

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 2 July 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 Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call Mr Clerk, I welcome to parliament today Ruby Knoll, who is a guest of the member for Schubert, as well as students who are with us this morning.

Bills

APPROPRIATION BILL 2019

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 June 2019.)

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (11:02): With great pleasure, I rise to my feet to speak on the Appropriation Bill. As is tradition, we will be supporting the bill. I was going to start off with some of the positive things that are in the budget. They are few and far between, but there are a number of things that I am supportive of, and I think it does not hurt to mention a few positives, especially in my portfolio area, because we do tend to always dwell on the negative, and I will certainly be getting to that.

There are a number of proposals within the budget. The additional funding for the dog fence is something that people in the metropolitan area would very rarely think about. It is one of the longest pieces of infrastructure in the world. A fair part of it crosses my electorate and also the electorate of Stuart. There is absolutely no doubt that the livestock industry has been faced with a number of problems when it comes to maintaining the fence's integrity and keeping out wild dogs. The funding in that area is welcome and it is needed.

During the federal election, I had an opportunity to speak with our federal colleagues to see if they would be willing to match the commitment made by the Liberal-National Coalition when it came to supporting the fence, and I was pleased that we made that commitment. Unfortunately, we were not elected, but if we had been we would have also matched the funding needed for the fence.

There is \$7.5 million going to technology support and innovation for the primary industries sector, so I think that is a positive as well. There is an emphasis on biosecurity, which is a continuation of some of the good work we did when we were in government. Contrary to the position that is often put across, the world was not frozen for 16 years. Many good things were done, and we did a number of good things in the area of biosecurity. It is good to see that continuing to be built on.

One concerning aspect of the Liberals' first budget, the one before the current budget—especially given that a number of people in the farming community and in the pastoral industry were facing some real challenges with drought—was that it had no tangible allocation to assist farmers and pastoralists in South Australia. It was incredibly disappointing. It was very disappointing compared with what was going on in New South Wales and Queensland.

Admittedly, their primary industries sector had been in drought for a longer period of time over very extensive regions but, given the scale of support that was offered for primary industries in those states and the capacity for some of that support to distort markets to the disadvantage of South Australia, it was unfortunate that no tangible assistance was provided. There was support for counselling services, which was something I supported at the time.

We have had some good rains across the state, but there are still areas that are doing it hard, and we still do not have much in the way of tangible support in the current budget. I am especially thinking about some of the northern areas of our state that have missed out to a significant degree on the rains that have fallen. There was a record-breaking dry period between January and May this year, before the rains hit. It was the driest period on record. We need to get our heads around some of this.

There are always ups and downs when it comes to weather. We are told ad nauseam, 'Well, the climate is always changing. We've always had drought, and we've always had this and that.' But the trends are just overwhelming. The trend we are in is going to be a drying trend. All the modelling that has been done in relation to climate change—I prefer to call it global warming—indicates that Australia, and this state in particular, is highly vulnerable, and our primary industries are especially vulnerable.

The global trajectory we are on at the moment is for a 3° to 4° increase in average global temperatures, and that is going to have a major impact in Australia. Looking at the grain industry and this budget, there is not much in terms of adaptation or innovation not just for the grain industry but for agriculture in general. This is coming down the road at a relatively fast pace. When we look at some of the science concerning a 3° to 4° increase in average global temperatures, the predictions—there is always an element of uncertainty, so they are probabilities—are that it could hit the global production of grain by as much as a 40 to 50 per cent reduction.

That is absolutely huge in a world with a growing population. I am not saying that South Australia can fix this problem, but I would have thought there would be some reflection in the budget of these issues that we are going to face in regional South Australia amongst our primary producers. It would have been good to see something in the budget instead of yet more cutbacks. When it comes to the primary industries, there are yet further cutbacks. There is a \$20 million cutback to the operating budget for the Department of Primary Industries and Regions.

That is significant, and that has come on top of a cutback in the first Liberal budget. This time around it looks like about 30 full-time equivalents are going to be cut from Primary Industries. That is disappointing. I do not stand up here in this shadow responsibility and say that our record when we were in government was perfect, because it was not. There was a series of cuts to Primary Industries, and I think some of the areas of cuts we have to come back and have a really close look at. What is going to be important? What are the things that we can do to assist our primary industries?

I guess I always come back to one of the things that I think is incredibly important with not just primary industries but economic development as a whole, which is that whole area of research and development. It needs the support organisations like SARDI and others when it comes to that innovation agenda. As a state we need to do far more in that area.

If we reflect back far enough, once upon a time South Australia was a world leader in dryland farming. I would like to see us get back into that position, and I will be doing what I can as the primary industries shadow to put pressure on our shadow treasurer, as this is an area that, when we come back into government, we should take seriously. We should not look upon it as one of those easy targets, because investment in that sort of area is incredibly important.

There have been a number of initiatives in the budget that are very damaging for parts of regional South Australia. The proposal to introduce a property tax in the Far North of our state in the unincorporated areas has come out of the blue. The history, when it comes to the property taxes, if you like—maybe the equivalent of a rate at a local council level—is that two communities do pay a property tax or levy at the moment—those are Iron Knob and Andamooka—because they are among the bigger communities in the unincorporated areas. Without any consultation, the Treasurer has talked about a property tax of between \$120 and \$400 per property. I am hearing on the grapevine that it could end up being significantly higher than that.

The issue here is that we are talking about incredibly small communities that have very limited capacity when it comes to raising money. We are also talking about widely dispersed pastoral properties, and the pastoralists, as a result of a levy of this nature, will not get anything in the way of either a direct or indirect benefit, so I do not think this is the way to go for the unincorporated areas when it comes to raising money for necessary infrastructure and necessary governance.

The Outback Communities Authority in some of the earlier comments they made I think got it right. They talked about going out and consulting with communities, consulting with pastoralists about the nature of governance in the unincorporated areas and how best to fund it. I guess my view is, given the incredibly scattered nature of the population, the administrative costs and compliance costs might well be more than what you are going to raise from some of those incredibly small communities. We hear #RegionsMatter again and again; obviously it does not matter when it comes to the unincorporated areas of our state.

Another big hit—and this is a big hit—on people in the unincorporated areas in addition to Roxby Downs, Coober Pedy and Kangaroo Island is the removal of the concessions on registration. For some businesses in the unincorporated areas, and in Roxby Downs, Coober Pedy and Kangaroo Island, that is going to be a big hit. I was speaking to one business who indicate that it is going to cost them, given the number of vehicles they have and the number of heavier vehicles they have, an extra \$20,000 hit a year.

When I had a look at the households in Roxby Downs as an example, and looked at the number of vehicles in some of those households, that is going to be a big hit on those households. This is a blanket removal across the unincorporated areas and a removal for Roxby Downs, Coober Pedy and Kangaroo Island.

The reason Labor never touched this particular registration concession was that we were incredibly mindful of the additional transport costs faced by people in remote areas. Fuel costs are significantly higher in remote areas than they are in the metropolitan area and in other regional communities in the more settled parts of our state. Sometimes diesel and petrol are 50¢ or 60¢ a litre dearer and that puts an impost on people straightaway.

Then there are the vast distances that are travelled and often have to be travelled in order to access services. We were very mindful of all that. Even during the Foley years and the other years, we never touched it. We talk about #RegionsMatter, but obviously it does not matter when it comes to the unincorporated areas and it does not matter when it comes to Roxby Downs, Coober Pedy or Kangaroo Island. All those areas face very significant additional costs as a result of this budget.

There was hardly any mention in the budget about the duplication of the road from Port Wakefield to Port Augusta. The minister has indicated that there is going to be a bit of a spend there. I am assuming it is the normal 80 per cent federal spend and 20 per cent state spend. I am told that another three overtaking lanes are going to go in. I welcome that, but I point out that, when we are told that the state was frozen for 16 years and nothing ever happened, the growth in overtaking lanes on that stretch of road and other stretches of road did happen under a state Labor government and with the support of both a Labor federal government and a Liberal-National government.

I welcome the overtaking lanes, but we need to get on with the initial work of duplicating that particular road. I acknowledge that this has to be done in a staged fashion, and you get different estimates. Depending on the approaches, it can be anywhere between \$1.2 billion and \$2 billion to do that duplication but, at the end of the day, it is National Highway 1. It is an incredibly important piece of infrastructure for this state. It was very disappointing that there was no mention of this highway in the budget, apart from overtaking lanes.

It might well be that the \$60 million that the federal government is going to put on the table will be used to do some of the initial studies, but we have a long way to go. It is not just an important piece of economic infrastructure; there is a far more powerful driver and that is saving lives. Over the last few years, over 20 people have been killed on that stretch of road and over 200 people have been seriously injured. That is going to continue until we start to seriously address this. For someone who drives a lot on regional roads, it is not all down to the infrastructure but, if you improve infrastructure, you will improve safety outcomes.

Those of us from the regions know that a not insignificant number of our fatalities and serious injuries are as a result of single-vehicle accidents, with people being tired, fatigued, on the phone, or there might be other issues at work. I recall that a few years ago three people were killed in one single-vehicle accident. They had been working late shifts, had put in a lot of hours of work and were driving back to their home, from Whyalla to Port Pirie, and they lost control of the vehicle. Three

members of the same family were killed in that particular accident. It is important that we continue to address some of these real needs when it comes to our country roads.

I will touch on both the recreational and commercial fishing sectors. In 2017, after extensive consultation with the commercial sector and the recreational sector, we came out with a \$20 million buyback scheme for commercial licences, plus the introduction of quotas for some of those species where quotas did not exist. That scheme was going to commence from 1 July this year, but unfortunately that commitment has not been worked on by the current government, which is incredibly disappointing.

I acknowledge that new governments can change policy, but all this work was done. I think we would all agree that commercial buybacks are necessary. I think we would all agree that quotas are necessary, especially when it comes to snapper and some other species. If the government had improvements, they could have implemented that particular program and then built upon it, but I suspect the Treasurer did not want to part with \$20 million.

I find it a bit rich when some of those opposite say that the state of the fisheries is all the fault of the previous government, when we worked over an extended period of time attempting to improve the fisheries. It is never easy, given the conflicting interests and the pressures. We have all seen the recent data from SARDI on snapper stocks. Once again, that is one of those areas that needs more investment so that the quality of the science is of a high standard.

It is of a high standard, but it is a standard that reflects the resources available. We need to do far more in that area. It is important to set quotas in the commercial sector. When we were in power, we reduced daily catch limits time and time again and then we announced that we were going to introduce quotas. We need to introduce quotas, and it needs to be more than just a daily catch limit: it needs to be a yearly or a seasonal quota in order to ensure the sustainability of a particular species.

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (11:22): I rise today to speak in support of the Appropriation Bill 2019. Our government has seen fit to hand down a budget that is focused on supporting regional communities, one that continues our agenda to build our regional economies and support regions, businesses and families. Our government has done this in the face of significant reductions in expected GST revenue, which is expected to total \$517 million between 2019 and 2020. Our Treasurer acknowledged this challenge in his budget speech delivered in the house on 18 June.

Our government has sought to address this shortfall in a responsible way while investing in priorities. On a statewide basis, the budget includes investments that will support our economy, ensuring competitive costs of doing business in Australia. Notably, the budget embeds the exemption from payroll tax for small and medium-sized businesses with a wage bill of less than \$1½ million. It embeds our government's commitment to reduce the emergency services levy to save South Australians \$90 million in total, which will enhance the ability of families to make their own choices about where they spend their tax savings.

The budget provides the opportunity for lower income households to benefit from reduced household energy costs. It has an emphasis on building stronger communities through the investment of \$75 million over five years to address critical housing needs for people in remote communities and \$45 million over two years to address preventative maintenance and construction programs. The budget has an emphasis on building a better health system, which includes \$537 million in new expenditure, and also includes investment in education, including investment in the building and upgrading of a number of regional high schools, including Glossop and the new Whyalla High School.

A strong and thriving economy needs good infrastructure, and investment is key for the economic success of our regions and state. A very welcome emphasis in the budget is on transport and infrastructure. We are increasing investment to address both metropolitan and regional road priorities, including significant works on priority metropolitan intersections and major roads. I am pleased that we have had some good outcomes for MacKillop in roads, community spaces, sporting grounds and the CFS.

Our government is undertaking a record spend on roads. Roadworks and upgrades have been neglected for too long and are a big winner in the budget, with \$1.1 billion over eight years to

be spent on regional road projects and transport infrastructure upgrades. Specific investments that will benefit MacKillop include the \$250 million upgrade to the Princes Highway. Works will include widening, safety upgrades, new overtaking lanes, as well as duplication along key sections of town bypasses.

As to the \$143 million in regional road maintenance, benefits for my electorate come from two examples. First, the Riddoch Highway will get new passing lanes, both north and southbound, between Tower Road and the Coonawarra and one between Nangwarry and the Mount Gambier forests. Also, the second example involves the works to increase safety on the Clay Wells and Ngarkat roads to enable the reinstatement of the 110 km/h speed limits. There is also the \$8 million allocated for the enhancement of freight linkages in and around Smith Street in Naracoorte. The works will ensure safer and more controlled heavy vehicle movement and support freight movements to Teys Brothers, the abattoirs, the saleyards and other agribusinesses.

On a wider basis, other regional roads to benefit from this transport infrastructure include \$125 million to upgrade Eyre Peninsula roads, including the Eyre Highway to the Western Australian border; \$87 million to upgrade the Sturt Highway, from Renmark to Gawler; a \$62 million upgrade to the Barrier Highway, from Cockburn to Burra; \$1 million over four years to improve roads on Kangaroo Island; and \$55 million to improve the safety and condition of the Horrocks Highway.

With all that expenditure, I acknowledge that—and others might want to bring up this point—yes, there are federal funds involved in all these road expenditures. But without our support and without our engagement from the state government, the federal government funding would never have come forward. With support for these upgrades, from both federal and state governments, we are able to deliver these improvements. I hope that continues into the future with the election of the new federal Liberal government and with us with at least another three years to go of our state government, the Marshall Liberal government.

Community and open spaces funding has also been approved, including \$267,500 to support the Millicent Parklands Revitalisation Project to enhance the recreational precinct in Millicent for festivals and community events and to improve opportunities for recreation and activities, getting people outdoors, while \$334,000 has been committed to upgrade the three main streets in Kingston to create a more vibrant townscape and improve the visitor experience.

Sporting facilities commitments include \$108,000 to replace the oval lighting at Mac Park at Millicent. This will enable the Millicent Saints, who play in the Western Border league, to play twilight games in Millicent. It is a vibrant town and it is a vibrant sporting town, and that will be a welcome addition to that sporting fixture. There is also \$150,000 for the Kalangadoo Football Club to upgrade their facilities, along with \$250,000 from the federal government, which totals \$400,000, plus support from the local government and the private funds that the club has managed to put together. It will be a magnificent build for the Kalangadoo township and their sporting precinct. I thank the minister for all the support he has given to our sporting facilities in MacKillop.

Mobile blackspot funding has been delivered to install a new tower for Tower Road between Penola and Nangwarry, which is a blackspot for those travelling between Naracoorte and Mount Gambier, alongside Nangwarry, where there is a blackspot where people travelling through lose their phone coverage. On a main highway, it will pick up within about five or 10 minutes and you are back on again. It is one of those nuisances that many travellers and motorists travelling between Naracoorte and Mount Gambier have to face.

Many of these initiatives have been possible through co-investment with commonwealth government funds. Other initiatives from which MacKillop may draw benefits include the investment of:

- \$42 million over two years for preventative maintenance and construction of Housing Trust homes;
- \$32.7 million over five years to fund a range of upgrades to regional high schools to upgrade facilities to assist and accommodate year 7 students;
- \$7.5 million over three years for the red meat and wool sectors to help grow both industries;

- \$1.8 million over five years to pay school fees for dependants of 457 and 482 visa holders in regional areas;
- continuing investment of \$140 million over 10 years to improve regional hospital and health infrastructure;
- interest-free loans of up to \$10,000 to help get people into the housing market; and
- \$4 million over four years into coastal management.

Touching on those expenditures into housing, we know and recognise, and we want the parliament and the state to recognise, that the areas between Tintinara and Bordertown and down to Naracoorte have massive housing shortages. This is holding back our regional towns in terms of growth and opportunities. There are some massive businesses that have been in the area for a long time that are also growing further, and we do have a housing shortage. I hope these moneys that are going towards Housing Trust homes and affordable housing—most particularly affordable housing—come to bear and that we address this issue and bring opportunities to MacKillop and the regions.

Given the difficult decisions that were required to be taken, the budget has brought with it some changes to fees and charges, notably:

- the obvious increase in gazetted fines for speeding;
- licence fees for builders, plumbers, gasfitters and electricians;
- liquor licensing fee increases; and
- the increase to solid waste levies to councils, which will increase to \$110 on 1 July and then go to \$140 in 2020. The primary driver for this change is focused on reducing landfill and increasing the recovery of resources and recycling.

As much as those tough decisions are being made by my government to apply increases in these areas—and I find them hard to support, in the sense that we do need them but they are hard to sell—this Appropriation Bill is very much consistent with the first budget that the Liberal Marshall government brought down.

We have actually been a bit consistent, in the sense that the budget last year did not pave the way for paying down any debt left behind by the previous Labor government. I think that caught the Labor government off guard. I was very pleased by the way that the Liberal Marshall government have gone about getting into government and going through the 100 days of promises—getting through them and getting them rolled out.

Coming back to the point, when the Liberal Party came into government one of the things that I think we suffered was in saying that we are economically responsible and will pay back all Labor's debts and perhaps expenditure that was not well thought out and that we will then roll out what we believe in. But we never get that opportunity. Our time runs short, and this is why this budget is quite unique.

I also find the way that the opposition leader responded to this budget was unique, in that I think the budget has probably caught Labor off guard. Perhaps they have even called us out in saying, 'Where are you Liberals? Where are you really welded-on Liberals in this, with the expenditure and debt projections out to \$22 billion? How do you think that you will navigate your way through this?' I have not seen anything to date that actually says that we will get to those debt levels, although it has been forecast—

Mr Malinauskas: It's in the budget papers.

Mr McBRIDE: It is, but we can do a lot of things. Economies change and we build on it. As the opposition leader would recognise, things change over years and opportunities come by. As we build the economy, we obviously expect to build this state, and that is what we do not think you did all that well over the last 16 years. One of the two things—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr McBRIDE: —that you really cannot point a stick at and throw stones at are education and health. I really welcome from our Marshall Liberal government that they never took a razor gang to the two portfolios of education and health that the Labor Party hang their hat on and say they are champions of. When you build a new hospital that completely runs over budget—a new hospital that runs \$300 million over budget annually—and you then in your speech accuse us of the high rate of ramping of ambulances at the bottom of the Royal Adelaide, let me tell you that we are all to blame for that.

Mr Malinauskas: Yes, well, it has doubled under your watch.

Mr McBRIDE: Yes, and we are all to blame for that. It is really ironic that within 12 months perhaps you are accusing us of closing beds, perhaps you are accusing us of sacking nurses and perhaps you are accusing us of not employing doctors, but we have not changed any of that. In fact, we have actually taken on what you left behind.

I would say to you, the opposition leader, in your speech when you talked about the budget measures you were critical of, that we have not taken a razor gang approach to any of these sorts of public infrastructure or spends. We have rolled on where you have left off. We have a lot of the people in charge of what you left behind still there operating, looking after the hospital and education systems—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Malinauskas: What's KordaMentha doing? What are we paying them \$50 million for? Nothing?

Mr McBRIDE: As the member has just so kindly reminded me, we have KordaMentha into the hospital. As I said in my initial point about the hospital, it is running at \$300 million above budget with a \$20 million spend, again, on one of those things that you know needs to take place, that we need to move documents to warehouses outside the hospital because the hospital does not work for a paper trail like it needs to. It is just one of those things we have to navigate our way through.

In response to Labor, and where we are with the budget and our expenditure, Labor now then has to say, 'Well, the Liberals are not going to be as responsible economically as they used to be and they're going to build their plans and progress.' We are going to build an economy, we are going to strengthen our employment, we are going to bring apprentices to rebuild the numbers to where they used to be. Apprenticeships used to be around 30,000 but, no, they have dropped—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr McBRIDE: —to about 13,000 under the previous government.

Just on the news today we hear about trade shortages in Port Adelaide. Port Adelaide is not all that far away from Croydon, which the opposition leader is meant to belong to. These trade shortages are a result of the previous government, and we have got to address this.

I recognise that we are so lucky to have a massive defence build coming to South Australia, but this government also has to navigate its way through that very carefully because I do not want to see my region starved of tradespeople who go to this massive defence build. It will be very lucrative, it will be very fruitful for the economy, it is going to build a whole economy around the Port Adelaide precinct down there, but we have to manage this well.

One thing is that it is a huge opportunity, but the second thing is that we have to manage the likes of tradespeople and apprentices coming through. In fairness, the opposition leader brought up that training of apprentices. He claimed in a speech that there have never been so few apprentices. I would say that, yes, there may be so few but it has not changed a lot since he left. We are going to put an emphasis on this, we are going to strive for it, we are going to bring those training programs back in.

We have a trade minister who knows all about bringing apprentices back. Both he and I went through a system back in the nineties—and maybe even the eighties for the minister at hand today—that had those 20,000 or 30,000 apprentices coming through. They then turned into tradespeople, and that then turned into small businesses that kept our state going, building our state as we think it ought to be built. This comes back to the point about the education system I just touched on.

The last Labor government had a lot of emphasis on students going through and completing year 12, and I think he mentioned that 75 per cent of students were going through and completing year 12. That is a wonderful accolade, but when apprentices are going through the apprenticeship schemes a lot of apprentices do not do year 12. They actually leave in either year 10 or 11; I think year 11 is the preferred outcome, but some do leave during year 10 and start their apprenticeship in their trade.

No wonder our tradespeople and the number of skilled workers out in the Port Adelaide precinct are becoming short in number—because the government had an emphasis on educating our students through the university program. They had a university degree, but they did not have the jobs to go to, so what did they do? They would normally find themselves in careers outside this state, and hence we saw the population decline and the skilled and the best brains in our state leave rather than stay and operate within the state.

It will be interesting to see how Labor navigates its way through this budget program we have. I know that the Marshall government has a plan, I know that it is not putting a strong emphasis on the way that the last Labor government left our budget. I know that it has a plan to spend money to rebuild the state, putting in infrastructure and build that actually create jobs and make it easy to do business in this state so that it can flourish to its full potential.

Our government has delivered a responsible and sustainable budget to address revenue challenges. I am pleased that the budget continues to deliver for our regional constituents to support building regional economies, and I commend it to the house.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (11:39): I acknowledge that I speak just after the contribution from the member for MacKillop. Mr Speaker, about 20 years ago I enjoyed listening to a radio program on the Triple J breakfast show hosted by Mikey Robins and Adam Spencer. You might recall that Adam Spencer is now a much-loved science commentator and MC of noble events. Although they did not have the broadest listenership, it was one of the most deeply loved and enjoyed breakfast programs in the country. They used to broadcast nationwide.

In particular, they had a segment they would play, not every morning but at least twice a week, called *Defending the Indefensible*. They used to ask a very knowledgeable, very talented and very skilled debater to come in and argue for three minutes why a particular outrageous conjecture was, in fact, a terrific idea. If my memory serves me correctly, although I did my best to perhaps damage my capacity to retain memories at university, I think they used to get in the world champion debater, Greg O'Mahoney, who is now a very skilled barrister in Sydney and was the world champion debater in the very early 2000s

Unfortunately, what we have here is a government which is bereft of Greg O'Mahoneys. We have a government which does not have the capacity to sell to the public of South Australia this most extraordinary state budget. In that respect, I will agree with the member for MacKillop. He was right: it was not just the opposition that was perhaps taken by surprise by this budget; it was the whole of the community of South Australia, bar those few dozen people who comprise the Liberal party room.

It is just extraordinary that here we are, within 15 or 16 months of the last election, and everything that we had been told was important to the Liberal Party of South Australia has been cast aside. All those commitments about lowering costs for South Australians have now been shown to be broken election commitments. Those commitments about better services have been completely skewered by the extraordinary level of cuts.

The member for MacKillop talked about how they are making sure that they are not getting stuck into the health system. Well, \$1.2 billion of unidentified savings over the four-year period, and the appointment of corporate liquidators to work in the hospitals and determine how patient care should be administered, is extraordinary.

We also had, year after year and budget after budget, under the former Labor government, the now Premier, the member for Dunstan, his predecessor, the former member for Heysen and, of course, the Hon. Rob Lucas of the other place, going on and on and on about how outrageous it was that the levels of debt that the Labor government, when in government, was projecting across their budget's forward estimates was unsustainable and outrageous.

What were the quantum of those figures? We were getting into figures of \$11 billion or \$12 billion for the total government sector over a four-year period at the end of the four-year period. Then we have the member for MacKillop and his other colleagues trying to argue with a straight face that double that amount, over \$21 billion, is absolutely fine: contrary to everything they told us before the last election, that level of debt is fine.

Of course, the other broken election promise that has now embodied itself within this budget is the promise about lowering council rate bills for South Australians. It is just extraordinary that on those four measures—lower costs, better services, debt reduction and council rates—this government have completely vacated the field. They have completely given up, and now we are at a point where we have to start asking: what does this government stand for?

Everything that the Premier has been telling us that is important to him and important to his government is not in this budget. In fact, the exact opposite is in this budget. They have left themselves, in this budget, with no credibility on the things that they told South Australians were the most important to them in the lead-up to the last election. Yes, it took South Australians by surprise because it is extraordinary. What is the justification for all these decisions that apparently needed to be made by the government? They complained for months and months about an unforecast reduction in GST grant revenues from the commonwealth and that this had necessitated the budget settings we now have.

It is interesting to go back and look at how much GST was forecast to be received in this current financial year and the financial year that finished only two days ago, that is, the 2018-19 and the 2019-20 financial years. If you look at the budget as it was handed to the incoming Liberal government, those figures as at the 2017-18 Mid-Year Budget Review—well, in fact, in the 2018-19 financial year—this government received \$100 million more than they thought they were going to get at the time of the last state election.

In the 2019-20 year, of course, the figure is less. It is \$150 million less, not the \$517 million that they complained about. The net effect of those two years? Being down \$50 million out of combined receipts of \$13 billion. Does that necessitate the extraordinary action this government is now foisting upon South Australians? It is an unprecedented—I think is the most accurate word—explosion in fees, charges and taxation levels imposed by this government.

For many years, there has been the same method of indexing these fees, charges and rates of taxation. It occurred under the former Liberal government of Brown and Olsen, it occurred under the former Labor government and, up until three weeks ago, it was also to occur under this government, but this government broke that model. They said, 'No, we won't look at inflation and we won't look at the cost of the public sector delivering goods and services. We will break from that and we will just arbitrarily increase them,' and those increases have ranged from 5 per cent to 600 per cent increases in taxes, fees and charges. Even in doing that, have they tried to insulate South Australian households from the worst effects of that? Absolutely not.

They have come straight after every single household and every single business here in South Australia with more than \$100 million a year of higher taxes, fees and charges. It is extraordinary. Motorists are bearing the brunt of it with higher registration charges, higher driver's licence fees and, incredibly, even an increase in the administration fee on people's vehicle registration notices and also an increase in the administration fee charged for transactions at Service SA Centres—you will remember, the very same centres that this government promised to close in last year's budget. In fact, the birth of this new financial year, which we are into the second day of, says that 48 hours ago the Minister for Transport was due to close the first one. Of course, something else that has blown out under his watch—in that case, this time line.

We have seen Consumer and Business Services fees or, for people speaking English rather than bureaucracy speak, those fees and charges which are levied on every business and registered

activity here in South Australia have exploded. We have also seen an extraordinary increase in marriage fees, of all things. It is remarkable that this government has left no stone unturned. Hospital car parking: if you are a worker at a hospital, for example, close to my electorate at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital you can look forward to an increase in hospital car parking fees of \$725 a year. If you are a visitor going to a hospital, you have lost two hours of free parking at those hospitals.

Public transport has been targeted—making people pay for the privilege of purchasing a ticket, the \$5 Metrocard fee is being reintroduced under this government; abolishing the two-section fare—trying to make sure that this government gets as many people out of buses, out of trains and out of trams as possible and shoves them into sole-occupant vehicles to further congest our roads closest to the city. It is absolutely remarkable public transport policy.

The police rent tax—making people pay for the benefit of being kept safe and protected by our police force. Liquor licensing fees—exactly what we were promised would not happen at the last election, the Deputy Premier has gone after licensed venues with a stick, seeking an extra \$3 million a year. For regional motorists, it is getting rid of the outer areas concession and increasing mining fees. I have not even mentioned the extraordinary increase in speeding fines designed not to change one iota of behaviour out on the roads but simply as a revenue-raising measure.

In last year's budget we were also promised up to \$48 million a year worth of land tax cuts. They were legislated, but they have not yet come into effect. Rather than the government just being honest with the people of South Australia and telling them, 'When we made that commitment, when we legislated these tax cuts, we thought we could afford them,' they have now chosen to massively ramp up land tax on thousands of South Australian landowners, many of whom can least afford it. Many came to this country, for example, in the 1950s and 1960s and started working for themselves or working as labourers or working in factories.

When they did not have access to compulsory superannuation because it was not even a gleam in the eye of a commonwealth government, they invested in property. They bought themselves a house for their family. When they had more money they could spend, they bought an investment property and they rented out to the community, thereby giving themselves a retirement income. Those people, who have used the existing tax law to structure their financial arrangements in a way in which they can provide for their own retirement, are the people being punished by these changes to land tax aggregation, which are designed to raise a further \$40 million a year. It is just extraordinary.

Then there is the attack on council rate bills. The government, which committed to introducing rate capping, which it said would bring down council rate bills, has now moved to do the exact opposite. Of course, when you put a minister in charge of introducing rate capping who cannot actually come up with a viable model for rate capping, it is no wonder there is no rate capping system in place at the moment. It is even more extraordinary that the rate cap that he told South Australians he would have introduced was multiple times higher than, for example, the council in my electorate—the City of Charles Sturt—was going to increase their rates by.

How does the government respond to this now that they have been embarrassed by the behaviour of councils in setting their own budgets, which were going to increase rates by less than what the Minister for Transport wanted them to increase rates by? They introduce a bin tax, a 40 per cent increase to the solid waste levy. This is despite being told by the Premier, when he was the leader of the opposition, that this is just a price gouge: 'It will increase illegal dumping right across South Australia. It is essentially another tax—a carbon tax on the households of South Australians—and they cannot afford it.'

He has now completely ignored those commitments and statements that he made to the people of South Australia before the last election. As a result, we have seen nine metropolitan councils, which have more than 500,000 households within their council areas, all having to move to increase their council rate bills for the coming financial year as a result of this unprecedented hike in the solid waste levy.

We have also seen this government shake down government businesses for additional revenue. That all might seem pedestrian and boring to the casual observer, but when SA Water is the largest government business that exists—and this government last year took an extra

\$128 million of dividends out of SA Water, and this year they have gone back in for another drink—the impact this will have on SA Water and their ability to deliver affordable water rates into the future is extraordinary.

We have also seen them go into the South Australian Government Financing Authority. If you compare the dividends in this budget with those in the last budget of the Labor government, even in the three comparable years there is an extra nearly \$80 million in dividends out of the South Australian Government Financing Authority and an extra \$60 million in dividends against HomeStart. It is remarkable. What is all this for? Why are we seeing the government take these extraordinary dividends out of government businesses, leaving the cupboard bare, leaving nothing in the pockets of South Australian households and businesses through these higher taxes, fees and charges? Is it to pay down debt? No. Is it to invest in productive infrastructure over the next four years? No.

It is remarkable that they could be imposing this higher level of taxation on South Australians and still ramping up debt. Their justification that this is for productive infrastructure is a fallacy. Of the \$5.4 billion that we have been told will be required for the future extensions of South Road, \$126 million is available from the state government in these forward estimates—remarkable. How much money they put into it is almost a rounding error. In regard to the amount of money that will be required to finish the Women's and Children's Hospital, a further billion dollars sits beyond the forward estimates.

It will not just stop at the \$21 billion. The member for MacKillop tried to claim that the \$21 billion will never happen anyway. No, it is going to get much worse than that. We have an extra \$4 billion rocketing down at us beyond the forward estimates, and they are the projects that have already been announced. That does not leave any room for any further spending in any area of government beyond what is in this budget over the next four years.

How much will that debt cost us? It is going to cost us \$1,075 million a year by the end of the forward estimates—\$3 million a day in interest repayments. Remember, this is when interest repayments are at their cheapest. According to the government, this is the right time to borrow because interest rates are cheap. I know that Rob Lucas is older than me. I do not need to stand next to him to demonstrate that. I know that he has been around longer than me, and even he can remember that sometimes interest rates are higher than the 3.2 per cent that the Premier tells us the South Australian Government Financing Authority can currently borrow at.

It might be fine for him to retire in 2022 but, for the rest of us who endeavour to be around here a little bit longer on either side of this chamber, this is absolutely frightening. If interest rates move by one percentage point higher, according to the budget papers there is an extra nearly \$100 million a year in interest repayments. Heaven help us if interest rates move much further up than that over the next five to 10 years, because those hundreds of millions of dollars in extra repayments are hundreds of millions of dollars less that we will have to spend in health and education and in all the other areas of government service delivery.

The extraordinary level of cuts that we saw in last year's budget has been compounded in this year's budget. The member for MacKillop said no cuts in Health. Over 1,000 full-time equivalent staff in the health department will be cut in this financial year alone. Also, we see this mean-spiritedness of the government in continuing to cut funding to those organisations that rely on government the most. They are cutting nearly \$1 million a year to the Victim Support Service, cutting nearly \$800,000 to the Women's Domestic Violence Court Assistance Service and instead picking it up and placing it in the Legal Services Commission, where, guess what, last year the Deputy Premier cut funding. How many people who are victims of domestic violence in our courts have to be without adequate representation for this government to get the message that you cannot cut funding from these organisations?

They are cutting low-security beds at Port Augusta Prison while complaining that the prisons are too full. They are trying to find revenues or cut funding to APY lands policing. They are cutting grant programs in the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing. They are cutting \$10 million from the Critical Skills Fund and cutting \$7 million from community grant programs in the Department of Human Services. They are also cutting programs aimed at reducing recidivism by those people who have previously been convicted of crimes. It is just remarkable. It is so mean-spirited and so out of

touch with the priorities of the community of South Australia that you wonder how much longer they will last.

Of course, it has not quite ended there. Only yesterday we heard the government's commitments about the privatisation of our train and tram networks. I assure you, Mr Speaker, you will be hearing a lot more about that later on today, particularly as we move into the grievance debate on this bill. This dreadful budget of broken promises does not just reflect on the credibility of this government and the credibility of the Premier; it also reflects a government that has no strategy and no vision for this state.

People could have forgiven a massive ramp-up in debt if there was a central narrative and a central purpose for it, but there is not—that is the problem. There is the tail end of a series of Labor government-initiated infrastructure projects and some promise beyond the forward estimates of future projects in the future. This is a dreadful budget by what is now regarded broadly as a dreadful government.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (11:59): I would like to make a small contribution, if my voice can hold up for this debate. I think it is very important to provide some context to this budget. Like any budget, whether a state or federal budget or even a council budget, it is not just a financial economic statement; it is also, in my view, a very strong moral document because it outlines the government's priorities for the wellbeing of the community.

It is not a question of whether you have a tough budget—we have heard it has to be a tough budget for a whole range of reasons—or a soft budget, but it is a statement about choices that governments make. Governments do have choices. Every time a government decides to do something, it can also decide to do something else. Circumstances may be such that governments do not make the choices they want but, in the end, they make choices. That is very important to remember. Over the last week, I have heard a number of ministers, particularly some of those close to my own electorate, talk about how this had to be a tough budget for the good of the people. I think that is just complete nonsense.

What is the moral of this budget? What is the Marshall Liberal government's story about this budget? The moral is simple: the Marshall Liberal government just cannot be trusted. It cannot be trusted on the three key pillars on which it sought election. It said it would bring down the cost of living. That was one of its tenets or pillars when it went into the election. It said it would take control of state debt. It said it would not cut public services. Amongst other things, they are the three key pillars on which the Marshall Liberal government—or the Marshall Liberal opposition at the time—sought government. On all three of those pillars, it has broken all its promises.

This budget can be best described as a smash-and-grab budget. It smashes the future prosperity of this community by sending our state debt into the stratosphere. It smashes our public services by cuts to public services. Only yesterday it was announced that it is going to privatise our train services. It is going to grab from each taxpayer in this community additional taxes, fees and charges way beyond the inflation rate. This government, therefore, fails the trust test.

I will give a brief overview of the increase in charges that people in this community now have to wear. Driving a car is more expensive, with hikes to motor registration up 5 per cent and driver's licence renewals up 4.5 per cent. Catching public transport is more expensive, with hikes to fares up 2 per cent, the axing of the two-section card, costing some commuters up to \$849 per year, and now they are actually going to charge you to buy a train ticket or bus ticket.

On the one hand, we have the Minister for Transport saying that patronage is down and we need to do whatever we have to do to increase patronage on public transport. I agree; it is important to increase patronage on public transport as an equity issue, but also to get cars off the roads. On the other hand, what does he do? He increases the charges. He actually puts in a disincentive to use public transport.

Going to hospital is also more expensive, with hospital car parking up \$725 per year for nurses, cleaners and other staff, while patients, their families and friends will pay 20 per cent more. Free car parking for the first two hours in some hospitals has been removed. Ambulance fees are up by 5 per cent. Even putting out the humble wheelie bin is going to cost more, with this government increasing the solid waste levy by 40 per cent, which means higher council rates.

As my colleague just said, on the one hand we have a minister saying that he wants to peg council rates and ease the pressure on ratepayers, and on the other hand what does this government do? It actually increases costs to ratepayers by a whopping 40 per cent in one year. The money is not going to be used to educate the community about increasing recycling programs, etc. The money will be used, basically, to fill the gap in this budget black hole that it has created.

This government has also decided to tax the tradies more, with licences up 10 per cent, trade registration up 10 per cent and ute registration up 10 per cent. I will say a bit more about that, and particularly what the MBA has to say about the increases in both the solid waste levy and the tradie taxes.

They are also taxing jobs, with a 70 per cent hike in mining taxes. They are also taxing entertainment, with hikes worth thousands of dollars on pubs and bars. The Liberals are also now going to introduce for the first time a police rent tax, where you actually have to pay to be protected by the police, which I would have thought would be a basic public service a government would provide to their community for their wellbeing.

In relation to the solid waste levy, and also the tradie tax, it is interesting that some government ministers have talked about how local government should absorb the 40 per cent increase. I am not sure how many councils have that sort of fat in their budget to sustain those sorts of increases. On the one hand, they have implored councils to keep council rates down—which I think is a good thing—but then they have increased the cost to councils and the cost to taxpayers from 0.5 per cent to 1 per cent.

Certainly, the councils in my area have said that they cannot absorb this increase and they are now passing on those increases in charges and fees to the ratepayers. It makes a mockery of the minister's whole campaign around rate capping, when some of the councils have gone beyond the recommended rate cap to an increase in the solid waste levy. It is also interesting to note that the MBA has expressed its concern about the cost of building new homes and the impact the solid waste levy will have on the building industry, at a time when the housing industry is doing it quite tough. We have seen a number of building companies go into liquidation over recent months.

So what does this government do? It imposes additional tax to make it harder in that regard and also imposes additional tax on subcontractors or tradies, who have to reduce their own net income by absorbing the costs or have to pass them on to the contractors and the homebuyers. At a time when we are trying to increase home ownership, this government has increased the cost of purchasing a first home. Prior to the election, as I have said, this government made a whole range of promises to the electorate. It is unfortunate that in this budget they have confirmed they are prepared to break every promise they have made.

The other point I would like to finish on is the state debt. For 16 years, the former government heard this then opposition say how critical it is to keep the state debt down, how to control expenditure, etc. In this budget, they have actually sent the state debt soaring. On the admission of their own Treasurer, this state debt is unlikely to be paid off in his lifetime. This government has created an intergenerational debt for not only this generation but the next generation to pay off. In one budget, it has achieved the ultimate trifecta: increase charges and fees, increase debt and cut services to the community. It takes a certain level of incompetence to achieve that in one budget.

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (12:09): I rise to speak about the Appropriation Bill. There is a lot to be critical of in any analysis of this budget, the second budget for this government. We could talk about the extra taxes, fees and charges that are hitting everyday people, the quite cruel concentration of measures targeting our most vulnerable people—including, it seems, the member sitting next to me, who is struggling a little—and the many sudden cuts to organisations that are doing exceptional work in our community. We could also remark upon the dismissive and cold language of those opposite directed at the many losers from this budget, especially in the other place.

The thing that worries me the most after well over a year of this new government is the lack of a vision. There is no coherent agenda and there is the lack of a narrative, a story to tell about our state's direction. There is no thread that binds the various cuts, closures and privatisations and, for that matter, the choices of spending, minimal as those investments are. It is a mishmash of bits and pieces, with no central theme or aspiration.

Budgets are about priorities. We all wish we could fund absolutely every good idea, but that is plainly not possible. Budgets are always full of choices, sometimes very difficult choices, but those choices put together in a budget show the priorities of a government. It shows their values, their direction for the state and their vision of where they want the state to be. But this is a value-free zone. The only values that might be gleaned from this budget are a propensity for taxes, cost shifting and privatisation, but that of course is not a vision at all.

Nowhere has a vision been so sorely needed, yet so completely absent, as in child protection: 115 full-time equivalent staff are set to lose their jobs, although the government—and, I must say, the minister—is nowhere to be seen on this, but it has instead been sending the CE to answer questions. Nevertheless, the government is saying that they will not be front-line jobs. Of those 115 FTEs, apparently they are not front-line jobs. What a joke! They have already admitted that 59 of those jobs are front-line jobs—59 FTEs are financial counsellors who will serve their last few days this week. If they are not front-line jobs, I am not sure what are.

Imagine a mouse-infested home in our northern suburbs with young, struggling parents inside. In their care are a toddler and a baby, and they have no money, no food in the house and limited parenting skills. They love their kids, but they just do not know how to care for them. They did not have any parenting models themselves. They had no-one to learn from. This young couple sought help from a non-government organisation. The NGO would not go into their home. They called the financial counselling wellbeing service.

A financial counsellor went into the home and a safety plan was developed for the children away from the home. The counsellor sat down with the couple and showed them how to get back on their feet. She equipped them with the skills and knowledge that many of us take for granted. The counsellor showed them how to budget for groceries, how to cook inexpensive family meals, how to fill out Centrelink forms and Housing SA applications to get the support they needed, and told them where to go for local parenting classes.

The financial counsellor worked hand in hand with a Department for Child Protection social worker, who was then brought in to assess the safety of the children long term. That story is not an invention but a real scenario described to me by a financial counsellor since this cut was announced. That is the work she does. She does not see herself as a number cruncher or a backroom operator but as a social support. She is on the front line, it is hard work, but she loves helping people who need it.

You might say, 'Hey, those things that she is doing are the job of a social worker,' and, yes, a lot of what she does is a lot like social work, but the fact is that this is the work our financial counsellors are doing. Should someone else be doing it? Maybe they should, but they are doing it—the financial counsellors are doing it—and no-one else will be doing it when they go this week.

Financial counsellors have said to me that they do not think the minister knows what they do. They say to me that she has no idea of the type of work they complete, how hard it is and, most importantly, what it will mean for families and children when they are not there. She has not visited them in the field or met the people they help. It is pretty easy to cut things when they are numbers on a page and not real people. When the financial wellbeing counselling service in the Department for Child Protection shuts down, what will fill the vacuum? I understand that in September last year most financial counsellors managed about 50 cases each, and there are 59 financial counsellors, including a manager. That is a lot of cases, and there is clearly strong demand.

In estimates last year, the minister told this house that a tender would go out within nine months and that it would be worth \$1 million. Well, the clock has counted down and there is no tender. Who knows if there was ever going to be one? A spokesperson for the department told the ABC that financial counselling services exist in the Department of Human Services. Others have been told they can go to an NGO.

Although both these groups do fantastic work, SACOSS and the Financial Counsellors Association have said that they are not remotely the same as the face-to-face services provided by the financial wellbeing counselling service. In addition, those services are not tailored to the child protection experience and they are not embedded within the Department for Child Protection. I hope

that the minister realises the impact of this cut before it is too late. There is no shame in realising a mistake and correcting it, especially when it comes to the welfare of little children.

Also among the 115 FTE job losses are an unknown number of staff hired to tackle the backlog of investigations and carer assessments. Something like 300 roles were recruited by the former government in response to the Nyland recommendations. By our best estimate, 89 of those were due for contract renewals or terminations on 30 June. It was only after the opposition asked questions about those roles that the staff heard something from the department about their futures, but it is still uncertain how many of those 89 staff have had their roles converted to ongoing positions or extended for another 12 months.

By our estimation, 44 will still lose their positions. The minister is welcome to clarify that anytime she likes and tell us what she is doing with these staff but, of course, when asked about this and other issues in child protection she has told us, 'I am not responsible.' It begs the question: who is? There will be additional roles scrapped and additional workers made redundant due to the target of 115 job cuts this financial year.

Concerningly, those additional jobs are apparently going to be achieved by natural attrition. We know that the most high-stress jobs, the highest turnover roles, are front-line positions, and those are the roles that we can least afford to lose. A bit of honesty about where the job cuts are coming from would be appreciated by the hardworking staff who dedicate their careers to helping children and families in need.

Then there is the overspend. Most deceitful, of course, is that half-hearted effort to sell the \$2.5 million overspend in the Department for Child Protection as an investment. For starters, it is more like \$9.5 million because \$7 million was already put into the exploding cost of care for the last financial year in the previous budget. It is not an investment. It is clear that this government does not want to spend that money. It is a mistake. It is a failing that is now being papered over—not very well, I might add—as an investment in the care of children.

This \$9.5 million overspend is the result of yet another broken promise. The budget papers spell it out: the cost is due to the increasing number of children coming into care, and those children are not even coming in at the same rate as under Labor. The speed at which children are coming into care is faster than under the previous government. In fact, the minister has managed to reverse the downward trend of children coming into care into a rise. Under the previous government, the rate of increase was falling; it is now going up again. This year, it has risen by about 9 per cent compared with 6 per cent last year.

There is no doubt that before the state election, and even for a while after it, those opposite were promising a huge reduction in the number of children in state care. They said they knew how to do it, and people believed them. They promised to reduce the number of children in care, increase the number of foster carers, reduce the number of child abuse and neglect reports and fill all the vacant positions in the department. If any of that has been achieved, the minister is keeping it a secret.

Last September, we heard from the minister that this minister would achieve 50 additional foster carers, over attrition, every year. Has that been achieved? I am going to go out on a limb here and say no because the minister and her department refuse to answer how many foster carers there are and whether it is more than in March last year. Why would the minister not be transparent about it if they had managed to reach the target of 50 new carers above attrition?

What about the minister's promise last September to see the rate of children coming into care arrested at around 3 per cent each year? That is just simply not happening. As I said, we have seen a 9 per cent increase under this minister and that is three times more than she promised. There are now almost 4,000 children in state care. That is a flat out broken promise and it shows that this government has no credibility when it comes to child protection.

It beggars belief that a department facing increasing pressure, facing more and more children coming into care under this government and unable to stick to its budget, could now be whacked with a \$20.6 million target for additional cuts. More than \$5 million a year needs to be found. Considering

the minister's last attempt to rein in the budget resulted in 59 front-line workers losing their jobs for a so-called saving of \$4.4 million, it makes you wonder where she is going to find \$20 million to axe.

The other thing that is really worrying in these budget papers is that, despite those budget blowouts, several of the key performance indicators are not being met. That at least raises some worrying questions. The number of child abuse notifications requiring further action is up by 2,591. The number of child abuse investigations is up by 766, which is a rise of 17 per cent. That, of course, can cut both ways, but it absolutely raises some questions about the levels of abuse and neglect in our community, and I think anyone would be concerned about that. The budget is blowing out, but we are not seeing improvements in some of the key performance indicators for this department.

The small glimmer of vision for child protection revealed in this budget is one that is rather familiar to those of us on this side of the house. We commend the government for the expansion of family group conferences. This was a great initiative started under Labor, and the credit goes to the member for Port Adelaide for her leadership on that front. I understand that it has been quite successful, so we welcome it being expanded or at least a pilot project looking at new ways of applying it. We look forward to hearing more about it.

We also welcome continued funding for continuous monitoring of screening, another great initiative under my colleague the member for Ramsay, a measure that ensures real-time detection of people who might pose a risk to children. We welcome the adoption of these elements of Labor's vision for child protection on top of the new legislation that is being rolled out, which is also a product of the Labor era. This is a vision we support because it was Labor's vision.

It was a central promise for this government to provide better services. I took that—and many did—to mean better services for all of us, including those who need the government's support the most: children, children without parents to care for them at home. Of all the people to let down, these children should not be the ones to have to bear the brunt of broken promises, but clearly they are. I would urge those on the other side to reflect on whether they think they are really providing better services to these children who need support the most and who need the services of this government the most.

Is it better for them to have 59 financial counsellors axed? Is it better for them to have 115 full-time workers cut? Is it better for them to have \$20.6 million cut from the department's budget? Is it better for them to have financial support for foster carers stripped? Is it better for kinship carers to have to fight to get into a Christmas lunch? Is it better for the workplace rights of those working in the department to be trampled or for 24-hour rosters or for uncertain employment? Is it better for them for workers hired to address case backlogs and assess kinship carers to be dismissed before their jobs are done?

Is it better for them to have a minister who is playing golf with her friends, rather than meeting with the guardian or the commissioner? Is it better for them to have a minister who says she is simply not responsible for the Department for Child Protection? It is not. It is not better for those children. There are not better services for them, more jobs, lower costs or better services. There are not more jobs in child protection—there are fewer—with 115 full-time equivalents being axed. There are not lower costs but much higher costs for those who sacrifice their own time to care for children, and there are certainly not better services in child protection.

Vital services, like financial counsellors, are being shown the door. This is a government that is not only unconcerned about sticking to even a semblance of its election mantra but it is a government that has no vision to replace it with whatsoever.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (12:25): Once again, the hypocrisy of the government knows no bounds. That is unfair on the new members who are here because the new members were not here in previous years when the then opposition members, now government members, railed against appropriations for moneys that were not outlined in the budget. Mr Deputy Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform you that once again a government is appropriating money that is not set out in the budget. It is being held in contingency for matters that will be announced at a later date; that is, debts are being incurred now for a purpose of which the house has no knowledge.

Members previously railed against the former treasurer for attempting to procure money through appropriations without having all that money accounted for in the budget, yet now there is

silence. There is silence from members opposite and silence from the critics of the former treasurer and the former government on this practice. Why? Because this government are experts at now increasing debt and not laying out the purpose for which that money is being spent.

I had intended to go through and critique a large number of the appropriation measures in the agency statements and the budget measures outlined by the Treasurer, but a new event has occurred. Things have changed. What occurred yesterday was that the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure announced the privatisation of our entire public transport network system. That is a wholesale breach of an election commitment made by all members—including you, Mr Deputy Speaker—that an incoming Marshall Liberal government did not have a privatisation agenda.

No doubt that reassured your constituents, Mr Deputy Speaker, and the constituents of all members opposite that the incoming government would not be the same as the Olsen and Brown governments that last governed in this state, when they made commitments not to privatise essential state utilities and then did. I was here in 1999 when ETSA was privatised. In the preceding 1997 election, the then premier and the then deputy premier (Hon. Graham Ingerson) ruled out categorically any notion that essential services, especially the Electricity Trust of South Australia, would be privatised.

Quite famously, the Hon. Graham Ingerson said, 'ETSA will not be sold'—full stop, unequivocal. Of course, history and events show a very different outcome. We were also told at the time of the privatisation of ETSA—and I think it is relevant for today's considerations of appropriation—and assured by members at the time of that privatisation, that prices would be strictly regulated and that there would be a net benefit for the people of South Australia. Sound familiar? It is exactly the same mantra we are hearing today from the government.

The government are claiming that the privatisation of our train and tram network will result in this magical formula, where the government will make savings yet services will improve; that is, less government money will be spent on this service yet, miraculously, there will be an improvement in amenity, in service, in frequency and in patronage but fares will not go up and there will be no additional costs to this whatsoever.

I have to say that I stopped believing in unicorns when I was a little boy. My daughters do—they are constantly searching for unicorns—but I did not think that the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure had not outgrown a childhood obsession with unicorns. Apparently, he still believes in unicorns. That could be just by virtue of his age, or it could be delusional, or it could be, of course, a lie.

Mr PEDERICK: Point of order: the member is quite obviously reflecting on the minister. I would ask him to withdraw and apologise.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens has said that the minister obviously believes in unicorns.

Mr PEDERICK: And he said 'a lie', sir.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Yes, it is.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No. Member for West Torrens, you should not be putting words into the minister's mouth. I bring you back to the Appropriation Bill. I know you have some stuff you need to talk about today.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you very much. A wise adjudication, sir. I take your point, and I think you have set me straight. Again, I thank you for that.

It is impossible for any member of this house to take seriously someone who tells us that they can make savings on a public service and improve the reliability, the frequency, the amenity and the outcome of this. I said yesterday publicly that the minister is using childish and juvenile reasons to justify the privatisation of our tram and train network—juvenile reasons. Why? Because the concept that he wants South Australians to accept is that we will get a better outcome.

I submit to the parliament that the privatisation of our bus network was a disaster for this state, but of course once these matters are done, it is very difficult to undo them. I am cautioning the

government now and asking them to reconsider what I think is an error, a juvenile error, an error that is, I think, simplistic and could be overcome very quickly if the government came to its senses.

Of course, there is another important matter that needs to be discussed and debated in this parliament, and that is the matter of a breach of faith with the public of South Australia. It was made very clear by the public sector in a public debate that the then opposition leader, the current Premier, attended with the former premier, the former member for Cheltenham, when they debated the future of South Australia, what their policies were, what their visions for the next four years were and what any potential new government, to be elected in 2018, would do.

It was put very clearly to the then opposition leader and now Premier: did he have an agenda to privatise SA Water? Did he have an agenda to lower the levels of public servants in the public sector? Did he have an agenda to privatise assets that he would be in charge of as the leader of this state? The answer was unequivocal. He did not have a privatisation agenda.

Indeed, he went on to talk about the benefits of public essential services and the benefits of a large public sector and how they were without a doubt one of the most important assets and tools of the state. For any employer your biggest asset are your employees. These documents and the money being appropriated by this house today lead us to fewer public servants and the privatisation of essential services.

You have to ask yourself this: were South Australians misled? Were they told something that was not true? When was this planned? Well, let's look at the government's track record. In April of this year—I think it was 20 April—the government announced a tender for Adelaide metropolitan bus services, and they split that tender. Within that tender there was no mention of rail or light rail services being included, yet the tender was split and it was announced to begin yesterday, 1 July. After previously being announced on 20 April, we heard yesterday that the light rail system would be included in that tender that conveniently opened yesterday.

I do not believe in coincidences; I do not believe that things happen by accident. I suspect that what occurred was the planning of the privatisation of our rail network was contemplated well before the budget. Indeed, Mr Deputy Speaker, I submit to you and the house that measures in this budget foresee the privatisation of our rail network. The money being appropriated by this bill would be larger had not the government attempted to outsource these services.

Interestingly, the Premier made public statements saying that there was no privatisation in this budget. It is just not true. Those statements were made outside the house, but they were made publicly. Assurances were given to the people of South Australia that there were no privatisations being contemplated in the budget.

Again, I say to the members of parliament who are here as backbenchers, who read these budget papers probably at the same time as I did, that they are being asked to do things to their communities and their electorates that they did not contemplate. Indeed, they are being asked to do things that they told their communities they explicitly would not do. But, of course, the future is in their hands. I do not think that government backbenchers understand the power that they actually have within a government. Governments rely on majorities. I think former prime minister Malcolm Turnbull put it best: 'the iron laws of arithmetic'. Numbers matter. Without numbers, nothing in this place can happen.

I say to the members who have light rail and rail services going through their electorates—the members for Morphett, Davenport, Waite, Black and Gibson—those members, although two of them are in the cabinet, have extraordinary abilities now to protect their constituents from these privatisations. If they will not protect their constituents, perhaps the other iron rule of politics, self-interest, will kick in and they will think about their own political futures.

Matthew Abraham, who is probably the father of the press gallery in this state, along with Mike Smithson, quite ably wrote an article that this Treasurer has cut the umbilical cord to the electorate. The Treasurer is flying off into the sunset in just over two years' time. He is not recontesting the next election. His fortunes are no longer linked to the government and to the members who are members of that government. His fortunes are now linked to history. He is chasing something completely different from what members who occupy this house are chasing. He is chasing a set of numbers.

He is chasing acknowledgement of the finances of this state, and I think he has led members opposite into ruin. We are heading into record debt, a debt to revenue ratio that has nearly doubled from what the government inherited. I do not know how any member opposite can sit calmly and quietly while knowing that they are increasing the state's debt to a level unprecedented in the state's history—unprecedented—and they are doing it willingly. They claim, because they have budget surpluses—they claim they have budget surpluses—that debt levels are acceptable.

The former state government ran a debt to revenue ratio that must always be below 35 per cent; that is, as a measure of household debt, if you are looking at an ordinary household, if your income was \$100,000, the maximum debt you could incur would be up to \$35,000. This government is taking our debt to revenue ratio close to 100 per cent and members opposite are calmly voting for all these measures, supporting these measures.

We had the incredible situation where the Treasurer of this state actually informed the public that this debt would not be reconciled or paid off in his lifetime—in his lifetime. That is an extraordinary thing for a Treasurer to say—a Treasurer who is retiring, a Treasurer who has broken faith with the people of South Australia, a Treasurer who did not tell anyone before the election that he would rack up such debt.

I will go further. Going through the budget papers, I suspect that members opposite are borrowing money now, appropriating money, to pay wages. They are claiming that they are appropriating money and borrowing money—'good debt', as they like to say—to be spent on infrastructure. Yet there is a discrepancy between their debt and their infrastructure spend. What is that money being spent on? We can only assume that that money is spent on the recurrent costs of government.

The former government did not borrow money to spend on recurrent expenses once in its entire 16 years—never, not once. Yet here we are, 15 months into this new government, and the debt burden that they are saddling South Australians with is dramatic, on top of privatisations they did not warn South Australians would occur, on top of abandoning a precedent set by treasurers—Stephen Baker, Rob Lucas, Kevin Foley, Jack Snelling, Jay Weatherill and myself—for using a formula for the indexing of fees and charges. Why? A couple of reasons.

The reason that every government from the State Bank on, until yesterday, 1 July, indexed those fees and charges according to that formula was (1) to give certainty to business, to give certainty to South Australians that there was a formula that treasurers would use so there would be no arbitrary increases in fees and charges just to suit the time of the current Treasurer. Inflation can go up and it can go down, but in running an inflation rate at about 1.3 per cent—it is lower in metropolitan Adelaide—how does a government justify increases of between 5 per cent and 60 per cent to 70 per cent? On what basis? On GST writedowns?

It is not the first time there have been GST writedowns. But, by abandoning that formula, they open themselves up again to this ridicule and criticism that they have no agenda and that they are simply scrambling to borrow money to pay for recurrent expenses. Members of the backbench, some of them from quite distinguished previous careers, are now being forced to go out and sell this pile of rubbish to the people of South Australia.

While I am on rubbish—the temerity of a government that wanted to cap council rates to then impose an increase on taxes on those councils after their budgets had been set that they could not recoup other than through raising rates! The hypocrisy knows no bounds. I can understand the anger in those local communities. I can understand the anger of those councils. Many members might not understand how the rating system works, but some do because they were on councils.

A rating system is based on a council consulting with its community about its budget, understanding what its asset base is—that is, its rateable assets—and then fixing a rate to raise the money that they have set out for their budget. When you add costs afterwards, it is not like they get taxes, fees and charges that they have not accounted for. They have to raise their rates to meet the difference.

Every time someone's rates go up now in South Australia, the people they can thank are the member for King, the member for Morphett, the member for Heysen and, unfortunately, you,

Mr Deputy Speaker, because this government has imposed on councils changes that they have not contemplated, despite having criticised the former government for introducing this levy and increasing it to levels. There was a difference: the councils were consulted. At least, that was my understanding. I have to say that, by and large, the government has got itself into some very difficult times indeed.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (12:45): Firstly, I apologise for the standard of dress. I have just jumped off a plane from Kangaroo Island. I did a site visit in Kingscote around the wharf this morning, so I have not had time to jump into the suit and tie.

Mr Pederick: I can lend you a jacket, mate.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Yes, actually, you are probably the only bloke who would have a jacket in my size, member for Hammond. I thank you very much for your generosity. You are always a very nice fellow who helps out his fellow travellers.

There is a lot of disappointment, heartbreak and anger on Kangaroo Island about this government. Of all the areas in South Australia, Kangaroo Island has been singled out by this government for the most pain. Having spent the past couple of days over there—I was there last week and the week before that as well—there is absolute anger at this Marshall Liberal government for the way they are treating people on the island. People are wondering: does anyone in this Marshall cabinet even know what Kangaroo Island does?

I think the Premier has been there once since the election. I do not think he left the airport. He came over and opened an airport that we committed the funding for. He was all very happy to take the credit for that. But you cannot just fly in on a chartered flight, stand there and try to up the stakes of Georgina Downer, who they were dragging on stage and trumpeting in the lead-up to last year's Mayo by-election. You have to do more than that. You have to come over and spend time in an area that needs all the help it can get, not having everything pulled from this very special part of South Australia.

Last night, in Kingscote the Commissioner for Kangaroo Island held the first of four forums they will be hosting over the next three days on Kangaroo Island—there will be another one at Parndana, Penneshaw and American River—to talk about life after the Commissioner for Kangaroo Island. The Commissioner for Kangaroo Island was set up after a parliamentary inquiry, after a couple of years of the Economic Development Board looking into it. It evolved out of the Kangaroo Island Futures organisation. A lot of hard work went into it, but this government decided that it would just throw it out.

Talking to members opposite, part of the thought process behind that was not that it was not doing a good job for the people of Kangaroo Island, not that it was not doing a good job for the various sectors on Kangaroo Island. They wanted to get rid of it because no other part of South Australia had a commissioner. That is like saying to people that just because you have running water in your part of the state and no-one else has we are going to turn the running water off in your part of the state.

Perhaps a more mature approach would have been to come up with a commissioner for the Murray and perhaps a commissioner for the South-East of South Australia, who would work across into western Victoria as well, jointly funded by the Victorian government and the South Australian government. I am not sure what the answers are for those parts of South Australia that could benefit from having a commissioner. By and large, the Commissioner for Kangaroo Island did a good job in terms of having contact with ministers, having contacts with senior people within government departments.

I will tell you something that obviously the ministry does not get. Kangaroo Island is 4,500 square kilometres and it has 4,500 people. It is separated by a sea crossing that you have to do either by air or by ferry, and that brings with it a set of circumstances and challenges that do not exist anywhere else in South Australia, so perhaps having a commissioner makes a bit of sense. In fact, we thought it made a lot of sense, and I want to thank the former deputy premier John Rau for the persistence that he put into coming up with some sort of solution.

Last night, at this forum in Kingscote, we looked at what life will be like after the demise of the Commissioner for Kangaroo Island. It was such a pity to talk to people in the room, to see all the momentum that had been built up and to know that it is going to be taken away. People in all sorts of places around not just South Australia but anywhere in the world get a bit fatigued with people coming up with new systems that they have to get on board with. Here we had something that was working, that had momentum behind it and that was only going to get better as time went on, and it has been ripped away from the people of Kangaroo Island.

Another thing that is heartbreaking for people on Kangaroo Island is the absolute lack of knowledge that the tourism minister of South Australia, David Ridgway, has about the visitor economy. They can feel the place going backwards. They say that, from 2013 through until last year, there was momentum and the bookings were great, but now they are seeing a real drop-off in visitor numbers on Kangaroo Island. They are very worried about what the future holds under a tourism minister who does not get it. He does not get it, and that is the scariest bit of all.

If you do not get it, at least listen to the people who are running the South Australian Tourism Commission. I can tell you what they are saying. They are totally frustrated with this government. They say that the \$11 million that was ripped out of the visitor economy and the tourism budget last year by the Liberal Party has had an amazingly negative impact on tourism in South Australia. In this budget, we had the government putting out a press release promising this and that. Do you know what the senior executives in the South Australian Tourism Commission are saying about this year's budget? They are saying that it is all smoke and mirrors and that the minister does not know what he is doing.

They do not know how they are going to look after the 18,000 businesses in South Australia that rely on or are part of the South Australian visitor economy. They do not know how the visitor economy is going to support the 40,000 people who are directly employed because of the tourism sector. They are worried sick about an area that, from 2013 through to the election last year, we built up from \$4.9 billion worth of value to \$6.8 billion. What did we see? Within a year of these guys coming into government it has gone backwards by \$100 million.

Anyone here who lives in regional South Australia and who represents regional South Australia has to be worried about this because 44 per cent of the spend in the visitor economy is spent in regional South Australia. There are people employed in the tourism sector in Ceduna, Port Lincoln, Renmark, Barmera, Mount Gambier, Penola, Naracoorte, up and down Yorke Peninsula, Kangaroo Island, McLaren Vale, Barossa, Flinders Ranges, Clare and right around this state because 44 per cent of what was \$6.8 billion, now down to \$6.7 billion, is spent in regional South Australia.

If I were on the backbench of the Liberal Party and I were from regional South Australia, I would be having a fair crack at this. No matter where you live in South Australia, I would also be asking the tourism minister, 'What's happening with international flights in and out of South Australia?' Never mind the fact that we brought in Emirates, China Southern and Qatar Airways, I am actually worried that we might be in danger of losing some of those airlines. Since the election, we have seen Emirates downgrade the aircraft they use on the route and we have seen them do fewer flights in and out of Adelaide.

Every time those flights land in South Australia, they bring tens of thousands of visitors from around the world into our state to spend money. The best money we can have in our state is money out of the pockets, purses, wallets and handbags of people from interstate and overseas. If we do not look after the relationships we have with these international airlines, we will lose them. If we do not continue the commitment to spend money on marketing South Australia and to put money into infrastructure in the visitor economy, we will have a poorer product and we will lose those flights.

The other side of this great value boost to South Australia—we have the visitors coming in from around the world—is that each one of those aircraft takes about eight tonnes of cargo out with it. Our premium produce from all around South Australia is airfreighted from here to all parts of the world. That is a very good thing to have, but it is very hard to do it if you then have to road transport your produce. Whether it is seafood or some other perishable commodity that needs to be out of

South Australia as quickly as possible, it is diminished if it has to be airfreighted; you lose valuable time taking it to Melbourne or Sydney.

There is no visitor information centre on Kangaroo Island. Can you believe that? This government, since the election, has allowed the closure of the visitor information centre on Kangaroo Island. I cannot believe it. I think it is a disgrace. The jewel in our visitor economy, in our tourism drawcards, has no visitor information centre. It is a disgrace.

If I were part of a government that had a minister who knew so little about tourism and who cared so little about tourism I would be saying, 'I want to put my hand up, Mr Marshall, Mr Premier. I want to put my hand up. I want to be the tourism minister because I believe this is a growth industry and I believe this is an industry that employs and supports communities right around South Australia.'

All you people on the backbench, how about you sharpen your pencils and get your résumés ready, because the bloke who is doing the job now is an absolute failure at it. You can talk to people on Kangaroo Island and you can talk to people in other parts of my electorate down in McLaren Vale; they are as one, that this guy has absolutely no idea.

Let's have a look at some other things on Kangaroo Island that this government has hit. For years and years our government was committed to a rebate on registration; if you lived on Kangaroo Island it cost you 50 per cent of the total registration cost to register your vehicle. From yesterday, that has gone up by 25 per cent, and next year the rebate will be gone altogether; they will be paying 100 per cent.

If you are farmer and you want to get your tipper registered, it would normally be \$1,500 if you are on Kangaroo Island; now it is \$3,000. It is hard enough to eke out a living and support your staff and support your family on Kangaroo Island without these further imposts that this government—that does not know Kangaroo Island, that does not understand Kangaroo Island, that does not care about Kangaroo Island—has imposed over there.

There is a group called the Road Safety Group on Kangaroo Island. It is a group of very thoughtful, well-meaning people; it was actually a group organised and founded by Andy Gilfillan, the Liberal candidate for the seat of Mawson in the last election. That group, like other road safety groups around the state, gets a grant each year of \$500—yes, \$500—to help with the photocopying, to help with a few other administrative charges, \$500. This mean, uncaring Marshall government had ripped that \$500 from these volunteers, who quite often have to travel more than a 100-kilometre round-trip to get to and from meetings.

All they are trying to do is make the roads on Kangaroo Island safer. They are being the voice. They are the people who can provide valuable insights into the roads and conditions on Kangaroo Island for the councils, the state governments. These people are at the coalface; they know what is happening. They are already giving up their time, often away from their families and their businesses and farms, to help their fellow Kangaroo Islanders, to help all the visitors who come to Kangaroo Island. A lousy \$500 is all they have got, and this government has taken that away.

It has taken away the visitor information centre, it has taken away the number of tourists who are going to Kangaroo Island, it has taken away the Commissioner for Kangaroo Island. Steven Marshall, this Premier, and this government do not give two hoots about the people of Kangaroo Island, and I can tell the house that in 2022, at the next election, the people of Kangaroo Island will remember. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

SUPPLY BILL 2019

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today the member for Sandringham, Brad Rowswell MP, from Victoria. Welcome to state parliament.

*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.

COUNCIL AMALGAMATIONS

Mr ELLIS (Narungga): Presented a petition signed by 782 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to review and instigate amalgamating an existing ward of the Adelaide Plains Council into the Wakefield Plains area, and two existing wards of the Adelaide Plains Council into the Playford council area, to improve efficiencies and reduce costs for local ratepayers.

*Parliamentary Procedure***ANSWERS TABLED**

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Dangerous Substances—Dangerous Goods Transport—Package Marking and Labelling

Emergency Services Funding—Remissions Land No. 2

Public Sector—Teachers Registration Board

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. V.A. Chapman)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Child Safety (Prohibited Persons)—

Fees

Miscellaneous

Volunteers Protection—General

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Criminal Law Consolidation—Medical Termination of Pregnancy

Independent Commissioner Against Corruption—Schedule 1 of Act

Liquor Licensing—Regulated Premises

Supreme Court—Fees No 3

Rules made under the following Acts—

Magistrates Court—Criminal—Amendment No. 74

By the Minister for Innovation and Skills (Hon. D.G. Pisoni)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Construction Industry Training Fund—Board

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Ageing and Adult Safeguarding—General
 Controlled Substances—Controlled Drugs, Precursors and Plants—Expiation Fees
 Health Care—Engagement Strategies
 Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia)—
 Amendment of Law No. 4
 National Electricity (South Australia)—
 Civil Penalties No. 2
 Local Provisions

By the Minister for Environment and Water (Hon. D.J. Speirs)—

Essential Services Commission of South Australia—2019 Review of Water Third Party
 Access Regime Revised Final Report May 2019
 Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Environment Protection—Waste Depot Levy
 Water Industry—Miscellaneous

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Motor Vehicles—Emergency Vehicles
 Road Traffic—
 Emergency Vehicles and Declared Hospitals
 Road Rules—Emergency Vehicles
 Rules made under the following Acts—
 Road Traffic—Light Vehicle Standards—Emergency Vehicles and Other Matters

By the Minister for Planning (Hon. S.K. Knoll)—

Regulations made under the following Act—
 Planning, Development and Infrastructure—
 Development Assessment
 Fees, Charges and Contributions No. 2
 Swimming Pool Safety
 Transitional Provisions—Staged Commencement

Parliamentary Committees

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:07): I bring up the third report of the committee, entitled 'Inquiry into the management of overabundant and pest species'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

ABORIGINAL LANDS PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:08): I bring up the report of the committee, entitled 'The key issues raised during its visit to the APY lands: 7 to 9 May 2019'.

Report received.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:08): I bring up the report of the committee, entitled 'Inquiry into the regulation of parking and traffic movement in South Australia'.

Report received.

*Question Time***PUBLIC TRANSPORT**

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): My question is to the Premier. Why did the Premier claim yesterday that the London Tube is operated by a private company?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:09): I think the Leader of the Opposition is referring to a post that went up. Different services from around the world are outsourced from time to time. I know this amuses the opposition. They get amused very easily. We would rather stick to important acts for our state.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the Leader of the Opposition, I call the following members to order: the member for Wright, the member for West Torrens, the member for Giles and the Deputy Premier. The leader has the call.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier aware that the London Tube is a publicly owned and operated business?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:10): As I stated in my previous answer, that is a service which has been in public hands, private hands and is now back into public hands—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and this is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —no great revelation. I think this has been well canvassed, and I have nothing further to add to the matter.

The SPEAKER: The leader will be seated for one moment. I call the following members to order: the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Light, the member for Lee and the member for Ramsay. Are you finished? The leader has the call.

PRIVATISATION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier now apologise to the people of South Australia for breaking his election 'no privatisation agenda' promise?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: I imagine the point of order—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left, be quiet. I imagine the point of order is for argument, section 97: 'a Member may not offer argument or opinion', and there is a characterisation of privatisation.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: What I am going to do is I am going to allow—the thing is, if I do uphold that point of order, the Premier also will not have an opportunity to refute any such claims. So, in the spirit of debate, what I am going to do is I am going to allow the Premier an opportunity to respond, but I will be listening carefully, and the point of order is a meritorious one. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:11): Thank you very much, sir. I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. Before the election, I was asked specific questions about the privatisation issue, and in fact questions were put to us regarding SA Water, and we made it very clear that we didn't have a privatisation agenda. Whilst that comment that the opposition has—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Whilst the answer that was provided to that question related specifically to SA Water, it does—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Cheltenham is called to order. The member for Elizabeth is called to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Settle, settle. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying, sir, even though those comments related specifically to a question that was asked of me regarding the privatisation of SA Water—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Cheltenham is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Shall I try a third time, sir?

The SPEAKER: Please.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Whilst those—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have finished my answer.

The SPEAKER: The Premier has concluded his answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order, and if this level of interjections continues members will be departing the chamber, and I will not be upholding points of order for debate when I can barely hear the answer. The leader and then the member for Morphett.

PRIVATISATION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): My question is to the Premier. How can the Premier assure the house and the people of South Australia that his government will not privatise or outsource any other government service, including SA Water?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:13): As I was saying in my previous answer, and I would like to finish the sentence if at all possible, whilst the statements that I made that the opposition has quoted were specifically related to SA Water, they equally apply to our agenda going into the election. We did not take to the election a privatisation agenda.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What we took to the people of South Australia was an agenda which would look after the best interests of the people of South Australia, the taxpayers in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: And, sir, I would point out—

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that we were extraordinarily clear about this with the PSA in the lead-up to the election, and in fact—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Elizabeth is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I don't know how much clearer you can be—

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: You're doing to the state what you did to the family business.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I don't know how much clearer you can be than to put something in writing to the PSA. The Hon. Rob Lucas wrote to Nev Kitchin on 12 January 2018, specifically—

Mr Odenwalder: I spoke to him this morning.

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I'm happy to read from this. I think it's important to have it in *Hansard*. Mr Lucas, in his letter to Nev Kitchin dated 12 January 2018, states:

There are many current examples where public services are being successfully delivered by private or non-government suppliers. We have a responsibility to consider such options where it is clearly in the public interest to do so.

That is in writing. So, far from—

Mr Brown: So we should believe him and not you.

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —the claims made by those opposite that somehow this is something new—I see the member for West Torrens or, as we refer to him, the 'prince of privatisation' over there, chuckling to himself—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —the reality is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —there wasn't a single thing they didn't try to flog off when they were in government.

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson, I ask you to withdraw that last interjection.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Thank you, sir. I withdraw.

The SPEAKER: We will move to the member for Morphet and then the leader. The member for Morphet has the call.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr PATTERSON (Morphet) (14:15): My question is for the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister inform the house about the history of public transport in South Australia and how the Marshall government is building a better public transport system?

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister, be seated. The member for Cheltenham can leave for half an hour under 137A for interjecting despite being on two warnings. When he does, the minister will have the call.

The honourable member for Cheltenham having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:16): Can I say that the decisions that the Marshall Liberal government have taken and announced over the last few days in relation to our public transport system are going to deliver a better and brighter future for South Australian communities.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Elizabeth, you can join the member for Cheltenham for half an hour under 137A.

The honourable member for Elizabeth having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call. I would like to hear the answer.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: We took to the election a policy of delivering a customer-focused public transport network. We took to the election a policy of not accepting that the status quo is okay. I think in government you have to accept that, if you want to change the outcome—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —you need to start to do things differently. You cannot simply accept that the way we do things today is going to deliver different results, because it doesn't.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: Why didn't you say so?

The SPEAKER: The member for Light is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: What does the current system in South Australia look like? It is characterised by having, at 8 per cent, the lowest patronage in the mainland across Australia. It has, at 3 per cent, the lowest level of integration of services in the nation.

Mr Hughes interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: It is an antiquated and old-fashioned system that does not deliver the modern digital platforms that customers expect and experience interstate. Lastly, what it doesn't do—and the reason that we know this is because we as a government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —have actually been open enough and transparent enough to actually ask our customers what they think of the service, and the report card ain't good. Half of the customers tell us—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —that they don't believe that the service delivers value for money. When half your customers say that the service doesn't deliver value for money at a time when our fare structure is amongst the cheapest in the nation, you know you are doing something wrong.

What is interesting is that the decision that people are choosing to make in Adelaide to drive their car instead of get on public transport is actually not one about cost, because catching the bus, train or tram is actually currently cheaper than it would be to drive in almost all circumstances. The reason that people are choosing not to make that decision—

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —is because the system does not deliver the service they asked for. It doesn't deliver the reliability, it doesn't deliver the frequency of service and it doesn't deal with overcrowding—the three things that our customers told us they want.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: We have taken a huge number of steps since the election to improve our public transport system.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister, be seated for one moment, please. The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. We employed a chief executive who has had experience running the biggest public transport system in the country, as well as working with private operators across Australia. We have set up a public transport authority with a single focus. We have set up an advisory committee with international expertise. We have put out to tender our bus contracts so that we can use those contracts to deliver better services for South Australia.

Mr Malinauskas: \$46 million in cuts.

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I can tell you that the early results are in. The early results are that in the 2018-19 year, as outlined in our budget, we saw a 1.6 million passenger increase in the number of people using our service and a huge increase to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Hurtle Vale!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —over 53 million service kilometres delivered. We have already taken the first small steps forward in improving our system and for South Australians there is much more to come.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Light is now on two warnings, as is the member for Wright. I warn the member for Lee. I call to order the members for Karna and Hurtle Vale and I call to order the member for Hammond. The Leader of the Opposition.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier rule out that a privatised public transport rail network will be foreign owned?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:21): We have made it very clear that we are not selling the tracks. We are not selling the trains or the trams or the stations. We are outsourcing the operation to make sure that we can achieve best practice for commuters and taxpayers in South Australia. I want to take this opportunity to commend the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —Minister for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure in South Australia. He has a vision for public—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —transport in South Australia that is much higher than was achieved over the previous 16 years of Labor, which talked a lot about public transport. They talked a lot about public transport.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They were going to electrify the Outer Harbor line—it didn't happen.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They were going to electrify the Grange line—it didn't happen. They went halfway to Gawler—we had to finish the job. So we are not going to take any lectures from those opposite regarding public transport. We now have a Public Transport Authority in South Australia. I think the people who are on it will be able to look after—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader! Members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and make sure that we enhance services for the people of our state.

The SPEAKER: Premier, be seated for one moment. Member for Light, you can leave for half an hour under 137A for interjecting continually.

The honourable member for Light having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying, sir, we now have the Public Transport Authority set up. We are investing hundreds of millions of dollars into the infrastructure for our public transport system in South Australia. Most recently—

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hurtle Vale is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Most recently, in a particularly tough budget, where there were increases to fares and fines and other government charges, we kept the charge increase for public transport to a minimum: 2 per cent and below. That is because—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —we believe

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —in enhanced services for public transport in South Australia. There is lots of talk from those opposite, sir. Finally, you are getting some action from those on this side of the house, and we really do—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: the question was about whether the outsourced service would be owned by a foreign entity. The Premier is not answering the question; he is debating, sir.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is for debate. In fairness to the Premier, there is a cacophony of noise that continues to come from my left. Many members have already been ejected and there will be more to follow if this sort of noise continues. Member for West Torrens, I'm really struggling to hear the Premier's answer amongst all this noise, but I will listen assiduously to ensure that he sticks to the substance of the question. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much. It was an interesting question, sir—a question about private ownership or foreign ownership of assets in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I would like to hear the answer.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That's an incredible question to ask and maybe the Leader of the Opposition could lean over to his good friend and economic adviser and mentor the member for West Torrens to hear all about how privatisation works. There was plenty of privatisation under the prince of privatisation. Have a look what he did to the forests. Were they owned by a foreign entity? I think maybe they were. There were plenty of other capabilities sent overseas by the former government, so we are not going to be lectured by them. The reality is, sir—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that we will retain ownership. Taxpayers will retain ownership of the trains and the trams and the tracks and the stations—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and the reality is that we are investing to grow our public transport capability based on best practice.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: An analysis has been done of best practice in public transport globally. We have taken those lessons and we are going to apply them here in South Australia. What we are doing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —is the work that those left on the shelf for the past 16 years.

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe is called to order and warned.

PRIVATISATION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:24): My question is to the Premier. Why did the Premier tell the media that the budget contained no privatisations?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:25): Because it didn't.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Narungga.

REGIONAL SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:25): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on how the state government is supporting and building our regions?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:25): I thank the member for Narungga for his very important question. Yes, this government's agenda is to build all of South Australia as well as put a serious focus on the regions. It was great to be up in the member for Narungga's electorate last week on one of my regional visits around the state. He is a great host. Not only did we get out to the grain belt of Yorke Peninsula but we went down and had a look at some of the seafood opportunities that Yorke Peninsula is currently presenting not only to our economy but to the great palates of people visiting South Australia.

We know that the grain industry here in South Australia is one of the major economic platforms—\$1.7 billion. It is underpinned by 4½ thousand grain growers across South Australia. We know that they have been doing it tough, and that is why I was over at Yorke Peninsula at Mark Schilling's property at Cunliffe to make the announcement of a \$140,000 grant to the grain industry. GPSA are now looking at ways to develop that blueprint to grow the industry, making sure that blueprint is about underpinning the grain industry to be bigger, better and value-adding even more.

The announcement was, as I said, at Mark Schilling's property. It showed us while we were there, joined by the CEO of GPSA, that what farmers are now looking to do is value-add. As a government, we think that the blueprint was money well invested as to how we can help the farmers value-add. Mark Schilling has a very diverse property. He now has colour grading for his legumes. Not only that, he is now producing wheat beer. He is also producing hemp dukkah. Some of these products are now being exported around the world—it is a great initiative—as well as some of the world's best malt and barley.

That is one private grain grower here in South Australia who has taken up an initiative that we think the blueprint will underpin. Not only that, the 10-year plan is about future growth. It is about how the government can work collaboratively with industries to help them grow to underpin South Australia's economy. It is also important to note that the blueprint is based on six pillars: value-adding, market demand, on-farm innovation, building industry capacity, infrastructure investment and—one of the most important—biosecurity and quality assurance.

The first meeting has already happened at the Waite Institute. It was attended by over 80 grain growers from around the state. The great thing about that was not only their input to the blueprint but, while they were there, they were talking about the great budget initiatives that this government has presented to them—\$1.1 billion of infrastructure investment into regional South Australia.

Mr Hughes interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles is warned.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: We look at the \$25 million that has gone into the dog fence. That is a generational piece of infrastructure that will help pastoralists and the red meat sector for generations to come.

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is warned.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: There is also \$7½ million for the red meat and the wool program. They are great initiatives for building primary producers' ability not only to grow their businesses but to underpin the state's economy. It is also really important to note that the Marshall Liberal government not only wants to build on the grains industry but wants to build on the economy of regional South Australia because we all know that #RegionsMatter.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for West Torrens, we have in the gallery today and I welcome the Very Reverend Dr Steven Ogden, who is a guest of the member for Heysen. Welcome to parliament, sir.

*Question Time***PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION**

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:29): My question is to the Premier. Are there any provisions or measures within the state budget to run, manage or deliver the privatisation or outsourcing of the public transport rail network?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:29): My understanding is that there's only a market call, which is going out to the market imminently regarding the outsourcing of some of the train and transport services. Any further detail on that we can provide, but that's my understanding.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:29): My question is to the Premier. How much will the process to privatise or outsource separation of the public transport rail network cost South Australian taxpayers?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:29): I thank the member for West Torrens for his question. The answer to that question is: we believe that the process that we are going to go through, this tender process and market-sounding process for the heavy rail that we are going to go through, will help to identify savings and efficiencies that will offset any of those costs of implementation. This is a model that has worked and is tried and tested all around the world.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: In relation to light rail, can I say that every single other jurisdiction in the country runs their light rail under an outsourced model, including in Labor states like Canberra and also with Gold Coast Light Rail in Queensland. This is the model that governments of all persuasions, red and blue, have chosen—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: the minister is debating the merits of the privatisation.

The SPEAKER: Debate.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am asking for the cost, sir.

The SPEAKER: About the cost. I have the question. I believe the minister has traversed matters that are germane at the beginning of the answer, but I think he is starting to deviate a little bit. I ask him to come back, respectfully, to the substance of the question.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Yes, Mr Speaker, and in providing facts to the house about how light rail systems are operated, here is a great opportunity for us in Adelaide to take advantage of the experience that the rest of the country has moved ahead of us on. Again, we are stuck with a system—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —that has been stuck in the 20th century. The opportunity now, through bundling the light rail contract out with the north-south bus contract, is the opportunity to be able to deliver that global expertise and actually save money, save money so that we can use that money to reinvest in better services.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We have the question.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: What is also interesting is that a number of the bus regions in Adelaide are currently run by two companies: Torrens Transit and SouthLink. SouthLink is actually a subsidiary of Keolis Downer. Keolis Downer is the company that actually operates the integrated bus, tram and ferry network in Newcastle that I had the opportunity to visit last week. What is interesting is that the contract that Keolis Downer or SouthLink was awarded in 2011—not by us; it was before we came to government—is to a French company. This idea that somehow we haven't had foreign identities running services in South Australia—

Mr Duluk interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —is completely false because the guys opposite did exactly that in 2011.

The SPEAKER: I think the minister has completed his answer. The minister has finished his answer. The member for West Torrens and then the member for Davenport.

MINISTERIAL TRAVEL

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:32): Supplementary question: my supplementary question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Who paid for his visit to Newcastle and was the minister entertained by the consortium operating the rail and tram network in Newcastle that he visited?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:32): The trip, which was an overnight trip, was paid for out of my ministerial office budget. I can detail to the house that I was offered the opportunity to have my own cup of tea in the meeting that we had. There was a teabag provided and some hot water and a bit of milk. That's about the extent of the hospitality that we went through. We did go out—

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier is called to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: We did also then subsequently go out to lunch at one of the local pubs. I did have a bowl of ragu pasta.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Who paid for that?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: As to the details of who paid for that, I am happy to come back to the house. I must admit I will need to check.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Can I say this—that all the details of that will be reported in the usual way. Here's the thing: we need to look outwards. I think there is an insinuation that there's a dog whistle that is being presented here, that it's only us in South Australia, that we should close and blinker our eyes and only look inside in terms of how we deliver better services. We need to take a global outlook.

An honourable member: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: As a government, we want to incentivise private investment to come here to South Australia. We also—

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hurtle Vale is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —want to incentivise people to come and live here. In order to do that, we need to open our eyes to what the rest of the world is doing.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The opportunity to go and have a look at a fully integrated system in Newcastle—where the ferry, tram and buses are all being operated at the one operations control centre, operated by the one company—is a fantastic opportunity to look at ways in which we can do things better.

We as a government are not scared to scour the globe and look at the best ideas for delivering things. This is something we will continue to do because, unlike some other political parties, we don't want to have fake fights. We don't want to make it seem like it's SA against the world. We want to live in the rest of the world, we want to exist in a global community, we want to bring their investment to South Australia, we want to bring their tourists here to South Australia and we want to bring the expertise in running public transport systems from around the globe here to South Australia.

SCHOOLS WITH INTERNET FIBRE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM

Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (14:35): My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister please advise the house how the government is building better infrastructure for schools in Davenport and around South Australia, including by the improvement of internet speeds?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:35): I am very pleased to be able to advise the member for Davenport that the government is doing a great deal, both in his electorate and around South Australia, to ensure that South Australia and our students benefit from the best possible education services, a system that supports every child in this state to fulfil their potential and one that has excellent infrastructure both in built form and in terms of the technology they are able to use.

We have had 111 schools already—20 per cent of our public schools in South Australia—connected to our SWIFT internet, Schools with Internet Fibre Technology to the school, since the Premier and I announced it in December last year. This is an \$80 million partnership with Telstra that is transforming the way our schools and our teachers are able to use the internet in their classrooms, whether for the curriculum offerings or to engage in activities, connect with the world, or indeed for professional development.

I know the member will be pleased to hear that in his electorate of Davenport Thiele Primary School was connected on 7 May, Flagstaff Hill R-7 School was connected on 28 May, Aberfoyle Park High School will be connected on Monday next week and Braeview School R-7 is scheduled for next term.

Members around the house will also be pleased to hear about some of the other projects that are happening this week. I imagine the member Ramsay will be chuffed to know that Salisbury High School was connected just yesterday. The member Ramsay will know that the Paralowie school is being connected today—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Ramsay is warned.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The Adelaide Secondary School of English, the School of Languages and the Bowden Brompton school, in the Leader of the Opposition's electorate, are all being connected to fibre-optic technology today to massively improve the services they can give the students in the Leader of the Opposition's electorate.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The East Adelaide School in the Premier's electorate today, and Marion Primary School in the member for Gibson's electorate also just today, and this week Findon High School, Gulfview Heights Primary School, Springbank Secondary College and Thebarton Senior College are all being connected.

This is a tremendously important project that will enhance the offerings in all our schools across South Australia. It is something we are immensely proud of. It is something other schooling systems are able to gain some benefit from as well because, while our project is specifically and unapologetically focused on attaching all the public schools in South Australia, the benefits extend beyond just the public school system to the Independent and Catholic school networks and, indeed, to small business and other government departments, particularly in those areas that do not currently have fibre technology rolled out to them. Telstra is able to work with those agencies, through the education department's IT people, to have them connected as well.

It is a great body of work that will enhance the capabilities of government departments, private schools, Catholic schools and, most importantly, the public schools across South Australia. I understand that there are dozens of non-government schools that are currently talking with Telstra, through the Association of Independent Schools, looking at leveraging that improved fibre-optic connection, and that will be great for those students as well.

The member for Davenport asked about support for schools in his electorate particularly. Not only is Aberfoyle Park High School gaining the opportunities offered by this fibre-optic connection next Monday but the school is also benefiting from one of the government's other programs, the expansion of the International Baccalaureate offering within our public school system. Glenunga was previously the only public school with that offering for some of their students but, as a result of this government's election policies, we are now rolling that out, and four more public schools are seeking accreditation: Unley, Norwood Morialta, Roma Mitchell and Aberfoyle Park High School.

I know that that offering, spread from the northern suburbs through Roma Mitchell to the southern suburbs in Aberfoyle Park, is giving opportunities to students across Adelaide. Hopefully, in the future we will be able to get to the country areas as well. These are great ways that we can help build the education system to be the best it can be.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Are any savings or costs contemplated in the forward estimates of the most recent state budget for the privatisation or outsourcing of the public rail network services?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:40): Sorry, could you repeat the first part of that?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sure. I will repeat the question, sir.

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My question was to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Are any savings or costs contemplated in the forward estimates of the most recent state budget for the privatisation or outsourcing of the public rail network services?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: There certainly aren't any costs and there isn't any new savings task. There is the existing savings task that was in last year's budget, but there's nothing new in relation to that. But can I say, the member for West Torrens talks about outsourcing, and outsourcing is actually something that government has done for a long time. It's not just limited to the buses in public transport for the entire 16 years of the former government, but if I look, for instance, at the running of forests, the running of the lands titles office, the running of compulsory third-party insurance, professional services, the running of the Mount Gambier Prison, road maintenance—

Ms Cook: We're talking about the trains.

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —security on public transport, hotel services in hospitals, agency nursing staff in hospitals, can I tell you that this idea that outsourcing is somehow anathema to the way that government deliver services is wrong. Every single one of the examples that I just listed are things that the other guys did. So it really is a case of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —do as I say, not as I did. I think that the South Australian public needs to look at the actions that governments undertake—

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurana is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —rather than the words that they say. What's interesting is that if outsourcing was not a model that delivered good outcomes for the taxpayers and for the people of South Australia with the services that they deliver, then those opposite would have done something about it over 16 years, but they didn't. In fact, there are so many examples of where they used outsourcing as a model to deliver services that delivered benefits for taxpayers as well as delivering better services. It's huge. We are talking about billions of dollars' worth of expenditure over the life of their government. On this side of the house, we are honest with South Australians about how to deliver better services.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: When asked in this place within the last couple of months—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir: comparing and contrasting governments is debate.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is for debate. With respect to the minister, I wrote the question down because I had two goes to write it down this time. There were a few aspects to the question, so I will be a little bit more broad with the minister, but I will be listening to ensure he sticks to the substance of the question. I ask members on my left to cease the level of interjections. If the temperature doesn't reduce, more members will be departing. Minister.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The central point here is that outsourcing works—it works—and the way that we know it works—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison: What else are you going to outsource?

The SPEAKER: The member for Ramsay can leave for the remainder of question time under 137A and when she does the minister can continue.

The honourable member for Ramsay having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The way that we know it works is because it was continued to be used on an ongoing basis by governments of all persuasions. There is a difference between outsourcing and privatisation, and here is the clear difference.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Are you selling anything? The answer in relation to this is no. You could have said that you were selling the Motor Accident Commission or you were selling the lands titles office or you were selling the forests. But what we are doing here is not selling a thing. We will continue to own the tracks, the stations, the trams and all the associated infrastructure.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: But outsourcing is a tried and tested method—

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Member for Waite is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —a tried and tested method that has worked and, over time, we will come to see this—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —more and more. The reason we know this works in public transport is that over the time of the early years of the Rann government we saw an increase from 2001-02—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —of 33.8 million passengers across our bus network, post outsourcing, to 40 million in 2009-10. What is interesting is that in 2011 the contracts changed and those opposite saw public transport patronage go backwards as a result of the contractual changes that they made but post outsourcing patronage increased, and that is precisely what is going to happen here for our trains and trams.

PRIVATISATION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:45): My question is for the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Will all savings and any other payments received from the new private operators be reinvested or hypothecated for the rail network?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:45): Yesterday, in announcing these changes, we said that we have a guarantee on the table that services will not go backwards. In direct contrast to some of the absolute mistruths—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —that have been spoken—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader! Member for Mawson, member for Giles, order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —by other members, our expectation is that these savings are going to be able to be reinvested in better services. This is why we are undertaking this process. This is the pathway to delivering better and greater services for the people of South Australia. So you are right: yes, we are going to reinvest in services as a result of the efficiencies that we are seeking to achieve through this, and the proof will be in the commuting, as we see going forward the ability to be able to improve our network. As we have seen in so many jurisdictions across the world, this is a way to deliver better services and we are going to get on with doing it.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION STRATEGY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:46): My question is for the Minister for Education. I refer to your better services announcements on 5 June and ask how schools such as Modbury High can be involved and receive part of the \$6 million International Education Strategy funding?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:46): I thank the member for Florey for this excellent question. We are very proud of the opportunities that we are looking to provide for schools across South Australia, particularly those who are not traditionally the ones who have had dozens and dozens and in some cases more than hundreds of international students, to be able to get some of the benefits of having those international students included in their cohorts.

To just frame some of the opportunities for Modbury and other schools in this area to help inform them of any benefits that exist, there are financial benefits and there are educational benefits. The financial benefits that come with international students are, of course, that, for a number of years—and this was operating under the previous government as well, of course, and I think the people running the international education stream under the former government are still the same people now and they are doing good work and they were doing good work—there are opportunities for the schools to get the funding stream to the school and also a certain funding stream to the system.

Indeed, the International Education Unit within the education department, as I understand it, is basically a self-funding unit and they provide support to the schools in terms of reaching out to international student markets, helping to coordinate homestay arrangements and helping the schools to have the best offerings possible that assist schools to be attractive to those international students. Having those international students at the school is a benefit for the students. They can share practice and they can share their experiences with the students at the schools.

Modbury High School is a school that currently has a good quality program for international students. I understand the member's interest in this school in particular, so I can advise that there are currently six international students at the school, with numbers increasing to 14 in term 3, so it is in the range of schools we are looking at in terms of potentially helping them to get some extra support. Of course, some of those schools that have large numbers of international students—Adelaide High and Brighton schools, some of the schools of that nature—are also schools that have significant capacity pressures.

They have excellent international programs, but we would love them to be able to share some of their practice with other schools in the education system to help those other schools take more international students, particularly where they have the capacity to do so, and Modbury High may well be one of those schools. But, of course, we can't have any more international students at Adelaide or Brighton or some of those other schools than we already do. Indeed, we have had to introduce a cap and reduce the number of international students at a couple of those schools.

In relation to Modbury, I can further advise that the school has hosted study tours, including groups from Vietnam, Indonesia and Japan, this year and last year. It has been part of the Partnership School program between the Office of the Basic Education Commission, the Ministry of Education, Thailand, and our education department. They have had recent visits from Thai leaders, plus the principal and the international student program manager visited Thailand last year. Under the recently announced strategy, we are looking to have tailored packages of support for up to 20 schools that have less experience, and get them that support so they can build their profile.

Modbury High School may be one of those schools; we haven't determined those 20 schools yet. It will be considered seriously in amongst the other schools that are interested. We honestly have to get a sense, also, from those schools that are keen to be part of the package, and the department is doing that work with schools across South Australia in the coming months. Certainly, the member for Florey's advocacy on behalf of Modbury High School is noted. I know that the member for Florey has a long relationship with the school.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:50): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General update the house on the Equal Opportunity Commission's budgetary position?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:50): The Commissioner for Equal Opportunity holds a statutory responsibility under the Equal Opportunity Act 1984 to prevent discrimination based on sex, race, disability, age or various other grounds, to facilitate the participation of citizens in the economic and social life of the community, and to deal with other related matters.

The overall activity of the commission has been in general decline over the past five years. For instance, the number of inquiries from the public to the EOC has reduced by 65 per cent from the five-year average between 2008-09 to 2013-14; that is, 1,618 down to 570. The number of discrimination complaints lodged in 2017-18 has declined by 20 per cent from the average of the

same five-year period, from 263 to 211. The commissioner sought an increase in funding for her office. A bid for additional resources was considered through the recent budget process; however, that was unsuccessful.

The EOC suffered significant cuts for years by the former Labor government, which the commissioner has previously described as 'death by a thousand cuts'. The Marshall Liberal government, however, has not reduced funding to the EOC. The EOC has received budget assistance through one-off funding contributions from the Attorney-General's Department since 2016, which amounts to \$300,000 for a range of measures. Various other government agencies provide significant additional funding to the EOC in addition to its core operational budget for dedicated projects, including \$750,000 over three years from various government departments, and \$200,000 from SA Police.

I was surprised, therefore, about concerns expressed by the commissioner published in an article in *The Advertiser* on 28 June about the funding levels of her office—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —and there are several matters that I wish to reassure the house on. Firstly, the commissioner is reported to have said that the current funding will eventually reduce to three staff, including the commissioner. The core salary budget for her office is estimated at \$661,000 by 2022-23. This amounts to an average cost of \$220,000 for each of these three staff. Salary costs of this order only apply to senior executive positions. It is not the case that the commission will have two staff, plus the commissioner.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Secondly, the budget assistance provided by my department since 2016 through one-off funding contributions was understood by the commissioner to be one-off funding, which was welcomed at the time. However, it appears this may have been characterised as a funding cut for the article. This is incorrect.

In April this year, my department offered additional funding of \$32,000 in 2019-20 to extend current staff while the EOC moved to a new organisational structure. Given the commissioner's concerns about funding, surprisingly, this offer was declined. I have also been surprised to learn that the commissioner has chosen not to utilise some corporate resources. Rather than using the media and communications support that exist in the Attorney-General's Department, the commissioner has spent nearly \$50,000 on a private public relations firm since October 2017. On occasion—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —the private firm has charged for even engaging with the Attorney-General's Department's own media team. This is an absurdity, and the use of private public relations companies is not justified or sustainable. All statutory officers must manage their budgets and their offices—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: It is my expectation that the commissioner manages—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —her own office within the existing resources, and my department will continue to assist the commissioner to ensure that she does. I trust that clarifies the matter.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. How will fares be set following the privatisation or outsourcing of the public transport rail network?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:55): Again, another opportunity for me to be able to debunk some of the bunkum that is out there at the moment. Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —in South Australia government has set the fares forever, and what is interesting is that there has been some suggestion by some people in this parliament that fares are going to go up—

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —as a result of this outsourcing.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: What is interesting here is let's look at the South Australian example of when buses were outsourced. Over that time and over the 16 years of the Labor government, even though the buses were outsourced the government still set the fares. That is exactly the way that it is going to operate going forward—exactly. South Australians have nothing to fear because government will continue to control the fare box.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Hughes interjecting:

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

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader will cease interjecting.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: There are those out there and on social media and at train stations saying, 'Oh, services are going to be cut and fares are going to go up.' That is completely not the case.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: That is absolute bunkum.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: And what's interesting here is that the private operators don't get the fare box. That fare box revenue comes to government. What happens is that there is a contract between government and a private operator to deliver a service, the quantity and quality of which is managed through the contract—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —but the fare box stays with government. The reason that people can feel comfortable with this is that it is exactly the way it has operated for 20 years without any issue, but what you've got is a group of people trying to scare South Australians about this.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, leader!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: It is complete—

Mr Malinauskas: Your example, not ours.

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: It is complete bunkum, and there are going to be those with egg on their face when this quite clearly isn't the case and we transition to this new model and services aren't cut and fares don't get jacked up through the roof, that we will operate in the same way that we have now. There was an opportunity, if this was not the right model, for things to have changed in 2011, or in 2005-06.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order, minister. The point of order is for debate?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: Yes. With respect to the minister, he is starting to deviate. I ask you to come back to the substance of the question, please.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: We will control the fares, we will continue the frequency, we will continue to own the assets. We will be in control of our public transport network. We will work, though, to use global expertise to drive patronage forward, as has been the case when other jurisdictions have gone down this path.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:57): Can the minister outline to the house examples—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: Which minister?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Minister for Transport and Infrastructure.

Mr Pederick: 22 years!

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is warned.

An honourable member: Chuck him out!

The SPEAKER: I might. Member for West Torrens, could you please start again from the start. Let's hear the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, sir. Can the minister outline to the house any examples of the better services or amenity commuters will receive as a result of his privatisation or outsourcing of the rail network services?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:58): I think we can take the yardstick as being bums on seats. I think that is the yardstick that we should be using, because people are voting with their wallets and with their feet to use a service, and the best example we can give is here in Adelaide in that after the outsourcing of buses in 2000 we saw a seven million passenger per annum increase over the ensuing years—seven million more people per annum choosing to use that service as a result of these changes.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: That's what happens—patronage grows.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We have the question.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I know it's hard—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Again, to step back, the decision that is made by individuals about whether or not they use public transport services is a complex one. They want clean and safe services, they want reliable services, they want increased frequency of services and they want it done at a price that they consider reasonable. If all those things match up, patronage grows. What we see at the moment is that—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: I didn't ask about patronage numbers. I asked about better services and amenities.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is for debate. The question was about how fares are to be set and then it was followed by examples of better services. I believe the minister is currently answering in a manner which is germane, but I will continue to listen. I was interrupted then. I ask members to cease interjecting. The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: If this complex equation, this series of factors that people define for themselves as better services, adds up, they use the service. At the moment, one half of the equation works—that is, we have a cost-effective fare structure here in Adelaide. Catching public transport in Adelaide compared with the rest of the nation is cheap. If price was the only factor, why do we have the lowest patronage in the country? Because the other side of the equation—

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The other side of the equation quite clearly doesn't work. There is price and then there is the value of the service that people see. That's the part of the equation we need to improve. We cannot simply sit still and expect that we are going to get a different result. What we have seen right across the globe is that when this outsourcing happens patronage grows. People make the decision, through the provision of better services that are more reliable, that are safe and clean and more frequent, that that service works better for them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, leader!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Here is the opportunity to be able to deliver that. We know what our customers want because we weren't too scared to ask them.

Mr Picton: Did you ask them about privatisation?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: We did ask them.

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: At the end of the day, they said, 'We want better reliability, we want better frequency and we want you to deal with overcrowding.' In relation to overcrowding, I talk quite specifically about our train network and the fact that our Belair line, which is the most loved train line on our network, has at the other end of the scale the Gawler line, which is the least loved train line on our network because of issues in relation to frequency and overcrowding.

It is why this government made sure that we got the final \$220 million of a \$615 million commitment to electrify the Gawler line, to buy new trains which are going to deliver a 15 per cent increase in capacity to deal with the exact issues that our customers told us that they want us to deal with. This is how you deliver reform in the public transport space. Again, we are more than prepared to look right around the country.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Here is the other part of the equation. In the last financial year, this government delivered more service kilometres than we have done in the preceding three years. We actually delivered more services that led to more patronage—1.6 million more bums on seats—over the course of the 2018 financial year. That is a clear example of green shoots across our public transport system network.

The SPEAKER: I will come back to the member for West Torrens. The member for Finniss.

GREAT SOUTHERN OCEAN WALK

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister please inform the house how the recently announced Great Southern Ocean Walk will benefit local communities and the South Australian tourism economy?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:03): It is great to be able to update the house, and particularly the member for Finniss, given he asked the question, on such a great piece of tourism and environmental infrastructure investment that was contained in the 2019-20 state budget—that is really the activation of the existing Heysen Trail.

The first component of that trail, which runs between Cape Jervis, comes close to Victor Harbor in the member for Finniss's electorate. It doesn't go into the town, but the plan is to create a multiday walk, activating the Heysen Trail and taking it into the town of Victor Harbor and to the destination point of Granite Island. The Granite Island conservation park is the destination we are keen to link up with there.

We believe that this can become one of the great walks of the world, extending from Cape Jervis, which is a place people often go to in order to get to Kangaroo Island. It is a tourism destination in its own right in a way. It is extending from there through a range of protected areas, a dramatic and incredible coastline along the south coast of the Fleurieu Peninsula, passing through Deep Creek Conservation Park, visiting sites such as Blowhole Beach, the Tunkalilla Beach and then along that coastline through areas like Balquhider and then into Newland Head Conservation Park, Waitpinga Beach, Parsons Beach—fantastic, beautiful landscapes which we can and should be sharing with the world.

We know that we can attract tourists to this area to enjoy those landscapes, to enjoy the views, to enjoy the great outdoors and to immerse themselves in the natural environment that we find along the south coast of the Fleurieu Peninsula. Those views aren't only of the mainland but are of course across that 13 kilometres of water to Kangaroo Island, which is very clear to see on a good day as well. We really think this can be a significant drawcard for domestic tourists and also international tourists. We look forward to working with local businesses and local councils as we bring this idea to life.

This was not an idea that was handed down by the state government. In fact, it was an idea that bubbled out of the local community. It was the Yankalilla council, local businesses and local environmental groups, such as the Friends of the Heysen Trail, coming together and saying, 'We've got something really great here. We've got this beautiful environment. We've got these views. Can we bring this to life as an activated section of the Heysen Trail and use it as a way to enhance the natural environment and to create businesses that can thrive as a result of drawing extra tourists to the area?'

The visitor economy is so important to South Australia, and it's particularly important to specific areas of South Australia. One of those areas is the Fleurieu and Southern Fleurieu Peninsula. We know that people love visiting that area, and we as a government want to create enabling infrastructure to draw people to our regions. This is exactly what we have here—the opportunity to spend around \$6 million in enabling infrastructure to upgrade campgrounds, toilets, car parking, signage and digital technologies to share the stories of that landscape.

The opportunities are substantial, and over the next couple of years I will be working with those local community groups, those stakeholders—particularly the friends groups, the Friends of Deep Creek, the Friends of Newland Head, the Friends of Granite Island and the Friends of the

Heysen Trail—as we bring this project to life and see a very significant investment in the Heysen Trail.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:07): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Has the minister met with any operators offering to bid, or who suggested that they would bid, to contract to operate our public transport rail network prior to yesterday's announcement?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:07): There is a very clear way that we deal with conflict of interest in relation to this and that is that—

Mr Picton: Have you got a conflict? What's your conflict? Barossa Fine Foods express?

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurana can leave for the remainder of question time.

The honourable member for Kaurana having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I suppose, Mr Speaker, that coming from the private sector isn't something that's valued by one half of this chamber. Having experience of trying to spend one's own capital to improve and create jobs in South Australia is not something that one side of this house—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —thinks is an appropriate use of somebody's time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I have met with so many operators—so many operators—and do you know why?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I would like to hear the answer.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Apart from the fact that these people, for instance, Keolis Downer and Torrens Transit, are actually operators of the current system—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —these are people with the global expertise we are seeking to take advantage of. I had a good opportunity to go across with Torrens Transit to look at how—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —they operate on-demand bus services in Sydney and look at the way they have been able to integrate their B-Line service, for instance, with some on-demand services, as well as some other various parts of their network. It was a good opportunity to talk with Keolis Downer, which is operating in Newcastle, which also has an on-demand bus service in a low frequency, low patronage area that could actually hold some answers here in South Australia. We should not be scared of talking to smart people and asking them what they think. What we also need to do is to make sure that when—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —we go into tender for something we maintain the integrity of that tender process. I have sought to do that on every single occasion. What I don't accept, and what this house shouldn't accept and what the South Australian voters shouldn't accept, is a government who want to stick their head in the sand and think that they are perfect at everything. That is simply not the case, and the facts bear that out with the last three years of the former government seeing patronage decline across our network. Bums on seats going backwards—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —is a clear example of their failure to grow our public transport network. We did see some green shoots last year, 1.6 million more passengers over the course of the last financial year. But can I say to the South Australian taxpayers: we are a government who are not scared to admit that going out and talking to other people is a great way to find new ideas. We are a state and a government who are willing to look at best practice—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —to talk with recognised experts and then bring that expertise to South Australia. It is something that we are doing in a whole multitude of spheres. South Australians are going to be the beneficiaries of that. All public transport users here in Adelaide will know that they have a government who have left no stone unturned in seeking to improve the service that we offer.

Grievance Debate

PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:10): I welcome the opportunity to be able to make a contribution to an incredibly important public policy question that South Australians now have to face, and that is the issue of whether or not we privatise our train and tram network here in South Australia. Make no mistake: this is an essential public service. This is right up there with public schools and public hospitals. Every single day, 70,000 people use our public train and tram network. They use it for basics—getting to school and getting to work.

These are people who rely upon this service and who without it may not be able to make a contribution in our society or in our economy. This is a service that vulnerable members of our community use on a daily basis. The elderly rely on this service, the disabled rely on this service, and they get that service from the government of South Australia because they know that service is there to deliver for them—not to deliver a profit to another company, not to deliver a profit to shareholders who may well be living overseas.

This is a critical government service that has been delivered in this state for a long time with an exceptional level of performance. The minister's own survey demonstrates that well in excess of 80 per cent of people who use our train and tram network are overall satisfied with that service, which begs the question: why do we have a minister who is going out of his way to talk down that service? Why is he seeking to demean those people who work in this service and deliver it with passion and effectiveness for the people of South Australia?

The answer lies in this government's ideological predisposition to privatisation. This is the same old classic neoliberal agenda that we thought we had dispensed with 16 years ago, but we were wrong because it is back. The people of South Australia would be forgiven for thinking otherwise when they went to the ballot box at the last state election. Front of mind amongst voters' considerations would have been what this now Premier said he would do and what this now Premier said he would not do.

What he said he would do was deliver lower costs and better services. That is what he promised he would do. How is that stacking up specifically in regard to public transport? There are certainly other areas of public policy that we could traverse in that policy promise, but let's just look at public transport. Lower costs? No. What we have seen since is a dramatic increase in public transport fares for a lot of commuters, increases that well and truly exceed the rate of inflation. For

those people who used to rely upon the two-section fare to get to and from work or their home, that has been completely abolished. That can amount to an additional cost in excess of \$800 a year.

What have we heard from the member for Adelaide regarding the abolition of the two-section fare? Absolutely nothing. The residents of Adelaide should know that the member for Adelaide seeks to impose upon them a higher cost to get to and from their workplace. What about the better services element of public transport? Better services? There are \$46 million worth of cuts being imposed upon public transport. That is what they said they would do; they clearly have not delivered.

What did the Premier say he would not do? This is probably the most important thing. The Premier said that he did not have a privatisation agenda. That was crystal clear and unequivocal, on the record, recorded live in colour: 'We don't have a privatisation agenda.' Since then, we have seen a maximum-security prison privatised. We have seen hospital patient transfers in the north-eastern suburbs privatised. Silence from the member for Newland; silence from the member for King. We have seen the potential privatisation of SA Pathology. Now what we have is the guaranteed privatisation of the train and tram network.

This cannot be characterised as anything other than a broken promise from this Premier, which calls into question the credibility of this Premier and this government's true privatisation agenda. How can South Australians take them seriously when it comes to SA Water? How can South Australians take them seriously when it comes to delivering better services that are orientated for people and not for profit?

PUBLIC HEALTH SYSTEM

Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:16): I rise today to speak about an issue of significant importance to a number of King residents and that is the current state of our public health system and my constituents' desire to finally see our local services improve.

Prior to the 2018 state election, the King community made it abundantly clear to me how important a better health system and services are to them and the importance of being treated close to home. With this in mind, it was my absolute pleasure to host our Minister for Health and Wellbeing to facilitate my community having firsthand access and an opportunity to speak directly with the minister and hear about the government's plans for our health system and the progress that we have been making to date.

For the forum, we were hosted by the dedicated members of the Salisbury RSL. The turnout was fantastic, with many engaging questions and conversations being held on the night. What was most inspiring was to see how engaged and interested the King community was in talking about our health services. Their questions covered topics such as our local hospitals and elective surgery. They were very pleased to hear of the reductions in elective surgery waiting lists. We talked about mental health and there was so much positive feedback, which I always hear about the people who work in our local hospitals and how they really care about our local community.

When I am out in my community, I encourage people to have their say and to put their feelings forward whenever they require further information or if they want their feedback taken on board. This is so important to help me best represent them when I am in this place. These forums are another important way for me to learn what matters most to people in King. A major concern that became apparent on the night at the forum was the continued interest in our mental health services. This was reflective of the many conversations I had when doorknocking prior to the election.

The minister shared with our community that, contrary to many reports, there has in fact been no reduction in funding for disability or mental health services in South Australia. Funding of \$6.8 million has actually been transferred to the National Disability Insurance Scheme to cover the services for those clients who are now eligible for transfer to the NDIS. This is exactly what was proposed to happen and it has been delivered. It has nothing to do with the state budget decision and everything to do with the NDIS agreements, which were put in place by the previous government.

I also mention that I am a member of the Social Development Committee and at the moment we are reviewing mental health services in South Australia and how that transition is going. I look forward to being able to provide further updates in the future. I have since also received correspondence from residents who attended my health forum, and they were extremely thankful for

the minister's time and willingness to answer as many questions as possible. A big thankyou to Robert and Michelle Howard from the Salisbury RSL who assisted with the set-up and close-down for such a successful event.

Prior to my health forum I also attended the Salisbury RSL for its working dogs dedication day held on Friday 7 June. This event was held to recognise all government working dogs and their handlers, who provide a valuable contribution to the security and wellbeing of South Australians. This is something we might not hear about as much in our usual annual commemorative services, and I was so happy to play just a very small role in recognising these dogs and their handlers. It was quite funny watching the photos being taken on the day, trying to get the dogs to turn around to have their photos taken.

Unfortunately, since both of these events there has been an incident that saw the Salisbury RSL broken into and a fair bit of damage had taken place. I am deeply sympathetic to the RSL and know that through the hard work and dedication of the committee the club will be back on its feet soon. I thank everyone who has offered their support to the club since.

I would also like to encourage every member of the King community to visit our many local RSLs, to pop in for a drink or a meal. Each time they do this they are adding to the support the RSL needs to keep on providing their services and providing ongoing support to our veterans. The committees do such a great job, and everyone involved should be incredibly proud of what they do.

MEN'S HEALTH NETWORKS

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:21): Today, I would like to speak briefly about a couple of things. First, I would like to speak about a recent event, the Men's Health Awards, held during Men's Health Week. I attended the awards, and I would like to acknowledge that Dr Harvey, the member for Newland, was also present on behalf of the government. The awards are sponsored by the Australian Men's Health Forum, a national organisation that seeks to bring together the various men's health groups across the nation to improve the health of men and boys in Australia.

A couple of the messages that came from that event included, as is the case in most countries of the world, that we are starting to understand that the most effective way to address both women's and men's health is by a sex-specific approach that recognises differences. In April this year, the commonwealth government released a men's health strategy and a women's health strategy for the next 10 years that recognise the need for this sex-specific approach to make inroads, particularly in the area of young men's health, depression and chronic disease.

First, it is important we understand and acknowledge that supporting men in their social environment is important for their health and wellbeing, and so we need to better understand how men are faring in our communities. There is a whole range of ways that a number of community organisations support men in their communities. In my own community of Light, for example, we have Willo's Men's Shed, one of the many Men's Sheds across the country that provide a lot of support for men in their community, offering them the opportunity to gather and talk about men's issues but that also offer a safe place for men to discuss issues of concern to them. Each men's shed right across the country is quite different, reflecting the nature of those communities.

Also in my electorate, I would like to acknowledge the work undertaken by John Goodger and his team at AnglicareSA, who coordinate the Northern Men's Wellbeing Network, which champions men's health and wellbeing, particularly for dads and children, in the Playford region. Organisations such as this are important at the local level as they create the right setting for conversations about the elements that make men healthy in the communities in which they live.

The decline in manufacturing and other traditional blue-collar employment has displaced many men from the workforce, leading to considerable stress on men and their families in my region, and the network helps to provide the support these men need. Networks such as this also place great effort on ensuring that their efforts are inclusive and reflect the needs of men right across the community, including young men, Indigenous men and men from emerging cultural communities.

I am also a proud member of the Board of Patrons of the Freemasons Foundation Centre for Men's Health based at the University of Adelaide. The centre is an initiative of the Freemasons Foundation, the charitable arm of the Freemasons in South Australia and the Northern Territory. I

am not a member of the Freemasons but my son is. The Freemasons Foundation has invested more than \$3.6 million, matched by the University of Adelaide, to support men's health initiatives and to support salary and scholarships for young scientists working in men's health, not only here at the University of Adelaide but across all universities.

So, Mr Speaker, when you go out to the countryside and go past a Masonic lodge, you should acknowledge that there are people behind the scenes raising funds for important works like men's health. Professor Wittert, who is the director of the Men's Health Centre at the University of Adelaide, leads a team of researchers and scientists who do important work. Their work is having an impact right across the world because their research is leading the area of men's health nationally and internationally.

I also acknowledge the contribution of Mr Robert Clyne OAM, the foundation's executive director, for his role in establishing the centre and its ongoing success. I also mention the fact that the centre is undertaking what is called the MAILES study, which stands for Men Androgen Inflammation Lifestyle Environment and Stress, which is one of the most comprehensive longitudinal studies of men's health and wellbeing regarding ageing. This is being undertaken in the northern and western suburbs of Adelaide. This research is critical to informing the practice of better service delivery to men and boys in our community. Healthy men and healthy young boys mean we have healthy families and healthy communities.

CAPUTO, MR D.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:26): Today, I would like to talk about a local person who has achieved 50 years not only as a Lions Club member in Port Pirie but also as a great community person. Dominic Caputo joined the Lions Club of Port Pirie in 1969. This was after another great local Harry Madigan had questioned Dominic as to why he was not a member of the Lions Club. Dominic joined the club in that year, in 1969, becoming the youngest member at 38 years old.

Over many years, Dominic has performed many different activities as a Lions member, but his greatest achievement was to suggest to the club that they host a district convention which had never been held in Port Pirie. As this progressed, with great support, the conference was an overwhelming success with, over 400 people attending the conference and filling completely the Donaldson Basketball Stadium at Port Pirie.

During Dominic's term as president, he instigated the sale of Christmas cakes as a fundraiser. This activity is still very popular and a great fundraiser for the club. The cakes are not 50 years old; they offer new ones every year. As a Lions member, Dominic has travelled extensively across Australia and attended numerous national and international conventions. It was during one such convention in Adelaide that the then mayor, Bill Jones, whisked Dominic away from the conference in Adelaide to a building where the mayor had a meeting with Bob Hawke, something that Dominic remembers to this day.

Dominic has been actively involved in many community projects, for example, the massive tree planting on Port Broughton Road's entrance to Port Pirie, which I must admit has deteriorated over the many years since the council took it over, unfortunately. It would be a shame to the people who were there at the start of that project over 25 years ago. He contributed to Rosemary Cottage for the aged at the Port Pirie Hospital and the Orana workshops for young people with disabilities. Dominic still goes to visit those people. These people at the Orana workshops are terrific young kids, even though they are in their 40s and 50s.

He contributed to the well-utilised skate park, which was when I was the mayor of the Port Pirie Regional Council, and this facility is still well utilised to this day. The current clubs project is a Liberty Swing for the Port Pirie Mid North Education Centre which caters for students with disabilities. This project was worth well over \$40,000. I must thank the Premier for \$8,500, after I wrote a letter to him asking for this funding for the special project. The Premier did not hesitate to come back with that \$8,500 to allow this organisation to provide the Liberty Swing for young kids in wheelchairs who cannot get access to normal playgrounds.

Today, Dominic is the club's oldest member and is still very actively involved with various fundraising activities. Dominic really loves meeting people at the fundraising barbecues the club

holds every Saturday and Sunday, and Dominic openly admits that these people greatly admire him. He mentioned the other day that even though it is only \$1.50 or \$2 for the barbecue, people give him \$20 and he asks, 'What would you like? Onion or not?' and they say, 'Don't worry about it. We'll just give you the \$20.' On receiving the award, Dominic stated:

I have enjoyed the fellowship with all club members over the years. I hope to continue contributing to the club for many years to come. It has been a really great ride.

He thanked the Lions Club of Port Pirie for having him for 50 years and said that he really appreciated their camaraderie and their service. In finishing, I would like to say congratulations to Dominic and best wishes for his future with the Lions Club of Port Pirie and the people of Port Pirie.

LIONS CLUB OF MITCHAM

Mrs POWER (Elder) (15:30): I rise today to recognise the outstanding efforts of the Lions Club of Mitcham and the significant contribution club members make in our local area. The Lions Club philosophy is 'We serve', and this philosophy certainly comes alive at the Lions Club of Mitcham. There are currently 28 members, with an average age of 81 years old (or should I say 81 years young) and recently the member for Waite and I had the pleasure of hosting the club for lunch here at Parliament House and attending the 53rd handover dinner.

At the handover dinner, I was honoured to be able to toast the Lions Club International, acknowledge the outgoing as well as the incoming board of directors and once again hear about the incredible achievements of the club. Under the stewardship of the board for 2018-19—which comprised president, Neville Haar; first vice-president, Peter Ellemor; second vice-president and immediate past president, Petre Thorn; secretary, Geoff Judson; treasurer, Rob Leeder; second-year directors, Doug Knuckey and Kate Helbig; as well as first year directors, Peter Mildren and Peter Scholefield—the club was able to raise \$30,000 to support key projects in our community.

I echo the words of Peter Ellemor, the first vice-president, where in his report he commended all the members for making this possible. Clearly, the \$30,000 raised last year was the result of a dedicated effort by all members. Fundraising activities by the club included running the Bunnings barbecue. If anybody has ever done that, they would know that is no easy feat, so a special acknowledgement to Lion Peter Mildren for his huge effort in coordinating the barbecue and liaising with Bunnings staff. Also, cake sales I am pleased to report were up 22 per cent compared with the previous year, thanks to the great efforts of Lion Brian Lawlor, who coordinated the project and the Woodies Project as well, as a number of other fundraising initiatives.

This incredible fundraising effort by all members enabled the club to then select projects to support. Led by second vice-president, Petre Thorn, and the committee members, I understand that the club chose to focus on selecting projects within the local community where there was a great need. More than \$10,000 was donated to community-based organisations such as Operation Flinders, which we all know does incredible work with disadvantaged youth, the Australian Cranio-Maxillo Facial Foundation and Lions Hearing Dogs.

The club also supported Bramwell House, which provides accommodation for people who have experienced domestic violence; a range of parks and gardens in the local area nurturing plants that attract butterflies, so there will be lots of local residents enjoying that from their hard work; and they also supported Meals on Wheels, which we in this house know makes a profound and positive difference to people's lives.

So 2018-19 has been another big year for the club. No doubt the year ahead will see the club once again make a positive difference in our local area, as well as provide opportunities for fellowship. The Lions Club of Mitcham is a part of Lions Australia, which itself forms part of an international association. It is filled with people who are united by their drive to support the community at a grassroots level and beyond, helping to make the world a better place.

I take this opportunity in this house to congratulate the incoming board, which includes president, Peter Ellemor; first vice-president, Petre Thorn; second vice-president, Colin Cordon; secretary, Geoff Judson; treasurer, Rob Leeder; second-year directors, who are the same as last year, Doug Knuckey and Kate Helbig; first-year directors, Brian Lawlor and Graham Spinkston; and, of course, the immediate past president, who always runs his meetings with a touch of humour,

Neville Haar. I acknowledge not only the board members but all 28 individual members of the club and, of course, their partners. I encourage anyone who is looking to get involved in a great community-minded club to consider joining the Lions Club of Mitcham.

MAWSON ELECTORATE SCHOOLS

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:35): I want to send a shout-out to all school students in the electorate of Mawson. I love getting out to visit the schools in our local area, and it is something that I have been doing now for 13 years. Those kids I visited in reception back in 2006 are now of voting age, so it is very important that you get out there and talk to the students right from the get-go and then maintain those relationships.

I love that I can be driving down the street and get out of my car at McLaren Vale, Willunga or Aldinga and kids will just come up and start having a chat with so much confidence and polite demeanour. They are inquisitive, and they have good ideas as well. I remember being in McLaren Vale in the December-January school holidays this year when someone came up to me on their scooter (there were about three of them) and said, 'Mr Bignell, Mr Bignell, we need a new skate park because Johnny just broke his arm. You should have seen it—it was gory and there were bones sticking out,' all that sort of stuff. These are the conversations I love having with the students.

We have all sorts of schools in the electorate of Mawson—government schools and non-government schools, area schools, primary schools and secondary schools. All of them are full of obviously wonderful teachers and leaders, but the students just blow me away all the time with how confident they are and how good they are at their academic and other pursuits. Just in the last week or so, I had the pleasure of visiting two schools on Kangaroo Island: the Kingscote campus of the Kangaroo Island Community Education school and the Penneshaw campus.

Last year, the Kangaroo Island Community Education system, which oversees Parndana, Penneshaw and Kingscote, was named the best regional school in Australia. I am delighted to inform the house today that they have been short-listed again for the finals, which will be held in Canberra in August, so we wish everyone there, including Maxine, Peter and Leanne—everyone in terms of those who run the school and all the students—all the very best.

It was really amazing to hear a young Aboriginal student, Jasmine, get up at the school assembly in Kingscote without any notes and give an amazing briefing on an Indigenous STEM seminar she went to, including a visit to the Botanic Garden here in Adelaide. They had to cut it short by a day because the rough weather was coming and they had to get back before the ferries were cut. Again, that is something that the students learn about—the resilience of island life and that sometimes you can be cut off.

I also heard very exciting recaps of the SAPSASA netball and football competition from the students in Kingscote and down at Penneshaw last week when I talked to some of the students there as I gave them some flags for their flagpole. They were so proud of everything they were working on at school. They showed me their STEM centre and their art lab and told me all about the musical they were working on. They also said during the assembly that they were going to do a sleep-out this week to raise money for homeless people and to raise awareness about those who are homeless. I slipped them 50 bucks and said, 'Good luck with that, and I hope you get a nice warm night.' It is unlikely in Penneshaw in July, but good luck to them anyway.

On the subject of homeless people, about three weeks ago the Tatachilla Lutheran College grade 6s came here on an excursion. There were 62 kids, but I did not hear a peep out of them, except for excellent questions. When they left, they encountered a homeless gentleman out the front of parliament and they felt sorry for him. He looked a bit hungry and cold, so they gave him some of their packaged food and started talking to him.

It turned out that normally he busks, but his saxophone was broken, so these grade 6 kids from Tatachilla Lutheran College went back to their school and talked about what they could do to help him out. They got together with some of the parents and other students and raised \$180 for this gentleman not only to get his saxophone fixed but also to buy him a bag to protect the saxophone and keep it dry. Well done to those wonderful kids at Tatachilla Lutheran College.

I was also there on Friday talking to the year 10 students and looking at the work that they had done during Business Week. They had split into groups of 10 or 11, 10 companies were formed and they had to come up with a business model, they had to come up with an app with a video—all these things about running a business. It was held over four days and there were eight quarters, as in financial quarters, so they had to make big decisions twice a day on the future of how their company was going.

There were some great stories and some immense failures that were celebrated as much as the victories were because what it did was to teach these year 10 students at Tatchilla Lutheran College about running a business and what it is like to interact in a business. Those students are out doing work experience this week in our local area. I wish them and everyone at all our schools the very best.

Bills

APPROPRIATION BILL 2019

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson has seven minutes to go—seven of the best!

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:40): It seems like only moments ago that I sat down. I have changed clothes and everything, which will be nice when we splice the contribution together—but one thing that has not changed (although the outfit may have) is the anger and resentment towards this government and its budget. It has been absolutely caned by people far and wide in the electorate of Mawson, both on the mainland and on Kangaroo Island.

As I said at the beginning, having just arrived back from Kangaroo Island during proceedings this morning, people are very angry. People are heartbroken actually that the work they have put into building their tourism businesses has absolutely been blown apart by this government and that a visitor economy, which was worth \$6.8 billion when we handed over the reins to the Marshall government, has now lost \$100 million just in one quarter, so they are very fearful.

These businesses see what is happening to their books and to their future bookings, and unfortunately they are going down at a very fast rate. There is no visitor information centre on Kangaroo Island, which is an absolute disgrace given that Kangaroo Island is one of the jewels in the crown of South Australia's visitor economy. There is a lot of work for this government to do. I know that not many ministers have actually been over to visit Kangaroo Island.

The Premier was there. It was a fly-in fly-out official visit (he did not leave the airport), when he got to open the airport that we funded, the airport that we fought for when the Liberal local member of parliament did not want an airport upgrade. We did that. We put in \$8 million and the federal government put in \$8 million. Of course, the Premier flies in, opens the new terminal and gets on the plane and flies out again.

I have been speaking to people on the island and they do not know whether Rob Lucas has ever in his life been to Kangaroo Island. He has been in this place since I was in year 10; in 1982, he came into parliament. I put in a question over a month ago to ask whether he has ever been to Kangaroo Island. Up till now, we have not had a response, but I am guessing, by the look of this budget, that he has never been to Kangaroo Island.

He has just doubled everyone's rego on Kangaroo Island. He has taken away \$500—this is how mean he is—that went to the road safety group on Kangaroo Island for administration charges, for expenses that volunteers should not be expected to have to pay. His leader, the Premier, actually has to be on the hook for this. He has got to take responsibility. He is the leader and he has to take responsibility for the cruel cuts that everyone on Kangaroo Island is suffering.

However, it is further than that. The hatred for this government is so widespread—for example, commuters we talk to are seeing services cut, and now we heard yesterday that they are going to privatise the tram and train network. I picked up the police journal. The police do an amazing job, and they are not known for being outspoken on political views. They are not known for picking

sides when it comes to politics, but the front cover shows the Premier and the Deputy Premier, and it says, 'These two lawmakers refuse to protect law keepers'.

An honourable member: Shame!

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: It's terrible. If you read the president's message from Mark Carroll, this is his opening line:

Politicians who take their emergency-services workers for granted do so at their peril. That kind of disregard wins favour with no one. Not the police, not victims of crime, not the community. Not anyone.

Yet Premier Steven Marshall and his government have so far responded to the vulnerability of police with complete indifference.

On this side of the chamber, we think that the police and other emergency service workers deserve to be protected. They deserve to have rules in place so that people who attack them in some way will be punished and, as the Police Association says, sent to gaol. That is what needs to happen to people who pick on these emergency service workers and police who are always putting themselves in danger to go into fires, to go into situations where their lives are at peril. They do not need anything more to add to the danger of this job, and we need to protect them.

We have the police up in arms about this government. We had teachers here in South Australia striking yesterday because of the way they are being treated by this government. The Marshall government is being condemned from all quarters. I tell you, it usually takes a lot longer than a year and a bit to get people as angry as the Marshall government has made South Australians. People are angry. As someone who is out and about in my local community a lot, I cannot remember hearing so much anger, so much disbelief at the way a government are treating the people of our state. Before the election, they came out and said that they did not have a privatisation agenda, and then we see things pop up that come as a complete surprise, just like when a former Liberal government sold off ETSA.

We see that trains and trams will be privatised. We see that a remand centre will be privatised. All these things hit at the sorts of services that people expect governments to provide. The promise, as we have heard from the transport minister, is that this is going to be great, that it is going to bring about cheaper prices and better services for everyone. When did we hear that last? It was from John Olsen when he sold ETSA. In that first tranche after the privatisation of ETSA, we saw our electricity bills go up by 23.7 per cent. Did we see any improvement in service? No. We saw a 23.7 per cent cost increase to the consumer and not one skerrick of improvement in service. I can guarantee that the same thing will happen with our buses and trains.

I catch the train a lot on the Seaford line. How about the government of the day just providing a reliable service, one that works, one where you do not get threatened with violence by people because either there are no guards or they are right down the end of one carriage and not going up and down the train. If you provide a regular, clean, secure transport system—guess what—people will use it. You do not need a private operator to do that. Government should be doing that. That is what we pay our taxes for, and that is what we expect. If you cannot do it, just nick off, get out of there and give someone else a go.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:48): This opportunity to speak on the state budget 2019-20 provides the chance for me to say that it is not all bad, but it reinforces my reasons for believing more than ever that there needs to be a new Australian constitution looking at the funding arrangements for all Australians. Since the federal election we have seen how decisions made in the Eastern States, where elections are decided, mean that smaller states are at a disadvantage and that an accident of birth means we do not all enjoy the same rights and access to services. Perhaps it is time to have a candid discussion on the expectations of the people of Australia, not the short-term marketing exercise election campaigns have turned into, and to have a true understanding that tax cuts may not be the answer to all our problems.

Day-to-day living costs remain the biggest concern for our constituents, and they expect us to look after this issue. In return, they are willing to give some leeway for the bigger decisions taken. They do not buy the 'we have a mandate' line for everything. Rather, they are resigned to accepting the least worst option in most cases. They applaud the efforts to keep election promises but do not

like the reprioritisation of projects, especially in the north-east, where there were promises such as the reintroduction of level 1 ICU at Modbury Hospital and new O-Bahn car parking facilities, to name just two. I will expand more on these and other local issues later.

Each state is responsible for its own revenue but has limited ways of raising revenue. In truth, we rely on the federal government and its capacity to raise funds through taxes on things like wages and via the GST for basic services, such as health and education, the last of the services still not completely privatised or outsourced. As we have seen in this state budget, when expected amounts of revenue fail to materialise, things go pear-shaped pretty quickly. However, each state still has a choice about how it spends its money, and it is with these choices that I continue to struggle, as I have for many years in my time in this place.

The large number of people I have spoken with since the Treasurer delivered his speech in this chamber have told me that, while they may not agree with many of the big spending measures, it is the lack of honesty and the disguise and/or burying in the budget documents of smaller revenue-raising measures, now under another type of accounting—shifting the basis of budget reporting and making it harder to compare like with like—that really encourages lack of respect in government and the system in general.

The 2019-20 state budget provides a sobering reality check about the current situation in South Australia. As stated, we have already seen a significant shortfall in GST revenue from the federal budget that has influenced this entire budget. An increase in state debt comes at a time when interest rates are low and will fund future needed infrastructure upgrades, which will no doubt benefit all commuters. However, north-east residents are still waiting for significant improvements on North East Road and on feeder roads such as Melbourne Street and OG Road, which is now also congested and narrow, especially in the peaks, and in need of improvement.

Scotty's Corner is a difficult corner for people coming home from the city via North East Road, so a \$19 million investment there to make it easier to turn right into Nottage Terrace will be welcome, as will \$19 million for Main North and McIntyre roads for an upgrade for those who travel to Modbury and Golden Grove along that route.

On the border of the Florey, Enfield and Port Adelaide electorates, the \$13 million earmarked for Briens and Grand Junction roads, where large numbers of articulated trucks and road trains are ever present, will improve flow at what has become a very busy intersection, especially since the completion of the Roma Mitchell Secondary College, another McDonald's and the soon to be commenced state centre for football in Gepps Cross.

The government is injecting much-needed funds into our training and vocational education system, as well as transferring assets from Renewal SA to TAFE SA, freeing up money TAFE previously used to pay rent. This must not distract from the fact that TAFE has endured many cutbacks in our area in recent years, with the slow decline of the Tea Tree Gully campus leading to its closure last year.

The community in the north-east has not forgotten that the culinary course, at Celia's, Tea Tree Gully TAFE was deemed surplus to requirements and relocated to Regency Park some years ago, yet this budget creates funding for a new food and hospitality school at Lot Fourteen in the city. Centralising services makes them harder for people in the suburbs to access, and when you factor in the added time and cost to drive and park in the city, it becomes more expensive too.

The rollout of the promised and long-awaited return of services and much-needed upgrades at Modbury Hospital finally have a time line. While not as soon as we had hoped or were led to believe, the often promised extended emergency care unit, which has endured nearly more announcements than there will be new beds, will be completed by the end of this financial year. That means the end of June 2020—two years after the election won on the promise of its arrival.

Meanwhile, a scoping study and procurement will occur for the rest of the many times promised \$96 million worth of upgrades, including the level 1 ICU for patients with high dependency, although remarkably it still has no fixed place on the plan. The expected date for all works completion in 2021, just months out from the next state election, may prove a bridge too far for the patience of long-suffering patients in the north-east. The people of Florey will be wondering why the restoration

of these services will take three years, when it took a previous Liberal government only three months to privatise the management of Modbury Hospital.

I want to speak a little more on emergency department problems being laid at the feet of emergency departments, an approach that unfortunately is not unique to South Australia. We cannot dismiss the evidence of ramping outside and inside hospitals as being just another day in the ED. It cannot be an accepted part of the environment at any hospital; rather, it is a symptom of trouble further up the line. Admittedly, we have to accept that there are sometimes peak times when ambulance personnel will need to wait for a bed to be ready, but there is room to believe official figures can be manipulated or just plain wrong.

While the people of the north await a major redevelopment at the ED at the Lyell McEwin Hospital, in the meantime, what affects acute services at the Lyell Mac affects Modbury Hospital because Modbury Hospital relies on the Lyell Mac to admit their ill patients. This is until the point where there is a level 1 ICU on site at Modbury, so now when inpatient beds at the Lyell McEwin are full, Modbury Hospital cannot transfer.

Between the Lyell Mac, Modbury, Flinders and the new RAH, we have the slowest EDs in Australia. This makes it a problem of overall and individual leadership in SA Health, notwithstanding the work being done by the KordaMentha contract, which might have been done in-house had the system not deteriorated to this point. One of the more staggering revelations in the budget papers is the number of patients overdue on elective surgery waiting lists. In NALHN alone, it has ballooned from one patient in 2018 to 209 in 2019. I am told that there are many more cases with worsening conditions more serious than currently assessed who are not even represented in the statistics.

Changes at Modbury Hospital were designed to ease the burden on patients with long waiting periods for surgery, yet changes are painfully slow to show significant effect. A mental health announcement about the replacement of ageing Woodleigh House infrastructure is good news until you realise that those beds will vanish until the new building appears. Being treated in the community where you have support is important when you face a mental illness. Rehab services at Modbury remain a bright spot for health in the north-east.

This brings me to the dark side of an increase in hospital parking fees, hitting people across the board at a time when they are particularly vulnerable. While impacts are not clear at every site, from 2020 it seems that the first two hours will no longer be free and a third hour will cost \$8. It appears that this measure will raise \$2 million, arguably the meanest way to save such an amount. In 2011, the then Labor government introduced paid parking at all metropolitan hospitals. At Modbury, we were told that this was to stop people using the O-Bahn from clogging up the hospital car parks while waiting for the park-and-ride car park that we had been promised would be built.

The public outcry then was sizeable. I tabled a petition with 4,332 signatures regarding the Lyell McEwin health service in conjunction with a petition of over 7,000 signatures for Modbury Hospital prepared by the local Messenger newspaper, which unfortunately could not be tabled. Parking costs at hospitals and safety at the car parks and around the hospitals remain big issues in the north-east. I have always felt this sort of user-pays, revenue-raising cost shifting deeply, and it was saddening at the time that no-one else at the ALP state convention that year chose to support the amended Florey sub-branch motion to make the first three hours of parking free and between 6pm and 8am also free.

Now we have come full circle, with the new government instituting their own increases while the opposition decries the measure. It is a heartless measure by both sides. The people paying the price are the patients, not the politicians they trust to represent their best interests. This measure will hurt sick people and the members of our community supporting them, and that is before we address staff parking rate increases, which will push more nurses into parking on poorly lit streets. We have seen an attack in recent days outside the Lyell McEwin Hospital on top of the ongoing issues in the North Adelaide Parklands adjacent to the current Women's and Children's Hospital.

Shift-working nurses and health professionals have a right to be safe when travelling to and from their workplace, and this move to increase the cost of secure, on-site parking will do the exact opposite. It is a pointless exercise. As we embark on the renegotiation of collective bargaining agreements for professionals such as public hospital nurses, the increased cost of parking will no

doubt be factored in, so it will end up costing the government more anyway, and that is if the government comes to these negotiations showing good faith and respect for all our community public sector employees.

If these nurses were planning on taking the bus to travel to work, access to the new RAH remains a problem and the savage axe taken to public transport will make that option more expensive, too. Gone is the two-section Metrocard, increasing costs by as much as 85 per cent. Dawn bus routes have already been scrapped, so if they have an early shift the bus may not even be an option for them or any other shift worker.

The concept of putting out a tender to improve a service or make it more efficient needs to be called out for the blatant spin it is. Every government seeks to pay less for these services, and the next bus contract will be no different. By offering a price that is near unworkable, any private contractor will have no option but to cut wages while diminishing the quality of our valued public transport services. There was no mention in this budget of train services being managed differently, and lately we have seen that there will be similar detrimental changes in this area of public transport, too.

Efficiency dividends are also applied liberally in this budget. These are simply Public Service cuts by another name. Cuts to the Department of Human Services, for instance, have led to a \$50 reduction from 1 October this year in the rebate given to elderly South Australians who have a monitored personal alert system. While \$50 might not sound like a lot, it is a significant impost for pensioners living week to week and dollar to dollar.

While there is significant investment in education, it is not showing respect for the working conditions of teachers and the learning conditions of students, especially those students who need extra help. In crucial early intervention child protection programs, slashing already under-resourced departmental budgets risks forcing teachers, social workers or foster parents to do more with less when caring for our youngest and most vulnerable people.

The first real effect of the cut to the child protection department is the culling of 59 financial counsellors. This appears very short-sighted, given that family breakdowns often begin with a struggle to make ends meet, so no doubt many who would have benefited from this now diminished service could very well end up back in the system anyway.

I am also told that funding has been cut for the BreakAway program run by Anglicare, designed to give respite for one weekend a month to foster families with young girls. The program for boys has already gone, and the strain these extra duties place on foster families cannot be beneficial in ensuring positive outcomes as these children grow and develop. Children are, after all, our most precious resource.

Vulnerable victims of crime have also seen reduced funding to the Victim Support Service, totalling half their annual operating budget. The Victim Support Service provides vital counselling as well as advocacy, information and support. The fact that many in crisis will no longer be able to access these important services from 2020 is a cruel kick to a group in our community who do it very, very tough through no fault of their own.

This budget also sees a 40 per cent increase to the solid waste levy, a \$24.9 million per annum hit to council budget bottom lines. This has come as a complete surprise, without warning or consultation with local government, and has come so late in the piece that it has not been factored into draft budgets that were already out for community consultation—a very disrespectful impost on ratepayers.

At the eleventh hour, councils across the state have held emergency meetings to account for this trash tax, some passing on parts of the increase in their council rates while also slashing grant funding that would have paid for sporting club and much-needed change room upgrades or community group initiatives. From a government that promised lower council rates through rate capping, one can only wonder about this measure, which will once again impact ordinary families.

It has also been revealed that Service SA administration costs are set to increase from \$7 a transaction to \$10 a transaction. This is at a time when we are being told more and more things can be done online at a far cheaper price. This is cold comfort for the thousands of people who already

use Service SA centres. While many who can do not transact online, some without access or the capability to transact on a computer cannot. That these changes may be thrust upon them is causing untold worry for many. A reasonable transition period, maybe five to 10 years, needs to be in place to ensure that no-one is left behind, especially given the way our modern, seemingly cashless society is becoming more and more digital.

So this brave new online world seems to be the justification for exploring the closure of Service SA offices in Prospect, Mitcham and, of course, Modbury. This cannot be allowed to happen, given the overwhelming response to the Save Service SA petition. My constituents in Florey want to receive face-to-face service with the ability to have their questions answered and not to be charged extra for it. This government was elected on a platform of lower costs and better services. This can only be interpreted as a broken promise.

Last year's budget can be seen as addressing many of the pre-election pledges made in the March 2018 campaign. By comparison, this year's budget reveals a more tacit attempt to unwind our social fabric. All manner of everyday costs are rising, most at a greater rate than inflation. From the escapable fines to the inescapable driver's licences and registering vehicle fees, the cost of driving a car, in particular, is going up.

That is before we begin on the ever-increasing cost of petrol and the wild cycles that exploit consumers, leaving us with precious little purchasing power at the pump. The government and the RAA have reached an impasse on establishing a fuel price reporting mechanism so that drivers can be fully informed of their choice between competing petrol stations. The anything but competitive environment that exists currently needs ACCC attention.

If Perth can have weekly cheap days, when fuel companies must report their prices at 2pm the previous day and stick to them for 24 hours, one must ask the question what the delay is in making this a reality in our state, where a change could ease the growing cost-of-living pressures people face every day.

Another issue that concerns many constituents in increasing parts of Florey is that we have become part of the top 10 SA Water hotspots, meaning that mains bursting or failures along the ageing 27,000 kilometre pipe system are more commonplace. While I am told of the good work being undertaken within SA Water, this is cold comfort to those affected and I expect a soon to be scheduled public meeting to attract a large amount of interest.

Social housing remains an issue of grave concern, the cost of accommodation being a major factor in the ability of many families to exist. The continuing failure of building companies in this state remains a troubling and all too often occurrence, and today we hear that building surveyors in Victoria are no longer able to secure professional indemnity insurance. This will no doubt have a nationwide flow-on effect on an already struggling building industry without federal intervention, which is urgently needed for social housing too.

Private certification has been an uninspiring part of the new world of planning, cracking (pardon the pun) under the new order, where problems are addressed only after, not before, they happen. In a time when we see tight margins and high-rise apartments, not to mention roadworks, with major structural deficiencies, one has to ask: where are the authorities who could prevent disasters for all concerned?

Consumer rights continue to worry me. The abrogation of responsibility by states through a federal system does not work as well as Don Dunstan would have liked and must be addressed. States have a role to play and must, if the people are to be protected from all manner of avoidable outcomes and unscrupulous behaviour. Herein lies the problem with the status of our federation. It is a travesty in this country that the state in which you live determines whether you are protected, able to access affordable energy sources like gas, electricity and petrol and whether you are entitled to universal ambulance cover—which again receives no attention in this budget. These are basic rights that should benefit all Australians equally, regardless of which state they call home.

The transition from a state-based disability care model for the federally administered NDIS has caused incredible friction for all in that sector and mental health and domestic violence advocacy groups, too, such as Catherine House, with many seeing their future funding reduced or altered to

now be derived from multiple sources. Parkinson's SA has lost group program coordinators and full-time support line staff as a result of federal funding changes, so those with Parkinson's are left to their own devices at a time when they need help the most.

Much the same can be said for aged care, with federally funded, state-run facilities lacking a uniform standard of care, allowing some mistreatment of patients. If facilities are passing all their accreditation assessments, it is clear there exists an accountability gap, where an ever-weary public is growing tired of the shameful blame game between tiers of government. This unacceptable situation must be righted once and for all by reapportioning the powers of federal and state governments to truly reflect the best interests of the population as a whole.

South Australia's diminishing influence in federal parliament is causing our state to fundamentally fall behind, whether through a GST squeeze or potentially losing out on vital defence contract work to other states. A conversation needs to start about how we want to function as a country in the 21st century, including recognition of the role of our Indigenous people within our democracy. It took 60 years to create our current constitution, drafted with a significant contribution from our own Charles Cameron Kingston, and we can take a leading role at COAG, seeking to improve our federation for the national good and benefit of all South Australians.

While acknowledging that we live in difficult financial times and have to make changes, it is the changes in across-the-board increases in fees and charges within this budget that impact almost every part of household budgets and underline the importance of making sure we leave no-one behind.

If every other measure in this budget stimulates employment, particularly in infrastructure, then wage growth and the weather remain problems. While we cannot control the weather and the fortunes of those working in agriculture and horticulture in the regions, we have to do all we can to stimulate small business, another engine of employment in this state. Payroll tax cuts are a start, but small business people tell me that there is not much else in the budget for them. In an economy that is flatlining, we have to hope we will survive this budget to get to the next two, which will no doubt look to provide the carrots to earn the votes to return this government.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (16:08): I am advised there are no other speakers on the second reading, so it gives me great pleasure to stand on behalf of the Premier to close the debate and offer my own reflections on the 2019-20 state budget of the Treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas.

As the Minister for Education, it is an extraordinary pleasure to be able to do so, and I thank Treasurer Lucas, who in the 2019-20 state budget has provided more money for education in this budget than any previous treasurer in any year in South Australia's history, both in terms of the capital spend encapsulated for the South Australian public school system and an ongoing program of infrastructure grants to the non-government school system. That has been operating for a couple of years now and is indexed, so they too are at record levels although, in real terms, the same as they were last year.

There are also recurrent funding increases to the South Australian education system, significantly in anticipation that that system continues to grow, and it is growing to a size it has not been before. It requires and has required additional investment in infrastructure to ensure that every student in South Australia is able to be supported in their local classrooms, in their local schools.

This year, that has provided the government with some challenges because in previous years those opposite had failed to adequately prepare for the growing numbers—the significant growing numbers—coming into our public school system. It may well be that they did not anticipate the significant growing numbers coming into our public school system. Indeed, the demographic modelling that was provided by the Department for Education to the government late last year had some startling facts in it, and we need to create 10,000 extra places. Some of our schools in the city, the eastern suburbs, the northern suburbs and the southern suburbs have extraordinary capacity pressures, and some of those have been growing for a little while.

We are also moving year 7 into high school. There is a range of reasons why the state government is doing that in South Australia. Fundamentally, we believe the current situation is a 20th-century model of education, one that was designed at a time when children coming into school

were younger than they are now. By and large, our year 7s are a year older than they were when people like the member for Lee and I were in school. Indeed, our year 7s are ready.

This has been shown in the three pilot sites that we have recently announced at Mitcham Girls High School, John Pirie Secondary School and Wirreanda Secondary School where, given the opportunity to have year 7 offered in those high school settings from next year, the families in those communities have flocked to that opportunity. We had more than 160 expressions of interest at Mitcham Girls High School, more than 110 at Wirreanda Secondary School and nearly 100 at John Pirie Secondary School.

Scores more families were interested than we needed to make those pilots successful and we are looking forward to them rolling out. The students in those pilots, as will all students in South Australia come 2022, will have the opportunity to have their year 7 subjects taught in the environment for which the curriculum was designed. Our Australian Curriculum, which all our schools offer in the primary and early secondary years, was designed for year 7/8. It is a year 7/8 curriculum to be taught in a specialist classroom setting with specialist teachers such as you find in a secondary school.

The opportunities for our students, we believe, to learn in these environments will be profound, but that creates some challenges for the system, and we are investing in infrastructure. So in order to meet the capacity needs of our growing education system in our public school network, to move year 7 into high school and also to meet some particular needs which were put to us in some particular schools, there was \$185 million worth of new infrastructure funding announced this year on top of all the previously committed infrastructure projects which this government has confirmed, regarding some of which I was privileged to be involved in the decision-making process which went to cabinet.

We have three new schools being built that will be open for the 2022 school year. One of them will be in the southern suburbs—we have identified a site—in Aldinga. It will be a new B-12 school and a fantastic project when it is finished. There will be one in the northern suburbs in the Munno Para-Angle Vale area where the details are in the process of being finalised, as I understand it. There will be a new high school in Whyalla—a \$100 million investment by this government in supporting the young people in that community to achieve all they can achieve. Those three new schools are progressing.

Across the rest of the capital program, investment in excess of \$1.3 billion continues to be rolled out by this government to ensure our school infrastructure is all it can be. The fact is that, at the end of that investment, we will have some fantastic facilities across South Australia. But, importantly, we will be able to deliver on what people in our community expect, that if they are in an area that has a zoned school, we will be able to find a place for their child. When we came to government that could not be promised in too many communities. We are creating the infrastructure that will enable that to be the case.

Of course, our ambition is not just that certain schools be seen as the schools people want their students to go to and other schools are the schools left that students must go to if they cannot get into other schools. Our ambition is nothing less than every student in every one of those classrooms being supported to fulfil their potential. Every school in South Australia is on a school improvement trajectory supported by this government and invested in by this government, where teachers, principals and SSOs are in an environment where they are able to deliver the best for our students in solid environments, and that requires funding.

This is the government that signed the national school funding reforms late last year, an agreement that was profound. We were the first state to do it. Minister Dan Tehan and I got together at an eastern Adelaide school in the Premier's electorate to talk to students and sign that agreement. It was a terrific opportunity for South Australia for two funding-related reasons and, of course, for a range of other non-funding related reasons. I congratulate minister Tehan and his predecessor, minister Birmingham, on the work they have done on producing that national school funding reform set of agreements, which will provide such great opportunities for us in South Australia.

I also congratulate minister Tehan on his re-election, along with his colleagues in the Morrison Liberal government in Canberra. Minister Tehan has had, and continues to have, a positive impact in that portfolio. What that agreement means for South Australia is nothing less than billions

of dollars extra coming into South Australian schools over the next decade. It is not just extra commonwealth money coming into those schools, although the commonwealth investment is significant, in the billions.

The South Australian government, in order to unlock that commonwealth revenue coming into South Australian schools, had to commit over the next decade to an additional \$700 million of South Australian government money going into the South Australian public school system, over and above issues related to enrolment and capacity, which are the general parameters in which education is funded in South Australia and which see over the next four years an increase of \$600 million-plus in revenue coming into South Australian schools.

Over and above the parameters left to us by those opposite when they were in government, an extra \$700 million has been invested into the South Australian public school system over the next decade as a result of our signing up to the national school funding reform agreement. It was disappointing to see the shadow minister for education criticising us for making that agreement with the commonwealth, and I think it portrays potentially a lack of understanding, that it was not just about getting extra commonwealth funding; it was also an extra investment by the Marshall Liberal government in our students.

It was an end to the fake fights with Canberra and the beginning of a collaborative relationship, where we see our students as being the important and central people in the equation, not the political opportunities that can be provided by picking unnecessary fights with Canberra. At the end of the day, it is rare to see anyone win out of those fights, and the former government certainly never achieved anything for South Australia by them.

What I would also say about the national school funding reform agreements is that, in addition to the extra commonwealth money coming into our schools and in addition to the extra South Australian government money coming into our schools, we also saw the opportunity for an agreement at a national level by all jurisdictions, Labor and Liberal, National even in New South Wales, all ministers of all stripes, who have committed to a set of goals to improve our school system across Australia.

There are a range of those that the education ministerial council treats with every opportunity at every one of the meetings we have, the most recent one being last Friday in Melbourne. It is a great honour to be able to sit at that council and work with other ministers from around Australia to be able to progress those goals for the mutual betterment of all our students. At that ministerial council, we combined our resources towards those agreed goals. Some of those goals, such as the establishment of a national evidence institute and the work on formative assessments being undertaken, will better inform our teachers and our parents on not only what our children know but how they are growing in their education, which is critically important.

That work is profound. One of the things that I think will be especially important and will help us immensely to stop those students slipping through the cracks of our education system, as too many do at the moment and have done historically, is the universal student identifier. Work on that program proceeds apace.

One of the things that became clear last year when some data was released in relation to SACE completion rates was that for too long we have been looking at the apparent completion rates in our school system and patting ourselves on the back for a job well done because there were a similar number of students finishing year 12 as there were students starting year 8, or indeed starting the SACE when they do their PLP in year 10. What that measure failed to take into account was that it included a number of students coming into our system, people who have migrated into the system and people who might go to a public high school at year 12 after having gone to a non-government school beforehand—indeed, it turns out there are a number.

When we stopped looking at those apparent retention rates and instead looked at some of the data that became available last year on the number of students who start in our public school system at the beginning of high school but actually complete their SACE in year 12, it was a dramatically lower number. When we have two in five South Australian students not reaching that goal, having started in our public system, it is very concerning.

There were a number of reasons why that happened. Some of those students had moved from the government school system to the non-government school system. Some of those students had moved from South Australia to another jurisdiction, and that is fine. There is nothing wrong with that, but we did not have a track on it. Some of them may have even completed the International Baccalaureate at Glenunga International High School, but that was a number in the dozens and we are talking about thousands of students slipping through the system.

A universal student identifier, when it is up and running, will enable us to keep track of all the students as they go from a government school to the private system, to the Catholic system, to a different state, whether they are doing the International Baccalaureate, the SACE or the VCE or whatever else. That is going to be an enormous opportunity for us to better track the performance of our students, not just so that we can have data that we can talk about and measure systems, although that can be useful, but, critically, when there are students who drop out of all the school systems, we will be able to find out where they are and give them the support they need to re-engage in education or in enterprise or, indeed, in an apprenticeship or a traineeship. That leaves one other critically important thing that our government is doing in relation to vocational education, and I will get to that in due course.

First, I want to put on the record my appreciation to minister Tehan and all the other ministers from around Australia for the collaborative way that they have been working with the South Australian government across a wide range of issues, from the national school funding reforms to NAPLAN and everything in between, over the last 15 months. It is a real privilege and an honour that I have enjoyed as minister, particularly last year when South Australia was the host to those ministers.

One of the first things I was told I had to do in my new job was to chair that meeting for the course of last year, and I enjoyed doing so. I appreciated bringing them to Adelaide as much as possible so that we could spend New South Wales', Victorian, ACT and commonwealth government moneys in the South Australian economy. I do not know if they spent much time here, but I certainly made them come here for the meetings.

In addition to the capital program, the South Australian Marshall Liberal government continues to roll out our internet in schools with fibre-optic cables to every school in South Australia in the public system. There are four schools where that is not possible for logistical reasons. I was in Marree and Leigh Creek with the member for Stuart several weeks ago. I was looking for the Marree river, which the Leader of the Opposition told us all about at one point, but I could not find it. It was very dry at the time, which was of very great concern to the local landholders—the School of the Air families—we visited and spoke to.

In Marree, Leigh Creek and Oak Valley and on Kangaroo Island, we are looking forward to Telstra and the department coming up with solutions that will help rapidly increase their internet speeds in the near future. In the more than 510 other public school sites around South Australia, fibre-optic cable to the school is going to be an extraordinary opportunity for them to enhance their pedagogy, their professional development and the way that they can do SACE exams online as we move towards that. Indeed, NAPLAN Online is facilitated by that.

While there are problems that still need to be identified with the national server for the NAPLAN Online program, I am very pleased that South Australia's local school infrastructure was in a much better position to cope than we were a year ago or, indeed, 18 months ago, when we first came to power, when 25 per cent of our schools had fibre-optic cable. We are headed for 99 per cent of our schools having that connection—all but four across our 510 system—and that will be delivered by the end of next year.

It is an extraordinary thing that we are working on with Telstra. It is an \$80 million investment for fibre to schools. The rollout continues apace, and I believe we are ahead of schedule with 111 schools already connected—six more today—and more than 50,000 students and more than 6,000 educators already connected. It is all part of the Marshall Liberal government's plan to give our schools the best opportunities to proceed.

Our workforce is tremendously important in delivering our school improvement model and delivering on our ambition to have South Australia deliver a world-class education for our students. It is well publicised that the government has put on the table in excess of \$600 million worth of offer

for the EB considerations that the AEU executive in recent times saw fit to reject. Indeed, the AEU executive encouraged the workforce to go on strike yesterday, and that took place.

Now, 28 per cent of our sites across South Australia—259 schools and preschools—closed due to that industrial action. At 15 per cent of sites, enough staff went on strike to ensure that the school or preschool could remain open only with a modified program. At both the schools that closed and the schools that remained open with a modified program, the staff are entitled obviously to take industrial action if that is what they consider the best thing to do. I respectfully disagree with them. What would have been better was for them not to take that industrial action and to reconsider the offer that was put.

Nevertheless, put that to one side for the moment. There were also staff of many of those schools who did not strike and who were there at the schools doing work for their students, and indeed 57 per cent of our sites—530 of our schools and preschools—remained open. This is significantly more than the equivalent figure in 2008 when the union went on strike, which is the equivalent one, of course, after an offer had been made.

I want to reflect briefly on what has happened since 2008 to now in the education system, because it plays in with what is in our budget this year and what is indeed in our offer. There is pay, there are conditions and there is support in the classroom that is available in the offer. The pay offer is 2.35 per cent and, over a series of four increases, that 2.35 per cent adds up to a nearly 10 per cent increase in pay. That is a very competitive offer by national standards.

There has been a discussion about whether it is a nationally appropriate offer and where it leaves our teachers in comparison to other systems. The fact is that, if you are looking at a graduate entering into the teaching workforce, or if you are looking at a band 9 teacher or somewhere in between, or if you are looking at a principal of a small school or a deputy principal or a principal of a big school, there is a range of different starting points for all those different positions depending on which position you are talking about.

In some of those positions, South Australia starts reasonably high on the league table in terms of where we are against other states and territories. With respect to some of them, it starts lower. It is no secret that the ACT pays some of its positions extremely well and higher than the other states and the Northern Territory lower. I think there is one band where the Northern Territory is the highest by a stretch and others are lower.

I do not think that South Australia is the highest or the lowest in any. I stand to be corrected but, as a result of our pay offer, we move up the rankings. There are other states that have had agreements that are two or three years in track so we can follow what they are doing. As a result of our offer we are becoming increasingly competitive, especially when you consider the advantages of living in South Australia.

I love living in South Australia. I know that many of our teachers and our principals love living in South Australia. I think it is a furphy to suggest that there is a line-up to move interstate for better pay when the pay interstate is not necessarily that much better, if it is better at all, and in many cases it is not. The cost of living is also a factor in many cases. Certainly, the cost of having a house in some of these places is a lot higher, plus you would not be living in South Australia, which is the best place in the world to live.

So, I do not think that is a real argument. I know that many people who have expressed points of view in favour of the industrial action on media and through correspondence have said that it is not about the pay. That is good, because the government does not have the capacity to offer any more than the 2.35 per cent, an offer which is well and truly above inflation.

We go to 3.35 per cent for principals and preschool directors because, of course, there is a need for us to better attract more people to go into those positions, and we felt that they had not gone as well as they should have in the previous rounds. We have offered a bit more for those levels, which is within the capacity to pay, and 2.35 per cent for the other staff. It is well and truly above inflation. It is an entirely reasonable offer and they deserve it, frankly. I think they do deserve 2.35 per cent, and it is a very good offer.

If the pay is not the issue—and many say that it is not—then hopefully the union will reflect on that, reflect on what teachers who support their actions are saying, that the pay is not the issue, and move on from arguing about the pay. The government has continued to say and has consistently said that we are happy to stay at the table with the union to talk about conditions, but the union set a time frame publicly.

They told their members they needed a letter of offer by a certain date, and the government duly complied. The union had previously booked the steps of Parliament House and decided to have their rally yesterday, which was a great inconvenience for many caregivers and parents and a disruption to the learning of the students in those schools. I respect that many of the people who were on the steps yesterday were doing so because they felt it was in the best interests of their students, and potentially it was not even for pay.

Let's have a look at complexity because the government has put on the table an offer in relation to complexity worth in the order of \$40 million. That is geared to providing extra support in schools and classes where there is a great deal of complexity, where there are challenges and significant extra supports needed. I saw the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the shadow minister for education, dancing on the steps of Parliament House, literally dancing with the union leadership yesterday during some of the songs, supporting this idea that students were being left behind as a result of our current circumstances.

But I make this point: she was the minister for education for two years at a time when the then government was providing less support for complexity than we already do and, indeed, than we would be after this offer. That \$40 million is not the first money that is being spent on complexity in our schools. It is in addition to the hundreds of millions of dollars that has already been spent, that was spent when the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was the minister for education and slightly more than that was spent last year—I think in the order of \$370 million for needs-based funding for schools through the department's needs-based funding model. That is extra support, and then we are looking at adding further support to that as part of our offer.

It is not unreasonable to have the conversation about what we can do to best support complexity, but it is more than disingenuous to say that we are not providing any support at the moment. For the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to be dancing on the steps of Parliament House saying that it is not good enough, without even reflecting on the fact that we are offering more and we are already giving more, doing more and investing more than they ever did when they were in government, is—well, there is a word for it that I will let members work out for themselves.

We are happy and remain happy to talk with the union and other staff representatives. I appreciate the support that a number of people have expressed for the agreement to the generous offer that is on the table. I hope that the union will reflect on that going forward. I think most of us, frankly probably all of us in our heart of hearts, and anyone who takes on the role of being a teacher, are driven by a desire to support our students. It is a job that you do because you want to help pass on knowledge, skills and capabilities to young people in your care because you have that as a calling. I have the greatest respect for it and I appreciate that role that is played in our system.

I think that the union would do well to reflect on some of the benefits in the offer and have a second think about what is in the best interests of our students and potentially reflect on the advice that they have given their members, which I do not think has necessarily fairly represented the offer put forward by the government. Be that as it will, there is a range of other things in the budget that are to the benefit of our education system.

The government continues to roll out our international education system, and I was pleased to be able to talk a little bit about that in the parliament today. I have received representations in the parliament today from the members for Florey, Newland, King, Elder and Kavel. Not that many days go by when I do not get a phone call from the member for Kavel wanting to do something for the people in his electorate. Certainly, members on the government benches, as well as some members of the opposition and the crossbenches, are regularly in touch, seeking to get the benefits out of programs such as the international education program and the music education program.

Currently, there is a call for nominations for the Music Innovation Fund, which is worth half a million dollars, and there are opportunities there. Across our school system, we are also investing heavily in supporting Aboriginal education, both in terms of the Clontarf academies and SAASTA (South Australian Aboriginal Secondary Training Academy), which provide great opportunities. We are also investing in a broad Aboriginal education program, focused not just on ensuring that Aboriginal students are prepared to be at school and get the best results but, as Peter Buckskin put it, that our schools are prepared for the students and that where there is a lack of cultural knowledge and understanding that we address that so that every student coming into our school can be best supported to fulfil their potential.

I spoke to a group of language teachers yesterday who came to a professional development conference at Adelaide Oval. They were extraordinarily excited about the work we are doing to enhance the offering of languages in our schools. We spoke about the opportunity for them to get more champions in their schools and to work with their principals to try to encourage more families and students to understand the benefits of doing a language subject in the higher secondary years and to ensure that the offerings they are doing are world class. The commitment of those teachers to offering their language programs in their schools was wonderful and sits alongside the government's focus on developing languages in schools.

We also have a substantial program in relation to vocational education. I encourage anyone who wants to make a contribution to do so on the YourSAy website. Until the middle of July, we are seeking people's reflections on vocational education schools and how we can better ensure that our young people understand not only the pathways that are available to them, to apprenticeships or traineeships or other forms of vocational education, but also how we can deliver a vocational education program for them that is world class and meets the needs of industry and the businesses that are going to be employing young people in these roles or that support them to be able to become an entrepreneur in their own right.

I was with the member for Heysen at Heathfield High School twice last week, and it was a great privilege to look at some of the work the department has funded through the budget in our entrepreneurial education program. Heathfield High School is very proud. I saw one of their parents, who is a noted columnist in our major newspaper in South Australia, proudly crowing about what was being done in that entrepreneurial stream at Heathfield High School. Two of the teams from Heathfield High School won in their categories at the Shark Tank last week, supported by MIE Lab, Sony and the University of Adelaide, and that was great to see.

We will continue to roll out that entrepreneurial education program, school infrastructure, the internet, international, Aboriginal, music, languages, vocational education and of course our literacy guarantee. The literacy guarantee is a key issue for this government. Supporting our students to be able to read and write and have strong literacy from the early years is absolutely foundational for their success in future education. It is a wonderful opportunity for our students in our schools to be able to enhance the offerings there.

Last week, literacy came up as the New South Wales government announced that they are going to be doing a trial of the year 1 phonics check. I commend Sarah Mitchell, the new Minister for Education in New South Wales, for that work. I think that the key thing when it comes to the phonics check is to understand that it is not a silver bullet designed to solve all the problems in one five to 10-minute session. It is not a high stakes test like NAPLAN because, of course, it is not independently assessed; it is delivered by the classroom teacher. I think that gave comfort to a lot of our teachers once they actually saw it in practice.

The research done by Anne Bayetto from Flinders University that was made public when we came to office was commissioned by the member for Port Adelaide as minister. There are no politics here, and I appreciate the bipartisan support the Labor Party gives to this. It demonstrated that students found it a positive experience, that staff doing it found it largely a positive experience, even if they had been sceptical about its potential benefits, and that it provided an opportunity for interventions for students who may otherwise slip through the cracks.

Carolyn Grantskalns and the Association of Independent Schools have taken the licence. I think that Catholic Education has as well, so those schools may also benefit from it. We have offered our experience to other states as well that may be interested in this area. As I said, it will not

necessarily be a silver bullet, but it will help improve practice and it will help us pick up a number of students who would otherwise slip through the cracks and help them be all that they can be.

Across the education department, these things are doing well and will continue to do well. I reiterate where I started, which is that the education department in South Australia has been provided with more money in this budget by the Treasurer, Rob Lucas, than in any previous budget under any previous treasurer in South Australia's history. We thank Treasurer Lucas for that support. Indeed, I am proud to be part of a government that is investing in education.

Even in times when budgetary constraints are significant and the GST writedowns provide a significant challenge for our system to deal with, the Marshall Liberal government continues to invest in education not just in our school system and the things that are offered in the education department itself but also in TAFE SA. Last year, members would remember that there was a \$109.8 million rescue package for TAFE SA.

By the way, I do not get a lot of questions about TAFE in question time in this chamber. I am looking forward to the opposition starting to ask me some questions about TAFE; apart from in estimates last year, I am not sure I have had a single one. We look forward to the Labor Party deciding to engage on the issue of TAFE and perhaps develop some questions and put them in the chamber.

In the absence of that, I will share with the chamber that, in addition to the \$110 million of extra support provided by the Marshall Liberal government to TAFE SA last year, this budget also contains an extra \$25 million of support, bringing our total support to help TAFE SA deliver a fresh start for its organisation to \$135 million. That fresh start is necessary because there was a crisis of confidence in TAFE after those opposite oversaw the absolute chaos of an audit by the national regulator, where it underperformed in all 16 out of 16 courses tested.

Ultimately, they were able to fix two of them quickly, and four of them ceased to be offered. It was not until April or May 2018 that the others were brought back online. The quality improvement work to bring us to the level of the national training packages that were expected was done throughout 2018. It was an absolute privilege to work with the senior people at TAFE SA and the people on the ground at TAFE SA, so many of whom helped do the work to ensure that, when ASQA came back again at the end of last year; 16 out of the 16 courses audited were passed and TAFE SA was given a clean bill of health in terms of its quality.

We are delivering what the national training packages expect. We are working with TAFE to ensure that it delivers what businesses and industry need in South Australia. We are also working with them—this is part of our VET review as well—to ensure that they integrate well with our school system. When our schools seek the opportunity for more of their young people to go on these pathways to apprenticeships, traineeships or other vocational education, TAFE is an organisation that can deliver on what our school students need.

Delivering for students and delivering for business and industry—between meeting those two goals, we will better deliver for the people of South Australia. That is what Rob Lucas's budget, the Marshall Liberal government's second budget, is doing for TAFE. We are really enjoying working with Jacqui McGill and her board and the new CE, David Coltman, who has hit the ground running. I cannot wait to see the great steps forward we will be able to take with TAFE in the period going forward.

As the local MP for Morialta, I indicate my gratitude on behalf of our community for some of the projects that are particularly important in that area. The upgrade to Magill Road and Portrush Road will be transformational for many people's commutes every day and a productivity improvement for the eastern suburbs. The upgrade to Graves Street and Newton Road addresses a long-held safety issue and concern for people at the school, people at the church and people in the local community in Newton. While it is no longer in Morialta, a significant number of the people going to that church and school are Morialta residents, so we are very grateful.

The Paradise Interchange upgrade—we are looking forward to seeing some shovels in the ground very soon—is an enormous public transport benefit for people living in Rostrevor, Athelstone in particular and some in Highbury. I cannot tell you how well the upgrade of hundreds of extra spaces

is going to be received. The upgrade to the Thorndon Park Primary School crossing will hopefully be completed this year. The money has been delivered, and we are working on that with the council.

At Highbury Primary School, students living on the river side of Lower North East Road benefit from the new crossing, which was promised before the election and which has been delivered; I drove past it the other day. I know that students from Highbury Primary School did a tour of Parliament House earlier today, and some of those students, living on the river side of Lower North East Road, can now walk to school much more safely than they could previously, and that is great news for them.

Traffic lights are being installed at the Dernancourt Village Shopping Centre entry and exit. When the member for Lee was the minister for transport, he and I spent a very awkward five minutes in my car waiting to turn right onto Lower North East Road. I appreciated the first steps that he, as the minister for transport, took in starting some improvements to that intersection. Now I appreciate the extra funding that has been provided by this new government to get the job done once and for all. I acknowledge that the member for Lee came out to the electorate to talk and engage in that way. It was a fun day, I thought. I thank the member for Lee for that time.

There is another range of projects that we are working on with the Adelaide Hills Council, where funding has been provided to improve local infrastructure. As the member for Morialta, this is a good budget for our electorate. We recently had the Minister for Emergency Services come to Morialta and provide the opportunity for the Norton Summit-Ashton CFS Brigade and the Summertown and Districts CFS Brigade to have support provided there to improve their stations, to improve public safety and to demonstrate respect and support for our local community.

There is a range of other things that will benefit the people of Morialta. The fact is the Marshall Liberal government is committed to delivering more jobs, lower costs and better services. This has been a difficult budget, this has been a difficult budget circumstance, but it is a grown-up government that is working very hard to deliver a fair budget to ensure that where we need to enhance revenues we do so in a fair way. It is a budget that still continues to deliver productive infrastructure, building South Australia both in our built infrastructure and the capabilities of our people through our education system. I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Estimates Committees

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (16:46): I move:

That this bill be referred to estimates committees.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (16:46): By leave, I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas), the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment (Hon. D.W. Ridgway), the Minister for Human Services (Hon. J.M.A. Lensink) and the Minister for Health and Wellbeing (Hon. S.G. Wade), members of the Legislative Council, be permitted to attend and give evidence before the estimates committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill.

Motion carried.

Appropriation Grievances

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (16:47): I move:

That the house note grievances.

Ms MICHAELS (Enfield) (16:47): I note for the record that I am not the lead speaker on these grievances, that would be the member for Lee, but I am first on the list. I rise to speak about the Appropriation Bill and, in particular, the measures in the bill that negatively impact on the constituents in Enfield.

We all remember the promises made by the Liberal government in the lead-up to the state election. Just to remind those on the other side of the house, the Premier promised us more jobs,

lower costs and better services. I say this to remind the Premier of the commitments he made to the people of South Australia because it appears he may have forgotten since he won the election.

I was not the member for Enfield when the government's first budget was handed down, but I heard all about it from the people of Enfield as I was campaigning and since the by-election. In particular, the closure of Service SA was a crucial issue in the campaign, such a crucial issue that every single candidate promised to oppose its closure. It was not just me as the Labor candidate or the Independents; it was the Independent candidate who was a member of the Liberal Party. It was the shadow Liberal Party candidate who retained her membership of the Liberal Party and received permission to use the Liberal name during the Enfield campaign.

So toxic was this government's decision to close Service SA that even those most closely aligned with the government opposed it. In fact, even the Minister for Child Protection wrote opposing it but did not seem to have the ability to do anything about it in cabinet. Call me naive, but I had been hoping that this government would have seen the error of its ways and reversed its decision to close Prospect Service SA in this budget. Along with many of my constituents with whom I have been speaking, I am sorry to see that the government is still blind to its mistakes.

I have previously spoken in this place about the importance of Prospect Service SA to my constituents. In particular, it provides vital services to those who have no internet access, to the elderly, those on low incomes and those with limited English skills. Service SA provides services to some of the most vulnerable people in our community. The Prospect Service SA is the third busiest centre in the state, and its use has been increasing year on year. I still go into the Northpark Shopping Centre and regularly see line-ups out the door.

Supported by facts, the waiting times at Prospect Service SA grew 20 per cent in the 2017-18 financial year. What I really want to know is where my constituents are expected to go once the Prospect Service SA centre is closed. I suspect the answer might be that they all drive to Mount Barker when that centre is opened. No measures have been put in place in this budget for the increased demand in the surrounding Service SA centres once Prospect is closed, not to mention the closure of the Modbury and Mitcham centres.

Over 27,000 South Australians have signed various petitions against the closure of the three Service SA centres and my community in Enfield, in particular, needs some certainty about this issue. I especially ask the minister responsible to urgently provide my community with some certainty about the future of our centre. So where are the better services the Premier promised?

I now want to move on to the domestic violence service. This government's attack on our state's most vulnerable people continues, with the government announcing that in this budget it will be cutting \$780,000 to the Domestic Violence Court Assistance Service. This cruel cut puts victims of domestic violence at a significant risk. In one year alone the Domestic Violence Court Assistance Service helped more than 800 people to secure intervention orders against perpetrators of domestic violence.

It is inconceivable in this day and age that a government would consider reducing services that protect victims of domestic violence. We all know the frightening statistics about domestic violence in Australia and the number of women who are murdered by their partners each year. At this time, we should be ensuring that services and supports are increased for these vulnerable South Australians.

It also appears that, while the government is reducing funding to this service, the Attorney-General's own department has failed to award the contract to run the service to the most competitive service provider. The Women's Legal Service (South Australia) has been providing women with legal advice across a range of areas, including domestic violence, for more than 20 years. I understand that the Women's Legal Service tendered for the contract, offering to provide the required level of service for \$200,000 less per year than the successful bidder.

In 2017-18, 62 per cent of Women's Legal Service clients were victims of domestic violence. This service knows the needs of its clients, and it knows how to provide the best assistance for these people in need. The Women's Legal Service has extensive experience in assisting victims of domestic violence; to award the contract to a provider that is apparently \$200,000 more seems just

reckless. That is an extra \$200,000 per year that could have been spent on education and the prevention of domestic violence in our community.

Unfortunately, this budget does not provide any additional funding to prevent domestic violence or for support services in this area. Not only is that a huge blow for the Women's Legal Service and other providers in this sector, worse, it is a massive blow to the women who need our help. So, again, where are the better services the Premier promised?

Now to the bin tax. While this government continues to cut services for South Australia's most vulnerable, it is also attacking South Australian households through the imposition of the new bin tax. The Marshall government first claimed it was going to implement an ineffective council rate capping policy, which they failed to do, and now they are hypocritically pushing more costs onto councils through this new tax increase. Increasing the solid waste levy by 40 per cent—that is 40 per cent—means councils that worked hard to actually limit the increases to their rates are being forced to push their rates higher because of this tax.

We have seen nine councils increase their rates beyond what they had stated in their draft budgets and one more council add a levy to its rates. In my area, Prospect council rates were increased by 0.6 per cent because of this tax. Port Adelaide Enfield council is meeting tonight to decide on additional increases in its rates because of the bin tax. That is a cost that is passed on to every South Australian household and business. This is an attack on all South Australian households. So what happened to the Premier's promise of lower costs?

Before the budget was even handed down, we knew the government had no interest in providing lower costs. Massive increases to government fees on car registrations, driver's licence renewals and public transport fares are a pretty good indication of where this government's priorities lie. I represent an electorate filled with hardworking families and pensioners, an electorate where great care and consideration is taken when spending every dollar that is earned. This government's decision to increase fees so greatly will have a tremendous impact on household budgets in Enfield.

A 5 per cent increase to car registration makes it harder for families to get their kids to school. Increases in public transport fares make it harder for people to get to work. Increases in staff parking for our public hospitals makes it harder for nurses and cleaners to get to work. Let's not forget the Premier's obsession with reducing public transport services, as was further demonstrated by yesterday's privatisation announcement, which means that public transport is not even an option for nurses and shift workers and will be less so in the future. Again, what happened to the Premier's promise of lower costs?

Finally, on the introduction of land tax aggregation, I suggest that the \$40 million extra in land tax that is predicted from this change per year is probably quite a conservative measure. This measure is going to hurt everyday mums and dads in a big way. Good policy or bad policy, introducing a change like this with no grandfathering of these rules, with no transition, is going to devastate people who have worked hard and invested their hard-earned money into building South Australia. In many cases, this could double the amount of land tax payable with no ability to increase rents. In fact, in some cases, almost the entire rent per year will go just to land tax. Doing that without any warning and no grandfathering of these rules is just cruel.

Many people before me have spoken about the crippling debt levels that we will be left with, as a result of not only this budget but also the unfunded and even uncoded projects that the government has committed to in the future. The sad state of this Marshall budget is the cruelty on everyday South Australians with no real vision and no real aspiration for our state. That, to me, is the saddest thing about this budget—the total lack of vision from the Premier and the Marshall Liberal government.

Mr DULUK (Waite) (16:57): I also rise to make a small contribution on the Appropriation Bill as it affects my community—or benefits my community, more importantly—and, more broadly, the people of South Australia. There are several key elements of this budget. If you just listened to the contributions of the members opposite, you would have thought that this is the worst budget ever handed down in South Australian history.

Mr McBride: It's not the worst.

Mr DULUK: Not the worst, the member for MacKillop said. I am sure that prize goes to the last 16 years of the state Labor government and their budgets that, year on year, hurt South Australia, did not invest in the future and failed to make any real benefit structurally for my community especially.

Some of the good things in this budget include road infrastructure. Across the state, we have committed to huge investment in road infrastructure in our rural and regional communities and across metropolitan South Australia as well. Busting congestion is certainly the theme of those road announcements and it is fantastic that the work on those congestion-busting projects is happening. Most important in my community is the Fullarton Road-Cross Road intersection upgrade at a cost of \$61 million.

The completion of the project, which I believe is within the forward estimates, will link the whole upgrade of the Mitcham Hills Road corridor, working at the Blackwood roundabout through the main section of the corridor, where \$16.5 million is allocated in the state budget, in last year's budget and across the forward estimates, an additional \$20 million in the recent federal election campaign and then complemented by the \$61 million investment at Cross Road-Fullarton Road intersection. The morning commute for my community will be improved by the Marshall Liberal government. They are improvements that never happened and were never planned by the former Labor government. I always like to remind people in my community of that very important investment.

There will also be an improved upgrade of the Glen Osmond Road-Fullarton Road intersection as commuters head down Fullarton Road, further benefiting commuters and bus congestion in my community. Of course, there is the alteration of the Springbank Road/Daws Road/Goodwood Road intersection, which is seeing additional funding from the state and federal governments to fix up that issue, which has been so important. I know there has been a lot of hot air from those opposite, but it has only happened because of the investment in this budget.

Another really important issue, which is no longer in my electorate but serves many communities in my electorate and certainly formed part of the electorate I represented before the boundary change, is the addition of a fourth lane to Flagstaff Road, which the community has been calling on for many years. Once again, it is only a Liberal government that is investing money in it. The former Labor government, in the past 16 years, could not allocate a single cent to that project, but it is this government that is committed to that project, and that is wonderful.

One of the important aspects in the budget for all South Australians and also for my community is the investment in health, in particular the Repat Hospital, where \$69.1 million has been allocated to reactivate the site as a genuine health precinct. This will include new statewide specialised brain and spinal injury rehab facilities, a rehabilitation gym, a town square and an 18-bed specialised facility for patients experiencing the most extreme behavioural and psychological symptoms of dementia. We continue to plan for surgical and procedural services at the site and, of course, we have already reopened about 40 beds and the hydrotherapy pool at the Repat site. This is on the back of our government's commitment to this site after the former Labor government closed the Repat.

There has been so much talk recently about so-called privatisation and our addiction to privatisation as a government, but of course it was the former Labor government that closed the Repat, sold the forests, sold the lands titles office and cut back Modbury Hospital. A whole range of services across South Australia were cut, slashed and sold by the former Labor government. There is also \$550 million in this budget to invest in the first instalment of funding for a new Women's and Children's Hospital. This is the biggest single investment in our health system for many years.

A really important part of my electorate and the budget is around the environment and green initiatives. That is so important in my community. Following a decade of funding reductions to the state's parks, the 2019-20 budget includes \$11.8 million of new funding for our beautiful parks. A \$3.3 million parks restoration fund will be created to fast-track upgrades and improvements to activate nature and heritage-based tourism experiences across South Australia and improve accessibility. Of course, \$2.5 million will be spent on infrastructure at the Glenthorne National Park.

Under the City Deal with the commonwealth government, which was signed earlier this year, we will see a \$3 million upgrade to Carrick Hill visitor centre, an important state asset; \$1.25 million

for digital tools and wayfinding trails as well as nature play at Wittunga House and Wittunga Botanic Garden at Blackwood, which is one of three botanic gardens in South Australia; and additional funding allocation for Old Government House and Friends of Belair National Park, the second oldest national park in Australia.

Another important thing, and the Treasurer touched on it in his contribution, was this government's commitment to the Aboriginal art and cultures gallery at Lot Fourteen. I think this is a fantastic initiative, one that needs and will have a wow factor for this state as we look to create something that I would like to see: the continued creation of a cultural boulevard on North Terrace, starting at the Botanic Garden all the way to the Casino, where people can enjoy the cultural parts of South Australia and the City of Adelaide, including our universities, the Museum, the Library, the Art Gallery and this beautiful parliament precinct, which will soon be overshadowed by a very large building commissioned by those opposite.

Investment in an Indigenous Aboriginal art and cultures gallery will be a game changer in terms of bringing tourists to this state and creating something really different. I am very excited about that and glad that it is part of the City Deal that will see the development of Lot Fourteen as more than just residential apartments—which was the dream of those opposite for that site—and create a smart city and invest in that infrastructure that is so important. Other funding that I really appreciated, and I know the member for Heysen did as well, was the investment in the Cedars art gallery and the Heysen gallery in Hahndorf.

More importantly, one of the most important things that any government can do is to play its part in reducing the cost-of-living pressures of its constituents across South Australia. I am glad that once again in this budget there is our commitment to reducing the ESL levy on South Australian households, seeing a cut of \$360 million over the forward estimates and, of course, changes in the CTP regime that will give money back to South Australian households. I have said quite often that government has a duty to its people and that anything we can do to save money and pass on savings through government efficiency is absolutely critical.

As I touched on, health is important, roads and infrastructure are important, as is supporting our volunteers. In the time I have left, I mention that there is money in this budget that goes to supporting our CFS and SES, and \$16.5 million has been allocated over three years to upgrade the SAPOL emergency communication centre, with \$5.5 million for vehicle maintenance and facility upgrades for the CFS and SES. In addition, \$52 million has been invested into building South Australia's security through crime prevention strategies and initiatives. I will talk about that in a future opportunity in regard to my electorate.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (17:08): I rise to make a grievance contribution on the Appropriation Bill and, in doing so, indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition with regard to this debate. I want to pick up on a point particularly around infrastructure funding, as well as the portfolio of transport, given the news we have had in the last 36 hours that the government is now looking to privatise the train and tram services here in metropolitan Adelaide.

This is, of course, despite the extraordinary increase in debt that will occur over the next four years, an increase to a total government debt position of more than \$21 billion with an annual interest bill by the end of the forward estimates of \$1,075 million in one year, or nearly \$3 million a day, despite that huge, extraordinary increase in debt, which of course we were promised by the now Premier, the then member for Dunstan and leader of the opposition, would not occur under a Liberal government, after railing against increases to debt in the state budget under the former Labor government, which did not come anywhere near the levels of debt this budget now foresees our state accruing.

You ask yourself, 'Well, for what?' We know that, according to the Premier's responses in the last sitting week, we have another \$5.4 billion to spend upgrading the north-south corridor, at least \$2.7 billion, or 50 per cent, of which will need to come from the state government. That is not provisioned for, certainly over the forward estimates, and is not provisioned for beyond that. So there is another \$2.7 billion of debt to add to that \$21 billion and again an extra \$1 billion at least—at least—for the total cost of the Women's and Children's Hospital. So there we are: close to \$25 billion.

I have been interested to hear some of the contributions both in the second reading debate and more recently in the grievance debate about some of the other infrastructure projects. It seems that here in South Australia, unfortunately, the South Australian Liberal Party has adopted the same deliberately misleading practice as their federal counterparts of talking about how terrific programs are going to be delivered over the next eight to 10 years under their government.

We had the announcement that the federal budget was back in black before the federal election. Of course, it was not. It was still in the red, and it was not going to be back in black, even projected for subsequent financial years. We see commitments about what, over the next 10 years, the Liberal government will spend. It is no different here with this state budget.

Essentially what the Premier and the government are asking us to believe is that if we are to vote them in as a state another two times, at the next two elections, then they might come good on the promises that are in this budget. That is just extraordinary. The insouciant arrogance of this government—that they think people should be required to elect them for 12 years in total so that commitments made at the 15-month mark of the government can be delivered—is quite extraordinary.

We also see that this situation has arisen because of the predilection of those opposite to completely kowtow to their federal counterparts. Those people opposite like nothing more than travelling to Canberra, rolling over onto their backs and having their tummies tickled by their federal counterparts. We have seen it with the Minister for Environment and Water, where South Australia once again is going to be duded on water allocations down the River Murray.

We have seen it with the Premier, when he came back and trumpeted how wonderful his City Deal is for the city of Adelaide. We will receive less money over the next four years than Wollongong. We received less money than Townsville. These are not even capital cities in other states, yet the capital city of Adelaide could not receive a City Deal over the next four years as good as those two locations. This is a Premier who was played like a fiddle—but no more so than the infrastructure minister has been completely played by his federal counterparts when it comes to infrastructure funding.

On South Road, where we have just seen the Labor-initiated and funded projects of the Torrens to Torrens project, the Darlington project and the Northern Connector project, which were under construction simultaneously after two funding agreements were reached in less than 12 months to deliver those projects in total over less than five years, we now have a promise that at some stage towards the end of the forward estimates we might see some work commenced on the Pym Street to Regency Road upgrade, money for which was provisioned in the last budget of the former state Labor government.

But there will be no further progress than that, other than, apparently, \$250 million of early works. No-one quite knows what those early works are; certainly people who live along those corridors, who look like they are going to have their properties compulsorily acquired by the government, do not know whether their properties are going to be consumed in the spending of this \$252 million. That is all we have to show for this state government's commitment to reaching infrastructure funding agreements with the federal government.

That does sell those members opposite slightly short, of course, because they did manage to get some deals done in the lead-up to the federal election to support some federal marginal seats here in South Australia. One that they were particularly worried about was the federal electorate of Sturt where the former member, Christopher Pyne, was retiring. The Premier's chief of staff was parachuted into that seat, despite a field of candidates, including women, putting their hands up for preselection in the Liberal Party. We know how much of anathema it is for those opposite to have proportionate representation of women in parliament, let alone in their political party.

We did manage to get some infrastructure funding to pork-barrel some federal electorates that the Liberal Party was sensitive about in the lead-up to the federal election, but anything of greater importance? No, of course not, not really, not least because I do not think many people have much confidence in the ability of the transport department, and in particular the transport minister, to be carrying out much in the way of getting things done around South Australia.

A great example of that is the three major projects, which we have been told we can expect to see across regional South Australia that MPs representing regional electorates in this place have been trumpeting: the rural roads, the roads of strategic importance and the Princes Highway upgrades. They are welcome initiatives, no question about that, given nearly \$900 million together. How much of that will be delivered over the next four years? Are any of those projects to be delivered over the next four years? The answer is no. Most of that funding occurs outside the forward estimates in five to 10 years' time.

That is not good news for people who live in regional South Australia. They have been promised that they are getting something, but the promise will not be delivered until well after the next state election and possibly after the state election after that one. That is just a government more obsessed with revelling in the spin of an announcement than the delivery of a project, and I have to say it is starting to become a characteristic of how we are treated by the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. He likes to say that his achievements in securing funding from the federal government are the product of a grown-up relationship.

We just heard from the Minister for Education about the funding agreement signed for public schools in South Australia. It is like the Minister for Transport protests too much in using that term: a grown-up relationship. I would imagine a grown-up relationship would be something respectful, something where both parties are placed on an equal footing, where funding is able to be received when it is needed for these projects. Unfortunately, that is not what we have, and it is no surprise really when we look at some of the other achievements of the member for Schubert, the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure.

Remember the promise that we had at the last election that the tram was going to turn right? How many months of ignoring departmental advice did it take until he and the government could walk away from that commitment? It took six months, six months of ignoring the incoming government brief, six months of ignoring the departmental advice updates that he was receiving until he could finally admit that he was wrong. That project was cancelled. We had the tram delay, of course. As soon as the 2018 state election was over, basically, tools were put down on that project and we had time line after time line missed until eventually it was completed.

Flinders Link was a project initiated and funded by the former state Labor government out of savings from the Goodwood Junction upgrade project. It still has not commenced. We saw that state budget money was committed for a new train station down at Tonsley, and apparently there is a \$40 million or 50 per cent budget blowout.

There has been no progress at all whatsoever with the Service SA centres that the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure was due to close, including one last financial year, to save the first \$2 million of \$6 million a year that eventually needs to be delivered. The landlords have no idea what is going on because the government apparently is not talking to them about what is going on with those Service SA centres, let alone the people we should actually be focused on, who are those South Australians who are just trying to do the right thing by their government and pay their government bills. They are trying to give some revenue to the minister and to the government, and they are still not told what the future arrangements will be.

In terms of public transport services, we have seen carriages removed from train lines, and then the minister has the gall to stand up here today and say, 'Our public transport network is too crowded. People are having to stand up too much on trains.' Well, a hint from somebody who was responsible in the portfolio for four years: do not take carriages off services that are overcrowded if you are that worried about it. The answer is not automatically privatising them.

In terms of bus service cuts, we have seen \$3 million of \$46 million of public transport cuts that need to be made, including, according to last year's budget papers, train services that need to be cut—\$46 million. You can imagine where he is going to come after those, just like the first tranche of bus service cuts, which occurred almost exclusively in Labor electorates. You can imagine what the Labor electorates are in for for the next \$43 million of bus and train service cuts.

In regard to the Footy Express service, an initiative of the former Labor government, we have been told by the minister that cannot happen anymore, at least not with government support. We had the Adelaide Oval hotel, itself a remarkable piece of behaviour by this government, allowing a

president of the state Liberal Party to come in and negotiate a deal for a \$42 million taxpayer-funded loan to go to the organisation that he was superintending—absolutely extraordinary. But the minister forgot to meet his legal obligation to consult with the Adelaide city council. We have legislation which requires the minister to consult with the Adelaide city council. You do not have to take my word for it: you can ask the Adelaide city council whether they were consulted before the announcement, and they were not.

We have the ridiculous situation about Springbank Road, the insistence to the public that two intersections are better than one. Anyone with a driver's licence, anyone who has ever navigated through there, knows that that is a farce. It took weeks and weeks and weeks until the minister realised no-one was listening to him and no-one would believe him that his two-intersection solution was worthwhile.

Then, of course, he was in charge of rate capping, and didn't that pan out well? He could not actually nominate what the rate cap was. He could not tell us how it would work, for months and months, and he wonders why the legislation was not passed through the parliament. Well, the proof is in the pudding is the saying, and the saying was shown to be true when councils were releasing their draft budgets to the community with increases of one point something per cent or two point something per cent lower than the piece of work that he had commissioned as minister, saying that the cap should be 2.9 per cent. So we would have seen increases in council rate bills from rate capping, not decreases.

But he did not stop there. He was part of a cabinet that sat around and increased the solid waste levy by 40 per cent and made sure that councils had no choice but to pass on the increased costs of that to their ratepayers—absolutely extraordinary. Gone was the promise of lower council rate bills and in was the delivery of higher council rate bills. We had his other agency, Renewal SA, that had not had a chief executive for months and in fact had the extraordinary situation of having in a two-week period three different chief executives. He must have had cramp from re-signing all the authorisation forms for the delegations.

That was not too dissimilar to what happened in DPTI, where they sacked the chief executive and the department rudderless for a month. We had projects where (pardon the pun) wheels were falling off, the tram extension was not completed for months and they continually missed the deadlines and then finally, in late 2018, we get some movement and we get a chief executive in there.

We had the park-and-ride projects at Tea Tree Plaza and Klemzig, funded and committed to by the former Labor government, cancelled for no good reason except that the car parks were overflowing with cars, and he wonders why public transport patronage does not continue to increase on the key routes like the O-Bahn. It is pretty hard for people to catch public transport if they cannot get to it to get on the vehicle that is meant to take them into town.

We had the announcement only a couple months ago about the privatisation of regional road maintenance. This completed the work of former Liberal minister Diana Laidlaw, who privatised the road maintenance here in metropolitan Adelaide. Now it is to be privatised out in rural South Australia. We had the extraordinary situation where the minister refused to meet with people who were concerned about the number of dolphins that were being killed in the Port River and around Torrens Island—extraordinary.

This went on for months and months and months, until the Messenger ran a community campaign to try to get him to intervene. After those months, finally—Lord knows how many dolphins were killed in the meantime—speed limits were reduced. It was an absolute no-brainer solution which could have been implemented by directing the department to erect a couple of signs in those waterways.

We had the farce about the Port Adelaide office accommodation. From releases under FOI, we know now of advice to the minister that the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure was pleading with him for a decision about whether the departments, which had previously been approved to move down to Port Adelaide under the former Labor government, were still going to move down there. Of course, no, someone gave the great idea that private companies instead should go down and take up the floor space in this building. How did that go? The building was empty for

months and the floor space, which was previously to be tenanted by public servants, lay dormant for months and months. All those businesses down there, all those new restaurants and hotel and bar upgrades, expecting the boost of 500 public servants from May 2018, in the meantime only got a trickle of new people going into that building.

We had the farce of the commitment to increase regional road speed limits. This was something that was committed to. Again, a mere changing of the signs is all that is required by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, and every time the member for Mount Gambier asks the minister what is going on with that it is laughed off as, 'Oh, we'll get to it.' Either it is happening or it is not happening. It was an election commitment. Is it happening or not? I suspect what has happened is that the minister has received the same advice that the former Labor government got, which is that it would risk poor road safety outcomes to continue those roads at a 110 km/h speed limit.

We have also had, unfortunately for the member for Reynell, the campaign to do something about the Wicked Campers to try to take those obscene slogans that we see on those rented vehicles off our streets in exactly the same way that we legislate and regulate numberplates to make sure that people do not have obscene words on numberplates. But, again, nothing.

Perhaps the most galling of all, certainly for me—and I cannot imagine how it affects you, Deputy Speaker—is losing regional rail services on Eyre Peninsula. I must have raised this issue three or four times, even when I was minister in this place. I cannot remember how many times I raised it with the federal government, about reaching a funding agreement where we could both fund those rail lines to be upgraded to make sure that those trains could continue to deliver grain through to Port Lincoln.

In fact, Genesee & Wyoming was even good enough to commit to doing a business case to give to the state government and the federal government to ask for that money. The member for West Torrens, the former treasurer, and I as the transport minister made the commitment clear to Genesee & Wyoming that, if there is federal money on the table, we will be there as a state government to keep these train services going. What has happened? Nothing. Those rail lines are closing, the services are not continuing and the road upgrades that have been promised by the federal government and by the minister do not get rolled out over the next four years. Some of it starts, but not all of it gets delivered. That is a terrible result for Eyre Peninsula.

After all that success by the minister in this portfolio, the minister now expects South Australians to get in behind him and his quest to privatise train and tram services here in metropolitan Adelaide. You have got to be joking, particularly when the first justification is, 'Oh, look at the London Underground. That's been a fabulous success.' Of course it has not. That is why it is back in public hands. That is why it is not being operated by the private sector operators.

What happened in Melbourne? That was the other example cited by the minister and by the Premier. What was the experience in Melbourne? No less than a research fellow at the Institute of Public Affairs, that last harbinger of 1990s economic rationalist, neoliberal public policy here in South Australia, says it did not even deliver the benefits that were promised to Victorians. Those are two examples. We have not got off to a good start with the sale job of the privatisation of these services.

The other justification, of course, from the minister is, 'Well, patronage growth was low in 2016, 2017 and 2018, and that's because Labor was rubbish, but the Liberal government are fantastic.' It is just because of their fabulousness and their presence in government that patronage is suddenly booming. Of course, it would not have anything to do with the fact that the 2018-19 financial year was the first year without major disruptions caused by major projects being delivered affecting the public transport network, would it?

I am talking here about the interruptions to the O-Bahn service for the O-Bahn City Access Project. I am talking about the interruptions to the Outer Harbor line and to the Grange line caused by the Torrens Rail Junction works to grade separate passenger and freight rail lines. I am also talking about the interruptions to tram services for the tram extension down the remainder of North Terrace. But that is all inconvenient truth; that is all inconvenient fact. We will just ignore that and continue saying, 'Labor bad and Liberal good.'

What justifies this continual overreach? It was again borne out on ABC radio this morning, when journalist David Bevan asked the minister, 'Is the London tube back in public hands after an outsourcing deal?' The minister said, 'What specific train is in what hands is not really the point we're making.' Well, it is the point. It is exactly the point because that was one of the two examples that was held up to be the justification for privatising the operation of train and tram services here in South Australia. When pressed on it, he said, 'I don't have details that specific in front of me.' How convenient. If that is the key justification for why we should privatise and it suddenly turns out to be a bogus reason, suddenly the details are elsewhere.

The nub of the issue for the government is what savings are to be realised. Then they say, 'It's not about savings. We don't have a savings figure in mind.' That was the quote. 'There isn't a specific figure in mind,' said the minister: it is not about the savings, it is about the vibe, it is about how good the private sector is. I think South Australians have a bit of an understanding that when it comes to the private sector and public services, particularly as a result of decisions made by Liberal governments in this state, it does not work out too well.

For example, it did not work out too well for the Thevenard wharf a couple of years ago, did it? It was one of the seven ports, I think, that were privatised in the 1990s by the former Liberal government when they privatised Ports Corp in South Australia. It has not worked out too well for prison management, it has not worked out too well for buses and, for a lot of people, it also has not worked out too well for facilities management.

These were all the examples that were given by the minister in question time today: 'It was Labor's fault for not renationalising the services that we privatised when we were last in government.' Is that really the level of argument we are at now—that we should have renationalised what they privatised back in the 1990s? Most people who turn their mind to these things know that it is nigh on impossible to unscramble the egg once it is scrambled. Do you know the best example of this?

The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I know—

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: Don't let the truth get in the way of a story.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —the minister is sensitive about this.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: He loves to be loved, and there is not much love at the moment. I can imagine he is sensitive. The example he gave in question time today was the exact reason when it comes to public transport services—that is, the buses in 2011. After setting up TransAdelaide, after privatising the buses, after seeing buses not running at all, after seeing drivers without jobs and after seeing fares going up, how did the then Liberal government respond? They had to actually spend more on public transport. They had to subsidise these private corporations more to improve bus services to try to cover up for the failings in the privatisation.

Then, when it came to renewing those contracts—yes, that is right—there was a new tenderer who put in and won those contracts. You could not get a better salutary example of why this does not work—because that contractor, who did not have a workforce, who did not have the corporate knowledge, who did not have the experience, who did not understand how to run rostering and who did not understand how to run a bus depot properly, took control of those services.

What happened? What happened when Transfield took over those services under Light City Buses? Buses did not turn up; they did not have enough drivers. The government was running around having to put taxis on, and that is why. This minister, with his history and his litany of failures—

The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Lee, could you take a seat for a minute, please. I am going to interrupt here. The Minister for Transport is taking a bit of stick during this half hour, I concede that, but he will, in due course, have an opportunity to respond if he chooses to do

that, so we will continue to listen to the member for Lee in silence. He has five minutes left. You have the call.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Speaker, for your protection. I can understand that this would come as sour medicine for the minister, but it is after this 16 months of performance that he is now asking South Australians to trust his ability to deliver and to trust his judgement that this is going to be in their best interests.

I can tell you that I was at the Grange train station this morning and I did not even have to say a word or even ask people to come and sign the petition against this privatisation. People saw the sign and they walked up and signed it. People are furious about this, absolutely furious. They are even more angry now than when they found out that security guards were being removed from the evening services on the Grange train—another Labor initiative to try to convince more people to use public transport by making them feel safe, particularly at this time of year when it gets dark around 6 o'clock.

They have taken the security guards off, so how do vulnerable people feel? How do women feel about catching public transport? They feel less safe, so are they likely to catch it? Probably not and that is why patronage is at risk here. It is because this government continues to make decisions that are against the interests of those people who rely on public transport the most.

Public transport is not an option for a lot of people: it is all they have. They cannot afford to run a car. They catch public transport because they need to get in on the early service to start their shiftwork or because they are students or because they are school students and their parents cannot get them to school because they have their own commitments trying to get to work on time. This is not optional. This is not some special luxury that a government affords its community. This is an essential service and they make it more expensive and reduce services and now they want to privatise it.

Why do they want to privatise it? Where is the full scope of savings achieved? They are achieved by going after the workers who deliver it, by going after the train drivers, the tram drivers and the passenger service assistants as if they were highly paid executives—fat cats—who deserve this sort of punishment. Well, they are not. They are not at all.

They deserve support from this government. They deserve more resources for more services. They deserve better working conditions. They do not deserve privatisation and being thrown at the mercy of a private operator, and that is exactly what this government proposes. There will be fewer people employed, their pay and working conditions will be reduced and that is where the savings get made. This is a direct attack on public transport workers, as well as a direct attack on the public transport commuters.

I cannot understand what motivates this government. It is cruel. It is completely uncaring for the people in our community we should be supporting the most. It is a cavalier attitude of the government and the minister thinking that it has happened elsewhere and that this is what we have been hearing from our conservative neoliberal economists since the 1990s, hence it must work here.

We know it does not work. It has not worked. It did not work for ETSA when we had people reeling under the highest electricity prices in the country. In fact, those opposite used to like telling us they were the highest electricity prices in the world. Thank you, John Olsen, and thank you, Rob Lucas, but we do not want that for our trains and we do not want that for our trams. I would encourage this government and this minister to think a little more carefully about how they choose to treat the people of this community because they are not here for their own gratification: they are here to serve the public.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. S.K. Knoll.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (DECRIMINALISATION OF SEX WORK) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES (PETITIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 17:41 the house adjourned until Tuesday 3 July 2019 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***ELECTIVE SURGERY**

828 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (4 June 2019). How many elective surgery operations on public health patients were performed in private hospitals for each of the following months:

- (a) November 2017?
- (b) December 2017?
- (c) January 2018?
- (d) February 2018?
- (e) March 2018?
- (f) April 2018?
- (g) May 2018?
- (h) June 2018?
- (i) July 2018?
- (j) August 2018?
- (k) September 2018?
- (l) October 2018?
- (m) November 2018?
- (n) December 2018?
- (o) January 2019?
- (p) February 2019?
- (q) March 2019?
- (r) April 2019?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Admissions from elective surgery waiting lists, including elective surgery categories, are provided annually by the Australian Institute for Health and Welfare.

INFLUENZA VACCINATIONS

839 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (4 June 2019). During 2019 what was the largest gap between the number of doses ordered by a GP for the flu vaccine and the number of doses provided?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The member is referred to the public weekly updates provided by the Communicable Diseases Control Branch of the Department for Health and Wellbeing.

SUBURBAN TRAIN DRIVERS

841 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (4 June 2019). Since 2014, how many people over the age of 50 have been successful in their application to be employed by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure as a suburban train driver?

1. How does this compare to the total number of people appointed to this specific position over the same period?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning): I have been advised the following:

Since 2014, the total number of people over the age of 50 who have been successful in their application to be employed by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure as a suburban train driver was 11. In total there were 66 people appointed as suburban train drivers over the period.

BUS SHELTERS

842 Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (4 June 2019). What work is done, both independently and in collaboration with local councils, before DPTI decides to install or move bus shelters on suburban roads and how many new bus shelters were installed last year, by both council and DPTI, in the electorate of Florey?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning): I have been advised the following:

The Public Transport and Planning section of the Department for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government (DPTI) works closely with all councils in regards to bus stop infrastructure across the metropolitan area. This includes regular dialogue, discussion and dissemination of data around the location of the stops and the facilities provided at each stop. DPTI recognises the need to provide expert advice and data for councils to make an informed decision to provide the best experience for public transport customers for their whole journey.

Councils are responsible for the maintenance of bus shelters, associated footpath infrastructure and requests for new bus shelters.

The electorate of Florey is within three local government areas; Port Adelaide Enfield Council, the City of Salisbury and the City of Tea Tree Gully. While DPTI have not installed any shelters since the end of the bus shelter investment program in 2014, councils advise us that there have been 26 shelters either newly installed or replaced in the past year. None of these have been within the electorate of Florey.

DPTI will continue to work with local government to assist in prioritising sites for the installation of new shelters.

SCHOOLS, YEAR 7 REFORM

851 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (18 June 2019). How much will the capital works cost to move year 7's into high school?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

While some of the funds announced for new capital are only necessary to enable capacity for the inclusion of year 7s, it is important to note that a significant proportion is also to meet the growing capacity needs that many of these schools were facing even without the year 7s. It is also noteworthy that a significant proportion of the announced capital investment will go towards specialist learning areas that will benefit other students at the school in addition to the year 7s.

Further details regarding investments to support year 7 moving to high school, along with other capital upgrades, are available online at <https://www.education.sa.gov.au/sites-and-facilities/upgrades-and-new-schools/major-school-upgrades>.

SCHOOL TRANSPORT

856 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (18 June 2019). What changes have been made to Adelaide metro school services bus routes and timetables for the 2019 school year?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning): I have been advised the following:

At the start of each year some dedicated school services operated as part of the Adelaide metro bus network are changed to accommodate variations to school dismissal times or other changes as advised when consulting with schools across Adelaide.

Further to this there are also changes made to accommodate requests from the community (such as extensions or route amendments). Any changes made to school services are carefully considered to ensure impacts on school students are minimised and to ensure that alternative options are available, where necessary. In summary changes have included:

- On 27 January 2019, changes were made to 15 individual services (outlined below).
- On 12 February 2019, an additional service on Tuesdays on school bus 922 was implemented.
- At the start of term 2, school bus 475 was amended to allow additional time on the journey and an earlier arrival time at the school.
- School bus 855 was also amended to travel through a new housing development.
- On 6 May 2019, school bus 889 had a slight route amendment to remove an un-signalised right hand turn.
- There is one amendment planned for term three which is school bus 886 being amended to start and finish at Cabra College instead of Annesley College. There are no students catching the service to or from Annesley College since it changed to operating as a primary school and these resources have been redirected to students at Cabra College.'

Changes made to school services 27 January 2019

School bus 610 Adelaide High School to Adelaide Railway Station:

This service will depart at 1520 on all days.

School bus 611 Adelaide High School to Victoria Square:

This service will depart at 1527 on all days.

School bus 638 Norwood Morialta Middle School to City:

This service will depart 10 minutes later on Wednesdays due to a later dismissal time.

School bus 639 Norwood Morialta Middle School to Paradise Interchange:

This service will depart 10 minutes later on Wednesdays due to a later dismissal time.

School bus 670 Marymount College to Grange Road 23:

Due to the closure of Marymount College in 2019 this service will be shortened to begin at Brighton High School (King George Ave 30A).

School bus 671 Tapleys Hill Rd 21B to Marymount College:

Due to the closure of Marymount College in 2019 this service will be shortened to terminate at Brighton High School (King George Ave 30A).

School bus 778 Noarlunga Centre to Reynella East High School:

This service will depart 5 minutes earlier to provide enough time for students to get to school prior to start time.

School bus 875 Stirling to Heathfield High School:

The AM service will be extended to terminate at stop 39 Longwood Rd, to allow students for Heathfield Primary School to use the service (approximately 400m away).

The PM service (including route 875T) will still start at Heathfield High School but will travel via Longwood Road (stop 39 for Heathfield Primary School) then left Cricklewood Road and current route.

School bus 890 Oakbank Area School to Nairne via Mt Barker:

This service will depart 50 minutes earlier on Wednesday due to the school introducing an early dismissal day. Cornerstone College and St Francis de Sales College have been contacted to advise of the change given that a very small number of students have also caught this service. Alternative regular 837 services are available for these other students.

School bus 922 Loreto College to Fairview Park:

This service will depart at 1535 on all days (no early dismissal on Tuesdays).

School bus 958 Brighton High School to Marion Centre:

The later service that departs at 1525 on Tuesdays only will no longer be required due to the closure of Marymount College

School bus 962 Loreto College to North East Rd 11:

This service will depart at 1538 on all days (no early dismissal on Tuesdays).

School bus 964 Portrush Rd 146 St Ignatius to Walkerville North East Rd 11:

This service will be discontinued due to ongoing consistently low patronage. Alternative services for students are school bus 962 and 963 (or route 300)

School bus 977 Sacred Heart Middle School to Flinders Medical Centre:

This service will depart earlier on Mondays to accommodate a new early dismissal time.

School bus 978 Sacred Heart Middle School to Marion Centre:

This service will depart earlier on Mondays to accommodate a new early dismissal time.

KANGAROO ISLAND MINISTERIAL VISIT

865 The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (18 June 2019). Up until 27 May 2019 when was the last time the Minister for Energy and Mining visited Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining):

Since 22 March when the Marshall Liberal government's cabinet was sworn in, seven ministers have personally visited Kangaroo Island with an eighth minister scheduled to visit in coming weeks. I am not one of the seven ministers that has visited.

KANGAROO ISLAND MINISTERIAL VISIT

866 The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (18 June 2019). How many times has the Minister for Energy and Mining visited Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): I refer the member to my answer to question with notice number 865.

KANGAROO ISLAND MINISTERIAL VISIT

869 The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (18 June 2019). Up until 27 May 2019 when was the last time the Minister for Health and Wellbeing visited Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining):

Since 22 March when the Marshall Liberal government's cabinet was sworn in, seven ministers have personally visited Kangaroo Island with an eighth minister scheduled to visit in coming weeks. The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised that he is not one of the seven ministers that has visited.

KANGAROO ISLAND MINISTERIAL VISIT

870 The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (18 June 2019). How many times has the Minister for Child Protection visited Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): I refer the member to my answer to question with notice number 869.

MINISTERIAL EXPENDITURE

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (18 June 2019).

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development): The following details for purchases of alcohol by the Office of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development which have been reimbursed:

Date of purchase	Cost	By Whom	Purpose
4 September 2018	\$92.00	Kangaroo Island Pure Grain to Department	Annual Lunch at Parliament with visitors from Japan.
30 October 2018	\$367.15	Minister to Department	Display SA Premium Wine
21 November 2018	\$6.40	Minister to Department	Meal
6 May 2019	\$305.10	Food SA to Department	Launch SA Food & Beverage Awards, Parliament House.