

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 20 June 2019

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

**The SPEAKER:** Honourable members, 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 Committees*

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: PORT LINCOLN WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:01):** I move:

That the 19<sup>th</sup> report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Port Lincoln Wastewater Treatment Plant Sludge Management Upgrade, be noted.

The committee heard from SA Water that there is a need to upgrade the wastewater treatment plant in Port Lincoln. That plant is located just over four kilometres from the town centre. The committee received evidence that the growth in the Port Lincoln catchment has contributed to an increase in load to the sludge treatment process at the plant.

The committee was informed that sludge lagoons were nearing capacity and that this had contributed in a material way to a number of environmental incidents, and evidence was sought in relation to those incidents. The committee understands that the Environment Protection Authority reviewed SA Water's operating licence and included an environmental improvement program annexure to the Port Lincoln wastewater treatment licence.

The committee also had the benefit of evidence that the proposed upgrade will address the requirements I have outlined to the house and the joint issues of odour and leakage in the old containment lagoons. The committee has been advised that the project proposal received full financial approval from the SA Water board for expenditure in the amount of \$18.794 million for the completion of the project, and the estimated time frame for practical project completion is December 2020.

Written and oral evidence regarding the upgrade to the wastewater treatment plant was considered by the committee. SA Water officials provided assurances to the committee that acquittals were received from the Department of Treasury and Finance and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. The committee heard that the Crown Solicitor had deemed the works and procedures followed by SA Water in relation to the bringing forward of this project to be lawful.

The committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to appropriate agency consultation and also meets the criteria for examination of projects, as described in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Based on the evidence considered, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:04):** It gives me pleasure to rise today to speak to the Public Works Committee report, the 19<sup>th</sup> report, on the Port Lincoln Wastewater Treatment Plant sludge management upgrade—always very topical, particularly in Port Lincoln when the lagoon is filled and the odour wafts across the city. The first one to hear about it is the local member, so I am pleased that this report has been tabled and the work is now going to go ahead.

The Port Lincoln Wastewater Treatment Plant is located at Billy Lights Point and was first commissioned in 1994. The treatment process consists of a screen and grit removal facility followed by two aeration basins operated as an activated sludge intermittent decant extended aeration (IDEA) process, discharging into sludge and polishing lagoons.

Treated effluent from the wastewater treatment plant is either reclaimed by the Port Lincoln city council's tertiary treatment system or discharged to the ocean via an outfall. Waste sludge from

the IDEA tanks is stored and stabilised in four sludge lagoons before being periodically dewatered and used for beneficial agricultural purposes.

The growth in the Port Lincoln catchment, which the Chairman also mentioned in his report, has led to an increase in load to the sludge treatment process at the Port Lincoln Wastewater Treatment Plant. This has meant that the lagoons are approaching capacity and are at times overloaded, resulting in a number of odour incidents being recorded in recent years. In addition, seepage incidents from the sludge lagoon onto the adjacent beach have also occurred in the past due to the lagoon's deteriorating condition.

As a result of these environmental incidents—odour and seepage in 2013 and earlier incidents in the late 1990s—the EPA reviewed SA Water's operating licence and conducted a risk prioritisation review. This determined to include an EIP annexure to the Port Lincoln Wastewater Treatment Plant licence in 2014. This EIP directed SA Water to prevent leakage and uncontrolled overflows from any sludge lagoon and ensure that odour does not exceed six odour units at the nearest residential boundary. I am not going to speculate on what one odour unit is, let alone six; we can only imagine.

The EPA approved SA Water's request to defer its compliance with the EIP until 2020 on the basis that an efficient and prudent solution could be developed whilst mitigating any immediate risk of wastewater odour to the Port Lincoln community or seepage of sludge to the nearby beach.

The objective of the proposed works is to upgrade the existing wastewater sludge management system at the Port Lincoln Wastewater Treatment Plant. This involves implementation of an anaerobic digester/sludge stabilisation system to:

- meet the requirements of the EIP to ensure that leakage of uncontrolled overflows from the sludge lagoons are prevented, and that wastewater odour does not exceed six odour units at the nearest residential boundary;
- accommodate current and future growth—that is, over the next 30 years—for residential and industrial communities, including the seafood industry. I might add that we all know very well that Port Lincoln is primarily a fishing town and that a lot of the fish are processed in the industrial area of Port Lincoln, which is a good thing to occur. The wastewater treatment plant needs to be able to accommodate the outflow from the fish processing plants but also be mindful of the fact that some of that water is quite saline in nature and so has to be ameliorated; and
- the current proposal also needs to improve operability and maintainability of the wastewater treatment plant, including the accommodation of transported waste.

The project is in response to the need for necessary upgrades, as we have said, due to the increase in load to the sludge treatment process at the wastewater treatment plant. This has meant that the lagoons are approaching capacity and are at times overloaded.

SA Water was presented with a number of options, and option A was the preferred option decided upon. This particular option involves the replacement of the sludge lagoons with the sludge thickening anaerobic digestion and mechanical dewatering processes, as well as on-site storage, which is compliant with EPA standards, plus the remediation of one existing lagoon.

Option A also had the fourth lowest NPV at OE stage but was the most preferred option as per the MCA outcome, with minimum risk to SA Water while still ensuring that the requirements of the EIP are met. This option also had a significantly smaller footprint, allowing more room for future expansion if needed; if the Port Lincoln and the seafood industry continue to grow, then that is a very real possibility. It also presents the opportunity to add co-digestion and cogeneration in the future. There are no major business risks and operational risks identified in the preferred option.

In July 2017, option A was endorsed by SA Water's executive steering committee. The scope has not changed since that option was endorsed. However, further investigations followed by the dual early contractor involvement process resulted in refinement of the project requirements, mitigation of some risks and a competitive design and construction total out-turn cost. This resulted

in an overall reduction in the capital cost by 14 per cent, from \$21.9 million to \$18.79 million, which, as I understand it, remains as the final cost.

Congratulations to the committee on good work, and congratulations to SA Water on finally progressing to this project. The fish processors and the residents of Port Lincoln will be only too pleased to get those odour units down.

**Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (11:11):** I will just add a little to the 19<sup>th</sup> report of the parliamentary Public Works Committee around the efficacy of the application of South Australian funds to this project, which has been outlined by both the member for Kavel and the member for Flinders, that is, the Port Lincoln Wastewater Treatment Plant sludge management upgrade. While this is quite technical in nature, it is certainly required by the good people of Port Lincoln for their needs.

The Port Lincoln Wastewater Treatment Plant is currently located at Billy Lights Point and was commissioned in 1994. Treatment at present consists of a screen grip removal facility, followed by two aeration basins operated as an activated sludge decanting extended aeration process, which then discharges into some sludge lagoons. The treated effluent can then either be reclaimed, and this is done by the City of Port Lincoln council's tertiary treatment system, or discharged to the ocean via an outfall.

The waste sludge from these decanted aeration tanks is stored and stabilised in some sludge lagoons, which are based in the same region as the wastewater treatment plant footprint. They are periodically dewatered, and then the remaining sludge is used for agricultural purposes. One of the reasons for driving this upgrade, the committee was informed, is that the growth in the Port Lincoln catchment has led to an increased load to this sludge treatment process.

Part of that is population, and the committee looked at population growth; it was one factor, but by no means was it the only factor. As the member for Flinders said, there are other issues at play, and one is the increased seafood manufacturing that goes on in Port Lincoln. To try to support the local economy there is obviously a key driver, and an upgraded wastewater treatment plant can be used to increase the processing and provide an economic impact to the area.

Another consideration of this potentially is seepage from these lagoons. We talked about the lagoons being there to be part of the stabilising of the waste afterwards, and it certainly has become an issue from an EPA point of view. There were some other factors, such as odour as well. In 2013, there were some odour and seepage incidents, along with some other incidents in the 1990s, and because of this the Environment Protection Authority reviewed SA Water's operating licence at this site and conducted a risk review.

As a result, it determined that there would be an annexure to the Port Lincoln Wastewater Treatment Plant's licence in 2014, and this directed SA Water to look to prevent leakage and uncontrolled overflows from the sludge lagoon and also to ensure that odour loss does not exceed six odour units at the nearest residential boundary. It is separated from most residences. It is not as though it is right in the middle of Port Lincoln. There are not a lot of residences but it still is something that needs to be looked at by the wastewater treatment plant.

The current proposal looks to meet the requirements of this annexure that I mentioned before, the EIP, to ensure the leakage of uncontrolled overflows from the sludge lagoons is prevented and that wastewater odour does not exceed these six odour units. It also looks to accommodate current and future growth projected over a 30-year period for residential, which I mentioned before, and also the industrial community, which includes the seafood industry. It is also to improve the operability and maintenance of the wastewater treatment plant, including the accommodation of transport of waste. That is an issue, so the more it can be treated on site and looked after, the less you need to have this transported via trucks on the roads.

I will move now to some of the cases. There were quite a number of cases put forward. The base case was to continue business as usual with the continued use of these existing sludge dewatering lagoons. In evidence, we spoke to some of the witnesses about whether the life of the plant could be extended as is. I suppose the directive from the EPA necessitated that that would not be the case.

Other options included option A, which is thickening anaerobic digestion, and dewatering and on-site storage, as well as air-drying from the local farm. That was the preferred option as well. It involves the replacement of the sludge lagoons with sludge thickening anaerobic digestion and mechanical dewatering processes, as well as on-site storage plus remediation of one of the existing lagoons. The committee was taken through as part of the evidence to see what that looks like. It is quite a mechanical, sophisticated process and it certainly is the preferred option, principally around the anaerobic digestion and dewatering.

Another option was a modified version of that where it looked effectively at implementing the thickening and dewatering and on-site storage, as well as the air-drying, for local farm biosolids but then deferring the anaerobic digestion until the next regulatory business period. That effectively produces the same result, but it would be the anaerobic side of it that would be deferred. It was suggested that the unstabilised dewatered sludge would in turn then have to be transported, as opposed to treated on site, and this would be transported to Dublin, which is approximately 600 kilometres from Port Lincoln, quite close to Glenelg—Glenelg?—which is obviously not very important to me! I should say Adelaide. Glenelg is the centre of South Australia, or the capital. But I digress.

This option of transporting it via trucks has high work health and safety risks as well as very real community impact risks from potential road traffic and spillage accidents. Other options were the thickening and aerobic digestions, as opposed to anaerobic, still with the on-site storage and air-drying, but it was put to the committee and SA Water that the anaerobic is a better form of treating the waste.

Two other options were looked at as well, which included implementing the thickening, dewatering and on-site storage but deferring the aerobic digestion. It was similar to option C but, again, with the deferral. The final option was to rehabilitate the sludge lagoons but to operate them at a reduced capacity with the excess unstabilised sludge then transported offsite to Peats Soil in Dublin for composting and re-use. Again, this would involve a lot of transportation of waste which, again, was thought to have too many community risks.

As I mentioned, the deferral of the anaerobic digestion in option B or the aerobic digestion in option D would require renegotiation of the current EIP with the Environment Protection Authority, so again we discounted it. After explaining those options, we came to the conclusion that option A was what SA Water endorsed and put to the committee. It was duly accepted and seen as the way forward in terms of the project itself.

In consideration of that, the committee decided to proceed with option A and recommended that this report be accepted. Oral and written evidence was given to the committee, and the committee is satisfied this proposal has been subjected to the appropriate agency consultation. Based on this evidence, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament, as we do here, that it recommends the proposed public works.

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:20):** I thank members of the committee for their assistance in bringing forward the report and also our committee staff for their diligence and hard work in ensuring that we have all the evidence available to us at the time we require it. The member for Flinders, closely familiar with his own community and an advocate for upgrades as needed for residential development and also for industry, has added greatly to the debate. I listened carefully to his commentary and I appreciate it. I appreciate also his guidance in relation to matters that concern his community.

The member for Morphett, of course an engineer by training, brings great skill and expertise to our committee. We depend at times on his advice. I am grateful that he is the deputy chair of the committee and able to bring the type of insight on occasion that lawyers could never bring, so I am personally grateful to him for that. He did make mention that Glenelg and its surrounds might otherwise have been picked as the capital of the state. It is a controversial statement, one I am sure we will debate at length; not now, though, member for Morphett, although I would otherwise take up that opportunity.

Without *The Buffalo*, of course, the member for Morphett could not lay claim to it being a centre all and perhaps Adelaide would not be here, so in a circular way, member for Morphett, I see

your reasoning. It is perhaps more circular than an engineer would otherwise entertain, but nevertheless I see the point and I see what you are thrusting at. It certainly is a matter of some interest to me, a matter I have now reflected on in the presence of us all.

I indicate that I am very grateful for the assistance of our committee staff; they are diligent and hardworking. I also appreciate the evidence that came before us from SA Water. I appreciate that much of the work that has been undertaken is directed at controlling odour leakage from the site. The new lagoons will of course contain much of the waste on the site in ways that are technically appropriate, and those matters are set out in the report. We commend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: MEMORIAL DRIVE CENTRE COURT DEVELOPMENT**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:23):** I move:

That the 20<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Tennis SA Memorial Drive Centre Court Development, be noted.

May I take this opportunity to make a number of remarks in relation to the preparation of this report and to outline the scope of this very important project. The Public Works Committee has considered a proposal by Tennis SA to develop the centre court facilities at Memorial Drive. Those facilities will be developed into an international stadium facility that will be suitable for all weather conditions.

I know that this proposal has been met with great excitement by participants who support tennis in South Australia, supporters and fans, and also by the government. It is a significant proposal, it is a significant investment, and I am pleased that this government is bringing it forward. The committee heard that the proposal would be achieved by demolishing the existing roofs at the northern and southern stands, and associated structure, and the construction of a new architecturally designed roof structure to replace the structures that will be demolished in the course of the works outlined to the committee.

Once completed, the new structure will cover the existing centre court platform area and the northern and southern grandstands. The fabric roof material will be similar to the fabric roof material covering the upgraded Adelaide Oval southern grandstand. The scope of these proposed works will further include new lighting, fencing and a refurbishment of the existing tennis courts. It is anticipated that the new roof structure will facilitate use of the centre court area for other events, including a year-round training facility for the national tennis academy and a major community space for concerts and community events, a pleasing second use for a very significant facility available to the whole state.

The committee has heard that the proposed works are necessary so that Adelaide is positioned to host the International Tennis Federation and Women's Tennis Association events in January 2020. The project is expected to benefit tennis in South Australia significantly and it is expected that, once these works are completed, the facilities will also attract concerts, community events and other high-profile sports, such as netball and basketball, to the Memorial Drive centre court complex. I mentioned earlier and I emphasise that this will be a significant community facility available to the state located close to the Adelaide Oval complex, and no doubt there will be some synergies from that location.

The funding partners for the proposed work will include Tennis South Australia, Tennis Australia and the South Australian government, and the estimated total cost is \$11 million, including a \$10 million grant from the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Practical completion is expected to be timely, with completion by December 2019 to ensure that the facility is available for Adelaide to host the International Tennis Federation and Women's Tennis Association events in January 2020, to which I alluded.

The Public Works Committee has examined a range of written and oral evidence regarding the centre court development project. We have also heard that all relevant assurances and acquittals have been received from the Department of Treasury and Finance, Premier and Cabinet and the Crown Solicitor. As such, the committee is satisfied that the project proposal has been subject to the agency oversight consultation that we expect and also meets the criteria for the examination of projects, which you, Mr Speaker, will know are described in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991.

Based on the evidence considered, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act, which directs us to matters relevant to the work we do on our committee, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (11:27):** I rise with great joy to speak on this matter and thank the Public Works Committee for their wonderful work. This is a really exciting project for South Australia, as has been outlined by the Presiding Member. We have a great opportunity here in South Australia, and the government saw that opportunity and took that opportunity. We brought forward this investment of \$10 million into Memorial Drive to put a roof on this facility, and we are very excited by that.

We are very proud that, since coming into government, we have put more than \$100 million into sport in South Australia in a number of key projects right across the state—from soccer, to cycling, to the Women's Memorial Playing Fields, to local community infrastructure as well. Unisex change rooms at local clubs are being rolled out as we speak. I know the member for Waite is excited about what is coming in his local community. Also, there is lighting infrastructure, and we are making sure that we are getting as many people active as possible. I will talk more about that in a second, but more on this project at Memorial Drive.

As I said, we had an opportunity to bring forward this \$10 million investment. We needed to do that in a timely manner, and I thank my cabinet colleagues for their support with this project. As has been outlined, this has meant that we have secured a WTA and an ATP tennis tournament event in South Australia. We had the men's ATP tournament here more than a decade ago. Since then, we have had the World Tennis Challenge, which was nice and a bit of fun, but now we have serious tennis back here at Memorial Drive, the home of tennis in South Australia, which I think is exciting. The men's event is coming back—we stole that from Sydney—and that is a big thumbs up for our state.

What I am even more excited about is the WTA event, a women's professional event, which we have not had before. I think we are going to see some absolutely fantastic names come along with that event as well, so that will be truly exciting. Of course, it was great to see Ash Barty win the French Open recently, and Wimbledon is just around the corner. I can tell you that phone calls are already being made. We are doing everything we can to try to get Ash here to Adelaide and other big names as well.

It was very exciting at the launch. We had a sod-turning just a little while ago to start work on this project to put the roof on Memorial Drive. Darren Cahill was there, a great South Australian, a player and a coach. He coached Simona Halep, the great Lleyton Hewitt and Andre Agassi to all be world number one. John Fitzgerald was there as well. Every time I see Fitzy, the smile on his face around this project is absolutely huge.

His quote on this was something along the lines of this being the most exciting thing to happen in tennis in Adelaide in his lifetime. That is how important it is. To have the Cockaleechee Kid, a tennis great of our state and our nation, saying such positive things is truly outstanding. This event is going to be exciting. At the start of the year, every year in the lead-up to the Australian Open, there will be a men's and women's tennis tournament back in Adelaide. It is going to be truly superb.

I note that the committee will work through the project and discuss other opportunities, potentially for other sports and concerts. This venue will be alongside the Adelaide Oval and will complement it, with the heritage of the drive and heritage of the Oval coming together to give us another great facility to use. It will be outstanding for other sporting events, for community events and for concerts and festivals.

I also thank the member for West Torrens, who is part of this committee. I see that he had no questions in this process. He said, 'The opposition is fully supportive of the project. I congratulate them and well done.' I thank him for his bipartisan support because this will be a great win for South Australia. It has been a long time coming, but we are very happy to be delivering on this.

I mentioned the other projects that we have invested in already: soccer, cycling and the Women's Memorial Playing Fields. There are tens of millions of dollars involved in those projects, but, again, at the grassroots level that is what we are very keen on. We want to get more people

active, more people playing sport in South Australia, from a young age, right the way through. We know how important that is. If people are active, it is great for their health. We know it is great for physical health, for mental health and for social wellbeing as well. There are plenty of positives to come out of being involved in sport and it is something that this government is very focused on.

As an aside to that, we announced the Sports Vouchers program when we came to government. That is giving every primary school person who wants to play sport at a local club \$100 back in the pockets of their family budget. It really helps with those fees. When you play at a local sporting club, the fees do jack up, especially if you have more than one child. Think about that: two, three or four children all going through primary school playing sport at the local sporting club; that is up to \$200, \$300, \$400 back in the family budget to help out with the cost of living—a real winner in the local community. I know it has been greatly received.

In total, that is \$29 million injected back into sport to make sure we have young people playing, starting out their sporting careers, getting involved in a club, learning values and seeing how good it is to be involved in community sport and giving back to their community. The effort there is to keep them involved right the way through so that they get all those health benefits that come with being involved in sport. We know the previous government did not have any money budgeted for this, but we made sure that this investment was there. Again, I thank my cabinet colleagues for their support in delivering this project. I know it is one that we on this side of the house are very proud of.

This brought not only sport into the equation but dance as well. We want to see people being active, and we know that it may not be football, cricket, tennis or basketball that people are interested in. Can I say that, just looking at the figures the other day of people who have taken up dance, the numbers are going through the roof and that dance has been prominent across almost every electorate. It is great to see more people getting out there and being active and being involved in sport.

AFL still probably leads the way through the SANFL as far as people getting and using these vouchers are concerned, and we know a lot of that also comes from the growth in young girls and women playing football. It is really changing the face of how sport looks across South Australia, and we are very conscious of that. We have rolled out our grassroots football, cricket, and netball program as well, putting more than \$24 million back into sport in South Australia.

We recently announced the first round. I think that it will equate to something like \$15 million worth of projects to be delivered on the back of these grants. That is absolutely fantastic. I have been speaking with the communities that have worked hard and put in great applications. It is a fifty-fifty project so, in most cases, the local councils or the local clubs themselves have injected money into this. They have skin in the game. The SANFL and SACA have also put money into this project.

It is absolutely sensational to announce these projects, seeing how hard these communities have worked and knowing what it is going to deliver for them. We know that this is about lights, safety, security, playing fields and change rooms as well. We have driven the unisex, family-friendly change rooms very hard. That is what we want to see. The idea of building women's change rooms over there and men's change rooms over here, and the women use theirs when they play and the men use theirs when they play, just does not make any sense. We want to build unisex change rooms across the board.

If there is a weekend with four or five women's games going on, they can just flick between all the change rooms and everyone has access to the facilities. Next weekend, if the women are playing away and the guys are playing at home, again they can use those facilities. It is absolutely fantastic, and we are very bullish about that. It has been incredibly well received. Round 2 of that grassroots program will open very soon, and we want many people to get involved in that. The first round was oversubscribed, and we expect the second round to be oversubscribed as well because it has been really well received.

We are also excited to roll out our state sports infrastructure plan. This has dovetailed in with the feasibility around the Commonwealth Games. We are having a look at what sporting infrastructure we need for South Australia going forward for generations to come. We are consulting right around the state. It is happening in the regions first. I think that it is starting in the Riverland as early as next week. We are rolling it out right throughout South Australia. We want people to come

along and talk about what it is their community needs and how they can come together and get sports and community groups working together.

We are also looking at what sport might look like into the future. It was a number of years ago that I played a little bit of sport, and I can tell you that clubs do not look like they did anymore. They are changing, and we want communities to talk to us about how they want their sporting infrastructure and sporting clubs to work. During the week, we saw a young woman wanting to play with the men down in the South-East. Of course, there were a few hiccups because of the registrations and the like, but it does pose the question, if we can take a positive out of a negative: what do we want to see in country sporting areas? Is there something we should be looking forward to down the track?

That is all part of the conversation we want to have with our state sports infrastructure plan and Game On as well. We will be out in the community consulting, and this has never been done before, because we want to get a very clear vision, listen to the community and work out what we want our sport to look like. What does sport and rec look like for South Australia into the future and for generations to come? This work has never been done. It has always been somewhat scattered and disparate, dare I say, with people looking at political opportunities, rather than at what is best for South Australia. That is not what we want to do.

We want to make sure that we deliver the right projects, and the Memorial Drive project is definitely one of those. The opportunity was there to get the WTA and ATP events and have the only covered facility for tennis in South Australia. To have that back so that young people and anyone else can get out and play all year round and develop their tennis skills—who knows? We hope that we can produce the next Lleyton Hewitt or Alicia Molik and have an Australian Open, Wimbledon, French Open or US Open champion from South Australia very soon.

**Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (11:38):** I also rise to speak on the 20<sup>th</sup> report of the Public Works Committee, which is about the Tennis SA Memorial Drive centre court development. I thank the Minister for Sport and Recreation for giving us his perspective. As the minister, he looked at the approval for money to be put towards a redevelopment at Memorial Drive. It was then referred to the Public Works Committee, as Tennis SA was looking for funding support from the South Australian government as well as some funding from Tennis Australia.

It proposed to transform its current facilities at Memorial Drive, which is obviously very picturesque and steeped in history. It is very close to Adelaide Oval, which has had such a great upgrade and really enlivened the Riverbank Precinct. Tennis SA is looking to transform Memorial Drive into an all-weather stadium facility and, importantly, to make it of an international standard.

The proposed centre court redevelopment will see the centre court area covered with an architectural roof structure that spans the existing court platform area and both the northern and southern grandstands that are currently there. The scope of these proposed works will also include the refurbishment of the existing tennis courts to bring them up to international standard. There is also new lighting to make these courts all-weather and able to be used at night-time for training. The redevelopment will also incorporate improved access between the centre court and some of the outside courts, which have previously been redeveloped as well.

The Public Works Committee was informed by Tennis SA that the proposed works are necessary because they want to position themselves to host the International Tennis Federation and, as the Minister for Sport mentioned, Women's Tennis Association events as soon as January 2020. We really want to put Memorial Drive back on the map and make sure that it has a pre-eminent position on the Australian tennis calendar, which of course leads into the Australian Open in Melbourne. We want to see exciting international-standard tennis played here in Adelaide to really inspire the next generation of South Australian tennis players and give them the opportunity to play against the world's best in front of their home crowd.

In terms of what was presented to the committee, we were advised that there are several sport and community outcomes that are expected through the completion of this project. These include:

- a venue that will help develop, grow and widen the appeal of tennis, as well as associated community events;



- improving efficiency, safety and amenity for the venue's existing players, patrons and spectators;
- providing a world-class, all-weather, covered playing platform to enable International Tennis Federation and Women's Tennis Association events to be hosted here in Adelaide; and
- year-round training facilities for the National Tennis Academy.

As a committee, we were informed that Adelaide is one of the only mainland capital cities that does not have an all-weather court. For our budding and aspiring tennis players to be able to progress, it really does help them to be able to train here in Adelaide rather than having to leave and go interstate and train in other states' all-weather facilities.

You can see from the age of many young tennis players that they start quite early in their teenage years. We saw Lleyton Hewitt, who was very successful as a young teenager, being able to compete on the world stage. In fact, he won his first tournament here at Memorial Drive back in 1997 or thereabouts. The opportunity of being able to stay here with your parents, live at home and train can only benefit those young players, rather than their having to go interstate and have the subsequent dislocation of family life, and potentially school life as well. I think that is a really important facet and certainly one that the committee rated highly when it considered this factor.

Another advantage of having this all-weather roof is that it will allow it to become a major community space for not only high-profile sporting events such as netball and basketball—again, the hardcourts here enable that—but also for concerts and community events. For a small-scale concert, an all-weather surface certainly provides an alternative location. For bigger concerts, there is the Entertainment Centre, with its capacity, and there is the Adelaide Oval.

This redevelopment provides a little sweet spot for some entertainers to come to Adelaide and perform in an all-weather environment. I think it is an attraction for those performers to come along and know that the crowds who have come to see them will not be deterred by potential weather considerations. It allows for those concerts not to be packed in until Mad March, which is during the prime weather season—it allows us to extend our events season.

The Minister for Tourism would certainly be very pleased with that, looking for fantastic events that bring people here. We know that once people come to experience South Australia they really get a lot out of it, but we need trigger points for people to come to South Australia and really enjoy what there is to offer, which is so much more than just the event itself.

Finally, it should be noted that Tennis SA were really mindful about retaining the heritage of Memorial Drive. We have seen that done very successfully at the Adelaide Oval, where the Western Stand was able to retain its heritage and retain the walls where past cricket greats had gone through and gone into the changing rooms. We still get to experience that history steeped in Adelaide Oval, and we want to be able to do that at Memorial Drive as well.

Talking of the history, it is worth pointing out that it was established in 1914, originally under the name of the South Australian Lawn Tennis Club, and it was not until 1938 that a permanent grandstand was erected—firstly, on the northern side of the courts, followed then by the southern grandstand roof, which was built in the late 1990s. This certainly will allow for a fantastic upgrade of this facility, which over the years has hosted many major events.

They were originally grass courts, and we had Davis Cup ties and even an Australian Open championship, so they are not just in the purview of Melbourne. In fact, up until 1967 Adelaide had hosted 14 Australian championships. While we are maybe not at the stage where we can take over from Melbourne, we are certainly looking to have some really high marquee players want to come to Adelaide to get warmed up and be ready to hit the Australian Open over in Melbourne at full strength. This is what this court upgrade will provide, and it should bring some really top-ranked tennis players to South Australia and Memorial Drive.

Some work has been done previously on the area around the tennis precinct. In 2018, the federal government provided \$9.8 million to undertake stage 1 of the upgrade of Memorial Drive, which allowed for some surrounding courts to be built and also the re-establishment of 13 natural

grass courts and four new synthetic grass courts so that it could become a tennis centre across different disciplines of tennis, including not only the hardcourts that we have now but also synthetic and clay.

It is worth pointing out that three new courts will be built there. The centre courts will be retained but reconfigured to comply with the current International Tennis Federation world cup standards and dimensions. It also includes an extension of the existing platform. The centre court area itself will be reconfigured to create three Plexicushion courts in the Australian Open colours, centred for maximum spectator viewing.

In the time remaining, it is worth talking about the roof structure. From a heritage point of view, it will be very complementary to Adelaide Oval. As we have seen with Adelaide Oval, it is really important that we retain its look and feel, and this will be no different; it will sit nicely alongside Adelaide Oval. There will be a new freestanding steel-framed, fabric-covered structure, which will be independent of the existing stands. The existing roofs of both the northern and southern stands will be demolished and in their place this new structure will not only cover the court platform area but also serve as a roof for both the northern and southern stands. Additionally, the new roof will extend to the east and west to provide shelter for temporary seating and/or the stage area.

I am very proud that this government has put approximately \$10 million towards this fantastic \$11 million upgrade. It will set up tennis here in South Australia for many years to come and I hope encourage many grassroots tennis players to aspire to play on this court in front of fantastic South Australian crowds who will cheer them home.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (11:48):** I also rise to support the Public Works Committee's report to the parliament on the development at Memorial Drive, which, as we have heard from the contributions of other speakers, ostensibly is placing a roof structure over the court facilities at Memorial Drive, as well as including some small upgrades to the seating and other accommodation facilities for people who visit Memorial Drive.

My remarks are timely to follow on from the member for Morphett because he also draws the house's attention to—I think we can be genuine enough to admit—some welcome works at the Memorial Drive precinct that were announced, funded and now completed by the former federal member for Sturt, the Hon. Christopher Pyne, to replace the court facilities at Memorial Drive and also the clay courts on the other side of Montefiore Hill, as well as a new facility there.

Again, I will pay some credit to those sitting opposite, the Liberal government. They have been looking at ways to champion the role of tennis in South Australia to try to lift the opportunity for higher level events, if I can put it so generically, to be attracted to South Australia. It is their sincere hope that this investment at Memorial Drive will not only continue some of the work that both the member for Morphett and I have just mentioned about replacing the practice or, how can I put it, perhaps amateur courts at Memorial Drive but, with the centre court facilities, try to attract some higher events. I think there has also been an announcement from the government about attracting an event to Adelaide in the future that was formerly hosted by Sydney.

That is all very welcome because this has been somewhat of a conundrum for quite some years, how we can deal with what was starting to look a bit like a neglected area of Adelaide's Riverbank Precinct—this time, on the other side to the central business district—particularly after the former Labor government had delivered the redevelopment of Adelaide Oval. As it became clear that the redevelopment of Adelaide Oval was such an extraordinary success, particularly towards the end of the 2014 AFL season and into the 2015 calendar year, there was a lot of talk around Adelaide about what on earth could be done with Memorial Drive.

A proposal being championed in some corners was that perhaps the Adelaide Entertainment Centre at Hindmarsh should be razed and sold off for a housing development or apartments, particularly because the former Labor government had extended the tram service down to the Entertainment Centre and it would perhaps enhance the value of the land and increase the appetite from private housing developers to build apartments or high-density houses down there.

The Entertainment Centre could be moved back into the CBD, or a CBD location next to Adelaide Oval, and become a multipurpose stadium. Not only could there be the concerts, events and conferences currently held by the Adelaide Entertainment Centre at this new Memorial Drive

location but there could also be tennis events, there could also be netball events and there could also be basketball events and other events from time to time attracted to South Australia. On the face of it, that seems a reasonable proposition.

I understand that some work was done by some private sector developers and some architects and that those plans were being shown to at least one side of politics—not necessarily the Labor side of politics—before the 2018 election around whether there could be this sort of redevelopment of Memorial Drive. I was not involved in any of those conversations, so I do admit that what I pass on is hearsay, but I was also informed that this plan was strongly supported by the Adelaide Oval Stadium Management Authority.

They thought, 'Who better to manage another part of the precinct that could be a revenue-generating opportunity than the Stadium Management Authority at Adelaide Oval?' All sorts of figures were bandied around about how much money would need to be spent on the Memorial Drive facility to ensure, once again, that the Stadium Management Authority could be gifted a state-of-the-art, bespoke piece of sporting infrastructure that they could monetise for the private interests of the South Australian National Football League and the South Australian Cricket Association and whether that could be extended to Memorial Drive. Indeed, I think a journalist at *The Advertiser* even managed to write a couple of articles on this, outlining that that figure was approximately \$150 million.

If that sort of development can stack up on its own merits, if it has a strong enough business case that it does not require a huge investment from any level of government, if it makes commercial sense and, most importantly, if it is in the best interests of the sports and the events that might be attracted to that facility, that sort of proposition should be publicised and taken to the people of South Australia. In particular, it would be important to ensure that Tennis SA was not going to be shut out of what could be an exciting development for that organisation and for the facility it owns. The last thing we would want to see is the Stadium Management Authority taking over what is an asset that should be controlled by Tennis SA.

Unfortunately, we have not heard any of those plans. It seems that, in time, the attentions of the Stadium Management Authority moved on into a new hotel at Adelaide Oval, but I should not let any of that detract from the importance of this new roof over the Memorial Drive tennis courts. I am sure that it will be most welcome for those people who will be playing on those surfaces. It will be most welcome for those people who are looking at coming along and watching those tennis events.

I think that if the government is able to see that there is a broader application for this piece of infrastructure, that more and more tennis events can be attracted to it and that we give young South Australians the opportunity to play on such a court, then that would be terrific and strongly supported. I am happy to lend my support to the government's endeavours in this area, particularly because it has not led us down the path where we have a hostile takeover from the Stadium Management Authority of a facility managed by Tennis SA.

**Mr COWDREY (Colton) (11:56):** I rise to make some brief comments in regard to this report from the Public Works Committee in relation to the Tennis SA Memorial Drive centre court redevelopment and in some ways wish to pick up on the spirit in which the member for Lee started the first half of his speech before reaching into, by his own admission, unsubstantiated claims.

The opportunity that now sits before Tennis SA is immense. I am certainly on record—not so much in this place but outside—as being extremely supportive of the previous government's redevelopment of the state and national swimming facilities here in South Australia with the South Australian Aquatic and Leisure Centre. In some ways, I certainly see this as an opportunity for tennis to go down the same track as swimming by way of completely changing the culture in the state in regard to that particular sport. Through the new facility, there has certainly been a change in the way that swimming is approached in South Australia.

It is the first time that I can certainly remember in a long, long time that we have had national and international events held here in South Australia, and for young people to be able to see their role models in the flesh, the people they look up to within sport, is very, very important. This is certainly something they will now have the opportunity to do with respect to Tennis SA. Young tennis players will be able to come to national and international events to see these people in person and

to play at that sort of facility I think is an incredible opportunity for our state into the future, so I certainly commend the Public Works Committee for undertaking this work and the project itself.

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:58):** I am certainly grateful to those members who have added their contribution to the debate in relation to receiving this report, most particularly the deputy presiding member of the Public Works Committee, whose insights I value and who appreciates the significance of this development and that it will be valued not only by the tennis community but also by all sports lovers in South Australia—Mr Speaker, yourself, I am sure, included.

I thank the minister, too, for his contribution to debate, the member for Lee, and also, of course, the member for Colton, whose enthusiasm for sports is well known as well as his lived experience of the significance, importance and value of sport in his own life and also to young South Australians throughout their life. It is a significant development. It is an exciting development. John Fitzgerald said that it was the most exciting opportunity of his lifetime. That is a very substantial endorsement and one that certainly we appreciate.

I also reflect briefly on remarks made by the minister in relation to the Sports Vouchers program. I was at a performance of Rockit Performing Arts at Mount Barker on the weekend and a number of members of the community mentioned to me that they value the Sports Vouchers program, available also for dance and other physical activity. It is an extremely good program of this government in view of the increased value of that program.

Motion carried.

### *Bills*

## **APPROPRIATION BILL 2019**

### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 June 2019.)

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (12:00):** I indicate that I am the lead speaker on the Appropriation Bill 2019. About 14 months ago, after becoming leader of the South Australian Parliamentary Labor Party, I commenced a thorough, comprehensive and diverse community engagement exercise. Labor had lost government for the first time in 16 years and, as a new leader with a pretty new team, I took the opportunity to travel across our great state, visiting all 47 seats within the parliament. I met people anywhere and everywhere, from suburban street corner meetings to regional pubs to shopping centres, town halls, RSLs—you name it, Mr Speaker. There were some long days but it was a wholeheartedly enjoyable experience.

We are so lucky to live and share a diverse community, living in such a diverse land and an even more diverse economy. The experience was utterly inspiring to be able to enjoy the company of so many South Australians in such a diverse manner, which probably explains why no two conversations I had during the Labor Listens exercise were exactly the same. However, there were three consistent themes that were regularly raised with me. The first I would describe as the future of work. We live in uncertain times, but this is particularly true in a relatively high-wage economy when compared globally.

South Australians understand that capital is increasingly mobile in an ever more competitive international marketplace, which means that jobs are vulnerable to being moved from one jurisdiction to another—just ask a former Mitsubishi or Holden worker. More alarmingly, for a lot of businesses and their employees, it is the unrelenting pace of disruption through extraordinary advancements in job displacing technology that is so concerning. Even some white-collar professional services, careers once thought to be immune from disruption, are now facing technological substitution. These are global forces, but they should not be sources of panic for South Australian workers, but they are right to be concerned.

The second theme regularly raised during Labor Listens was the household budget. Whether you are employed, a pensioner or a student, whether you are single or have to manage a family, everyone strives to keep their head above water, provide for their family and ideally get ahead. For many, if not most, this is a genuine struggle. We are in a period of record low wages growth, while

at the same time many non-discretionary household costs such as gas, electricity, petrol and groceries all continue to go up. Cost of living is not theoretical as an issue. It is a genuine, real, live issue.

The third key area of concern is government services. No matter how much the forces of conservatism wish for the day that people no longer rely upon the state, the truth is that real people do rely on government for some key services that (a) improve their standard of living and (b) without government, people would otherwise never be able to afford. Health and education are always top of mind in this category, but the value and utility of practical necessities like public transport should also never be underestimated.

I love every minute of engaging with as many members of the community as I can, hearing about their concerns, hearing about their aspirations. Although the themes I have just mentioned are hardly surprising, the exercise of listening and hearing them has been utterly invaluable. The truth is that, in comparison to government, opposition does afford front bench members more time to undertake a listening tour as comprehensive as I have undertaken. To be fair, I suspect the same was true for the Premier when he was the leader of the opposition.

No doubt, when the Premier and his colleagues were hearing people's concerns from opposition, they heard the same things I do. They hear the same things we hear. People care about jobs, they care about how to pay the bills, they care about important government services, so it was easy to see how the member for Dunstan came up with the promise of more jobs, lower costs and better services. It is also easy to see why the promise would be well received in the community, but there is one problem: this defining promise from the Marshall government; that is all it was: just a promise. 'More jobs, lower costs better services' now appears to be a slogan that is just another promise delivered by just another politician. It is a promise without a policy.

In this state budget, that disheartening reality is all laid bare. Take 'more jobs'. On the all-important subject of jobs, the news has at best been mixed for this government and the people of our state. Thankfully, the most recent numbers show that jobs were created in the month of May, but unemployment on trend terms is still higher than it was at the last state election. It is also true that we have seen jobs growth halve in a comparison of the last year of 16 years of Labor and the first year of this government. Meanwhile, there are more people who are currently unemployed, and the government's own budget projects that employment growth will diminish over the forward estimates.

Then we have 'lower costs'. When it comes to this government delivering lower costs, it is a categorical broken promise. The centrepiece of the government's lower costs promise was the reduction in the ESL along with other tax cuts that were featured in last year's state budget. Again, though, it now appears that the Liberals did not even really have a plan about how they were going to pay for these policies. They fudged it through last year's budget, with the GST right up, additional stamp duties and more in commonwealth grants, but as those revenues have dried up the state is now left with a very substantial fiscal problem.

So what has our Premier done? He has decided to hit every South Australian family by introducing huge tax hikes on almost everything the government does; there is the new police rent tax, the new late-night bar bill, the tradies' tax, new mining tax and a wildlife park tax. The aspirational mum-and-dad property investors have also been hit with huge increases in land tax, and that is before we start looking at the fees and charges, the ones that are almost impossible to avoid. I am advised that for over 20 years we have had a formula in this state that has helped successive governments of both persuasions calculate the increases to fees and charges. It is a formula that has resulted in increases in the past largely being in line with CPI and growth in public sector wages.

Well, this Premier has torn up that formula. They have thrown it out and now they are letting it rip. CPI in Adelaide is currently 1.3 per cent—remember that number, 1.3 per cent. What has been going on with fees and charges? Driver's licence renewal, up by 4.5 per cent; car registration for some vehicles, up over 5 per cent; public transport, up 2 per cent, but if you are lucky to be travelling only a small distance it is up 10 times that; trailer registration, up 5 per cent; and then there is the hit on every household, with the impending government-delivered spike in council rates.

The irony of the government once being for lower council rates, then in their second budget delivering an increase in council rates without any notice, will not be lost on South Australian families.

Imagine if Labor had supported yet another ill thought-through promise on rate capping. First, ratepayers would have been hit by the state government-sanctioned hike of a 2.9 per cent increase in council rates, then the Premier would serve them up another 40 per cent hike on the rubbish tax. The worst part is the hit on families that are the most vulnerable.

I do not think any of us can imagine a more terrifying experience than watching a loved one be rushed off to hospital in the back of an ambulance. That is a family in pain, that is a family in need of support, but what the Premier sees is an opportunity to raise more revenue. They are doing it through an extra 5 per cent increase in ambulance fees, and that cost for one trip is now in excess of \$1,000 for the first time. Then after paying more for the ambulance, the Premier is now also charging families an additional 20 per cent just to visit their loved one in hospital through additional car parking costs.

I met the Pollard family yesterday who live in the southern suburbs. Mr Pollard suffers chronic back pain. He is a regular attendee at Flinders Medical Centre and his son has type I diabetes. Spending time at Flinders Medical Centre is not a luxury but a necessity. It is something they have had the misfortune of not being able to avoid. Regular attendees, working people, are now faced with a massive tax hike. They work hard. He works in the community services sector trying to look after people. You would have thought the government might want to try to look after his household budget rather than see his misfortune as a source for additional revenue.

The ESL cuts have been utterly eclipsed by \$350 million of new taxes. Rate capping has been turned into 'ratejacking', and the fuel watch exercise did not last as long as it took for the Attorney-General to hand over \$2 million to Henry Keogh.

In relation to 'better services', let's start by remembering that the better services promise was broken well before this budget. That promise was broken when the Premier decided to shut Service SA centres, dramatically cut public transport and close down TAFE campuses. Unfortunately, this budget only makes the matter worse. The message from the community on services to us through Labor listeners was clear: health and education remain priorities. Let's start with health.

Ensuring a public health system is one of the fundamental responsibilities of the South Australian government. Public health services will always be fundamental to the social equity mission of the Labor Party. Every South Australian deserves the right to universal coverage on safe, high quality, timely hospital care when they need it. When it comes to health, yes, of course our state does face challenges ahead, with an ageing population, rising rates of chronic disease and inadequate primary and aged-care services fuelling further demands on our hospital system. This Liberal government was elected on saying they were going to fix the health system. Well, what we have seen ever since then is everything but that.

Where paramedics are calling for extra resources to deal with worsening response times to emergencies, the government only responds by jacking up ambulance fees. When we are facing the impact of massive numbers of flu cases this year, the government is cutting and potentially privatising SA Pathology who, of course, diagnose the flu. When ramping outside emergency departments is now more than twice as bad as it has ever been in the state's history, the government appoints corporate liquidators to run our hospitals and cuts \$420 million over the next two years.

When, sadly, the impact of suicide has been far too devastating upon our state, the government is cutting non-government mental health services by 25 per cent and toying with abolishing the Mental Health Commissioner. When doctors, nurses and paramedics say that the pressure on them is far too great and more support is needed, the government's priority is on spending \$15 million on director fees for new boards they are establishing. It does not help one patient.

This budget delivers nothing to improve our health system. There is a plan to cut 1,140 staff from health over the course of this year. There is a plan to freeze health expenditure over the next three years, despite the growing demand. There is a plan for nurses, cleaners, allied staff and more to pay \$725 extra just for the privilege of parking their car at work to help save the lives of South Australians. There is a plan for loved ones visiting a family member in palliative care to pay triple the price at The QEH to park their car for 2½ hours.

But what is more worrying is that there is no plan to address the structural problems within the health system. There is no plan for ramping, which is in epidemic proportions at our hospitals right now, and there is no plan to improve mental health services that are overstretched. Patients who cannot afford private health care and rely on the public health services deserve better.

Let's look at the way education is being treated by this government. Apart from the sudden inexplicable exclusion of hundreds of families from the Adelaide High School zone, the only new policy the government has, the only one that is not appropriating the policies of the last government, is to move 12 year olds from one school to another. That was the only new money in last year's budget: the additional cost from 2022 of teaching 12 year olds in secondary schools. The bulk of the capital cost for moving year 7s is coming from the money the previous government allocated to new specialist facilities, such as performing arts centres, gymnasiums and science facilities all cancelled to build classrooms for the move of year 7s.

The government is so impoverished in its ideas about education that it keeps re-announcing the Labor initiative of high-speed internet for schools, started by the previous government, provisioned in the education budget by the previous government well before the election and inherited by this government, yet it has been described as a landmark initiative in Tuesday's speech because they have no ideas of their own. It is an important project and the government should get on with delivering it and stop trying to claim credit for it.

The real story of this year's budget is the massive cut to education, the massive cut to the education department and the skills department to the tune of \$100 million. There are cuts to adult foundational education, termination of the Critical Skills Fund and cuts across the board in education and skills. It is worth knowing that the last time the Liberals were in government here the school completion rate was 50 per cent. The Labor government got it up to 75 per cent, but we cannot rest. It is still not good enough in an aspiring modern economy to have a quarter of all students not completing high school. This government has no plan and no investment in the budget to lift that rate.

Australia's rankings in the PISA, which compares 15 year olds in OECD countries on reading, maths and science performances, are not good enough for the emerging economy that requires all students to have higher literacy and numeracy, scientific and critical thinking skills. The most recent results, from 2015, show that nations like Vietnam and Slovenia are overtaking Australia and that we are experiencing an absolute decline in our performance. Disadvantaged students in Australia are far more likely to do badly in the PISA testing—the very students the Gonski funding model was designed to help, the students let down by their government and their federal allies as they tore up the Gonski funding deal.

Let's not forget that it was the Marshall government that signed up the new school funding deal that financially disadvantages our public schools and guarantees that we will never catch up to the funding we need, funding we would have had if Labor were in government at a federal and state level—funding for specialist teachers, for literacy, for numeracy intervention programs, for students with disabilities, for Aboriginal students, for regional students, for the highest quality facilities in the sciences, humanities, arts and technical specialist subjects. It is a substantial point of difference that will continue to be prosecuted.

Vocational training is essential, yet this government, for all its rhetoric, is seeing declining apprenticeship commencements, declining completions of government-funded certificate III and declining participation in government-funded VET courses. We need more investment, not less; more focus on what matters to students, parents and teachers, not just a preoccupation with moving students between schools. Cuts to skills and education are not going to get us anywhere near the future that South Australia needs and deserves.

The Marshall Liberal government's second budget lays waste to the idea that this government is serious about keeping its promises of lower costs and better services. In the immediate future, it is South Australians paying the price for this broken promise. But what about the long term? What about the structural financial settings in the budget that frame up the future of our state? The answer here lies in the debt.

In many ways, now would probably be an opportune time to relay the dozens upon dozens of quotes made by those opposite, retrieved from very recent history, when they demonised debt and espoused the virtues of debt-busting fiscal conservatism. Some of those quotes are fascinating, to say the least, but reading them out now would almost make light of what could be historically very significant.

The South Australian parliamentary Liberal Party has almost overnight changed their guiding economic philosophy. All those John Howard acolytes who were elected last year rushed into the parliamentary library and swapped their Milton Friedman and Friedrich Hayek texts for masterpieces by John Maynard Keynes. Watching these leopards change their spots is honestly a sight to behold. I thought that a Port supporter barracking for Norwood was something, but this is truly something else.

On this side of the chamber, though, we have been consistent, especially since the lessons of the State Bank. Put simply, South Australian Labor believes that when times are good growth in public debt should be constrained, while in economic headwinds expansionary fiscal policy is a powerful tool to stimulate the economy and keep people in work. However, the use of debt should be subject to monitoring and long-term planning. This has essentially been our long-held position. Throughout our 16 years in government, this approach was applied.

Remember, in 2006 state debt was eliminated by a Labor government. Post the GFC, during one of the most significant economic transitions in the history of our state, expansionary fiscal policy was deployed, but that occurred with a plan. We committed to keeping state government debt below 35 per cent of our total revenue, and we did, even when the most significant and largest infrastructure project in the history of our state, the NRAH, was placed on our books. At the end of 2017, in the MYBR that number was 25.6 per cent.

On Tuesday, the Premier announced that that number is now skyrocketing to 59 per cent. It is more than double. What is this government's new self-imposed debt-to-revenue target? What is their new target? They do not even have one. The total government debt is over \$20 billion and the interest bill is now at record levels. The question that has to be asked is: why are they doing this?

Why have they chosen to take this unprecedented action that seems to be inconsistent with their own ideology?

For over 12 months, we have had both state and federal governments telling us that, because of their brilliant economic management, the economy is in good times. Are they now telling us that the economy is in bad times? For 12 months, the state government has been telling us that the state is experiencing a confidence boom. Are they now telling us that confidence has lulled? For decades, the state Liberal Party has been telling us that if government withdraws from the economy and taxes are lowered activity will increase and debt will be lowered. Yet, after 14 months, are they now telling us that that philosophy is dead, government intervention is required and massive unchecked increases in debt are now necessary?

The new Liberal Party would like us to believe that the reason for the debt is productive infrastructure. That is far from the whole truth. Firstly, not all the debt is accounted for by capital expenditure and changes to accounting standards, which means that debt is propping up the general activity of the government. Secondly, what happened to Infrastructure South Australia? This was the body that was set up to ensure that infrastructure investments were indeed going to be productive. Have any of the projects funded in the budget been given the tick of approval by this auspicious body? No. That is probably because many of the projects actually funded in the entirety of the forwards are nothing more than pork-barrelling exercises for James Stevens. Remember, #SturtMatters.

But the biggest problem with the debt is emblematic of this whole government: it is the fact that there is no plan. They had a plan for 100 days, and that is it. There is no debt target, no repayment plan and no metrics at all pointing to a plan for future debt discipline. The only debt plan is a decision to leave uncoded debt bombs lying around outside the forward estimates—that is, after the next election. The most glaring example of a post-election debt bomb is the new Women's and Children's Hospital. I would like to read something from the government's own 100-day plan, in which they say:



In our first 100 days, we will establish a high-level task force to drive the project and develop a fully-costed project plan...

That is in the first 100 days. Well, we still do not know the cost. That task force was said to be completed by the end of last year, yet here we are in June, over 450 days since the election, now fully committed to the hospital, with no costing. There is partial funding but nowhere near enough to cover the bill. It is utterly reckless to commit future taxpayers to expenditure when you cannot even tell them how much it will be. The art gallery is no different. My concern here is not about the projects themselves; it is the way the government is going about approaching the funding that is the problem.

Consigning future generations to debt is one thing, but to do it without even telling them what that debt will be is another thing altogether. The Premier is making all this someone else's problem, without any restraint or regard to what the size of that problem will be. Even I believe that many of you are better than this. The only explanation for this budget is the Premier himself.

In March last year, the people of South Australia elected a new premier. It turns out that he is a West Adelaide supporter, was elected to parliament when Malcolm Fraser was prime minister and loves American sports. Only a premier retiring in 2½ years' time could approve a budget like this one because, regardless of who wins the next election, the mess will not be his problem. As inspiring as premier Lucas's address was on Tuesday, my biggest concern is about what is not in this year's budget.

A budget should be a defining policy document that speaks to the government's values and its mission. A budget should help light the path to the future that our state's leadership aspires to. I honestly do not know what that is in this year's state budget, and I worry that it amounts to a wasted opportunity. However, within this budget there is a big lesson for the opposition and that is: do not make promises without policy.

I said earlier that opposition affords members more time than in government, but that does not mean that the time in opposition is any less precious. As we start to move from an absolute focus on community engagement towards policy development, we must allocate our time to ensure our vision for a prosperous, fairer society is underpinned by a robust, progressive policy that can be delivered for the long term.

We will continue to perform our duty to hold this government to account, but the real work of this opposition is only about to begin. We do enjoy a good standard of living in this state—indeed, one of the best in the world. It was best summed up to me by an older couple in Whyalla. An earthy gentleman, a retired steelworker, said: 'All-up, life has been pretty good to me and my kids. I just hope it is as good for my grandkids.' Then the gentleman's wife pointedly interrupted him and said, 'Life has been good to me, too, but he keeps whinging about his bloody knee, so get that replaced and we'll all be better off.'

That simple interaction sums up nicely the legitimate aspirations of our society. We have to work hard, lead a good healthy life but, critically, leave the joint in a better shape for our kids. This budget may not reconcile with that humble aspiration, but with hard work Labor can and will have a policy at the next election that does—a policy for the present focused on jobs and people's health, a policy for the future focused on education and health. It is an exciting proposition—let us begin.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (12:31):** Deputy Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity of being able to speak on the Appropriation Bill 2019. Obviously, the gallery is heading back to the second floor where they are erstwhile employed. It has been widely attributed to—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Minister, I am going to interrupt you there. You should not be referring to people in the gallery, so I will ask you to withdraw.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** I will withdraw, Mr Deputy Speaker.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Minister, you have the call, continue.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** It has been attributed to Mark Twain that one should 'never let the truth get in the way of a good story'. Often in this chamber, we hear a lot of that, and I think that this morning that is precisely what we heard. We heard a great tale, a tale that speaks about some sort

of budget or financial situation that exists, but it certainly does not exist in South Australia and it certainly is not a reflection of the budget that was handed down on Tuesday afternoon.

What we heard today, and just now from the Leader of the Opposition, was an eclectic mix of contradiction and hypocrisy. On the one hand, we are being told that it is irresponsible to put up fees and charges but, on the other hand, that debt is way too high. On the one hand, we are being told that there are services that are being destroyed but, on the other hand, that debt is increasing.

What we heard was not a coherent alternative plan for South Australia. What we heard was a grab bag of whinging from an opposition leader who does not have an idea. What he has is a kitbag of grievance. It is precisely the kind of grievance culture that those opposite have sought to perpetrate in our community. It did not work out so well for Bill Shorten and I do not think it is going to work out so well for the Leader of the Opposition.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens is called to order. You will have your opportunity to contribute to this debate in due course.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Firstly, let's talk about jobs in South Australia. We took to the election a promise of delivering more jobs for South Australia and, 14 months on, that is a promise that we are keeping. The seasonal unemployment rate is down to 5.7, the trend unemployment rate is down to 5.8 and there are 16,300 new jobs since we came to office, 10,000 of which are part time. That is the definition of more jobs.

In relation to policies we have put in place to support more jobs, the biggest thing we can do to drive jobs growth in South Australia is support higher population growth, something those opposite did not want to countenance while in government but something this government has embraced wholeheartedly. It is why we see a reduction in the net interstate migration rate, even in the first few months of last year, under the Marshall Liberal government.

We have also seen us, as a government, use confidence in our economy and transition that to increase plant and equipment investment and capital investment, which is now at record levels. Through cooperation with the federal government and the Designated Area Migration Agreements, we are also going to support skilled migration growth that will grow jobs in the South Australian economy.

We did hear something from those opposite in relation to skills training that I could not come at. We are talking about a former government that butchered the private training industry and also presided over the debacle that was TAFE and the way they undertake training, with a 100 per cent failure rate of audited courses TAFE was undertaking. We saw a government that pulled all money from the private training sector to prop up TAFE, but they did not even get that right.

What we have seen is a massive reduction in the number of skills and apprenticeship starts under the former government. In fact, the baseline that the Minister for Innovation and Skills has had to work with is extremely low. What did we do? We put \$100 million on the table in our first budget together with \$100 million from the federal government, and we are meeting the targets to get to the 20,000 new trainee and apprenticeships starts as a result of that Skilling Australia program. We are on track to deliver on our promise to deliver more skills training in South Australia.

Something those opposite really do not want to talk about is that we have also put \$130 million back into the budget of TAFE in South Australia, \$130 million of extra money, so I do not want to hear any talk about the fact that we are not investing in skills: we are the skills government, and the Minister for Innovation and Skills is delivering on that front.

We have also heard those opposite talk about costs here in South Australia. Well, we took to the election a promise to deliver a reduction in the ESL of \$90 million a year, delivered in our first budget. We took to the election a promise of delivering payroll tax deductions, delivered in our first budget. We also took a promise of delivering land tax cuts to the election, delivered in both the last and in this budget.

But there is more. The changes in relation to compulsory third-party insurance this year will deliver savings to South Australian households of \$100 for a one-car household, \$200 for two-car households and \$300 for three-car households.

*Mr Brown interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** One moment, minister. The member for Playford is called to order for continuing interjections.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** We have also made some positive statements in relation to the cost of water, which we will have more to say on in coming months as our pledge to help reduce water prices in South Australia comes to fruition, when Lew Owens hands down his report into how far over the odds the regulated asset base is costed at in order to get increased dividend revenue for the former Labor government.

We also took to the last election a comprehensive plan to lower electricity prices, money delivered in the first budget and continued in this budget, which is starting to pay dividends, especially when we talk about the discounts offered to over 100,000 South Australians to help reduce their electricity bill. This is a government that is serious about delivering on lower costs. We do not deny that there are fees and charges increases in this budget. We do not deny that. It is a difficult decision we take, but it is one that is prudent to deliver the overall fiscally responsible budget we were elected to deliver.

But wait: those opposite—and especially the Leader of the Opposition—talking about better services could not have been further from the truth. You need only look at Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, and public transport to understand that we have delivered a better service. Not only have we delivered an increase in the number of service kilometres from 52.8 million to 53.9 million—that is more, rather than less, so any talk about cuts to the overall level of service are not borne out by that figure—but, more than that, we saw a massive increase of 1.6 million passengers in the 2018-19 year using our public transport system. It is categorically a fact that South Australians are choosing to use services under this government.

Now, again, the Leader of the Opposition has the temerity to stand up and talk about the state of the health system that they left us. Think about the good grace they could exhibit. They could just be quiet while we go about fixing the awful mess that they left South Australians. But what have we done cumulatively in our first two budgets? We have put \$1.6 billion back into the health budget—\$1.6 billion to deliver better services for South Australia. We do know, especially in relation to the Central Adelaide Local Health Network, that there is a challenge ahead.

Minister Wade in the other place has made some very good steps forward with the plan that we have put on the table to deliver better health services and to make sure that our health systems are not wasting money that can otherwise be used to deliver better services. It could be simple things, for instance, like making sure that claims are logged properly so that the federal government pays us the money that is due and payable under the National Partnership Agreement—things like making sure that instead of using 10 per cent agency nursing staff that we now get that figure well down using internal staff to deliver the same service at lower cost.

These are prudent things that government should be doing. Why? Because there is an opportunity cost when you waste money, and this government is keen and able to clamp down on that so that we can deliver the better services that we promised at the last state election—\$1.6 billion back in the health budget, and we will not be lectured to by those who left us the mess in the first place.

Now we move on to education. This budget delivers \$611 million more in 2022-23 than it did in 2018-19—

*Dr Close interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —\$611 million more.

**Mr DULUK:** Point of order: I am thoroughly enjoying the minister's speech, but the member for Port Adelaide keeps interrupting—131, if you could call her to order, please, sir.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Yes. I uphold the point of order, member for Waite. A moment, please, minister. I have already called to order two members of the opposition, who have taken my point of order on board. The deputy leader will have her opportunity in due course, and I am sure she will be heard with deference as well. Minister.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I must admit that I do not need the member for Waite's protection, but we will move forward. Apart from the \$135 million extra we put back into TAFE, and apart from the \$611 million extra we have put into education, we have put on the table \$1.3 billion to deliver infrastructure upgrades right across our school network. There is no part of South Australia that is not going to get the benefit of the infrastructure education spend that we are going to put forward over the next four or five years—infrastructure that is going to help improve the education we give our children.

Again, we know that when it comes to NAPLAN scores there is one measure that we have not done as well in the past as we should, and the Minister for Education has both eyes focused on making sure that we deliver the best education to our kids, and he has been backed by a government that is giving him the money to make sure that he can get on and do that.

What was interesting in the Leader of the Opposition's speech was that he did not give us any plan for what he would do differently. On the one hand he says, 'Don't increase fees and charges,' but on the other hand says, 'Don't increase debt.' Well, he cannot do both, unless of course he is willing to outline to the house what he is willing to cut to offset those measures. What is he willing to cut to offset those measures?

He did not give us any of that. He gave us a magic pudding answer instead of what we have done, and that is to deliver a fiscally responsible budget. I do not understand where the Leader of the Opposition has been when it comes to talking about this government's attitude to debt. Back in 2015, the then leader of the opposition, Steven Marshall, sat down with the party room and discussed our forced posture going forward in relation to fiscal responsibility.

We resolved and printed for the entire world to see in our '2036' document—three years out from the election, roughly about the time that we are now—that we would deliver surplus and balanced budgets over our government term, but that we would take a longer term approach to debt reduction, because we know that good, responsible use of debt is a great way to stimulate the economy and to build the productive infrastructure in our state.

What we did see at the time was a government that delivered seven out of 10 budget deficits, that was borrowing money to pay the wages. That is not a responsible use of debt. But a government now that delivers balanced books and a surplus means that we can spend money debt funding infrastructure and building capital assets because that is precisely what you are supposed to do. It is what households do. It is what businesses do when they want to grow and create jobs, and what this government is doing to grow and create jobs is to debt fund infrastructure to build the productive capacity in our economy.

It is responsible, and now is the perfect time for us to be undertaking this. How do we know this? Because the Reserve Bank said so, because the federal government is encouraging states to get on and do so, because other states, including Victoria and New South Wales, are doing so. We are using this time of low interest rates to deliver infrastructure to build the productive capacity in our economy, and it is the strategic direction that this budget is going in—surplus budgets, infrastructure spending to stimulate our economy.

Again, this is something where the Leader of the Opposition needs to come clean about which infrastructure projects he wants to cut and which projects he is suggesting we now should not go ahead with. I will give you this quote. The Leader of the Opposition, in relation to an announcement that Bill Shorten made in the lead-up to the last federal election, said this of Bill Shorten's \$50 million commitment to the Women's and Children's Hospital: 'Bill Shorten's commitment to invest \$50 million in a new Women's and Children's Hospital is a great opportunity and to get this important project started.'

**An honourable member:** Who said that?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** The member for Croydon on 17 April. It is about two months later and when the state government put, not \$50 million but \$550 million on the table towards the Women's and Children's Hospital, he said, 'Who commits themselves to a brand-new presumably over \$1 billion project without actually knowing what the full cost will be?' So it is okay for Bill Shorten to commit 50 million bucks but it is not okay for the state government commit 550 million bucks. I do not understand if that is not the definition of hypocrisy, but I invite the Leader of the Opposition to give me an alternative view.

What he also said today, for all those people who live in the eastern suburbs and will get the benefit of the Portrush-Magill roads intersection upgrade, was that Labor is not on board. All those people who have to drive up and down Magill Road on a daily basis know, and every heavy vehicle and road user who has to use Portrush Road on a daily basis knows, that if the Leader of the Opposition had his way he would not be delivering this project. Thank God for those people that this project is in the budget over the four-year cycle and will be delivered before the next election before the Leader of the Opposition can cut that project.

But more than that, in relation to responsible use of debt, I think we as a government have been able to demonstrate that we are willing to take the tough decisions to keep the books in balance. We have delivered a surplus now in 2018-19. We are delivering small surpluses over the forward estimates. That is in contrast to the seven out of 10 deficits that those opposite left this state. But more than that, instead of assessing ourselves on what responsible use of debt is, why don't we ask the rating agencies?

Standard & Poor's and Moody's last year put our rating back to Aa1, and this year they have also confirmed that Aa1 rating. They say that we are being responsible in the way that we use debt because we have been able to demonstrate that we are a government that will stick to the savings tasks that we have put in place for ourselves. They are the independent arbiters—who, by the way, the entire world uses—who have said that we are responsible in the way that we have delivered our infrastructure program and the way we have put our budget together.

If you look through the '2036' document, it says that we will deliver more jobs, and we have. It says that we will deliver lower costs, and we have. We will continue to do that, and there is a lot more that is going to happen for South Australians in that space. It says that we will deliver better services, and we are, by making sure that we put money into those key areas of health, education and TAFE to make sure that we are delivering the better services that South Australians want. We are doing all of that and also delivering a budget surplus.

That is what good responsible economic management looks like. It is what this government committed to doing at the last election. It is what '2036' commits us to and it is what we have delivered in last year's budget and again in this year's budget. The proof will be in the pudding as we go forward, understanding how this stimulates our economy, and I look forward to standing here in a year's time, in two years' time, as the fruits of what we have put on the table in this budget come to fruition. I look forward to those opposite realising that this is what stimulates economies—good economic management from Liberal governments that helps to stimulate economies. The way that we know that is that it is precisely the formula that centre-right governments have used right across the Southern Hemisphere—if you look at Tasmania, if you look at New South Wales, if you look at New Zealand.

This is the formula that works—by not wasting money and making sure that you keep the books tight but not being scared to grow and stimulate the economy by building productive infrastructure. This is a strategy. It is a long-term plan that is going to see economic prosperity come back to South Australia.

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:50):** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I am sure I look forward to your protection in the way you gave protection to the minister.

This budget is an odd mix of policy. I can reflect on it only in the context of the way that the people I represent in this place, Port Adelaide, will feel about this budget and about the experience they have had in the last year. Their experience is that they are seeing in the paper today a slash in the number of jobs in the health department.

They have seen a decline in the funding for mental health associated with the bringing on of the NDIS but in the face of the absolute knowledge that there will be people who will be caught between the two who will now not have services that they had previously. They see and they will come to understand the level of cuts being visited upon the education department and the innovation and skills department. They have already seen over the last year the decline in public transport for our area.

For our area, we are not seeing a growth in the kilometres being offered. We are seeing a decline, where people with disabilities and older, frail people, people who cannot afford to run a car, are now being deprived of bus services that previously allowed them to go shopping, to go volunteering, to visit family and to have family visit them. They are losing their services. We see in the budget papers no mention at all of the Port rail spur that had been committed to by the previous government and that the current government said they would maintain.

They very recently had a day in Port Adelaide, with maps and plans of when it would all be rolled out. It is not in there. I think it has gone, and I think it has gone because this government does not care about people who do not vote Liberal and might never vote Liberal. This government has demonstrated that if you happen to live in suburbs that belong to Liberal seats you can be excised from the high school zone overnight. This government operates in a way that is politically motivated, and that is not the mark of a good government. That is not the mark of a government that understands that it governs for all.

I have particular responsibilities and very great honour for both education and the environment and water. I regard those as being connected in the sense that they are both profoundly about the future. They are obviously about the future in terms of the way in which we educate our young people and prepare them for their future—a complex future. However, the environment and water are also part of our future because we are seeing them falling apart in front of our eyes through a combination of the biodiversity crisis and looming climate change, where we are seeing the absolute urgency of doing things differently, that more of the same will be a catastrophe for our young people.

And what do we see? There is an overarching, threefold theme that I see across both those portfolios. One is that the point is constantly missed. What matters is not paid attention to. Distractions of trivialities are focused on. The second overarching theme I see is a blind obedience to Canberra when the Coalition is in government. Whatever they say is appropriate, 'Fine, we'll sign up to that. That'll be absolutely terrific for South Australia,' when it patently is not. The third element of the overarching theme is in this budget where we are seeing serious cuts to the basics in both those portfolio areas. So let's have a look.

Education I thought was shaping up to be characterised simply by a distraction about where 12 year olds go to school. Fine, they won the election on the basis, in part, by saying that would happen. Go ahead. It is not the biggest issue in education. There is absolutely no evidence that it makes any difference where 12 year olds go to school but, fine. It is a distraction. It is not actually what matters. It is not going to make a difference to PISA results, as the leader was talking about. It is not going to make a difference to the percentage of students who graduate; in fact, possibly with evidence from Western Australia, it will do harm to that.

While a well-balanced student who has no disability and who is from a family that is aspirational and believes in education is just as fine in secondary school as in primary school when they are 12, disadvantaged students tend to disengage more quickly from school when they go into a secondary setting at the age of 12 than when they go a little bit later. It puts off for a year that teenage impulse to disengage when they are already from a disadvantaged background. My very deep fear is that we will actually see a diminution in the number of students who finish high school, rather than the increase we desperately need.

We have also seen (and in some ways it is very flattering) a government that has decided that what we were doing in education was pretty good otherwise. Everything that I announced previously as the minister has been continued: languages, policy, music strategy, high-speed internet, which was not simply an election promise as has been said many times in this chamber, but a government commitment provisioned within the education department—in fact, a little bit more

provision than the minister has announced, and we might find out in estimates what happened to the missing money.

They were ideas which were based on evidence, based on thoughtful policy, based on research and which this government has continued. Although disappointing perhaps, and showing a lack of imagination in coming to grips with the constantly changing environment we have in education, it was nonetheless pleasing to see that things were not being discontinued. But then what do we have? First of all, we have an agreement with the federal government that Gonski is over. What does Gonski mean? It means that students who are more disadvantaged get more funding. That is what it means.

This government was one of the first to sign up to the federal government's new approach, where they made sure that private schools were looked after and they betrayed public schools—they betrayed them. They will never get to 100 per cent of the school resourcing standard that they ought to have, whereas already all the private schools are over 100 per cent. How is that acceptable? How does a government say, 'That's fine, we don't mind about that'? They were talking about the importance of improving the NAPLAN and they are not paying attention to the most disadvantaged students.

What we also see in this budget, which surprised me—I did not anticipate this; I thought that the minister was a more powerful minister around the cabinet table—is \$50 million in cuts, \$50 million out of the education department. What is that going to look like? What could it look like? What does the department do that is not done directly in schools that is protected by the federal agreement and always has been protected? What is up for grabs? Well, early childhood could be; that is not protected. Will preschool hours be on the table? Family day-care quality assurance—and, my goodness, we need to make sure that that family day care has good quality assurance—will that go? Will that be cut? Will infrastructure support for schools go?

What about the IT support the department provided, admittedly not brilliantly in the recent NAPLAN Online? There were a few incidents that have made NAPLAN Online pretty much a laughing stock amongst anyone who cares about education, who understands what matters in education, but it might get even worse if you slash the IT department to find the \$50 million. What about the support for learning and teaching that happens in schools that is run out of head office? Will that be protected? Are you going to have to look for the \$50 million elsewhere, or is that going to be on the table? In regard to Aboriginal education, a strategy is being prepared right now inside the department. What is going to happen to that?

What about support for principals that HR provides, not only placing teachers in schools but also providing support when the teachers are not performing well? We put extra resources in so that the principals do not have to do all the laborious paperwork and HR processes so that they can deal with poor performance. Is that going to be slashed? How else is the \$50 million going to be found? What about the speech therapists, the behaviour coaches, the attendance officers also attached to head office? I do not believe that they are protected by the agreement with the federal government. Are they going to be cut? Is that going to disappear?

I have noticed that anything that is not strictly limited to the definition of education is being moved out of the department at a rate of knots. Child wellbeing practitioners are being assigned to another department. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.*

#### *Petitions*

### **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.

### TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale):** Presented a petition signed by 58 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to reverse its decision to discontinue the South Australian Transport Subsidy Scheme from 31 December 2019, and to continue the scheme indefinitely akin to other Australian jurisdictions, or engage with the disability sector in helping to create a new scheme enabling South Australians the transport freedom and flexibility they deserve.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

### ANSWERS TABLED

**The SPEAKER:** I direct that the written answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

### PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Independent Commissioner Against Corruption South Australia—The Trusted Insider, An Examination of Issues from Two ICAC Investigations Report

By the Minister for Energy and Mining (Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan)—

Review of the performance of South Australian health systems, the health of South Australians and changes in health outcomes over the reporting period 2015-18—SA Health's formal response to the Health Performance Council's four-yearly review Report June 2019

Social Development Committee: Review of the operation of the Motor Vehicle Accidents (Lifetime Support Scheme) Act 2013—Response from the Government of South Australia Report June 2019

By the Minister for Child Protection (Hon. R. Sanderson)—

South Australian Aboriginal Children and Young People in Care and/or Detention—Snapshot from the Report on Government Services 2019 Report

*Question Time*

### STATE BUDGET ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:05):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the house how much taxpayer funding is being used on advertising—

**The Hon. S.S. Marshall:** Sorry, could you say that again?

**The SPEAKER:** Start from the beginning.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Sure. It's not a tricky one. Can the Premier advise the house how much taxpayer funding is being used on advertising the 2019-20 state budget?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:05):** I don't have that number at hand. I am happy to get an answer and come back to the house, but I can say that it is a fraction of any expenditures incurred over the last decade or more.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Ramsay and the Deputy Premier are called to order.



**STATE BUDGET ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:06):** My question is to the Premier. Will the new advertising campaign for his budget tell South Australians how much interest the budget forecasts will be paid on the state government's \$21 billion debt?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:06):** I think what the advertising is doing—the limited, modest advertising that we are doing—is promoting the various elements of the budget, the expenditure being made to build productive infrastructure in South Australia and the investments being made in health and education facilities, which the Leader of the Opposition, based upon his budget reply speech today, would stop if he got into government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** He has made it very clear to the parliament today that he does not believe that the South Australian government should be going into any more debt. In fact, he has been railing against increased debt in South Australia. What he failed to do in his budget reply speech, though, was point out all those capital projects, those important capital projects that we have outlined, that he would cut. We are looking forward to him standing up and making it clear to the people of South Australia which hospital projects he would stop—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —which projects in country South Australia, important road projects, he would stop and what he will do—

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

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Debate, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The point of order from the Father of the House is for debate. I believe that the question was about whether an advertising program by the state government will tell South Australians how much interest is in the budget. That is how I caught it. I have allowed the Premier some latitude, and he is finished. Before I call the Leader of the Opposition, I call to order the following members: the member for Badcoe and the leader, and the member for Ramsay is warned.

**STATE BUDGET ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07):** My question is to the Premier. Will the new advertising campaign for the Premier's budget include the additional \$40 million per year land tax announcement?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:08):** I don't have details of the advertising campaign with me today. What I will do, though—I think this is important—is compare what we are spending with what those opposite have spent in recent years with their taxpayer-funded advertising campaigns, and I will provide that. I think that is an important comparison that the people of South Australia would be extraordinarily interested in.

**STATE BUDGET ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN**

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:08):** My question is to the Premier. Will the new advertising campaign for the budget explain why South Australian households are being slugged more than \$353 million in higher fees and charges?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:08):** As I said, I don't have the details of the advertising campaign with me here in the parliament, but we are proud of the budget. It's a responsible budget. Most importantly, it is a budget focused on building our state. There is a massive \$11.9 billion investment in infrastructure and key projects right across the state that all South Australians will benefit from.

We think that this is an important time to be investing, while interest rates in South Australia are so low. I again acknowledge the comments that were made in this parliament earlier today, when

the Leader of the Opposition made it very clear that he does not believe that we should be going into further debt in South Australia.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Point of order, sir: debate. The Premier was debating in his answer.

**The SPEAKER:** I have the point of order. It was about \$353 million in fees and charges. I think the Premier is speaking about the budget, but he could come back to be a bit more specific; I will listen carefully. Premier.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** As I was saying, our education campaign for the people of South Australia is really focused on the elements which are going to benefit the people of this state: further investment in productive infrastructure that we have spoken about for a long period of time and investments that we are making in the environment. I note that those opposite are against these programs. In fact, they have been against all of the—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order: that is clearly debate, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes. The Premier has finished his answer.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** I have the pleasure of welcoming today to parliament year 6 students from St Anthony's school, who are guests of the member for Badcoe, and also students from Waldorf School, Mount Barker, who are in the gallery and who are guests of the member for Kavel and the member for Heysen.

#### *Question Time*

#### **REGIONAL SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:10):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house about the government's commitment to build our regions?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:10):** Yes, I can. I can very proudly say that this budget has put the spotlight on the regions of South Australia and primary industries like never before. We have seen history-making in our budget. The Marshall Liberal government is committed to building our regions and, as the Premier has just said—

*Mr Hughes interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** —proudly, a critical part of the growth is through the primary industries sector, and our regions are part of the state's economic drivers. The budget delivers on primary industries and invests significantly in the livestock sector, and I just want to touch on where the livestock sector is going to benefit.

We know that the \$7.5 million red meat strategy is a significant game changer for the livestock sector, which has been under severe pressure to grow over the last couple of years, particularly with the drought. What we have seen is that \$7.5 million with respect to not only the red meat but also the wool program will provide growth and greater transparency and traceability in the sector. Through this program, we will see voluntary electronic tag reading introduction, enhancing the One Biosecurity program and building skills in farm management.

The funding is a vote of confidence in the livestock sector to produce consistent year-round supply of premium beef, sheep and wool to enable greater adoption and research. We have also seen why we have put in \$10 million as a collaboration. It is an absolute game changer for the pastoralists of South Australia. We have seen a \$25 million coming together. The commonwealth, the state government and industry are coming together to rebuild a 100-year-old piece of

infrastructure—and I commend the foresight not only from this side of the house—a piece of generational infrastructure that has been long ignored.

I have talked in this place about the pastoralists losing large numbers of sheep. It has been estimated that more than 20,000 lambs were lost this year. It is also unknown exactly how many calves have been lost and how much native wildlife has been taken by the wild dogs. The South Australian government has put \$10 million on the table in collaboration for a \$25 million rebuild of a 100-year-old piece of infrastructure.

As we know, 1,600 kilometres of that fence will be rebuilt. It is a 2,150 kilometre fence. It is the longest, largest piece of fence infrastructure in the world, and we have seen right to making sure that we upgrade that. It is also looking at installing confidence into our primary sector. It is looking at how the budget is going to deliver vital infrastructure and road upgrades for our primary industries and the transport sector.

We are putting \$14 million into not only the external investment around the TFI project at Murray Bridge but also infrastructure down at Naracoorte around the Teys brothers processing plant, and we have also put money towards the Dublin saleyards—\$11 million for access roads into those saleyards. We have also put money into bridge upgrades to enable road trains to be a part of the transport network.

Biosecurity is also at the forefront. We have invested an additional \$5 million to help protect South Australia's horticulture industry. We know that fruit fly outbreaks have been one of the bugbears within the sector, but we have also now put money into the citrus canker fight. That is one of the world's most invasive diseases in horticulture. South Australia produces some of the best fruit and best produce known in this country. This government is putting support there. It's putting infrastructure in place, it's putting biosecurity in place and it's putting all the measures that primary producers expect of a good government to support them, because they support us.

#### REGIONAL SOUTH AUSTRALIA

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:14):** Supplementary question for the minister: how many regional vehicle owners will be impacted by the removal of the outer area registration concessions?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order: a supplementary question must actually pertain to the advice given in the original answer, and the member for Lee's question is not a supplementary question.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** The minister's answer was talking about initiatives in the budget for regional South Australia.

**The SPEAKER:** One moment, member for Lee. The member for Kaurana and the member for Reynell are warned. The member for Lee has a point of order on the point of order, which is what?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** The minister's answer canvassed matters in the budget affecting regional South Australia. It's clearly germane to the response that the minister gave.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Lee, be seated. I am going to allow the minister an opportunity to respond.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:15):** That is a good question. It is out of order, but it is a good question, and what I would say is—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The minister can leave for half an hour under 137A. Thank you. The minister can leave for half an hour.

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** If I hear another word on my left, members will also be leaving.

**Mr Odenwalder:** How embarrassing.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Elizabeth, you can follow for half an hour.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Does the member for Lee have another question?

#### **STATE BUDGET ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN**

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:16):** I do, Mr Speaker. Thank you very much. My question is to the Premier. Will the new advertising campaign for the budget include the additional 90 million motorists who are being charged in administration fees?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:16):** I don't have that information, but I am happy to come back to the house. It is a promotion of elements of the budget. It points people to the website, which provides more information to the people of South Australia. We think it's important to tell them about the key elements of our investment to grow and build the size of our economy here in South Australia, and to create more jobs. I have now information that I can provide to the house. I have been sent some information on the former government's advertising campaign in the lead-up to the last election.

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

**The SPEAKER:** There is a point of order. Premier, please be seated for one moment.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** The Premier is intent on debating in his answer, and I ask that you save him from himself.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Lee, you can leave for half an hour for the impromptu speech. I have been quite open to your points of order that have some merit in them, but that one is a little bit over the mark. Premier, please come back to the substance of the question.

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Thank you very much, sir. The question was about a particular element that was covered off in the budget and whether it will be considered as part of the education campaign that the government is currently running. As I have given in my previous answers, I will come back to the house with more information regarding that education campaign. I was going to provide the house with some information about the cost that was incurred by the previous government. I am happy to leave that out if they don't want to hear it because it seems to me that they don't want to hear it, but I am sure it will come out anyway.

#### **STATE BUDGET ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18):** My question is to the Premier. Will the advertising campaign for his budget include information regarding the additional \$33 million on higher fees for hospital car parking?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:18):** I refer the member to my previous answer.

#### **STATE BUDGET ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18):** My question is to the Premier. Will the new advertising campaign for the budget include the additional \$89 million he is raising for the rubbish tax?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:18):** I refer the Leader of the Opposition to my previous answer.

**COMMUNITY SAFETY**

**Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:18):** My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister inform the house how the Marshall Liberal government is building safer communities?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:18):** I thank the member for Elder for her question and her interest in making sure we do what we can to keep our community safe.

What a week it has been—a very, very good week. The Marshall Liberal government has been out there talking about what we are doing to build a better South Australia and what we are doing to build a more secure and safe South Australia. In the budget papers people will have seen that the Marshall Liberal government is investing \$52 million into the security and safety of South Australia. We know that when those opposite were on the government benches they didn't care for security and safety here in South Australia, but over on this side of the parliament—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** —we are investing 50 per cent—

**Ms COOK:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, be seated for one moment.

**Ms COOK:** This is debate, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** I will listen carefully. I have given the minister an opportunity to provide some preamble. I ask him to come back to the substance of the question.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I could refer to the \$80 million of cuts in the mid-year financial review before they left government, but I won't go into that. I will talk more about the \$52 million that we are injecting into the safety and security of South Australians through our police.

Firstly, \$16.5 million into the upgrade of SAPOL's communications centre is for a very important piece of work. We saw a report through the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure that highlighted the primary concerns around the communications centre and its vulnerability in the case of a significant earthquake. This report stems back to the Burns review in 2016. We know that the previous government had a look at this but did not take any action. On this side, we are taking action.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** We are taking action and we are making sure that our state is secure. We are investing in the communications centre on Carrington Street because it is the state's primary communication and emergency coordination centre. The member for Kaurua asked about the CFS and SES headquarters. He didn't check last year's budget paper because it was in last year's budget papers. He can't even read the budget papers from last year—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —but we are committing to that as well, he will be happy to know. We are delivering for police and we are delivering for emergency services as well.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, be seated for one moment.

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

**The SPEAKER:** In fairness to the minister, there are interjections. I ask the minister to not respond to interjections, and I ask the member for Kaurna to cease the interjections. Thank you, member for West Torrens. Come back to the substance of the question.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I can turn now my attention to the \$9.4 million we are injecting into the rapid response capability, another capability to keep South Australians safe. We are delivering for this state. The rapid response capability is that middle tier of protection. Most other states have it. We haven't had it here in South Australia. We have the STAR Group at the top, the police on the beat and the front-line police at the bottom. In the middle now, we have this rapid response capability, all invested for in this budget. We are building South Australia's security, and we are proud to be doing that.

We also have \$7.7 million outlined for the expiation notice branch system. This is a back-end system that the previous government had left to run to wrack and ruin. The police came to us and said it was something that was very much in danger of falling over, so we have invested in this to provide greater efficiencies, more functionality and new technologies in the back end of the network.

But there is more. For front-line policing, there is \$18.6 million for District Policing model stage 2. We rolled out stage 1. The cuts I talked about from the other side before they left government eliminated stage 2. We put the money back in so we can deliver stage 2. Stage 2 will make sure there are more police out there on the front line, proactively policing, checking our communities and making sure people are safe. That is what we are here to deliver.

We are making sure that we are doing all we can to keep our communities as safe as possible. District Policing model 2 will dovetail into District Policing model 1. The first part was rolled out. The second part allows police, as I said, to be more proactive, to have more vehicles on the street and to make sure there is a greater presence of police out there protecting South Australians. Also, on the other side, I know there have been some numbers peddled about policing that have been incorrect—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order: the moment he references the opposition, it's debate, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** I have the point of order from the member for West Torrens. I will allow some compare and contrast—not a lot but some—but I will be listening to make sure that the minister doesn't overstep the mark.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I appreciate your indulgence because I do want to talk about the actual figures, not the ones that have been peddled out in the media. When it comes to crimes against a person, the great news is that our policies are working and they have actually dropped. We will continue to do all we can to make sure that we keep protecting South Australians and make sure they are as safe as possible.

It's all part of our state government's commitment to build South Australia but also to build the security of our state. To be injecting \$52 million into police, into the security of South Australia, I think is a really great thing. We are doing everything we can on this side of the house to keep our constituents as safe as possible right across the state and to make sure that we are protecting South Australians.

#### STATE BUDGET ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24):** My question is to the Premier. Will the new advertising campaign for your state budget include the \$2.8 million extra being raised from Metrocards?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:24):** As I have previously stated, the government is running a very modest education campaign. This is not a new practice. In fact, I am happy to provide the details, which I don't have here with me today. I am happy to provide the details of the content and also the cost, especially in comparison with previous years.

What the website does is it provides all of the information with regard to the budget. People are directed to the budget website; it puts all of the details with regard to the 2019 budget up online

so that people can scrutinise it and so all those details that the Leader of the Opposition is asking about are covered off in that education campaign. I must say that we are very pleased, as the prudent financial managers that we are on this side of the house, that we are doing it—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —at literally a fraction of the cost that the previous government wasted on their very exorbitant advertising campaigns.

#### STATE BUDGET ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25):** My question is to the Premier. Will the new advertising campaign for the state budget include information around the additional \$4.4 million being raised through scrapping the two-section public transport fare?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:25):** I can only direct the Leader of the Opposition back to my previous answer. I don't know whether he's got time to send a message up to the dream factory on the second floor to get Kevin Naughton to send down some more questions, but the reality is that I do not have the content of the entire advertising campaign with me. I think I have given a fulsome explanation of what I do know.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I will come back to the house with more details, but perhaps if he had a friend on that side they could text up to the dream factory between questions and help him out.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hurtle Vale is called to order.

#### STATE BUDGET ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:26):** My question is to the Premier. Who approved the Premier's budget advertising campaign?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:26):** The budget, of course, is something which is essentially signed off by the entire cabinet.

#### STATE BUDGET ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:26):** My question is to the Premier. Will the new advertising campaign, presumably signed off by the entire cabinet, include \$3 million being raised by the police events tax?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:26):** I have nothing further to add than the contribution I have already made on this topic.

#### ENTREPRENEURIAL LEARNING STRATEGY

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:27):** My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house on the delivery of the government's Entrepreneurial Learning Strategy?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:27):** I am very pleased to receive this question from the member for Heysen because I think it demonstrates that the government is not only seeking to build infrastructure in this year's budget in the work that we have been doing for some time but also build the capabilities and the growth in educational opportunities for our school students in the South Australian education system.

The member for Heysen is particularly interested, I am aware, in the Entrepreneurial Learning Strategy as Heathfield High School in the member's electorate is one of the 500 entrepreneurial specialist schools that were announced since this government introduced our entrepreneurial learning strategy, along with Seaton High School, Murray Bridge High School, Banksia Park International High School and Mount Gambier High School. Those schools are doing great work in terms of some of the early work in delivering and preparing the strategy, which will of course expand in the coming years.

Work has started on the development of the entrepreneurial learning curriculum and pedagogy resources, and specialist programs will be available in those schools from 2020. The five schools have all recruited their specialist staff and their assistant principals. Their expert teaching staff are in place, and those staff will champion, model and deliver entrepreneurial learning and teaching in their respective schools and also help build the capacity of schools in their secondary alliances and partnerships. Of course, as we develop those resources further, that work will spread out across the state.

Those specialist schools are also engaging with the Office of the South Australian Chief Entrepreneur. Indeed, last Friday I was pleased to go to the Lot Fourteen innovation hub to meet with the principals and the leaders in this area who were coming together with departmental leaders for a meeting where we talked about strategic planning for the Entrepreneurial Learning Strategy. It was an opportunity for each of the schools to share what they were doing locally in their areas and their visions that they were building locally so that we can work on a shared vision that will cross the overarching vision for entrepreneurial education across South Australia.

The shared vision describes how all South Australian schools can support young people to develop an entrepreneurial mindset through innovative educational approaches and collaboration between education, industry and potentially the tertiary sector.

Social enterprise is a critically important part of this as well. Whether young people are looking to start their own business or they are looking to work in a large organisation, start a social enterprise, get involved in society, there is none of these that an entrepreneurial mindset is not relevant for.

The member for Heysen will be particularly interested to learn about some of the specific work that is already going on at Heathfield High School. As part of a program they have called Design It, Engineer It and Pitch It, Heathfield High is working with Jurlique to give students the opportunity to help this particular South Australian business to design, develop and market what could be its next big-selling product.

Students with skills in art or design or engineering or chemistry all take on different roles in marketing or design, product development and finance. They work collaboratively with Jurlique, visiting the Jurlique farm and production facilities to see firsthand how the business operates, and eventually pitch their final projects to experts from Jurlique. They also have a similar partnership with Beerenberg that is working really well, working on a creative marketing plan for Beerenberg products.

They have also been involved in the Shark Tank eSchool eChallenge, a joint initiative with the University of Adelaide, Sony and MIE Lab, teaching students to think creatively to develop solutions to real-world problems. It is great work, and Heathfield High was particularly successful in that. They are also involved in the Schools Cyber Security Challenge, a great initiative where students undertake specific work in this area of fantastic job opportunities in the years ahead.

We are really excited about the Entrepreneurial Learning Strategy, and I look forward to continuing to provide more information about what it is and how it works as it is rolled out.

#### **STATE BUDGET ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:31):** My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier's new advertising campaign on the state budget include information regarding the \$6.8 million in new taxes on the state's mining industry?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:31):** I am going to refer the specifics of that question to the previous answers I have provided, but I have further information to provide to the house. The Leader of the Opposition is constantly asking questions about and is interested in the advertising budget, so I asked my office—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —to do a quick comparison of the first nine months of this year compared with the same period when the Labor Party was last in office.



**Mr Hughes:** That was not the question.

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I have been advised that there is actually a \$7.5 million reduction under this government compared to those opposite. That is important for the budget—

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

**The SPEAKER:** One moment, Premier; please be seated. The point of order is for debate—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Debate, sir. The question wasn't about—

**The SPEAKER:** You have asked about an advertising campaign. The Premier is talking about the advertising campaign and relating it to the former government. However, I agree that the \$6.8 million context has not come up yet, but I will be listening carefully to ensure that he returns to the substance of the question.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I don't have details of this specific advertising campaign as it relates to the element the Leader of the Opposition asked about, but there is a \$7.5 million reduction in advertising expenditure if we take a comparable period, the last nine months versus the last nine months of the previous government. That is important because it means that we as a government can put that \$7.5 million saving in advertising into important services for the people of South Australia.

**Mr Malinauskas:** To pay off the \$20 billion debt.

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is warned.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I think everybody appreciates that there has been a \$2.3 billion writedown in revenue coming into the state coffers. This is a particularly tough period for our state, and that is why it is important that when we spend money we spend it in a prudent way, and a \$7.5 million saving to the budget in terms of advertising expenditure, Liberal versus Labor, is a very important saving to make.

#### STATE BUDGET ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:33):** My question is to the Premier. Will the government's new advertising campaign on the state budget include information regarding the fee increase to ambulances so that the callout fee is now over \$1,000?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:33):** I refer the Leader of the Opposition to my previous answer.

#### SCIENCE AND INNOVATION

**Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:34):** My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Can the minister please update the house on how the Marshall government is supporting science and innovation?

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (14:34):** Yes, I can, and I thank the member for Morphett for his very strong interest in innovation. The Marshall government is growing science and innovation across the state. Yesterday, I attended an innovation event at Lot Fourteen. Do you remember Lot Fourteen, sir? That was the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site that the former government wanted to turn into a building site for apartments.

It was delivered in partnership by the Department for Innovation and Skills, and the commonwealth Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. It was terrific to meet the Chief Innovation Officer and Chief Scientist, Dr Sarah Pearson, who was the keynote speaker. She was also part of the panel discussion, together with Professor Caroline McMillen, the Chief Scientist of South Australia, and Dr Michelle Perugini, the CEO and founder of Presagen.

The event is part of the Marshall Liberal government's drive to connect the business community, start-ups, researchers and students. The government has set an ambitious growth agenda for the South Australian economy, and our economy will grow through commercialising new ideas and discoveries, supporting established and evolving industries, and maximising the value of

science, research and design. We are making South Australia the leading centre for future industries and entrepreneurship. As we heard from the education minister earlier, we are starting in our schools and continuing that through the business sector.

To help us do this, last year we established the \$28 million Research, Commercialisation and Startup Fund. Industries like space, defence, biotech, health, and the digital and creative industries, are driving innovation and economic growth, creating new knowledge-intensive jobs. Australia's space economy is expected to triple to \$12 billion and create 20,000 jobs over the next decade. Adelaide, of course, has been chosen as the site for the Australian Space Agency and the SmartSat Cooperative Research Centre.

Over the next 40 years, South Australia will be home to the largest share of Australia's defence spend. Major defence companies from around the globe are already operating in South Australia and many local manufacturers have transitioned into the defence industry. Adelaide's rapidly expanding biomedical precinct is home to some of the best minds on the planet who are at work on groundbreaking research.

That's why this government is committed to securing funding for R&D initiatives such as the \$19.6 million outlined in this week's state budget. This will support six South Australian based National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy facilities. This investment will leverage another \$47 million from the federal government and more than \$15 million from the state's research institutions. The Marshall Liberal government is creating an environment that nurtures and encourages scientists and entrepreneurs to take risks and create jobs now and for the future.

#### STATE BUDGET ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:37):** My question is to the Premier. Will the government's new advertising campaign for the state budget include information regarding the nearly \$10 million to be raised through scrapping the outer areas motor registration concessions?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:37):** I refer the Leader of the Opposition to my previous answers on this line of questioning.

#### STATE BUDGET ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:37):** My question is to the Premier. Will the new advertising campaign for the state budget include information regarding the \$10 million cut to the Critical Skills Fund?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:38):** I refer the Leader of the Opposition to my previous answers on this line of questioning.

#### STATE BUDGET ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:38):** My question is to the Premier. Will the government's new advertising campaign for the budget include information regarding the \$3.6 million cut to the victims support grant?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:38):** I refer the Leader of the Opposition to my previous answers.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader and the Deputy Premier are both called to order.

#### INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING

**Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:38):** My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister update the house on the Marshall government's \$11.9 million general infrastructure spend over the next four years?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:38):** I can update the house about all the extremely worthy projects that this government has taken the responsible course of action on in terms of funding via

debt that we are able to finance at extremely low levels. They are very worthy projects and I think it would be very good, as we list through them, for those opposite to let us know which ones they don't support, which projects they don't consider should be going ahead and would be going ahead if they were on the treasury bench.

We have talked a lot over the course of this week and the last few weeks in relation to our spend on road infrastructure but, of the \$11.9 billion we are going to spend over the next four years, only \$3.2 billion is actually road infrastructure. That is certainly welcome news for the civil construction area, but for the commercial construction area there is a heap of good news that we need to actually work with them on to deliver.

There is \$1.8 billion worth of water and sewerage infrastructure, including, and probably most excitingly, the \$390 million that the Minister for Environment is looking after to install solar PV generation and storage solutions right across South Australia to allow SA Water to achieve zero net electricity costs from 2020. We then move across to health facilities at \$1½ billion. Whether that is \$550 million towards the cost of the Women's and Children's Hospital—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** I find it quite interesting—

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

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —that when Bill Shorten commits \$50 million towards the Women's and Children's that's okay, that is welcomed, but when we commit \$550 million towards the Women's and Children's Hospital that's not so welcomed.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** But that's okay. I wouldn't let—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —contradicted fact get in the way of trying to make a cheap political argument. What is also interesting is—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —that there have been times in the recent past when projects have been announced and the full costs of those projects have spanned beyond the forward estimates. Sometimes, with a project like the north-south corridor, because it is going to take longer than four years to build, you can't put money into a budget for a time frame that is beyond the four years.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** But there is a project that I am glad to say has been fully funded now in this year's budget that, when it was first announced, almost all the money projected—in fact, if not all the money—was outside the forward estimates, and that is the duplication of South Road, the first 10-kilometre section of that duplication—\$305 million that, when it was announced, wasn't in the budget but progressively came—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order: first, the question was about \$11.9 million, not billion; second, the minister is debating an answer about budgets five budgets ago.

**The SPEAKER:** Sorry, what was the point?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Debate, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** That was, respectfully, not your most articulate point of order. I have the question. I do respectfully ask the minister to come back to the substance of the question.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** The \$305 million is part of the \$11.9 billion spend that we have over the next four years. Sometimes, not every post is made a winner. In extension of the \$550 million for the Women's and Children's Hospital, there is also \$264 million for The Queen Liz, \$97 million for the Modbury Hospital upgrade that I know the member for Newland and the member for King have been long championing, and here for regional MPs is \$140 million towards—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —spending money on vital sustainment works to upgrade the amenity of our regional hospitals, a backlog in regional hospital maintenance that has been left sitting there for a generation, that now we are getting on and actually delivering.

**Mr Hughes:** Most of it was delivered under Labor.

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

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** There is also the \$1.4 billion that we are spending on school infrastructure—\$1.4 billion that we are spending on school infrastructure—including \$361 million to build three new schools across the state, including in the member for Giles' electorate, where this government is delivering—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —a new high school for Whyalla. Again, I am sure the people of Whyalla are grateful, if not their elected representative in this place. We are spending \$11.9 billion on infrastructure, responsibly using debt to grow the productive capacity of our state. I challenge those who disagree with that spending to articulate what they would cut—

**The SPEAKER:** The minister's time has expired.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —because they refuse to acknowledge that spending.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you. The member for Playford is warned and the member for Ramsay is warned for a second and final time. The deputy leader.

#### STATE BUDGET ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:43):** My question is to the Premier. Will the new advertising campaign for his budget include the \$780,000 cut to the domestic violence court assistance scheme?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:43):** I refer the deputy leader to the answers that I have already provided to the house, to the Leader of the Opposition, regarding the content of the education campaign.

#### HEALTH BUDGET

**Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (14:43):** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier accept responsibility for the health budget overspend of \$258 million this financial year?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:44):** We are very proud to see in our budget a \$1.6 billion increase since we came to government in the health budget in South Australia. We are investing in creating the very best health system that we possibly can in South Australia; we believe the people of South Australia deserve it. What we saw under the previous government, of course, was their absolutely horrendous and failed Transforming Health, which removed services and cut back services at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Modbury Hospital, Noarlunga Hospital and closed the Repat hospital and basically left us with a completely inadequate health system in South Australia.

By contrast, what we see in the budget that is being presented is a massive investment into capital both in terms of addressing some of the urgent and overdue components of Country Health

maintenance programs and also massive investments into The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Repat hospital and Modbury Hospital. We are very pleased with the capital investment that we have made.

In terms of any budget overspend, I note that in this current financial year there is an overspend of around \$95 million, and I accept that that is unacceptable. But can I make the point to the house that: we are working through the basket case of a health system that we inherited from those opposite. I note that the member for Kaurana, who is asking this question, was the previous adviser to the minister, the architect for Transforming Health. The Leader of the Opposition, who was the—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Wasn't Hill the architect of Transforming Health? This is one of the things: nobody wants to take responsibility.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** It was somebody else.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** The member Kaurana wants to deny that he ever advised the previous minister for health, the Hon. John Hill, who was, of course, the architect of Transforming Health. Now he wants to distance himself: 'Nothing to do with me.' It was such a failed program that he would love to forget about it.

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

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** The question was about the \$95 million overspend this financial year.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** There are elements of SA Health that still need to be brought back into budget control. The primary areas that need to be addressed are the overspend in the Central Adelaide Local Health Network and SA Pathology and, of course, Medical Imaging. I am happy to update the house and let them know that, in terms of South Australian Medical Imaging, we believe that this is now back in control.

We are very pleased with the progress that has been made to bring this component of SA Health back into alignment. We have a program of works with regard to SA Pathology, and we are hoping that they are going to also be able to bring themselves back into alignment with the report that was provided to the government earlier this year.

With regard to the Central Adelaide Local Health Network, we are encouraged. Progress is being made. I think I have already updated the house on some of the progress that is being made. If we look at what we have inherited from those opposite, I think it is pretty clear that it was out of control in terms of cost and also in terms of performance.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** It was running about 30 per cent above the National Efficient Price. In the six months to the end of last year—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, Leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —that came down to 21 per cent. It's still well above where it should be, but we believe we have the controls and the personnel and the culture in place to make sure that we can return this budget to being in a balanced situation.

*Mr Picton interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Kaurana is warned. I will give him one more question.

#### HEALTH BUDGET

**Mr PICTON (Kaurana) (14:48):** My question is to the Premier. How will the government keep the health budget frozen for the next three years despite increasing demand for services?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:48):** Far from keeping it frozen, what we have done is invested an additional \$1.6 billion into the health budget in South Australia. If we didn't do that and the previous government's health budget—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —was in place, I think we would have put lives at risk in South Australia. By contrast, what we have done is a massive investment—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —\$1.6 billion back into the health system to give it a realistic budget. Let me tell you what the previous government did.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order: debate, sir, whenever you reference what the previous government did.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I have the point of order. I am trying to be consistent here. I will allow the Premier some compare and contrast but only to a level, and if it does deviate into debate I will pull him up. Premier.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I think that the \$1.6 billion reinvestment that we have made into the health system will give it a sustainable budget going forward. We are not pretending that all issues in the health system have been solved. There are still very significant issues that we inherited from those opposite, but we are happy to work through those in a controlled way.

If we take, for example, the work that has recently been done at the Central Adelaide Local Health Network, there has been progress. I will outline a couple of those areas for the house. For example, we have reduced the use of agency nursing within the Central Adelaide Local Health Network by 90 per cent. This is an improvement to the bottom line because we know that the cost of agency nurses is actually 40 per cent higher than the cost of permanent staff within the department. The good news is that it is also very good from a clinical perspective because we have continuity of care for patients.

Moreover, it creates more jobs within the Central Adelaide Local Health Network, rather than pushing them out to the private sector. So it is a big win in terms of the budget, a big win in terms of continuity of care and a big win for permanent nurses within the Central Adelaide Local Health Network. They are just a few of the examples that we are putting into place to drive a better, more sustainable budget outcome in terms of health and, most importantly, a better health system for the people of our state.

#### MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:50):** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister inform the house of recent announcements that demonstrate progress towards the full implementation of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:50):** I thank the member for Hammond for his question.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Cheltenham is called to order.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** It is always good to be able to update the house on the very successful progress being made towards the fulfilment of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan because this is good news for South Australia. It is good news for this government and very bad news for the opposition, of course, because they don't want good news for our environment. They don't want good news for the river. They want to continue that same pattern of screaming from the sidelines and causing chaos—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for West Torrens is called to order.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —in terms of federal, state and intrastate relations. What we have been able to see is progress that has flowed (excuse the pun) from the decisions made and the agreements forged—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —on 14 December 2018 at the ministerial council.

*Mr Szakacs interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** We are seeing that progress and real water starting to be agreed to, and that will flow across the border in a way that never occurred under the previous government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I have gone through it many times before in this house, but we are seeing a lot of repetition from the opposition today, so I can do some repeating as well. How much water did we see under the previous government? How much additional water?

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

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Again, sir, debate: talking about the previous Labor government is debate.

**The SPEAKER:** I have the point of order. Thank you, member for West Torrens. In fairness to the minister, there is a cacophony of noise coming from my left. I ask for that to cease. Minister, please get on with the answer. He has the call.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Thank you as always for your protection, Mr Speaker.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The minister has the call. I would like to hear his answer in silence, please.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Of course, it is important to provide context as to the lack of success previously and what we are now heading towards. We saw last week an announcement of almost \$130 million to go towards constraints projects. This was part of the agreement that was forged—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —on 14 December last year, which would have been completely impossible under a Labor government. Constraints funding—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order, sir: that's clearly debate.

**The SPEAKER:** I have the point of order. I will be listening carefully. As I have consistently pointed out, I will allow some compare and contrast with former governments and other approaches to this government, but I will be listening to ensure that the minister does not cross the line. The Minister for Environment has the call.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Comparing and contrasting is very important when we talk about this approach.

**The SPEAKER:** To a level.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** The constraints measures, which have now been progressed, will see projects such as bridges, jetties, flood plain levies and the like improved so that environmental water can be delivered to South Australia. We know that we need more environmental water moving down the River Murray, but we can only do so in an effective way if we aren't flooding productive properties alongside the river and if we're not taking out bridges, jetties and other pieces of infrastructure.

There is \$130 million that we have now seen signed into agreements last week between New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia and the federal government as the funding entity. This gives us an incredible opportunity to continue to move forward with the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, delivering that critical environmental water and getting the key agreement from the other states that we needed so that we can start getting that water.

That water is coming because, as well as constraints measures—and the opposition won't want to hear this either because they have almost bet their reputations on the fact that water will not come as part of the efficiency program—we now have projects being constructed, being signed, that will deliver water towards that 450 gigalitres. The opposition said that wouldn't happen, and lots of their mates said that wouldn't happen as well, but that is now happening.

We've got projects out to tender in Victoria. A few years ago, when we had screaming from the sidelines and in Leigh Street, we would never have thought—

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —that any projects in Victoria would be out to tender, that is, the Victorian government saying to their communities, 'Tell us what you can do to deliver efficiencies so that we can get water back in the river.' That is happening under the Marshall Liberal government. That is good for the river, it is good for our economy and, more than anything else, it is good for our natural environment.

#### MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:55):** Supplementary: can the minister tell the chamber whether the 62 gigalitres that are due at the end of next week are going to arrive?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:55):** What I can tell the chamber is that there is an incredible amount of activity—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —happening in the basin.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, be seated for one moment. The member for Cheltenham is warned for a second and final time. If that level of noise continues, members will be departing. The minister has the call.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** There is more activity happening in the basin than ever before because these projects are coming. The Labor Party and their mates said they would never come—



*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —but they are coming. We have a substantial project which has been announced in the—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —ACC, in that jurisdiction. We have those projects—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —out to tender in Victoria. There is work being advanced in New South Wales, and there wasn't a single interstate project being advanced under the Labor government.

*Dr Close interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader is warned.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** And the deputy leader doesn't want these projects and the Labor Party don't want these projects because they don't care about the river's health.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** They don't care about the Riverland. I had the opportunity to go up to the Riverland last week with the member for Chaffey, the Minister for Regional Development, and meet—

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Debate, sir. The question was about whether the water would flow this week.

**The SPEAKER:** I am going to refer to one of Speaker Atkinson's practices. If a member has severe interjections, it does reduce the standing of members to call points of order. I respectfully ask the tone to quieten down for the last nine minutes of question time; if not, members will be leaving. I have also allowed the minister a fair bit of latitude in his preamble and I ask him to come back to the substance of the question. Thank you.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I think it's very important that we understand, as a house and as a state, the number of projects that are now happening upstream. We will get to the 450; that is my very firm view. Every legal requirement that is required under the Murray-Darling Basin Plan by 1 July 2019 is being progressed and I believe will be attained on time. We will meet all the legal requirements. The milestone of 62 gegalitres of water—

*Dr Close interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader is warned for a second and final time.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —is being substantially progressed, and what we are seeing are projects being established, being planned, being designed upstream. Those projects are often based on the great practice that we have seen in South Australia historically, and that is why I wanted to mention the trip that I made up to the Riverland to look at some of these efficiency projects that have not only enabled less water to be used but in some cases has seen expanded economic development and job creation in the Riverland region as well.

The Riverland is a great region to visit. There are great people. There is a high level of innovation, and one of the things that is very interesting when I meet people in the Riverland is their passionate agreement with the deal that was struck—

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

**Dr CLOSE:** Relevance. It was a very narrow question.

**The SPEAKER:** About the 62 gigalitres? He is talking about water. I will ask the minister to come back to the substance of the question. Minister.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Mr Speaker, I am providing context as to what these projects are looking like, and we can look at the projects—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —that are in South Australia, and opposition don't give two hoots about our Riverland, clearly, because of the cacophony of noise they are throwing at me while I am trying to explain.

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Standing order 137: personal reflection on members.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes. I don't think it's 137, but, yes, there may have been a personal reflection. Is the minister finished?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Not as individuals, as a substantial class, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, please wrap up your answer.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I will wrap up my answer by simply saying that on this side of the house we are backing our irrigators, our fruit producers and our environment; on that side of the house, they are backing politics.

#### **WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL**

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:59):** My question is to the Premier. What are the construction cost estimates for the new Women's and Children's Hospital that the Premier said he had seen and was not worried by in the house yesterday?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:00):** Yesterday, I outlined the details of the task force that we established, on coming to government, to look at this issue. It's chaired by Mr Jim Birch. We are listening to and we are talking with people on that task force. They are providing advice directly to the government. We are very keen to get the right advice. We are not rushing that advice, but we do know that we want to start construction during the forward estimates that were presented in the budget on Tuesday. That's why we have put \$550 million already into the budget. When we have further detail to update the house, then we will certainly come back and update the house.

**The Hon. Z.L. Bettison:** Why won't you be honest with the South Australian people?

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Ramsay can leave for the remainder of question time. When she does, the member for Kaurana will have the call.

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

#### **WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurana) (15:01):** My question is to the Premier. Why did SA Health delete from their website references to the WCH task force delivering to the government the capital cost of the project by the end of 2018?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order, sir: the question presupposes facts that haven't been established by leave of the house.

**The SPEAKER:** It does contain a fair bit of argument, arguably, so I will uphold the point of order. The member for Kaurana may wish to rephrase the question.

**Mr PICTON:** I will rephrase, sir, thank you. My question is to the Premier. Did the WCH task force provide the government with the capital cost of the project by the end of 2018?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:01):** Well, clearly not. As I have already outlined to the house, the final cost has not been provided to the government yet, and we will update the house when that is available. As I have also outlined to the house, we want the right number, the most accurate number. We know what happens when people rush these announcements. We know what happened under the previous government.

I know that you will allow some 'compare and contrast', as you call it, sir, so if we look at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital the fastest thing the previous government announced was the name—not usually the most important component of a hospital, but they announced the name. They had to then step back from that. Then they announced the cost, which was \$1.7 billion.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Did it come in at \$1.7 billion?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Not a chance. What we are doing is sitting down and talking with clinicians so that we get the very best cost estimate, the very best best-practice hospital, which the people of South Australia deserve. I will make this point, and I think it's an important point to make. We were elected just 15 months ago and we have already put money into our budget for the commencement of the construction of the new Women's and Children's Hospital.

Those opposite promised the people of South Australia that they would have a new co-located Women's and Children's Hospital in 2013. They then had budgets that they brought down in 2014, 2015, 2016 and 2017, and all of them failed to have a single solitary cent allocated to the construction of the Women's and Children's Hospital. The last people we are going to take any advice from, in terms of our costing or our inclusion in the budget, are those opposite.

#### **WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurana) (15:03):** My question is to the Premier. Was the Minister for Health in the other place incorrect when he informed the other place that the WCH task force has completed its work and provided a report to the government?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:03):** No final cost has been received by the government, and I make that point very clearly. Cabinet has not considered any final costing from the task force that has been charged with the responsibility for developing the new hospital and the proposal to the government.

#### **KANGAROO NUMBERS**

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:04):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development.

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** He's back. The genius is back.

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

**Mr TRELOAR:** Can the minister update the house on how the government is assisting drought-affected farmers to address kangaroo numbers?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:04):** Yes, I can. I thank the member for Flinders. I know that when I was last up at his farm at Edillilie he had kangaroo problems on his front lawn

Many South Australian farmers have seen a significant amount of kangaroo pressure on their pasture and on their standing crops, so that is why the Marshall Liberal government has reached out to support not only farmers but also sustainable kangaroo numbers. We know that there are over 48

million kangaroos in South Australia. The sustainable harvest numbers are somewhere in the vicinity of 400,000. At the moment, they are harvesting about 120,000.

The pilot program that this government committed to recently was about putting a pilot program in place not only to help kangaroo numbers and the farmers struggling with drought but also to take the pressure off our pastures and feed for the livestock here in South Australia. As I have said previously in answers to questions, we are looking to grow our herd and flock numbers, and to be able to do that we need the feed and we need sustainable pasture present so that we can feed them, grow them and take them to market.

The \$25 million is for working with Livestock SA in a three-month pilot program to help those drought-affected farmers. What it gives them is the capacity to commercially harvest kangaroos, rather than those farmers having to go out there and gain destruction permits at no commercial value. We know that for a long period of time the increased numbers of kangaroos has raised serious concerns about not only our environment but also the unsustainable number of kangaroos we see.

We are going to focus on the member for Flinders' electorate on Eyre Peninsula and in the Mid North. Those 10 landholders will have the accreditation, food safety accreditation and capacity to go out and commercially harvest kangaroo numbers. If that pilot program is deemed successful, we can then consider expanding that program. The state government is now seeking feedback on the commercial kangaroo management plan to expand the commercial harvesting zones.

If we can expand those commercial harvesting zones, it then also takes pressure off other landowners through not only the Adelaide Hills but also Spencer Gulf and down in the South-East. It gives landowners, the primary producers, a much better capacity to manage kangaroo numbers to be able to retain pasture and to be able to grow their livestock to create jobs and therefore enhance exports with their red meat sector.

This is a critically important pilot program through the state government, PIRSA, landowners and Livestock SA. It's a partnership that we see as a win-win-win not only for the farmers, for the kangaroo management plan, but also for our exports. It gives us a capacity to grow our red meat exports. It gives us a capacity to make sure that we help our farmers manage those kangaroo numbers.

#### *Grievance Debate*

#### **STATE BUDGET**

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:07):** Yesterday, the Minister for Transport boasted that this budget was the Oprah Winfrey budget for electorates. I am not sure which Oprah Winfrey he is familiar with, but the one I have come to see on television screens is respected, experienced, socially progressive and treats everyone equally.

You could not think of attributes further from this government, this state budget and even, given the decisions he has made in this budget, this minister's decision-making. It was extraordinary how the western suburbs were treated in this budget, particularly Labor-held electorates in the western suburbs, compared with the largesse foisted on Liberal marginal seats in the eastern suburbs. It was extraordinary.

I had the great pleasure to work with the member for West Torrens, when I was the former transport minister and he was the treasurer, to secure funding for the upgrade of the Cheltenham Parade/West Lakes Boulevard/Port Road intersection, a project fully funded, with funding placed in the budget across the forward estimates. In fact, that project was to start more than 12 months ago, just after the state election, and be delivered in only two months' time. Where is that project? It has vanished—absolutely vanished.

We also saw the treatment by the transport minister of commuters in the western suburbs, removing security guards from trains on the Grange line after 6pm. This was an important initiative of the former Labor government to place security guards on the trains to keep people safe and to encourage more young people, more women and more vulnerable public transport patrons to use public transport after dark. That has been removed.

Bus services in my electorate have been removed, including the 350 bus service, and there have been massive cuts to the 333 bus service, which took elderly people from communities along the Lefevre Peninsula to do their shopping at the West Lakes regional shopping centre. That has been slashed. There is now no longer one bus service on the whole community of Delfin Island in West Lakes—one ageing community now left without transport options when it comes to public transport.

We also saw the treatment of The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, with the slashing of free parking for visitors for the first two hours and the imposition of an extra \$725 per year in car parking fees for nurses, cleaners and other workers at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It is not only cruel and heartless but it is completely out of touch. Of course, we still have not seen any progress on the Coast Park project, and that is probably because we were told by the now Minister for Environment that he would do what he could to oppose me, as the member for Lee, in my desire to see that path completed—a further outrage.

The worst has come today, with the cancellation of a major public transport project in the western suburbs. The Port rail extension, the first extension of Port train services into the heart of Port Adelaide for more than 35 years—once again, fully funded, fully costed and fully factored into the state budget—has been scrapped. In fact, not only was money provided but the tender was awarded more than 12 months ago. In January 2018, a tender was provided. The work should have been nearly completed by now, but it has been cancelled.

What else happened earlier this year? In mid-March, we had a community information session—this year, not three months ago—to tell people about how the project was going to be delivered. What has happened since then? What happened in between that community information session and today? The state budget process. It is clear that the most junior minister of this government was rolled by the Treasurer and a project that would service a Labor electorate was taken away from the people of South Australia. It is an absolute outrage.

One of the biggest public transport improvements that the Port would have seen for decades has been scrapped by a Liberal minister in a Liberal government solely because it serves a Labor electorate. Meanwhile, \$300 million is being spent on upgrades in Liberal marginal electorates—Liberal marginal state electorates and Liberal marginal federal electorates. It is an outrage. Their priorities could not be further from those of the South Australian people. It is an outrage.

#### STEM EDUCATION

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:12):** I rise to speak about the new exciting learning facilities—

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

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Lee, be quiet.

**Ms LUETHEN:** —which I have recently had the opportunity to open at a number of schools across the King electorate. These facilities are so important to our young generation's future because the nature of work is going to change. For example, Lot Fourteen in Adelaide has been transformed into the innovation capital of our nation, excitingly hosting the Australian Space Agency, and this week we heard we will triple the size of Australia's space economy by 2030.

Furthermore, the Marshall Liberal government is committed to growing our state's defence and space sectors. We recognise that these sectors provide enormous opportunities for future generations of South Australians, particularly through the naval shipbuilding program and supply chain. Defence SA will continue to engage with naval shipbuilding partners to maximise opportunities for South Australians. This work will complement the government's Skilling South Australia initiative, which will ensure that South Australians have the required skills to be employed on the shipbuilding programs.

In the space sector, the government will collaborate with private companies and research institutions to grow jobs in the space sector and support students in pursuing science, technology, engineering and mathematics pathways. How exciting is our future for South Australia? It is great to see our schools are preparing our students well for these future career opportunities.

I have had the absolute pleasure of visiting a number of local schools and officially opening their new, purpose-built STEM facilities. STEM is increasingly important. We know that 75 per cent of the fastest growing industries will need some form of skills associated with STEM learning. King students and parents should be excited because South Australia is a fantastic place to live and it will grow and provide many awesome opportunities for jobs in the future.

I recently visited the One Tree Hill Primary School's new STEM facility. This school is nestled in a beautiful, serene and natural setting, and the STEM building includes a maker base, testing area, breakout space, green wall and display areas for students to investigate, think and create while using up-to-date technology. The students were incredibly engaged, and they were having fun learning too.

These STEM spaces provide our fantastic teachers with the specialist facilities they need to inspire innovation and creativity in STEM studies. A special mention must go to the One Tree Hill Primary School principal, Ms Keogh, for her tireless efforts in planning and managing the project on behalf of the school.

I also represented our Minister for Education at the openings of both the Golden Grove High School and the Salisbury East High School STEM facilities. At Salisbury East, an existing building was given a new lease on life and turned into a brilliant new dedicated facility. The spaces available will inspire students to investigate and create. They have an awesome virtual reality room, they have an educational laptop programmed Lego collection, a collection of drones and a number of 3D printers.

It was great to witness students collaborating on the use of these smart technologies. They are learning lots of skills. Credit must go to school principal Joe Priolo and the entire school community for working around the interruptions to create this space, which has certainly been optimised for learning and engagement. Joe had a conversation with me regarding the important role parents now play in helping the kids to understand where their careers might be in the future and to entice and encourage their students to enrol in the STEM subjects.

Similarly, the brilliant Golden Grove High School's STEM facility was recently opened, and it was fantastic to be able to speak with some very excited students at the opening. This is where my own daughter achieved a great public education. Congratulations to Golden Grove on celebrating its 30<sup>th</sup> birthday recently, and to the principal, Peter Kuss, who passionately advocates for the students and our local community.

While technology is ever changing, it is brilliant to have new learning areas and great teachers engaging our students in learning that can prepare and challenge students to be the best they can be in the future. Our government is certainly focused on creating the career opportunities to match their enthusiasm. Pleasingly, there is also an additional \$10.3 million invested in disability funding in our latest budget to create 180 new places in special units in classes across our government high schools.

Lastly, this week we announced the welcome news of another state budget with high state funding for education. This includes over \$80 million to deliver high-speed internet, and we will see our schools experience internet speeds of up to and beyond a thousand times faster than ever before.

### **VOLUNTARY EUTHANASIA LEGISLATION**

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:18):** I might give us a bit of a change from talking about the budget; I suspect we are going to be talking about it all afternoon.

Yesterday was something of a historic day in Australia, with the commencement of the Victorian Voluntary Assisted Dying Act 2017. One of the hardest things—in fact, the hardest thing—I have ever done in this parliament was during the term of the last government. It was the debate about the euthanasia bill that was before this chamber, and most members took part in that debate. It was a conscience vote, and we all expressed our deeply held beliefs, whether we supported the bill or opposed it.

As I said, yesterday was a historic occasion with the commencement, for the first time in a state in Australia, of a voluntary euthanasia act. It was a difficult debate because I have seen a number of members of my family pass away. My dad died in 1998 in a major hospital in New South

Wales and the circumstances surrounding that death—he had cancer—were horrendous. The quality of the palliative care was poor. The facilities were poor, which was surprising for such a major hospital, the Concord hospital. So the memories of those weeks will always be with me.

Just before the debate about the bill that came before the South Australian parliament, my brother passed away of the same cancer my father had passed away from in 1998. The quality of the care at the Whyalla Hospital was fantastic. The palliative care was fantastic, and the new facilities were really good, but it is never an easy time. We were rolling him out to have his cigarette almost until the last day and we did have a conversation about voluntary euthanasia.

I asked him what his thoughts were. He was supportive but he said that he could never make that choice himself. I guess, given the quality of care that he had received, that was easier to do. But it is a choice I believe we all should have if need be, and few people would exercise it because we do tend to hang on dearly to life right to the end.

The bill that has been enacted in Victoria has been called one of the most conservative voluntary euthanasia bills in the world. I think it would be well worth replicating. Why reinvent the wheel? I acknowledge we have a select committee looking at this, but there is a whole range of conditions in that particular act which I think are worthy of consideration. We have seen in some overseas jurisdictions people under 18 being able to avail themselves of voluntary euthanasia, but in Victoria you have to be over 18, you have to be an Australian citizen and you have to have been a permanent resident of Victoria for at least 12 months.

You have to have a disease, illness or medical condition which is incurable, advanced and progressive, which will cause death within six months or 12 months for a neurodegenerative condition. You have to be assessed as having suffering which cannot be relieved in a manner the person considers tolerable. Two doctors have to determine eligibility and a person is not eligible for only a mental illness or a disability. Doctors have the capacity to conscientiously object.

Between the first request nine days can elapse and you can get an opportunity to then continue on, but the person can revoke a request at any time. The drug is self-administered, but a practitioner can administer it, if the person is incapable of digesting the drug, if that becomes an issue. There has to be active reporting back to the parliament. I hope if a bill does come before us in this house that we do pass the bill this time.

### SUICIDE PREVENTION

**Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:23):** I rise today to speak about the serious topic of suicide in relation to the recent work that I have begun as the chair of the state government's Issues Group on Suicide Prevention. The loss of life under any circumstances is always difficult but the notion that any person would intentionally take their own life is incredibly distressing to so many in our society. The reasons people take their own life are complex and often there is no single reason why a person attempts suicide or is successful at suicide.

Society's approach to people who have issues with mental health and suicidal thoughts continues to improve each and every year, and it is fundamentally important that we continue to support organisations that play such a great role in suicide prevention. It is these groups, whether they be in our community, such as those in my Blackwood and Mitcham communities, or as part of government such as the issues group I chair on suicide prevention that continue to facilitate discussion and ensure that governments and, more importantly, our society adequately provide care for people who are going through a difficult time and require access to appropriate services.

Suicide remains the leading cause of death for Australians aged between 15 and 44 and is the biggest cause of death of men in that cohort. Australian Bureau of Statistics data shows that over 3,000 people died from suicide in 2017. Deaths from intentional self-harm occur among males at a rate more than three times greater than that of females. For every death by suicide, it is estimated that as many as 30 people have attempted to take their own life.

Last year, the Premier appointed the Hon. John Dawkins from the other place as his Advocate for Suicide Prevention. Shortly after, the Premier's Council on Suicide Prevention was established. The issues group is a working group of the Premier's council and tasked with supporting

the council by providing information and reporting on new initiatives and programs to enhance the ability to facilitate change in policy and community awareness.

The issues group involves 22 senior executives from state government agencies who work collaboratively on mental health and wellbeing strategies for their workplace and their consumers. In identified high-risk areas, such as the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander portfolio and emergency first responders, there is more than one representative on the issues group. We meet monthly for approximately two hours and work closely with the Department for Health and Wellbeing's suicide prevention unit and the SA Mental Health Commission to identify key cross-sector issues for the public sector in suicide prevention.

It is so important that government works in a collaborative fashion, and it is fantastic that Ms Erma Ranieri, the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment, sits on this issues group and co-chairs it with me, ensuring that government agencies have the ability to share employee and consumer programs, ideas, data and statistics to best create good public policy. We are also guided by the South Australian Mental Health Commissioner, Chris Burns, and SA Chief Psychiatrist, Dr John Brayley.

As the biggest employer in the state, it is important that the public sector has mechanisms in place to work together in providing the best support for their staff, resulting in a positive effect to their families, other work colleagues and community members. The Premier's council and the issues group on suicide prevention both support initiatives and events run by local suicide prevention networks across South Australia.

There are 34 community-based suicide prevention networks linked predominantly to local council regions currently in operation, and this number continues to expand. The issues group assists in increasing the profile and reach of suicide prevention programs for both public sector staff and consumers. Examples of some of the work that we have been undertaking and looking at is the establishment of working groups to investigate and progress data collection in the state. That is so important in many of the key emergency service departments.

We are ensuring that local suicide networks are present at country field days to hand out information on suicide prevention and counselling services. We are looking at ways of addressing actions within the state suicide prevention plan specific to individual agencies, reporting back and then using that data to best create good public policy. They are some of the positive examples that we have been working on to date.

The state government is committed to improving efforts to reduce the state's suicide rate. It is indeed a state and national tragedy. We are working towards breaking down the stigma surrounding suicide and encouraging people to seek help when they are having suicidal thoughts. Every effort—and we are doing this to increase awareness on the importance of suicide prevention—is critical. Through community programs, we can break down that stigma and hopefully save lives.

## STATE BUDGET

**Mr BOYER (Wright) (15:28):** I think it is fair to say that characterising last year's budget, at least insofar as how it affected the north-eastern suburbs of Adelaide, was pretty easy: cuts, closures and privatisations. There was the cutting of the contract to build the new park-and-ride at Tea Tree Plaza, the closure of Service SA in Modbury, the closure of TAFE SA at Tea Tree Gully and the privatisation of patient transfers between Modbury and Lyell McEwin hospitals.

Of course, there was also the continuation of some projects funded by the previous Labor government, like the upgrades of Modbury Hospital and Golden Grove Road. However, this year's budget is more difficult to characterise because there really is not a great deal to characterise. Indeed, this budget is pretty solemn reading for residents of the north-east, and there are some very notable omissions.

There is no mention of a desperately needed park-and-ride at Tea Tree Plaza, no reinstatement of the funding for Service SA in Modbury and no money for the much-hyped north-eastern public transport plan either, even though the minister has been saying for months that the plan would be hitting his desk soon. Nor does this budget clear up the confusion about how



residents of the north-east will conduct their Service SA business in the absence of a Service SA centre.

The minister has been saying for months that he thinks we are going to be really excited when we hear what it is that will replace Service SA in Modbury. Well, it has been nine months now since the closure of that Service SA centre was announced, and I think the very least that this Liberal government can do is come clean with people about how they are going to conduct business once the centre at Modbury is closed.

Members will remember well the vociferous campaigning of those opposite on the issue of rate capping, none more so than the members for Newland and King. This was, we were told, a big issue, possibly the biggest issue, and something that South Australians clearly voted for, so you would be forgiven for being somewhat confused this week when the Treasurer announced an increase of 40 per cent to the solid waste levy.

This has clearly come as an enormous shock to councils, who were completely blindsided by this announcement, so blindsided in fact that tonight I believe Tea Tree Gully council is holding an extraordinary meeting of elected members to discuss the 40 per cent increase and how they are going to pay for it. I am also reliably informed that Salisbury council will be holding a similar meeting on Monday night to assess the potential impact on their ratepayers.

I believe that the members for Newland and King have been invited to attend tonight's meeting at Tea Tree Gully. I very much hope they accept that invitation so they can hear firsthand the impact this 40 per cent hike will have on councils and ratepayers in their areas. Of course, we have already heard some strident comments from the mayors of Tea Tree Gully and Salisbury council. The Mayor of Tea Tree Gully, Mr Kevin Knight, called it 'disrespectful to community—a mockery of the budgeting and public consultation process'. The Mayor of Salisbury, Ms Gillian Aldridge OAM, said:

We were very conscious of keeping rates at an affordable cost. We sat there, night after night, trying to get it right and now we have got to the stage where we have to throw it all out.

It is a easy to throw numbers around, but what would these increases mean in real terms to councils like Salisbury and Tea Tree Gully? In Tea Tree Gully, it could mean that ratepayers will be paying an extra \$3.1 million collectively. That is a lot of money to a local council. There are a lot of new footpaths, playground upgrades and dog parks in \$3.1 million. To add insult to injury, those very same ratepayers are set to wear a whole lot more pain elsewhere, with a \$725 increase in the cost of parking at Modbury and Lyell McEwin hospitals and a 5 per cent increase in car registration and driver's licence fees—but, of course, you will not be able to go to the Service SA centre at Modbury to pay them.

On the one hand, we have local Liberal members of parliament, like the members for Newland and King, espousing the virtues of rate capping, and on the other hand they hit those very same councils with an enormous levy hike, a hike that those councils can only meet by passing it on to ratepayers—the same ratepayers those opposite told us they desperately wanted to protect with rate capping.

You would be forgiven for thinking that, after effectively outsourcing the responsibility for balancing the budget to local councils, we would see debt going down. But, no, what we have seen from the party that for decades took the moral high ground on fiscal restraint is a massive increase in state debt, an increase that will see state debt go from around 25 per cent to 59 per cent. To turn briefly to the north-east before I conclude my remarks, I ask: what do we get for these levy hikes and fee increases in the north-east? Well, not much, but certainly not lower costs or better services.

### **SPRINGBANK ROAD INTERSECTION**

**Mrs POWER (Elder) (15:33):** For decades, our local community has been fighting to see the Goodwood Road/Dawes Road/Springbank Road intersection aligned. Some local residents tell me they have been fighting for more than 40 years to see this intersection upgraded, and understandably so. Anyone who travels through this intersection knows the current layout severely slows the flow of the traffic, creates congestion and causes potential safety risks.

Data tells us that on average more than 60,000 vehicles a day travel through this location and that there have been 21 crashes between 2012 and 2016. The former state Labor government promised the community that this problem would be fixed right before going into an election, yet there was no specific funding line in the final budget and only an artist's impression had ever been released.

Last year, along with Nicolle Flint, the federal member for Boothby, I put on the public record the launch of the Fix Springbank Intersection campaign. It was time for action. Our local community needed three things: (1) community consultation about the project plans; (2) a final master plan with detailed costings; and (3) funding actually allocated in the budget, not just hollow rhetoric. This week marks an incredibly big win for our community as we take another step closer to fixing this intersection with funds specifically allocated in the budget.

The Marshall Liberal government has got on with the job as a priority since being elected last year, working with the federal Liberal government to fund and deliver a solution. Alongside our local community, we have worked hard to see this project be properly scoped and funded, with planning underway. The community's voice has been heard. The recently announced solution, with one four-way intersection, will improve connectivity for vulnerable users, improve transport capacity and traffic flows, improve safety for all users and support adjoining land use. This means less time sitting in traffic and more time doing the things you love.

The detailed costings have been scoped, a concept plan has been developed and, this week, funding has been secured in the budget. The community can be assured that this project is going ahead. It may very well be completed as early as next year, but certainly by 2022 at the latest. As I mentioned, community members have told me that they have waited decades for this project to be completed. Just a few weeks ago, at a community forum one resident shared that she held grave concerns for the safety of her children and other schoolchildren as they attempted to cross the current staggered T-intersection, known as a dogleg.

Today, I stand proud to be part of the Marshall Liberal government that is getting on with the job of delivering for our local community. I give my thanks to local residents for taking the time to get in touch with me and care about this important issue. Whilst this week is a significant milestone in the project, I look forward to the next steps, which will involve community engagement and consultation providing residents with the opportunity to help shape the detailed plans. I will keep the parliament up to date as I continue to work alongside my local community.

#### *Bills*

### **SUPPLY BILL 2019**

#### *Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

### **APPROPRIATION BILL 2019**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:38):** I now continue my remarks, I think with 11 minutes to go. Just to reframe the way in which I have been looking at both the environment and water and education portfolios in the budget, my view on both of them is that they have been treated poorly by this government, as you would not be surprised to hear.

On the one hand, they have avoided paying attention to the serious issues that exist within both those portfolios, which ought to be above partisan politics. Secondly, they desire to please Canberra, with a Coalition government. Thirdly, they are cutting very important services right at the heart of the departments. When I sought leave to continue my remarks earlier, I had been listing the areas in the education department from which \$50 million will have to be found for the cut that has been imposed by this budget, a new cut of \$50 million over the forward estimates.

I think I had got to support for principals in managing poor performance for teachers, which is something the HR department does well and which it has been supported to do so additionally under the previous government. We gave them additional funds to help support that. I think I raised

the question of some of those specialist allied health and specialist teachers who are attached to the education department and who provide additional services, such as speech therapists, behaviour coaches and attendance officers, to students in need. I am concerned that this \$50 million cut is likely to go close to them as well.

Then there is the Incident Management Division, which I understand has already been cut in the last financial year, in the one we are just about to finish, where the department is managing serious issues that occur within schools centrally, and that that has now been cut. There are also new programs that are established, programs such as the music strategy and the languages strategy. I do not know whether the entrepreneurial strategy has been run out of it, but I would expect that it has. That area has already been targeted and presumably will be targeted more.

All these areas are deemed to be head office and are therefore vulnerable. I know that there has been some rhetoric about saying, 'Well, schools won't be affected.' It is impossible to cut \$50 million out of the education department and not have a shift of effort or an absence of support for schools. Schools will feel this, and schools will let their local members know what they are experiencing when they start to lose more and more of these services. I will be very interested to hear what the plans are for the immediate \$12 million, the one coming in the next financial year, and overall for the \$48 million.

What we have is an education department that is being set the task of moving 12 year olds within a financial agreement with the commonwealth, which has ripped off public schools and set that in stone through federal legislation, and now is burdened with finding a very, very deep cut across what is a comparatively small department because the vast majority of education, of course, is sitting out in the schools. I think I heard earlier in one of the contributions from the government side of this chamber, 'Oh, there's more money going into education,' some of which is referring to the very substantial capital spend, the vast majority of which was dedicated by the previous government.

I appreciate that the government changes hands and that people get to cut ribbons for projects they did not actually initiate or think about. However, the lack of graciousness in acknowledging, and claiming expenditure that had been allocated previously—and in fact in this case, even more egregiously, had been allocated for projects that are now being cancelled in order to fund the unfunded move of year 7s into many of the high school—is galling. When people look at our chamber and look at politicians in general and talk about their behaviour, that is the kind of behaviour they notice.

When they go to schools and see STEM facilities being opened that were initiated under the previous government, no acknowledgment of that is made by the Liberal backbencher, and the Liberal member of the Legislative Council who is often sent out to get their name on the plaque does not even acknowledge that this was a project initiated, paid for and substantially completed under the previous government. We do not expect them not to cut the ribbons. I just think a little bit of graciousness, of acknowledgment, of behaving in a way that acknowledges that the Labor government made an enormous contribution to education ought to be acknowledged.

Then, of course, we turn to the environment portfolio. I am not going to suggest, the way the minister suggested in question time, that no-one on that side cares about the environment, no-one on that side cares about water, because it is certainly not true on that side and it is certainly not true on this side. We all care. The question is: what are we doing about it? I feel sorry for the environment minister. He has received a royal commission report that he still has not responded to, presumably because the Attorney-General's office is holding up the process.

I am not sure what the record is for the longest time between receiving a royal commission and providing a response, but this must be pushing the limits of that record. Last time, he was dealt the blow of cutting out climate change altogether in the department and of cutting a staff of 115 over a period of four years. I understand that 117 TVSPs were offered between August and March and, of those, 64 were accepted, and possibly more have been accepted now.

In the election, he was in the position of going out and saying that he wanted more rangers, but he was not given any money for that in the last budget or in this one, and he therefore had to cut other areas in order to fund that. We have seen the change of names and the change of titles that

have been offered to people like construction and maintenance workers to allow them to be called rangers, and I understand that rangers have been given TVSPs. Rangers have been told that they can have money to stop working as rangers. I do not understand what is happening in the department.

*The Hon. D.J. Speirs interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk):** Order! The Minister for Environment will restrain himself or he can leave the chamber. Deputy leader.

**Dr CLOSE:** Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. The only new project of any substance that we are seeing in this budget that had already been announced is the sand management along Adelaide's beaches. I understand that our sand has a northward push, a natural drift that would, without any intervention, see almost no sand on some of our southern metropolitan beaches.

However, I am concerned on behalf of the residents of my electorate—the residents of Semaphore South, Semaphore and Largs in particular—who have seen quite serious dune erosion in the last few years. We have been told that there will be funding to take more sand away from Semaphore Beach, including through a pumping process that will take it directly away. Yet, what I hear from residents—and I am myself a resident, and I walk the dogs along that part of the beach—is that they are watching our dunes erode.

I have written to the minister and asked to have someone come and talk to our people. We understand that there has to be proper sand management across all Adelaide beaches, but surely we should not be further damaging the northern suburban beaches in order to relocate sand and protect beaches further south. I have not had a response, but it does not surprise me. The Minister for Environment and the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure take quite a while to get back. I am sure they have lots of letters, but they do take quite a while to respond.

I am hopeful that he will be able to send someone, perhaps from the Coast Protection Board, to talk to my residents about what they are seeing crumble before their eyes. The quality of the experience of walking along the beach in Semaphore has already been compromised. The risk is that we start to lose those magnificent dunes that have been built up and protected and are now being maintained by volunteers. We will see those eroded because the focus has shifted down to the southern beaches.

In the last bit of time I have left, I raise my concerns about the increased cost in the solid waste levy. That has been taken up very substantially by the Local Government Association, which is very concerned that the problems they have raised with the minister have not been acted on and have not been reported. Their concern is not only the additional burden of cost for residents but also that no attention has been paid to the increased risk of illegal dumping.

I am interested to know, and to explore during estimates, the dividend from SA Water; that is, the way in which the money is flowing in (if you will forgive the pun) to government coffers because of the price that people pay to their councils to have their waste managed and to SA Water to have water and sewerage managed. I am concerned to see the degree to which that money has been taken in order to replace general money that ought to have been provided to the three environment department areas.

I think that the two portfolios I started with are the most crucial for the future, and I am concerned that we have people running them who are interested in pet projects that are good to announce and great to cut ribbons on but are not going to make a substantial and lasting difference to the future of this state. I think they are wrongheaded in the way they are spending their money, and I will be asking many questions about that in estimates.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:49):** It is a great opportunity this afternoon to spend a moment reflecting on the 2019-20 Marshall Liberal government's state budget, as handed down on Tuesday this week by Treasurer Lucas. It was interesting to hear from the deputy leader, as she provided conclusions on a government from her point of view. There are two important portfolios that she shadows: education and environment. She alluded to the fact that, particularly with environment, there was a real opportunity to leave a legacy because of its importance.

I can tell you that the best way to leave a legacy is not to slash and burn the environment department's budget, as occurred when the deputy leader sat as a cabinet minister in the Labor government between 2014 and 2018. That is how to not leave a legacy. What the environment department went through over the last couple of terms of Labor government was horrendous. The level of cuts that were inflicted on the environment department's budget were chaotic and catastrophic. There was an at least 30 per cent reduction in overall budget, and that was felt at the front line: in national parks, wildlife and rangers.

For the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to make any statements around the number of rangers in this state is the height of hypocrisy. It is the height of hypocrisy because there were around 300 rangers when the Labor Party came to government in 2002 and when they left office in March 2018 there were 93 rangers. To make comment about a few rangers who have been given voluntary separation packages as part of the renewal of the workforce, which is obviously an operational matter for the chief executive, while having stood by and, as far as I am aware, not raised any concerns, certainly not publicly, while the ranger workforce in this state was obliterated, I think is just shameful and quite unbelievable.

I will not reflect any more on the comments of the deputy leader. I think I will have plenty of opportunity in estimates to refute nonsensical and ludicrous claims. However, I do want to reflect at the macro level about the Marshall Liberal government's 2019-20 state budget and also focus on the portfolios that I have responsibility for covering the areas of environment and water.

The Marshall Liberal government's latest budget is a working budget. It is a budget that has been handed down in challenging times with a substantial reduction in revenue from the GST and other falling revenue streams as well. This government is trying to build on South Australia's strengths, and we aim to substantially renew our infrastructure and give our state the opportunity to grow, even in the face of those challenges.

We have ambitious aims for economic growth in this state. We want to see 3 per cent growth, year on year. We believe we should really push for that. It is absolutely critical that we do that and that we back it up with population growth and get this state moving in a dynamic, productive way.

The budget is framed around a very significant investment in infrastructure. We have seen an incredible investment in regional roads and that will make such a difference to areas of our state that have been long forgotten when it comes to infrastructure investment. The billions of dollars that will go into roads over the forward estimates, both in metropolitan Adelaide and regional South Australia, will not only bust congestion challenges across the capital city but also make our regional roads safer and enable people to get home quicker and in a much safer way.

We know that is important in regional South Australia. We also know that the quality of roads in regional South Australia is important for productivity as well and for economic development. Investment in regional South Australia will help our farms, our food producers and our tourism industry as well, and will enable people to get to their destinations across our state, particularly in the regional parts of our state, in an effective, efficient and safe way.

In metropolitan Adelaide, we have had a number of very significant road announcements, and those have often been in partnership with the re-elected federal Morrison government. That was a great result on 18 May—I think it is great for Australia. We now have a real opportunity, in South Australia in particular, to take advantage of cooperative federalism when working with our federal colleagues to deliver for this state.

We have seen in the state budget, and through the federal election process, plenty of examples of high-quality investment in areas that will create real productivity gains in our regions in metropolitan Adelaide, no more so than in the south-western suburbs that I have the privilege of representing, with the announcement that the Hove crossing at Brighton Road will be grade separated. That is something that the local community has been crying out for for many years.

Just a couple of kilometres away we have the Oaklands crossing. It was great to see all tiers of government come together to see funding put in place to get that project up and running. That project is almost complete now. The congestion nightmare at the point where the Seaford line crossed Diagonal and Morphett roads has been eliminated. That is a very difficult intersection, and

the amalgamation of roads and the train line has now been eliminated. The work now moves just a couple of kilometres further to the west to the Hove crossing.

This is a project that I have been working on with my colleague the member for Gibson and Minister for Police and Emergency Services for a substantial length of time. When I first was running for election for the former seat of Brighton in 2013, I launched the Fix Brighton Road campaign. The member for Gibson, who at the time was the member for Mitchell, launched the Fix Oaklands crossing campaign.

We always acknowledged publicly that Oaklands was the more problematic intersection in terms of ranking because of the chaos it caused in the Marion area with the shopping centre nearby, the GP Plus nearby and the state Leisure and Aquatic Centre just around the corner. We said that Oaklands had to be done first, but then the effort would switch to the Hove crossing. We switched that effort. We got alongside Nicolle Flint, the federal member for Boothby, and we have been able to get together \$170 million to see that crossing grade separated. That is a real win for the south western suburbs.

I know that many of my constituents in Hallett Cove, Sheidow Park, Trott Park come down the hill, along with residents from Seacliff Park, Seaview Downs, Kingston Park, Marino, Seacliff and through into the member for Gibson's electorate with the suburbs of South Brighton, Brighton and Hove and the adjacent suburbs of Dover Gardens and Warradale. They all pass through that intersection, which has some 40,000 movements a day.

During peak hour, the boom gates are down for around 25 per cent of the peak-hour period, causing very significant delays. It is exacerbated during school holidays because nearby we have Brighton Primary School, St Theresa's Primary School, Mary Mount College, Sacred Heart and Brighton Secondary School, all on that strip of Brighton Road. Getting this crossing is something my community has been very keen on for a long time. It has been great to work alongside not only the member for Gibson but also the federal member for Boothby to get that money in place. It will be really good to see that project get up and running in 2020 through to 2023.

The opposition leader has made it very clear that he is incredibly concerned about the level of South Australia's debt and, equally, he is railing against the government's budget repair strategies, so I am worried about what will happen with some of these projects that fall outside the current forward estimates. We know that these projects will be up and running, but they will take some years to get going. The opposition leader really has to outline where he will cut some of these state building projects that have the opportunity to transform our productivity and make our city a more livable, accessible place to call home.

I am concerned about what the opposition will do with regard to some of these longer term projects because they have been railing against the budget repair measures at the same time as railing against our increased borrowings. Something has to give there. They do need to put on the table what they would cut or what approach they would take to deliver these projects—if they would deliver them at all.

I now want to reflect on the portfolios I have responsibility for under environment and water. This has been a budget that has been really good for the Department for Environment and Water and the associated portfolios. No matter what the deputy leader says—and I know she carries the burdens of the left around with her, and that is a great burden to carry—it must really pain the deputy leader to know that the Liberal government is rebuilding the environment department's budget and has seen an uptake in the amount of investment coming in and new investment trending upward for really the first time in many years.

I have seen the graphs, and it is great to see that new investment, not just in national parks and wildlife but also in waste management, and also very significant new investment in coastal protection. I stand here all the time, and my colleagues the member for King, the member for Newland and the member for Colton would hear me talk about our precious coastline; 5,067 kilometres of coastline in this state. Some of it is under particular pressure in the face of increasing population and in the face of man-made intervention, in the face of a change in climate, increasing storm events and rising sea levels.

We do need to invest in our coastline, we need to give it resilience, and we can do so in this budget in three ways. We have a \$4 million regional Coast Protection Fund, which is a quadrupling of the funding available under the previous government for regional coast protection projects to about \$1.3 million per annum for regional coast protection projects. I know that colleagues such as the member for Narrunga, the member for Finniss and the member for MacKillop will value those projects because I have been out to their communities and they have taken me to areas where the beaches are under threat and are washing away. There is a real opportunity for us to get in front of those problems, partner with regional councils and ensure they have the funding to tackle some of these coast protection challenges.

Another huge component of our coast protection strategy is the saving of West Beach and Henley Beach South, the vulnerable spots in our metropolitan coastline. The member for Colton is here this afternoon; he has been lobbying me for several years on this matter. He experiences it day in and day out. West Beach is literally falling into the sea in his electorate, and we know that is spreading. There are also problems at Glenelg North, but we are particularly seeing challenges emerge at Henley Beach South and Henley Beach.

If we do not find a solution to coast protection in metropolitan Adelaide, we will have a really significant challenge on our hands. We will lose infrastructure, whether it is surf clubs or sailing clubs, whether it is parks or roads, even houses. That is the future we will have unless we take hold of this, rise to the challenges of a changing climate, put our money where our mouth is and actually deliver real infrastructure and environmental outcomes to improve the situation.

So we are spending \$48.4 million in securing West Beach and the adjacent beaches as well, putting in a very significant injection of new sand and then completing that pipeline, the missing part of the jigsaw, that was planned by the previous government but not funded. It stunned me that the deputy leader has now come out and called into question whether this project should go ahead or not, criticising it this afternoon, when not only was it planned but unfunded under the previous Labor government.

We know through numerous scientific reports that the reticulation of sand and reversing that natural littoral drift from south to north is the only way to be able to rebuild our beaches. We are not prioritising the southern beaches. Being someone from the south, I certainly would not count West Beach as a southern beach. We are not prioritising one set of beaches over the other. What we are looking at is the success in my electorate that was achieved, albeit under the previous government, in rebuilding Kingston Park, Seacliff and South Brighton. They got the science, they funded it and it has worked there.

We need to replicate that. We need to put in that injection of sand, rebuild and remanufacture those sand dunes and then get native vegetation through dune care programs into that new dune to hold it together. That is how we will save West Beach and this government is rising to the challenge. It is not cheap but it is necessary, otherwise we will have very long-term consequences that will cost this government in this state far more. So we are rising to the challenge. We are looking after our whole metropolitan coastline and we are certainly not leaving behind the northern beaches either because they are equally as important to retain as healthy vibrant beaches so that all the cells within our beaches are working together.

I also want to spend a short period of time reflecting on our investment in national parks and wildlife. When I walked through the environment department's door on 22 March 2018, national parks had fallen right to the bottom of the list of priorities in that department—overtaken by gesture, symbols, slogans, planning and strategies, but not a lot of doing on the ground. Investing in our national parks is something that I really want to see happen under a Marshall Liberal government.

We made a big announcement around creating Glenthorne National Park in the southern suburbs in the lead-up to the election. We funded that in the last budget. We are applying another \$2.5 million to Glenthorne this time around in this budget, but we are also investing considerably more money in national parks and wildlife—again, for the first time in many budgets that we are seeing this sort of investment. Our national parks, 21 per cent of the state, give us another front-line defence against climate change. They create a place for biodiversity. They are protected. They are safe places.

We need to invest in them to uphold the condition of their habitats and also invest in their amenity as well so that they are places that people want to go to interact with and enjoy so that they fall in love with nature and want to protect our environment. So we have a \$3.3 million fund, which we will invest in asset maintenance, trying to clear some of the very significant asset maintenance backlog within our national parks, and then we are investing \$6 million in the creation of the Great Southern Ocean Walk, which will reactivate and invest in the amenity along the Heysen Trail between Cape Jervis and Victor Harbor.

It is a great project. It is a project that has bubbled out of the community, not driven by government. It has come out of the community. The District Council of Yankalilla, local businesses, local environmental groups, the Friends of the Heysen Trail, they have all been involved. They have said that you could create a multiday walk within the broader Heysen Trail walk. You could lift the amenity of campsites, toilets and signage and get conservation outcomes there as well, work with friends groups and get the private sector involved around the provision of accommodation.

It is not that far from Adelaide, just a bit over an hour's drive. The opportunity for the Great Southern Ocean Walk from Cape Jervis to Victor Harbor is phenomenal. It is an absolutely stunning part of our state where we have Waitpinga Beach, Newland Head, Deep Creek Conservation Park, Tapanappa Beach, Blowhole Beach. This is an incredible part of the state. I think it needs to be shared, but it needs to be done in a sensitive way.

The budget we have before us is a budget that makes a very significant investment in our natural environment. There is much that we can do in this area. Will we ever have enough money to look after our environment? As the minister responsible, I would say probably not; I would like a lot more, but we are working hard to rebuild the budget after years and years of cuts. We are trending up. We are getting some good outcomes, and I think the future is positive. In the face of global environmental challenges, we can have a really good news story in South Australia.

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (16:09):** I rise today in my capacity as shadow minister for tourism, trade and investment, a portfolio I am very proud to represent. This is a very economic and jobs-focused contributor to the state. It is a portfolio that delivers billions of dollars in economic benefit to the state and employs tens of thousands of people. To illustrate in very rough terms the impact of this portfolio, the combined economic contribution of both merchandise exports and the value of tourism in SA is \$18.8 billion.

This \$18.8 billion is more than a number. It represents the tens of thousands of jobs that are dependent on these sectors. These are jobs that lead into career pathways. They are good jobs that tap into the potential of the global market for South Australia. However, at a time when we are struggling to increase our national share of exports and tourism, the government is sending a clear signal that these areas are not its priority.

If we look at the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment, the government plans to cut the department's budget by 20 per cent in one year alone. In the lead-up to the election, the Liberal Party was completely clear that we should measure South Australia's export performance as a proportion of national share. I believe the term was 'an export-led recovery of the South Australian economy'. This was a key part of their election commitments. In reality, it was like unleashing a bull in a china shop.

The government have made drastic changes to the structure of various departments and agencies. They tore up existing regional trade strategies and sacked expert trade advisers. They abolished industry advisory boards and investment attraction and health industries, and all this happened in the space of less than one year. After these changes, the Premier and the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment decided that it was probably best to have a think about what they have done and to conduct a review, so they hired one of their conservative mates across the pond and asked if he could come to South Australia for a few days and report on what he thought. A few months later, a report is handed down, and guess what? It recommended even more machinery of government changes. The cycle goes on and on.

Meanwhile, the minister is going on international trade missions without giving enough notice to South Australian businesses that he is going. It explains why the minister is taking almost 90 per cent fewer businesses with him on trade missions compared with the Labor government.



While the minister is on these trade missions, trade missions that do not have a plan underpinning them anymore, he cuts a ribbon on new trade offices but cannot tell us what tangible outcomes he has achieved.

Meanwhile, senior leadership in his own trade department are leaving in droves. The department's budget is getting slashed left, right and centre, and it is cutting full-time staff in the process. In February this year, the Joyce review recommended that the government not pursue their suite of stand-alone trade offices across the world and, instead, embed people in Austrade offices. There is complete uncertainty and a lack of vision leading the department, and the government should be held accountable for this chaos.

Our share of national exports has hit a 30-year low. It is a worrying trend that has been picked up in more than a year of the Marshall Liberal government. The reckless behaviour of this government towards trade and investment in this state is shameful. Yes, the government is opening trade offices, but at what cost? Is it worth the cost of completely dismantling public sector infrastructure that has brought significant economic benefit to the state? Is it worth the cost of losing world-class senior trade and investment officials who have chosen to serve our state? Is it worth losing Brand SA and its successful initiatives for boosting sales and support for local businesses? If you are not strong as a business in South Australia, how can you contemplate selling interstate or overseas? It is important for us to back our businesses here.

As I make this speech, I am reminded of how many businesses in South Australia are putting their capital on the line to sell our products and services to the world. Many of these businesses started as, and perhaps still are, small to medium enterprises. They are looking to the state government for assistance in opening up new markets overseas. But this is a government that does not want to partner with local industry. The minister thinks he can do a better job of managing the state brand than the private sector. I find that very hard to believe.

What we need is a serious plan to boost our exports and the resources to back it up, not the state of chaos that we have now. There are more cuts when it comes to tourism. The government has announced \$12 million of cuts earmarked for the South Australian Tourism Commission. The government needs to understand that tourism equals jobs. It is estimated that tourism directly employs more than 36,000 people. Visitor expenditure to South Australia is around \$6.8 billion. There is a 2020 goal, a shared goal between industry and government, for this number to reach \$8 billion by 2020, which is why it is completely surprising that the government is cutting funding to our events and tourism marketing.

We have already seen the effects of what happened when the Marshall Liberal government cut \$11 million from tourism in the last budget. The economic contribution of tourism went down by \$100 million, from \$6.9 billion to \$6.8 billion. Members in this chamber do not need to take my word for it; all they need to do is ask any tourism operator about how important the funding is. The industry has been calling for increased funding to tourism marketing and sector development. South Australia should be taking the lead to try to capture more of this market. But with these budget cuts, the government is asking the industry to reach the targets with one hand tied behind their back.

We have seen recent declines in both domestic daytrip and international visitor numbers. South Australia needs more tourists coming here and spending more money, which in turn will create more jobs. It is not too long ago that I was in this chamber talking about how important the industry is to the regions. The drop in daytrip visitors is hurting the local economies of regional South Australia.

When Labor was in government, the proportion of visitor spend in our regions reached 44 per cent. Under this government, it is now around 42 per cent, and under the draft 2030 Tourism Plan, the target is 40 per cent—and the government has been absolutely silent about why it has not announced any new funding for our regional tourism organisations. The staff who work in these organisations do great work promoting our state and work together with local tourism operators. To cut their funding is shameful.

I see no future commitments to the cooperative marketing fund, which expires this financial year on 30 June 2019, or any future funding beyond 2019-20, or funding for staff for our regional tourism organisations. Based on my estimates, that represents at least \$700,000 per annum in lost

funding to our regional tourism organisations. These are locally based organisations that are on the ground actively selling our regions to the country and the world.

I know that the member for Giles and the member for Mawson are concerned about this. It has serious implications for Kangaroo Island, Flinders Ranges, the outback and Eyre Peninsula. The members for MacKillop and Mount Gambier would know that daytrip expenditure on the Limestone Coast is down by \$30 million. Daytrip expenditure is also down in the Barossa by \$21 million and by \$4 million in the River Murray, Lakes and Coorong region. In total, that is \$70 million less in the pockets of our regional tourism operators.

So my question to the government is: why cut funding now? There is no new money for the SATC in this budget. The marketing money that was announced earlier by the minister was simply a rehash of marketing activity that already existed. The total marketing budget has been cut, but most telling is that international marketing expenditure has been cut by 7 per cent. It is with great disappointment that I inform the house that the latest Tourism Research Australia data shows that South Australia's international visitor expenditure is down by 7 per cent. That represents \$80 million less coming to our tourism operators.

This government has been duplicitous. They have completely hidden the fact that marketing is getting a cut in this budget, and it seems like any event that is not part of Mad March faces cuts. We only have to look at what happened to the Adelaide Fashion Festival and the Adelaide Motorsport Festival. It is just more cuts. I want to make this clear to those in the government: in its first year, the Marshall Liberal government's \$11 million budget cut led to \$100 million less spent by visitors in South Australia.

Tourism is a supergrowth industry. The opportunity to grow the industry is there for the taking; we just need a government that does not actively try to stymie the industry. Good governments are based on successful programs. At a time when the Marshall Liberal government is racking up a record debt of more than \$21 billion and when interest payments will be more than \$1 billion per year or nearly \$3 million a day, trade, tourism and investment can play a key role in stimulating the economy.

They will help generate a very healthy return of investment to the state. This is important, a key role in our economy. It just has to be supported. These cuts are short-sighted. They are not in the best interests of the South Australian taxpayer. The South Australian people want growth. They want jobs. They want jobs throughout all of South Australia. Tourism is the answer; exports are the answer. This budget simply does not cut it. Once again, the tourism industry has been let down.

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (16:24):** Mr Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

*A quorum have been formed:*

**Ms COOK:** I rise to speak on the Appropriation Bill. The budget put forward by the government is, as described in the ABC, an 'overalls and hi-vis' budget. It has nothing in it for vulnerable people in our community. It hits the hip pocket of the average South Australian household.

These decisions on increased taxes and fees will flow down the chain to renters and to those who are vulnerable in our community. It will flow down to retail consumers. It will hurt those who hurt the most. The budget is short-sighted. It will inflict more pain than anything. I fear that we are about to go into some kind of two-speed economy. There will be road and large infrastructure movement, this spend will continue, but retail will suffer, as will our housing industry, which continues to be under pressure.

As the opposition shadow for human services, I have a responsibility to every person in our state to hold the government to account in protecting and providing for the most vulnerable in our community. This task is one I fully commit to and is a challenge I enjoy. The government purports to have injected money to provide a stimulus package which will provide much-needed housing in our community, yet the \$42.5 million package is not new money: it is simply making the South Australian Housing Authority use its scarce cash reserves and receipts from the sale of further properties and spend just \$21.1 million on the maintenance of properties and \$21.4 million on building just 90 homes

and, according to the government's own budget papers, not all of them will be affordable homes. It is outrageous.

As data from the Don Dunstan Foundation and Project Zero showed only in the last few weeks, there are 227 known homeless persons in the Adelaide CBD alone. These people are already in desperate need of housing, and that is not even starting to think about the thousands of others in crisis across our state. Indeed, a report earlier this year commissioned by the Local Government Association suggested that South Australia needs at least 14,000 more affordable homes.

The government has also set aside \$2 million to provide one-off \$10,000 interest-free loans to bridge the gap to deposits. HomeStart, the government's own lending arm for housing in the state, provides low 3 per cent deposit loans. I do not really want to fully unpack this at the moment. I want to wait and see who comes to me, who we hear from.

How many families earning under that \$60,000 threshold will be able to afford what is likely to be at least a \$300,000 mortgage as well as pay back their \$10,000 loan for what is probably a modest home? I am sure that there will not be too many in our electorate. We already see mortgage stress in our communities. Without proper support, families will be under enormous pressure trying to repay these loans as well as their mortgage. How many people will even consider accessing this poorly considered offering remains to be seen.

The South Australian Housing Authority, in addition to being forced to use their cash reserves and sales receipts, is also experiencing a funding cut, the same as all departments. I cannot find in the papers, because of the change of treatment, how many or if any staff are being cut from the Housing Authority. What I can find is a \$4.3 million efficiency—that is Liberal government code for cuts—and that is just this year. Thereafter, it is \$7.6 million indexed. The Liberals purport to be build, house and save, but what they are really doing is cut, cut, cut.

In this budget, we see a savage cut to the subsidisation of monitored personal alarms, personal alert systems that are used by many of our most vulnerable South Australians, the older South Australians in our community who live alone. Monitored personal alarms ensure that they can maintain at least some degree of independence and have help at the push of a button. From July—that is, within two weeks—any older person who needs help to access a personal alert will need to do so through My Aged Care. We sadly know how unresponsive that process can be.

This service is incredibly difficult to navigate. If they do not have a level 1 package already, they will need to apply for one, as the cost of their system is then covered through that package, rather than through the state government's budget. People who are on packages 2, 3 or 4 will no longer qualify. This will affect people in every electorate in this state, and they need to let the Minister for Human Services know that older South Australians will not stand back and let this happen. It is a savage cut.

In addition to this cut, from October the monitoring fees go up by \$50 per annum. This is only a dollar, you might say. Well, it is double what they are going to get extra for their concessions payments. My late parents used this service. As a family member, I know that it enabled us to have some peace of mind that our parents could live with some dignity and have help at hand. This system saves lives; we know that it does. The reduction in funding and the increased charges for this will likely see less people using the service. I hope it will not result in people dying because of this. This will stop people getting timely help after a fall, and it may even push people over the edge and make them unable to stay at home.

These changes, while they hurt older South Australians, will also do great harm to many businesses that help to provide personal alarms. They have less than two weeks' notice of the change in the system. It is pretty disgraceful. This is not a government that is helping South Australians.

**Mr BROWN:** Point of order, sir: I call your attention to the state of the house.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Ms COOK:** While going through the budget papers, Mr Acting Speaker, I noticed that major security upgrades to the Adelaide Youth Training Centre had been highlighted. As you know, I am

sure, youth justice is something particularly close to my heart, so I keep a very close eye on the goings-on. These upgrades were forecast last year, but they still have not been completed. I thought the word 'major' in the budget line may have indicated the urgent need for them, but instead I wonder if they have just been delayed until they can be reannounced somewhere in the future. We are seeing this as a bit of a trend. In a high-debt budget, a reannouncement could be something interesting.

The Department of Human Services does, and always has done, a great job supporting vulnerable people in South Australia. It has been under a lot of pressure with cuts to jobs, but in this next budget it sees the government axing a further 322 members from the workforce. That is a 10 per cent cut to a department that relies on a lot of intellectual property and history in order to get their great work done. Forgetting that staff transitions to the NDIS and other areas do occur, there are 70 FTEs alone in the section of the department supporting communities.

How does this government think that an already stressed department is going to undertake its role supporting the not-for-profit sector, vulnerable communities, our young people, volunteers and more? The very slow transition to the NDIS has meant that this budget sees additional funding of \$6.7 million to support the finalisation of service reform and disability functions as a result of the state's full transition, we hope, to the National Disability Insurance Scheme. I welcome this. However, there is no identified funding for the National Disability Strategy and anyone who is not eligible for the NDIS. What will happen with this and where will those people be supported?

I would usually applaud a government increasing the amount given for concessions to support the high cost of energy, but an increase of 50¢ cents per day is really not enough. In fact, I think it might be 50¢ a week. I will have to double-check that.

**Mr Pederick:** You are not misleading the house?

**Ms COOK:** I think I was being far too kind to you. You are far too tight for that.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk):** You have been kind to me, member for Hurtle Vale.

**Ms COOK:** Yes, you are far too tight, Mr Acting Speaker, I know. I believe that it may be \$26 per annum, which is about 50¢ a week. We cannot forget that many of these concession holders are also very fragile when it comes to the impact of the rising cost of living elsewhere, such as in retail, supermarkets and transport. Incomes have stagnated. Lower income workers are ostensibly getting less pay compared to the rate of inflation.

Pensioners and Newstart recipients have not kept up with inflation. In very real terms, these incomes are going backwards. Many of the people on concessions live in public housing or in high-cost rental. All those costs are going up, and particularly last year there was the unfair and disproportionate increase to rents in Housing Trust tenancies. For these people, 26 bucks a year is going to mean nothing to them, sadly.

I worked in hospitals for around three decades. The Olsen government, under the current Treasurer, introduced paid parking in hospitals, so paid car parking has a long history. This government went to the 2018 election with the promise of providing more affordable car parking fees that would help ease the financial and emotional strain of people attending hospitals as patients, carers or visitors.

Well, Mr Acting Speaker, the Treasurer has duded you and has since reneged on his promise, telling vulnerable patients, carers and their visitors—which I can tell you provide a wealth of support to people who are in hospital—that higher public hospital parking fees have been necessary to help cover the \$517 million GST deficit, a GST drop that their Liberal friends in Canberra have decided to make vulnerable South Australians pay for. Shame!

Do not get me started on my former colleagues, allied health workers, nurses, doctors and ancillary workers, who work tirelessly in public hospitals day and night and are required to drive to work because public transport is not available in the middle of the night when their shifts finish. Even worse, their bus routes have been cut in the last 12 months. Many of these workers will have to pay an additional \$725 per annum for car parking, and some of them are on very low wages. We should be valuing all people who support those who are in our hospitals who are unwell and those who are doing the great work to help them.

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk):** Member for Hurtle Vale, apologies from the member for Playford for disrupting the house.

**Mr Pederick:** It's such a scintillating speech, sir.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk):** Order, member for Hammond! The member for Hurtle Vale has the call.

**Ms COOK:** On Wednesday this week, we heard from the Chief Justice that the burden of having stripped vital justice support services will fall on judges and courts. One such service that has been axed in recent weeks is the Welfare Rights Centre's Housing Legal Clinic, which services about 500 vulnerable people a year who are in housing crisis. This service will shut its doors in a week because this government has cut its funding. This service has provided support to keep people in their homes—people facing eviction as well as other complex housing matters, which many vulnerable residents of South Australia simply do not have the funds to pay for privately.

Additionally, there are cuts to the Women's Domestic Violence Court Assistance Service. This court assistance service has been cut by three-quarters of a million or \$750,000. There is also reduced grant funding for the Victim Support Service by \$3.6 million over the forward estimates. Where will they go? I doubt the Attorney-General is going to be providing her own legal services to support these vulnerable South Australians. These decisions will disproportionately affect people on low incomes and those on no incomes at all—pensioners.

We know the number of South Australian households surviving on low incomes that are struggling to pay their rent has almost doubled from 22 per cent to 40 per cent, so the chances are that each one of us in this place will know somebody in that situation. Every person in this place will have people in their electorate who will suffer because of this, someone who will need assistance from a service like the Housing Legal Clinic. Who will now provide that service?

I will be looking at this and many other services like it, services that have already been contacting my office this week about the lack of funding, the lack of support, and the lack of an ear to their problems. This is a budget by a man who should have retired many years ago, in my opinion. He was bitter when he lost the 2002 election and he has dug in since then. If nothing—

**Ms LUETHEN:** Point of order: that sounded like a personal reflection on another person.

**An honourable member:** He's not in this house.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk):** Order! The member for Hurtle Vale will please take her seat. On a point of order, when a member rises other members must be seated. Member for King, your point of order?

**Ms LUETHEN:** That it was a personal reflection on another member, but I am not sure if that applies in this house.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk):** Thank you, member for King. That it is not parliamentary to reflect on a member of the house applies only to this chamber, but I remind the member for Hurtle Vale to undertake all her discussions, as she always does, with decorum and manner.

**Ms COOK:** Thank you, sir. Can I have 30 seconds back, sir? It was a bogus point of order.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk):** Member for Hurtle Vale, your clock is ticking.

**Ms COOK:** Thank you, sir. I repeat: this is a budget by a man who should have retired long ago, in my opinion. He was bitter when he lost the 2002 election and he has stayed here to haunt us. If anything, he is resilient, he is tough and he enjoys his sugar; however, this gentleman is at the end of his career, on the way out. As the Leader of the Opposition mentioned earlier, he leaves this legacy for the current Premier and for future generations.

If we are to move forward with this new, almost ideologically neoliberal Liberal budget, we need to create jobs that are viable in the long term. Roads are good for now, good for the short term, but building more houses not only relieves pressure on an already stagnating market but also provides a skill base for workers who can continue to use those skills, a diverse range of skills, into the future, building more houses, creating more apprenticeships, creating more small businesses.

It will be our younger people, our future generations, who will be saddled with this Liberal debt for years to come. Without a legacy of small businesses and diverse opportunities debt will just keep increasing, debt that they cannot even forecast—or at least reveal to us. How much will the north-south corridor cost to finish? Probably around \$5 billion. How much will the new Women's and Children's Hospital cost? What will our debt be in the next five years; equal to our budget?

I am saddened by this budget. I am saddened for my former health colleagues, vulnerable people, young people who have to bear the brunt of the Liberal Marshall budget. This budget is unfair. It brings results that are unfair, and we have to put the responsibility square on the shoulders of the Premier: broken election promises, more taxes, higher fees and charges, higher debt for future generations, job losses in the public sector, cuts to housing, false stimulus packages.

In a community where there is low wages growth, where people are struggling to keep their heads above water, a \$350 million extra slug of charges is simply irresponsible. The budget is irresponsible. It is a legacy of someone retiring, handing the baton on to the Premier, who will then hand this on to a future Labor government. Shame!

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (16:49):** I rise to make a very brief contribution to the Appropriation Bill. I will not be reflecting on anybody's honour in the way the member for Hurtle Vale did. I would not want to push the Treasurer over the edge. He is fragile.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk):** Order!

**Mr ODENWALDER:** That's the line I was looking for, member for Stuart. I will go into the particulars of this year's budget and what it does in a few moments' time, but it is more concerning at first blush from the point of view of my portfolio areas of police, emergency services, corrections and road safety for what it does not do in the context of last year's budget. It was tempting to view last year's budget as something of an anomaly in the course of a Liberal government, the product of an ideological Treasurer who has waited 16 years to rip into the public sector to get rid of what he sees as wasteful public spending, i.e., spending on public transport, public housing and those types of things.

So it is the product of an ideologically driven and impatient Treasurer and a new cabinet and inexperienced ministry who would be easily guided by this one man. It is easy to see that budget as an anomaly, but nine months later, that does not turn out to be the case at all. It is clear that it was not an anomaly and that the Treasurer, with the blessing of the Premier, is entirely in control of this cabinet, entirely in control of the budget process and simply gets what he wants.

As has been pointed out by other speakers, particularly the leader, the member for Croydon, we have seen a complete 180 turn in terms of the ideology of the Treasurer and his approach to debt and absolute silence from the neoliberals, particularly on the backbench. There is certainly silence in the house, not so much in the corridors, but that will probably be teased out in the estimates committee process, I would hope.

As I said at the beginning, this year's budget is more notable in my portfolio areas for the things it does not do. It does not redress and reverse the cruel cuts of the previous budget which some people in certain sectors were expecting, frankly. Certainly people in the local government area and in community groups were expecting a reversal of the strange and, in the scheme of things, small cuts to community safety grants, funding for CCTV, safety lighting in the suburbs and the city and those types of things. They expected to see those small cuts reversed, a reinstatement or even a rebadging of those types of grants. As far as I can read from the budget papers, at least we have seen nothing of that sort.

It is going to be up to the Adelaide city council, for example, to find its own resources to maintain and expand its CCTV network. It has the in-kind support of SAPOL, of course, but it has

been responsible with state government money in the past for the maintenance and replacement of both the hardware and the software, importantly, that controls the CCTV set up in the city. That is just one example. In fact, I spoke to the Adelaide city council last year. They were concerned about CCTV. They were concerned about safety lighting and the community safety grants.

What they were most concerned about, and what they were very unhappy about, was the cut to the managed taxi rank program, which was funded through the Attorney-General's Department and money was given to the Taxi Council in order to staff six taxi ranks around the CBD on a Friday and Saturday night between the hours of 12 and five. These were places, I am told—I do not go out at night, but I am told—that people, young people, particularly women, know because they go out regularly and they know that they are safe havens, safe places to go when they are out in the city enjoying themselves. The state government put an end to that. In fact, the funding officially ran out on New Year's Eve of all times. Bizarrely, it ran out at midnight on New Year's Eve. The Adelaide city council had to rush to prop it up for another six weeks and now the program is in limbo.

Of course, we did not see the cut restored, which I was expecting actually. I thought it unthinkable that they would not reinstate the funding to Crime Stoppers. We all know the history of Crime Stoppers. Some months before the last election, there were many discussions with the then government and Crime Stoppers, and I believe with the then opposition, about ongoing funding since their major sponsor had pulled out some years before. They had eaten into their existing fund base and they needed—as all other states have now provided—some level of state government funding to continue their promotional operations in particular.

Oddly enough—and this shows again that the police minister has no control over this budget and that it is entirely the Treasurer's budget; it is entirely ideologically driven—there was no money for the reinstatement of funding for Crime Stoppers. Crime Stoppers themselves make no secret of the fact that they are upset about it. I quote from their media release of 18 June:

Crime Stoppers SA says a decision to not allocate any budget to support the independent crime reporting and prevention program in South Australia will not dampen its resolve to keep advocating for state government funding.

The decision comes less than 48 hours after the release of the latest wastewater test results by the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission that shows Adelaide as having the highest concentration of methamphetamine in the nation.

The chair is quoted as saying:

...We have been in ongoing discussion with the Minister for Police and his advisors to try and address the fact that South Australia is the only state to not receive any state government support.

We had been advised that a budget bid had been put forward to Treasury, so it is naturally disappointing to see nothing allocated once again. What this does is strengthen our resolve to keep engaging the business community to help fund our operations, as we have done for more than 20 years,...

However, she goes on to say:

We will need to curb or delay a number of earmarked crime-solving and prevention activities in response—including plans to better engage with non-English-speaking communities and tackle country crime...

As I said, certainly in my portfolio areas this budget has been more notable for what it does not do than what it does, but let's look at some of the things that it does do that we know of. Perhaps I will start with a bouquet: it provides some funding for the emergency services. I will give it that. It provides some funding of a relatively modest nature over four years for the MFS and the CFS in particular for equipment—helmets and those types of things—which they do need. No-one begrudges them that funding.

There is also \$1.9 million over two years to address the PFAS issue (I will not attempt to pronounce the scientific name for PFAS; we will call it PFAS), which is a chemical used in firefighting which has reached the news, particularly over the last year or so. It is believed to be a very dangerous chemical. Like asbestos, there are ongoing studies into exactly how dangerous it is, but it is generally accepted to be dangerous. It is generally accepted that it is not going to be used anymore in firefighting activities, certainly in this state, as of last year.

As has been widely reported, serious levels of PFAS were found particularly in the Largs North Fire Station. To their credit, the MFS acted very quickly and instituted a series of testing for

officers. It soon became very clear that there was a cluster around the Largs North Fire Station. In fairness, the MFS did exactly the right thing: they temporarily closed it, under some pressure from the union, I understand. However, I understand they temporarily closed the station and rehoused most or all of that brigade at the Fort Largs Police Academy.

Apart from an initial delay in action or any sort of addressing of the issue by the minister, we have seen this strange process where, first of all, a report was commissioned from Melbourne fire brigade's respected and well-known expert, Mick Tisbury AFSM. He is a commander in the Melbourne fire brigade, but he is also something of an expert in PFAS contamination in fire stations around the world. He provided the MFS with a report in February, which stated that PFAS, despite the decontamination efforts of the MFS, was still likely to be dangerously high in that location.

The central recommendation of the report he handed to the MFS was to 'strongly consider permanently decommissioning the Largs North Fire Station'. Those are his exact words from the report he handed to the MFS in February. In April, the MFS put out the PFAS newsletter to its members and its workforce. It does this on a periodic basis to advise people of the progress of the rehabilitation and remediation of the site, etc., and the results of blood tests and so on, and the services they provide, to be fair, to the firefighters and their families.

But there is no mention in this April newsletter of the Tisbury report, which strongly recommended decommissioning the fire station. In the words of Tisbury himself, that report was dropped like a hot potato. A second engineering report was commissioned; I have not seen that report, but apparently it recommends that remediation would result in the fire station being ready to be rehoused. The union has some concerns about this. I have some concerns about this, simply on the strength of the rejection of the Tisbury report.

I will try to tease this out further in estimates, of course, but I wonder what the minister himself has done to get to the bottom of why this report was not acted upon, whether he had in fact seen the report and what further information he required of Tisbury and of the MFS management about this report. That is an ongoing issue for the MFS. As I said, across the emergency services sector some money has been allocated in terms of equipment provision, and I think that is probably altogether a good thing.

In the police portfolio, we saw quite a generous pre-announcement of something which is hardly formed at all, which is the user-pays scheme for police attendance at major events.

**Mr BROWN:** Mr Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I want to thank the member for Playford for allowing me time to refresh myself. I believe that I was talking about the proposed user-pays scheme, or the police rent tax, which was pre-announced, but then clearly there was very little in the way of detail provided to either the house or the general public.

The reason for the lack of detail is that all that appears to have happened—and this was teased out again at the Budget and Finance Committee—is that the police commissioner has been given a significant revenue target to meet over the next four years. It turns out that at some level it has been proposed that there is \$1 million in savings to be had with the implementation of a user-pays scheme. Under questioning, the commissioner revealed that there is simply no pre-planning for this at all.

There are some models interstate to look at. I am sure that the police commissioner has a preferred model, but there are still so many questions about what this would look like. The police commissioner said that there could be a situation in which the police, doing their due diligence in providing a management plan, as they do at every major event, could recommend a certain number of police officers to attend and then impose a cost on the organisers for the provision of those police officers.

It is still not clear if that would be the case. The police commissioner certainly seemed to indicate that it was a possibility. It was also revealed that this is in the context of no consultation at all with any major event providers. There was no consultation with bodies like Adelaide Oval, the



SMA or anyone who would normally be called on to facilitate or provide a major event in the city or the state, so there is a whole lot of confusion around how that would actually work.

There are other questions around this. For example, having hired police officers of various ranks to patrol their premises, would a major event organiser or their management have the power to somehow direct police officers in a way that clearly no-one can, except the police commissioner or his proxies? There are serious operational questions to answer about how a model like this would work. There simply has been no detail. All we know is that there is a \$1 million a year savings target for this measure and we wait with bated breath to see how it would work.

There has also been an announcement of an APY lands staffing model. Again, there is very little detail. We know that it will save \$1 million per year over three years. It is called the 'APY lands staffing model'. What it appears to be is the training of more Aboriginal community constables, which in itself is a very good thing in the APY lands, but it also seems to suggest—and it is by no means clear how this would work—that uniformed, permanent sworn police officers and detectives would not be permanently stationed on the lands but that tactical response teams would be brought in on a fly-in fly-out arrangement.

Media reports seem to suggest that there would be a continuing police presence in the APY lands but not a permanent police presence. If there is a fly-in fly-out model, police officers are not permanently stationed there, building relationships with people, which is what policing is about. Policing is not a paramilitary activity: policing is a process of building relationships with people and keeping the community safe through building trust. I fear that may be lost in this APY lands staffing model. I trust the commissioner implicitly in putting these things into operation, but I wonder if the minister is across the detail and asking the right questions as these things are put into practice.

With the time left available to me, I will go over some of the other measures in the budget. Of particular concern to me is the complete cessation of the New Foundations program. The member for Kaurana would be aware of this program, and the member for Croydon is certainly aware of it and was a great supporter of it in the last years of the previous government. It would have been a very good program of rehabilitation and prerelease preparation, providing service wraparound, providing access to housing, etc., for prisoners leaving prison.

Of course, the underlying motive for this is to stop reoffending. The government has paid lip service to the idea of reducing reoffending and yesterday somehow claimed that, under their 14 months of government, recidivism is in such rapid decline that they can start closing prerelease beds and so on. The most recent Productivity Commission figures do not bear that out at all. In any way the Productivity Commission measures recidivism, across South Australia it has remained reasonably static and, in fact, is slightly up, so I am not sure where the minister is getting his figures. I have given him a signal that I will be asking those questions.

**Mr BROWN:** Mr Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr ODENWALDER:** As I was saying, the cessation—

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk):** Order!

**Mr ODENWALDER:** —of the New Foundations program is of particular concern.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk):** Order! The member for Elizabeth has the call.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Thank you, sir. Extra time?

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk):** No.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** In last year's budget, we saw a partial rejection of the New Foundations program. It was downgraded to a trial of something else. This year, we learn that that trial has been abandoned in the interests of saving \$1 million per year over the next four years. I know that the minister has paid public lip service to the idea of reducing reoffending—the same commitment as the

previous government had. I will be really interested to see all the evidence laid out of the vast reduction, the rapid reduction, of recidivism over the last 14 months, but I will be interrogating that further during estimates.

Time has obviously got away from me, but I do just want to touch quickly on the road safety portfolio—clearly, the minister's favourite. There is still plenty of confusion, despite the fact that, thankfully, the funding that previously went to the Motor Accident Commission for road safety, promotion and research seems to have been included in this year's budget and in ongoing budgets, if we believe the Treasurer.

There is still plenty of confusion about how that will work. Again, the police commissioner was in the Budget and Finance Committee on Monday, but no light was shed on how that will work, and, in particular, which minister—the Minister for Transport, the Minister for Police or road safety—has jurisdiction over which area, what role the police commissioner will play or whether the new tsar of road safety will have the power to direct the police commissioner in some way. I am sure that he will have something to say about it, and I look forward to interrogating all these issues and more in the estimates committee.

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (17:13):** I rise to discuss the Appropriation Bill, which of course is a piece of legislation for this year's state budget, a budget that is disappointing, a budget that is completely bereft of any vision for the state, a budget that sets record levels of debt for our state and in particular, in my area of shadow responsibility, a budget that is bad for the healthcare system.

Sadly, we have seen healthcare in this state deteriorating over the short term of the Marshall government so far, and that is set to continue under this plan set out by the government in their budget. You only have to look at one of the first pages of its health portfolio statements to see what their vision is for health over the next 12 months in South Australia, and that is a reduction in the number of staff working for SA Health of 1,140 staff—1,140 full-time equivalent staff they are expecting to go over the next 12 months.

That is going to be a significant blow to our hospital system. That is going to be a significant blow to patients who rely on healthcare services in our public system in this state. This year, we have seen a record start to the flu season, and we have seen a particularly bungled response from the government at the start of the flu season, when we had hospitals running out of vaccines and GPs being denied access to vaccines for their patients. Now we are seeing what impacts are hitting our hospitals at the moment. It is particularly severe.

We are seeing extreme ramping happening at our hospitals and we are seeing extreme overcrowding of the emergency departments across Adelaide, and that is only going to get worse by removing 1,100 staff. When we are talking about the healthcare system, we have to bear in mind that two-thirds of the money that we spend on health goes to pay for the staff: the nurses, the doctors, the allied health professionals and the paramedics on whom people rely to look after them in their times of need. You cannot cut money from the health budget without it ultimately impacting upon front-line care and front-line staff. That is what we see in this budget.

Despite the Premier's denials today, we only have to look at the expenditure statements in Budget Paper 3, which show that the expenditure projections for the next three years are that there will be no growth in health expenditure in this state whatsoever. This is despite the fact that we are going to have more people needing services, just from the fact of population growth alone, let alone the fact that our population of older South Australians will need more services and let alone the fact that there is an increasing cost of providing those services in terms of technology and other needs. We are also seeing increased demand through the flu and increasing rates of chronic disease.

Of course, there is going to be more demand for health services over the coming years, but the government is proposing that we spend not one dollar more on health in South Australia for the next three years. How can they do that? Apparently, they can do that by removing 1,140 staff in one year alone. We are going to see the impacts of that in our emergency departments, we are going to see the impacts of that in terms of elective surgery and people waiting for procedures and we are going to see the impacts of that in terms of care for people in the community.

I think it is going to be quite diabolical. I think that people will start to see some very significant impacts because of that, particularly those people who rely on health services. The government has

been talking about the need for restraining expenditure on health and has been saying that they can manage the health budget to the last dollar and make sure that nothing is ever overspent, but, lo and behold, the budget papers revealed that there was an extra \$258 million overspent in health over the past year, compared to their budget.

Today, the Premier said, 'We have an overspend of \$95 million,' but that is only the overspend since the Mid-Year Budget Review came out at the end of last year. The overspend since the last budget is \$258 million, so all these calls from the government, that they are somehow masters of making sure that health expenditure is under control, have turned out to be complete rubbish. Not only have they brought in corporate liquidators KordaMentha to run our hospital system but they have appointed them to run the Royal Adelaide Hospital, The Queen Elizabeth Hospital and all the other areas inside the CALHN network, such as Glenside and Hampstead. They have appointed these guys to run this and have paid them very handsomely for that.

So far, these interstate corporate liquidators have received \$23 million from the taxpayer, and that could well rise to over \$40 million, or potentially even up to \$50 million spent on this project over the next two years. What have we got out of it? So far, we have massive overspending over the past year that they have been in control of our hospital system. It does not appear that very much has been delivered from that. It appears that it has been an abject failure.

This is a contract that was entered into originally with KordaMentha but did not go through a tender process. We found that out through estimates last year, and it is something that we have referred to the Auditor-General to investigate because they just picked KordaMentha without going through any process to do that. We have seen that the process by which they decided not to do a tender is very questionable, and the results have been abysmal. Let's remember as well that KordaMentha are not employing anybody from South Australia on this project.

There is \$23 million so far, potentially rising to over \$40 million and potentially up to \$50 million over the next couple of years, and we are sending all that money interstate. The only money that is being spent in South Australia is for hotels that we are paying for so these staff can fly in and fly out of South Australia, as though these are mining workers in the Pilbara. Apparently, there are no accountants or other staff who could help manage the books in South Australia; all of them need to come from interstate. The lawyers are coming from interstate, the accountants are coming from interstate and the corporate liquidators are coming from interstate.

Despite all this taxpayer money going there, it has been an abject failure so far, and I fear that it is going to continue to be an abject failure because clearly they have no experience in health care. Clearly, this is the first time they have ever done such a project running a hospital. Let's remember as well that over the next two years their project plan says that they are meant to cut \$420 million out of those two hospitals. Cutting \$40 million out of the RAH and The QEH will be a detrimental blow to health care in this state.

They project in their report that it is going to involve potentially thousands of operations. They project in their report that potentially 170 overnight beds will be lost out of those two hospitals. That is a massive number of wards shutting down and closing up shop every night, sealing the door so no patients can go in, all so that they can pull out this \$420 million, which they have so far failed to do. We see this government not only hitting people now in this budget, in terms of a reduction of services and a reduction of staff, but also trying to charge those patients more to get there in the first place. We have seen this unprecedented hit in terms of car parking fees across the board.

Every Adelaide metropolitan hospital bar one, I think, is seeing a massive increase in hospital car parking fees of 20 per cent. It is a 20 per cent increase. Patients, carers and people who need to access those hospitals for appointments or to visit their loved ones are going to be hit extra. They are not getting anything extra for that. This is just going into Treasury coffers to help the bottom line. Adding insult to injury, the government is pulling out the two hours free that is available and has been available for many years at The QEH.

People in the western suburbs, obviously some of our most socially needed areas in our state, will see the removal of that two hours free, so they will pay significantly more to visit people. I was at The QEH talking to people about this recently. I spoke to one gentleman who said that his wife has been in the hospital for the past month. She has a particularly awful condition. He visits her

twice a day and is able to visit twice a day using the two hours free and is not paying anything at the moment. That obviously will skyrocket the costs for him to visit his wife under that scenario, and there are many other people that this is going to hit across the board.

But it gets worse because the government have hit the staff who work in these hospitals even more. Not only are they cutting—sacking—1,140 staff from the hospitals, but those who get to keep their jobs will have the delight of paying \$725 extra just for the pleasure of turning up to work. These are people who are going there to save people's lives in our hospital system. Many of them are not very well paid at all and we are slugging them an extra \$725 to go to work. I am sure the government would say that maybe they should catch public transport.

There are two issues with that. First, the government is cutting public transport, particularly after-hours buses across Adelaide and, secondly, these people work shift work. These people work particularly unsociable hours, so how can you say to a nurse who works at, say, the Lyell McEwin, who leaves work at 11 o'clock at night, 'You have to catch a bus home,' when there are no buses that run in that area after that time? How are they supposed to get home, other than by paying over \$1,000 for a car park pass to park at the hospital to have the ability to go to work?

If you are an enrolled nurse on \$56,000 a year, that is 1.3 per cent of your pay gone in this absolute travesty of a budget—it is basically just taken as a pay cut—let alone cleaners, other staff, administrative assistants and others, who are also low-paid workers in our hospital system. All these people are going to be hit by this hospital car park tax. I think that they have a very good claim to the government to say that maybe they should be compensated more in their next enterprise bargaining to make up for the fact that they are now paying more to even get to work, to provide the care and provide services that they do in the hospital system.

Over the past two years, we have seen ramping in our hospitals worse than ever before. In the last week, the Ambulance Employees Association put out a graph that shows just exactly that, that ambulance ramping in our hospitals is now more than double what it was only two years ago. It has never been this bad in South Australia's history, and this is a budget that has not one single plan to address that. Not one single effort is being allocated to ramping, hospital beds or overcrowding in our emergency departments. There is nothing there whatsoever. Of the things that the minister has been talking about that he wants to try to do and that he thinks will have some effect, none is in here.

Either the minister is going to have to cut something else to do these projects or the minister was unsuccessful in getting them funded in the budget. I am thinking here of the supposed home hospital program that the minister has been talking about. There is not one dollar in the budget for that. The minister has been talking about priority care centres. There is not one dollar in the budget for that. There is not one dollar in the budget for extra resources for emergency departments, not one dollar in the budget for our ambulances.

Our ambulances are completely overrun at the moment. They are spending so much time ramped at hospitals that they are not out on the road responding to calls. We have seen the effect of that. This budget paper makes it clear where it says that we are seeing a huge reduction in the response times that ambulances are providing to members of the public. That is the reality that is set out in the government's own budget papers, but there is not one extra dollar to help those ambulances, not one extra dollar for extra paramedics to address that. We know that the government is sitting on a report saying that there needs to be extra investment in that, but there is nothing here in this budget to address that. But there is an additional feature in this budget to claw money from the patients in the ambulances.

We are jumping into the hip pockets of people who call out an ambulance. Either those people who are paying for ambulance cover or those people who are calling an ambulance without ambulance cover are going to pay 5 per cent more, which is three times the rate of inflation. That means that if you call an ambulance you will now pay at least \$1,025 for the privilege of being taken to an emergency department—because it is a privilege under this government. That is over \$50 more once you factor in the per kilometre charge, which is also rising by 5 per cent as well, and that is be another way that patients are being hit under this budget.

So we are hitting you when you park your car to get to hospital, we are hitting you if you catch an ambulance to get there and then we are hitting you with fewer services inside the hospital.

Either way, South Australian patients are being hit under this budget and it is particularly cruel. We are seeing a number of the cuts, a number of closures that were proposed in the last budget continue in this budget, most notably the potential privatisation of SA Pathology and, before it is privatised, the very significant cuts that are about to befall SA Pathology.

Many people, including me, were expecting some relief from those savings targets for SA Pathology, but they are nowhere to be found in the budget. The government have not relieved any of those targets, and it appears to me and others as though this is just being set up for privatisation in about 10 months or so when the government said that they will be making their final decision on that. It will be sold off.

South Australians will not have a public pathology provider in what the AMA has described as a weird experiment that has never been done anywhere else in the country. That is going to be disastrous for health care in this state, for the teaching of health practitioners in this state, for medical research into conditions where we want to be a leader of that in this state and also for dealing with outbreaks, as we are seeing at the moment with flu, in this state.

One thing the government has been keen to triumphantly talk about is the money in the budget for the Women's and Children's Hospital. Many people were expecting to see their full plan, their full budget for the Women's and Children's, but they have been sorely disappointed in this budget. In a bizarre way, the government has said that there is going to be some money, but they have not actually detailed anywhere in the budget papers where this funding is; there is no allocation year by year of any funding. The government are saying, 'Well, we still haven't worked out how much this hospital is actually going to cost.'

I do not believe that there is any other health project in Australia that has ever been embarked upon without an idea, a projection and an estimate of what the total cost will be at the end of the project. I know the government has a report from the task force they set up. They handpicked this task force and they said it was very important, and they said it was important to work out the total capital cost of the project. We know so because they put it in their election policy. We know so because they had on their website until recently that that is what the task force was advising the government to do.

Lo and behold, the government have a report from the task force, but they will not say what the cost is. In fact, they will not even say whether the task force recommended what the cost was. Apparently, the Premier has seen enough cost estimates that he is comfortable and not scared by the figures, but South Australians do not get the right to know what those figures are and what the cost of this project is going to be.

It is utterly bizarre, and it is something we are going to continue to pursue, particularly when we have had answers before from ministers, in this house and in the other place, saying that they would release a report and that the figure of the cost would be known this half of this year—which only has 10 days left to go. I think South Australians who care about the financial probity of these projects will want to know what that figure is. It is all very peculiar why there is such secrecy surrounding that.

Unfortunately, in the last few weeks we have also seen some very devastating news come out for non-government mental health providers in this state. They have been told at the last minute, in the last month, I think only five weeks before their funding will be cut, that their funding will be cut by 25 per cent, that \$6.8 million will be pulled out of mental health services in this state. This will impact our hospitals and it will impact our community sector.

It will have a devastating impact on those people who are suffering from mental health conditions who need these supports, these non-government supports that have been doing a great job, many of which are oversubscribed and many of which have waiting lists, many of which do not have people who are transferring to the NDIS at all. All this has been told to the government, but the government has refused to move. The government has refused to address that. Sadly, I think we will see some very significant impacts of people losing access to these important services and the terrible results that will come from that.

The government is in complete denial mode about this. The minister has written an outrageous letter to MPs attacking advocates of mental health in this state for daring to raise concerns about the cuts to these programs. They are being cut. There are going to be 25 per cent fewer of these programs from 1 July than there were on 30 June. That cannot be disputed, and we will see the impact of that—and I fear it will be very bad. This is a budget without vision that is going to impact on people and patients across the board and our health system very severely

Time expired.

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (17:33):** I also rise to speak in relation to the budget handed down by the Treasurer two days ago, a budget bereft of any vision or plan for the future, a budget devoid of any expression of how those opposite will prioritise the people of South Australia and their hopes for the future, a budget characterised by two things: huge, unprecedented state debt that will create a burden for future generations of South Australians to bear and an utter disregard for South Australians already struggling with the cost of living.

All budgets speak to what governments value and prioritise, and this budget clearly says to South Australians that this government does not value them or understand what their day-to-day lives and their budgeting look like. Some state budgets are about giving people a hand up, about making things a bit fairer for people, about giving people a hand and some support when they are having a go, when they are going about their day-to-day lives and when things are really difficult. This one, sadly, is about none of those things. It is all about the Treasurer putting his hand into the pocket of hardworking South Australians with no explanation whatsoever about why and for what purpose he will use the cash that he is raking in from them.

This morning, the leader spoke about the Pollard family and what this budget means for them. I have had the pleasure of speaking with that family, too. It is really clear that, like many other families, they will find it even harder to make ends meet as a direct result of this careless, mean budget. We on this side of the house value people and their experience. We empathise when things are difficult and we think deeply about how fees, charges, parking costs and rate rises will impact people's lives. We listen to people.

Just the other day, a woman who is a cleaner at the Flinders Medical Centre came to visit my office. She was utterly distraught about the increase in parking fees that she will now incur as a result of simply parking at work. She really did not know how she would afford them. It is one of the bus routes in my community to Flinders Medical Centre that has been cut that she would have had to use, meaning that at the time that she goes to and from work public transport is no longer an option. This budget has made life harder for her as it has for many South Australians.

The outrageous fees and charges hikes that this Liberal government has introduced go way beyond inflation rates. Higher costs for fewer services is not what we heard from those opposite before the election but it is certainly clear now that that is what they value. Every single time a South Australian drives their car, catches public transport, has to go to hospital for treatment, or is sadly rushed there in an emergency, every time they go for a day out to Cleland or for a night out, those opposite will make it harder for them and, in some instances, will make it impossible.

Even when you put out your bin, you will pay more. This is alarming for so many people and alarming in the context of the fact that this budget also delivers a debt to South Australians that the Treasurer has said will never be paid in his lifetime; however, South Australians will continue to pay for generations to come. The decision made to exponentially increase debt in this budget will have long-term consequences for every single person in South Australia.

Who and what you prioritise in your budget speaks volumes about who and what you value. South Australians, sadly, now know that they have a government that does not value them, does not understand struggles with the cost of living and does not care. Sadly, this has all happened while their federal counterparts have seen off any chance of a restoration of penalty rates and any commitment to equal pay. This has all happened whilst wage inequality and job insecurity grow. South Australians should be treated fairly and so much better than this by those opposite.

I turn now to speak on a few things in my portfolio areas about what is in and, unfortunately, what is not in this budget in that regard. As I said before in this place, sport is an incredibly powerful tool for including all people, for giving them a sense of belonging, community and family. In every

corner of our state, South Australians are kept active and healthy through their connection with local sporting clubs, through their active participation in sport and recreation.

Through that connection, their mental, physical and emotional health and wellbeing is improved and they are often less likely to develop a number of debilitating conditions. That is why it is crucial that we fund sport and recreation well, that we recognise the benefits it brings to the health and wellbeing of South Australians. Sport and recreation deserves serious investment. It needs to be acknowledged for the central role that it plays in our community's wellbeing, for the way that it strengthens the very fabric of South Australian community life.

Unfortunately, this government has done the complete opposite to this. They have created a funding crisis in sport and recreation that will significantly decrease our chances of realising these benefits of creating the vibrant, healthy, connected communities we strive for. For this, those opposite should hang their heads in shame.

This government has cut more than \$3.4 million from the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing. They have cut \$300,000 per year from the research and planning grant program accessed by multiple sporting organisations and they have reduced funding by a further \$1.2 million overall. This government has cut \$26 million overall from sport and recreation since our last year of government.

While we, the former Labor government, spent \$20 million in our last year of government on the female facilities program and on the synthetic surfaces program, this government has spent just \$1 million this financial year on the exclusive and totally inadequate grassroots football, netball and cricket family-friendly facilities program, which completely relies on a 50 per cent contribution from clubs and councils. They have refused to listen to South Australians across our state and restore the \$24 million female facilities program and the \$10 million synthetic surfaces program.

Other than the already announced \$10 million upgrade for tennis at Memorial Drive and the injection of funds into the racing industry, they have done literally nothing. There is absolutely nothing new for sport and recreation in this budget. They have created a crisis for every sporting organisation, peak body and club across our state that is crying out for funding. To use the minister's language, they have put us at the bottom of the table in terms of funding for sport and recreation compared with other states.

The government have demonstrated a total lack of understanding about what it takes to achieve gender equality in sport. They simply do not understand the principle that when one group starts from an unequal place you need to specifically invest in that group and the facilities they need to secure an equitable outcome for that group. By not restoring the dedicated female facilities program, they have ensured that girls and women all over our state who play sport of any code will continue to have to change behind towels, in bars and in kitchens, behind trees and in their cars.

No matter how this minister attempts to dress up his program, the budget clearly shows that it is worth less: it is restricted to just three codes, it does not provide for dedicated female facilities and, in its reliance on council and club funding, it completely shuts out hundreds of clubs across our state.

They have proven that they simply do not care about the difference that hardworking volunteers and clubs across our state make to the lives of many, about the children and their families who find connection and engagement through sport and recreation or about the remarkable staff at the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing who undertake such fine work with and for sporting organisations and the people who engage with them.

This government also clearly does not understand what is required to address the terrible scourge of domestic violence. When speaking about the last budget from those opposite, I highlighted that there was absolutely no funding, not one dollar, for domestic violence prevention in that budget. I am an eternal optimist and I fervently hoped that maybe they would hear this, that maybe they would listen to the thousands of women who deal with domestic violence or to the hundreds of community advocates and support organisations and allocate money for this prevention priority.

However, there is nothing—absolutely nothing, not one dollar—dedicated to prevention, to breaking the cycle, to addressing the gender inequality that lies as the root cause of the prevalence of violence against women. There is not one dollar. Appallingly, they have also cut \$780,000 from the Women's Domestic Violence Court Assistance Service. Not only have they not funded domestic violence prevention, meaning that it is more likely to continue, but they have also savagely cut a key service that people who have experienced domestic violence rely on at one of the most difficult and scary moments of their life.

If you have gone through domestic violence, if you have a loved one who has gone through domestic violence, if you have had anything to do with anyone who has experienced domestic violence, you know that by the time you get to any sort of court setting you are likely to have gone to hell and back and you need all the help that you can get. I, and every single South Australian who understands the tragic, terrible scourge that is domestic violence, will remember these two things from this government: no funding for prevention and a savage cut to a service for those who have gone through the most horrendous of times.

We will remember it every time they step forward to say that they are doing what they can. They are hollow, hollow words when you consider these two things in this budget and of course when you also consider the savage cut to the Victim Support Service and the Equal Opportunity Commission, other avenues for help for South Australians who most need support, care, compassion, advice and assistance from these organisations.

As I have said before on numerous occasions in this place, and as I will keep saying, I keep hoping for something better for South Australian women from this government. But when you have such a terribly low representation of women in this government, with only four women out of 25 in this house, I need to stop being surprised that nothing better comes. There is so much to speak about in terms of the horrors that this budget will bring to South Australian people for generations to come. I know that I will run out of time to highlight them all, but I cannot conclude my words without mentioning the savage \$6.8 million cut to mental health services by this cruel, out-of-touch government.

I had the deep honour of being the minister for disabilities in our Labor government, of representing workers in the sector for years and of working very closely with community organisations and with people with mental illness. I had the honour of supporting, empowering and walking alongside people with mental illness in the very difficult journeys that they traverse. I have also supported my mum and my sister to negotiate her own NDIS plan and I have done the same for many local community members in Reynell.

Through all those experiences, I have come to know the NDIS well and how it is funded. Every single time we on this side of the house speak about the savage \$6.8 million in cuts to mental health, those opposite seem to get very wound up, and very, very defensive. But I will not stop speaking about this because this cut that they are making is not fully explained by the excuse of a transition to the NDIS.

People with a mental illness and people experiencing mental health issues rely on us. They need us. They are amongst the most vulnerable members of our community and they need to be heard. They need more funding, not less, to ensure that they can live their best possible lives free of stigma and in a way where they get the treatment they need when they need it, where they have a support worker alongside them engaging them, where their selfless loved ones can get a break from caring, and where they can still access a support group or a program when they need to.

This cut puts all those things at risk. It takes away the supports that we have had in place provided by remarkable and compassionate community sector workers and supporting people. They are the workers who often stand between people with mental illness being able to fully and actively participate in community life and being at risk and isolated. This cut is shameful. It is small-minded and small-hearted and it negatively impacts the people who most need us, people who are not necessarily ever going to transition to the NDIS, people who already wait a very long time for much-needed services.



This budget utterly fails South Australians. It is lacking in value, it is lacking in vision and, most of all, it is lacking in kindness and thought for South Australians and what makes a difference in their lives.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

At 17:50 the house adjourned until Tuesday 2 July 2019 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***BUS SERVICES**

**857 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (18 June 2019). What changes have been made to the 665 school service since March 2018?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning):** I have been advised:

No changes have been made to School Bus 665 (Seaton High to Port Adelaide via West Lakes) since March 2018.