

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 24 June 2021

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. J.B. Teague) 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

STANDING AND SESSIONAL ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:01): I move:

That standing and sessional orders be so far suspended as to enable Private Members Business, Bills, Order of the Day No. 46, to take precedence forthwith over Private Members Business, Committees and Subordinate Legislation.

Motion carried.

Bills

VOLUNTARY ASSISTED DYING BILL

Final Stages

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's message No. 115.

Dr CLOSE: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

I will just speak very briefly. These amendments are sensible and in fact consistent with the lengthy and very high-quality debate that we had in this chamber a couple of weeks ago. They reflect the intention, I think, of people in acknowledging that, when someone is living in their own home, be that run by an organisation such as an aged-care facility and, in this amendment's case, a retirement village, that person has the right to have access to lawfully available medical interventions and medical advice.

The amendments that we passed here a couple of weeks ago referred only to facilities under the Aged Care Act and these amendments make sure that that extends also to retirement villages. On the basis that it is consistent with our previous debates and is a clarification and an elaboration on them, I wholeheartedly endorse them and recommend them to this house.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I rise to indicate my support for the motion accepting the amendments from the other place. I wish to place on record that the other place did wholly accept the message from this house after the comprehensive debate that the member for Port Adelaide outlined and the reasons for doing so.

What this essentially does is ensure that when we look at aged-care accommodation it is not just confined to commonwealth residential aged-care facilities but also to state-based retirement villages. That is in recognition, I am advised, that some 26,000 people live in residential retirement village options; of those, I am advised 1,400 are in retirement villages provided by Catholic-related agencies and approximately another 1,500 are in retirement villages provided by members of the Lutheran community.

Both these communities have indicated their concerns in relation to this legislation and they are therefore a not insubstantial number within the cohort who reside in this accommodation, but clearly the overwhelming number in relation to those who operate these facilities are people who, as the member has rightly pointed out, are living in their own home and therefore ought to be accommodated.

I thank the Legislative Council for its fulsome acceptance of our amendments and note this helpful addition.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:07): I move:

That I have leave to introduce a motion forthwith without notice.

The SPEAKER: Does the member for Kavel wish to address the motion?

Mr CREGAN: No, sir.

Motion carried.

Motions

PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:08): I move:

That this house asserts its privileges, in particular the freedom of speech in debates and proceedings in parliament (and in relation to any records, documents or materials however so created, stored, transmitted or maintained) ought not be impeached or questioned in any court or place out of this parliament, and reasserts that principle in relation to the subject matter I introduced and raised in the house last evening.

The SPEAKER: Does the member for Kavel wish to speak to the motion?

Mr CREGAN: Thank you, sir. This form of words and protection were also relevant in the *Niarchos v Snelling* matter, and I seek to continue to enjoy, for the protection of myself and my constituents and other members of the community, the ancient rights and privileges of this house. I do so emphasising, too, the connection to proceedings between the remarks I made in the house last evening and the importance of maintaining privilege over certain documents that inform my judgement in relation to those remarks.

I emphasise that the budget bill does, of course, contain funding for ECSA and other important related authorities and for this very parliament. Therefore, there is a close and direct connection between the matters I raised and electoral probity, transparency and other matters related to the duties and obligations of those bodies but also, importantly, to the duties and obligations that I have as a member and that every member ought to continue to enjoy in this house. I say that also in answer to matters that you raised from the chair last night. I am very thankful for the emphasis of the opposition last night in relation to the connection between the remarks I was making and the proceedings then on foot.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (11:10): I am very happy to rise to say that the opposition will be supporting the member's plight in protecting himself and his constituents against anyone who wishes to usurp those rights, especially in the ongoing difficulties or troubles that are occurring internally in the Liberal Party. This parliament's walls should not be breached, and the opposition is prepared to support the member for Kavel in whatever difficulties he is facing internally with these documents.

People should be able to contact their local member of parliament freely, without fear of any coercion from any outside body at all. It is a sacred principle that people can come to their member of parliament to raise grievances and have those grievances aired or concealed. That is the point. We should not have to be doing this today, but alas, in case of there being any ambiguity, we declare that we will absolutely support the member.

The only other point I make is that it is unusual to extend privilege on documents we have not seen, but I understand the member will be tabling those documents after the passage of this motion. The *Niarchos v Snelling* case was one that was before the courts, and the house had full transparency over those proceedings and what was being sought from the member, so I would assume that the same would apply today. I support the motion.

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:12): I reassure members that I am not aware of any proceedings presently on foot or of any investigation by anybody in this state. I am simply ensuring that my

constituents continue to enjoy the ancient rights and privileges that are extended to me in order that I can discharge my functions and protect them.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:13): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to table a series of documents as a private member of this place.

You know of course, Mr Speaker, that private members do not otherwise have that right, which is a great frustration to me.

The SPEAKER: An absolute majority is present. I accept the motion. Does the member for Kavel wish to speak on the suspension?

Mr CREGAN: No, sir.

Motion carried.

Mr CREGAN: I table a bundle of documents in relation to a matter of concern.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE: TEACHERS REGISTRATION BOARD PETITION

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:14): I move:

That the report of the committee on the House of Assembly petition No. 13 of 2020, entitled 'Maintenance of the current composition of the Teachers Registration Board', be noted.

The Australian Education Union and the Independent Education Union commenced this petition to maintain the current composition of the Teachers Registration Board and to retain their ability to nominate members to the board. On 22 July 2020, the member for Port Adelaide, then shadow minister for education, tabled the petition in the House of Assembly. The petition was signed by 11,606 residents of South Australia and requested that the House of Assembly:

...urge the Government to ensure political independence of the Teachers Registration Board and maintain its current composition and nomination process.

On presentation to a house of parliament, the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 refers eligible petitions to the Legislative Review Committee. Once referred, the committee is required to inquire into, consider and report to parliament on eligible petitions. The petition was commenced in response to the Teachers Registration and Standards (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2020, which was presented in the House of Assembly on 4 March 2020 by the Minister for Education.

The bill proposed amendments to the Teachers Registration and Standards Act 2004, including alterations to the composition of the Teachers Registration Board. The minister advised the Legislative Review Committee that these amendments were intended to improve the flexibility of the board's size, and I quote:

...and ensure that members would be appointed based on the knowledge, skills and experience the Board needs to carry out its functions effectively...

The bill sought to alter the composition of the Teachers Registration Board in three ways. The first was to reduce the number of members on the board from 16 to between 10 and 14 members. The chair of the board, Ms Jane Lomax-Smith, had raised concerns that the size of the board made it difficult to manage. Both houses of parliament supported the government's desire to make the board more modern, flexible and agile by reducing the number of members.

The second proposed amendment required that three practising teachers be nominated to the board, one from each of the areas of early childhood, primary and secondary education. The petitioners objected to this proposal, as it would reduce the minimum number of teachers on the board from seven to three. The petitioners argued:

The current composition of the Board has ensured that high standards for professional practice and development are required for teachers to maintain registration. It has also ensured that decisions regarding

competence are made by those who have an understanding of current teaching practice and the professional context in which teachers work.

The Minister for Education emphasised in this house that teacher representation on the board is 'critically important'. He explained that he expected that, in practice, there would be more than three teachers on the board.

The third proposed amendment to the composition of the board was to remove the power of teacher and education organisations to nominate board members. That power would instead be vested in the Minister for Education. The minister explained that this amendment aimed to ensure that members were appointed based on knowledge, skills and experience, rather than on the basis of nominations from particular stakeholders. The petitioners argued:

It is essential that the majority of Board members are nominated by teacher and education organisations, not hand-picked by the Minister of the day.

The committee heard evidence from the member for Wright, shadow minister for education, and received written evidence from the Minister for Education. The committee determined, based on this evidence, not to proceed with a call for public submissions in relation to the petition.

Both the Minister for Education and the member for Wright advised the committee that, through genuine collaboration and negotiation, they agreed on a number of amendments to the bill that achieve the outcomes sought by all participants in the parliamentary debate. The bill, as amended, passed both houses of parliament on 15 October 2020. The resulting Teachers Registration and Standards (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 2020 will commence on 1 July 2021.

Consistent with the petitioners' requests, the amendment act provides that at least six members of the board will be practising teachers and at least half of the members will be registered teachers. The Australian Education Union will nominate four practising teachers and the Independent Education Union will nominate two. Although the number of members nominated by the unions will be reduced from seven to six, this number is proportionate with the reduction in the overall number of board members.

Contrary to the petitioners' request, the amendments to the act will remove the power of teacher employers and universities to directly nominate members to the board. However, the amendments will require the Minister for Education to call for expressions of interest for nominations. Representative bodies for employers of teachers and teacher educators will have an opportunity to put forward nominations for members and to make submissions in respect of nominations. The minister will also be required to ensure that the members of the board collectively have the knowledge, skills and experience in areas of teacher education and matters affecting employers of practising teachers.

Both the member for Wright and the Minister for Education advised the committee that, in their opinion, the amendment act adequately addressed the petitioners' concerns about the composition of the Teachers Registration Board. In his evidence before the committee, the member for Wright advised:

The chair's and registrar's main reasons for wanting to make change was that they felt the board was too big and unwieldy. I think what we have found here in the end is the capacity for the chair and the registrar to have smaller meetings but still maintain the representation from registered teachers on that board.

The minister, in his correspondence to the committee, commented:

The provisions in the Amendment Act that will modify the composition of the Board represent a sound compromise between the Government's position set out in the Bill introduced into Parliament and the petitioners' request that the current composition and nomination process for the Board is maintained.

In the committee's view, the petitioners' concerns were satisfactorily resolved by the amendments made to the bill and the subsequent enactment of the Teachers Registration and Standards (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 2020. While the amendment act does alter the composition and nomination process of the Teachers Registration Board, the committee is satisfied that the political independence of the board remains intact. The committee made the following findings:

1. The Teachers Registration and Standards Act 2004, as amended by the Teachers Registration and Standards (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 2020, will ensure that

at least half of the members on the Teachers Registration Board will be practising teachers.

2. The amendments to the act will maintain the political independence of the Teachers Registration Board. The Australian Education Union and the Independent Education Union will continue to have power to nominate members to the board.
3. Under the amendments to the act, teacher and education organisations will be entitled to provide submissions to the Minister for Education, who must consider those submissions when nominating members to the Teachers Registration Board.

On 20 March 2019, in support of her successful efforts to have the Legislative Review Committee inquire into, consider and report on eligible petitions, the member for Florey said:

A petition...is the oldest and most direct way citizens can draw attention to a problem and ask parliament to act.

The petition has enabled the voices of concerned citizens to be heard by both the parliament and the government. As a result, the parties came together to negotiate a compromise position and amend the bill. In their evidence before the committee, both the member for Wright and the Minister for Education expressed their gratitude at the genuine and effective discussions and cooperation in coming to this agreement.

As a representative of the Legislative Review Committee in this place, I would like to thank the other members of the committee: the member for MacKillop and the member for Ramsay in this place and the Hon. Connie Bonaros and the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos in the other place. I would particularly like to acknowledge the presidency and leadership of our presiding officer, the Hon. Nicola Centofanti, in the other place. I would also like to thank former members of the committee who were involved in the work on this petition, they being the member for Heysen, your good self, sir, and also the members for Kavel and Narungga.

In addition, I would like to thank the committee secretary, Mr Matt Balfour, and research officer, Ms Maureen Affleck, for their assistance. I would also like to express the committee's gratitude to both the member for Wright and the Minister for Education for their contributions to the committee's inquiry into this petition.

Mr BOYER (Wright) (11:25): Can I begin by thanking the member for Flinders for his very gracious words; it is appreciated by those on this side. I also acknowledge the collaborative way in which the minister chose to work with me, as the shadow minister, at that stage a very new shadow minister for education. That was also appreciated. I think that that collaborative spirit helped us to arrive at a good outcome for all parties involved, which is a rare commodity in this place.

On that note, what started out as a potentially quite provocative amendment bill ultimately made its way through this place and the Legislative Review Committee to finish in a place where the majority of parties involved were satisfied with the outcome. Although I have not been a member of this place for particularly long, I have been a member long enough to know that is not something that happens too frequently. All the parties, many of whom the member for Flinders just thanked, should be commended for their role in making that happen.

That brings me to briefly add my own thanks to some of those parties, including the unions that were at the centre of some of the proposed changes here—the Australian Education Union and the Independent Education Union—who went to enormous efforts to rally their members and members of the teaching profession more generally to support the petition they put together calling on their representation on the Teachers Registration Board and the representation of practising teachers to be maintained.

I note that the final number of signatures on that petition was 11,606, I think, which is certainly an incredible effort at any given time. Taking into account the fact that these were collected largely during the peak of the COVID pandemic, the quite sensible restrictions in place prevented the collection of those signatures in the traditional way, which would maybe be out at a rally, sub-branch meeting or something of that nature, and a petition would be physically handed over for someone to sign. That was not able to happen, so the fact that those unions still managed to mobilise close to 12,000 signatories I think is a great reflection on their work and an indication of the level of support

for maintaining that representation of both industrial representative bodies and practising teachers on the Teachers Registration Board.

In closing, I would just add that this was one of the first, if not the first, petitions to go to the Legislative Review Committee on the basis that it passed the threshold of 10,000 signatures, which I know is something that the member for Florey has pushed for a long time and has now been adopted. I got to see that up close for the first time and provided evidence to the committee, and I found that a very valuable process.

It has proved to be a very valuable addition to our parliamentary processes. Not only does it potentially have the ability to help the parties involved in whatever the proposed amendment is come to some kind of agreement but it also serves to empower and include members of the public in our parliamentary processes on another level, and that can only be a good thing. I thank all for their involvement and kind words. Let's hope that we can continue with this collaborative spirit on matters like this.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:29): I thank the member for Flinders for his presentation, which was erudite and comprehensive and I think covers the material of the inquiry very well, and I thank the member for Wright and join with him in commending the Legislative Review Committee for their work. I will speak briefly about the subject matter at hand and briefly about the process identified in relation to petitions.

The Teachers Registration Board reforms that the government sought were to significantly improve the operations of the Teachers Registration Board. Many of the reforms came about as a result of a significant level of community consultation, led by the Hon. Dr Jane Lomax-Smith, a former education minister from the Labor Party who was reappointed at least once under the Liberal government since our election as chair of the Teachers Registration Board. Many of those amendments came from that consultation, and, indeed, prior to that from suggestions made by the current Teachers Registration Board.

Of the matters where amendment was sought, one of the key matters was in relation to the composition of the board itself. The government had a view that we should move to a smaller, skills-focused board without any nominees directly from representative bodies but with those bodies having the opportunity to suggest nominations. The opposition's view, if I can characterise it, was to have a higher proportion of the board still retained as nominees of representative groups, and there were a number of other suggestions for how that board might be comprised.

Across the scope of the broad bill, the bill did significantly improve the operations of the board, and I think most people accept that. In relation to the composition of the board, the petition was certainly a demonstration of the membership of the two unions and the support they had for retaining the previous arrangements, and the numbers of their members who were signing up to that are perhaps not surprising from that point of view.

The opposition of the Labor Party was expected. They put their position clearly and eloquently, indeed, in the House of Assembly. Ultimately, in the upper house the Greens and SA-Best supported the Labor Party in those amendments and in some amendments went further. So the government was faced with a choice at that point of whether or not we proceeded with insisting on our proposition or accepted that the Legislative Council numbers suggested the majority of those members shared at least a strong part of the Labor Party's views.

As the member for Wright alluded to, I took the view that improvements to the bill which we could all agree on were too important to stand firm over the issues on which we disagreed. The member for Wright and the member for Port Adelaide, who for the first part of the discussion had been the shadow minister, were collaborative in discussing compromises, and I thank them for that. They, too, were willing to give some ground in what they had sought to come closer to the government's position, as, indeed, the government gave some ground to the Labor Party.

If I am completely candid I might say that I think the government potentially gave a little bit more ground than we asked in return because I was very eager to reach a speedy resolution so that the matters could be dealt with quickly. So I congratulate the member for Wright on achieving potentially a 55-45 outcome, arguably.

I am really pleased, however, that the compromise does indeed leave one key, core deliverable from my point of view. This was that in the identification of a skills-based board, which a majority of the board is at this point, we are not just refining the skills of the early childhood, primary and secondary teachers, which our amendments and this bill ensure—with those three cohorts all recognised for their own skills uniquely for the first time in the composition of the board—but we also have the capacity to appoint teachers who are not necessarily nominees of the representative groups.

When the bill comes into effect on 1 July, I look forward to seeing, hopefully with the Governor's consideration, potentially even a teacher who is not a union delegate who is able to join their colleagues who are union delegates alongside those other people who bring a range of skills and experiences that will serve the teachers of South Australia.

It is a reasonable compromise. It is a compromise that, as the member for Wright said, I think most people were able to be happy with. My key here is that we have improved the operations of the bill. We have served an outcome that serves the people of South Australia and, in this body, particularly because they are paying for this organisation, the teachers of South Australia whom the organisation serves.

I thank Jane Lomax-Smith and I thank Leonie Paulson—Jane is the chair of the board and Leonie Paulson is the Registrar of the Teachers Registration Board—for their support and assistance to me and, indeed, I am sure to the opposition and other minor parties who were interested in their views. They continue in that service.

As the member for Flinders and the member for Wright said, I think this is the first time that the new mechanism, enabled under the petitions legislation moved by the member for Florey, has come back to this place. I was the Manager of Government Business, the leader of the house, at the time the debate was happening. In discussions with the member for Florey and the Clerk about how this measure might be enacted, we were eager to ensure that, while giving voice and agency to petitioners, particularly those who had reached a threshold of 10,000 written signatures, which we felt was a reasonable demonstration of the interests of a wide range of constituents, that it nevertheless not be unduly disruptive to the house's considerations.

I recall the member for Florey being eager for the house to hear an explanation from the minister in relation to whatever matter was being raised. It was suggested that, if the review itself was done by the Legislative Review Committee, the committee's business time in the chamber would obviously be the orthodox and useful place for such consideration of that petition and the ensuing report to be considered.

While that standing order does not require the minister to provide a response, as the minister in this case I felt it important—even though the member for Flinders and the member for Wright were very comprehensive and accurate in everything they said—to set an example for future ministers who are being petitioned in this way to respond to the petition and respond to the reports. I thank the house for the eight minutes they have given me to do so.

For the member for Florey, I do not know if she is planning on continuing as the member for Florey after the next election, or if she alternatively proposes to retire from this place, but either way I think that this is a moment of reform she has been responsible for in the way we deal with petitions and I commend her for that.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:38): I would like to thank both the member for Wright and the Minister for Education for their contributions and the glowing way in which they both spoke about the committee and this entire process. I think it has been a great example of how parliament can work well and how our standing committees can add to the value of parliamentary debate, discussion and outcomes.

What we have managed to achieve here is a timely, effective and efficient outcome through the committee process and cooperation from all to a point. As negotiations should be, there is always a bit of give and take, and that is how negotiations are undertaken, but ultimately what was achieved was a position that was satisfactory to all parties. With that, I once again move that this report be noted.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: HAMILTON SECONDARY COLLEGE REDEVELOPMENT

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:39): I move:

That the 119th report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Hamilton Secondary College Redevelopment Project, be noted.

Hamilton Secondary College is located on Marion Road, Mitchell Park, within the City of Marion. The Department for Education has advised that Hamilton Secondary College offers the SACE Education Certificate Program for adults seeking to complete or return to secondary education. The school also hosts the Mike Roach Space Education Centre, which delivers the only designated secondary school specialist curriculum for space education in our state.

Hamilton Secondary College was allocated funding of \$9 million as part of the Department for Education's capital works program announced in October 2017. This funding allocation was confirmed on the change of government in March 2018. The Department for Education has advised that Hamilton Secondary College is further contributing some funds of its own to maximise the opportunity of the build. As a result, the total project funding is \$9.165 million.

Hamilton Secondary College requires capital works to provide sufficient capacity to accommodate 900 students on the school site, catering for the transition of year 7 students into high school in 2022. There is also aged infrastructure on the school site that requires refurbishment to support contemporary teaching and learning.

Specifically, the Hamilton Secondary College redevelopment project proposes the following scope of works:

- construction of a new performing arts centre, providing flexible areas to enable general and specialist teaching and learning with teacher preparation, storage amenities and a canteen;
- the redevelopment of the existing drama and music space to include flexible contemporary learning areas, breakout spaces and independent learning zones;
- refurbishment of the resource centre to create multifunctional learning areas, including a year 12 centre; and
- creation of an outdoor central plaza, linking the new building to the administration and general teaching areas along with a new covered link to the resource centre.

The works and scope of works will also include refurbishment of general teaching areas to upgrade air conditioning and acoustics, the demolition of aged accommodation, as I earlier foreshadowed, and new landscaping to the Marion Road frontage to improve the school street presence and amenity. The Hamilton Secondary College redevelopment project will be staged with construction expected to commence in October 2020 and be completed during October 2021, so we anticipate those works are now underway.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to this project and received assurances that appropriate consultation in relation to this project has been undertaken. The committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to the appropriate agency consultation and does meet the criteria for the examination of projects set out in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Based on the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works I have outlined to you.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:43): It is really exciting to be able to talk in the parliament and reflect on the Public Works Committee's report on the redevelopment of Hamilton Secondary College. This is an investment of a little over \$9 million the Marshall Liberal government is making towards the Hamilton Secondary College. It is part of what is now \$1.4 billion worth of public school infrastructure works across South Australia as we seek to ensure that we have capacity to support all our students in a way that will encourage them to prosper and thrive and that we can deliver the teaching and learning they deserve.

This project, I have to say, is outstanding bang for buck and value for money in terms of what is being delivered. I commend Totalspace Design, the architects, and Marshall and Brougham, the builders, for the work they are doing and, of course, I commend Peta Kourbelis and her team from Hamilton Secondary College. The infrastructure division within the Department for Education and indeed the Department for Infrastructure and Transport are to be commended for this work and I also acknowledge the great work of Helen Doyle and her team in education.

I have been to visit Hamilton Secondary College a couple of times to see what the project will achieve. The performing arts spaces are going to be an outstanding uplift on what the school currently has. The planetarium that is going to be a part of what the school has to offer is unique, and I think it goes to the heart of one of the things that makes Hamilton Secondary College really special—the space school concept.

Hamilton Secondary College is so well focused on an area of learning that is going to be such an uplift for South Australia's economy in the years ahead, and I think that should give every student and family involved in Hamilton Secondary College a great deal of pride. It should get every family thinking about where their children are going to go to high school, especially if they live in the inner south-western suburbs of Adelaide, a great deal of confidence in considering Hamilton Secondary College.

They have run a space school program at Hamilton Secondary College for a number of years now, since about 2017. I am fairly sure former Minister Susan Close was the minister when that opened up. This is a useful body of work, and I thank the former government for that aspect. That program was able to support not just students at Hamilton but indeed students from surrounding primary schools and other secondary schools in engaging with the Mission to Mars project, where students can play out a number of roles considering potential opportunities for how space missions can work, and a range of different STEM subjects from which they can gain benefit from that hands-on learning.

Taking that to the next level is the charter now. Since the Marshall Liberal government's election and the Premier winning the Australian Space Agency for our state, there has been the development of the SmartSat Collaborative Research Centre, Mission Control and the Space Discovery Centre at Lot Fourteen on North Terrace, not 500 metres from where we stand today. There has been extraordinary burgeoning interest by space industry-related companies in South Australia like Myriota and Inovor—Australian, South Australian companies—making satellites and creating opportunities for data to be transferred between South Australia and space for the benefit of government, for the benefit of farmers and for the benefit of people in bushfire-prone areas.

We now have multinationals like Boeing and a range of others setting up their operations in Australia at Lot Fourteen here in Adelaide, creating extraordinary opportunities in the years ahead with space conferences and all the other space-related industries. Adelaide and South Australia will be the headquarters for the space industry not only in Australia but really in the southern hemisphere, with rocket launches being undertaken on Eyre Peninsula.

I cannot speak enough about the extraordinary opportunities for young South Australians who are interested in careers related to this exciting area of work in the space industries here in South Australia. Once upon a time, not that long ago—I am talking five years, 10 years, certainly when I was at school—young South Australians with these sorts of skills and capabilities, dispositions, knowledge and interest would not have thought of South Australia as a place where they could pursue that career.

I made some friends at university doing astrophysics and other exciting high-technology science-related degrees, and they were able to do that study in South Australia but not one of them got a job in South Australia afterwards. Every single one was thinking, 'Am I going to move to Sydney or Hong Kong or the United States or maybe to Europe?' Now Adelaide is the logical place for the best possible career for those people and they can do that at home with their families.

For any young person thinking about a future career in space industries and the space sector in the most high-tech and in the best geography of high-tech industries in the space sector, South Australia is the place to pursue that future. Hamilton Secondary College is a school that is giving some sort of grip and reality to those dreams from the moment students enter high school in year 7 next year and is supporting primary school students to get an understanding of this in earlier

years through those primary schools that continue to visit and support the Hamilton Secondary College Space School program.

In school holidays, we have young scientists in upper secondary levels who engage with the holiday Space School. I have seen these 14, 15, 16 and 17-year-old students engage with astronauts at Hamilton Secondary College, not just Australian astronauts—of course, Andy Thomas is doing a wonderful job—but a number of astronauts who have worked with South Australian companies like Nova Systems. They lend their time to that Space School program and inspire the next generation to think about what sorts of careers they might have in the space industry.

This construction project, with the development of the planetarium and the other enhancements to the Space School program at Hamilton Secondary College, will really take that engagement to the next level, and it is coming at a time when the jobs in this industry are really set to—forgive the pun—skyrocket. I cannot wait to see this work finished. It is going to be October, and I hope the members of the Public Works Committee will think about having a meeting off site, out of Parliament House. Perhaps they can come to the planetarium that we are building at Hamilton Secondary College, the only planetarium in a school in Australia, only the second planetarium in South Australia.

The member for Playford is, of course, well aware that the northern suburbs are well served. This is the first planetarium in the southern suburbs, in the southern half of Adelaide, so when the member for Playford wishes to cross the threshold of Greenhill Road and head south, he can go to the Hamilton Secondary College planetarium. Maybe he can join the Public Works Committee so that he can attend the meeting that I am sure they are now going to have at the planetarium at Hamilton Secondary College.

In this contribution, I have focused very much on the space program at Hamilton, because it more than anything is what makes Hamilton unique, but Hamilton is special for the entire curriculum of teaching and learning and training operations it offers. The refurbishment, of course, is also more than just the space program. The old music and drama buildings are being refurbished into contemporary flexible learning areas. The new performing arts area will, I think, be spectacular—a 152-seat theatre.

The refurbishment of the resource centre is part of the space program. The new plaza, the link to the performing arts building, the refurbishment of other spaces, air conditioning and acoustic upgrades to some buildings, upgrading of the school frontage on Marion Road for street presence, and the demolition and removal of some ageing architecture that is no longer fit for purpose will all enhance the teaching and learning at Hamilton.

The teaching and learning, of course, is part of a broad curriculum that suits students of all dispositions. Whether they be focused on space and science, performing arts and film, or their English or their maths studies, Hamilton Secondary College does a great job. I have a lot of excitement about its future.

The local member of parliament, Carolyn Power, the member for Elder, and Corey Wingard, whose electorate is across the road, are both very strongly engaged with this school. I have joined them at the school on a number of occasions to celebrate their achievements. I cannot wait to see many more in the years ahead.

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:52): As I have earlier emphasised in this place, we are especially grateful to the Minister for Education for seeing through a record capital works program in our state. It is, of course, in part to accommodate the transition of year 7 to high school, but it is far more significant than that. In seeing through this program, he has not only met the needs of existing or current students in our school system but is also ensuring that many future generations will continue to have the best education facilities available to them. I acknowledge his contribution and the contribution of other members and provide the report to the house.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: REYNELLA EAST COLLEGE REDEVELOPMENT

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:53): I move:

That the 120th report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Reynella East College Redevelopment Project, be noted.

Reynella East College is located on Malbeck Drive, Reynella East, within the City of Onkaparinga. The Department for Education has advised that the college offers education from preschool to year 12, with specialist programs in the arts, STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) and business. It is also a music focus school, offering an extensive instrumental music program from years 5 to 12. The college also offers a special focus Sports Academy program, providing a range of sports that includes Australian Rules, basketball, rugby, netball, soccer, volleyball and cricket.

Reynella East College was allocated funding of \$10 million as part of the Department for Education's capital works program. This funding allocation was the subject of a further contribution of \$1.2 million, with an additional \$1.8 million approved as part of the Capital Works Assistance Scheme (CWAS), which is a loan scheme as members will be aware. As a result, the total project funding is \$13 million.

Reynella East College requires capital works to provide sufficient capacity to accommodate approximately 1,900 students on the school site to cater for enrolment growth, including the transition of year 7 into high school in 2022. The Reynella East College redevelopment project will include the following scope of works:

- the construction of a new gymnasium, including four competition courts, change rooms and amenities;
- flexible classroom spaces;
- office space, staff amenities and storage areas;
- a commercial kitchen and canteen; and
- construction of a new car park and landscaping.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to this project and received assurances that the appropriate consultation had been undertaken. The committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to the appropriate agency consultation and does meet the criteria for the examination of projects as described in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Based on the evidence considered, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (11:56): Thank you to the Public Works Committee for their work on this project, and I would like to pass on my hearty congratulations to Principal Caroline Green and the governing council of the school, headed up for many years by Barry Temme, although he stood down at the end of last year. They played a big part in advocating for not just this but many other projects over the years at Reynella East.

Reynella East is one of the biggest schools in the state. There are around 1,800 young people who are in the care of Reynella East College, and that is expected to rise over the next few years up to around 2,000. They run an extraordinary volleyball program, amongst other sports at the school, and this particular piece of infrastructure is much needed in terms of their capacity to be able to support many young people in my community.

It is important to note that, although the data does not always reflect it, the socio-economic profile of quite a number of families in that area reflects that they really are the ones who need additional supports and investment. So I really appreciate the four-year journey that it has taken from announcement to the completion—almost—of these works, and I look forward to seeing the ribbon being cut later this year.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:57): I am really pleased to be able to speak on the Public Works Committee's report on the upgrade to Reynella East College. It is a \$13 million upgrade as part of what is now a \$1.4 billion body of work, improving our public schools around South Australia—the most significant contribution of any state government to upgrading their public schools in the state's history.

I join with the member for Hurtle Vale in particularly commending Caroline Green, the principal, who is a well-regarded leader around public education in South Australia and has been for

many years. Her journey as an educator in South Australia will, I am sure, continue for many years in one form or another after her retirement from her current role as principal, which is not too far away. She is going to be sorely missed, but Reynella East College will prosper and thrive.

I will be brief because we are running out of time, but can I say to anybody who is in the southern suburbs who has the possibility of driving past Reynella East College, right now you can see the skeleton of what is going to be the most spectacular school gym that you could possibly imagine in amongst some other upgrades to classrooms and other learning spaces. It is going to be dramatic and very impressive when it is completed towards the end of this year.

Currently, it is on track to be completed by the end of October. Indeed, whether there is a ribbon cutting at the end of this year or the beginning of next year, I look forward to joining the member for Hurtle Vale and potentially having a go on the basketball courts or one of the four basketball courts that are going to be underway in that gym, potentially, with Caroline Green.

Congratulations to Detail Studio Pty Ltd, Kennett Builders and all those in the education department—Helen Dwyer and her team—the Department for Infrastructure and Transport and the school governing council for their work on this project.

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:59): In view of the time, I acknowledge the contribution of all members and recommend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

Bills

APPROPRIATION BILL 2021

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 June 2021.)

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (12:00): I rise to indicate that I will be the opposition's lead speaker on the bill. It is not lost on me, the privilege that has been bestowed upon each and every one of us elected to this place. The men and women of this state have invested in each of us the authority to pursue the betterment of our society. It is a grave responsibility, and I take that responsibility seriously. Furthermore, it is not lost on me, the significance of having this privilege at this time: 2020 was arguably the most significant year our world has ever experienced since World War II.

As COVID-19 descended upon us early last year, the whole world knew that this crisis was going to be something different. In a new age of internationalism and globalism, this pandemic would encroach on all four corners of our planet. In Australia, in customary fashion, we have combined the good fortune of having a continent to ourselves with the hard work of our people and sound judgement to find ourselves in a better position than almost any other nation around the world in our handling of COVID-19.

In our federation, South Australia has been no exception. Through the leadership of our Public Service, from the Premier right down to the lowest paid and least recognised public servants, our state has responded well to the health crisis. We have all collectively backed the judgement of Grant Stevens and Nicola Spurrier to make the big calls, and they have got them right. The whole state's collective effort has undoubtedly saved lives, and the overwhelming suppression of the virus has thankfully mitigated the curse of mass unemployment. For this, I think we can all breathe a cautious sigh of relief.

However, we know there are many challenges that remain. As we speak, COVID-19 is causing increasing alarm in the state of New South Wales, reminding us all that the COVID story is not going to be over anytime soon. Only 4 per cent of our state's population is fully vaccinated, and our island continent remains closed to the rest of the world, a status nobody believes can be maintained in perpetuity.

As for our economy, despite the fact that today, and for the majority of this year, our state has had the worst unemployment rate in the nation, it is also true that as a nation our labour market

is in a better position than anyone would have expected 12 months ago. In no small part this is a function of the greatest fiscal stimulus our country and our state have ever known. The level of borrowing undertaken by a conservative government at the federal level, and a supposedly conservative government at the state level, is truly unprecedented—truly unprecedented.

We should be clear that every self-imposed metric on debt and borrowing that the former state Labor government rigorously applied to itself for 16 disciplined years was dismantled by the Marshall Liberal government in the two budgets before the pandemic. In the two budgets after the pandemic, those debt metrics have been completely obliterated. It will take decades for even the most shameless partisan South Australian Liberal to ever suggest that theirs is the party of fiscal discipline. Indeed, this budget all but guarantees that no Liberal will ever make comparisons between this Premier and his purported political mentor, John Howard.

While it is true that both expansionary fiscal policy and loose monetary policy have combined to keep people in work, it is also true that Australians intuitively know this cannot and will not last forever. People rightly expect that those on the treasury bench are making expenditure decisions that are oriented explicitly to either growing the economy or improving their wellbeing. Anything short of this is reckless.

If we are consciously going to burden future generations with unprecedented debt, then the least they are owed is a plan to pay that debt back while also inheriting a better society. I believe we can do both, not just because we must but because we have done it before. The post-COVID world does present our home state and our home country with an extraordinary opportunity, a rare opportunity, one that we have not seen since World War II.

Not too dissimilar to today, in the summer of 1945-46 Prime Minister Ben Chifley and South Australian Premier Thomas Playford presided over governments deeply indebted, but both led a population that was equally weary post World War II yet eternally optimistic about the days ahead. Both leaders knew the pursuit of economic growth was paramount, not for the sake of it but for the betterment of every man, woman and child. South Australians wanted industrial expansion but coupled with economic mobility and social progress—and both leaders delivered in spades.

Chifley, having taken on the leadership and the prime ministership in 1945, delivered major programs like Snowy Hydro; the establishment of what is today the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme; a huge housing build; massive social security reform, including new maternity allowances; university and technical college reform, including the establishment of the ANU; and the creation of the Commonwealth Employment Service—not bad in 4½ years.

Playford, having developed a taste for government action during the course of the war, acted equally assertively post the war: the mass expansion of the Housing Trust, the nationalisation of electricity supply and the establishment of ETSA, and the foundation of Elizabeth are just three examples. When my grandparents arrived in 1948 and 1949 they had literally nothing to their name, but they knew they had landed in a state with truly unparalleled opportunity.

Post World War II, both Chifley and Playford understood the significance of the opportunity they had to be leaders at that time. So they delivered policy, they grew the economy and built a fairer society. They did not just see the moment, they seized the moment. Chifley and Playford knew how to lead.

Fast-forward 75-odd years, and here we are with a strikingly similar opportunity to that of the post-World War II South Australian era. Spurrer and Stevens have delivered us COVID success, debt is high, the population is weary yet extremely optimistic. People appear willing to tolerate more debt, but they want a plan to pay it back and they expect any extra debt must deliver a better society. Therefore, reform is on the cards. The state is ready to be led.

Enter Premier Marshall, and what do we get? Cuts to health and a basketball stadium. The dilettante is exposed. In the big post-COVID pre-election budget, the only new idea the government has is to move a basketball stadium two kilometres up the road. If there is a virtue in this budget it is that it gives South Australians a crystal-clear window into what another four years of this government looks like: more talk but no delivery on infrastructure, more cuts to health and no new ideas. This budget represents a tragic waste of opportunity and a mud map to maintain our status as having the worst unemployment rate in the nation.

On this side of the house, we have a different plan. We have already started rolling out a serious economic policy to put our state on a trajectory of long-term growth, growth that is not only sustained by an ever-increasing debt burden. I submit two examples to you, Mr Speaker: firstly, our policy to lead from the front in reform on the higher education sector in this state. We have three good universities in South Australia, but none of them are in the top 100 globally. Our young adults deserve better. Young South Australian men and women should not have to travel interstate or overseas to get access to a world-leading university.

In a global context, South Australia is and should always aspire to be a high-wage economy. In a world where both capital and labour are increasingly mobile, our best chance to maintain our prosperity is to ensure that every last young person maximises the functionality of the muscle between their ears and the skills with their hands. Universities are central to this cause. Furthermore, research and development is a much unheralded key plank of growth policy in any advanced economy. Although some of our universities punch above their weight in R&D funding, we need more, and on this score size does matter.

We know that early in this Premier's term he was presented with an opportunity by the Adelaide University and the University of South Australia to show leadership, but this Premier chose to look the other way and did nothing. He squibbed it. If university amalgamation can deliver our state a top 100 university, increased R&D funding and greater access to higher education for our kids, then the state government should take an active interest in that reform. Despite the complexity and the difficulty and the controversy, Labor will show leadership on university amalgamation.

Secondly, I have announced the most ambitious hydrogen policy in the nation that, if elected, will see a Malinauskas Labor government deliver one of the largest hydrogen production facilities anywhere in the world. At its heart, my hydrogen plan is all about jobs—secure, well-paid, full-time jobs. We will build a 250-megawatt electrolyser, a 3,600-tonne hydrogen storage facility and a 200-megawatt combined cycle gas turbine fuelled by hydrogen. All of this will deliver cheaper, clean electricity produced right here in South Australia—not interstate but right here in South Australia.

The whole plant will be owned and operated by South Australians through a government-owned business enterprise. This policy will establish our state as the centre for the hydrogen industry, which has unlimited potential. The race is on around the globe for the key first-mover advantage in the hydrogen industry. With our abundant renewables, once derided by this Premier, we can lead this race and set about exporting clean, renewable energy and reinvigorating our manufacturing industry.

Again, this policy is complex. It is hard, but with leadership its delivery is not beyond the people of our state. Make no mistake: I am not naive to the fact that, politically, higher education reform and hydrogen are a harder sell than a basketball stadium, but this is the sort of serious industry policy our economy needs if we are going to grow our economy and expand our middle class while making it more prosperous.

These are the opportunities before us here and now that cannot wait for the election, but there are others even more glaring, like the chance to make Adelaide as the centre for mRNA vaccine production in the nation. In BioCina in Thebarton, we have the plant and the company that are ready to go with approvals in place.

So what are we waiting for? The Premier has not even picked up the phone to call the CEO. Let's be frank: if the CEO of BioCina is willing to make time for the opposition leader, I am sure he will make time for the Premier. If I had my hand on the tiller right now, I would be bending over backwards to get this deal done. Premier, on this you have my support. Let's work together and allocate what funding is needed to put our best foot forward and get this vaccine production off the ground in South Australia.

In Labor, we understand not everyone is going to work in vaccine production, or at Lot Fourteen for that matter, so other economic policy in other areas matters too, like major events. Given the Premier decided to axe our biggest, most economically successful major event without any thought being applied to what is replacing it, can the Premier please find another tourism minister—maybe even bring back Ridgy—because it has been eight months since the current tourism minister promised replacement events for the Adelaide 500. So far not one—seriously, not

one single event—has been announced to replace the Adelaide 500. Illuminate was announced before the Adelaide 500 cancellation. With the worst unemployment rate in the nation, we cannot afford to wait any longer.

Education has always been the central policy vehicle in our society to achieve upward mobility and fairness. Education is an area where there is much self-congratulation by this government with very little effort actually made. In short, on the one hand the vast majority of the investment made was inherited by this government and, on the other hand, the outcomes claimed in training are vastly overstated.

Before I explain what is so inaccurate in the budget and the summaries about education and training, I will congratulate the government on one element of the education budget: the investment in health checks in early childhood is a worthy one and one that this side of the chamber wholeheartedly endorses. We know how important the early years are, not only in guiding development but also in intervening if there are challenges. 'The earlier the better' is the mantra for early childhood education and development.

But let us return to the issue of the government claiming to be spending so much more money than ever before on education. As the government papers themselves explain, when you turn up or look to the detail, the increase in education spending is as a result of enrolment increases in public schools—as a result, I hope, in part, because of the investments made by the former Labor government—and the increasing numbers of students with identified disabilities, and the flow-on of the increase in funding of what was left over from the Gonski deal.

The Gonski funding was fought for by teachers, SSOs, principals and parents. It was fought for by state and federal Labor. It was not fought for by the South Australian Liberal Party, but they are happy to claim the increase as it flows in. Similarly, the government claims a massive increase in apprenticeship and traineeship commencements, illustrating the claim with a graph. It is always worth reading the fine print when it comes to this government, and there is an asterisk that says it all: 'The Skilling Australia Fund includes pre-apprenticeships-traineeships and apprenticeship "like" activity.'

In other words, the data the government congratulates itself on is not the same as the data it compares itself to, which is actual apprenticeship and traineeship commencements. Let us not overlook the \$143 million decline in the innovation and skills budget over this budget because the federally funded Skilling Australia program comes to an end. What happens afterwards? Nothing, according to the budget.

Then there is the all-important area of our natural world. This government has tried to slide into Labor's slipstream on climate change, going from deriding South Australia's investment in renewable energy in the Bolt report to embracing Labor's legacy as its own. We want climate change to be bipartisan—it should be—but that requires action to match the rhetoric. The first sign of trouble came in the first Marshall budget, which slashed \$11 million from climate change work in the environment portfolio.

This has been followed by tepid policies on having a plan to have a strategy on hydrogen while we watch the other states start to seriously enter the race to profit from making the low-carbon transition. The Climate Council report card in 2017 on the renewable energy race had South Australia far ahead of the rest of the nation. By 2018, Tasmania and the ACT had caught up to us and the rest of the states are well on their way. Make no mistake: the state and the nation that moves quickest on not only having low-carbon energy grids but also being able to export that energy will secure its place in the emerging 21st century economy.

Is there any awareness of that in this budget? The short answer is no. There is not one mention of climate change in the budget speech—not one mention of climate change in the budget speech. There is no real policy in the entire budget. The nearest it comes to that is \$2.1 million for clean energy initiatives that come to an end after the first two years.

A policy designed to undermine transition to a low-carbon economy is, of course, the electric vehicle tax, which was announced last year, then delayed and now announced again. This tax would make South Australia the only state with no financial incentive to buy an electric car yet have a tax to make it more expensive to run one. It is clear that we will not have the full range of electric cars

available in South Australia, including the newer, cheaper vehicles, if there is no growing market for them, and this government appears to be absolutely determined to make sure there will not be one.

What is also under threat in South Australia as a result of this government is the natural environment—nature. In 3½ short years, the Minister for Environment has racked up quite the record. He has been found by a royal commission to have capitulated to the Eastern States in regard to the River Murray and since then has delivered not one drop of the 450 gigalitres due to South Australia. He has managed to agitate communities across the state—the phone is ringing hot.

The Kangaroo Island community, for example, were so appalled by his approval of a private development on clifftops in the Flinders Chase National Park that they went to court to seek a review of the decision. He slashed marine park sanctuaries despite the recommendation of his own scientific review that they be kept intact. He put out a proposal for consultation for seven soccer pitches for the Belair National Park, and, when the backlash forced him to retreat, he tried to distance himself from the idea, leaving the club to carry the can.

He proposed putting a road for trucks through the dunes at Semaphore and found it was not needed after all when all the locals started to push back. He was part of two government decisions that have now been reversed, one to remove memorial pine trees at Hove for the ill-fated level crossing and the other to demolish the state heritage listed Waite Gatehouse, which was suddenly able to be relocated. It is not a great record coming into the final year before an election.

What has he achieved in this budget? In this budget, the minister is evicting the National Trust, a community organisation that has been headquartered at Ayers House for 50 years and spending money on the building to put a government department in it. Make no mistake: Labor has no issue with the History Trust; it is a fine agency, worthy of support. It is the government and this minister who have chosen to pit the National Trust against the History Trust by evicting one in favour of the other.

In this budget, there is nothing for nature, other than giving some councils more money to plant trees. Labor has no issue with money for trees, but nature is more important and the challenges the planet faces more serious than this budget reflects. As the Conservation Council calls it, this is a deeply disappointing budget that does not keep up with the huge challenges we face in the areas of climate and biodiversity protection.

Health: every South Australian was looking to this budget for a response to the health crisis. The first pages that anyone worth their salt was looking at when the budget papers were handed down on Tuesday were those that refer to health expenditure and staffing in the health system. I was stunned, genuinely shocked, that in this budget this government in the upcoming financial year are reducing funding to our health system. They are reducing staff in the LHNs of our health system. Our health system is in crisis. People are calling out for change.

I have spent some time in recent months trying to talk to frontline workers about their experiences in the health system. You can read all the briefings in the world and you can have all the arguments about the statistics you like, but nothing replicates talking to someone on the frontline and hearing the experience they are having to endure.

I think it is sometimes true in politics and public policy generally that small issues can be exaggerated and inflated and can mischaracterise an issue as a crisis when there is not one. But anybody who has spoken to people who work in our health system will tell you that this is real. It is real and it is getting worse. Stories from the Ambulance Service are particularly pertinent, particularly disconcerting; one is the story of Judi and Pauline.

Sixty-six-year-old Judi of Aldinga was ramped outside the Flinders Medical Centre for 6½ hours in August last year with a perforated bowel with complications. She then spent another two hours stuck on a gurney next to the entrance door of the ED before finally seeing a doctor. Judi's 86-year-old mother, Pauline, suffered the same fate to an even more horrifying degree, forced to wait for seven hours on the ramp at Flinders after waiting 2½ hours for an ambulance to attend her nursing home. With another six ambulances ramped before hers and a suspected neck injury, Pauline was required to stay completely still at the age of 86, unable to move for seven hours.

Next is Amanda, who presented to The Queen Elizabeth Hospital last month with suicidal thoughts. She was offered a longer term care bed in Queenstown and multiple days of care to recover, and then that offer was abruptly taken away because Amanda was told there were not enough beds. Amanda said she is reluctant to head back to hospital even if she thinks she needs to because she knows ramping is out of control and she is worried she will be turned away again.

Then there is Sarah, whose six-month-old niece was experiencing breathing difficulties and frothing from the mouth at her Mile End home. Sarah's sister Emily phoned the ambulance at approximately 6.40pm and the case was classified as a priority 2. For those unaware, that is a life-threatening case. A SPRINT car arrived on scene and warned that, because of extreme ramping, there were no ambulances available to transfer them to hospital. They waited for over an hour before an ambulance was available to attend. Both of Sarah's own daughters have existing breathing difficulties, so they stayed on FaceTime together through the horrifying wait. Sarah summed it up perfectly when she said:

There are no concerns whatsoever with the care my niece received from paramedics and those at the WCH—who were all fantastic, professional and caring. But the wait times are unacceptable and downright dangerous.

Yesterday, I had a cup of coffee with four or five ambos at a coffee joint in Hindmarsh. Naturally, there is a predisposition for our frontline workers not to disclose their stories. They are a resilient bunch and not accustomed to showing struggle. We should be conscious of the fact that our ambos are some of the most intelligent South Australians we have. It is not easy to become a paramedic. You have to get into a university degree with a TER of something like 98 or 99 just to get in the door. These are highly intelligent individuals with compassion in their hearts.

Yesterday, I was talking to a few of the ambulance officers and I met Sam from Mount Barker. Sam enlightened me that in Mount Barker there is one ambulance for a population something in the order of 30,000 people and growing apace. Sam explained to me that basically on every shift that he and his workmates have to endure, if you get one callout and the second one comes, there is nothing. He told me one story that I have struggled to stop thinking about.

He told me that he got dispatched from Mount Barker to go to a hillside town, which I will not name because it is small and I do not want to compromise the patient. He was dispatched from Mount Barker to a small town, and normally that town would be serviced by the Woodside ambulance. Woodside to this town is about a 15-minute response time.

The parents had called the Ambulance Service because their five-year-old child was experiencing multiple seizures that were not stopping, and it had never happened before. They called the Ambulance Service and they waited and they waited. The 15-minute response time passed. Sam's crew was dispatched from Mount Barker and it took 40 minutes to get there. They rolled up, came down the driveway, the parents were waiting at the bottom of the driveway, and mum was completely beside herself.

Two seconds later I am hearing another story from another ambo about his being stuck, internally ramped, with a father who was beside himself after their 11-year-old son had attempted to commit suicide. And then there was the next story, and then there was the next story. You cannot hear stories like this and justify \$600 million of taxpayers' money being spent on a basketball stadium.

To our ambos, amongst so many others in our Ambulance Service, I know you are crying out for change. I know that you are not crying out for your own interests. You are crying out for the interests of your fellow South Australians who look in your eyes in their time of greatest need. I want to say to our ambulance officers: I have heard your call, my team has heard your call, the people of South Australia hear your call, and we will not let you down.

When you hear the real-life stories that are happening every day in our health system right now, you cannot possibly justify a basketball stadium, which is why I will not. I have announced today that a Malinauskas Labor government will not proceed with the basketball stadium. The \$600 million of South Australia's money that Premier Marshall will spend on the stadium I will spend on the things that really matter, and nothing is more important right now than getting our health system right. Instead of the basketball stadium, we will invest in our ambos and our hospitals. Furthermore, I commit today that, of those funds, at least \$100 million will go to our regional communities—to Country Health.

Elections are always about choices, and with a whole 10 months to go there are already a few: a South Australian-owned public transport system running for the interests of people, or a private public transport system running for overseas profit? The Adelaide 500 or nothing? Lead on hydrogen, or wait for someone else to go first? Invest in our health system, or build a basketball stadium? These are the decisions that the people of our state will have to make in nine months' time. And there will be more to come, but none more so than who will lead our state into the 2020s.

I have been observing this Premier rather closely over the last 3½ years, and a theme has been emerging: it is always someone else's call. Just think about it for a moment. The most obvious example is our COVID response. Just as COVID-19 was starting up, the Premier handed all his authority over to Grant Stevens and Nicola Spurrier, and thankfully that has served us well, very well, which is probably why the Premier seeks to take all the credit. But when things go bad, it is always someone else's advice that is responsible.

Think: the member for Schubert and the bus cuts; Rob Lucas and the land tax debacle; Scott Morrison's position and ours on medi-hotels; the upstream Nats for his government's capitulation on the River Murray; the WA Premier and Malcolm Turnbull dictating our GST share for the benefit of Western Australians; and my favourite, the SATC for the Adelaide 500.

You never heard the Premier saying, 'I made the decision to cancel it and here are the reasons why.' Instead, it was, 'The SATC recommended it, so I took their advice.' Premier, if all you do is take other people's advice, why are you here? I am afraid to say it, but this government is not being led by a Premier, it is being led by an MC. A leader who wants all the credit but none of the responsibility is not a leader at all.

I do not need the credit, but I do want the responsibility because we do live in the greatest state in the greatest country in the world. COVID has put that up in lights. But if we are going to maintain our standard of living and hand over South Australia to our children in a better state than the one that we enjoy, we have to realise the opportunities staring us in the face, just as Chifley and Playford did.

If this Premier will not seize the post-COVID opportunity, then I will. Where the Premier's team is not ready to step up to the policy plate, mine is. We are united and excited about the months ahead. In March next year, my team and I will humbly submit our policy and ourselves to the people of this state. With their blessing, we will do good things for the great people of South Australia because goodness knows they deserve nothing less.

There being a disturbance in the galleries:

The SPEAKER: Order! Expressions from the galleries are disorderly, including applause from the galleries.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (12:36): I rise today to make my contribution to the appropriation debate and to indicate how disappointed I am by the lack of direction in the budget handed down on Tuesday. As a commentator noted on breakfast radio yesterday, this is the response the government makes when it knows a response is needed but does not know what that response should be. He summed it up well. Across my portfolios of trade, tourism and investment, I could not agree more, because what is missing is a real plan for recovery and renewal.

Let me start with trade and investment. In the budget papers across the forward estimates, the Department for Trade and Investment's operating expenses will be massively reduced from \$62 million to \$42 million. This cut means that seven FTEs are gone this year, nearly 5 per cent of the FTEs of the whole department. How do we expect the department to achieve its goals with continued cuts?

Let's talk about the failures of this government in trade and investment and key performance indicators on the South Australian share of foreign investment. When this government was still experiencing the flow of investment from the work of Investment Attraction South Australia in 2019-20, South Australia had 15 per cent of the national share of foreign direct investment. Today, we have achieved just over 6 per cent. It is in black and white that we have gone backwards.

There is also the failure of South Australian exports in the share of national trade. The minister for this portfolio recently crowed about our trade success and whilst overseas—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The leader will not interject from out of his place. My point is: the leader has had his opportunity. He was listened to in silence, as will be the member for Ramsay.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Whilst overseas goods exports did increase over the past 12 months, they remain at only 3.3 per cent of national overseas goods exports. This is far away from the 7 per cent target this government set itself and well below 4.3 per cent when Labor was in government. This target is unlikely to be achieved as we battle several challenges.

Whilst there is money in the budget for trade diversification of our wine sector, it would be remiss of me not to mention that the China tariffs are still going to have ongoing impacts on jobs. About 8,000 South Australians are involved in the grape and wine industry alone. Our state at its peak exported nearly \$800 million worth of wine to China each year, making up the majority of Australia's \$1.2 billion in wine exports to China. As well as producing 42 per cent of Australian wine grapes, we produce 78 per cent of Australia's highest quality grapes.

As we pivot away from China, we are now in a rush to look to other markets like the US, the UK and the Indo-Pacific. The recent announcement about the wine export support is simply not enough to truly support the massive impact on this industry. Jared Stringer, the President of the Adelaide Hills Wine Region, said in *The Advertiser* that, whilst there are some really good green shoots in some overseas markets, it would be naive to think that more than \$1 billion previously bought by China could be easily absorbed by other markets. This is jobs in South Australia. It needs our support; it does not need cuts.

Let's talk about trade offices. One of the key trade announcements is the creation of a trade office in Paris to capitalise on the opportunities arising from the free trade agreement with the UK. While I have no objection to the opening of trade offices per se, I do have concerns that the best intelligence tells us that for these offices to work effectively and achieve results on the ground they need to be well resourced and supported back here at home. The reduction in staff at a local level seems to raise questions about whether this support is going to be delivered. I am also concerned that there is no apparent funding to resume trade missions when international borders eventually reopen.

At a recent trade round table I convened, one of the several key takeaways was the importance of Australian companies actually meeting with potential buyers face to face. It was also noted that, while trade shows were of use, nothing replaces the building of relationships one on one and that government can have an important role in facilitating and supporting this initial contact. There is great disappointment that this department has cut once again and this government has failed to achieve, on its own metrics, an increase in foreign direct investment, going backwards from what we had before, and of course our national share of exports is nowhere near 7 per cent.

Let me now turn to tourism because the tourism sector, as has been acknowledged, has been one of the hardest hit by the COVID-19 pandemic. With our national borders closed to the rest of the world and snap border closures across the nation hindering interstate travel, the toll on this sector has been enormous. We have seen a massive decline in our annual visitor economy from a high of \$8.1 billion at the end of December 2019 to now just \$4.7 billion. It is expected that this will decrease even further this year. Let's just hear that again: a massive decrease of \$3.4 billion to the South Australian economy. What does that mean? It means jobs—jobs lost in a significant industry. It means real people losing their livelihood in what was previously a growth industry sector.

Let us remind ourselves that, prior to COVID, 18,000 businesses were engaged in the visitor economy, employed in tourism and hospitality, and we had reached a high of 40,500 people directly employed in this industry. It is not up for debate. It is a simple fact that the visitor economy has taken a massive hit. You would think that a sector of our economy that has had a \$3.4 billion hit would deserve continued attention—not just one-off but continued attention. That is what is so disappointing.

Many of the employers in this space tend to be run by families who run smaller microbusinesses. Tourism Research Australia data in June 2020 showed that 89.8 per cent of businesses in this space are small. Smaller businesses, usually family run, employ between one and 19 employees. With the end of JobKeeper, we sadly saw that a number of them closed their doors,

particularly those reliant on international travel that could not easily or economically pivot to the domestic market, such as travel agents.

We know that with snap border closures our tourism operators face instant cancellations, so I know today we will have tourism operators throughout South Australia accepting cancellations and spending their time arranging refunds. I am not criticising the need to close borders. What I am drawing attention to is the continued impact on our visitor economy. It needs our attention; it needs our support.

Of course, even before COVID-19 tourism was an incredibly competitive space. Marketing our state to ensure that we maintain our state's percentage of domestic tourism is vital, and we are going backwards on that metric. The South Australian Tourism Commission National Visitor Survey, released in March, shows that our interstate overnight trips decreased from 2019 to 2020 by a whopping 61 per cent—61 per cent.

As I have talked about in this house before, there is a two-speed economy emerging in tourism post COVID. Whilst some operators in some regions have reported good summer bookings and early signs of a positive winter, this is patchy at best. In fact, the government's own budget papers state:

It is important to note that the impact on the regional visitor economy of COVID-19 has not been uniform, and there are many regional tourism operators, particularly those previously reliant on international, interstate or corporate markets, for whom business conditions remain suppressed.

That is in your own budget papers. The Tourism and Transport Forum's previous analysis has reported that the South Australian Tourism Commission would need at least \$400 million over the next four years to address the economic black hole the pandemic and the bushfires have left.

Despite this landscape, this budget has continued in the true Marshall Liberal government style by rolling out more cuts in this important sector—\$20 million of them, in fact, over the next four years. Let me just read this out for you. When we look at the operating expenses for tourism for 2021 it is \$96 million; in the coming financial year, down to \$92 million; in 2023-24, down to \$88 million; then \$75 million; and by 2024-25 it is \$72 million.

This is a massive cut. This is even more concerning given the fact that nearly \$10 million of this is being cut from the tourism marketing budget this coming financial year. So at a time when our competitors are investing to market their states, to maximise their holiday at home advantage, South Australia is going backwards.

Tourism is a job creating sector, and it creates jobs fast. We know that every dollar invested in tourism exponentially grows our visitor economy and with it brings jobs. South Australia regained the unwanted title of highest unemployment rate in May with 5.8 per cent. We have 53,900 people looking for work, and it beggars belief that instead of using this as an opportunity to grow and support this sector we saw nothing of that in the budget. So I am genuinely starting to believe that this government either does not get it or, possibly worse, places no value in it.

Our Premier, Premier Marshall, is responsible for tourism. Where was your voice for this industry? You are letting them down. You think your job is done. You are abandoning them. It is not done. This is a government that does not believe that tourism is worthy of government support, despite the sector being largely made up of mum-and-dad businesses in regional South Australia.

Let's talk about the vouchers because this Marshall Liberal government had to be dragged kicking and screaming to do anything to help the tourism sector. From as early as June 2020, the Labor opposition was calling on the state government to launch a travel voucher scheme to assist the sector, similar to the one in the NT and Tasmania.

The Great State Voucher scheme, when it was finally announced in October, only covered specific accommodation providers, excluding other businesses, such as hospitality, travel agents, experiences, tours and attractions, offering \$50 vouchers in regional areas and \$100 for the CBD and North Adelaide. This is well short of the \$200 vouchers proposed by the opposition, which would have covered the entire state and all people and businesses involved in tourism.

Once dragged to the party, the first iteration of the scheme was stingy and narrowly focused, benefiting only 3 per cent of all listings on the government-run southaustralia.com. It was only in

response to lobbying on behalf of other tourism-related operators that finally in round 3 there was support for tourism experiences. I had someone talk to me the other day who said it was fantastic for their small startup. They had \$9,000 worth of bookings through that experiences voucher—something that we had been calling for from the very beginning.

We know that when JobKeeper was ending people were very concerned about what was going to happen to the tourism industry. Many people believed that the Morrison government would extend JobKeeper for those involved in tourism, but of course it did not happen. We know the tourism vouchers have had some success.

However, we remain concerned about their low redemption rates and the fact that it was bungled from the beginning, focusing just on accommodation and not supporting travel agents and experiences. You have to wonder what the outcome might have been for this voucher scheme had it been correctly targeted and properly promoted with a broad registration of operators and businesses across the sector.

I want to touch on events because the Premier, with great acclaim, started the events advisory committee in November 2020 to supercharge the events calendar after the axing of the Adelaide 500 Supercars race. When we asked the chief executive of the SATC, Rodney Harrex, for a definition of the group's role recently in the Budget and Finance Committee, this is what he said:

The group acts as a think tank, in terms of providing a forum to share suggestions and ideas regarding additional leisure event opportunities for South Australia.

So South Australians have been asking: what is going to replace the Adelaide 500? Let us remind ourselves that in 2019 the Adelaide 500 injected \$45.9 million into the state's economy and attracted more than 15,000 interstate visitors. It was a shock announcement when this Premier made the decision to cut this event. Let's be clear: this decision is still burning in the community. They are angry about the axing, and that is why Labor—agile and led by a great leader—made the decision to commit to South Australians that Supercars will be back.

It is six months since the establishment of the events advisory committee—six months—and there is not one new major event to replace the cancellation of the Adelaide 500. What was the point of this Events Advisory Group? There are some great people around that table, yet nothing has been announced.

There is an interesting definition of what a new event seems to encompass. In fact, in the budget papers, apparently there are new events happening, but they are not quite what we were thinking. Apparently, annual events that have been resecured by the SATC, such as the Masters Games or the State of Origin, are now new major events. Apparently, the 10 years at the Adelaide International at Memorial Drive is considered a new event. Exhibitions at the Art Gallery are now new events. Securing a change of sponsor may also trigger capturing new event status. These are not new events: this is business as usual. This is what the Tourism Commission does. None of these events come anywhere close to replacing the economic impact of or the jobs lost from the Adelaide 500.

With no Adelaide 500, we now have a massive hole in our events calendar. With the continued closure of national borders, the Tour Down Under is likely to be small again. How are we going to replace those 15,000 interstate visitors here? When you look at this, others have done more. Just last week, New South Wales announced a \$200 million fund to market for significant events. There is nothing like that in this budget. The impacts of COVID will be with us in the tourism industry for many years.

Time expired.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (12:57): I, too, rise to speak to the Appropriation Bill. This is a budget of misplaced priorities and wasted opportunities. Sadly, this is a budget demonstrative of a deep lack of care for South Australians who most need support and a budget demonstrative of a government that refuses to hear our community's growing calls for change.

Budgets always speak to what a government prioritises and values and to how a government understands or does not understand the needs of the community and what matters to them. This budget is no different. Interminably, we hear the clichéd slogans over and over again from those opposite that they are building what matters—hollow, clichéd words without substance and often

uttered to avoid answering questions, slogans given by a government that absolutely does not understand nor has any compassion for what actually matters to our community. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Independent Commissioner Against Corruption and Office for Public Integrity—Evaluation of the Practices, Policies and Procedures of the Department for Correctional Services

By the Minister for Education (Hon. J.A.W. Gardner)—

Chief Public Health Officer—Report—July 2018 to June 2020

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I acknowledge and draw honourable members' attention to the presence in the galleries presently of participant members of the 2021 Governor's Leadership Foundation Program. Welcome to all of you to the house.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:03): I bring up the 151st report of the committee, entitled Breakout Creek Stage 3 Redevelopment Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr CREGAN: I bring up the 152nd report of the committee, entitled Kangaroo Island Desalination Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Question Time

RIVERBANK ARENA

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04): My question is to the Premier. When will the Premier cancel his basketball stadium?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader might repeat the question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I would be more than happy to, Mr Speaker. The question being to the Premier: when will the Premier cancel his basketball stadium?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:05): I don't know how the Leader of the Opposition or the Australian Labor Party go about their policy announcements, but we are not planning on cancelling the Riverbank arena. We think it's an excellent proposal. We think it's focused on jobs. In fact, the budget that was handed down on Tuesday was incredibly focused on two key

areas: the first of those was job creation and the second of those was fixing the health mess that we inherited from those opposite, and we have very significantly leant into those two options.

Jobs are very important. We have more people employed in South Australia now than in any time in the history of South Australia. They hate that opposite, but in the last two months 20,000 jobs have been created in South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and Tuesday's budget was all about creating that ongoing momentum to create more and more jobs in South Australia to keep South Australians here, to bring South Australians back into South Australia. We've got the runs on the board. There are more people employed in South Australia now than at any time in the history of the nation.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Those opposite, when they were in the last four years of their pitiful government the unemployment rate was 6.8 per cent. It is now 5.8 per cent.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurana!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The cherrypickers love to look at one month or one quarter, but look at the last four years they were in government—6.8 per cent.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is called to order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No global pandemic. In fact, when the global pandemic hit, those opposite were saying, 'This is an absolute disaster. We're going to have double-digit unemployment in South Australia.' In fact, some of the political commentators were saying that we were going to have an unemployment rate in South Australia that was going to be 13.1 per cent. In fact, it's 5.8 per cent. We started off the year at 7.1 per cent; we are down to 5.8 per cent. We have created 20,000 jobs in South Australia in the last two months and there is plenty more to come, and that's what this budget was all about.

The Riverbank arena is not only about creating more jobs in South Australia—more construction jobs in South Australia but also more ongoing jobs in South Australia. We know that the Convention Centre here in South Australia is a great precinct, which both sides of politics have invested in over the longer term. I think that the original was Premier John Bannon with the ASER project.

Mr Boyer interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I know that John Olsen and his government then did a further development. I think the previous government did two additional developments. It's a pity that they didn't do it to the requisite size because we know that we are continuing to lose more and more conferences and conventions to South Australia, and these bring money into our state. They create jobs in this state.

The Adelaide Entertainment Centre is much loved by all South Australians, but it's too small, it's tired and it's in the wrong place. The Riverbank arena will address these issues. This is a project that has gone off to Infrastructure SA to make sure that there is a return on this project for the taxpayers in South Australia. The Leader of the Opposition likes to characterise this as a basketball stadium. He likes to characterise it—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You did.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —as something that is going to—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —cost the people of South Australia. Actually, it's an investment. After all the interest and all the depreciation, it returns a surplus to the people of South Australia, which can then be used—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —for other important projects in our state. It has been independently verified by Infrastructure SA, and most importantly it will create not only the direct jobs here in South Australia but a flow-on effect to our CBD in South Australia, which is doing it tough, like most other CBDs around the world.

Can you imagine, after a conference, after a concert, after a basketball or netball match, people flooding into the city. They don't do that at Hindmarsh. They finish their event and they go home. We want that economic stimulus. We want jobs. That's what we stand for in this government.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the leader, I warn the member for Wright, I call to order the members for Playford and Kaurna, I warn the member for Lee, I call to order the Deputy Premier, and I call to order the leader.

RIVERBANK ARENA

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): My question is to the Premier. For clarity, is the Premier confirming to the house that there is no circumstance under which he will dump his basketball stadium policy?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:09): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for giving me another four minutes to talk about the important aspects of the Riverbank arena in South Australia. This is an important part of our state, and it has been somewhat neglected for a long period of time.

That is one of the reasons why a previous Liberal administration in South Australia said that we needed to bring football back into the city, a proposal that was initially pooh-poohed by those opposite: they said, 'No way.' In fact, they went down to the SANFL and down to Football Park—of blessed memory—and said, 'We're going to put \$100 million or \$150 million into keeping you down here.' But the people of South Australia wanted the activities to occur in the CBD, and I think there were two excellent proposals —

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that were taken to the 2014 election: one by the Labor Party and one by the Liberal opposition at the time—

An honourable member: 2010.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The 2010 election, quite right.

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Playford!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Ultimately, we now have football in the city, and I think—

Mr Brown: And who won that election?

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —most people appreciate that that has been very good for our city, it's been very good for football, it's been very good for cricket. Of course, we have listened to the people at the Stadium Management Authority—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —when they said, 'What we would also like to do is have a hotel within that precinct.' What did those opposite say? No. They said, 'No, we don't want that here in South Australia.' Actually, the people of South Australia love that new hotel in there. The member for Lee can't stop going on about how much he hated it. He also didn't like—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —the extension to the Memorial Drive tennis courts.

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

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. The member for West Torrens rises on a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 98, sir: the Premier is not answering the substance of the question but is debating the answer.

The SPEAKER: Well, on the point of order, member for West Torrens, the question—which I listened to carefully and noted down, as members observe I am in the practice of doing—was about as broad a question as one can imagine in some respects, in that it invited consideration of all the circumstances that might pertain to the consideration of the proposition that was put to the Premier. The Premier is answering the question. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, sir. Those opposite also didn't like the plan to put a cover over Memorial Drive. I don't know why they don't want to see that precinct in South Australia developed. I don't know why they don't want to see people coming into the CBD, spending money with our pubs, our clubs, our hotels, restaurants. People coming in, that is the focus for us at the moment because the CBD is doing it very, very tough.

Those opposite say, 'Is there any circumstance, ever, where you won't proceed?' Well, I suppose if there were a nuclear holocaust, if there were a volcano that erupted out of the sea and shattered South Australia, maybe it would be a problem. But we envisage we will be delivering the Riverbank arena, we will be creating jobs in South Australia and, more than that, we will be fixing the mess we inherited from those opposite with the failed Transforming Health and making sure we can take ramping out of South Australia and provide South Australia with the health service it deserves.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the leader, I call to order the member for Hurtle Vale, I call to order the Minister for Child Protection, I call to order the Minister for Innovation and Skills and I call to order the Minister for Education.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the minister!

RIVERBANK ARENA

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier's city-based basketball stadium have support from all his party room, particularly the members for Chaffey, MacKillop, Flinders and Hammond?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:13): We are obviously looking at these proposals very, very carefully but, rather than making decisions on the back of an envelope, we go through detailed planning and consideration. One of the things we do very differently from the previous government is submit those plans to Infrastructure SA for its independent verification.

This was a proposal we took to the 2014 election. It was a proposal we took to the 2018 election. We were the only state in Australia that didn't have an infrastructure body, an independent umpire, if you like, to look at the way we spend the state's capital and make sure we get return on that investment—the only state.

One of the first things that we did on coming to government was to put legislation in the parliament to establish an infrastructure body in South Australia. That is chaired by Tony Shepherd, and we have other very reputable and high-calibre people who are on that board, including Carolyn Hewson and three of our own chief executives of departments. It is headed up by chief executive Jeremy Conway. They look at a long-range, productive infrastructure plan for South Australia.

We also have Capital Intentions Statements. You would have seen, in the most recent Capital Intentions Statement, that this is a project ready for investment. So that is how we made our decision: is this the right way to spend the finite capital of South Australians? Will it give an adequate return? Because there is finite capital and there are infinite projects that government could spend their money on. One of the areas of focus for us is whether or not this will create jobs and whether or not it will cost or give a return to us in South Australia.

We know that once this project is delivered, after meeting all its interest costs and all its depreciation costs, it will still give a further return to the taxpayers of South Australia—not just a financial return but a jobs return, and it will also stop a leakage. Too many people are travelling interstate to go to concerts, flying directly over the top of South Australia. Why? Because the capacity of the existing Entertainment Centre, when it is set up for concerts, is 8,300—8,300.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We are going to take it up to 15,000, which massively improves the viability. It will bring people into South Australia and stop that leakage out of our state. I was very disappointed—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —because, in the last couple of months, the Land Forces conference was held in Brisbane. This is despite the fact that we had historically held the Land Forces conference in Adelaide and it had brought millions and millions of dollars into our economy. Every single hotel in the entire city was full. The people who hire equipment for exhibitions were all flat out. Our restaurants were busy, our bars were busy and our cafes were busy. This was a very good time for our state. We lost that conference to Brisbane because we didn't have the capacity.

We said to them, 'But we have got the capacity. We might have to put some in the CBD and maybe some out at Wayville.' No. 'What about some in the city and some down at Hindmarsh?' No. 'What about some on the southern bank of the Torrens and some on the northern bank, within the Adelaide Oval?' No. 'What about if we build a marquee on the riverfront?' (This is how desperate we were to get this here.) No. They want high-calibre, high-capacity venues for the larger conferences. That's what this will return.

Those opposite love to characterise it, for political terms, as a basketball stadium. The reality is that the Riverbank arena—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —will bring increased capacity for conferences, for concerts and also for our sporting teams.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the leader, I call to order and warn the member for Mawson, I call to order the member for Badcoe and I warn the member for West Torrens.

RIVERBANK ARENA

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Does the minister provide unqualified support for the city basketball stadium?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:18): Well, Mr Speaker, it—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the Premier!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: It is a long time since I have played basketball—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —but let me tell you, it's still in my blood; it is still very much in my blood. More than that, I went to the Land Forces conference when it was held here in Adelaide, and it was an outstanding conference—an absolutely outstanding conference. So many of us on this side of the chamber were terribly disappointed when it would not be held in Adelaide again this year.

It is an extension to the Convention Centre that we are talking about—the Convention Centre that has been extended year after year by government after government. This is a continuation of solid, smart investment. We are putting more money into health, more money into education, more money into transport, more money into disability services, etc., and we are putting more money into extending the Convention Centre—and guess what? We will also be able to have some sport played there. We will also be able to have some sport there. So, yes, I do give my unqualified support to this project in exactly the same way as I give my unqualified support to the—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I do give my unqualified support, just as I do to the road building—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —just as I do to the projects that we are doing in Port Pirie, Port Augusta, Whyalla, the outback, the Mid North, Southern Flinders and all those places. This is something that regional people will benefit from. If those opposite had their way—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: If those opposite had their way they would prevent every single regional person from coming to Adelaide Oval to watch Port Power or the Crows play. They would say, 'No, you stay there.' Regional people will benefit from this facility by being able to come down to do it as they currently do for lots of things in the CBD. They will thoroughly enjoy it, and regional people will benefit through the tourism opportunities, through the people who come from interstate and overseas into South Australia for conferences—and those conferences always have additional packages attached to them for people to go out and enjoy our food, our wine, our amazing scenery, our regional tourism opportunities. Regional South Australia will benefit from this very important project of extending the Convention Centre.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Newland, I call to order the member for Davenport, I call to order the member for Hammond, I call to order the member for Chaffey and I call to order the Premier.

TEA TREE PLAZA PARK-AND-RIDE

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:21): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is building what matters by investing in the Tea Tree Plaza park-and-ride?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:21): I thank the member for Newland for his question. I am getting a little bit hoarse in the voice with all the infrastructure projects that I have been talking about over the last few days. It's amazing and great to see, and the member for Newland should be holding his head incredibly high in his community because he is delivering a brand-new \$48.5 million park-and-ride with 400-plus spaces for his community, with 215 jobs in construction in the process. That is outstanding.

Those living in the north-eastern suburbs have seen and will continue to see a massive investment in public transport by the Marshall Liberal government.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You sound sick?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, not sick.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Sore throat?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No. Working my voice over—

The SPEAKER: The minister will not respond to the interjection.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —talking up our great infrastructure projects, and I am glad you're so interested. When we came into government the first cab off the rank—of course, thanks to the lion of Hartley—we did the Paradise park-and-ride, and the member for Morialta was incredibly involved in this as well, a \$23 million park-and-ride there, loved by the people of his community.

Next, the member for King—the queen of King, as they call her—pushed forward with a park-and-ride: \$33.5 million in Golden Grove. That is currently under construction and it looks absolutely outstanding. Now we see a further \$48.5 million to build a second park-and-ride at Tea Tree Plaza. That's around \$105 million to build these three park-and-rides, which means more than a thousand car parks for the people of the north-east.

Our budget for a stronger South Australia, creating more jobs, building what matters and delivering better services is what we promised and that is what we are delivering. With a thousand new car parks thanks to the advocacy of the member for King, the member for Hartley, the member for Newland and also the member for Morialta, we are delivering public transport infrastructure for the people of the north-east.

The former government like to talk about public transport infrastructure and they like to talk about park-and-rides, but they just did not walk the walk. The Premier and I had a good laugh last Friday when the member for West Torrens tried to justify it and say, 'No, we were going to build two park-and-rides for \$15 million.' What fairyland is he living in? He is absolutely kidding himself. We are investing \$105 million to build three. That's what it cost. We did the work, we did the analysis and that's what it costs to build these park-and-rides for the people of the north-east. They do not believe the member for West Torrens when he says he could have built two for \$15 million. They know that it is just not correct.

The people of the north-east know too, that Labor is all bark, no bite. For 16 years, they talked and talked and did not deliver for the people of Paradise, for the people of Golden Grove or for the people of Tea Tree Plaza, so we are getting on with it. Sixteen long years—

Ms Bedford interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and they did not deliver a thing. The record is abysmal. We know that.

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The claims by the member for West Torrens are laughable. While those opposite continue to yell, they have delivered nothing for the north-east, but the members here on this side, the member for Newland, the member for King—

Mr Boyer: Didn't you guys oppose the O-Bahn tunnel?

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright will cease interjecting!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and the member for Morialta have done an absolutely outstanding job delivering park-and-rides for the people of their community, more than a thousand car parks. I tell you what, it takes people off the streets, and it puts people into car parks so they can use our public transport infrastructure. We know that we want to get more people using public transport—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and we will continue to do that, and we are building what matters for the people of South Australia and creating jobs in the process.

Ms BEDFORD: Supplementary, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I will give the member for Florey the call in just a moment. The member for Florey seeks the call. Before I give the member for Florey the call, I warn for a second time the member for Wright and I remind all members that the member, in asking the question, is entitled to be heard in silence and the minister answering the question is entitled to be heard in silence.

MODBURY PARK-AND-RIDE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:25): My question is to the minister, obviously, who has just finished the question. Wasn't a second park-and-ride parking station for Modbury a promise at the election last time, in 2018?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:25): No. Again, I think I have outlined it very, very clearly. We delivered a park-and-ride to Paradise. We said we would do it and we delivered it. We said we would do a park-and-ride at Golden Grove; we are delivering it. We are doing a park-and-ride at Tea Tree Plaza; we are delivering it—we are delivering it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: And on my right!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Premier! The member for Lee.

RIVERBANK ARENA

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:26): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier secured an agreement with AMDA Foundation Limited, Land Forces conference organisers, to host the Land Forces conference each year once the stadium is completed?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:26): There's no commitment at this point in time—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens will leave for 10 minutes in accordance with standing order 137A.

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —but there's still quite some time between now and when the arena is going to be delivered; in fact, I think that it's not going to be delivered until quite some years down the track. But I'm more than happy to be taking the offer to return Land Forces to South Australia. We spent an extensive time with the organisers prior to their decision to move to Brisbane. They regretted having to move to Brisbane, but the nature of these conferences and the equipment that is exhibited will of course—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —not fit into the current level facilities. Of course, what will undermine our ability to win these projects back in the future is the Labor Party's position that they will scrap this plan. We think it's a very important plan to build it up. I don't quite understand why the Labor Party hates creating jobs in South Australia. To me, it's very important to be able to create as many jobs as we possibly can, and that's precisely what we will do. One of the two major areas of focus in the budget was of course around job creation. It's one of the reasons why it contained \$17.9 billion worth of infrastructure projects—

Mr Malinauskas: The worst unemployment rate in the nation.

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —which was actually the highest level infrastructure investment in the history of the state. It was the highest in the history of the state, and that's why we've now got the largest number of people ever employed in the history of the state.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sorry?

Mr Malinauskas: Where is it?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Where's the \$17.9 billion?

The SPEAKER: The Premier will not respond to interjections and the interjections on my left will cease.

Mr Brown: Where are the results?

The SPEAKER: Member for Playford! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Those opposite are finding it difficult to comprehend that we do have the most people employed in the history of this state. We've also stopped the brain drain. What we had for a long period of time was people who were leaving the state because they couldn't find jobs here. We are finding them here because of our focus and a big part of that is on defence.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier will resume his seat for just a moment. The member for Lee rises on a point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Standing order 98: debate. We have already secured the fact that he hasn't secured the commitment, so he's now debating the answer.

The SPEAKER: As the member for Lee knows, a point of order is no occasion for providing further personal contribution. I am listening carefully to the Premier's response. The Premier will respond specifically to the question. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have only just announced that this will definitely be into the forward estimates. We've got a date that we are focused on. We will definitely be speaking to each and every person. The only thing that is going to undermine our ability to attract additional conferences, conventions, exhibitions and international exhibitions to South Australia is the Labor Party's announcement that they are going to scuttle the entire plan. They are going to say, 'We're going to constrain South Australia to a size that is not winning the larger orders.'

We had the IAC here in South Australia in 2017. We want to have it back in the future. In fact, we already put it on the table that we would like to have it back. We would like to bring as many international conferences to Adelaide as possible when the borders permit. We want to open those borders. We want people flooding back into South Australia because we know that it's good for jobs.

One of the things that has happened in recent times is a very significant increase in the number of beds in the CBD. We have recently seen the Adelaide Oval Hotel open up with rooms, opposed by those opposite—

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: And this is the person who opposed it.

The SPEAKER: The Premier will resume his seat. The member for Lee rises on a point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Again, standing order 98: this is clearly debate. It's nothing to do with the question that I asked.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. I don't uphold the point of order for the moment. The Premier will direct his answer to the specific question. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The specific question was about attracting the Land Forces conference back and what the appropriate time is to get in touch with those people to win that work back. I am saying it's very important to win those jobs back because we have more hotel rooms in South Australia. We have the Adelaide Oval Hotel and the Casino expansion—\$330 million. We have the Crowne Plaza Hotel. We have the Sofitel, which is about to open, and now we have, if you like, a complete schedule of new projects that are going to come online, so we must get conferences like Land Forces.

It's regrettable that those opposite are playing politics with this important opportunity to bring more conferences, more exhibitions and more concerts here to South Australia, most importantly to create jobs for the future.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Lee, I warn the member for Playford for a second time.

LAND FORCES CONFERENCE

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:31): My question again is to the Premier. In the three months and five days since the Premier first announced his stadium, what efforts has the Premier exactly made to reach out to AMDA Foundation Limited to secure the Land Forces conference?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:31): I refer the member to my previous answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee will resume his seat.

SCHOOL INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:31): My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister advise the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is addressing urgent capital works across a range of government schools and preschools?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:32): I thank the member for Hammond for this question. He is a passionate advocate for schools, preschools and learning in his electorate. Indeed, it's a great opportunity to be able to talk about the impact of this budget, released by Rob Lucas on Tuesday, his eighth budget, for a range of things.

It's a budget that creates a stronger South Australia. It creates jobs, it builds what matters and it delivers better services, and through this program it is indeed doing all three of those things all at once. There is a \$42 million schedule of works announced, according to the education department's priority, for some of the most urgent works, as indeed we follow the education

department's advice in our capital investments in South Australia, whether it be new schools, according to the education department's priorities, or indeed scheduled capital works.

This \$42 million package of measures is supporting learning in preschools and schools. Lucindale in the South-East to Elliston on the West Coast, Langhorne Creek in the member for Hammond's own electorate, from Salisbury East to Nailsworth, Pimpala Primary School, Seaview Downs, around the city are a group of sites where urgent work has been needed to be done and why we are prioritising that investment. Indeed, some of these projects will start before the end of this year. All will be completed in the next three years.

In the member for Hammond's electorate, the Langhorne Creek campus of the Eastern Fleurieu R-12 School is a case in point. It's a school where there has been significant damage to the facilities. The learning areas are old and past their use-by date, if you like. They have had extensive ongoing conditions for a number of years and that school's governing council, led by Sue Miller and Ian Kent, the principal, have been seeking assistance.

The education department was keen to help fix the buildings as part of our minor works projects, but what was identified last year on close inspection of those buildings was that, to bring those buildings to the level that we expect for our children to be able to have world-class education, teaching and learning, it was going to be a much better prospect to replace them altogether with modern modular facilities that will rapidly enhance the way that the expert teachers at Eastern Fleurieu School are able to deliver the curriculum at that site.

Some of the other projects to be supported in this important announcement include the Balharry kindergarten in Lucindale, where there is an important extension to the preschool to accommodate rural care, which is currently provided in an adjacent building that has significant risk issues and a lack of opportunity for supervision.

In terms of Nailsworth Primary School, Prospect council has handed back to the education department the library that was previously used. It is a complex building requiring significant upgrades for it to be suitable as learning areas. Indeed, for that project we are committing \$5 million to ensure that students at Nailsworth Primary School in the member for Enfield's electorate will be able to get the benefit of a world-class education in those facilities.

Not so long ago, the member for King and I visited Salisbury East High School to engage with new principal, Kristen Masters. Indeed, she was engaged with the department already. Certainly, the member for King advocated strongly to pursue a project that ultimately happened, and I am very pleased it formed part of the department's priority, with \$4 million to expand the learning areas, particularly two classrooms supporting inclusive education at that school.

I tell you what, we went back and we visited the teachers of those very special young people, and those teachers are very excited. They are making do as best they can at the moment in facilities that are not fit for purpose. They are going to have a specially designed, fit-for-purpose modular facility built for them along with other areas. The rebuilds at Pimpala and Seaview Downs have been on the cards and demanded by those communities for many years. In 16 years of Labor, they got nothing. A Liberal government, in our first four years we are delivering for those two schools.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The time for answering the question has expired.

RIVERBANK ARENA

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:36): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier sought agreements from any other organisers of major conferences for his new stadium and, if so, what are they?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:36): Can I tell you that the Adelaide Venue Management do an excellent job speaking to a range of different organisations about their conferences, their conventions and their exhibition needs here in South Australia. Obviously, we

have excellent facilities at the moment. The problem with the excellent facilities we have at the moment is that they are too small. Of course, with the announcement and with the money committed in the budget over the forward estimates and beyond the forward estimates, we now have something new to sell.

The international borders are creating a problem at the moment, as most people would be aware, with regard to bringing people in from overseas. There will be no immediate resumption of large-scale international conferences in Adelaide, although I would like to also acknowledge the great work of the team led by Anthony Kirchner and the chair, Bill Spurr, at Adelaide Venue Management, who have done an excellent job continuing with conferences and using video technology to make sure that we can keep as many conferences in Adelaide as possible.

It's a very important driver for investment into South Australia. We know that a lot of the developments for some of the hospitality venues in South Australia are on the back of the projected improvement in overall visitation to South Australia. Recently, we have been judged as the most livable city in Australia. We were also judged as the third most livable city in the world, and I think this is another way we can sell our city and our state to international visitors.

As I said, those international borders are not going to open up immediately, but I must say that I was very proud today with the great milestone for South Australia. We have now sailed past 500,000 COVID-19 vaccinations in this state. That is something that every South Australian should be very proud of. I know that Professor Nicola Spurrier said repeatedly that she wanted to have the best testing rate in the entire nation, and I think we showed that—in fact, I think we showed the world what could be done with testing. We invented the drive-through testing regime here in South Australia.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order, sir: the question was about the Premier's proposed new stadium, not vaccination rates. This is clearly debate.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. It was a rather extensive—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right! As I listened to the Premier's contribution, it was a rather extensive segue into the present circumstances that are pertaining to the subject matter of the question. I direct the Premier to the specific question. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What I am saying is that there are a number of issues we must address before we get people booking conferences in going forward, and one of those issues is to make sure we have an adequate facility, and I think we have dealt with that now once and for all in our budget. Of course, those opposite seek to unwind that and drive people out of South Australia in terms of making those big conference bookings.

I am not quite sure why they do that. They must be getting the same information that we are getting, and that is that these conferences require larger and larger facilities. That's why we have seen a very significant increase in the capacity in Sydney at the Darling Harbour complex and a very significant increase in the facilities in Brisbane.

South Australia led the country and, in fact, I would have thought those opposite would have been very proud of the legacy of John Bannon with the ASER Project, developing that conference capability in South Australia, with the first area. It was something that every South Australian I think ultimately was very proud of. As I said, governments of different political persuasions over a long period of time have added to that in response to the changed circumstances in terms of the market and demand, and we have responded. But we are now too small.

The biggest issue is not that we don't have enough capacity in South Australia, it's just that it's dislocated. We have some in Hindmarsh, we have some in Wayville and we have some across the other side of the river. What we need, though, to win these larger conferences to South Australia, these larger conventions, is for it to be in the same area co-located; that is what we propose. We know those opposite oppose this, just like they opposed the Adelaide Oval Hotel, like they oppose the interconnector in South Australia, like they oppose the Rostrevor school. They love opposing. But what do they stand for? It's less than nine months to the next election—no policy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The time for answering the question has expired.

RIVERBANK ARENA

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:41): My question again is to the Premier. How many additional major conventions unable to be accommodated at the recently expanded Adelaide Convention Centre does the business case for the new stadium outline as being hosted at his new facility each year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:41): Infrastructure SA is independently operated from the government. It has its own separate board and it looks at all the proposals independently. We ask it to do an independently verified benefit cost analysis and it makes sure that those projects are fit for purpose for us to spend taxpayers' dollars on. I would have thought that the member for Lee might have taken a look. I think he has the shadow responsibilities for this area.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I would have thought he would have looked at Infrastructure SA. It's an excellent body and we thank those people who are dedicated to that cause. They have made the assessment, the independent assessment, looking at what the demand for a facility like this is going to be, what the likely construction costs are going to be, what the likely operation costs are going to be and have formed the opinion, independent of the government, that this stacks up.

I would point out that this is not the first proposal that has been suggested in terms of a new facility on the Riverbank. We have seen speculation about other proposals that the government was considering. In fact, the Treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas, made it clear on Tuesday that there were other proposals including a soccer pitch that was basically raised up and lowered down and this came with a very much larger price tag. It didn't offer that benefit cost ratio that this version offers, and that's one of the reasons why we decided to further invest in Coopers Stadium at Hindmarsh—so that we could have that done in time for the Women's World Cup in 2023.

If we didn't do that, there was just no chance that we would have matches played here in South Australia. We want those matches to be played in South Australia. We want to advance women's sport here in South Australia. That's why we are investing in the Hindmarsh stadium here. That's why we are investing in—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —grassroots sport in South Australia. That's why we are investing in change room upgrades. That's why we are investing in a range of sports.

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell will cease interjecting. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sorry, I was slightly—

Ms Hildyard: You said you didn't want it.

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I was slightly distracted then, sir. I almost lost my place but not quite. There are still other things to say about the upgrade that is going to occur down there. I think it's going to offer much greater amenity in a much faster time frame. We know that the world game is a very exciting game. We are seeing higher and higher participation in South Australia. That is one of the reasons why we are also investing out at Gepps Cross in a fantastic new facility there.

The SPEAKER: The Premier will resume his seat. The member for Lee on a point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Standing order 98: once again, debate. The question was quite specific about conferences, not soccer matches or developments at Gepps Cross.

The SPEAKER: The question was to a rather more specific aspect of the business case. I uphold the point of order. The Premier will direct his answer to the specific question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think the question was what were the elements of the viability, and what I have been outlining is that we assessed independently a range of demands for the new facility, whether they be sporting matches, whether they be concerts—which previously weren't coming to South Australia which we will now be able to bring to South Australia—or, of course, conferences, conventions and exhibitions in South Australia.

In looking at the viability of a project like this or the attractiveness of a project like this, we also ask what are the added benefits and who else is going to benefit from this? We say that the CBD will benefit. In other cities around the country and around the world where you have big events, where you have a big drawcard like an entertainment centre or a conference facility, people spill out into hotels, restaurants and cafes.

It enlivens the city, and that is one of the other many benefits that we see from the Riverbank arena. We feel that the position that the Labor Party has taken in South Australia is very short-sighted and will cost jobs in this state going forward.

POLICE STAFFING

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister please inform the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is boosting Australian police resources in the state budget to keep South Australians safe and strong?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (14:46): I thank the member for King for her advocacy in community safety, in reducing crime, and for the great work that she does in her local electorate. Obviously keeping South Australia safe and strong would have to be the ultimate priority for the Marshall Liberal government.

The COVID-19 pandemic has, of course, created one of the greatest health and economic crises the world has faced, but thankfully, because of the strong leadership of the government and the people of South Australia, our state has tackled this pandemic head-on and all South Australians have played their part in our state's response.

Of course, South Australia Police have played an enormous role in fighting this pandemic. Recently, I was able to be in Rundle Mall with the police commissioner and also the Premier announcing an additional 114 PSOs who will be funded as part of a \$23.6 million commitment in this state budget. This builds on the more than \$21 million that we invested in last year's budget to fast-track the recruitment of 72 cadets and 54 PSOs. The PSOs' employment will be extended as part of the additional funding in this year's state budget.

Yesterday, I was actually at the Police Academy where I saw over 20 new recruits graduate. It was an absolute privilege to stand side by side and have a chat to some of those recruits. I wish them well in keeping our state safe and strong—and what a fantastic career opportunity they have ahead of them.

This significant boost to SAPOL resources is just another example of our government's continued support for SAPOL's response to COVID-19. As I said, more than \$21 million was announced in last year's budget and there is a further \$77.5 million injection in this year's budget. Therefore, our government has provided almost \$99 million to support SAPOL's COVID-19 response.

This additional investment puts the total additional officers since February 2020 to 240, in fact. It is critical to not only ensure that South Australians are protected from the ongoing threat of COVID-19 but, of course, that SAPOL continue to have the resources they need to keep South Australians safe and to protect us from crime as well.

We have seen recently, only in the last sitting week, the significant policing efforts that were required as a result of Operation Ironside, an operation that continues and will require work for an

extended period of time still to go. The additional PSOs will obviously be deployed and undertake a range of COVID-related duties while sworn police officers maintain oversight of COVID activities.

Our dedicated officers have gone above and beyond in their response to COVID-19, and I want to say thank you to each and every one of them. They have had to work long hours. Many of them have not only had to sacrifice time away from friends and family during this time but also had to place themselves at the very frontline of community safety. To each and every one of them I say: thank you very much and our government certainly appreciates it.

This is why the Marshall Liberal government will continue to provide SAPOL with the resources and the support that they need to keep South Australians safe as we navigate through this pandemic. SAPOL have a dedicated recruitment and training program, and we want to ensure that extra resources are available for deployment as soon as possible.

The last group of PSOs from the pool of 54 graduated on 28 May this year. I encourage anyone who is interested in becoming a PSO to please seek more information, get online and have a look through the SAPOL website.

RIVERBANK ARENA

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:50): My question again is to the Premier. Why hasn't the Premier released the business case for the new stadium in conjunction with the budget, as he committed to when he first announced it in March of this year?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Elizabeth!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:50): Those opposite continue to characterise this as a basketball stadium and, whilst there will be basketball played there, there will also be netball played there. We think it is really important to get female sport centre stage in that overall Riverbank Precinct. We think it is absolutely important and something that should be done.

It is one of the areas that we focused on, and my understanding is that there has been an agreement with the Thunderbirds to play some of their matches at the existing Adelaide Entertainment Centre as a precursor ultimately to the Riverbank arena. It just would be fantastic, wouldn't it, to see the Thunderbirds play in terms of a capacity crowd.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have obviously been investing very significantly in women's sports since we came to government—

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

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. The member for Lee rises on a point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Once again, standing 98: debate. The question was quite specific about the business case, not the playing arrangements of the Thunderbirds.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The Premier will direct his answer to the specific question. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying, Infrastructure SA has done work on this business case. They have evaluated it, and, of course, Jeremy Conway, the Chief Executive of Infrastructure SA, actually appeared before a Budget and Finance Committee earlier this week. He answered a series of questions from the opposition. I am not sure whether they were paying attention. I know it is a committee from the other place, but usually in a political party people get along, they give people a call, flick somebody a text—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It's commonplace on this side of the house.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. The member for Lee rises on a point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Once again, standing order 98: the question was quite specific about why the Premier hasn't released a business case, not about turbulence in his political party.

The SPEAKER: I have upheld a point of order.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I remind the member for Lee that there is no occasion for the introduction of further remarks in the course of making a point of order. I uphold the point of order. The question was directed to the release of the business case. The Premier will direct his answer to the specific question. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying, there are various milestones with regard to this project. The most recent one, which was released by Infrastructure SA, is that this project is ready for investing. Now, of course, all that detailed design work is done. We have seen some fantastic images of what this incredible new facility could look like. We know what the benefits are going to be, whilst those opposite are sceptical. They have been sceptical about lots of things, including—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —being very sceptical about projects like the Adelaide Oval Hotel, which those opposite were very sceptical about. In fact, many people in South Australia were very sceptical about it.

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

The SPEAKER: The Premier will resume his seat. The member for Lee on a point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, Mr Speaker. Once again, standing order 98: debate. The question was quite specific about why the Premier hasn't released the business case, as he previously committed. We have traversed the Thunderbirds, political turbulence in parties and now a hotel.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Lee has now raised the point of order on three occasions. Again, I uphold the point of order. I was listening carefully to the Premier's contribution following that further specific direction, and I'm—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I'm in the course of ruling on the point of order. I'm listening carefully to the Premier's answer and looking for the context in which the Premier is addressing the timing or circumstances that might relate to the release of the business case or otherwise. The Premier has been directed to the specific question, and the Premier will address the specific question. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, sir. As I was saying, Jeremy Conway, who is the Chief Executive of Infrastructure SA, appeared before Budget and Finance only earlier this week, and members of the opposition had the opportunity to ask detailed questions about the project. They had that opportunity and they asked those questions, and I encourage them to share some of those notes—or maybe the member for Lee could take a look. I think it has all been captured by Hansard.

It is not clear to me what detailed information over and above what has been provided the member for Lee actually requires. What we do know is that they oppose it. We are going to build it: they oppose it.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: The Premier will resume his seat. The member for Lee, on what I presume to be a point of order on standing order 98, and once again reiterating the point of order he has made on a number of occasions.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, sir.

The SPEAKER: At this point I will move on. Does the member for Lee seek the call?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: No, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Elder.

STATE BUDGET

Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:56): Thank you—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Elder has the call. The Minister for Innovation and Skills is warned.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left!

Mrs POWER: My question is to the Deputy Premier. Can the Deputy Premier please update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government's budget is delivering a stronger South Australia and, in particular, what has been the community and industry reaction?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:56): I am very happy to, and I thank the member for Elder for her interest in a number of aspects that relate to us delivering a stronger South Australia.

Key to this, of course, has been jobs, and we have repeatedly heard the significance of the historic moment of the most people in South Australia being employed in the history of the state and, importantly in that, heavy lifters in small business and employment of women and the most women ever in the history of the state in employment. I commend that.

Part of that, of course, is due to business and consumer confidence that is at record levels; that is part of the conditions that are important for that. The third most livable city in the country—these are all aspects—

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Wright!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —that stack up to us being a stronger economy and being stronger for the environment in which our South Australian families grow.

Can I just add to that what I think has been a staggering turnaround, and that is the three successful quarters of population reversal in terms of people coming to live in our state rather than leaving our state. The net migration for the last three quarters was in the positive, an outstanding achievement by the Premier in relation to the state's future.

However, there are three areas that have really been targeted in this budget that I think have really drawn our attention. In addition to jobs and educational opportunities for our children, there is also health. There has been a staggering trifecta of abandonment by the previous government in the last 16 years. If I were to give three direct examples, I would start with mental health.

The member for Florey would be very interested in this because she was very active in this space during the time of the previous government to ensure that we put extra money into social housing, mental health and those who are vulnerable in the community. The previous government's decision to sell off 40 per cent of Glenside, to let Woodleigh House go into decay, has been unacceptable.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurna is warned.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: To close the Repat hospital, in particular Ward 17 for our veterans for mental health—

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurna is warned for second time.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —just all adds to the cascading abandonment of responsibility.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: So I am very proud, as indeed are some of the commentators—

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —in relation to mental health, like Geoff Harris of the Mental Health Coalition of South Australia. He says that this budget has welcome initiatives to invest—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurna will cease interjecting.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —in the SA Mental Health Services Plan, in particular investing in strengthening pathways for crisis support to help and avoid presentations at emergency departments. These are people, like Mr Harris, who have worked in the Mental Health Coalition—

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Kaurna!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —for decades. He understands the problem and he has given a very clear tick of approval to this budget in relation to a constant, continuous abandonment by the previous government. I am very proud to be part of this government that is remedying that as we speak. Let's stick to the Repat hospital—to reclaim that land, to rebuild that facility, when the previous government had just said, 'No, we are closing it. We're flogging off that service. We'll cherry-pick out a little bit of Ward 17—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford will leave for the remainder of question time, pursuant to standing order 137A.

The honourable member for Playford having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —we will set up a James Nash House over what's left of Glenside, and then we're just going to flog off the rest.' It was totally unacceptable. To leave the whole of the south-west metropolitan area of South Australia without a serious hospital to be able to deal with surgical mental health services was a disgrace, an absolute disgrace.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The Hon. Stephen Wade—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader will cease interjecting.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —has spearheaded the reclaiming of that site. You should go down there and have a look, Mr Speaker, because honestly the intersection has been upgraded. Thank you, Minister for Transport: that is a stunning improvement. There are buildings going up everywhere and they are important to be done. And the third hospital—

The SPEAKER: Order! The time for answering the question has expired.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the member for Lee seek the call?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Chaffey! Does the member for Lee seek the call?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I do.

RIVERBANK ARENA

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:01): My question is again to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the house whether the business case for his new stadium has actually been completed?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:01): I love getting up to speak about the benefits of this important project for South Australia. It is very important for South Australia and, as the member would be aware—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister for Education!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —if he looked at the Capital Intentions Statements—I think you can look them up on the Infrastructure SA website—

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

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —this is a project that they say is investable now. I know that the opposition was opposed to the establishment of Infrastructure SA. They refused to implement the independent scrutiny of government projects when they were in government. They refused to implement—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —a project like Infrastructure SA or a body like Infrastructure SA—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —when they were in government. They did, I think, ultimately support the legislation going through this house, and now it's time for them to take a look on the website. Take a look on the website and see the great work that Infrastructure SA has been doing. Of course, as I have previously reported to the house, this is a project that is going to deliver very significant benefits to South Australia. Those benefits will come over and above—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader will cease interjecting.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —the costs, in terms of interest and in terms of depreciation. There will be direct benefits and there will be indirect benefits. We will enliven our city in South Australia.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Jeremy Conway has answered questioning by a parliamentary inquiry as recently as this week. They had the opportunity to ask any questions that they may have. We have seen the detailed work that has gone into this by Adelaide Venue Management. I might have made it clear earlier today that it wasn't the first plan that had been submitted. It might not have been the first plan that had been submitted. In fact, Adelaide Venue Management were very keen to see—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that development here, an expansion of their capacity. But we didn't just jump at the very first proposal that was put in front of us.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We needed to be sure that—

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Kaurna!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —this was would provide an adequate return to the taxpayers here in South Australia. That's precisely what we did. We said, 'You've got to go and test what the demand is going to be,' not just the demand immediately, because of course we know that there is a subdued demand at the moment. It's very difficult to have people moving around to go to conferences and exhibitions and conventions at the moment, but we needed to look at what was going to happen going forward. We needed to look very carefully at what the size, the capacity and the make-up of these new facilities should be going forward.

We know that the new areas are far more digitally enhanced than they have been in the past, so we needed to make sure that that was going to be adequate. We needed to look at and speak to the people who are running the concerts and ask them why they weren't coming to South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —why they were flying directly across the top, over Adelaide, from Sydney to Perth, and make sure that there was going to be an adequate return.

The SPEAKER: The Premier will resume his seat. The member for Lee rises on a point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Again, standing order 98 for debate: it was a very specific question about whether a business case has been completed for the new stadium.

Mr Picton: It's so simple: yes or no.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will rule on the point of order, and while I rule on the point of order—and particularly, for the moment, members on my left might take the opportunity to get out the green volume and have a close look at standing order 142—I direct all members on my right and on my left to the standing orders: what the Speaker is charged with the responsibility to maintain in this place. I uphold the point of order. I note that the question was quite specifically directed, and the Premier will direct his answer to the specific question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: To the specific question, sir, the answer is yes.

RIVERBANK ARENA

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:05): The supplementary is again to the Premier: when will the Premier release it?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:05): As I have said, full detail has been provided to Infrastructure SA. They have submitted themselves to a parliamentary investigation and inquiry with regard to this. We believe that this is an important project to create jobs in South Australia. Those opposite oppose.

HOUSING SA

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:06): My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Social Housing. Can the minister advise if Housing SA have sold any Housing SA homes in Port Pirie in the last 12 months; if so, how many? Also, can the minister advise the current number of vacant Housing SA properties in Port Pirie and also the estimated number of outstanding responsive maintenance requests and the value of these requests? With your leave, and that of the house, sir, I will explain further.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I have spoken in this house before about homelessness in Port Pirie and surrounding areas. It's around 450 people on my information. I have had discussions with some NGOs and they are at their wits' end. They have over 400, on my information, across the region, and they've got no homes to go to. I've got people like Raymond Turner, who has no housing and he just walks around the community with a bag and a blanket—that's all he's got—and he cannot get any home in Port Pirie. So I'm asking the question: how many homes have been sold, the maintenance and vacancy?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:07): I note the questions that have been asked. I think there were a couple of extras in there also in relation to data sought for the particular area in the region of Port Pirie. I have no doubt the member, in representing part of South Australia's regional areas, is conscious of the incredible pressure in relation to accommodation generally in relation to rural towns at present, given the large levels of infrastructure going on and, of course, huge amounts of tourism, so it adds to the pressure in relation to accommodation. I do understand that. I will take it on notice and make sure that Minister Lensink in the other place is able to provide that information.

I just remind members that, if they do seek information in relation to particular areas, they are able to actually put on notice those questions to get them back directly. They don't have to wait until question time to do that for that information to be provided.

PARK-AND-RIDE FACILITIES

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:08): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Who made the decision to take the \$15 million budgeted in the 2017-18 document for the Tea Tree Plaza and Klemzig park-and-rides and use it instead for park-and-rides at Golden Grove and Paradise in the 2018-19 first Liberal budget? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms BEDFORD: The member for Newland reaffirmed in the *North Eastern Weekly* on 17 April 2019 that the government was delivering its promise on the Tea Tree Plaza Interchange; he just didn't say when that might happen.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:09): I remember this very clearly because it was an issue which was canvassed very publicly in the lead-up to the last state election. The member for Florey quite rightly points out that the previous government had allocated \$15 million for two projects. These weren't the projects that we had promised in the lead-up to that last election. In fact, we were very clear with the people of South Australia the project that we favoured, where we thought there was the highest need, which was the Paradise park-and-ride.

In addition to that, though, since coming to government we have made sure that we have been able to put other projects on the table; of course, the first was Golden Grove. I was very pleased to be out with the member for King, who had very strongly lobbied on behalf of her constituents who love getting onto the O-Bahn. Then, more recently, we made an announcement with regard to people in the Modbury area, who already had 700 car parks available to them, to increase that by a further 400 car parks, up to 1,100.

We love the O-Bahn in South Australia. It was actually a Liberal piece of infrastructure. It must be coming up to around the 40th anniversary at the moment because it was put in place by the

Tonkin government, Dr David Tonkin, who was the member for Bragg, the very first member for Bragg. It is one of the most incredibly well used pieces of public—

Ms Bedford interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —transport infrastructure in the entire country, so it's something that all South Australians can be very proud of. In fact, I was on it this morning with the member for Newland. I caught the 540 service at 7.53. I was in the city in Currie Street or Grenfell Street about, I think, 17 or 18 minutes later. It was absolutely fantastic. I had a great opportunity—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to speak to people. One of the things that they are very keen on is making sure that we continue to have very good public transport services in South Australia, and that's why we are constantly investing in public transport in South Australia. It's been a major focus for us since we came to government. I hope that clarifies for the member the commitments that the Australian Labor Party made and the Liberal Party made in the lead-up to the last election. Of course, we also very significantly said that we would be investing in the Modbury hotel, which I know—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —Hospital, sorry, which I know—

Ms Bedford interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —she has long advocated for. Over 16 years of the previous government, of course, they weren't able to effect those changes. They presided over massive cuts to the Modbury Hospital, to the Noarlunga Hospital, The Queen Elizabeth Hospital and, as we know, it's a matter of the public record now that they actually closed the Repat hospital. That was done under the Leader of the Opposition's reign, five-month reign, as he pointed out on the radio today, when he was the health minister in South Australia.

We make commitments in the lead-up to elections. We delivered on ours with regard to Paradise and then, of course, subsequent to that, over and above what we committed, Golden Grove and Modbury.

MODBURY PARK-AND-RIDE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:12): Again to the Premier: I just seek some more clarification for the people of Modbury, who actually thought you had promised them a park-and-ride at the election. We will go back and check those documents, but the other thing I want to ask is: did you get wet this morning at the interchange because there is absolutely no cover for anyone standing on the platform?

The SPEAKER: Before I give the Premier the call—

Ms Bedford: You don't remember the rain this morning?

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Florey! There's a whole raft of content that is interspersed in what might be elements of an orderly question. I remind the member for Florey of standing order 97 and the necessity to seek leave should that be necessary in order to explain the question. I will give the Premier the opportunity to respond.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:13): There were two parts to that question. The first part was about whether or not we promised it and then reneged on it. Well (1) we are actually building it but (2) no, we didn't promise it at the previous election.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Maybe the member would like to move a substantive motion because it's my very clear understanding that that wasn't a commitment that we made. We know that

those opposite when they were in government did promise at one stage the Paradise Interchange. They did definitely pull that, so that was a clear example of the type of behaviour that you're looking at there. But, no, that wasn't us.

We were very clear. I'm not saying that the current member for Newland, when he was the candidate for Newland at the time, was particularly happy with that position at the time because he has argued and lobbied for that, and that's why, when we could find the available money to push on with these other important infrastructure projects, we have. The people in Modbury have had car parking for 700 car parks. Many other areas have had very, very limited car parking, so that's why we have wanted to prioritise those and that's why we are of course delivering it now.

In terms of the second part of her question, where she asked me whether I got wet standing on the platform, the answer to that is no. In fact, there was very good cover. I think that there is an issue getting onto that platform because, if you are on the TTP side, or of course you are on the other side, that's not completely covered, but when you are standing on the platform there is excellent coverage, excellent lighting and excellent width.

I had a great opportunity not just this morning with the member for Newland but of course yesterday as well. People are really pleased. People are pleased with the budget. They are pleased to see a further \$17.9 billion incorporated there. They are very pleased to see the investments that are being made in health. They are very pleased to see investments are being made in their local area, like the ongoing upgrade of the Modbury Hospital precinct.

I will also inform the member—because I'm sure she will be interested—that the new palliative care services are now on track to be delivered—a 16-bed facility. I think this is going to be an excellent facility for the people of the north-east. They were neglected by the former government over such a long period of time.

It's not just the Modbury Hospital with a very, very significant upgrade. I think with the upgrade that is now being delivered there is \$146 million, even significantly higher than we promised at the last election, but of course there are very substantial increases to the facilities at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. Those two hospitals in the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network will really make sure that those services that the people of the north need are delivered closer to home, and that's even before we look at the very substantial increase to the emergency department capability at the Gawler hospital. We know that the population in the north is growing and we want to make sure that they have the requisite health facilities that they deserve.

TIMBER INDUSTRY

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:16): My question is to the minister for forestry. Does the minister support the application by Kangaroo Island Plantation Timbers for a wharf to be built on Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:16): I thank the member for his question. Certainly, we are looking at every opportunity as to how we might be able to get timber off Kangaroo Island. It's certainly a big challenge that's sitting there. There is a lot of timber that has a limited life now that it has been burnt that we have to deal with, so it's something that we are working on with KIPT, plus the private growers themselves on the island, as well as being in conversations with other mills on the mainland, etc., as well as the federal government. As mentioned yesterday, there have been discussions with the federal government about what we can do in this space to see whether there is an opportunity to get that timber off.

There is urgency in getting that timber off and the opportunity to get that timber off is limited in the short term by how we can actually do it. My understanding is that, in the short term, to be able to achieve it, there are time lines to deliver structural timber to the South Australian community but also to make sure we are able to use the timber that has been damaged in this process. We are very limited in what we can do.

Trucks onto the ferry is the simplest option and we are having conversations with the federal government on whether they are prepared to assist in that movement. There are also other options that could be in place—where timber is carted into Kingscote itself—to have a look at whether there

are options of barging that timber off to different locations to get that processed. So the issue is still very much alive. It's very much a conversation that we are having, to look at these options to see whether there is an opportunity.

This timber, as I said, has a very limited time line in its ability to be processed—a maximum of 10 years once the timber has been burnt before it can be processed, and that's only if it has been submerged. We are working through this to see what opportunities there are, particularly in the next 12 months, as there is huge demand right across Australia for structural timber. There is an opportunity for us, working with the federal government, to make sure that we can get this timber to market so that we are able to see not just the benefit to the timber being processed but—

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

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson is warned for a second time.

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: We are making sure that we get that timber off in a timely manner so that we can process it and get that timber back into the market so there is an opportunity for jobs to be maintained going forward. The building industry needs this timber, so we are working on it to make sure that we can—

Mr BELL: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: The minister will resume his seat. The member for Mount Gambier rises on a point of order.

Mr BELL: Relevance, sir. The question was specifically whether or not the minister supported the building of a wharf. I understand there is some relation to burnt timber, but that is not the point of the question. The point of the question was whether the minister himself actually supported the building of a wharf.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is pursuant to standing order 98. I note the question was directed more specifically to the matter of the wharf. In the context of timber transport, the minister was addressing the broader circumstances. I do direct the minister to the specific question. The minister has the call. I think the minister has concluded his answer.

Grievance Debate

RIVERBANK ARENA

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:20): There are some people saying at the moment that there are some ructions in the Liberal Party. Some people are saying that they do not believe the current Liberal Party represents the Liberal Party they know here in South Australia. Some people say this Liberal government does not stand for what a Liberal government usually stands for here in South Australia. I think that is harsh; I think that is unfair. I think this Liberal Party and this Liberal government are exactly the same as the Liberal Party and the Liberal government that South Australia has come to know over the years. In fact, this Liberal government is nearly a carbon copy of the last Liberal government we had here in South Australia.

Let me walk you through it. They are in minority government, just like the last Liberal government. They are riven by factional division, just like the last Liberal government we had. There was a constant stream of privatisations in this term, just like there was in the previous Liberal government. We have a health system in crisis, just like we had in the last Liberal government. We have an economy lagging the nation, just like we had in the last Liberal government.

They are at war with public sector unions, particularly in the health area, just like the last Liberal government. They of course have the same issues at the moment, with serious questions over the Deputy Premier's judgement, just like they had in the last government. We have the same issue with a Premier who cannot remember key details of a major deal that he is involved in, just like the last Liberal government. In fact, they even have the same Treasurer as the last Liberal government.

What I really want to talk about today is the extraordinary capacity for the Liberal Party of South Australia, when they happened to fall into government here in South Australia, to stuff up major projects. We can see it right now unfolding before our very eyes. Of course, you will remember during the term of the last Liberal government the famous one-way expressway debacle. It was something

that would have cost \$97 million to rectify with a dual-way expressway, had they built it at the time. By the time Labor came around to rectifying it, it cost over \$400 million.

You will remember that the last Liberal government extended the Convention Centre. The first one was opened by the former Bannon government and the former Liberal government extended that with a new extension. Then what did they do? The then Premier listened to his advisers and he decided to immediately invest in a competing convention centre down the road, the National Wine Centre. What a basket case that turned out to be.

The thing that has stumped us on this side of the house today are the revelations that have just come out of question time. The major plank of this Liberal government's re-election, announced exactly one year out from the next state election—19 March it was announced by the Premier—was what was to be pitched by him as a new multipurpose arena. He overrode the objections of his advisers and public servants advising him and he stood up at a press conference and proudly announced that this would be a basketball stadium for the benefit of South Australia.

He committed at that time, on that same day, that he would release the business case in conjunction with the state budget, setting out the benefits of this new stadium. Now we seem to learn from the Premier, who cannot answer a straight question in this house, that we do not even know whether a business case has actually been completed. Sure, it has been referred to Infrastructure South Australia, and that indeed was confirmed in the other place, but no business case has been completed.

Without a business case, what is the purpose of having a new facility that the Premier tells us we need to secure more major conferences like the Land Forces conference? So quite understandably we asked him today: have you secured the Land Forces conference for when this place is built in future years? Not only was the answer no but the Premier also coughed up to the house that they have not even been contacted and asked—absolutely extraordinary!

Not only can he not demonstrate the economic need for this new facility without a business case but he himself has not even thought to go to the basic effort of reaching out to those conference organisers who he assures South Australians will be flocking to use this new facility.

The truth is there is no justification for this new basketball stadium and there is no justification for it when this government, for example, is building a new Women's and Children's Hospital that has only one extra paediatric bed in it. This is meant to be a hospital to provide for South Australia's future for the next 50 years. How can we justify spending nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars on something that does not even have a business case?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order on my left! The Minister for Education has the call.

EARLY LEARNING STRATEGY

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:26): It is a great pleasure to be a minister in a government that is building what matters, that is creating jobs and, importantly, that is delivering better services for the people of South Australia.

Just today, I was with the Premier at the Hackney Kindergarten launching the Early Learning Strategy, which was funded in this year's budget. It is a \$50 million project which will support children and young people in South Australia to thrive and learn, to succeed in their education and succeed in life. It is an outstanding document and, indeed, I am very pleased to be part of a government that is investing in the future of South Australia.

We are focused on the wellbeing of our young people and we are focused on their futures. That is why we are engaged in supporting a budget that is going to also create jobs and ensure there are future-focused investments that are going to create jobs for these young people so that we pick up any developmental issues in their first 1,000 days or their first five years as part of our strategy to ensure that all young people are thriving and learning as part of our Early Learning Strategy.

We support them through their preschooling and their schooling with world-class educational opportunities so that they can be their best and so that they can be supported to fulfill their potential. We are reforming vocational education training, pathways to traineeships and apprenticeships,

further education and higher education so that in South Australia, as a result of these investments that are made by people like the Minister for Innovation and Skills, we are seeing double-digit increases in the relevant KPIs on how we are going on commencements.

While the rest of Australia is either going backwards or progressing at a marginal pace, we are seeing dramatic increases in young people taking up traineeships and apprenticeships, fast outstripping every other jurisdiction in the nation at a time when it could not be more important; and the government is investing in jobs of the future. Whether they be in defence, space, cyber, high-tech, agtech or in hospitality and tourism, an investment like the arena will create jobs through the opportunities for conventions and concerts and sporting events when it is completed towards the second half of the next decade. Some of these young people will have great jobs there too.

But we want to support them in their schooling. In the discussions about the dramatic improvements that the Marshall Liberal government is supporting in early learning, it also reminds me of some of the work that has already been done. I want to commend some of the people who do not just work in those early years before children get to school but in the early years of school. Since the Marshall Liberal government's election, there has been a radical overhaul of the way that many of our schools are delivering early years literacy programs.

When we first came to government, we became the first state in the nation to require all our government schools to offer a year 1 phonics screening check to every student. It is also a screening check that we have made available to independent schools and Catholic schools and many of them have taken up the opportunity to do so. One of the challenges that that screening check identified in 2018 was that only 42 per cent of our students in year 1 in South Australian government schools were able to correctly identify 28 of the 40 words in the check, which was the expected standard to which we expected achievement.

Indeed, the British screening check, the English screening check on which our check was based, requires 32 out of 40 as the expected standard, but it takes place at a different time in the child's development. We had support from Flinders University—Anne Bayetto, from memory, and Jennifer Buckingham, who did a review of it as well, and they identified that 28 was the appropriate standard.

Only 42 per cent could achieve it though. In our second year, as a result of the evidence-led practices that were encouraged throughout our schools—the guidebooks on literacy that were supported through the education department's expert what was then learning improvement division and our Literacy Guarantee unit, and the coaches who were working with schools—that was able to be lifted to 53 per cent and then last year to 62 per cent, a further dramatic increase despite the ravages and disruption of the pandemic on so many elements of society.

I am very much looking forward to seeing how our students and our children and young people go in that phonics screener in August this year. I am confident that there will be further improvements because what I have seen in our schools is an absolute embrace of evidence-based teaching practices by our early childhood teachers and principals who have seen the dramatic improvement that it has led to in children's literacy and then behaviour in following years.

The confidence with which our children are now reading when they are discovering the opportunity to do more complex texts later on is all part of a piece of world-class education being delivered by the Marshall Liberal government that is investing in education, that is investing in the future of our state and that is delivering better services for the people of South Australia.

COMMUNITY WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Mr BOYER (Wright) (15:31): I rise today to speak about the Community Wastewater Management System forum I attended on the weekend, on Saturday 19 June, at the Tea Tree Gully RSL. This forum was hosted by the Deputy Mayor of Tea Tree Gully, Mr Lucas Jones, and co-hosted by Councillor Jessica Lintvelt, who is a councillor for the Steventon Ward. Over 100 residents attended the forum, which I am sure people in here will acknowledge is a very considerable number of residents to turn out on any issue.

But on what was a Saturday, and obviously not necessarily particularly convenient for all people, to get 100 concerned local residents to come and listen to the comments from Councillor Jones and Councillor Lintvelt, but then also to ask questions of the SA Water experts I will say, who

were there in attendance as well, shows the high level of both interest and concern in this issue in the north-eastern suburbs.

It will come as no surprise to people that real concerns were raised by those residents about a number of key factors, particularly around the Marshall Liberal government's plan to transition all those residents who are in properties still using a septic tank system onto a more modern system, especially given the time line for getting that work done and any potential costs that may be brought to bear upon the resident.

Members of this place might recall that in around June of last year this government rushed out an announcement that they would spend \$65 million on working with SA Water and the Tea Tree Gully council to upgrade the CWMS. That came just after Labor's announcement of \$92 million to connect 4,700 properties in the Tea Tree Gully council area to the SA Water mains network. The key tenet of Labor's announcement, the \$92 million commitment as opposed to the \$65 million commitment, was that there would be no cost under Labor's plan to the householder.

The \$65 million commitment by the Marshall Liberal government obviously falls quite short of the \$92 million that Labor had set aside to fully fund the transition of those 4,700 homes, and we based our commitment on data provided to us by the government, by SA Water and by the Tea Tree Gully council too. We looked at how many properties there were in total that needed to be transitioned. We had a look at what the range of costs might be, in terms of each property being transitioned off a septic tank.

Unfortunately, one of the great complexities of this issue in the north-east is that no two properties are the same. You can walk along a single street in which there are multiple properties that are still on septic tanks and one might have the septic tank in the front of the property and another might have the septic tank in the back of the property. We were informed that a rough guide in terms of the cost of transitioning those properties would be, at the low end where it was easy, about \$2,000, I believe, and at the high end, where it was more complex, around \$12,000 or \$13,000.

We took an average of \$10,000 and that is how we came to the figure of \$92 million. We believe that will be enough to make sure that those 4,700 properties are transitioned without any cost to the ratepayer. Unfortunately, the significant and most pronounced area of concern for those residents who came along on Saturday was that under the Liberal's \$65 million plan, particularly those people who fall into stage 3—that is, they may have their property transitioned between 2024 and 2028—who is going to pay the extra \$30 million or so to make sure that that stage becomes funded.

They were led to believe, when the Liberal government made its commitment, that there would not be any cost to them, but it is becoming apparent now that there will be a cost somewhere for them.

Dr Harvey: There won't be. There won't be any cost to them.

Mr BOYER: The member for Newland interjects and says that there won't be a cost to them, but I ask: if the council is asked to put in the \$30 million, which is the gap between the two, where does that come from? It sounds all well and good. Hypothetically, the council is asked to contribute something towards this; after all, they do own the system, that is true, but of course the fact is that if council cannot afford the money where is it coming from? It will be the ratepayers, or more likely, because of a commitment or a determination from ESCOSA, it will have to be those people still on the system, which means a higher cost for a smaller number of people.

The message is loud and clear. People here have waited long enough. They deserve to be transitioned at no cost now. It deserves to be done properly. Only Labor has—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

Mr BOYER: Who's on Unley watch today? Is someone minding him?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Wright, have you finished your contribution?

Mr BOYER: No.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am going to give you a few extra seconds to wrap up, please.

Mr BOYER: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, for your protection. People in the north-eastern suburbs, the 4,700 property owners who are still on septic tanks, have waited long enough. They have waited decades and decades here.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Point of order, sir: the time has finished.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Except, member for Unley, there were interjections that caused the member for Wright not to be able to fill his allocated five minutes. I am going to give you just 15 seconds, member for Wright, to wrap that up.

Mr BOYER: They know the plan is a dud. That is why they are so upset. The people of the north-east deserve this to be done properly. Only Labor has a fully funded plan. Only Labor will make sure the transition happens without cost to the ratepayer.

Time expired.

CHAFFEY ELECTORATE

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:37): I would like to rise and talk about some of the goings-on in Chaffey of recent times, and the first thing I would like to talk about is a recent visit by the Minister for Innovation and Skills.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Chaffey, I am going to give you some time at the end as well. Member for Newland and member for Wright, if you want to chat, please go outside.

Mr WHETSTONE: I am talking about the visit from the Minister for Innovation and Skills to Chaffey. It was great to have him visiting the region not only giving his expertise around skills and the innovation world but also spreading the message that we need employers to continue to employ apprentices. We need employers and we need organisations to take on trainees. It was great to have him up there for a public forum. It was well attended. What I would say is that the forum at the Berri Hotel talked about some of the current activities of the labour workforce and about its bright future on behalf of skills here in South Australia.

While in the electorate, Minister Pisoni also met with several larger businesses that continue to employ apprentices and trainees, and then they go on to be long-term permanent staff in those organisations. We dropped into Almondco, a great organisation. Not only have they just invested an extra \$30 million into their plant but they continue to employ more people. They continue now to give more consideration to taking on apprentices and trainees to skill their workforce so that they have a world-class facility with world-class trained staff.

Agriexchange, or CostaExchange as it is now known, also have a significant workforce, and they are looking for a more highly skilled workforce, particularly with the use of agtech, particularly with the use of some of the new technologies within not only growing and producing fruit but also packing and marketing. We also talked to a young trainee who had been there for 12 months and who considered staying on, but she is looking to spread her wings and move further afield.

We also attended the Loxton Research Centre, the centrepiece of which is the ThinkLab demonstration farm, where entrepreneurs, companies, agribusinesses, associations and members of the community can develop their innovations and business models. It was a great visit by the minister, and the community was very appreciative of the time the minister gave them and understanding of the opportunities the Marshall Liberal government is giving those businesses to take on more trainees and more apprentices.

I also attended the Pasifika Sports Carnival last Monday week at the Renmark sporting precinct. It was great to see Pacific Islanders, who had just been through two weeks of quarantine, out there with their activities: volleyball, soccer, touch rugby, sack races, tug-of-war and basketball. Some of those boys are big boys, the Tongans in particular, and the boys from Vanuatu, Kiribati and Samoa all played their role in a great day—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey, you are going to get some more extra time. I am going to ask members on my left, and there are a number involved here, to cease their conversations while others are contributing. Thank you.

Mr WHETSTONE: Thank you, sir. Not only were we privileged to watch the Pacific Islanders playing sports but we also listened to their music and watched their customs and dances and it was really a treat. It was an experience I had never seen before; some 800 were singing, chanting and dancing. It really was a multicultural experience I have never seen before, and it is something that will be a lasting memory.

I want to thank the Pacific Islanders for being part of the work program, particularly in horticulture, and I want to thank the government agencies that have made this quarantine exercise possible. I want to make sure that every Riverlander understands the unique opportunity that is before us at the moment, that having this workforce on hand, safe and COVID-free, is an opportunity to further our credentials in Chaffey as being one of the multicultural centres of the state. It was a true honour.

On a sad note, I would like to pay tribute to a great Riverlander, John Menzel. John is a Riverland legend, who was recently recognised with an Order of Australia in the General Division for services to horticulture. Hailing from Winkie, John has been recognised for his service, in particular his involvement with dahlias. John was a grower for more than 45 years and eventually grew around 4,000 plants. He was involved in dahlia societies in South Australia, Victoria, New South Wales, Tasmania and Queensland, and worked towards unifying those organisations to form the Dahlia Society of Australia, of which he was a founder and then president for over 10 years.

John was a keynote speaker globally. He spoke with huge knowledge and great authority at national conferences at least three times. His awards and recognitions included the Dahlia Medal from the Dahlia Society of Australia, the Noel Bracewell Medal, the S and M Bowtock Medal, the National Dahlia Society of the United Kingdom and the American Dahlia Society silver medal.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: On that note, member for Chaffey, I have given you some extra time—

Mr WHETSTONE: Vale, John Menzel, a great Riverlander lost.

KINGFISH FARMING

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:43): I rise today to talk about a couple of local issues—or hopefully a couple of local issues, if I get the time. One is the return of aquaculture, kingfish farming, to Fitzgerald Bay to the north of Whyalla. It would be fair to say that it has been somewhat controversial in the area, but we will see a return to aquaculture. I am on the record as supporting the industry, but it is qualified support.

I believe there needs to be a conservative approach to stocking rates and to the increase in stocking rates in Fitzgerald Bay. As I have indicated, it is a return to kingfish farming in the bay, and it has something of a proud history because South Australia Aquaculture Management was the first kingfish farmer in there. It was a syndicate, a bunch of Whyalla businesses and others, involved in a syndicate. They did some good work with SARDI in cracking the breeding cycle of the kingfish, which is native to the area.

Southern Star Aquaculture was a smaller company that also operated in the bay. They worked their guts out. They were a hardworking company with the Edwardses and Lyndon Giles. It was a good family-run business. There were no escapes and high-quality fish. It was a smaller operation that was managed very well. So kingfish farming started there.

Of late, the council have copped flak from some people. I did not get involved in the early discussion in my community because it seemed as though it was being used politically by some people as a vehicle to have a go at the council. The council is not the approving authority for the kingfish farms. Indeed, ultimately the marina is not a council marina, even though they have care and control over it.

Some people in the community wanted the council to say no in relation to the use of the marina. What would have happened is that the state government would have stepped in and

negotiated with Clean Seas about the marina. The council held off on making a decision until such time as they got what they felt was a good outcome for the community when it came to the use of that facility. I commend the council for the work it did with Clean Seas. Initially, Clean Seas were not negotiating. They were inflexible, but they did change their position, and maybe a change of CEO helped that process along. So they now have an agreement with Clean Seas.

Sometimes it is forgotten that the facility at Fitzgerald Bay, the marina, was specifically built for the aquaculture industry using money from the Rail Reform Transition Program, which funded a nursery in Port Augusta, the marina and a number of other things in Fitzgerald Bay many years ago. Now Clean Seas are coming back to Fitzgerald Bay.

When I talk about conservative stocking rates, the approval is for up to 4,000 tonnes of fish. I think there might well be issues with that. I will have a deeper look into this, but I think there are going to be issues with that. We know that, to the south of Fitzgerald Bay—at False Bay, which is on the other side of the Point Lowly peninsula—over many years BHP discharged into that bay what was essentially a nutrient load in the form of ammonia. We know that, over time, the ammonia destroyed or degraded around about 20 square kilometres of seagrass beds in False Bay. We have all the figures, going back over the years, for the ammonia discharge.

We know that nutrient load was less than the potential nutrient load that is going to be generated in Fitzgerald Bay. I do not think the impact is going to be on the cuttlefish, because of the coastal dynamics in that area. If there were to be an impact, it would have come from the ammonia from BHP, which was downcurrent from the kingfish.

The fact that so much seagrass was destroyed in that bay is a cause of concern. We need complete openness, complete transparency and really decent monitoring, and it needs to be done in a way that it is not usually done. The public needs to be involved with it so that aquaculture in Fitzgerald Bay can continue to have its social licence to operate. If it is not completely open and transparent, they will lose their social licence to operate.

COMMUNITY WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (15:48): I rise with great pleasure to speak about the government's commitment to a project that has already commenced to transfer over 4½ thousand households from the Tea Tree Gully council's ancient, archaic septic system across to modern, reliable SA Water sewerage. This is a very important project for our community in the north-east. We will be fixing a decades-old issue at no cost to the household. We are being very clear about that: we are transferring all properties right across, and it will be at no cost to the household.

Prior to becoming the local member, I lived in a part of Newland that was not on the old system, so I had normal SA Water sewerage—as most people assume they will have when they live in the metropolitan area. But I had heard the odd rumblings about septic tanks, which I thought was a little bit odd. My parents have one, but they live out north of Angle Vale, and everyone has one out there. I thought, 'This is odd. What are people talking about in areas like Fairview Park and Banksia Park about having septic tanks?' But it became very clear after being elected that this was a really big problem.

People had been struggling with these things. They were getting blocked up all the time, the fee was starting to increase dramatically and they were being told a lot of information about, 'This is why the fee has to go up. It's because of the Water Industry Act'—all this sort of thing—which turns out not to be true. Nonetheless, there was a lot of information floating around the place that people were not trusting. They had been paying a fee to the council for a system for decades believing that the system and the future of that system were being taken care of. There was someone out there who was planning for its future.

What has really enraged so many within the community is that it turns out that has not been the case. There has been no plan for its future, and it did not take very long for me to work out and to really see that rage. I can remember going to a community meeting at the Tea Tree Gully council where they had decided to set up a series of different stands where people on the system could go around and find out different bits of information. It very quickly turned into a very angry crowd asking questions of the council leadership. People were very angry.

From quite early on, I had conversations very quickly with the Minister for Environment and Water, the Premier, the Treasurer and anyone else who would want to hear about this important

issue for people in the north-east. I was dumbfounded at how little interest anyone had paid this issue before. As time went on, we worked on it. This is obviously a very big commitment of tens of millions of dollars to fix what is ultimately a council asset and a council system.

I was thrilled when the state government decided that we would fix this decades-old system. The problems had gone beyond what was within the means and ability of the council to deal with on their own and, ultimately, SA Water would need to step in and fix it. This was fantastic. The community was thrilled. This is not about me, but a number of people in the community came to me and said, 'No-one has ever talked about this issue before. Everyone just pushes it under the carpet, hopes no-one notices, and now finally there is someone who is talking about it and advocating for us on this issue.'

I do welcome the Labor Party's new-found interest on this issue. They had 16 years and they did nothing. I was very curious to find out what sort of correspondence the former local member had with council on this. Had the council been lobbying that local member for state government intervention prior to us coming to government? I was really surprised when we did an FOI quite a number of years prior to coming to government that there was pretty much nothing. There was almost nothing.

Mr Whetstone: No interest?

Dr HARVEY: There was no interest. There was some correspondence on behalf of a constituent who had an issue with their tank, but there was essentially no interest from either side on that issue in terms of what we were able to get. I was really quite shocked. In any case, I do welcome that the Labor Party, who were in a position where they were unable to do anything, now suddenly do care about this issue. But we are very clear: we are committed to transferring all properties across. It will be at no cost.

I am extremely excited about this project. We have actually started, so it is not a case of just talking about it prior to an election and then hoping that people believe us, and then afterwards deciding what we are really going to do. We have already started. Households are already being connected. The full project will commence at the end of this year. Early next year will be stage 1. We will go to stage 2, we will go to stage 3 and, finally, after more than 60 years, we will fix a problem that has impacted so many thousands of households within my community in the north-east.

ROYAL AUSTRALIAN AIR FORCE CENTENARY

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:53): Today, I would like to talk about the Royal Australian Air Force centenary celebrations and also the recent 80-year anniversary celebrations of the Port Pirie Bombing and Gunnery School at Port Pirie.

On 16 June this year, the local RSL commemorated the 100-year celebration of the RAAF, the 80th anniversary of the loss of life of the young airmen whilst training at the Port Pirie Bombing and Gunnery School in World War II, and also commemorated Sergeant Reuben Maurice Plummer. The following message is from Gary Fradd of the Port Pirie RSL sub-branch. He said on the day:

On the 13th of August 1942, Fairey Battle L5759 spun into the sea of Port Pirie and both crew members were killed. The probable cause of the accident was listed as 'obscure'.

Sergeant Reuben Maurice Plummer, Service Number 408754 (Pilot) and Leading Aircraftman Leslie Gaunt Price, Service Number 38217 were killed on impact. LAC Prices body was recovered from Spencers Gulf and is buried just a few metres from here in the Port Pirie General Cemetery (with a Commonwealth War Graves Headstone) but sadly, there is no mention of Sergeant Plummer on this hallowed ground, whose body was never recovered from the sea.

Reuben's name is however, inscribed on the Sydney Memorial within the Sydney War Cemetery. His name is listed alongside 748 other men of the Australian Army, Royal Australian Air Force and the Australian Merchant Navy who lost their lives in the southwest Pacific region during World War Two, and who have no known grave. Specifically, Reuben's name is listed on Panel 6 and this is his official commemoration.

However, at the conclusion of the service, Maurice's niece Judy Briedis gave the following tribute:

Over the years there have been many notable conflicts, some that come to mind.

Although Reuben Maurice Plummer was christened Reuben, in the family he was forever known as Maurice. I will refer to him today as Maurice.

Maurice was born in Koondrook, spent some of his youth in Merbein, and moved to Wonthaggi as an 11 year old.

When Sergeant Maurice Plummer died in that fateful plane crash, his family desperately asked the RAAF, how, when, where and why, did their son and brother die?

How...Plane crash.

When...3pm, 13th August, 1942.

Where...Port Pirie, near the mouth of Second Creek.

Why did he die...This question was asked by the family, over and over again. The [Royal Australian Air Force], without ever recovering the plane or Maurice's body, continually replied that they could only record it as an aircraft incident. The situation we have here is that Plummer family grief, far outweighed RAAF logic.

The question the family was really asking was,

'Why isn't our son and brother coming home?'

There is no satisfactory or acceptable answer to a shattered and heartbroken family.

Let me tell you about the young, single Maurice our family lost. Short in stature. An ideal gentleman that didn't smoke, drink or swear. A perfect replica of our gentle grandfather.

He participated in many sports such as cricket and football. He was an above average runner and excellent swimmer, which was evidenced by gaining his bronze medallion as an 11 year old. He excelled at tennis, being the district men's champion, and also golf where he held the local course record for [several years].

Academically, he was somewhat of a boy genius.

He matriculated in 1936, with honours, when still only 15 years old. He passed Maths, Geography, History, English and would you believe...French...

The [Royal Australian Air Force] obviously identified Maurice's exceptional talents. The normal training period for a RAAF pilot was nine months. Maurice enlisted in May 1941 and in five and a half months attained his flying badge. Six weeks later he was promoted to Sergeant, and two weeks later, posted to Port Pirie as a flight instructor.

The Plummer family had already been drawn tightly together by grief. They had lost a young sister, Dorothy, in infancy. Then, when Maurice and his three sisters, Edna, Joyce and Gwen, were all teenagers, their mum died of cancer. Such tragedies made the Plummer sibling bond [very] unbreakable.

Now the RAAF were not able to tell the three doting sisters, why wasn't he coming home. They were devastated by the fact that their extremely gifted young brother was lost, never to return. He was somewhere out there in [the middle of] the ocean. In a deep, dark and cold place, and most of all...alone!

Alone at a time when he most needed his sisters help. He was always there for them in their troubled times, but now, in his desperate time of need, they could not put their arm around him and comfort him.

This is, of course, is the 'why' question the Plummer family were asking, and as we all know, there is no answer.

To quote a recent RAAF post about Maurice...'Tragically, his body remains, to this day, lost in his own country without a known grave.'

War time was terrible waste of many brilliant lives.

Maurice Plummer's nephews and nieces could not be here today [due to COVID restrictions]...

Through them we all learnt to love Maurice...

However, we do understand now that Maurice was given a memorial service and a final resting place in Port Pirie. She goes on to say:

The Plummer family gratefully accept that his spirit and soul now reside here, at a tangible place we can visit. Edna, Joyce and Gwen are no longer with us, but you can rest assured, today they are beaming with joy, for their long lost brother is not still alone, but here, reunited with his family.

WAITE ELECTORATE

Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:58): I rise today to acknowledge some of the fantastic local service groups in my community. Members of these groups volunteer significant amounts of time and devote their own money and efforts to serve others and our broad community. I will always maintain that they are key measures of a thriving society that can be found in how many of these service groups exist and how they are active in their community. I offer my thanks to every single member of these groups in our community. We simply would not be what we are without them.

First of all, the Lions Club of Blackwood has been part of the community since 1965 and continues to maintain a strong presence with their good work throughout the area. The club's bargain centre is open every Saturday morning, selling second-hand goods to raise money for worthy causes. This year, the club celebrated its three millionth dollar raised through the bargain centre, which is an outstanding achievement. It was a privilege in March to attend the handing over of the new Lions shelter at Manson Oval in Bellevue Heights to the City of Mitcham.

In recent times, I have been working closely with the Lions Club of Blackwood, as we look to put on the 2021 Blackwood Christmas Pageant, and a big shout-out to Chris Martin and Lew Corso, the outgoing president of the club, for putting together what has been a very difficult COVID management plan, which we submitted to SA Health last week. Fingers crossed, there will be a Blackwood Christmas Pageant this year.

Many thanks to Lew, the outgoing president of the club, for that work and congratulations to Kevin Brooks, who is the incoming president, and we celebrated at their changeover dinner last week. At the changeover dinner, we also congratulated Anthea Stretton on being named as a Melvin Jones Fellow and Graham Smithers on his work as a Guiding Lion. They are one fantastic community organisation.

The Rotary Club of Blackwood is another sterling institution in Waite that provides much-needed support and service to the Blackwood community. This July, they are holding their 37th art show and sale, exhibiting hundreds of artworks by South Australian artists, many of which will be available for purchase. Proceeds support local community projects and other Rotary-specific ventures. Of course, the art show was not able to be held last year due to COVID, so we are really looking forward to the opening of that show in a couple of weeks' time.

The club also celebrated its 50th anniversary, and I have been fortunate enough to spend time with the club members to celebrate this important occasion. A few weeks ago, the club opened a new shelter, in conjunction with the City of Mitcham, at Karinya Reserve on Shepherds Hill Road. They continue their fantastic work with local youth and fundraising through book sales.

On Monday night, I had the pleasure of being at the Belair Hotel for their changeover dinner. A big thankyou to Robyn Venus for her sterling efforts over the past 12 months as club president and for really bringing the club back together. I wish Lyn Muller all the best as this year's incoming president.

Some award recipients at the changeover dinner were Graham Lough for the Vern Surman Award—Vern Surman was a charter member of the club—Chris Howard for receiving a Paul Harris Award (Sapphire); Don Venus for receiving a Paul Harris Award, mainly for being the spouse of Robyn Venus and being a long-suffering Rotary husband; Robyn herself for receiving the Paul Harris Award (Sapphire); and Martin Rowe, Volkan Demir, Peter Geer and Barry Sheridan for all receiving President's Awards.

The Mitcham Rotary Club also play a huge role in our community. They meet a bit down the hill to engage and support charities and organisations that help so many vulnerable South Australians. Some of their recent efforts include a thankyou barbecue at the Repat, book sales, sponsoring young people through their Rotary programs and cleaning gardens at local aged-care facilities to install sensory gardens.

Last night, the club celebrated their changeover dinner. Unfortunately, as the house was sitting I could not attend that dinner, but big thanks to outgoing president, Barry Hurst, for his service and welcome to Marko Klobas as the incoming president. Congratulations go to Peter Dry, for being awarded the Paul Harris Fellow; and secretary Andrew Atterton, Community, Vocational and Youth Services Director Lee, and bookshop manager, Chris, for receiving the Paul Harris Fellow (Sapphire) Award as well.

There are so many groups in our community that do so much: Brown Hill Creek Rotary Club, Coromandel Valley Rotary Club, Mitcham Lions and the various Probus Clubs that all undertake amazing work in our community. I hope to be able to speak about their outstanding work in the future. Every dollar raised, every program run and every effort makes a difference in the lives of those who are fortunate enough to live amongst these service groups. I look forward to continuing to support

their good work and the work of all our service groups in Waite to ensure a better community for all of us.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (16:04): I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 20 July 2021 at 11am.

Motion carried.

Bills

APPROPRIATION BILL 2021

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (16:04): As I was saying before the lunch break, interminably we hear the clichéd slogan over and over again from those opposite that they are building what matters—hollow, clichéd words without substance, and often uttered to avoid answering questions, given by a government that absolutely does not understand nor has compassion for what actually matters to our community.

It speaks to this government's lack of priority for those who are ill, unsafe, looking for a home, struggling to keep their family together. It says to many in our community that a basketball stadium planned for sometime in the distant future is of more value to this government than ensuring every South Australian is safe, can access the health care and housing they need and is able to equally participate in community life, experience equality of opportunity and economic equality.

This budget says to our community that this government does not understand that these are at the heart of what matters to our community, that these are the issues that occupy the minds and the hearts of South Australians every single day. They are certainly issues that matter deeply to our community in the south. This is a budget that pays scant attention to growing crises in health, child protection, domestic violence prevention and our environment whilst simultaneously splashing \$662 million on a city basketball stadium.

What do we actually have to show for the huge billions of dollars of debt Treasurer Rob Lucas has saddled our state with as his swan song? Debt is understood by people and there is some acceptance of it, particularly given the challenges our community has recently traversed, but South Australians want to know what the purpose of accruing this debt is. They want to know that it will address those issues that impact them and their families in their minds and hearts and that they spend days and nights worrying about.

This debt does not address those issues. What this debt delivers is shallow, long-range, vague promises that might or might not be delivered in the very, very distant future. It certainly was not spent on improving prevention and early intervention programs in child protection, nor on supports and prevention services for women who are experiencing or at risk of experiencing domestic violence.

How can we amass an eye-watering \$1.8 billion deficit and end up with 371 fewer jobs across the health sector? How can we commit to a \$662 million inner city basketball stadium when we cannot afford \$200,000 for the City-Bay, an event that has attracted up to 40,000 participants each year for almost half a century? How can we spend \$49 million on a new headquarters for elite sport whilst community sporting organisations are folding due to a lack of recurrent funding?

As our leader made very clear this morning, Labor will not proceed with the Liberals' \$662 million basketball stadium whilst our health system is in crisis. Our priorities are to ensure that our health system can cope with growing demand, that we address hospital overcrowding and ambulance ramping and that South Australians who need care can access that care when they need to do so—and access that care they must.

It has been absolutely heartbreaking to hear story after story, day after day, of South Australian people, including children and senior members of our community, when faced with the

terror that comes with needing urgent medical care, waiting and waiting for that care, often whilst ramped in the back of an ambulance outside a hospital whose emergency department is already full.

It has been absolute devastating to see how hard this situation is for our incredible health heroes: ambos, nurses, doctors, PSAs, cleaners in our hospitals, people who are here today who know just how hard this budget's cuts to health will be. Every one of those people undertakes the work they do because they care and because they want to be there for people at their hardest moments. The sadness, stress and anger they have felt as a result of their frustration at not being able to provide the care in the way they know is best because of a lack of resources is something that these outstanding people should not have to feel.

As our leader has done today, I commend every single one of them and express my gratitude for their work and for their advocacy for a system that is best for South Australians. Unlike those opposite, I applaud them for taking their message to the streets. Again, whilst the Marshall Liberal government focuses negatively on chalked messages, South Australians who know exactly what matters are sharing messages of support for these health heroes. Budgets should always be about people, not about vague announcements.

Ensuring every single South Australian child can physically, mentally, emotionally and socially thrive must always be at the heart of what we do in this place. This state budget offers little new spending on child protection over and above what is desperately needed to address the huge continuously increasing numbers of children going into care. Our child protection system is in crisis, with chronic staff shortages in residential care homes, foster carers leaving the system en masse, children being abused and injured whilst in care, and families crying out for the support they desperately need to keep them strong and to keep them together.

Despite its own projected increase in the number of children expected to go into state care over the next 12 months, very little is being done to address the dire lack of early intervention and prevention programs. In this budget, we see very little investment in any programs that will address these issues. We see no commitment to implement Nyland recommendation 150 to ensure that there are always two staff members in residential care homes.

We do not see any commitment for a community visitor scheme for children in residential care homes, which would provide them with an extra layer of protection, support and advocacy which the Guardian for Children and Young People has expressly asked for amidst dire warnings that children in care are at ongoing risk of exploitation and abuse. We see very little in the way of resources to address the absolutely shocking fact that one in every 11 Aboriginal children in South Australia is in state care or anything to address the fact that just 23.3 per cent of young Aboriginal offenders are being diverted away from the courts—the lowest number since records began, compared with 55.6 per cent of non-Aboriginal young people.

Recent figures show 10,166 missing person reports concerning children in state care were made in 2019-20, up from 8,968 the previous year. Again, what in this budget will address this shocking statistic? There were 4,542 children in care as of April this year including a staggering 582 in residential care. Residential care staff say that they just cannot keep up with the demand and are often forced to do a second shift once they have completed their first day's shift. This has led to protests outside the minister's office by staff who are absolutely at breaking point.

Earlier this year, it was reported in the media that children in state care are being looked after in state government offices. The Public Service Association told InDaily that about 20 children have been cared for in nine different metropolitan offices over the holiday period, yet we have a Liberal government that is focused on basketball stadiums.

This is a government that is forcing foster carers to rely on emergency food relief charities to feed children in state care, a leaked Department for Child Protection memo showed. So on one hand, we are urging Department for Child Protection staff to refer young people and carers to charities including the amazing Foodbank, Fred's Van and the Salvation Army for their food needs, while on the other the government is running around proposing stadiums very few people seem to want.

Along with Department for Child Protection workers, our foster carers are the backbone of our child protection system. Yet they are leaving in droves because they feel undervalued,

disrespected and are often out of pocket by a cumbersome reimbursement process. Yet there was no money for foster carers—no support whatsoever—despite repeated requests from peak bodies.

We see nothing, shamefully, by way of support for outstanding organisations like Grandparents for Grandchildren, who undertake exemplary work to support and empower the growing numbers of grandparents who look after their grandchildren full time. Again, this budget fails to focus on what actually matters to South Australian families and places no value whatsoever on what the most vulnerable South Australian children and their families need to thrive.

This budget further highlights the Marshall Liberal government's neglect of grassroots and community sport. It allocates \$662 million for a basketball stadium and \$49 million for a new SASI headquarters, whilst leaving the City-Bay, Reclink, state sporting organisations and community sporting clubs across our state to wither on the vine.

This follows a pattern of cuts to community sport that is the hallmark of this Liberal government—a government that cut the dedicated \$24 million Female Facilities Program and the synthetic surfaces program almost immediately upon coming into government in 2018. Of course we should support elite-level sport; however, never ever at the expense of organisations, clubs, associations and leagues across our state that bring our community together week in, week out and include people and support them to be their best.

Demonstrating his lack of regard for community sport, the minister recently diverted a large proportion of \$2.3 million in Partnerships Program grants away from community sport toward private providers. The awarding of these grants came after a flawed grants review process that was finalised almost 18 months after it was scheduled to be concluded. More than 70 per cent of the Partnerships Program grants went to private providers instead of state sporting organisations and others that rely on these grants to run competitions across South Australia.

Meanwhile the government, as I have said, has simultaneously announced it will spend \$49 million on new headquarters for SASI. This prompted Sport SA CEO, Leah Cassidy, to tell ABC radio on Tuesday that the government's funding arrangements contradict its own Game On strategy. Ms Cassidy said:

It's a massive shift...We can't produce SASI athletes if we don't grow participation at the grassroots level...Every athlete I talked to says, 'We wouldn't be here if it wasn't for our local clubs.'...I just question this investment by the government. If your agenda is Game On participation, and then you put [millions of dollars] into elite where we know we get less than 1 per cent of the population who'll make that elite level.

Indeed. How can we train elite athletes when we are starving feeder clubs and associations? While Labor welcomes any investment in sport, we are seeing money flow to elite sports whilst many community clubs, peak bodies and state sporting organisations are struggling to attract small grants to keep their operations going.

Our sporting peak bodies, associations and clubs were severely impacted by the COVID-19 crisis and this restructuring of infrastructure funding is just compounding that pain. This is particularly the case in areas where we have seen the government systematically award grants to wealthy clubs in wealthy areas that can afford the exorbitant co-contributions required under the flawed Liberal government's program.

The Marshall Liberal government's latest round of the Grassroots Facilities Program again saw an overwhelming number of projects go to Liberal-held seats. Just 11 of 70 projects went to Labor areas. Its predecessor, the Grassroots Football, Cricket and Netball Facility Program saw just six clubs in Labor electorates receive funding from no less than 47 successful bids.

In the case of Reclink—founder of The Choir of Hard Knocks and the hugely popular Reclink Cup—it is struggling to survive in South Australia after losing \$50,000 of recurring state government funding. This is a group whose innovative programs help develop people experiencing significant disadvantage and to improve their physical and mental health through engaging in sport, recreation and the arts.

The Victorian and the Tasmanian governments recently provided \$4 million and \$500,000 respectively in long-term funding to Reclink, recognising the important role that they play in getting people back on their feet. Reclink is just one amongst a number of community organisations to have missed out. It is the same story with the City-Bay, which has also missed out on funding through grants and other government funding.

The City-Bay, a not-for-profit event, which is used by a multitude of community organisations for fundraising activities, began in 1973 and, as I mentioned, now attracts up to 40,000 participants and is one of the nation's biggest fun runs. Its future is uncertain. As well as missing out on grants through this government's skewed programs, it asked and asked for the government's support and got punted from office to office. It was only after a Labor media conference that anything changed, and a meagre, inadequate \$50,000 was offered up.

This is yet another event that could disappear under this Liberal government, following in the footsteps of the Adelaide Fashion Festival, the Adelaide 500 and the Adelaide Motor Sport Festival. Organisations like Reclink and the City-Bay, and our state sporting organisations and peak bodies that engage thousands of South Australians in sport week in and week out, should not have to beg or miss out altogether as numerous other clubs repeatedly have in this government's flawed grants program.

The South Adelaide Football Club, for example, again misses out on its desperately needed women's change rooms. Again, this government, through this area of the budget, shows that they do not understand what is actually important to South Australians and what matters in their day-to-day lives. We know that women bore the brunt of economic loss experienced through COVID, with industries that women predominantly work in heavily impacted.

We also know that women are more likely to work in insecure work, to earn less and to be subject to sexual harassment at work. We know that a stringent focus on these issues is required if we are to make meaningful changes that enable women to equally participate in our economy.

Sadly, last year we heard horrific stories about women locked at home with their abusers and the resulting increase in domestic violence. Despite all this, this budget shows a 25 per cent cut in staffing at the Office for Women and an enormous reduction in its budget line overall. The rate of domestic violence in South Australia has significantly increased over the past year, with more than 1,100 additional domestic violence related offences, yet despite these and other shocking figures that show the detrimental effect COVID has had on the rates of domestic violence this government refuses to properly fund domestic violence services.

In last year's budget estimates, the human services minister confirmed that there were no ongoing funds for their much-lauded domestic violence prevention hubs, saying:

We have been clear in relation to the safety hubs that they needed to be quite lean. There was not any election commitment funding attached...

And later that, no, there was not a budget allocation. So, here we are again, a year later. The government is vowing to continue to 'support the establishment of safety hubs', yet still there is no dedicated funding. Their budget talks vaguely in last year's highlights about developing a service model for the statewide perpetrator response—

The SPEAKER: The time for the member for Reynell's contribution to the debate has expired.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (16:24): Adelaide is a great place to live, the third greatest city in the world on some measures, and it can be a lot better. Budgets are complex documents, and most South Australians want their elected members to analyse the details and represent them and their interests in the debates ahead. This budget, at the beginning of the election campaign cycle, provides the background of the contest of ideas voters will consider, and it itemises the priorities for this government's future agenda.

So it is an exciting time, especially for people like me who think democracy happens every day and not just once every four years. South Australia will always need to plan ahead and continue to fight above its weight. We have been leaders before and, with purpose and faith in our people and Public Service, must continue to strive to be leaders again.

There is an old saying, 'The devil is in the detail,' and all budget announcements have a lot of detail. Then there is the much older saying of looking after the pennies, the pre-decimal equivalent of the cent, while the eye-watering number of dollars in this budget are seemingly looking after themselves. The people of South Australia could be referred to as the pennies, and they are not

feeling well looked after when you consider that the focus is no longer on them and the basic services they rely on for their daily lives and wellbeing. The penny does need to drop.

I want the major parties to tell us the truth, stop the spin, keep their promises and show us the money when they tell us what they will do so we know when they are going to do it. I have seen and heard it all and will stand up, as I have always done, when things need to change. However you look at it, the big picture impacts of COVID and this government's reaction to the pandemic will be with us for years.

Here I must put on the record how grateful I am to each and every frontline worker, especially in the health, paramedic and police sectors, who have contributed to our COVID response. To everyone who has been involved—the retail workers, those working in the community and caring for others, or those just doing the right thing—thanks to you too. The outlay to combat COVID had to be significant, and it is a sobering thought when you consider the amount of pain we have had to endure so far to receive any gains at all.

Under often exciting headings, there is sometimes very little or immediate change to see in any budget at first glance, and, while technically not untrue, some of the projects or initiatives are not what they first seem. Sometimes they are scheduled to start so far into the future you can see promises made several elections ago still being announced years later, and so it is in this budget, with some of the local announcements for the north-east—and I deliberately say north-east because I think the people of the north-east are missing out in several areas—big announcements and smaller ones and ones not due for years when examined.

Meanwhile there is good news in the budget, but there is also bad news. Access delayed is access denied, and the new park-and-ride at Modbury TTP Interchange, which was first funded in 2017, might finally be delivered by 2023. It is now projected to cost \$48.5 million over two years, almost five years since it was first mooted. What happened to the park-and-ride promised as part of the campaign last election? Well, it was moved to an adjoining electorate, to Golden Grove, and while we do not begrudge anyone at Golden Grove anything it would have been much better if it had not meant people at Modbury had to miss out.

What some people may not realise at first glance is the distance from the concourse for both park-and-rides. That will be an issue, as will be the exposure to the weather for commuters using the facility. It lacks amenity and is like a lunar landscape, well below par when you look at interchanges both interstate and internationally. Hopefully those who currently park in the allotment earmarked at the site for the new build at Modbury, those who work at Datacom or the kindy cohort at the Modbury Community Children's Centre, will receive adequate notice of the commencement of the work to be done, unlike those in Golden Grove, who were left without any alternative place to park for more than two months.

The rush to have the project up and running by the next election has also meant the parking problems have piled up over to all the stations on the O-Bahn line, seeing congestion returning to the streets around the Modbury, Klemzig and Paradise interchanges. That brings me to the associated issues of parking charges at TTP and improvements to public transport.

Paid parking at Tea Tree Plaza is something that has hung over our heads in the north-east for many years and may, in fact, soon become a reality. This could be sheeted home to the delay in building the new park-and-ride at Modbury, which allowed Westfield the excuse of saying they had to turn over parked vehicles at their shops faster. Mind you, once the parking equipment has been installed there will be no way to stop charging for parking.

While it may seem we are complaining before there is a problem, the number of car parks at Tea Tree Plaza has been reducing for years, and though charges may start low they will definitely increase. Shame on the person who thought the decision to delay building a second park-and-ride at Modbury would have little consequence, and shame on those who allowed it to happen without greater opposition.

For better public transport and higher patronage you need new ideas, and bus rapid transit (BRT) is one of them. When I first had a close look at the new parts of Florey following the last election's boundary changes, there were a couple of stand-out gaps. One was the lack of cross-suburban linkages in the public transport system.

Public transport use in South Australia is low compared with other states because the current bus system runs slow due to the congestion caused by other road users. A BRT can provide a more efficient solution, requiring less time, energy, land and resources to move people between destinations. This system can reduce the average kilometres travelled by vehicles, petrol costs, parking charges and greenhouse gas emissions, especially with the eventual use of hybrid or electric buses.

I did some work at the Southgate Institute at Flinders University on BRT, and their vision for better communities. I am grateful to Fran Baum and Michael McGreevy for their work outlining how simple initiatives and measures can make a real difference. I also thank Renewal SA for their in-kind support in this ongoing work.

Adelaide's O-Bahn was the first guided busway in the Southern Hemisphere and, until 2011, when Cambridge put in a 25-kilometre one, it was the longest in the world. The 15 kilometres from Tea Tree Plaza to the city via Paradise and Klemzig now takes 20 minutes and has been deemed far more efficient than the rail network.

The no-longer-in-use model of the Footy Express to West Lakes encouraged and increased the use of BRT as buses were able to navigate through traffic more efficiently, reducing travel times and costs for commuters. Connecting the Modbury Interchange to the Mawson Lakes railway via Ingle Farm would provide residents of the north-east with an east-west connector and greater use of the whole public transport network.

A BRT of this type can be built for less than 10 per cent of the cost of light rail. It can be built in months rather than years and with little or minimal disruption to surrounding businesses and residents. It will be an opportunity lost forever if the existing vacant Walkleys Road Corridor MATS land from Ingle Farm through to Pooraka is built on, as per plans already out for consultation. An east-west connection of north-eastern suburbs would take people to the job centres at Mawson Lakes, UniSA, Parafield and Edinburgh Parks.

Over recent years, Adelaide has seen the trial phase of electric and hybrid buses being integrated onto our roads. This budget is set to deliver \$17.3 million over five years for the purchase of 20 new Adelaide Metro buses to cater for the year 7 transition to high school, but it does not consider any investment into the RBT east-west connector in the north-east.

Health is an issue on which people are really focused, especially if they have ever had experience of the system. One of my constituents recently said to me that being sick is a tough, full-time job. In this budget, we see \$48 million allocated to building a new 20-bed older persons mental health unit at Modbury Hospital. I know the dedicated and brilliant medical professionals who have long been urging for improved dementia care in the north-east will appreciate this upgrade, as will the families of the patients who receive this care. While this money will not deliver everything hoped for, it certainly is a step in the right direction and one which can hopefully be supplemented in future budgets, particularly with a veterans' mental health hub of some kind.

But there is a devil existing in this measure, a bit of pea-and-thimble announcement: part of the upgrade will see the decommissioning of Woodleigh House, the acute adult mental health facility at Modbury Hospital, which is a tired facility desperately in need of rejuvenation. Instead, its 20 beds will go and the services provided there will be relocated to the Lyell McEwin Hospital in Elizabeth. It is yet another example of the shifting resources within the health system, with more services lost from Modbury. It is a continuation of the worst aspects of Transforming Health, which was rejected by the north-east community, with the same bureaucrats professing the same flawed thinking to the detriment of the healthcare services at Modbury Hospital.

We in the north-east have seen many health announcements and plans over the years. No-one ever will forget the failed Healthscope experiment, which is something the then Liberal government began at Modbury, with The QEH firmly in its sights. What it did was decimate the workforce and the corporate knowledge that goes with employees of long standing. I do not think Modbury Hospital has ever really recovered from that—being picked off first because it was a strong and well-performing hospital.

The failed Healthscope experiment was the beginning of Liberal moves to rein in the healthcare budget, and now KordaMentha is their latest reiteration of that sort of approach. These

sorts of approaches to me suggest that someone somewhere does not think access to health care is a right, so all the gains of Medibank and Medicare are being unwound and the delivery of a one-tier health system is being lost forever. Unfortunately, the rising costs of private health insurance and the shift to health services being delivered in private hospitals mean health care will remain an enormous worry for nearly everyone.

The much-touted and often announced rebuild at Modbury Hospital has nearly finished, and I acknowledge and thank this government for that. However, it has taken four years longer than we were led to expect during the last election campaign and in large part was budgeted before the 2018 election, after I had undertaken years of lobbying, finally having to stand hard and fast in the face of a decision I could not tolerate.

Sadly, patients are still being transferred to Lyell McEwin Hospital and not all services will be performed at the newly revamped Modbury Hospital. Here, again, the devil is in the detail: Modbury's operating theatres will not be delivering a full suite of procedures, and waiting lists, while reducing, are still unacceptably high. For example, paediatric ear, nose and throat wait times remain at 4½ years—no longer the nine years experienced until recently—and they are no longer delivered at Modbury Hospital. Some of the services do not even happen at the Lyell McEwin Hospital, meaning the promise of services closer to home has not been kept.

The damage done to a child's learning and development while waiting that long for a procedure at that young age can mean lifelong learning difficulties and a gap that cannot be made up. This is disgraceful, and no amount of speech pathology or audio equipment can make amends.

Waiting for a hip or knee replacement can also have huge impacts, mostly on older people, although I have seen much younger people in a similar situation. While we may see this sort of surgery become commonplace at Modbury, too many people have had to wait too long for a reduction in chronic pain and a return to acceptable standards of life.

Palliative care will be eventually delivered in the north-east in a recently started purpose-built facility—again, announced years ago, but nevertheless it will be welcomed. Its integrated services are provided by a team of dedicated healthcare professionals who rightly enjoy a wonderful reputation. We are grateful to them for all they do for us at the end of life. Ambulance ramping cannot be resolved easily or it would have been. This is another example of staggered expenditure announcements not being implemented in a timely manner, meaning little or no change to poor services.

Aged care is another area needing attention and, while there will always be discussion about the responsibilities being either federal or state, that is not what older people and their families want to hear. They want to know there are standards and protections in place and know they can afford care in the final years when independent living is no longer possible. Retirement villages are another area of concern and, while many are happy in well-managed facilities, many are not. The residents who feel trapped are expecting to have assistance, and I am looking forward to seeing the results of the review that is already underway.

For those unable to afford their own homes, affordable social housing is desperately needed, and there is nothing about increased number of homes in this budget. Rather, there seems to be a leaning to encourage people into private rental accommodation with all the associated vulnerabilities. With a housing market pricing out entry-level buyers, first-home owners especially, this is an area needing a lot more thought and attention. Access to affordable, secure and clean rental homes should be a basic right, particularly for families struggling on low fixed incomes.

Jobs, secure employment, unemployment and underemployment are all connected to the education system, and parents should not have to feel they must send their children to private schools, as not all parents can or have the opportunity to give these children a future they need. Education at well-resourced and staffed schools with reasonable course choices is another right. There seems to be plenty of money around for some schools but not for others. I congratulate the government and education minister on their work on the education portfolio. Early learning is now truly a focus: a concept that has been around since Muriel Matters was teaching over 100 years ago.

While speaking of Muriel, I particularly want to acknowledge the Speaker and the Minister for Education for instituting the Muriel Matters award in every South Australian high school, and I

look forward to working with them to make sure activism is nurtured and delivers the leadership so necessary in a progressive world.

There is a massive education infrastructure build program underway and, while I appreciate the need to prioritise, merit must also be part of the process. What do we see? Money for schools in marginal seats: Golden Grove gets \$15.5 million, Modbury High gets \$7 million and Banksia Park International High School gets \$9 million. All constructions have started versus funding for schools in safe seats, often the schools most in need. Again, while not begrudging any other school help, I bring this up merely as an example of what could be called a sort of pork-barrelling. It occurs perhaps more so in sports club funding too, and there are many examples of this sort of funding bias at both state and federal levels. I will talk about sports projects and funding a little later.

All these education projects are intended to primarily accommodate the inclusion of year 7 into high school in 2022. The impact of these changes on the funding for small primary schools is not yet known. Schools like Ingle Farm East Primary School and Modbury South Primary School provide vital education for all students, including disadvantaged students and those with specific needs, whether in special classes or disability units. Public education must remain strong so every child has the chance to reach their full potential.

Compare the marginal seat funding with funding for Valley View Secondary School and Para Hills High School—each part of either the current or the 2018 Florey, and what will soon be what I call 2022 Florey, considered by the boundaries commission to be a safe seat. Para Hills High gets \$5 million (construction has commenced) while Valley View Secondary School gets \$10 million, but nothing has commenced and, as far as I know, no architect or builder has been assigned.

I contend these high schools must provide better opportunities for our local students. Programs like Pedal Prix and Ice Factor must be maintained to keep students engaged and extended and, more broadly, the question must be asked: are our local students being prepared for the new jobs coming online—jobs in defence and the space industries we hear so much about? What will be our north-eastern students' chances in the competitive job markets of the future? This is where TAFE comes in. You cannot cut jobs at TAFE or privatise the number of courses at TAFE and still hope the students who need this pathway will succeed.

I want to talk more about how essential training and jobs are—jobs with good conditions and entitlements. They are essential, and I will address this area along with Aboriginal issues, safer communities, police and crime, courts and the Coroners Court in detail in my appropriation grievance.

Arts, heritage and the environment are important to the people of the north-east. We are already working with councils, Greening Adelaide and Aboriginal groups around the Dry Creek Linear Park section from Walkley's Road to Bridge Road and Stockade Botanical Park. It is an exciting opportunity, with links to RM Williams at his original property. This area will connect up with cycling, hockey and soccer in the sports area at Gepps Cross. Although light on big art and heritage sites in our area, there is a keen interest in maintaining and expanding on what we have, and contributing to the broader debate.

To finish off my time today, I want to look at cost-of-living expenditure measures—increases in fees and charges, hard to meet when wages are static. The cost of petrol is something I have worked on all year and, while I am happy the app regime is in place, I still contend a 24-hour rather than 30-minute window for price changes would have served us all better and flattened out the fuel cycle. No other commodity can change its price as often as petrol.

Navigating the world of contracts for services like gas, electricity, phones and data, to name a few, gets harder, and a better consumer system could help. Access to Service SA offices remains not negotiable, and downsizing to a few terminals and fewer information offices will not be acceptable to my community. More than 20,000 of them will not be happy with any cuts made here. Deregulation of shopping hours is not something people ask me about. They seem more happy with what they have, and when they understand enjoying the cheapest grocery prices in Australia could be jeopardised it is a no-brainer. They are happy to support local independent retailers and buy Australian whenever they can.

One issue that touches on parts of Florey and more so in Newland is the Community Wastewater Management System (CWMS), something that has been around since the area

mushroomed too quickly for services to be installed before homes sprang up. It does not affect everyone; around 4,700 properties are involved. Contrary to what you may have heard, not everyone on the system does want to change over, even though there is no way to opt out.

The project will be staged over how many years? That's right! According to the budget documents, seven years: it will be going until 2028. Will all the planning work be done in South Australia? Is this the most cost-effective solution? Is council being squeezed? Are they being forced to continue ownership and therefore charging ratepayers for maintenance of a system due to be replaced within seven years?

New builds are being forced to go onto the CWMS even though they will be moved onto mains sewerage eventually. Someone should ask them. They are not very happy at all. The state government should stop council bashing and take responsibility. After all, everyone else in Tea Tree Gully will be paying as a taxpayer to support the 4,700 ratepayers make the move, and they, those ratepayers—the 4,700 that is—could end up paying twice, as a taxpayer and as a ratepayer.

In closing, I would like to acknowledge the work of the Public Service, the staff who support parliament and its functions and, lastly but by no means least, the staff of the Florey electorate office who work tirelessly with me to support the people in our part of the north-eastern suburbs, who will continue to do so in the lead-up to the election and beyond, we hope. We have an exciting plan to put to the government—the new government—at the time or after the next election.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (16:41): I would also like to speak about the Appropriation Bill 2021. Before I start, I would like to pay my respects to the Hon. Rob Lucas in the other place, who is retiring. Over 40 years of service in the parliament is a testament to anyone's patience. I would like to contribute today, and I will concentrate my comments on my current electorate in particular.

The budget appears to be a very important part of our future direction following the COVID-19 pandemic. I have spoken in this house previously regarding my concerns about the services that may be available to people suffering from any type of mental health issue. Whilst everyone states that there are funds available for the sector, my concerns are that there appears to be a lack of an actual workforce on the ground, particularly in regional South Australia.

There is \$163.5 million in the mental health package, including the establishment of a crisis stabilisation centre in the northern suburbs. What about those from the regions? The issues that will eventuate from the pandemic have not, in my opinion, reached their peak. The tsunami is coming later, when reality actually sets in. Do not get me wrong: there are lots of issues out there that we are all aware of, but there are lots of people out there who have not faced the reality of issues of concern or who have not brought their concerns to the relevant authorities due to their pride, especially males.

I would just like to mention the mental health services in the budget. There is \$163.5 million over four years to respond to the Mental Health Services Plan. Support for our mental health system includes \$20.4 million over three years and \$8.5 million per annum ongoing, a new crisis stabilisation centre in the northern suburbs, \$12 million in 2021-22 for the creation of an additional psychiatric intensive care bed capacity, \$48 million over four years for a new older persons mental health facility and \$5 million in 2021-22 for additional housing for people with a mental health disability.

Whilst I mentioned earlier that these services are welcome, I really question how many services and how much of these funds will be established in regional communities. If it is all in Adelaide, we again have the issue of these struggling people having to come to Adelaide or having a teleconference. There will be opportunities to transfer metropolitan patients in Adelaide to peri-urban hospitals for ongoing care in peak periods, which is very simple and should create more spare beds in metropolitan hospitals. However, to be able to do this, we will need to have far more Ambulance Service staff and ambulances to get these people to these hospitals.

We have ramping in metropolitan Adelaide all the time. Every day we hear about that. We are not too bad in the regional areas, but there is an issue out there. There is a private ambulance service in Port Pirie, ActFas, which has the contract for hospital-to-hospital transfers. I know our metropolitan Ambulance Service staff work under extreme pressure, but so do our regional staff, who at times have to work a complete shift without any breaks. This is unacceptable. I hear this all the time from people.

I had a stroke just before the new year and was very fortunate as there was an ambulance readily available there, but there are times when ambulance staff are at their wits' end. They are at the extreme end of their shift. They are under extreme pressure out there. I ask the Minister for Health and Wellbeing to put more staff on and more ambulances and to not forget about our regional services.

Another issue is the shortage of GPs across all regional areas, and Port Pirie and Port Augusta are no exceptions. Recently, the Goyder's Line clinic at Peterborough stated they were closing that facility, which would mean that people from Peterborough would have to travel to Orreroo some distance away. Some of these people may not have a motor vehicle, may not have the funds for petrol or may not be capable of driving to the required services. I have been pushing this for the last 18 months. I have had discussions with the minister and I have had discussions with the federal member.

The issue is that we get doctors here, but we are not getting them into regional areas. Everybody says there are plenty of funds, but the issue of getting doctors into regional areas is of the utmost importance because people are starting to go into the regions from metropolitan Adelaide and interstate. They are going into regional South Australia because it is a lot safer and it is a better lifestyle. If they are going to be doing that, we need those services out there, so I ask the government to address this as a matter of urgency.

I also see that there is new funding for our most vulnerable people, with \$1.3 million over two years to help children who are at risk of being remanded in custody due to a lack of accommodation and support services by connecting them to appropriate supports. I will be looking forward to how this works, especially when we already have over 500 people in my region who are homeless.

In question time today, I asked a question about vacant Housing SA homes and how many Housing SA homes have been sold over the last 12 months and the outstanding preventative maintenance. The issue is that everybody says there is a lot of money there. There are plenty of funds, but they are not expending those out there. I know tradespeople in the regions who are only too happy to do that.

One of the concerns is the maintenance services facilities management. The government is looking at transferring it from the regions back into metropolitan Adelaide. Both parties need to realise that the regions really do matter. It is a logo that the government has: regions matter. But we have to put the job there and say, 'Let's put the stuff out there.' Let's not make it about terminology. Do not just talk about it. Let's have a bit of action on this.

With schools in my electorate, the rebuilds that were approved previously—and most of those were by the previous government—are nearly completed and will be a great asset to those students and teachers using the facilities. We have some great schools in my area. Balaklava High School and the primary school and Clare High School are absolutely fantastic. They have a trade school in there.

Roger Nottage, the principal at John Pirie Secondary School, has done a fantastic job. He has transformed that school into what it is today. It has great pride. The \$11 million redevelopment is going well there. It is a school that people are taking pride in at the moment. Years ago, it had a bad image, but at the moment they have a very good image. The SACE has around a 98 per cent success rate, so I am very happy with that. But, again, I really have to say thank you to the previous government because they committed those funds. The actual work was done in the term of the Liberal government now.

When the government spruiked the \$17.9 billion infrastructure spend, it sounded very impressive and it is. However, this is over many years and nearly half is being carried in the north-south connector—nearly \$10 billion—and \$662 million is for the sports stadium. I will talk about the sports stadium. We have issues out there with health, ramping, ambulances, nurses and doctors, yet we are going to put \$662 million into a sports facility on the River Torrens. I hear everybody say that it is going to be good for South Australia, that it is going to bring in more attractions and concerts and things like that, but we really need to be very serious about what we have to concentrate on.

As I said, all the stuff being produced for the operation and the running of this state is from the regions, yet we do not get anything out there. We will talk about roads in a minute, but for that

\$662 million I would rather see more MFS trucks and CFS vehicles out there. I would rather see more ambulances out there. I would rather see more staff out there and more people out there on the ground to help these people out. Get more doctors out into the regions and into the hospitals and you will save money.

Again, I note that some members here say they believe in it. I do not believe in it. I do not think that this particular point is the right time to do it. I really would ask that the government reconsider it and put that \$662 million into other opportunities, particularly into health and education, which I will talk about it in a minute. I also thank the commonwealth government for their 80 per cent contribution to the \$786 million, being \$628 million, with \$158 million from the state. We can see that without federal contribution these works probably would not succeed.

I notice there is no extra funding to complete the Horrocks Highway. There are several sections, particularly south of Tarlee, where the surface is very dangerous. That is around Roseworthy and surrounds. Two or three years ago, \$55 million was put in there. They transferred \$8 million to a rail crossing and \$3 million to a bridge, which left \$44 million for the Horrocks Highway.

The Horrocks Highway is a long road. It stretches to the Clare Valley and is used for tourism and so on. I see bits and pieces being done there, but we really have to concentrate on it. That \$44 million is not going to be anywhere near enough to complete that road. I always say that if you are going to do something, do it properly the first time. I can see that we are going to do half-baked work on the Horrocks Highway and that in three to five years' time we are going to have to come back and do more work on it.

I welcome the extra funding for the Augusta Highway duplication from Port Wakefield to Port Augusta, the extra \$100 million for the planning and commencement of the highway from Nantawarra to Lochiel and the extra \$80 million towards the previously announced section from Port Wakefield to Nantawarra.

I have been harping on about the duplication of the highway from Port Wakefield for the last two or three years. We are going to have the overpass there and we are going to have the bypass going up on the eastern side, but we are going to have more and more traffic going to the north, with the renewable energy projects up around Upper Spencer Gulf, and to Yorke Peninsula, with the tourism opportunities there.

We need to have that opportunity for the duplication from Port Wakefield to Port Augusta. I was going back to Port Pirie one night and from Port Wakefield to Port Pirie I counted 176 semitrailers coming the other way. That is not what was in front of me or behind me. There are more caravans out there and there are more RVs out there. If we want to be safe and look at safety, we need to duplicate that highway.

It was also really great to see \$5 million towards a business case for the duplication of the Augusta Highway from Crystal Brook to Port Pirie. As I said, I have been a great advocate of the duplication for many years and these small sections that are being done will be going towards the total duplication.

I noticed that the budget papers state that the commencement of this duplication from Nantawarra to Lochiel should commence—and I say 'should commence'—in 2021-22. We have not even started the construction of the road from Port Wakefield to Nantawarra, which is just a bit south of Lochiel. I do not even think we have a design for the Nantawarra to Lochiel section, yet the budget papers say they need to commence it. I am sorry, but we work very, very slowly in these departments.

From a quick glance at the budget papers, these areas are included in the \$786 million: Truro bypass, at \$202 million; Augusta Highway, at \$180 million; KI roads, at \$40 million; Fleurieu Peninsula, at \$31 million; the Strzelecki Track, at \$80 million; the Old Murray Bridge refurbishment, at \$36 million, and \$105 million for safety concerns, including shoulder sealing, which is absolutely fantastic.

Shoulder sealing does it make it easier. There is more and more traffic on those roads. As I said, I travel nearly 80,000 to 100,000 kilometres per year, so I see the traffic on those roads. It is getting to the situation where there are going to be more and more accidents or deaths on those roads.

The sealing of the Strzelecki Track will be a great asset to enable trade and goods to come to South Australia for export processing instead of going to Queensland. That has been on the cards for many years. I think the previous government committed \$40 million and then the feds put some money in, but that is absolutely necessary.

I have driven on the Strzelecki Track with the previous minister, the Hon. Stephen Mullighan. We did see that little sections, about seven kilometres each, were sealed at that particular point. We did drive the Strzelecki Track. We did not just fly in there. This is the issue: if you are going to have a look at things, you do not just fly in. You actually have to drive on those roads to appreciate how bad they are.

The Strzelecki will also assist with the viability of a proposed Pirie meatworks announced on Monday by Reg Smyth at Adelaide University. This will use the new technology of harvesting seaweed, drying the seaweed and using it to feed to the animals. This will result in 90 per cent less methane from those animals, both cows and sheep, and it will also mean 15 per cent less energy used by those animals, so it will give them more weight.

I have mentioned, not only in this house but wherever I travel across the Upper Spencer Gulf, that these cities and the surrounding regions are the home of renewable energy and battery storage and the best location in the world for any renewable projects, whether they be solar, PV, thermal pumped hydro or others. The Upper Spencer Gulf has everything in the location, including an abundance of renewable energy, national rail networks, national highways, deep sea ports, airports, reliable gas supplies, the Morgan-Whyalla water pipeline, a great lifestyle and plenty of available workforce. These are really great facilities up there.

With everything that has happened in the past couple of years, and in particular with the above assets of Upper Spencer Gulf, I believe it is the right time for both the state and federal governments to put in place a master plan for utilisation and value-adding of the resources we have on our doorstep.

With the uncertainty of the future of the Whyalla Steelworks, with Gupta—I understand that he has a reprieve now, and I hope that that goes forward—and the stimulus packages that are being offered by the state and the federal governments following the pandemic, it is time to harness the assets we already have in place, and future emerging opportunities, to look at utilising these vital assets to achieve more value-adding opportunities for industries to look at relocating to the Upper Spencer Gulf to produce their products and transport their goods across the whole of Australia and also overseas.

Some time ago I was at a conference in Port Augusta where Ross Garnaut, a world-renowned economist on renewable energy projects, commented that the Upper Spencer Gulf in particular is the best place in the world for any renewable energy projects, as I said earlier. He said it would be silly for industries not to look at relocating and establishing in the Upper Spencer Gulf. As I said, we have everything there. We are at the crossroads from Queensland, New South Wales, Western Australia and also the Eastern States. I implore the state government and the federal government to look at a master plan for the Upper Spencer Gulf because we are and will continue to be the powerhouse of the state, and we are going to be a bigger powerhouse in the next two years.

Another concern has been the continuation of our regional development associations across the state. As we know, our partnership with this operation is unique. We are the only state to have federal, state and local government as funding partners. We need to have those people there because the regional development associations need to have the security and the certainty that they have a long-term contract and funding, both state and the federal, to allow them to retain the best people for their jobs.

It is great to see targets for 2022 to innovate and transform TAFE SA campuses with modern and accessible facilities. I have questioned ministers in this house previously about the continuation of the TAFE campuses, especially in regional South Australia. TAFE facilities are out there, and I think both sides have not put enough into them. TAFE is out there, and I mentioned before: do we charge our children to go to primary school? No. Do we charge them to go to high school? No. But when they go to TAFE, yes, we have to, but we subsidise it. We need to do that because regional people need to be able to get those certificates without having to come to Adelaide. It is the cost of

transportation, it is away from their family, it is away from their employment, and it is also the cost of the accommodation.

Our regions continue to struggle due to the pandemic. However, there are several tourism operators who are looking to expand and diversify to be able to capture more of the market. Those who currently have not been able to travel overseas are now experiencing the great attractions that our regions have. The Tourist Industry Development Fund is vital to these people, and I would like to see this increased to be able to facilitate the increasing demand from my operators.

It is great to see under trade and investment that the government will support 140 South Australian businesses to become new exporters or enter new markets. In the Upper Spencer Gulf there are several wineries, feed processors, and other industries including the great Golden North Dairies at Laura. Golden North has been the best ice cream in Australia for four years running. They have the opportunity, they have nearly 80 people there and they are exporting overseas.

They want to diversify but they cannot get any assistance from the government to be able to go into other products. If they could do that, they would then increase that workforce from 80 to about 130 people. That is in the little community of Laura and that would be a great stimulus. With the renewable energy projects that are happening around Crystal Brook and Bungama, and in the Upper Spencer Gulf around Port Augusta, we now have an opportunity for transition in those areas. We need the government to look at training facilities to make certain they have plenty at TAFE, and we also need accommodation, which is a big issue.

It is also pleasing to see that they are going to complete the service planning and implementation of the Yorke and Northern Local Health Network governing board strategic plan, which is well and truly overdue. Our current hospital at Port Pirie has been there for about 60 years and has had numerous reports on the structural integrity of the current building, and I am informed this includes subsidising of areas such as the kitchen, X-ray department and other locations.

What needs to happen is either major remedial works or preferably building a new hospital. I will be pushing for a new hospital because I understand this facility contains a lot of public servants who work in allied health, but 50 per cent of it is closed off due to OH&S issues. I will be asking for copies of reports about things like that, and I will be pushing for either a new hospital or a massive rehabilitation and repair job. I commend the bill to the house.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (17:01): As I rise to speak in relation to the state budget, I reflect upon one of my earliest political interactions which was out on the steps of this parliament with my mother, who has been a teacher in public schools in this state for over 30 years. She was campaigning with the Australian Education Union, and I was a little boy, and we were campaigning against the Hon. Rob Lucas. This was during the Brown-Olsen government when the Hon. Rob Lucas was closing schools, and defying teachers' pay rises and appropriate conditions.

I also reflect that I am now 38 years of age and I have been in this parliament for over seven years. When I was born, Rob Lucas had been in this parliament for two months already, and he is still the Treasurer and he has now handed down his eighth budget. I like Rob. I think he is one of the people with whom you can get along with on a personal level in this house, but I certainly do not like his policies. I certainly do not like the consistency that we have seen throughout his career in terms of cutting budgets, cutting essential services and attacks on public servants that have been consistent right through his, coming up to soon, 39 years in the state parliament, and eight budgets across many decades.

I am sure it is disappointing for him that he has had to continue on this long because of the complete dearth of talent on the treasury benches of the Liberal Party. We still do not know which of the worst possible options they are going to pick to be their next, they hope, Treasurer, but I am sure it will be shadow treasurer after the election. It will be interesting to see if we do get an announcement of that before the election or not.

As I say, this budget is very consistent with what we have seen from Rob Lucas over his career. There are no surprises there. South Australians over a long period of time, whether you are a teacher, a nurse, a doctor or a paramedic, know whose side Rob Lucas is on, and it is not on the side of those public servants in South Australia.

We have seen the most unprecedented war going on at the moment, with the government and our frontline paramedics over the past year. I think all South Australians are just absolutely

shocked by how this government has not listened, has not acted and has gone out of their way to attack paramedics rather than to listen to them and provide them the services they need.

Nothing highlights this more than what we saw recently in Rob Lucas going out to attack one of our paramedics for putting some chalk on an ambulance and apparently causing this massive damage to the ambulance, which it turned out was this tiny little dent, which has certainly caused no issues for our health system whatsoever.

But this shamed that person, with pictures in the paper, pictures on the news, which then forced 'Nick', otherwise known as the Hills Ambo, to have to speak publicly on social media and express the shame and embarrassment that he has felt because of the actions of this government—that they have taken to shame and embarrass him—and to explain the reasons why he is so upset.

That is because it struck him particularly when, as I said, being from the Hills, he was stuck on an ambulance ramp, having taken the only ambulance from his station and waiting, stuck with a patient, for hours to get treated outside a hospital emergency department and hearing on the radio a case in his own community that needed an urgent ambulance to respond.

He knew he could have responded if he had not been on that ambulance ramp. He knew that an ambulance was going to have to come from too far away, that it was going to be late and that that was going to have serious implications for that person. He then found out that that person was a friend of his. Then he found out that that person passed away. This is the reality that our paramedics are dealing with day in, day out.

Today, the Leader of the Opposition and I hosted a number of our frontline health heroes here in the parliament for this debate. We heard from paramedics, from nurses, from allied health professionals and from our support staff across our health system what a perilous state services are in; how patients are being impacted day in, day out; and how staff are getting increasingly burned out, and it is having a real impact upon them as well.

We heard about the injuries paramedics are getting, both physically and mentally, because they are not getting breaks. They are working 12, sometimes more, hours without a break. They are meant to get breaks, but they do not get breaks, because there is not enough resources and because ambulances end up getting ramped.

We heard from the people who work in the coordination and the dispatch roles who have to make these awful decisions where you have got a whole lot of cases that have been triaged as needing urgent ambulance responses, but you have got no ambulances available to respond to them, or, if you do have one, you have to pick which of these awful cases—that all need ambulances urgently—you are going to send that ambulance to, knowing the others are going to miss out. That is an awful situation to be in.

In my role, I also hear about the patients, the people who are affected day in, day out—people's loved ones who end up ramped, end up stuck in emergency departments for many days. That has a real impact upon people's lives, and sadly some people lose their lives, because we are not providing an appropriate level of care.

The stats paint the picture very clearly, but those real-world stories really make it hit home. The stats show that ramping has doubled since this government was elected. The stats show that ambulance response times have got dramatically worse. The stats show that emergency departments in South Australia and Adelaide are amongst the worst in the country.

The stats show very clearly in terms of the budget that over the past year the government has cut 112 nurses from our hospitals. The Productivity Commission shows that this is the only state that has cut funding to the ambulance service. Every other state has increased funding. It also shows that this budget is going to see 371 frontline healthcare staff cut. These are the people in our hospitals, not the people in head office in Hindmarsh Square—371 across the state. That includes every single local country hospital area. Every country LHN will be affected by these cuts, not just the city.

The city is most affected—the Royal Adelaide Hospital, The QEH and part of the Central Adelaide Local Health Network—and they have already seen significant job cuts take place there, but there are set to be another 164 this year. But 164 fewer people in some of our busiest hospitals

will not address ramping; it will only make the situation so much worse. We heard it from the paramedics in their own words today in speaking to the media when they said that this idea from the Premier that this budget will somehow fix ramping is a complete lie, an absolute lie. That is what the paramedics themselves said to the media today.

At the same time, the government has proposed a \$662 million inner-city basketball stadium. It is just astonishing how far off the mark that priority is, considering what we are seeing in the health system. I have not heard from any member of my constituency who is advocating in favour of this basketball stadium in the inner city.

I am sure a lot of people like basketball, but even those people I do not think are saying, 'We really need this. This is a top priority. We really need to replace the Entertainment Centre and build an entirely new stadium or arena for \$662 million right now', let alone all those people across regional South Australia who missed out 100 per cent in this budget. They are now seeing this mountain of cash being delivered for this inner-city CBD stadium, while their services are crumbling. We see regional health services crumbling right across the state.

There was another story just out this morning in terms of doctors not being available at Minlaton hospital. We have heard this recently at Balaklava hospital, with surgeries being stopped there. We have heard about cancellations and suspensions of obstetric services at places like Waikerie and Ceduna. We have heard about some of the violent incidents that have happened in places like Mount Gambier, Port Lincoln and Whyalla. All those places need additional help in this budget; none of these places are getting additional help in this budget.

Compared to the \$662 million arena, I think there is a tiny new little budget for Leigh Creek Health Service, and this complete fabrication of a promise to the people of the Barossa where we have the local candidate, Ashton Hurn, running around saying, 'We are going to deliver a new hospital.' But there is not one cent to build a new hospital in this budget.

They said that they did a business case; now they are promising another business case and are putting in another \$1 million to do a second business case. What was wrong with the first business case? They have never released that first business case, now apparently they have to do a second business case, and right at the end of the forward estimates they will buy some land. But, there is not \$1 in this budget for actually building anything.

There is no commitment in this budget for building any hospital, and that is just one example of how regional South Australia has been let down, from the edge of our borders to the other edge of our borders, right across our coastline, right through the whole state. We are absolutely letting down regional South Australia. That is why a very important announcement has been made today by the opposition leader that an elected Labor government will cancel that basketball stadium.

We will not spend one cent on that basketball stadium, and we will deliver that \$662 million to our ambos and our hospitals, and we will make sure that at least \$100 million of that goes to country health services. So people in the country will have a very clear choice at the next election: do you want an investment in your local regional country health services, or do you want a CBD basketball stadium? That will be a topic in the South-East, a topic in the Mid North, a topic in Port Augusta and Port Pirie, and a topic on the West Coast.

We will be reminding people at every turn that they have that very stark choice at the next election, because this budget has been aptly described by a member of this chamber as not being a state budget but an Adelaide budget. Health is just one of those areas where that is very apparent, and that is why we have made that major commitment today.

I want to spend a little bit of time talking about the issues in the mental health care system that have completely failed to be addressed by this budget as well. Mental health is in an absolutely shocking state of affairs in South Australia at the moment, and it is getting a lot worse. Statistics out recently showed that people were waiting five days in emergency departments to get a bed; five days in an emergency department bay or sometimes five days in one of the emergency department padded cells is not a situation any South Australian should be put in. It would only make their mental health condition so much worse.

They are stuck in that situation not because they could have seen their GP or another primary health care provider; these are people who are acutely unwell who need to be in an acute mental health care facility. There simply is not enough availability for that, and there are no extra beds in

this budget to address that. They are pretending there is, but there is absolutely not. We see eight beds being promised, but when you look at the budget detail there is only money to refit somewhere. There is no money to actually open those beds and provide doctors, nurses, psychiatrists, psychologists, peer workers, and allied health to provide services for those patients. Those beds are just going to be sitting there empty, according to the state budget.

We have seen investment in Modbury Hospital which is, of course, welcome, but it will deliver zero extra beds for people in the north-eastern suburbs. They are knocking down 20 beds to build 20 beds. That is not going to provide any additional capacity for our system. What we heard from our stakeholders, across a whole range of different groups, is that this absolutely ignored the issues. Australian Medical Association President Dr Michelle Atchison said:

For example we asked for 136 acute adult in-patient beds to help this crisis and we got eight so that's fallen 126 beds short of what we actually need to help this service for mental health patients here in South Australia.

We heard from the former RAH and QEH mental health boss, Professor John Mendoza, who was spectacularly basically sacked for speaking out about the awful situation of SA Health and the department. He said:

...it looks like one of those planks you pick up at the dump with a whole lot of termites through it. It's not clear to me what strategy and what is the purpose in your investment in mental health. And I might say the overall investment, while welcome, is way, way short of what is required to even address the longstanding problems, let alone COVID.

Then we heard from the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists, their SA branch chair, Dr Paul Furst, who said:

On paper today's budget sounds nice but it's just the government forging ahead with their own plan, providing Band-Aids and quick fixes, without listening to what is needed. Not nearly enough is going to be spent on the things that are important and their biggest spend is on something we didn't ask for and won't improve the ramping crisis in our emergency departments.

So this variety of groups is saying very clearly that this is not going to address the problem. In addition to that, there is nothing to address the ramping problem.

I think everyone acknowledges that one of the major problems is about making sure that there is throughput through hospitals, and making sure that there are discharge options available for people. I have even heard this being talked about by the current health minister. There is nothing in here to address that. There are no additional resources for that.

The only resources they point to in regard to ramping were in previous budgets, some of which go right back to previous budgets and the budgets of the Labor government. They are using this as part of some apparent \$110 million for emergency departments, which includes money committed under the previous government. None of it whatsoever is new in this budget, and none of it will address those discharge issues that everybody in the health sector knows are so important. From the ramping perspective, you hear very clearly from the stakeholders that this is not going to address the issue. The Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation's Professor Elizabeth Dabars says:

You can broaden the funnel as much as you like and that is what this budget tends to do but if you haven't actually addressed the back of house and how to actually get people out of hospital and prevent their entry in the first place the chronic overcrowding and the rampant ramping will continue.

The Salaried Medical Officers Association's Bernadette Mulholland said:

There's no addressing of the ramping, there's no addressing of the current shortage of resources in our Women's and Children's Hospital. Now we'll continue to see ramping, we'll continue to see bed blocks.

The Ambulance Employees Association's Phil Palmer said:

First of all, we are disappointed that the only extra funding for the Ambulance Service is that small number of paramedics that will provide a small number of crews. So the capacity of the Ambulance Service is not increased enough to make it safe. We've already got a Coroner inquiring into two cases where there was long response times and the patient died. Fiddling around the edges is not going to resolve ramping, we need increases in capacity right across the board.

From all the key stakeholder groups, you see that this is definitely not going to address the issue. As I was talking about, take what is happening in regional South Australia. The SA Rural Doctors Association's Dr Peter Rischbieth said:

There doesn't seem to be anything as far as support for the rural mental health beds that many of us have been advocating for, for acutely disturbed intensive care-type patients who are transferred down from country areas into the metro system.

That is another issue where we clearly have a lack of capacity in our mental health care system that is causing bed blocks and is causing ramping.

This is another very consistent Rob Lucas budget. We have cuts to frontline health services, we have ignoring of pleas from our frontline clinicians and we have continuation of the problems that are going to make things worse for ordinary South Australians. That is why we will stop the stadium and we will invest in health care in South Australia.

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:21): I rise to speak on the Appropriation Bill, and I do so conscious of the current circumstances that this budget ought to be seeking to make better, to make South Australia fairer and safer and more sustainable. Of all the challenges we face collectively, climate change and the transformation in our economy it demands are by far the most difficult to manage. Dealing with climate change takes understanding multiple disciplines, economics, science and politics and a willingness to make changes now for the benefit of others, including future generations.

Our emerging and future economy must be one of high complexity and low carbon. It cannot be otherwise, or we will not only fail to pull our weight in the urgent need to reduce the threat of climate change but be left behind as the rest of the world's economy tilts away from carbon and every nation seeks to be the home of good jobs and a high standard of living.

If we are to make the transition to a high-complexity economy—and we are very far from being one now—we need to invest in education, higher education, research and commercialisation of innovation. We need in this state a top 100 university. This will not happen by itself; it will only be by an act of will by those invested in a smarter state. The minimal engagement in universities in this budget suggests this government is not so invested.

It is true that this budget does not entirely ignore the new economy. We know that the Premier likes space and likes Lot Fourteen, which is fine but not enough. What will guide the \$200 million Jobs and Economic Growth Fund? How will it work with research institutions? What kind of manufacturing sector does the government envisage in South Australia? There is nothing clear, nothing defined.

What our universities need is support in this hard time, with COVID-19 keeping international students out and a hostile federal government forcing them to teach more domestic students without more funding and without any support for international students who were stranded here by the virus. The Marshall government was silent in defence of our universities when the Prime Minister told international students that they should just go home.

The government was silent when the federal government put a wrecking ball through the fee structure for domestic students in the greatest act of attempting to narrow the education of future generations I have seen. As happens too often, the Marshall government is timid when dealing with Canberra, which means our universities are left to fend for themselves. Without them being unleashed, we will not make the transition to good jobs and a sustainable economy.

We also need a low-carbon economy, and it is here that the government has gone completely missing. There is no mention of climate change in the Treasurer's speech, even though this is the most pressing challenge we face. What does the transition to a low-carbon economy look like? Two significant features are, firstly, making renewable energy work reliably by harnessing the power of storage technology and, secondly, reducing emissions from transport. Yet the government has derided Labor's Hydrogen Jobs Plan, which achieves the former, and is proudly reannouncing a tax on the use of electric vehicles, which will impede achieving the latter.

As an excuse for reannouncing the electric vehicle tax, the government has used the fact that interstate there is now such a tax in Victoria. While I do not support the Victorian government's approach, at least they have the good grace to give subsidies for the purchase of electric vehicles while at the same time slugging owners for their use. This government proposes only to do the latter.

Alongside the serious task of shifting our economic base to one that has good, secure jobs and is resilient as the world decarbonises is the equally serious task of caring for Mother Nature. Nature requires our protection and every effort to restore its resilience so that it can continue to nurture us, including all the primary production that feeds and clothes us. Every farmer and landholder knows how important a healthy environment is. You would think that the party that purports to represent the regions would understand this better, yet we have a government that has gone on a spree of environmental damage.

It started badly by miscalculating the intentions of the Eastern States and Canberra when it came to the Murray, with the government thinking its new environment and water minister could land a deal something like the magic pudding: keep giving and yet get more. Capitulate in haste and repent at leisure. Ever since that capitulation, we have seen, day after day and week after week, the news getting worse about our prospects of getting the water our environment desperately needs down the River Murray.

The Premier said that he looks forward to the Murray-Darling Basin Plan being delivered in full and on time. Well, wake up. That is simply not possible while there is a Coalition government in Canberra, and pretending otherwise lets down all South Australians because it gives the Eastern States and Canberra free rein to keep up their vandalism without a word being raised in protest beyond expressing mild disappointment.

Pretending that Barnaby's vandalism is nothing more than a stunt lets down every South Australian who is dependent on a healthy River Murray. Barnaby Joyce's actions yesterday, through the National Party in the Senate, are entirely consistent with his actions as water minister previously. He does not want South Australia to have the additional 450 gigalitres. We will not have the additional 450 gigalitres—not only not by 2024 but ever—while the current settings are in place and while the current government in Canberra continues to put National Party MPs in as water minister.

The government has also turned to marine park sanctuaries that were set up to protect our extraordinary offshore biodiversity. Having commissioned a scientific review, the government promptly ignored it—because it found that the sanctuaries should be maintained—and has ripped up the sanctuaries. Only the good work of the Hon. Connie Bonaros MLC in the other place gives us any hope that the government may yet agree with a compromise that she has hammered out. We wait with our disallowance motion ready should the government not deliver.

Not content with threatening nature in the water, the government has decided to bring in regulations to allow fast-tracked clearance of native vegetation for private developments in Flinders Chase National Park, one of the most precious and vulnerable parks we have. It is a true national park. This was in the face of sincere opposition by the Friends of Flinders Chase National Park—a pattern which is becoming all the more common in the way the government treats people who care about the environment. There is nothing in this budget to protect or restore nature in our parks.

Native vegetation more broadly indeed is under serious threat, with this government allowing the Native Vegetation Council—which is legislatively charged to protect vegetation from illegal clearance—not being fully constituted for some time and seeming not to have met since February, a far cry from the previous regime of meeting every two months. There is nothing in this budget that supports the Native Vegetation Council in its work.

This government has embarked on a highly divisive attempt to alter the management of the pastoral lands which has to date seen South Australia have much healthier and much better managed rangelands than interstate. It has done so without seeming interested in recognising First Nations' interests in land management. It has done so dangling the prospect of 100-year leases rather than recognising that the real need is to increase the effort in assessing lease extensions under the current regime.

It has done so, one might suspect, because big corporations have bought up leases and it suits them to keep officers charged with making sure that the land is well managed off their properties. There is nothing in the budget to better manage the rangelands—40 per cent of South Australia—which is an absolute dereliction of responsibility. In all, this budget is more than a disappointment, as it was described by the Conservation Council, the peak body for the environment.

It is a wasted opportunity to make the investments necessary if South Australia is to shift to an economy that is low carbon, complex with good sustainable jobs, and is biodiversity sensitive.

Children come to this parliament—when they are allowed to under the COVID restrictions—and they want to know how our democracy works. They want to know why our democracy works, what is it that it is trying to do in this place? I cannot see much in this budget that one could proudly explain to a group of schoolchildren coming in. What they expect is that they will have the hope of good, secure, decent jobs and a future that will not be constrained by carbon. What they expect is investment in education that is not merely the investment that was made by previous governments flowing through the system.

What they expect is that if they should go to university that they will be part of a thriving research institution that will be capable of generating innovation, that will be commercialised and turned into good jobs for all in the future. What they expect is to see our economy based on sustainability: that means from primary production through to every aspect of the economy, reflecting that we must have a healthy environment if we are to have a sustainable future. None of that is reflected in this budget.

However, I would like to say that there are a few things in this budget that I do like, and it is important to acknowledge them. One that was spoken about by our leader earlier today was the health checks that have been included for early childhood development. At present, what we see is a very sad reduction in the percentage of young children who are seen by doctors for their development health checks. We see well over 90 per cent in that very first check, done in the first few weeks of life, dipping down to under 30 per cent, down to 20 per cent in later checks, and then back up to 50 per cent at the age of four at preschool—because I guess kids are going to preschool and that is a good thing—but 50 per cent is not enough.

I am pleased to see an addition of two extra stages of health checks at 12 months and at three years; 12 months is an important check because much of the physical development and serious intellectual development issues are very apparent by the age of 12 months. One hopes that if parents avail themselves of the opportunity they will identify those serious issues and, with good fortune, be able to have some of them addressed through early intervention.

The three-year health check is extremely important because it is at the age of three years that we start to see the social interactions and the language capacity where, if the child is not hitting that developmental milestone, it might well illustrate challenges that can in fact be very responsive to early intervention. So I am pleased to see those health checks. I will be interested to understand how the government proposes to make sure that more than the 20 per cent of children that are seen at some of the ages are seen at those stages.

It is important to offer these health checks. It is equally important to make sure that parents are aware of them, that there are adequate facilities to make sure that they can go and have them done and that they are then able to take advantage of early intervention: the kinds of services offered by speech therapists, occupational therapists and other allied health professionals who will be able to assess young children if, indeed, there are concerns that are picked up. So I support that.

Another element I support, which sits in the environment portfolio, is the investment in the recycling funding; the attempts to see us turn our waste better into resources. This was, of course, provoked by China in the National China Sword program when refusing to continue to take waste that they regarded as contaminated and too difficult and expensive to clean up and turn into proper resources.

Having severed that line of being able to get rid of a whole lot of what we regard as waste, the federal and state governments have taken some time to work out what their alternative is. It now looks like there is a proper national partnership that is giving significant funding to South Australia to make sure that there is the proper level of new technology and equipment in order to take the mixed plastics to be reprocessed. This is essential.

If we do not shift the way in which we treat our household, industrial, commercial and, overwhelmingly, construction waste, if we do not make the shift to treating that differently, the high complexity/low-carbon economy that I talked about at the beginning of my contribution will be very difficult to achieve. If we cannot shift to a circular economy where we treat waste as a resource—as an input, not just an output—then that becomes all the more difficult to achieve.

I am also happy to see the Greener Neighbourhoods program, which partners with councils to provide more trees. When one is confronted with the extent of challenges to the proper management of the rangelands, which is occurring through the revision of the Pastoral Act; when one sees the willingness to fast-track native vegetation clearance, as we have seen in Flinders Chase; and when one sees the proposal, later overturned, to put seven soccer pitches into Belair, it is easy to overlook the significance of the simple street tree and the trees that exist in our cities.

Yet that is a very significant way in which we can encourage the biodiversity that lives in Adelaide and the other cities—I think they need to have a population greater than 10,000 people—and also the importance to people living there of living in an environment that feels more natural, that feels more connected to nature. I have seen this \$5.5 million over four years criticised because it does not seem to be enough to some of the stakeholders, and I respect their views. I nonetheless think that it is the kind of initiative that ought to be supported.

My final comment will be about the sand replenishment program, which does not get any new money in this budget but nonetheless gets a little bit of a blurb in the budget summary. It appears to me very likely that the cost of the pipeline, which is being paid for through the dramatic increase in the waste levy which was announced a couple of budgets ago, is being largely but not entirely put into digging up about 15 to 18 kilometres of the coastline to put a pipe down through my electorate, the member for Lee's electorate and the member for Colton's electorate to reach West Beach.

That cost is probably greater than the cost would be to simply continue to source external sand. I think we need to tease that out because, although it might seem to people who do not live in a place that is having to have graders dig up their beach and huge machines rattling away to clean out all the material that actually keeps the sand together—all the larger shells and seagrass wrack—it may not seem if you do not live there or you do not like visiting that beach that that does not really matter and that it is nice just to keep pumping it down, that it is a nice and simple engineering solution.

But when we see what happens down at Kingston Park, where the sand simply washes straight off once it is pushed out from Glenelg, and we see what looks like significant damage to seagrass beds as a result of that big washing out, we have to question whether that is the best approach and whether we ought to be better investing in understanding how we can keep the sand on the beaches in the first place.

We are told that this is all an entirely natural process and that this is about sand naturally moving from south to north, but if it were simply entirely natural it would have happened long before European Australians showed up here. We would not have beaches the shape that they are if it had been natural for thousands of years. What we have is a coastline that has been affected through the development of Holdfast Shores at Glenelg, when the Liberals were last in government, and the development of a marina at West Beach, which has interrupted the flow of sand.

You can see the big hollowing out of sand at West Beach as a result of that, which was not the case previously, and also the enormous damage done to seagrasses along the shoreline that played a very significant role in keeping sand on the beach, slowing down the wave action. If we do not look at those causes and we simply regard this as an engineering problem to be solved with heavy machinery disrupting nature further north and disrupting people's enjoyment and pleasure in spending time on beaches, we are missing an important opportunity to really treat our environment with respect rather than somewhere Tonka toys can drive around and shift sand and it does not matter what disruption that causes. With that, I conclude my contribution to the appropriation.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. S.C. Mullighan.

LEGISLATION INTERPRETATION BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (DRIVING AT EXTREME SPEED) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

UNEXPLAINED WEALTH (COMMONWEALTH POWERS) BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 17:44 the house adjourned until Tuesday 20 July 2021 at 11:00.

Answers to Questions

CHILD PROTECTION

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (22 June 2021).

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): I advise:

Given this matter is before the court, it would potentially prejudice the prosecution to make public his prior history (if he has one). No further information can be provided at this stage.