let alone understood the issues that were important to the people living out in those regions.

I am the first to agree with the Deputy Speaker that ministers, regardless of the government from which they hail, are less capable of representing constituencies than the local MP. It stands to reason. They are not spending as much time out there. They do not have as close a connection with those constituencies, but that is not to say that requiring the cabinet as a whole, and cabinet ministers individually, to attend different regions around the state on a regular basis to speak directly with the people who live in those regions and are members of those communities is not beneficial—it is. My experience as a minister, and what it led me to do in my portfolio, is a direct result of having those country cabinet meetings.

It does not matter whether you are a regional member or a member of parliament who represents a metropolitan constituency; roads are always very topical for all members of the community. I noticed that they are certainly more so in the regions because most people derive their living either from the use of the roads or, in an indirect way, from how efficiently and effectively those roads can be used, particularly primary producers and those involved in transport and logistics industries. It would be no surprise to any of you, and certainly no surprise to the member for Schubert,

that it is usually the transport minister who is first in line to get an earbashing about the state of the roads in a particular community.

The way the country cabinet regime ran ensured that ministers were pushed out in front of the communities, and it gave every member of those communities the greatest possible opportunity to have a one-on-one personal conversation with that minister about the things that were important to them. For me, it meant driving up to the communities. I always made sure that we drove to all the communities to experience what the roads were like, with two exceptions; one is Kangaroo Island, of course, as it is a bit hard to drive all the way there, unless the Hon. Frank Pangallo gets his wishes, and then the drive to Kangaroo Island would be much easier.

Mr Pederick: It is not going to happen.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I suspect that the member for Hammond is spot on the money in that regard. The only other region that I did not drive to was the APY lands, but I will come to that in a minute.

When driving through those regions, experiencing the roads and having the opportunity to visit the local school, even on a Sunday, members of the community knew that, if they wanted to collar you and talk to you about an issue, you were going to be there for a couple of hours and they could come and talk to you about whatever their issue was. For me, usually, it was somebody who relied on the transport industry, or was a member of the transport industry, who needed specific road improvements, and that was incredibly useful for me.

We would then go to a community forum where for two hours you were put under a blowtorch in a way where, fortunately, you do not get punted by the presiding member for having the wherewithal to interject into proceedings, but you do get the opportunity to converse directly with members of the community. They can put questions to you. Some of them are very pointed, I think we would all admit, and that was very useful for us.

We then spent some time afterwards mingling with those people who did not get the opportunity to ask a question, catching up with the council and going to the local pub and having a beer with the locals to see what they were thinking, what concerned them and what they were interested in. We would basically repeat some of that process the next day when we were invited to the local footy club or sporting club for a community morning tea, when, again, people could come up and speak with you one on one and raise issues with you, if not ask you questions in a forum. Lastly, before you left to come back to Adelaide, you had the opportunity to go out and visit those sites or places that people made representations to you about over the previous 48 hours.

Why did I go through all that rigour? It was because a lot of the feedback that I got, particularly in the early months before the first state budget was handed down after the 2014 election, led us to increase road maintenance funding across the state by \$70 million and two-thirds of that was spent in regional areas. That was important at the time, of course, because in the federal budget that the Coalition delivered in 2014 they not only handed down a \$9 million cut to regional road maintenance for South Australia but they also cut the \$20 million of supplementary road grants to councils. This saw a massive reduction in funding to regional communities in road maintenance funding, so we stepped in.

We also committed \$20 million to implement the first tranche of reforms that were developed by primary producers, led by the Hon. Rob Kerin, former premier; the primary industries department; and the transport department under the white paper, 'A modern transport system for agriculture'. It was \$20 million of reforms to increase productivity across the regions for the heavy vehicle industry.

For the first time in the state's history, it allowed road trains to come down from the Northern Territory border to Port Augusta, increasing the maximum length of road train prime movers up to 20 metres—a small, you would think, but crucially important reform for the heavy vehicle industry. Finally, after asking for more than 30 years, it allowed the heavy vehicle industry to use tri-axle dollies, which was something pursued by the Livestock and Rural Transporters Association. I joked at the time that it would not stop at three axles and that we would be up to four-axle dollies and maybe even five and that Mr Quinn from the Livestock and Rural Transporters Association would finally get his quin-axle dollies. That is probably the best I can do for a heavy vehicle industry joke.

We also got higher mass-limit heavy vehicles access to grain sites across Eyre Peninsula and the Mid North and higher mass-limit access to saleyards. We increased the radius of travel to 160 kilometres for primary producers before they were required to use a fatigue work diary. We also got B-triples for the first time from the Mid North to Outer Harbor. There were hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars of productivity improvements for the heavy vehicle industry and the reason why is that they had the opportunity to collar me around the state and tell me what they needed to change so their businesses and the farms that they served could be more profitable by reducing their transport costs.

I mentioned the APY lands before, and I will quickly finish off this contribution. I was also very pleased that not only did we upgrade the Sturt Highway, Dukes Highway, Riddoch Highway, Southern Ports Highway, those curves on the Tod Highway that I see the member for Schubert attempting to take credit for, the Lincoln Highway, and the Horrocks Highway—the curves outside of Clare—but I was particularly pleased that the state government co-funded with the federal government a \$106 million improvement to the APY lands main access road.

I was asked by the Coalition government federally if we would cancel that project so they could redirect the money towards metropolitan Adelaide. I am pleased to say we did not and that is why country cabinet meetings are important: they deliver real change for people in regional communities.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (16:45): I would like to sincerely thank all speakers on this motion, which, I will be quite honest, went on a little bit longer than I thought it might, but that is okay. In particular, I would really like to thank the member for Mawson for his contribution because I thought it was not a partisan speech. I thought it was getting to the heart of what I was trying to achieve, in that there is a difference between ministers heading out into the regions.

I certainly acknowledge and welcome the Liberal ministers who are very active in the regions. It is great for South Australia that that occurs. The same did occur under Labor, as well. At the heart of what I was trying to get at with this motion is there is a difference between a minister attending a regional area and the entire cabinet or a vast majority of the cabinet attending as a bloc in a regional area. The difference is that the community engages more with the cabinet, and the structure that I saw enabled that interaction to occur.

I really want to thank the member for Frome, who reinvigorated country cabinets as part of his discussions after 2014, recognising that there is a difference between a minister attending a regional area and a cabinet attending. They are vastly different concepts, and I would like to have seen the debate focus more around that. That is where I come to the member for Lee and his contribution today, talking about the improvements for regional areas that came about because of that cabinet commitment to going, not a minister going out.

These discussions and these interactions occurred because cabinet attended that regional area. As the member for Mawson said, what have you got to lose? It can be very beneficial for team bonding and for engagement with communities more at a social level. As we all know, in the regions that is where communities really do come together, whether it is Saturday football or down the pub on a Friday night, if you get there a little bit early. Many of the real insights for cabinet occur at those moments that are unplanned. The other point was the community forum is very much an unfiltered opportunity for those in the community who, quite frankly, might have a gripe or an issue that they do not feel they have had addressed, to raise that in a respectful but certainly a very direct way with cabinet.

I thank all members who have spoken on this issue. I am a little bit disappointed that it became more partisan and politically and ideologically driven. That certainly was not the intent. The intent is really about the opportunity that could present itself. If you do not give it a go, how will you know? With that, I will conclude my remarks.

The house divided on the amendment:

Ayes	23
Noes	20
Majority.....	3

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Duluk, S.	Ellis, F.J.	Gardner, J.A.W.
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.	

NOES

Bell, T.S.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brock, G.G.	Brown, M.E. (teller)
Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.	Gee, J.P.
Hildyard, K.A.	Hughes, E.J.	Koutsantonis, A.
Malinauskas, P.	Michaels, A.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Szakacs, J.K.	Wortley, D.	

Amendment thus carried; motion as amended carried.

WORLD HEALTH DAY

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (16:55): I move:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges and celebrates United Nations World Health Day, which will be held on Sunday 7 April;
- (b) acknowledges the commitment that the Marshall Liberal government has to health care in South Australia, particularly in regional South Australia;
- (c) welcomes the commitment to address the backlog of capital works in regional hospitals and the efforts to address the shortage of regional healthcare professionals; and
- (d) condemns the former Labor government's Transforming Health program and the dire situation in which it has left health care in South Australia.

It is with great hope that I move this motion. I hope to get support from both sides of the house and that now those opposite have been relegated to the opposition benches they can see the folly of their ways and support this motion and its intent, acknowledging the mess they have left this state in.

Since becoming the member for Narungga, regional health services, and the importance of improving and maintaining them, have been the number one topic I have been contacted about. I feel compelled to make a difference to the constituents I represent, and the towns and communities they live in, as well as the whole population, which relies on the delivery of appropriate levels of health service.

Regions that cannot provide reliable, adequate health services and hospitals will die because it is an undisputed fact that families, retirees, the elderly, all age groups will choose not to live where they cannot confidently access the health services they need. They will choose to move to where they can see they will receive care when they need it, and with such population shifts come subsequent small business closures, job losses, school closures, loss of services across the board, and spiralling economic and social consequences.

With this motion, which acknowledges World Health Day and the value of quality healthcare provision across the world, I highlight the value of investment in regional health services in particular. I wish to commence with the good news: inroads are being made into the significant capital works and maintenance backlog in country hospitals that were left to spiral out of control by the previous city-centric Labor government to the tune of about \$150 million.

Recently announced was a \$2.7 million upgrade of the Snowtown Hospital's Lumeah Homes aged-care facility to meet fire safety compliance and replace roofing, a significant investment in a town that is heavily reliant on its hospital and its aged-care facility. When I toured there last August the Director of Nursing, Andrew Daulby, showed me specific areas of need, and we discussed the roof and what needed to be done as a priority.

The \$2.7 million investment comes from the Asset Sustainment Program created by the Marshall Liberal government when it came into office, providing an additional \$14 million per annum for the next 10 years to significantly improve country hospital infrastructure and undertake urgent upgrades such as the Snowtown Hospital Lumeah Homes project, which is expected to start this year and be completed next year.

This new fund has also ensured that other urgent maintenance at multiple hospitals in the Narungga electorate is now being addressed and scheduled for completion this year. These projects include a new generator and electrical switchboard for the Wallaroo Hospital, construction of the Central Sterile Supply Department at the Yorketown Hospital, and telephone and nurse call bell upgrades at Yorketown, Maitland, Wallaroo and Port Broughton hospitals as well as at the Melaleuca Court Nursing Home at Minlaton.

The Marshall Liberal government understands how crucial it is that health services are maintained in country areas and, whilst there is a huge backlog of work to do, we are getting on with the job. There is much to be done, and a good start has been the provision of \$720,000 for the Ardrossan Community Hospital and \$750,000 for the Yorketown Hospital, the latter to reinstate services removed in 2016 due to the hospital not being able to meet its theatre standards because of the lack of maintenance by the former government. This government understands the crucial need for ongoing maintenance for service retention and also the need for action to address GP staffing shortages across rural South Australia, which are impacting on service provision.

The dire need for improvements to regional health care was one of the driving forces behind my decision to contest the state election and represent the seat of Narungga. That has not changed, and providing enough healthcare professionals to service our electorate is a vital part of that. To that end, the Liberal government has developed a policy platform designed to increase the representation of rural GPs, registered midwives and other health professionals to provide vital services. We have committed \$20 million directly into country health to fill skill gaps and attract specialists to help address the recognised ongoing medical staffing shortages in our regions.

The decision last October by Kadina Medical Associates to withdraw from the Wallaroo Hospital emergency department on-call roster was not a shock. What should be more of a surprise is how long the hardworking Kadina Medical Associates' GPs were able to continue to be the sole provider supporting the Wallaroo Hospital after the withdrawal from the roster in the last 18 to 24 months of both the Wallaroo and Moonta medical practices. Such unacceptable workloads are doing nothing to attract and retain GPs in our electorate and across regional SA, and outcomes are urgent from the policy work that has been underway for many months to address this issue.

The \$20 million from the state Liberal government planned to address GP skill shortages includes:

- doubling the number of medical interns in country areas;
- allocating teaching hospital funding to country LHNs to enable those LHNs to negotiate cooperative shared training arrangements with metro LHNs;
- supporting recruitment and retention of resident specialists in country SA through the engagement of interns, registrars and medical officers with specialist skills;
- developing registered nurse/midwife collaborative graduate programs in regional, rural and remote South Australia;
- encouraging rural and remote registered midwives to undertake training for dual registration;
- ensuring that the Ambulance Service accommodates the changing employment and volunteering patterns in rural and regional areas; and

- strengthening the Aboriginal health worker and allied health professional training opportunities across rural and remote SA.

I believe that the impending rollout of the Marshall Liberal government's new local health network governing boards will make a difference just by decentralising the system and putting real responsibility and accountability back in the hands of local board members. Our doctors, nurses and allied health staff are under great pressure, and the passage of the Health Care (Governance) Amendment Bill last year means that they will not have more pressure imposed by a remote head office out of touch with local needs and challenges specific to regional areas.

It has been well documented that in the last 10 years of Labor SA Health's head office staff was doubled, growing four times faster than our nursing workforce, and this excessive bureaucracy resulted in budget blowouts and poor project management. The cost of their Transforming Health plan has been put at at least \$200 million, and that bill came with a reduction in services that the Marshall Liberal government is now having to spend more money to put back on. The Marshall Liberal government last month unveiled the final concept plan for a reopened Repat health precinct, with state-of-the-art services to care for brain and spinal rehabilitation patients and older mental health and dementia patients to be the focus of the site.

The former Labor government closed the Repat in 2015, after promising that they would never ever do so, leaving people in surrounding areas without that service, and set about selling the site. Thankfully, we were able to secure it as a public asset by terminating the sale contract two months after the March 2018 election. Health professionals and people at the coalface are now being listened to, and I can attest they are also being heard when assessing needs for country hospitals, long neglected, that are now requiring urgent high-risk repairs and maintenance. Under the new local health network governing boards, to commence in July, real responsibility and accountability will be put back at a local level and provide strengthened oversight and improve patient safety.

The new health governance measures legislated by the Marshall Liberal government ensure that money raised in local communities is spent in local communities, that local bequests and private donations go to where they have been pledged, and in doing so restore faith and connection between communities and governance, and that more regional and rural hospitals will not lose services and be downgraded.

In absolute frustration over the last 10 years, communities have become increasingly despondent about having no voice. It is believed that local communities lost decision-making authority over 42 country hospitals across South Australia when the previous government removed their management boards. In their stead, HACs were designed to be the local voice for the minister, but they were described as toothless tigers without directives on how to act without clear lines of communication and with no say on how funds they raised were allocated.

I heard the concerns firsthand. Locals wanting to donate to their hospital have not been sure where their money would go. Dr Max Van Dissell of the Kapunda Health Advisory Council lamented that, in 2016-17, two applications were made to use its fundraising to purchase a steriliser and an operating microscope the local clinicians deemed essential, but both applications were knocked back by the minister.

Another doctor, from the Nuriootpa Medical Centre, Dr Michael Hoopman, despaired publicly over the many battles faced by local doctors, which he listed as including outdated facilities, the winding down of services, such as obstetrics, and the lack of support patients who are experiencing mental illnesses receive. He said that he had been in the Barossa for 25 years and that numbers at the hospital had halved.

At a public meeting in Quorn in March 2017, local doctor Tony Lian-Lloyd addressed the packed town hall and described the loss of the lifeblood of many small townships—the local hospital, diminished by stealth, threatening the economic viability of rural doctors and, by extension, service delivery to patients. Of note were the supporting medical professionals who travelled from all over the state that night to attend—from Mount Gambier, Robe, Kimba, the Barossa, Burra, Cleve, Port Broughton, Bute, Maitland and Kadina and local mayors and members of the Rural Doctors Association and the Nursing and Midwifery Federation.

We are committed to fixing a broken health system. Patients in the Narungga electorate are often disadvantaged by distance and challenges in accessing doctor and specialist attention, but they, just like their city cousins, are entitled to fair access to health services. Regional areas cannot afford to lose anymore services. Retaining health services is at the top of the list of concerns for locals, and it is what I hear about most.

Our increasing and ageing population needs the state government to invest in its services. Since the Marshall Liberal government came to office in March 2018, regional health services have been significantly improved, and our communities in the Narungga electorate have been reassured by the evidence they have seen that regional healthcare matters to this government. Yes, the workload ahead to improve health services across metropolitan and regional South Australia is enormous such as has been the damage done by the previous government and Transforming Health.

To be able to provide adequate, affordable health care and services is the goal of states and countries across the world, and we are all facing challenges. The World Health Organization's World Health Day is being celebrated on 7 April 2019, and the focus this year is universal health coverage. The campaign organisers state that the key to achieving universal health coverage is ensuring that everyone can obtain the care they need when they need it right in the heart of the community. The World Health Organizations say, and I state from its web site:

Progress is being made in countries in all regions of the world. But millions of people still have no access...to healthcare. Millions more are forced to choose between healthcare and other daily expenses such as food, clothing and even a home.

The World Health Organization does clarify that universal health care does not mean free coverage for all possible health interventions regardless of cost, as no country can provide all services free of charge on a sustainable basis.

I take this opportunity in marking World Health Day to recognise the vital role of this state's health sector and its extensive workforce of doctors, nurses, specialists and paramedics—everyone who works in the healthcare setting in any capacity. I also commend all within the World Health Organization for their dedicated effort to progress health standards and service provisions around the world—a vital contribution indeed.

I would also like to acknowledge the Minister for Health, who is doing a mighty job in his new role and contributing a great deal to regional health care. I have been honoured to host him in our electorate a couple of the times, once almost immediately after the election when he visited the Wallaroo Hospital.

Unlike the previous government, whose efforts at Transforming Health resulted in the closure of hospitals and the winding-back of services, this government cares about good health care. I find it ominous that those opposite have installed one of the architects of Transforming Health as the shadow minister for health. Heaven forbid he ever be afforded the opportunity to reconstitute it. I commend the motion to the house.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (17:09): I move an amendment to this motion:

Delete all the words after (b) and substitute:

- (b) expresses grave concerns over the Liberal government's cuts and privatisation agenda for health, including the state budget reduction of 880 health staff this financial year;
- (c) condemns cuts to our hospital system currently being undertaken by corporate liquidators KordaMentha; and
- (d) condemns the budget cuts to SA Pathology, SA Medical Imaging, the Health Consumers Alliance, SHINE SA, HIV services and ambulance transfers.

It is important to mark United Nations World Health Day in this parliament. However, I think it is pretty typical of this government's approach to come into this place and mark it by trying to score political points for something that should be seen as an important non-partisan day to mark. We will return in spades what the government is throwing in terms of their attacks and outrageous abuse of parliamentary time in order to talk about this day because what we are seeing, day after day in this state, is a campaign of cuts, closures and privatisations in our health system in South Australia.

On the day the state budget was handed down, we could see immediately what was being envisaged by this government in terms of health services in South Australia: cuts, closures and privatisations. Already, we have seen the closure of health services in South Australia. SHINE SA has been singled out for very significant cuts in South Australia. The Health Consumers Alliance—the people who are representing patients in South Australia—have been singled out for cuts to the point where they may be forced to close. We have seen HIV services singled out for cuts, so that HIV services have closed in South Australia due to the actions of this government.

However, nothing says more about the priorities, opinions and budget of this government than what they are doing in the Central Adelaide Local Health Network by bringing in KordaMentha to run those health services. They have brought in corporate liquidators KordaMentha not to provide advice, not to look over the books, but to actually run health services in South Australia. It is completely unprecedented that two of our largest hospitals in South Australia are being run not by doctors, nurses or health management experts but by people whose job it is to be corporate liquidators. They are now running our hospitals.

This will affect patients across South Australia. We have seen their plan, and it involves closing 170 beds across those two hospitals. It will put more pressure on ramping. Ramping is worse now than ever before in South Australia. Just last week, we saw the effect this is having on clients from the statewide spinal surgery unit. Previously, invoices were very quickly approved for custom-built wheelchairs, so that patients could be discharged from hospital, get into the community and regain their lives.

Unfortunately, we are hearing from doctors in the service that it is now taking three months to get past KordaMentha and for those wheelchairs to be approved. It is delaying patients' discharge from hospital. It means that it is more expensive overall to the public because those patients are staying in hospital for longer, and it is leading to worse health outcomes for those patients.

Just today, we have seen the Central Adelaide Local Health Network, under the management of administrators KordaMentha, bringing in a new management plan for their health service. They will now appoint accountants and business managers to head each area of health delivery in that hospital. It will not be the doctors or nurses in charge of how your health services are delivered: accountants, business managers and corporate liquidators will be in charge. That goes to show that this government's priorities are all about saving money, not patient care.

Over the past few months, we have also seen this government close beds in our hospitals. They have closed 25 subacute beds at Hampstead, beds needed to help people recover and to free up other beds in our hospitals. We have seen 16 medical beds close at Flinders Medical Centre, beds needed to take the brunt of the load from emergency departments. These are critical beds in our health system and they have closed.

We saw a new ward at the Women's and Children's Hospital closed for months—an unprecedented length of time—up until the end of February. We have seen 10 mental health, high-acuity beds closed at Glenside since January. These beds are desperately needed in the system at the moment because there is such dramatic pressure on our emergency departments. We have seen ramping in our hospital system that our clinicians have said is worse than ever before. While those beds stay closed—that the government has closed—the pressure is only going to increase.

If the government goes ahead with its plans to close 170 beds across the central region, and no doubt more in other regions as well, we will see more pressure, more ramping and more cases of what we saw in the last few weeks where a patient stayed in emergency for 85 hours before they could get access to a bed. This has been described by doctors' groups as an abuse of human rights. The reaction from the minister was not to open any of those beds that he closed, not to take any action, but to cut more money out of the health system and put the corporate liquidators in charge. That was ultimately his response.

This government has closed 41 beds at Flinders and Hampstead. We have seen ramping worse than ever before and we are going to see more pressure on the health system because of those cuts and closures in terms of primary and community health services. We were talking about SHINE SA clinics in the north and south of Adelaide. Patients do not have access to those clinics

anymore because they have been closed under this government and that means that more people will be going to emergency departments.

We have also seen closures of mental health services that were being run by the federal government. The government closed them with the transition to the NDIS. The NDIS has not picked up those services. We had a mental health services guarantee to ensure that those services would continue. This government has not done that and we are going to see more pressure on emergency departments because of that.

We have seen more patients on the emergency surgery waiting lists, we have seen that those waiting lists have expanded and we have seen more people overdue on those waiting lists since this government came to office. This government promised that they were going to eliminate colonoscopy waiting times for bowel cancer screening within 12 months. That 12 months has passed and there has been no action on that whatsoever. Not one dollar has been spent in terms of achieving that end and we have not seen the elimination of that.

At the moment, there is a dispute in regional South Australia with Keith hospital desperately calling out for support from this government. They had promises from the Premier and the health minister before the election. Those promises have now been broken and there is the potential that that regional hospital might close.

We are seeing governance reforms where more money is going to be spent on board members to the detriment of public health services. We are setting up new boards, we are paying those board members lots of money, we are setting up more bureaucracy around those boards and around all the other staff connected to that, all of which is taking money away from health services and away from the coalface where it is needed.

We are seeing the government privatise ambulance transfer services between Modbury Hospital and Lyell McEwin Hospital, when we know that almost all those patients being transferred are at a high acuity level. These are patients who need the dedicated work from SA Ambulance, but they are going to be shunted off to a private operator so the government can save money because we know that that is their priority.

We are seeing the government's plans crumble from what they promised at the election for Modbury HEU because they did not have a plan and they do not have support from the clinicians, and we know that the department is working on delivering something which is not what they promised. We have seen the government reject bringing in no jab no play in supporting our laws to do that.

What happened last year, and what I am sure is potentially going to happen this year as well, was a lax response to winter demand management from this government. Last year, it was halfway through winter before we had a demand plan. We knew that the government was sitting on that for months. There was no action taken and we saw one of the worst winters that we have ever seen. All the indications are that this winter is going to be even worse than that. There are fewer beds because of the action that the government has taken, our flu cases are up and there are likely to be more because of the action they are soon to be taking.

We have also seen just this week their cuts to SA Pathology: 200 staff to go and 10 clinics to close. We know that will lead to more wait times, longer delays for patients getting access to treatment, more pressure on emergency departments and more ramping. It is a bit rich for those opposite, with this record of cuts, closures and privatisations in just one year, to come in and say this. They should be condemned for the actions they are taking, and South Australians will hold them accountable.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop.

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (17:19): Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr Picton: Tell us about Keith hospital.

Mr McBRIDE: Of course. I rise today to speak in support of the motion by the member for Narungga:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges and celebrates United Nations World Health Day, which will be held on Sunday 7 April;
- (b) acknowledges the commitment that the Marshall Liberal government has to health care in South Australia, particularly in regional South Australia;
- (c) welcomes the commitment to address the backlog of capital works in regional hospitals and the efforts to address the shortage of regional healthcare professionals; and
- (d) condemns the former Labor government's Transforming Health program and the dire situation in which it has left health care in South Australia.

Like the member for Narungga, since becoming the member for MacKillop the issue of the status of regional health services has been one of the key matters about which my constituents contact me. It is appropriate that, in celebrating United Nations World Health Day, which will be held on Sunday 7 April, we highlight the commitment of the Marshall Liberal government to health care in regional South Australia.

It is unfortunate that South Australians in regional areas experience worse health outcomes than their metropolitan counterparts, in part due to less access to health services. I am proud to be part of a government that is committed to navigating this challenging area and to be part of a government for which regions matter. A key action that our government has taken included the formation of the local health network governing boards. I was pleased to see the formation of the South East Local Health Network Governing Board take a step forward with the recent appointment of board members to work with Grant King, the chair.

This action taken by the Marshall Liberal government will assist in ensuring that local decision-making is made regionally. It is a strong step forward that recognises the value of ensuring that there is local oversight and understanding of the needs of regional communities. I also welcome the action of the Marshall Liberal government in providing funding to support the outer Limestone Coast paramedic service. This service provides two paramedics who deliver extension services and backup to local GP providers serving the townships of Robe, Lucindale, Padthaway, Kingston and Beachport. The service is unique and is a new way to deliver regional healthcare services in areas and towns that are, by virtue of their location and distance, not able to support full-time GP services.

The hospital infrastructure and services in our region have been subject to appalling neglect and have suffered from centralisation of services. I welcome the commitment to address the backlog of capital works in regional hospitals and the efforts to address the shortage of regional healthcare professionals. There is much to do. Naracoorte hospital is tired and needs upgrading. Years of neglect have taken their toll on this important central hospital facility for the region.

During the term of the previous government, it took a private donor to fix the appalling condition of the roof of the Kingston hospital. It beggars belief that a private donor would have to step up so generously to address such a basic need for a public health service. Millicent hospital used to punch above its weight in providing services and local procedures akin to those of the larger hospital in Mount Gambier. During the neglectful years of the Labor government, we saw services stripped from the Millicent hospital. Services and procedures retreated back to Adelaide, leaving the hospital a shadow of its former self.

Despite these drawbacks, it must be said that our region has benefited from vision shown by local doctors such as those at the Kinraig Medical Clinic at Naracoorte, who have been forging ahead with great commitment to provide services to the community and attract visiting specialists to the region. The GP skill shortage is another critical area that our government has recognised needs to be addressed. The member for Narungga highlighted the initiatives earlier, and I believe that they are worth reiterating. The Marshall Liberal government's \$20 million plan to address these shortages includes:

- doubling the number of medical interns in the country;
- allocating teaching hospital funding to country LHNs to enable cooperative training arrangements with local health networks;
- developing a registered nurse/midwife collaborative graduate program in regional and remote South Australia;

- supporting the recruitment and retention of resident specialists in country areas through the engagement of interns, registrars and medical officers with specialist skills;
- encouraging rural and remote registered midwives to undertake training for dual registration;
- ensuring that the Ambulance Service accommodates the changing employment and volunteering patterns in rural and regional areas; and
- strengthening Aboriginal health worker and allied health professional training opportunities across rural and remote South Australia.

It is timely and on point, when referring to the critical shortages of GPs across the state, that this motion provides the opportunity to reflect on the status of regional health services in the MacKillop electorate, specifically and with reference to the Keith and District Hospital. The Keith and District Hospital, situated on the Dukes Highway, is a private community hospital. The hospital is an important regional community hospital facility that services a population of approximately 3,500 residents over more than a 10,000 square kilometre area.

The hospital includes 14 private acute beds and services a federally accredited 18-bed aged-care facility for permanent and respite care and a busy GP service to the Keith and Tintinara areas. The hospital is the only location between Murray Bridge and Bordertown that offers a 24/7 accident and emergency facility. This site is also a strategic operational site for rescue helicopters. One only needs to speak to locals and hospital staff to realise the critical importance this hospital plays in saving lives through the availability of a 24/7 accident and emergency facility.

We know that in 2017-18, the Keith and District Hospital accident and emergency department assisted more than 500 patients. Treatment times for emergency patients can be improved due to this location. Ambulances will travel to Keith to meet the rescue helicopter. At this stage, both Naracoorte and Bordertown hospitals are too far away to take a round trip without refuelling. The hospital currently offers private inpatient services only. Public beds were lost from the hospital during the years of neglect that were part and parcel of the then Labor government.

The Keith and District Hospital clearly provides a critical service to the community. The community recognise this and their financial support for the hospital reflects this value. The community of Keith provides substantial community donations. In 2017-18 alone, these donations amounted to more than \$600,000. It is worth noting that the Keith community has raised more than \$1.2 million in donations for its hospital in the last five years alone.

Like many regional locations, it has been a challenge for the Keith and District Hospital to recruit doctors. It is well documented that there are around 60 doctor vacancies—GP doctor vacancies—around the state. It is a struggle to recruit these GPs. This issue in particular is a key driver of the difficult position the Keith and District Hospital is in today.

As I identified earlier, the Marshall Liberal government is investing and taking action to address the GP shortage across the state. The Marshall Liberal government has been working with the Keith and District Hospital board and the South East Local Health Network board to address the issues being experienced by the hospital. As a local member, I am acutely aware of the importance of the hospital to the community and have been working with the Minister for Health, the hospital board and local government to advocate for a way forward in response to the challenges before the hospital.

The government, recognising the importance of the hospital and working through the South East Local Health Network board, has also initiated a review of the Keith hospital, with a view to seeking a sustainable, medium and long-term operating approach. Since the election, \$400,000 has been provided, in addition to the \$1 million funding support for the hospital. The government is continuing to work with the hospital board to seek to navigate through this challenging time. Work is ongoing in this area. I look forward to the finalisation of the review being conducted through the South East Local Health Network board and the outcome of ongoing discussions with the Keith hospital board, which I hope will secure the future of this important facility.

There is much work to do in the area of health and, in particular, to improve the delivery of health services in regional areas. The Marshall Liberal government has a plan to address this challenge. It is appropriate to take the opportunity to reflect on this plan in acknowledging and celebrating the United Nations World Health Day on 7 April. I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (17:28): I also rise to speak on this motion ostensibly about World Health Day 2019—a day, of course, that is promoted by the World Health Organization to try to foster a greater understanding throughout the global community of the need to extend universal health care to the millions and millions of people who do not have access to it. Indeed, according to the World Health Organization, half of the global population do not have access to the health care they need. I thought it might be a large number, but I did not quite think it would be that significant.

Indeed, I understand that the World Health Organization advises that 100 million people are pushed into extreme poverty every year by attempting to fund their healthcare needs. It is timely for us to be contemplating what we could be doing as global citizens through our national government to try to foster greater access to health care for those millions and millions of people, or indeed billions of people, who do not have access to it. That is something we can reflect and ruminate on at length, I am sure. However, that is not quite the intent of this motion.

The intent of the motion actually is to use the opportunity of the United Nations World Health Day 2019 to try to chip some cheap political points more than a year into the fledgling life of the Marshall Liberal government and try to re-exercise the wearily tired arguments that they have been trotting out since 2015 about Transforming Health. Honestly, I thought the member for Narungga was a little bit better than that, but clearly he does not want to be a one-trick pony. He does not want to be about just splitting from his government on the mining bill. He is spreading his wings a lot more broadly these days. As the member for Kaurua already has, allow me to retort.

It is extraordinary that we would have a government or members of a government who would try to put to this house how terrible they think the former government's program of Transforming Health is while turning complete blind ignorance to the actions of their own government at the moment with the South Australian health system. This is a motion and this is a government that claim the Transforming Health process, which in its beginning was to seek the advice of corporates to try to reform the South Australian public health system to ensure that health services could be provided more efficiently, is a bad thing and that changing the public healthcare system here in South Australia in line with those recommendations is a bad thing.

Let's consider what this government is currently doing. Rather than go out to market and ask for a number of people to answer a tender call to provide their professional services to assist in the reform of the healthcare system, they just walked up to a corporate liquidator KordaMentha, which has no presence here in South Australia, and said, 'Would you like the job to come in and look at our healthcare system?' They started out by awarding them a contract, if I remember rightly, of about \$880,000, in clear breach of the state's procurement guidelines. But that is okay; the Auditor-General has been informed and he, in return, has advised that he will look at this as a matter in his annual report. But it does not stop there.

Not only did they write their \$880,000 report, but in that report it seems that they have recommended that their work scope be extended so that their maximum contract value might increase to \$37 million. What a gig! I can understand how KordaMentha make all their cash: get a gig, preferably with a government that has deep pockets, and write your own recommendations to continue getting more work. That is \$37 million that is not going to be spent on the front line, providing healthcare services to South Australians in the public healthcare system. How extraordinary!

Not only that, but those people who are providing the leadership in that organisation (KordaMentha) to provide these services have no experience in doing this type of work. None of them have been executives in a local healthcare network in the public health system, yet they have been appointed to substantive positions in local healthcare networks to try to run our public hospitals and to run our other healthcare agencies. It is absolutely remarkable.

We have had an early taste of what is to come from corporate liquidators KordaMentha. Not only do we have \$1.25 billion of unidentified, unallocated savings for SA Health to achieve over the

forward estimates, but they have attempted to get off to a cracking pace. They have started by trying to squeeze \$105 million out of SA Pathology. Of course, we knew earlier this week, through a report that was selectively leaked to the media on the morning of federal budget day, that that is not working out so well. Instead, they have a one-year reprieve before privatisation will commence, when they are expected to save a further \$20 million and sack 200 staff, including clinical staff.

We have already seen from last year's September state budget that 880 FTEs are to be saved from the Central Adelaide Local Health Network. As we have heard the member for Kaurana say, 41 beds have already been closed in Flinders and Hampstead. This is a remarkable number, particularly in Flinders, which I think has just had about a quarter of a billion dollars spent on it by the former Labor government to modernise and upgrade it. Those beds are closed while we experience the worst ramping this state has ever seen.

In fact, I cannot quite say 'worst ever seen' because the Minister for Health, the Hon. Stephen Wade in the other place, erected a wall so that the media could not see the ramping. Not only did he erect this privacy screen so that he could hide his poor performance as the health minister superintending our public health networks and the operations of our most important hospital, the Royal Adelaide Hospital, but when he was asked about it in parliament he did not tell the truth. He said that he did not know about it and that the first thing he heard about it was from the media. Then, of course, he had to come back in and correct the record because he did know. He sighted and approved advice from his department about the erection of the privacy screen. It is extraordinary.

We have just had the member for MacKillop placed in the invidious situation of having to make the excuses for his parliamentary colleagues over the treatment of the Keith hospital. Of course, they railed against the former health minister John Hill for not extending their funding by \$100,000 a year, I think it was, to enable them to continue operating in the manner they needed to to keep their doors open. Now, under the current Liberal government, the situation is much worse. However, we can pay not hundreds of thousands of dollars but millions and millions of dollars on re-creating health boards for the local health networks.

It creates the extraordinary situation where we do not actually know who is responsible for the budgets of these local health networks. We do not know whether it is the board, who of course owe their fiduciary duty to the local health network and not to the overall superintendence of the public healthcare system. Is it them, is it the minister or is it one of the executives in between in the local health network? I guess we will wait for some of the disasters to continue to unfold under the superintendence of health minister Wade in the other place. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Bills

CRIMINAL LAW (HIGH RISK OFFENDERS) (PSYCHOLOGISTS) 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 3, page 2, line 20 [clause 3(2), definition of *prescribed health professional*, (a)]—

Before 'psychologist' insert 'qualifying'

No. 2. Clause 3, page 2, after line 26 [clause 3(3)]—After the definition of *psychologist* insert:

qualifying psychologist means a psychologist who—

- (a) has at least 5 years experience as a psychologist; and
- (b) either—
 - (i) has an endorsement from the Psychology Board of Australia as a forensic psychologist; or
 - (ii) has, in the opinion of the prescribed authority, sufficient experience in the forensic mental health field to properly carry out functions as a prescribed health professional;

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

I indicate that the government consents to the schedule of amendments made by the Legislative Council, in particular in reference to the change of definition of a prescribed health professional, namely, a qualifying psychologist, and, further, the circumstances in which a qualifying psychologist will be defined—in particular, that the psychologist has at least five years' experience as a psychologist and either has the endorsement of the Psychology Board of Australia as a forensic psychologist or has, in the opinion of the prescribed authority, sufficient experience in the forensic mental health field to properly carry out functions as a prescribed health professional. Members may recall that in this proposed legislation—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Mr Chair, regrettably I draw your attention to the state of the committee.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I confirm that, as members may recall, the prescribing authority under the bill in consideration is, in fact, Dr Nambiar, the head of the forensic unit covered by SA Health. With his advice, the recommendation put by the Hon. Connie Bonaros in the form of these two amendments is able to be accommodated for particular application, recalling, I suppose, that if there were any concern raised about this matter it was the question of who was going to select the relevant psychologists for the purpose of doing this work, which had previously been done exclusively by psychiatrists, and what their qualifications would be. He has given us that assurance, and on that basis we have received the same.

I would like to acknowledge the work of the Legislative Council in the consideration of this matter and their approval of the importance of this new regime being introduced to ensure we have both protection of the community via the gateway of professional medical practitioners and, secondly, accessible, experienced practitioners being expanded for the purposes of accommodating the level of work required. I commend the amendments to the house.

Motion carried.

At 17:44 the house adjourned until Thursday 4 April 2019 at 11:00.