

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 1 June 2017

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 10:31 and read prayers.

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

Bills

PUBLIC INTEREST DISCLOSURE BILL

Conference

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (10:32): I move:

That the sitting of the house be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the bill.

Motion carried.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION (SERIOUS OR SYSTEMIC MISCONDUCT OR MALADMINISTRATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10:33): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Act 2012. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10:33): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

In presenting this bill to the parliament, I confirm the opposition's position that we should deal with an amendment to the principal act. The Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Act is legislation that provides for an Independent Commission Against Corruption. We now know that Mr Bruce Lander QC has taken the view during his term in office that some amendments need to be made, and where those amendments that are of merit have been presented to the parliament by the government or by us we have supported them.

There is one aspect that is a stark example of what the government has refused to consider, that is, that any aspect of a hearing by the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption should have access to be in public view. The integrity of the commission and the importance of its standing in the community is reaffirmed, in his view, in the event that he has an opportunity for serious or systemic maladministration to be in the public view.

Historically, there has been consideration of whether an investigation in respect of a corruption allegation should be heard. That has been made abundantly clear in respect of an objection by the independent commissioner. Mr Lander has at all material times said that his investigations in relation to corruption should not be the subject of any opportunity for a public hearing and, in that way, public scrutiny.

'Why?' he says. Because that is an investigation in relation to which he does not make a finding. That is an investigation that he would refer, if he considers it needs to be prosecuted, to the relevant authority—usually the Director of Public Prosecutions—to make a determination about whether there is sufficient evidence to prosecute a person or persons. On that basis, on the distinguishing feature of that, he says, and certainly at all material times has said, that corruption investigations should not be public.

On the other hand, to ensure public confidence in our public administration when there is an allegation of serious or systemic maladministration or misconduct, it must come with the opportunity for some evidence or aspects of that investigation to be under public scrutiny and be available to be public. He suggests and this bill promotes an opportunity for that to occur by him receiving powers under the Royal Commissions Act to enable that to occur.

This bill specifically provides that, in the event of him determining that he should conduct an investigation in relation to maladministration or misconduct, it is now elevated to 'serious or systemic', and he makes the determination about whether he or some other public integrity body should investigate, i.e., the Ombudsman. In the wake of the Oakden scandal, the commissioner has now made a public statement that he considers this to be of a serious nature that qualifies for his attention and investigation.

He has committed to undertake that inquiry in respect of the entity since 2007 and, in particular, in respect of public officers, including ministers, as to their conduct or failings in respect of their obligations, as outlined in the Mental Health Act. He has made it abundantly clear, in particular, to ensure that there is public confidence in this type of investigation, that there is a capacity to be able to declare that it or all or part of those aspects are by way of public hearing.

Members will be aware that in recent times we have had the royal commission by Her Honour Margaret Nyland, former Supreme Court judge, in respect of the child protection system. She determined in the course of that inquiry that there ought to be available information from the evidence of Mr Shannon McCoole on a daily basis of that case study in respect of her inquiry and that it should be made public, and she identified certain conditions to do that.

So, it is not an unheard of circumstance, where we have the available evidence, the opportunity for public scrutiny, the importance of securing public confidence in an investigation, that it is necessary for us to ensure that we identify and obviously expose, where there has been maladministration, who was responsible, and of course the findings that would go with it. It is quite clear as to what the independent commissioner says about this, and we are introducing a bill to ensure that happens.

I also inform members that the powers under the Royal Commissions Act would allow him, as they would have allowed Margaret Nyland in respect of her inquiry, the opportunity to suppress any evidence in the event that he made a finding in respect of a public hearing that some statement or some piece of information that is presented is contrary to the public interest—for example, an unsubstantiated allegation. If a witness were to get into the witness box, for example, and say in a public environment, 'I consider that Jay Weatherill has murdered my mother,' then that would be an unsubstantiated statement on the face of it, and it would be quite open in those circumstances for the commissioner to suppress the evidence in respect of that part of the public hearing.

It is important that we arm the commissioner with the tools to ensure that this process is a process the public has confidence in—that they can see how he conducts the inquiry to be fair and of course to ensure that it complies with the law—and also to arm him with the tools to ensure that there is a suppression of evidence. If I were to give members an example of the latter, it would be the Debelle inquiry where there were ongoing police investigations.

In respect of his inquiry into education, the circumstances of a particular event, he declared that there should be a published report with aspects of it concealed. The transcripts of those proceedings were held and suppressed for a period of time. So, we have clear precedent, in respect of both these matters, which is important that we pass today, to ensure that the Oakden scandal is thoroughly investigated by a person who is armed with the tools to both provide a fair representation of that investigation and ensure that there is an opportunity for the public to have full confidence in whatever the findings might be.

In recent days, we have heard the Premier announce that he will not allow cabinet documents to be made available in respect of this proposed inquiry. I found that rather surprising, particularly as his own Attorney-General has announced a protocol in respect of cabinet documents, which is that there will not necessarily be open availability of cabinet documents and submissions but that any application to view a cabinet document which has cabinet protection will be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. I found it rather surprising that the Premier would reject that even before

Commissioner Lander in this inquiry even identified any document or documents that he may think would be relevant. It seemed to be a rather pre-emptive strike, more about the protection of the Premier and his government than in relation to the protection of proper process.

Nevertheless, I bring to the attention of members that our Auditor-General, when he undertook an inquiry in respect of the process of unsolicited bids in the Gillman inquiry, viewed the cabinet documents, and in fact cabinet submissions, which, incidentally, were being presented to support the government's contention in respect to submissions that were put after the Renewal SA board had dealt with certain aspects of it. Indeed, in the Auditor-General's own inquiry in December 2014 he highlights on page 17 his reference to the cabinet submission, which was a proposal documented on 13 November 2013.

Integrity agencies from time to time do need to view documents. They do view documents, and for the Premier to actually say in this parliament at this point that there will be no publication or no provision of cabinet documents, either directly for public dissemination or indeed even privately, as they have occurred to the Auditor-General, to the commissioner, I find unconscionably secretive and very concerning, particularly as the Attorney-General has announced the protocol which is to apply in respect of cabinet documents.

Clearly, there must be a balance between the public interest of securing the discussions and, ultimately, determinations of a cabinet. For good reason, we have those rules and we have those standards. But there are certain circumstances where they are important in the identification of integrity investigations and sometimes they need to be produced and appropriately not made public. They need to be produced for the investigative officer to be able to have a clear understanding, and if it is good enough for the government to be happy to rush them in for presentation for consideration by one party of an integrity assessment it should be good enough for Commissioner Lander.

We wish Commissioner Lander well with his investigation. We hope that it will progress promptly. We would like it to be in the envelope of having an opportunity to have public confidence with the scrutiny of public hearings with it. We call on the government to come in and support this bill, which essentially has exactly the same terms of the position we have presented for the last two years, which is now item No. 7 on the parliamentary agenda under private members' bills.

I urge members to think very carefully about this. In respect of those on this side of the house, we are clear about our commitment. Each one of you has a conscience, and I would ask you to exercise that to ensure that we have a proper and thorough and, where necessary, appropriate public examination of this tawdry and disgraceful chapter in the service of public administration of an aged-care facility in this state.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (10:46): I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The house divided on the motion:

While the division was being held:

The SPEAKER: To explain the situation, standing orders require that a bill be adjourned after its second reading has been moved and the second reading explanation is complete. The motion has been moved by the member for Newland that the debate be adjourned. If that proposition fails, then someone will need to move that standing orders be so far suspended as to allow the bill to proceed.

So, the default position is that after the second reading is moved and spoken to by the mover the bill is adjourned; that is the practice of parliament. But if this motion fails, then standing orders will need to be suspended to enable debate to continue in the second reading. The motion before the house from the member for Newland is that the debate on the bill be adjourned. The ayes will pass to the right of the Chair and the noes to the left.

There being no members supporting the motion other than the teller, standing orders require me to abandon the division and call the motion for the adjournment lost without the division proceeding.

Motion negatived.

Standing Orders Suspension

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (10:52): I move:

That standing orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable the passage of all stages of the bill to proceed forthwith.

The SPEAKER: That is in order and, as an absolute majority of the house is present, I accept the motion.

Motion carried.

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (10:53): I rise today to support the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption (Serious or Systemic Misconduct or Maladministration) Amendment Bill 2017. We on this side of the chamber support an amendment to the principal act because we support the amendments that are needed in order for transparency to take place here in South Australia. We on this side of the chamber stand for open government. We stand to give the ICAC commissioner the power that he needs to do his job, the power that he has asked this government to provide to him time and time again.

What do they say? The Premier is quoted as saying that he wants to avoid a circus in this place. Let me say of the only circus and all the clowns that the ringmaster is the Premier and the circus is the state Labor government because all they are interested in is preserving their term in government. They continue to hide and stifle any progress or transparency in this regard.

It is not about the government; it is not about preserving their term in government. It is about the victims and the families of victims. Think about the families and victims involved in this horrid, putrid saga. We on this side are here to restore faith and transparency and democracy in this state. We will support the families and the victims involved at Oakden and we will give the ICAC commissioner the power that he needs to conduct this investigation. If he wants it to be in public, then so be it. We commend this bill to the house.

The SPEAKER: Are there any other speakers?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (10:55): I gather we are dealing with the substance of the bill now?

The SPEAKER: We are—second reading.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Very good. This is a very interesting bill that has been moved by the deputy leader today. What we are actually seeing is an interesting change in the attitude of the opposition to this matter over the course of the last few months. Indeed, some people have basically observed that the change must have occurred at a party room meeting between senior members of the opposition and Matt and Dave that occurred the other morning.

The fact of the matter is that this parliament debated this matter last year, and there were considerations given to the very question that we are on about now, and I think it is probably important for us to put this question in context so that we understand what we are debating. It goes back to the beginning of the legislation relating to the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption.

At the very beginning of that process, we considered a number of options and, if I recall correctly, the then leader of the opposition, the member for Heysen, had very clear views about the notion of the public spectacle that we see in New South Wales. She was very firm on the notion that the Independent Commission Against Corruption should not be conducting hearings in public, and that was a position that was an agreed position between the government and the opposition. Indeed, the legislation which eventually came forward was legislation which reflected that agreed position.

In that original legislation, there was a contemplation which was actually reduced to elements of the bill that it may be that an inquiry agency, as they were described in the bill—and an inquiry agency in this context would mean the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman might be involved in an inquiry, and in the course of that inquiry the Ombudsman might stumble across things which amounted to, or at least appear that they might amount to, corruption. Corruption under the legislation is defined essentially to be a criminal offence perpetrated by a public official in the course of their duties as a public official.

It was thought that in those circumstances, should the Ombudsman tumble across such a thing, it would be appropriate and indeed necessary that the Ombudsman should have the capacity to refer that matter immediately to the Independent Commission Against Corruption and that the Independent Commission Against Corruption should have the capacity to take over the investigation of that matter both in the context of its original framework, which would have been presumably a maladministration investigation, but also in relation to any dimension that might involve allegations of criminal conduct.

Conversely, it was considered possible that the Independent Commission Against Corruption might commence an investigation which initially appeared to be potentially a matter of involving criminal conduct and it turns out that the matter perhaps does not involve criminal conduct as such but involves conduct that is maladministration or misconduct. In those circumstances, obviously, it would have been necessary and appropriate for the commission to be able to refer the matter back to the inquiry agency, in this case the Ombudsman.

If we look at the legislation itself and at what is going on, and I am looking here at section 36A of the legislation, that section is in the subdivision that relates to action in relation to misconduct or maladministration, and that is the particular thing we are dealing with here. It is important to understand that the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption has indicated that in the context of his present inquiry that is the process he is proceeding under. He is not using the process associated with the investigation of alleged criminal conduct by a public official.

If we go to section 36A, which is the general provision dealing with the exercise of the powers of the agency, subsection (1) provides:

The Commissioner must, before deciding (in accordance with section 24(2)(b) or (c)) to exercise the powers of an inquiry agency in respect of a matter raising potential issues of misconduct or maladministration in public administration, take reasonable steps to obtain the views of the agency.

The agency in this context is the inquiry agency, namely, the Ombudsman. It goes on to provide, in subsection (2)(b):

the Commissioner—

- (i) has all the powers of the agency; and
- (ii) is bound by any statutory provisions governing the exercise of those powers...

as if the Commissioner constituted the agency

So that we are really clear, as a matter of law the commissioner remains in title the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption. That is beyond dispute. However, inasmuch as the commissioner is exercising a power pursuant to section 36A, I repeat, the commissioner has all the powers of the agency (in this case, the Ombudsman) and is bound by any statutory provisions governing the exercise of those powers as if the commissioner constituted the agency.

That then begs the question: what is it, in fact, that the Ombudsman can and cannot do? I take the parliament to section 18(2) of the Ombudsman Act, 'Every investigation under this act must be conducted in private.' So here we have a situation where we have a proceeding which, but for the exercise of jurisdiction under section 36A of the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Act, would be dealt with by the Ombudsman. If it were dealt with by the Ombudsman, it would be a matter which, as a matter of law, would have to be conducted in private. What the opposition here is saying, in effect, is that some inquiries which occur using the tools and the framework of the Ombudsman Act will now no longer be heard in private but not those dealt with by the Ombudsman.

I point out that as recently as July last year we were debating this very issue, and the deputy leader in that debate did make some comments about the question of whether or not these things should be presented in public. Certain amendments went through the parliament, with the agreement of the opposition, that did not disturb the arrangements I have just described, even though that was a topic of discussion at that point in time. On 6 July last year, we have the deputy leader on *Hansard* saying that there is no need to disturb these matters at the present time. We also have—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —on 20 September, the Hon. Mr Lucas in the other place, who was talking about exactly the same matters, saying:

...it would be informative...for [both major parties]...to reflect on their positions in relation to public hearings and the arguments for and against.

And here is the important thing. He continues:

There are certainly arguments for public hearings, but there are certainly arguments against public hearings.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: And the Liberal position as at last year was the status quo. We say we should stick with what the deputy leader and Mr Lucas undertook last year—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —and have the matter dealt with in due course. There has been a backflip on this by the opposition, presumably stimulated by a conversation with two gentlemen on the ABC the other morning.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader will be seated. The speakers for the opposition were heard in silence, yet there has been repeated interjection during the Deputy Premier's contribution, so I call to order the members for Finnis, Stuart, Hartley, Morialta and the deputy leader, and I warn for the first time the deputy leader. Leader.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (11:06): I rise to speak on the bill and I commend the deputy leader for bringing this bill to the house. The Liberal Party in South Australia has held the position that our state has needed an ICAC for an extended period of time. In fact, it was the member for Heysen who raised this issue in this parliament more than a decade ago, and what was the consequence of that? Based on self-preservation—let's face it, that is all it ever was—those opposite made sure that we did not have an ICAC in South Australia for an extended period of time. They were dragged kicking and screaming to establish an ICAC in South Australia, and what was established was the most restrictive and secret ICAC in the country.

In the lead-up to the 2013 election, the Liberal Party, those on this side of the house, made it very clear that we wanted open hearings for our ICAC here in this state. That was our stated position. We won 53 per cent of that vote because, I believe, the people of South Australia wanted open and transparent hearings for their ICAC—

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: —to get to the bottom of corruption and systemic maladministration and misconduct here in this state which Labor said did not occur in our state. Quite frankly, their position has been made very clear on this. They do not want the people of South Australia to know what is going on. We have a toxic culture of secrecy and cover-up in this state and it is now time to expose this government for the hopeless managers and the hopeless government they are. They have failed the most vulnerable people in our state.

The ICAC commissioner, Bruce Lander, has made it clear that he would like to have open hearings, and in particular he would like to have an open hearing to deal with the matters that have been raised very recently in this state regarding Oakden. Some of these concerns go back not weeks or months but in fact years. He said that nobody has taken responsibility for the shameful episode that has occurred at Oakden. The commissioner believes that somebody needs to take responsibility.

The public of South Australia needs to see somebody taking responsibility. Certainly, those of us on this side of the house believe that somebody needs to take responsibility.

Mr Lander has made it clear that, to do this work, he needs two things. First, he needs information provided by the government in the form of cabinet documents. The government has ruled that out. The second thing he has requested is open hearings for his inquiry and, to date, the government has ruled this out. Well, today they have an opportunity. They have an opportunity to vote this piece of legislation through to provide the commissioner with the resources he needs to get to the bottom of this very shameful episode in our state's history to make sure that we can move forward on this. It has been the Liberal Party's position for a very long period of time that we would like to have open hearings.

We completely reject the arguments put forward by the Attorney-General when he says that this has not been our position. I make it very clear that in 2015 the deputy leader responded to the apathy of those opposite in not putting legislation into the parliament that responded to Commissioner Lander's report into the Gillman sorry saga. The commissioner made very specific recommendations for improvement of the ICAC Act. It was the deputy leader who put that legislation before the house. She spoke on that in 2015, and I draw the Attorney-General's attention to those words the deputy leader put on *Hansard*, on the public record, regarding our position.

In 2016, yes we did support the government's bill because that was all that was on offer. That was all that was on offer, and we wanted to see some reform rather than no reform whatsoever. But we have never, ever moved away from our public position, which is that we support open hearings with our ICAC. That is why the amendment bill that the deputy leader moved in 2015 remained on the *Notice Paper*.

Today, the deputy leader has come back into this parliament and given the government a further opportunity to join with us, to make sure that we can put an end to this toxic culture of cover-up and secrecy, which is doing the people of South Australia no good. We call upon the government to support this bill and to support it today, and that is why we have brought this urgently to the house.

The SPEAKER: I call to order the member for Little Para for interrupting the Leader of the Opposition's speech.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:11): I wish to thank all members who made a contribution to this debate. I am disappointed that the first law officer of the state—the Attorney-General—should make assertions in respect of this matter. He knows full well what the opposition's position has been on this matter. I find it quite disturbing that, in these circumstances, he should speak to vote this down.

You, sir, have held that office. Whilst you had a different view about whether we should have an ICAC at all, and this government might have given us the skinny, secret alternate of that, we nevertheless have one. For the first law officer of the state to stand in this parliament and say that he is going to keep hearings secret in circumstances of maladministration in our public authorities I find galling and quite sickening.

The other thing I find concerning is that in the course of this debate we obviously considered whether we would all leave and put this off to another day. I call upon the Minister for Trade (the member for Waite) who has stood hand in hand over a period of years to support an open and transparent policy of having open hearings. Whilst a member of the Liberal Party, he went out and advocated to the people of South Australia the importance of having public hearings.

Now, today, we see him sit arm in arm with a government of secrecy and vote with them in respect of the discourse in relation to this bill. I find that very disturbing. He, along with our other allegedly Independent member of the cabinet, has a signed agreement, as we know, to ensure that, on matters they consider to be important, they speak independently and have that opportunity to be independent of government. They have skulked across the floor of this house and maintained support for a government that is wickedly concealing an opportunity for an open and public transparent approach to the investigation of this matter.

I find it sickening to think that there has been no capacity for independence. So anyone over there who has one scintilla of commitment should ensure that we expose it when our public

administration has failed, whether a minister has failed or not. We need to make sure that, whether it is a child in a canteen who is being sexually abused or whether it is an old person who is assaulted or drugged in a facility run by a government, we will be there to protect them and that we will root out any failings. We will certainly expose any cover-ups and we will punish those who have attempted in any way to conceal this. That is what is necessary here. I call on everyone on the other side of the house to really call upon their conscience in this matter and vote with us to support this bill.

The house divided on the second reading:

Ayes 20
 Noes 23
 Majority..... 3

AYES

Bell, T.S.	Chapman, V.A.	Duluk, S.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Goldsworthy, R.M.	Griffiths, S.P.
Knoll, S.K.	Marshall, S.S.	Pederick, A.S.
Pengilly, M.R.	Pisoni, D.G.	Redmond, I.M.
Sanderson, R.	Speirs, D.	Tarzia, V.A.
Treloar, P.A. (teller)	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.
Williams, M.R.	Wingard, C.	

NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Brock, G.G.
Caica, P.	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Gee, J.P.	Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.	Hildyard, K.
Hughes, E.J.	Kenyon, T.R. (teller)	Key, S.W.
Koutsantonis, A.	Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K.
Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.	Rankine, J.M.
Rau, J.R.	Snelling, J.J.	Vlahos, L.A.
Weatherill, J.W.	Wortley, D.	

PAIRS

McFetridge, D.	Bignell, L.W.K.
----------------	-----------------

Second reading thus negatived.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Finniss is warned.

Parliamentary Procedure

SPEAKER'S RULING

The SPEAKER (11:19): Yesterday, I took the member for Unley to task for using the Treasurer's surname in debate and, to explain that ruling, I refer to page 514 of *House Of Representatives Practice*, which states:

In the Chamber and the Federation Chamber a Member must not be referred to by name, but only by the name of the Member's electoral division (that is, as 'the Member for...' or 'the honourable Member for...'), or by the title of his or her parliamentary or ministerial office. This restriction has also been extended to the terms of motions, amendments and matters of public importance. The purpose of this rule, in conjunction with the requirement to address the Chair...Is to make debate less personal and avoid the direct confrontation of Members addressing one another as 'you'. A degree of formality helps the House remain more dignified and tolerant when political views clash and passions may be inflamed.

I quote that to amplify my ruling. I am also reminded that one cannot use unparliamentary language by the device of quoting from the media or documents.

*Bills***ROAD TRAFFIC (MAIL ZONES) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 May 2017.)

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (11:25): This is a very worthy bill that the member for Adelaide has brought forward. I appreciate the endeavour she has put in to identifying an issue that has been brought to her by a number of residents who have faced issues and that this is actually a solution to the problem that is entirely sensible.

Of course we understand that Australia Post vans need the opportunity to pick up the mail and have exclusive use of the space in front of mailboxes, but they only need that for a period of time every day and for the rest of the day this is a space that could be available to relieve some of the congestion issues in our streets.

The member for Adelaide has gone about her business in an assiduous, dutiful manner looking for a way to achieve a solution that is very sensible. I hope that the government will be looking at this issue in the coming two weeks, ahead of the next sitting. I also hope that we will have one of those beautiful moments in the parliament when the government will support an opposition private member's bill because they acknowledge that there is no sensible argument against it. I therefore support the bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.R. Kenyon.

*Motions***INTERSTATE MIGRATION**

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:27): I move:

That this house—

- (a) notes the ongoing exodus of South Australia's population interstate;
- (b) calls on the state government to address the concerning population drain to ensure our skilled workers are not continually moving away to seek work, career and lifestyle opportunities;
- (c) notes the latest Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show that South Australia had 27,467 people move interstate resulting in a net loss of 5,887 people in the 12 months to March 2016; and
- (d) acknowledges South Australia's net population loss interstate is almost double the 10-year average of 3,480 people.

It is with great concern that I bring forward this motion today, but the facts are clear: South Australia's population growth rate is well below the nation's and we continue to see significant interstate migration from South Australia. At the time I put this motion forward, the ABS showed a net loss of 5,887 people to interstate in the 12 months to March 2016. The figure, in fact, rose in the updated statistics to a net loss of 6,484 people to interstate from South Australia in the 12 months to September 2016.

According to the ABS statistics, the preliminary estimated resident population of South Australia as at 30 September 2016 was 1,710,800 people, an increase of 9,450 people since 30 September 2015 and an annual growth rate of 0.6. However, the nation's growth rate over the same period was 1.5 per cent. A positive net overseas migration of 9,300 people helped to counter South Australia's extensive net interstate population loss.

These losses are long term under this Labor government, with net population loss interstate almost double the 10-year average of 3,480 people. The 6,500 who moved interstate in the 12 months to September 2016 are no longer employed in South Australia, no longer studying, no longer buying houses and not eating at restaurants or educating their children in our state. They are no longer contributing to growing our economy, and that is of great concern to me.

There is no doubt that South Australia's status of having the highest unemployment in the nation is contributing to the loss of people to interstate. Comparisons have been made that there are more people looking for work than could fit into Adelaide Oval. In terms of where Australia's existing population shifted over the past 12 months, it was a continuation of a familiar theme: more people left than arrived in New South Wales, South Australia, Western Australia, Tasmania and the Northern Territory, while the opposite occurred in Victoria, Queensland and the ACT.

Population growth has recently been thrust back into the spotlight with Deloitte releasing a report titled 'Make it big Adelaide', which identified that growing the population to two million people in the next 10 years is critical to the state's future. The report stated that we now have fewer 15 to 34 year olds than we did in the mid-eighties, and Deloitte's managing partner, Andrew Culley, told radio:

It's really staggering for us to find that there are less young people in the state today than there was when I started working. I've got children at 24 and 21 and I just want them to have the opportunity to build a career in South Australia.

I have the same story to tell. Deloitte found that South Australia needs two million people by 2027, which is essentially another 290,000 above where we are now.

Through this report, eight industries were identified and four of those have particular global demand from South Australia, such as agribusiness, tourism, higher education, energy and gas. Deloitte believe that by accelerating the growth in these industries we can boost our economy and build services and jobs.

A key element of attracting more overseas migrants to South Australia is international students. As the state's largest service export industry, our international student attraction has experienced strong growth, although not at the same level as that of other states. This is an area where I believe that there is even more room for us to grow. The South Australian Liberals will have some positive announcements in this space in the lead-up to the March 2018 election. As Aaron Hill, who co-authored the Deloitte report, stated:

What you see is the growth of these big cities around the world, like Sydney and Melbourne and San Francisco and New York...All the really big exciting jobs are being sucked into the big centres...Unless we actually build our economic scale there's a real risk that a lot of the best jobs might go with them, so I think that it's not just about the change, we're going to change regardless of what we choose to do, it's about making sure that the future looks how we want it to look and we think that that ultimately has to come back to people.

He goes on:

One of the things that's driving this as well is the fact that the natural growth ultimately, according to our modelling, will eventually reach almost zero over the next couple of decades as the baby boomers age and what that might mean is you start to see the similar effects that are happening in some of our regional centres that are seeing stagnating, declining populations in some places in the Adelaide metropolitan area, which is a really scary prospect.

The population growth prospect is an interesting one, but I believe that in order to grow the state's population in line with the national average we need to stop the interstate brain drain. In many ways, people are also leaving because they cannot find a job as skyrocketing electricity prices, the most expensive water in the country and the massive hike in the ESL tax strangle local economic growth.

South Australia's small to medium businesses are the backbone of this state and we need them to be investing in their businesses and creating job opportunities, not just investing in power generation, as are many of the businesses, particularly SMEs, in South Australia. Instead, they are forced to continually dig deeper into their pockets to pay utility bills and government taxes.

I want to see South Australians remain in our great state with secure jobs and a long-term future, and the state Liberals are committed to providing sound economic policy that will address the loss of people from South Australia. The state's economy cannot afford to have thousands of people continue to migrate interstate. If we look further to South Australia's Centre for Economic Studies at the Adelaide University, they released a report last year that suggested South Australia risks an exodus of young people not seen since the State Bank collapsed in the early 1990s unless more jobs are created. The reported noted:

Most notably, young people and young families left the State from 1993-2002, adding to other states' younger populations and depleting our own.

We are a transforming economy based on innovation and industries of young people and young ideas, but we are losing the population. Michael O'Neil said that one of the most important things in the paper was that South Australia has 25,000 fewer young people under the age of 24 than it did in 1982. All states have an ageing population, but South Australia has a more rapidly ageing population, which will put a lot of pressure on our workforce because a smaller size workforce will be supporting a larger retirement population.

The South Australian Centre for Economic Studies also predicted that it is not likely that we will reach the South Australian government's two million population target until approximately 2034, and there is a fair chance that we will not reach it by then either. The Property Council has also raised concerns about the net loss of almost 6,500 people to other states and they are calling on the state government to undertake urgent research to better understand the brain drain.

The Property Council's director, Daniel Gannon, has said that we need greater clarity around the movements and motivations of the approximately 6,500 South Australians who left our state last year to fully understand the risks and the opportunities. He said that we need population growth and that we need it now to futureproof the state's economy and create jobs for forthcoming generations. Factoring in an additional 9,400 residents, South Australia's population is now 1.71 million. Again, this is the lowest of any state, bar Tasmania.

Recently, the UDIA released the national State of the Land report, which stated that South Australia's slow population growth significantly contributed to a weak demand for housing and land. The report quotes Lael Mayer, the Project Manager of Adelaide Development Company, who said:

We need to increase the number of people Aged 0-30 in Adelaide. We need 1% total population growth per annum of people in that age bracket, and we need to stop losing them interstate.

The loss of people has flow-on effects. The State Strategic Plan set a population target of two million people by 2050, with an interim target of 1.64 million by 2014. The Economic Development Board then recommended that the target of two million be brought forward to 2027. The last detailed government policy on population, Prosperity Through People, published in 2004, predicted a population decline to 2030 because of falling fertility rates, the ageing population and South Australia's slow share of international migration. The NAB state economic update in 2017 states:

An increasingly narrow industrial base, characterised by ongoing structural declines in steelworks and car manufacturing activity (Holden's Elizabeth plant will officially shut down in October this year) and the lack of 'modern' job opportunities in finance and technology that appeal more to younger workers, have witnessed a continuous outflow of interstate migration and consequently, our rapidly ageing population.

One of the really concerning points of South Australia's population growth is the loss of people from the regions. I am sure that this contributes to what this current government's centralisation policy means. We have seen an increase in the Barossa, the Fleurieu and Yorke Peninsula, but we have seen population declines in the Lower North, the Murray Mallee, Eyre Peninsula, the south-west of the state, the Limestone Coast, the Mid North and the outback in the north and east of South Australia.

Many other regional areas in Australia experienced positive population growth, but South Australia had a net loss of 109 people. KPMG demographer, Bernard Salt, believes that we could better encourage migrants to settle in regional areas and ask that they spend the first three years in that region.

I have also had a number of meetings and correspondence with migration solutions agent Mark Glazbrook, who last year wrote a letter stating that in 2012 our population grew by 16,500, whilst in the 12 months to December last year our population growth fell to 11,200. Unless action is taken now based on the current trends, it is likely that South Australia's population will continue to fall below the 10,000 mark in 2017 which will have long-term ongoing economic ramifications.

It takes South Australia approximately 10 years to experience the same level of economic growth and development in construction, new jobs and consumption expenditure that Victoria experiences every 13 months. I repeat: it takes South Australia 10 years to experience the economic growth that Victoria experiences in 13 months. The more people who leave, the more jobs you lose.

He has cited that his research indicates that between 1.3 and 1.6 jobs were created for every migrant worker who came to live in a regional or rural sector and worked in a job that no-one else wanted to do.

Again, I think it is important to take on all these ideas that are being put forward. We need to consider all options in addressing our interstate population loss. The state government in 2016 said, 'South Australia's population growth has averaged 1 per cent per annum over the past decade, and by the standards of most western countries it is a very solid population growth.' Really? I am not at all convinced that this is the right response. We need to act and have a focused population policy to address the issues that we currently face.

In my electorate of Chaffey, the Riverland has suffered a population exodus between 30 June 2015 and 30 June 2016, losing a net total of more than 300 people, raising concerns about the impact of high unemployment and current barriers to providing career opportunities for our youth in the region. ABS statistics show that the Riverland has lost a staggering 2,256 people in net terms over the past 10 years. The reality is that high unemployment and underemployment are impacting upon the region's ability to maintain population size.

What are we doing wrong? One of the key points in ensuring people do not leave South Australia is that they have secure jobs, and we want to ensure that business can thrive in South Australia. A Marshall Liberal government will reduce the tax burden on businesses and households, cut red tape and unnecessary regulation, invest in productive infrastructure, support export businesses to encourage their growth, foster entrepreneurialism and support growth opportunities for our regional businesses and industries.

We will reduce the tax burden by putting \$360 million back into the pockets of South Australians by slashing ESL bills. We will invest in productive infrastructure through the Globe Link plan to assist our exporters and get their products to market. We will open up four new overseas trade offices to support our exporters in business. We will encourage entrepreneurs to invest in new ideas and innovation and foster entrepreneurialism at our high school level. We will always support our regional businesses and industries to grow and create jobs in South Australia.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (11:42): I move to amend the motion as follows:

Delete the words after 'That this house—' and insert in lieu:

- (a) notes that South Australia has enjoyed population growth of 0.6 per cent which while relatively slow in Australian terms is relatively robust in international terms;
- (b) notes the importance of maintaining a population growth policy which fundamentally addresses our workforce development needs;
- (c) notes South Australia's relatively high unemployment rate has been contributed to significantly by the uncertainty created by the federal government's decisions including the closing of the car industry, an incoherent energy policy and dithering around our defence procurement which means that the priority is for the utilisation of our existing underutilised workforce rather than supplementing our workforce through population growth;
- (d) notes that South Australia has crafted an enviable lifestyle, a harmonious community, steady economic growth and an affordable and attractive investing environment which makes us well placed to respond to these economic challenges; and
- (e) rejects the Liberal opposition policy of rapid population growth as the policy for South Australia's present economic circumstances.

I rise to speak to this motion, and particularly my amendment, which is to describe more accurately the situation facing the state of affairs in South Australia. Unfortunately, the motion put forward by the member for Chaffey fundamentally misrepresents and oversimplifies our state, so we are seeking to remedy that.

South Australia has recently enjoyed population growth of 0.6 per cent as of September 2016, up from the previous year, according to the ABS data released mid-March this year. Over the long-term average, the growth rate has been 0.9 per cent over the past 15 years. Although this level of population growth is relatively slow compared with that of some interstate counterparts, it is quite strong if you compare it internationally. The United Kingdom as a whole, for

instance, grew by only 0.53 per cent last year, France by 0.41 per cent, and Germany experienced a reduction in population of minus 0.16 per cent, according to the statistics through the CIA website.

It is also important to note the long-term trends in our population growth. Over the past five years, from 2001 to 2005, South Australia's net population increased by 43,000 people. However, over the most recent five-year period, from 2011 to 2016, our net population increased by 67,529 people, representing a 57 per cent increase over the previous five-year growth. It is important to look not only at the interstate migration figures but also at both international migration figures to South Australia as well as the natural population growth in South Australia to get the true picture of the fact that we already have population growth happening in this state.

You only have to compare that with a state like New South Wales, which, of course, you would think has had rapid population growth in recent years. However, they have consistently had negative net migration interstate from New South Wales, and in the most recent year 11,733 people left New South Wales by interstate migration. That has been as high as 32,891 in 2003 leaving New South Wales. So obviously we have to factor in the international migration as well as the natural growth to give us the true population figure.

There is a lot of discussion about the need for population growth and some of the reports that have been released recently. On this side of the chamber, we believe it is important to pursue population growth that takes into account the needs of our state's workforce development and economic development in South Australia. We need to make sure we are growing the economy, creating jobs, so that the population will grow to meet that. South Australia is at a time when the identity of our workforce is rapidly changing, ensuring our focus remains on transitioning our workforce to the jobs of our future—and that is imperative work.

This government is committed to ensuring that we fully address our workforce development needs and help South Australians find employment in our new and expanding industries. We know that it is not just about growing population for the sake of it; we need to focus on investing in South Australians, too. This government is doing a great deal to address our workforce development needs. We are focusing on helping transition our automotive industry workers through to areas of the defence sector. We are committed to making South Australia the defence state and we have worked tirelessly to make sure we have contracts in this state; contracts which were going to go to Japan are now coming to South Australia to build submarines as well as frigates and other work in the defence sector.

We have established a Northern Economic Plan with a focus on creating jobs and are working with local communities to assist them in this time of transition. We have established WorkReady, strategically targeting those skills that are required for meeting the needs of our growing industries. We established the Tonsley precinct in the southern suburbs, a hub of innovation. What could easily have been just a whole bunch of warehouses is now becoming an innovation precinct with universities, TAFE and start-ups all operating on that site. It has been a great achievement.

We can see the government's commitment to creating jobs for South Australians evidenced clearly in the work of the Industry Advocate, helping Australian companies tender for government contracts and find opportunities for growth, and obviously we have had something to say about that this week. We know it is important to ensure that our South Australian companies are getting work here, and the Industry Advocate will continue to do a great deal in working with these companies to ensure they can continue to expand their workforce and continue to employ local people.

And, of course, the other significant factor in the past year is that we have introduced the Job Accelerator Grant program, which is providing grants of up to \$10,000 for small and medium-size businesses in South Australia who want to employ extra people. We are seeing a lot of small businesses and a lot of medium-size businesses take up those grants and employ extra people in South Australia, and we want to encourage much more of that in the future.

Sadly, we have seen higher unemployment levels compared with those in other states and a below trend population growth recently. We have to attribute a large part of that to the uncertainty created by the federal Liberal government's decisions, which have impacted negatively on South Australia. It is clear that Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull and his government are not interested in helping to address South Australia's workforce development needs and they do not care about the

high unemployment levels that their apathy fuels. The federal government's lack of support for the car industry in this state has been appalling.

Members interjecting:

Mr PICTON: It has been appalling, and members opposite laugh at that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PICTON: Members opposite laugh at that, but it is no laughing matter.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no need to reflect on them and they needn't laugh.

Mr PICTON: Well—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, they needn't laugh and we needn't reflect on them.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If he is going to laugh audibly, I will have to call him to order or something. Just go straight on with the debate.

Mr PICTON: I do not believe it is a laughing matter for anybody in the northern suburbs of South Australia—

Mr Pederick: Don't worry. I'll address that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for Hammond!

Mr PICTON: —or people in the southern suburbs in my electorate who work in the car industry. This is a significant issue and unfortunately we did see the federal government pull support. In fact, they still have hundreds of millions of dollars in an automotive transformation fund that is sitting there—

Mr Pederick: Stop trying to rewrite history, mate.

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

Mr PICTON: —that could be going to support those car manufacturing businesses in South Australia, those people in the supply chain who are looking to transfer their business to work in other areas. That money is sitting there. It is going to become a saving for the federal government. They are saving money out of the destruction of the car industry in South Australia, so I do not believe it is a laughing matter at all.

The last day for Holden this year will be a very sad day for South Australia, particularly because it could have been so easily prevented. We have also seen a lack of certainty around energy policy that has driven away investment as a result, not just in South Australia but around the country. We have seen the closure of many coal-fired power stations and we have seen an investment drought where companies are too fearful to invest in new technology that is needed in our power supply because they are not sure what the certainty for our national electricity policy is going to be.

From our perspective, we have done what we can with our state's energy plan to secure a certain energy future for South Australians and to secure the investment in our state that comes with that certainty. We have also seen delay upon delay and a lack of certainty around our defence sector, and there has been a lack of investment in the federal budget in infrastructure in South Australia. Despite all these challenges facing South Australia, we know that we are in the best possible position to respond to what lies ahead. We can point to a great combination of factors that will help to underpin a successful future for our state.

We have an enviable lifestyle, one that has been getting us international recognition by the likes of Lonely Planet and also the economists. We are further improving our city's image by investing in Adelaide, the Riverbank Precinct and our biomedical precinct. We have a harmonious community and a multicultural community in South Australia. We are seeing steady economic growth over the past decade in South Australia and we have created an environment here that makes it an affordable place to live, the best place to do business—

Time expired.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I just remind everybody that we do need to all listen in silence. Not that you did, but everybody is going to, I am sure. Observe the standing orders. The member for Hammond.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:53): Thank you, Madam Independent Deputy Speaker, and I thank you in advance for your protection. I rise to support the motion by the member for Chaffey:

That this house—

- (a) notes the ongoing exodus of South Australia's population interstate;
- (b) calls on the state government to address the concerning population drain to ensure our skilled workers are not continually moving away to seek work, career and lifestyle opportunities;
- (c) notes the latest Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show that South Australia had 27,467 people move interstate resulting in a net loss of 5,887 people in the 12 months to March 2016; and
- (d) acknowledges South Australia's net population loss interstate is almost double the 10-year average of 3,480 people.

I just want to reflect on some comments made from the other side in regard to power policy and the dreadful power policies that have been implemented in this state because of both the Rann and Weatherill Labor governments' passion to have 50 per cent renewable energy. We heard the member for Kaurna talk about coal-fired power stations closing down. The Weatherill Labor government were directly responsible for shutting down—

Mr Picton: You privatised it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for Kaurna!

Mr PEDERICK: —directly responsible for shutting down Port Augusta and—

Mr Picton: You privatised it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Kaurna!

Mr PEDERICK: —shutting down a perfectly good coalmine at Leigh Creek, putting 650 people out of work and turning Leigh Creek into a ghost town. They came up with an arrangement, 'It will turn into a tourism mecca.' There has already been tourism going through Leigh Creek for decades, and I am yet to find out whether there are extra tourists going through there just because Jane Lomax-Smith is working in that field.

It is an absolute disgrace that people put ideology before reality. We saw it back in former premier Rann's day with the mini wind turbines they put on top of Parliament House that were not worth a cracker. They were not worth an absolute cracker in regard to power generation in this state. We saw the result of the shutting down of the Port Augusta power station on 28 September—black Wednesday in South Australia—when, because of the power policies that have been implemented, South Australia was essentially left with one circuit breaker for the whole state when towers fell over 250 kilometres north of the city. That is just outrageous.

You have to be an absolute genius to put things like that in place—and I hope people notice the sarcasm—that put the state at such risk. It is absolutely crazy. On that Wednesday, anyone who lived along the border, whether it was through the Riverland, right down past the Mallee or down to the South-East, could see the lights glowing in Victoria and New South Wales, but just across the border, in South Australia, nothing has happened.

What also happens with the loss of power in this state is there is a lack of companies that want to invest in South Australia. I have mentioned the almond industry here before. In a previous speech, I said that, in light of power costs and the uncertainty of power in this state, if I had properties in the Riverland or on the Victorian border and I was working out where to put my packing shed, I know which state I would put it in. Sadly, I would not put it in this state. Victoria's power was privatised at the same time ours was and their power prices are half the cost of ours.

I see the ludicrous arrangements that people have to make to put power into their businesses, especially new businesses like the Swan Reach almond hulling plant. I think it was a \$6 million project that I was pleased to be at the opening of the other week. This is a massive

contribution by the Costa family, and do you know what they have done? They have gone completely off grid. They have hybrid power generation, and they need diesel. They have set up diesel generation because they can get that power for half the cost of hooking up to the grid.

The power policies in this state cause more and more people to go off grid. You can see it with investments like this. These policies are supposed to constrain emissions. They are certainly not constraining emissions with all these diesel power plants going in and not just for business. There are plenty of people, as I have mentioned in this place before, who are installing generators worth over \$20,000 so that they can have power in their homes when the lights go out in South Australia, because they just do not have confidence in the policies of this state government.

We look at the taxes that are killing investment in this state. The emergency services levy is another impost not just on home owners but on businesses and community groups. It hits everyone, yet there is no relief. Sorry, there was some relief: we could buy a small cup of coffee with the relief offered this last week by the Treasurer. What a great effort! There is \$3 of relief for every ESL payer. He would have been better off saying nothing. I am sure he would have got better media out of it.

What we do need in the regions is skilled migration. We need skilled migration because there is a lack of resources for people willing to work, who could work, who do not go through the processes or, if they do, they either do not turn up for the drug tests or they fail them. That is just a fact of what happens. There are thousands of jobs in my electorate, and if they were not filled with visa holders and migrants we would be in real strife. Yes, a lot of locals work in these jobs. People are expanding their businesses in my community, businesses such as Adelaide Mushrooms. Their biggest problem will be sourcing those 200 workers. That will be their biggest problem: sourcing 200 workers for that expansion.

I want to make a few comments with regard to Globe Link. I note that the member for Lee, the transport minister, and members on the other side do not like it because we—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Kaurana is called to order and the members on my left are reminded that it is unparliamentary to interject.

Mr PEDERICK: —put up this groundbreaking policy that looks at the future of all South Australia and what we can do with freight diversion around the city with road and rail transport and an airport at Monarto. Yes, it is a project that would be worth billions, but this is a project that would probably be up to 20 years in the making. It is a great forward-looking project for South Australia. I can say that 95 per cent of the people who have given feedback to my office support the plan to put rail and road freight around Adelaide.

I note the comments made about the Coorong council saying that they do not like it. Coorong council does not like it because we suggested putting it at Monarto instead of near Taillem Bend. That is their position. If they want to build a freight hub at Taillem Bend, that is up to them—if they want to put in a submission, they are more than welcome to and we will have a look at that submission—which would mean extra bridges across the River Murray and more expense. The government do not like it because they are not forward thinking enough to think about positive outcomes in the regions.

I want to correct the government on its comments about Holden's closing down. They really need to check history. After billions of dollars of subsidies from both Labor and Liberal governments at the federal level—and those on the other side can check; they know it is true—Detroit pulled the plug no matter what subsidies were coming in to South Australia. That is exactly what happened, so we have to stop hearing these untruths from the other side. Detroit pulled the plug and said that they were doing that no matter what subsidies were coming in.

There is another project that looks like it will not happen in South Australia, and that is the LAND 400 project. I note that the member for Waite is sitting here today. General Dynamics fell over at the first hurdle as a bidder, and it looks like Rheinmetall or BAE Systems will either have that work in Melbourne or Queensland. So, there we go: more jobs out of South Australia. I support the motion of the member for Chaffey.

Time expired.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (12:03): I congratulate the member for Chaffey on bringing this important issue before the house. I do not quite agree with his motion, and I will be supporting the amendment to be moved by my parliamentary friend and colleague the member for Kaurana, but it is a matter of substance that does need the attention of the house.

I think that when the member for Chaffey and others look at the facts they will find that it is not so much a net loss of people out of South Australia that is the issue but, rather, a failure to attract new migrants to South Australia from interstate that gives us the net difference. As the minister responsible for migration, I want to put some facts on the table for the member for Chaffey and others to consider. For instance, the net interstate loss of population from South Australia across all age groups in 2015 was about 4,967. This is quite evenly balanced by gender, because there have been issues raised about women or males leaving as well. The figure was 2,518 males and 2,449 females.

It is important to note, however, for the purposes of debate that a net figure of this sort is merely a residual. It is the difference between two much larger figures: departures and arrivals. There were 26,546 departures in 2015 and 21,579 arrivals. In the 10 to 24 age bracket, which is very much in focus, there was a net loss of 591, which does indeed show a relatively large imbalance by gender—178 males versus 413 females. When you break it down into arrivals and departures, it is made up of 3,365 departures and 2,774 arrivals; that is, South Australians moving interstate numbered exactly 11 more females than males. I know that has come up in previous media commentary.

Furthermore, net loss in each of the next three age groups—25 to 29, 30 to 34 and 35 to 39—is higher than that which has been in the public realm and, overall, contains more males than females. In 2015, net loss of population to interstate over all age groups was 4,967 and it was the highest dataset in around 20 years, though not by much (it was 4,920 in 2008), and that is an interesting point. There is hardly a whisker between net departures now and net departures in 2008. In every year in this dataset, there was a net interstate loss.

In fact, only in two years out of the last 35 years has there been a net interstate population gain, and the current figures for net loss do not approach the peak of 7,070 departures in 1994-95. It was actually during the period of a Liberal government that departures were at their record level of 7,070, in 1994-95. I make the point that in only two of the last 35 years has there been a population increase over successive governments.

What does that tell us? We have some specific issues in South Australia. No, we do not enjoy the sort of population growth seen in Sydney and Melbourne. We are not Sydney and Melbourne: we are Adelaide. We are at the end of the river. We are the driest state in the driest continent and, as Playford found, we have some fundamental economic challenges. He tried to address them in his economic climate by attracting whitegoods and manufacturing here—Holden and so on—and now the economic situation has changed and we are finding new solutions, new formulas and new ways to make this an attractive destination.

It is a very important point because those opposite and some in the media want to talk about a 'brain drain'. It is not factual to characterise it in that way. It is actually a failure of people to come. We are not sufficiently attractive as a destination, compared with some other states, for people to move here from interstate, and that is a challenge we need to overcome. We need to make South Australia a more attractive destination. We need to get more people to come here. It is not so much stopping people from going, important though that is.

In a regional location like Adelaide, South Australia, there will always be a desire for young people to go and live in the big smoke. In America, they leave smaller cities and go to New York and San Francisco. In Britain, they leave cities all around the UK and go to London. In Europe, they might go to Paris. They move because they want the excitement, the energy and the experience of travel and working somewhere else. It is whether they come back and it is whether Adelaide is a sufficiently attractive option for people to move here from Sydney and Melbourne. This is a dynamic and fluid process, and the doom and gloom of 'For heaven's sake, everybody is leaving' is not factual and not an accurate portrayal of the physical movements of people.

A growth rate of around 0.6 of 1 per cent by OECD averages is formidable. Compared with most countries in the OECD, South Australia's population growth rate is good. It is strong. True it is, though, that it is around half the national average. A lot of migrants want to go to Sydney and Melbourne, particularly internationals. A lot of young people want to go and live in the big city. It is true that we need some solutions, and therein lies the weakness in the motion and in the contributions so far from those opposite.

We need some suggested alternative policy measures. It is not enough just to moan about this issue and discuss the problem. It would be encouraging to hear some solutions from members opposite. The government has some solutions. We fought the fight to keep submarines, frigates and shipbuilding in Australia, based in South Australia. Those opposite gave up on that. We are arguing that they did nothing. It was pathetic. We are doing everything we can to promote—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Stop the clock. We can spend all morning waiting for members to observe the standing orders with the clock stopped. It is entirely up to you. On your behalf, the Chair is tasked with keeping the house in order, and I do call on you all to assist me in that task. Minister.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: I will get back to some statistics about population growth. Looking at departures, on only five occasions since 1997 have there been fewer departures in this 20 to 24 age bracket and on only three occasions fewer female departures. Furthermore, in terms of gender imbalance, which is not specifically raised in the motion but has been raised in the media, while a small imbalance towards females is the norm across the state, in both 2014 and 2013 more 20 to 24-year-old males left the state than females. The issue is not a sudden and unusual exodus from the state of its young females or males; it is a matter of systemic trend over a long period of time—in fact 35 years, as I have mentioned.

It is hard to generalise about all this. Interstate population movement is the definition of a zero sum gain. If some states have net losses interstate, others have net gains, and the reasons will vary state to state, not necessarily bearing on the question of concern of why South Australia, according to the motion put by the member opposite, is losing population overall; nonetheless, there are some interesting points that warrant consideration.

On a national basis, the numbers of interstate arrivals and departures must be identical. They totalled 350,134 in 2015. South Australia contributed 26,546 in South Australians departing for other jurisdictions. That is 7.6 per cent of the Australian total, or almost precisely what one would expect on a proportional population basis. The same calculation on the basis of interstate departures in the 20 to 24 age bracket shows that South Australia accounts for 7.3 per cent and accounts for 7.4 per cent when the calculation is further narrowed to females in this particular young age group.

While some tweaking of these figures to take into account slightly different demographic structures across the state might be needed to make them more strictly comparable, it certainly does not seem that the current interstate exodus, so-called, from this state across the board or in this specific category that we are discussing, is wildly out of line with those of other states. Sustained trends in net migration between jurisdictions are the norm not the exception.

I get back to the very point that it is not so much the number who are leaving but the failure of others to arrive. It is up to us as a government, as a parliament, to make South Australia a more exciting destination for migrants, from both overseas and interstate, to come here. Our government has a plan to do that. We are transforming this economy. I urge members opposite in this debate to tell us what they would do—provide some constructive suggestions and recommend some policy steps. Let's see if there is anything to offer. It is easy to talk about a problem. The member for Mount Gambier says, 'We'll see.' I doubt it. We need solutions, not navel gazing.

Time expired.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:14): The rewriting of history that goes on in this place amuses me, but we will move on. I rise to support the member for Chaffey's original motion:

- (a) notes the ongoing exodus of South Australia's population interstate;

- (b) calls on the state government to address the concerning population drain to ensure our skilled workers are not continually moving away to seek work, career and lifestyle opportunities;
- (c) notes the latest Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show that South Australia had 27,467 people move interstate resulting in a net loss of 5,887 people in the 12 months to March 2016; and
- (d) acknowledges South Australia's net population loss interstate is almost double the 10-year average of 3,480 people.

I want to briefly address the member for Kurna's comments about electricity and power prices in South Australia, which is again another attempt at rewriting history, a history that will condemn this current Labor state government as making some of the most fundamental mistakes this state has seen.

Power is certainly one of the key cornerstones of a thriving economy. If you do not have reliable power, and if you do not have affordable power, not only are your costs of living high but the ability for businesses to produce jobs and produce becomes more and more difficult and then, of course, businesses seek other jurisdictions to do their business in. What was particularly alarming was the offer from Port Augusta power station (Alinta) to keep generating electricity until mid-2018 in return for \$25 million from the state government, which is 22 times less than the \$550 million so-called power plan that the state government has put together—all this before the Finkel report has even concluded, which will be released next month. It will be interesting to see what is in that report.

Alinta warned of significant risk to the security of South Australia's power supply and a surge in electricity prices. These people are actually in the game and warning the state government what would happen if there were not an orderly transition from coal to other sources of power. The secret Alinta letter also warned that the closure of Flinders Power, which included the Northern power station and Leigh Creek, would trigger a \$150 million annual blow to regional gross domestic product and cost 450 jobs.

Since that time, South Australia has been hit with three major blackouts, including a statewide outage last September since the closure last May of Alinta's Flinders power operations. Businesses across the state took an estimated \$450 million hit because of the statewide blackout, and mining giant BHP has said that the outage at Olympic Dam cost it \$137 million alone. Not only would you say that the original offer was good value for money but not accepting it has indeed cost businesses and the people of South Australia far more and, not surprisingly, the majority are in regional South Australia.

Electricity prices for forward contracts in South Australia have jumped from about \$80 per megawatt hour in mid-2016 to about \$140 per megawatt hour now, and all this is because of an ideology of, in the Premier's words, 'a clunky old coal-fired power station'. Well, if that does not sum up where this government is heading, then I do not know anything else that will. The member for Kurna comes in here and tries to rewrite history about it being someone else's fault, but he only needs to look at the stats.

Of course, the regional population estimates by the Australian Bureau of Statistics indicate that South Australia's population rose by 0.5 of a per cent (in actual terms, about 9,000 people). South Australia's population growth rate is well below the national rate of 1.4 per cent. The member for Waite comes in here and says, 'We have to compare it with England or we have to compare it with somewhere else where the statistics are more favourable. Let's not compare with other states in Australia.' What he would have found was that we were only slightly above the Northern Territory and equal with Tasmania, which is certainly not a great statement going forward. Of course, this decline is largely felt in regional South Australia, whilst we have a modest gain in metropolitan areas.

I did a little research and dragged out the population strategy from the Environment, Resources and Development Committee dated 27 June 2012. A number of members of that committee are still in this house, but maybe some for not much longer. It is quite surprising that there needed to be a minority report put in by this committee because members on the committee thought that it was being driven in a direction by the numbers of the government of the day. So, there are actually minority reports put in there.

This morning, I had the pleasure of meeting Mark Glazbrook, who was really talking about migration and the assistance that migration can lend to population growth in South Australia and

particularly in regional South Australia. He talked about the multiplier effect of employment for somebody who travels here on a visa either to undertake work or relocates here and what that multiplier effect is.

What struck me was that for every job that is created another one is created in another area—normally in a service area as a shopkeeper, a pharmacist, a publican, for example, or any of those types of jobs—and you have people working here and earning money. However, we are seeing the effects of decline in population in regional areas, and that is to do with our hospitals and our schools coming under more and more pressure, as well as cuts to legal aid services in Mount Gambier and the Riverland just this week. Of course, this comes on top of palliative care cuts, mental health bed cuts and a whole range of other cuts that this state government has inflicted on regional South Australia.

Mr Glazbrook said that it was not that long ago that population growth in South Australia was more than 20,000 per year, including 5,000 in regional South Australia. In fact, the former Rann government—and who would have thought that that appeared to be a better government than the one we have now?—had a plan for a population target of two million by 2027. However, to achieve that we would need to grow at 30,000 per year, not the 9,000 we currently have. Yet again another statistic is thrown out with a bit of massage and a bit of popular press and the facts seem very different.

I would like to see a Labor frontbencher stand up and defend yet another failed target of their government, but the fact is that there were more people living in regional South Australia 12 months ago than there are today, and that is a real cause for concern. The member for Waite wanted some solutions; well, he does not have to look too far past the City of Pittsburgh, which I visited last year. They have gone through a transition and their major transition was into universities and technologically advanced manufacturing, along with research, and I think that is one place we need to look at.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (12:24): I rise today to recognise and speak on the motion put forward by the member for Chaffey, namely:

That this house—

- (a) notes the ongoing exodus of South Australia's population interstate;
- (b) calls on the state government to address the concerning population drain to ensure our skilled workers are not continually moving away to seek work, career and lifestyle opportunities;
- (c) notes the latest Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show that South Australia had 27,467 people move interstate resulting in a net loss of 5,887 people in the 12 months to March 2016; and
- (d) acknowledges South Australia's net population loss interstate is almost double the 10-year average of 3,480 people.

The South Australian government is one that does not care about the people of South Australia. They claim they do, but the facts are that they do not. They do not care that our young people are leaving South Australia; they do not care that it is important to keep these people here in our state and grow opportunities for young people. That is what the Marshall Liberal team is very much focused on. It is a big part of the reason that I came into this place.

As a father of four young people in South Australia and knowing lots more in my community, I am very aware of how important it is that we create opportunities to keep young people in South Australia and to give them an opportunity to grow. Also, we need to create an opportunity that will attract great people we have lost back to South Australia and bring others to our great state. We have a great state—no-one is disputing that—but the way that it is being run under this current Weatherill Labor government is an absolute shame. It is a big part of the reason that after 15 years of this government people are just leaving and not coming back to South Australia. It is a real shame, as I said, to see this happen, and South Australia is paying the price.

We need to do all we can to create the right environment to keep businesses here. We see businesses leaving all the time. Recently, we have seen Coca-Cola investing \$90 million to go to Queensland and exiting South Australia. We need to do all we can to keep businesses like that

operating here in South Australia. It is the economic environment that has been created by this Weatherill Labor government that is causing this mass exodus.

We heard the member for Mount Gambier talking about the high electricity prices we have in South Australia, higher than any other jurisdiction, and the lack of reliability with our electricity. It causes great conjecture for businesses when they are facing a decision to (1) set up in South Australia or (2) reinvest and stay in South Australia. They can do the sums and work out that they operate better on the eastern seaboard or outside South Australia. We are losing the battle because of the environment that has been created by this current Labor government.

The push for renewables and the 50 per cent renewable energy targets that have been set by the state Labor government are forcing up our electricity prices, decreasing the reliability and the supply side of the electricity market and forcing businesses to say, 'There is that uncertainty. We are going to be paying more for electricity in South Australia.' If they have to make a decision, they often choose to go interstate. That takes out opportunities, businesses, industry and jobs for people in South Australia and as a result people are flowing out of our wonderful state.

We know South Australia has the highest unemployment rate in Australia and has done for 29 months in a row on trend. That is phenomenal. We have been at the bottom of the ladder when it comes to our employment. We have been the worst state in the nation with the highest unemployment rate for 29 months in a row. Let's just think about that for a minute, because this is another blight on this government. We hear those on the other side keep blaming anyone else they can—the federal government, anyone who is moving. They will blame them for the situation that they have put our state in. They take no responsibility.

We hear it with other issues as well, social issues like Oakden. It is someone else's fault. Child protection? It is someone else's fault. This Labor government has made a mess of our state, and this is just one area where we have seen the exodus of people from South Australia because of what they have done to our state. We see how bad the unemployment rate is in South Australia, how long it has been absolutely woeful and how much it is hurting the retention of people staying in South Australia. We look at the youth unemployment rate as well and that is also the highest in the country at 18.7 per cent. We are approaching a situation where almost one in five people aged under 25 are unemployed, and that is just horrendous.

We know that Holden is closing later this year, it has been on the cards for a long time. The government has underspent in its automotive transformation funding and the schemes that it has set up. It has talked about helping these people, but it actually has not delivered on its programs, and that has been another big setback. It has alarm bells ringing for the future unemployment rate in South Australia as well as the youth unemployment rate. Again, to have the highest unemployment rate and the highest youth unemployment rate in the nation, to have had it for such a long and extended period of time, is incredibly damaging, and we can see why people are leaving the state because of it. It is unacceptable.

When I go out and speak to people in my community, doorknocking or at the local supermarkets or shopping centres, at the local sporting clubs or just walking the streets or having a coffee on the weekend, people tell me they are concerned. They are concerned about where the opportunities are for young people in South Australia, they are concerned that they will leave the state and they are concerned that there is nothing for them to come back to.

I have talked about unemployment, but let us talk about underemployment as well. That is also at a very high rate here in South Australia and more needs to be done to get people more hours. They are working and they are available to work more but, again, there is not the opportunity there for them to get more work. There are 85,500 people in South Australia who fall into that underemployed category at the moment. Again, no wonder people are looking interstate for more opportunities.

The cost of living is another issue. I have mentioned electricity prices, which are a real kicker, and we know there are things like the ESL, and fees and charges that go on households and businesses here in South Australia are through the roof. When I get out and talk to people in industry and people in business that is something fed back to me all the time, that the cost of doing business in South Australia is far greater than it is in other states.

A lot of operations that have arms here in South Australia as well as in other states actually line their bills up and they show me, 'Look, this is what it costs for electricity, this is what it costs in fees and charges here in South Australia, and this is what it costs in Western Australia, Queensland or other states.' There is a marked difference: it is a lot more expensive here in South Australia, and that is a great concern.

We see that the government has released the 2017 version of their 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide. They have been in government for half that time, 15 years, and you would think they might have achieved something in that time, that they might have actually cared about the South Australian people. Clearly, the figures we see show that they do not. In that plan, we see that the government has revised down their population growth projection for the next 30 years, with their initial population increase of an additional 560,000 people by 2040 now reduced to 545,000 by 2045.

This is a great insight, an example, of how this government has failed. They have failed to grow the population, they have failed to grow the pie. If we grow the economy, if we grow South Australia, we will generate more jobs and everyone will succeed. However, this government has just strangled South Australia, strangled any growth here and, as a result, people are leaving. On our side, the Marshall Liberal opposition have a plan.

We put out our '2036' manifesto, which had the direction we want to take. We have been slotting in our policies around that and we are getting a very good response. We want to reduce the tax burden on businesses and households, and we want to cut red tape and unnecessary regulation to allow these businesses to grow and employ more people. We want to invest in productive infrastructure, support export businesses and encourage their growth. We want to actually send stuff overseas and send stuff interstate and bring their money into South Australia to grow our pie.

We want to foster entrepreneurialism; we have great people in South Australia and we want to see them doing wonderful things. We support growth opportunities for our regional businesses and industries. We have already said that we will return the ESL remissions, put money back into the pockets of South Australians and businesses, \$90 million a year, which is a total of \$360 million over four years, with council rate capping, again to reduce the costs on families and households and allow more money to go back into the economy to grow that pie. There is Globe Link, a great infrastructure project that will allow us to get more product and produce out to the international market and grow that—a great initiative.

Trade offices overseas, too, are a great initiative of the member for Chaffey, to say, 'Let's get more trade offices overseas so that we can sell more of our goods and services overseas and, again, bring money into South Australia,' and this is exciting. With entrepreneurialism, we want to encourage our entrepreneurs to take big and bold ideas and turn them into industries we can grow in South Australia. We have a lot of upside, but under this Labor government we are not seeing it. A Marshall Liberal government would deliver a brighter future for our next generation.

Time expired.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:34): I thank speakers on this side of the house. I will be opposing the amendments put forward by the member for Kaurana. The reason I will oppose paragraph (c) is that this continual blame game of the federal government is a bit of a broken record. I think what we need to understand, as the member for Hammond has said, is that the closure of Holden, our last car manufacturing plant here in South Australia, was a decision made in Detroit in the head office. Let us be clear about that.

In relation to other issues we talked about, such as the cost of power and the reliability of power, it is all about the transition of power generation. Yes, we are moving to renewable energy, but the manner in which this government has moved the transition process has led to the high cost of power, the continual disruption and the unreliability of power, and that is what is driving business away. That is why businesses are not employing people and that is why we have people moving interstate. That is why we have a brain drain in South Australia.

In terms of a stimulus for jobs, a \$90 billion defence contract is coming into South Australia. That is a federal government announcement that is a game changer for South Australia—a \$90 billion defence contract. We heard the minister laying a bit of blame and using overseas stats.

We are not overseas: we are South Australia. We are part of a great nation and what I am doing is comparing the stats here in South Australia with those of our neighbouring states and territories.

It is very clear that South Australia is not performing, and it is not performing because we have a state government that has the wrong policy settings. It does not have its eye on the ball. It is all about survival and not about growth, and that is a real concern. The current government has the 'silver bullet' approach and it is clearly not working. They are always looking for one silver bullet to solve all our problems.

Paragraph (e) rejects the state Liberals' population growth policy, but why? Because we are going to do more of the same? Are we going to continue to perform at the bottom of the pack? Are we going to continue to see the high cost of living and the high cost of doing business? Are we going to continue to have the highest unemployment rate in this great nation? I think it is about creating opportunity and that is what Liberal policies present.

We have put out some great Liberal initiatives to date and there will be many more. The state Liberal Party in opposition today is ready to take over. It is ready to govern. It is ready to turn South Australia around to be a great state once again. It is about giving our youth and every South Australian an opportunity to be—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WHETSTONE: —to reduce unemployment, to reduce the brain drain here in South Australia.

Ms Digance: Bring it on.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Elder!

Mr WHETSTONE: It is about making South Australia a great state again. I will be voting against the amendments and I commend the motion.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

PROCLAMATION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ANNIVERSARY

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (12:38): I move:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges the historical significance of the 180th anniversary of the proclamation of South Australia; and
- (b) highlights the major political, social and cultural milestones that have been achieved in South Australia over the past 180 years.

It gives me great pleasure to speak to this motion that recognises the significance of the 180th anniversary of the proclamation of South Australia. Everybody in this place is well aware of the many firsts we have achieved in South Australia and should be very proud of.

I will go through a few of those in a few moments and also list some that people may not be aware of. If other members in the place have contributions to make with particular emphasis on their own electorates and any firsts or significant achievements that may have occurred there, I would encourage them to do so because this is an important recognition of the state of our state, where we have come from and where we are going.

We should also recognise the fact that there is more to South Australia than what happened in 1836. The 39 Aboriginal tribes who have lived in South Australia for many thousands of years should be recognised at all times. Particularly in this week, which is NAIDOC Week, we do pay our respects to Aboriginal groups in South Australia and recognise their long history with this part of the world that we now call South Australia.

In fact, the earliest records of Aboriginal settlement or industry in South Australia go back to 18,000 BC when there was evidence of flint mining activity and rock art in the Koonalda Cave on the Nullarbor Plain. We never forget that, we always remember it, but particularly today we will focus on

some of the more recent—particularly in those terms, very recent—things that have happened in South Australia.

Before I do that, though, as the member for Finnis is here, I should recognise the fact that the first recorded European sighting of South Australia was in 1627, and then in 1802 the South Australian coastline was mapped by Matthew Flinders and Nicholas Baudin. In about 1802, there was an unofficial settlement on Kangaroo Island of sealers. I know the member for Finnis will dispute the fact that South Australia was founded in 1836. It was actually founded a bit earlier than that, in 1834 in London, with the passing of legislation by the British parliament.

I will be interested to hear what the member for Finnis has to say on this matter because there is always some good-natured discussion about where the state was first formed. In going back over the history of South Australia, we are unique in that we have so many firsts. We have children coming into this place, and we talk about the first women in this place and the first things that have happened in South Australia, but it is much broader than that as every member in this place, as they go about their work in their electorates, realises.

I should say that Proclamation Day will be held for the last time in my electorate of Morphett next year because it then goes to the seat of Colton due to the changes in the boundaries. The Proclamation Day ceremony on 28 December is held every year, and has been since 1836, under the Old Gum Tree down at Glenelg. If there are members who have not been there, and I would be surprised if that were the case, I suggest very strongly that they go down and have a look at the place where the first proclamation was read under the Old Gum Tree by Governor John Hindmarsh in 1836. It is interesting to read that proclamation and see the aims and ideals that were set out for the then colony of South Australia, now the State of South Australia.

In 1836, the site for Adelaide was chosen by Colonel William Light beside the River Torrens, which was more of a creek in those days. It still has its issues with algal blooms, but it is certainly a much different place from what it was in 1836, as you can see when you go back and look at the watercolour paintings that exist of early Adelaide.

In 1837, the first regional town, Gawler, was founded north of Adelaide. As a kid, I grew up at Elizabeth and Salisbury, and that always seemed a long way from Adelaide, but I can only imagine what it was like to have to travel to Gawler in 1837. It would have been a fairly arduous trip. In 1838, the first Australian police force was formed in Adelaide. The South Australia Police was the first Australian police force, and it was formed here in South Australia in 1838.

In 1839, the first road in South Australia, Port Road, was opened. It seems that, during the time between 1836 and 1839, there must have been some rough dirt tracks, but to have an official road opened three years later would have been a huge task with the limited machinery and horse-drawn vehicles they would have had in those days. In 1840, the Royal Adelaide Show was held for the first time. Everyone here will have been to the Show and taken their family to the Show. It is a fabulous institution that is continuing to go on in leaps and bounds, and it is wonderful that it was founded in 1840.

The Adelaide hospital, now the Royal Adelaide Hospital, was opened in 1841. The long, proud history of that hospital I hope will be preserved in some way in an interpretive centre or museum at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital because the work that has been done since 1841 at that hospital on the east end of North Terrace should never be forgotten and should always be admired and respected. Of course, in 1843, in Old Parliament House, the first Legislative Council building was opened on North Terrace. That is now a much nicer building after renovations, but it was and still is a bit of a rabbit warren. I am glad that we have been able to move from a place like that into this building which, although is showing its age in some parts, is still absolutely wonderful.

In 1843, the Ridley stripper harvester was developed. South Australia was then a huge agricultural centre and developing all the time, as it certainly is now. Part of our state's economy relies on agricultural production, but it is very pleasing to see how far back innovation in agriculture started and how it continues to grow in South Australia.

The discovery of copper at Burra in 1845 was the first of the resource booms in South Australia—we have had lots of booms and some busts—and we continue to benefit from South Australia's natural resources. The wealth under our ground is phenomenal. The curse of cover

is something that many people talk about. Removing the topsoil to get to that mineral wealth is something we have to overcome in South Australia, but it is certainly a blessing to have that resource just under our feet.

In 1845, Port Pirie was founded. It was a shipping port in the early days. BHP mines were developed at Broken Hill and smelters were opened a bit later. In 1847, St Peter's College was established, and in 1848 Pulteney Grammar School was established. Both are fine schools that continue to this day. In 1854, in the member for Stuart's electorate, the township of Port Augusta was surveyed. As a schoolteacher there in the 1970s, I remember the last small cargo ship that left Port Augusta. I am not sure what it took out of Port Augusta, but it was a sad day. The town of Port Augusta is a thriving and vibrant place, with railways, power stations and the port and as the gateway to the outback and the Northern Territory, and it is where I spent three very enjoyable years of my life.

I never knew that Mount Gambier was called Gambierton. It was founded in 1854. Anybody who has not been to Mount Gambier has missed out, but I know that every member in this place would have been there. It is a beautiful spot, with the Blue Lake. I remember one of my first holidays as a child, when I was five years old. Mum and dad bought a new tent, and away we went and had a wonderful holiday in Mount Gambier—it was very cold, though.

In 1856, the South Australian Institute, from which the State Library, State Museum and Art Gallery were derived, was founded. In 1856, South Australia became one of the first places in the world to enact the secret ballot—again, another first for South Australia. You only have to look at the board to see the list of premiers in this place. In 1858, the Real Property Act was enacted, and Torrens titles are now used all over the world to delineate properties and establish their ownership. It is a very proud first for South Australia.

At the Bay, in 1859 a jetty longer than 350 metres was constructed. The jetty we have now is a far cry from the one that was planned to enclose 35 acres of safe waters for small boats in which to moor. It is a much shorter jetty, a concrete structure. Storms have taken their toll, particularly in 1848, when storms blew through and wrecked most of the jetty, but there are now plans for a new one.

In 1851, copper was discovered at Moonta. Between 1854 and 1867, the great drought hit Adelaide. That is when Goyder's line was drawn. People realised that they could continuously and sustainably grow crops south of Goyder's line, and to the north was more pastoral country. In 1869, the city's Central Market was opened in Grote Street and Prince Alfred College, where my grandson attends, was also established.

For Port supporters, in 1870 the Port Adelaide Football Club was established. In 1872, the General Post Office was opened and Adelaide became the first Australian capital linked to Imperial London, with the completion of the Overland Telegraph—again, another first. Adelaide Oval and the University of Adelaide were officially opened in 1874. The Adelaide Children's Hospital was founded in 1876, as was the stump jump plough, another terrific South Australian invention that made a huge difference to farming right around the world.

I understand the Bay tram will be back in the next few days after a lot of heartache down at the Bay because of upgrades, but it will all be worth it. In 1878, the first horse-drawn trams in Australia commenced operation in this city, and in 1880 the telephone was introduced to South Australia. In 1883, the Adelaide Zoological Gardens were opened and, for the Labor Party, in 1884 the Adelaide Trades and Labor Council was inaugurated.

In 1885, South Australia became the first state to levy income and land tax: we do have some firsts that we perhaps wish had been left for other times. In 1887, express trains between Adelaide and Melbourne commenced, and in 1891 the Central Australia Railway reached Oodnadatta in the Far North, and we saw in our time, we all remember now, the extension up to Darwin. How things have progressed! In 1894, the world's second act granting women's suffrage passed in this place, and we all recognise the Deputy Speaker's role in furthering the cause of women's suffrage and congratulate her on that.

In 1889, a South Australian contingent left Adelaide for the Second Boer War. That is something that I do not know a lot about. We have that wonderful memorial just across the road near

Government House, but I do not know as much about it as I would like and I should make a point of finding out more. In this last century, the first electricity station opened on Grenfell Street in South Australia in 1900. In 1901, Adelaide became a state capital upon the establishment of the Commonwealth of Australia and the state flag was officially adopted in 1904.

In 1906, this state was the first in Australia to issue driver's licences—again, continuing with firsts. There are a number of other firsts that we see throughout our history. I would encourage members and readers to go back and look at the sources of history of firsts in South Australia. They are extensive, they are long and they are all worthy of note; whether it is proclamation in 1836 or the latest changes that are happening now, we should all be very proud of them.

I know every member in this place is very proud of this state, and I hope that we can all work together to recognise that we owe our seat in this house to those who elect us and that we continue to do everything we can to make sure that they are proud of what we do. Unfortunately, politicians are not held in the highest regard, which I think is completely out of sorts with what we do, but this state is the better for having a long history of politicians in this place who have done their very best to make this state the way it is.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (12:52): I also rise to speak to this motion to recognise the 180th anniversary of Proclamation Day. In doing so, I thank the member for Morphett for bringing it to this house and for his extraordinarily extensive knowledge of South Australia and the number of historic moments and landmark decisions that have impacted our state. So, thank you very much to the member for Morphett.

As I said, I rise to recognise the 180th anniversary of Proclamation Day and the approval of the letters patent by King William IV establishing the Province of South Australia and establishing our boundaries. Included, rightly, within the letters patent was a recognition of the rights of the Aboriginal people to live within the lands of the South Australian province clearly stating that the establishment of the new colony would not affect the rights of Aboriginal people living within those stated boundaries to occupy and enjoy their own land.

It is disappointing that the statements of the South Australia Act 1834 did not similarly recognise the original inhabitants of the land, the Aboriginal people, and did not give Aboriginal people fair rights and access to that land. It is important to note that a number of people continue to campaign today to have the intent of these letters patent recognised for Aboriginal people. Proclamation Day is a time when we come together to celebrate our achievements and recognise the strong bonds of community throughout our state. We can celebrate our representative government and how all South Australians can participate in and contribute to our democracy.

We must also acknowledge, however, that South Australia was proclaimed on the land of the Kaurna people, never ceded, and I do acknowledge their elders past and present and all Aboriginal peoples of South Australia and their ongoing relationship with the land across our beautiful state. It is timely that we speak to this motion during Reconciliation Week, a week when we commit ourselves to ensuring that the benefits of living in South Australia are shared by all and to working together respectfully towards a truly united state. As I said in this house just a few days ago, reconciliation is a journey of many steps and I am proud that in South Australia we have taken some important next steps in our journey of healing as a state and moving towards reconciliation.

In 2015, we launched our Stolen Generations Reparations Scheme to provide both individual and whole-of-community reparations to Aboriginal people and communities affected by the shameful forced removal of children. The individual payment scheme provides some redress for South Australia's stolen generation people. It also provides Aboriginal people opportunities to tell their stories, an important part of the healing process for individuals and for communities.

This is a step forward; however, it is crucial that in South Australia and beyond we continue to acknowledge that nothing can take away the pain and suffering of those who were removed from their families as children. Nothing can mend the family, community and cultural bonds that were destroyed—in some cases, never to be repaired. This Reconciliation Week it is integral that we all accept the solemn responsibility for working together in the direction of healing.

In December 2016, our South Australian government also proudly announced that we would begin treaty discussions with Aboriginal South Australians. Conversations with Aboriginal

communities across South Australia that will inform the elements of a possible treaty model are now happening. As we contemplate the 180th anniversary of proclamation and our journey since that time, this commitment to achieving treaty must be included and celebrated as a very important step on that journey as a state. It speaks to what our state must always hold dear: acknowledgement of our past and a shared vision for our future, a future that is grounded in inclusion, respect and equality.

The proclamation naming South Australia as a British province was read on 28 December 1836 when we continued our journey to where we are today as a state in the Commonwealth of Australia. As a colony, we were granted self-government in 1857 and we began to govern ourselves. After a hard-fought campaign, we moved from a system of having our representatives appointed by the Governor to a system of representative democracy in 1857.

In 1894, after decades of struggle by a remarkable group of women activists—including Mary Lee, who knew how to organise around a cause and win—women were granted the right to vote, and at the next election in 1896 we were the second place in the world where women cast a ballot and where women were allowed to stand for election. Of course, we cannot and will not forget the role of Muriel Matters in this movement for change, this movement for equality.

As we mark 180 years since proclamation, I pay tribute to the will of these suffragettes, to their capacity to fight, to their capacity to win and to their deep and abiding commitment to the achievement of equality. We recognise and thank them for their efforts, efforts that rightly opened our democracy and finally afforded respect to Australian women. In their honour, and because it is the right thing to do and because it will engender better outcomes for all South Australians, I know that many of us, on both sides of this house, will continue to fight for equal representation of men and women in this house. Our progressive beginning is a history of which we can be proud and which can spur us on to strive to continue this fine example of progressive and inclusive policy.

Another example of our state working to include people is through the work we have done to ensure that our LGBTIQ communities are included and treated with dignity and respect. In 1975, former premier Don Dunstan's Labor government became the first government in Australia to decriminalise male homosexuality. Just over 40 years later, I am proud that our government, together with many of those members opposite, responded to the voice and the views of our LGBTIQ brothers and sisters here in South Australia by removing systemic discrimination in our laws and by creating more rights and opportunities for people of diverse sexuality and gender. We took momentous action last year, through the Premier's apology to our LGBTIQ communities for previous discriminations in our state's laws, and introduced important legislation to remove rules that unjustly impacted upon them. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Attorney-General (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Rules made under the following Acts—
Magistrates Court—Civil—Amendment No. 17

By the Minister for the Public Sector (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Public Sector (Data Sharing)—General

By the Minister for Health (Hon. J.J. Snelling)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Motor Vehicles Accidents (Lifetime Support Scheme)—Release of Information

By the Treasurer (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Public Corporations—Adelaide Film Festival

By the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion (Hon. Z.L. Bettison)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Cost of Living Concessions—Indexation

By the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion (Hon. Z.L. Bettison) on behalf of the Minister for Education and Child Development (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Education and Child Development, Department for—Annual Report 2016

By the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure (Hon. S.C. Mullighan)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Firearms—
Fees
General

Ministerial Statement

MINTABIE TOWNSHIP

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:02): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the Mintabie township made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Hon. Kyam Maher.

ARRIUM

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:02): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I would like to update the house on the sale process of the Arrium business. Today, I was contacted by the deed administrators and informed that there have been two offers by the short-listed bidders for the business. The process from here will involve a thorough review and comparison of the offers in consultation with the sale advisers, Morgan Stanley. Both the state and federal government will now enter detailed dialogue with the administrators.

The successful sale of Arrium to a new owner is vital for the long-term prosperity of the people of Whyalla, South Australia and the nation. We are optimistic that a successful sale will secure the long-term prosperity of Whyalla and the steelmaking industry in Australia. I look forward to working with the administrators, the commonwealth government, unions, bidders, local council and sales advisers over the coming weeks for a successful resolution.

NATIONAL HOUSING AND HOMELESSNESS AGREEMENT

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:04): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: On 19 May 2017, I convened a meeting of the housing and homelessness ministers to consider critical housing and homelessness issues in the context of the 2017-18 federal budget. The federal budget included a range of initiatives that form part of the

commonwealth's affordable housing plan, including a new National Housing and Homelessness Agreement that combines funding currently allocated to the National Affordable Housing Agreement (NAHA) and the National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness (NPAH).

While the original five-year NPAH supported innovation in the sector, the resulting short-term agreements have since been a challenge for future planning and staff retention. This proposed new agreement is expected to take effect from 1 July 2018 and will be ongoing. Subject to the detail, this will provide much-needed certainty around the sustainability of South Australia's homelessness sector, which currently employs approximately 800 people. While the new agreement is a welcome result for long-term homelessness funding, uncertainties still remain, including the possibility of new targets and how policy issues will be managed.

Further work is required to ensure that any new funding or policy arrangements will lead to improved housing outcomes for those most in need, and I will seek to ensure that South Australia plays a lead role in this work. For example, last year I met with the homelessness services sector to implement better support services for those sleeping rough. This led to the creation of the extreme weather framework, and funding from national partnership agreements is vitally important to providing those responses, including the Code Blue response in place tonight.

Another major omission from the budget and the comprehensive plan to address housing affordability is the lack of certainty for remote housing funding for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. The National Partnership on Remote Housing ends on 30 June 2018, and one of our priorities will be to protect the achievements made under this agreement in order to meet future needs and to continue to respond to overcrowding. Over the time of the remote housing agreement, more than 200 South Australians have gained employment through associated capital works programs.

Sustained investment from all levels of government is imperative if we are to build on the strong foundation of achievements made possible through each of the current agreements. Time is running out to negotiate and agree on arrangements to secure longer term funding and continue to make inroads with respect to Closing the Gap targets. Along with my interstate colleagues, I will continue to advocate to the Turnbull Liberal government on these important issues for a longer term agreement in the best interests of our community.

Question Time

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION OAKDEN INQUIRY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): My question is to the Premier. Given that the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption has said that he has been told 'future requests for cabinet documents will be considered on a case-by-case basis', why has the Premier already ruled out providing our commissioner with any documents relating to Oakden?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:08): There was an occasion (I cannot remember exactly, but in the last 12 months) where there was a discussion—more than a discussion; there was a series of questions, if I recall correctly, here during question time, which at that point in time were focused on the particular instance of the Auditor-General. People opposite were asking a number of questions about that, which were answered and clarified.

If one goes back through the *Hansard*, one would see that it was explained to the parliament at that point in time that there had been a determination that there should be clarity around the position with regard to cabinet documents. The position with regard to cabinet documents, which needed to be clarified because of some muddying of the waters largely by those opposite, was the longstanding tradition—which has actually been dealt with in the courts in varying cases over many years—that cabinet documents are exempt from production. Those documents are confidential documents.

In that context, it was the case and it was mentioned that, if the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption in a particular matter made a particular request pertinent to that matter, it was of

course open to the cabinet to consider that request on an ad hoc basis and that obviously if such a request were made it would be considered. We have never indicated that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is warned and the member for Unley is called to order.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: But I remind members that the context of that particular conversation was that there had been a circumstance of extremely rare nature, as far as I am aware, where documents had been extracted by reason of a Supreme Court order and those documents were in a particular case thereafter the subject of a request. That was a very unusual circumstance. Our position has been, and remains, that cabinet documents are cabinet documents and they remain, as they have always been, confidential.

Let's be clear about this. The particular circumstances in the case that the Leader of the Opposition is referring to were circumstances where there had been an order of the Supreme Court. Over the objection, I might add, of the government, which maintained its position that as a matter of law these things would not be volunteered, there was an order made by the Supreme Court. So, that is the context of those remarks.

The position is very clear. There are many legal decisions about the nature of cabinet documents. This is not something new. This is not something that has been invented in the last few days, the last 12 months, the last decade, probably the last couple of centuries. This is a longstanding proposition.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION OAKDEN INQUIRY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): A supplementary, sir: is the Attorney-General suggesting to this house that the cabinet would consider an application from the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption for documents related to Oakden?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:12): This is a completely hypothetical question.

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is warned for the second and the last time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The position is that there is no request for anything as far as I am aware, and if a request were to come forward that would be a matter to be determined on its merits at that point in time.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION OAKDEN INQUIRY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): My question is to the Premier. As the Premier referred in the house yesterday to some material about Oakden given to cabinet that would assist the investigation by the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, can he outline to the house what that material is and why won't it be released to the commissioner?

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

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

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: No, I heard it. Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:13): This is not a game of 20 Questions about what might be in cabinet submissions. The Premier has made it very—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order. The Deputy Premier has offered him no provocation. Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The situation in relation to this is very clear. The Premier and the government have indicated that there will be full cooperation within the law, full assistance offered to the commissioner. That has been said by the Premier, it has been said by me, it has been said by others, and that is how we intend, within the law, to proceed with this matter.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION OAKDEN INQUIRY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): A supplementary: will the Attorney-General confirm to this house that the material the Premier referred to in his answer to the house yesterday, the material which cabinet has and which would be useful to the ICAC in this investigation, will be identified and forwarded to Bruce Lander?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:15): The framing of the question is a misrepresentation of what was said by the Premier, and I return to what I have already tried to explain to the parliament. All of these questions are hypothetical, and the general legal position is what I have already tried to explain and will not burden members by repeating.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Given that two weeks have elapsed since the minister told this parliament she was seeking increased staffing, oversight and supervision at Oakden following the second assault referred to police in 10 days, what increased staffing, oversight and supervision have been put in place?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:16): The chief psychiatrist on that site, Dr Duncan McKellar, continues to provide the clinical leadership in that space with the team there, which flexes up and down each day according to the number of consumers on that site—and we know, unfortunately, that yesterday there was the sad loss of an older South Australian who was a resident at that site. Those staffing levels and the clinical support that is needed for the complex consumers living at Makk and McLeay and Clements wards are addressed on a daily basis.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16): A supplementary, sir: can the minister provide any evidence that her commitment to this house, made two weeks ago, that there would be increased staffing has actually occurred?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:16): I am happy to get the latest information for today but, as I said, that moves up and down on a daily basis.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16): The minister has previously indicated that she will provide updates to this house on a daily basis regarding this area of staffing and oversight and supervision. We have had nothing for two weeks. Can the minister now provide that update to this house?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:17): The Leader of the Opposition continues to twist words in relation to Oakden. I said at the time that I will provide updates to the house. I provided a ministerial statement to the house yesterday—I take that back, it was Tuesday.

Mr Griffiths interjecting:

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

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Why did the minister state, in a press release of 20 April 2017, that 'in December last year I became aware of concerns about the care of a resident at the Makk and McLeay Older Persons Mental Health Facility at Oakden', when she had received a letter dated 14 October 2016 from the Principal Community Visitor informing her of these concerns a full two months earlier than stated in her own press release?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:18): We have covered this ground many times over the preceding weeks. The opposition has failed to read the ministerial statements a number of times or has misread them. When I received an inquiry from the Principal Community Visitor in October, I triggered a briefing inquiry to the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network. We now know that that is the trigger. Thankfully, the Spriggs family fought through this with the community visitor, and the breadth of the inquiry that their inquiry set off—also triggered by me in December—is now known as the Oakden review.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Before I call the leader, I call to order the member for Finniss, I warn the leader, and I warn the deputy leader for the second and final time. I remind the member for Morialta that he is on two warnings, yet he continues to interject.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): A supplementary, sir: when did the minister read the letter from the Principal Community Visitor dated 14 October 2016?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:19): I am happy to go back through my office files and check on the particular dates that we receive correspondence and when they make it to my desk.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): Can the minister confirm that in fact it was read before or after the December date that she refers to in her press release?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:19): I am happy to check my records.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Did the minister refuse to release the Principal Community Visitor's letter to the parliament in an attempt to cover up her failures?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:20): No.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: It's a prejudicial and rhetorical way of questioning when the questioning could be done in a parliamentary and measured and forensic way.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: It's just part of his performance, sir.

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Wright to order. Minister.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: I replied no.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:20): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Is the Clements unit at Oakden going to close and, if so, when?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:20): As I have outlined in a number of the ministerial statements I have made in the house, there is a transition committee that is being formed around Mr Stubbs, and the model of care and the transition to another site is part of that long-term piece of work.

We do know that Clements has a very different patient or resident profile, typified more as a transitional ward. We will work through with the transition committee as we eventually close Oakden fully, but we do know that very shortly, the Northgate aged-care facility will be available to take the Oakden Makk and McLeay ward people as they move into that. The renovations are almost completed and we are in the final stages readying for that move.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:21): Supplementary: minister, do you expect Clements to close within the next three months?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:21): I rely on the advice of that committee on those clinical matters.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:21): Supplementary: minister, why did you tell the people of South Australia that you were going to close Oakden when one of the three units, Clements, is obviously going to remain open for more than three months and maybe into 12 months?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:22): Oakden will be closed.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:22): Supplementary, sir: can the minister confirm that Clements will be closed?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:22): As I have just previously stated, Oakden will be closed. We will rely on the advice of the transition committee led by Mr Stubbs on the appropriate timing of that time, but the most important thing is that the people at Makk and McLeay who have been at the centre of the Oakden report are important, that we place their care and concern and quality of environment and respect for their difficult end of their lives that they are potentially facing with dementia and other mental health conditions, that we fast-track the care and concerns. That is what this government has had at the heart of its response to this terrible report that we received in April.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:23): Minister, given that the Clements ward was the site of a number of abuse incidents, why is the government only willing to close two-thirds of the Oakden facility at the moment?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:23): We know in the Oakden report that the most significant care and concerns issues related to Makk and McLeay. Clements was treated in a different way.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: We have also addressed any intermediate concerns at the Clements ward as they arose.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

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

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:23): My question is again to the Minister for Mental Health. Given the Chief Psychiatrist's concern about stand-alone facilities, does Clements operating as a stand-alone facility without Makk and McLeay represent a risk to patient safety?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:23): As I have outlined several times in all the ministerial statements, there is a different consumer profile—

Mr Wingard interjecting:

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: —residents, patients, whichever word you wish to use for the people who are residing in Clements. It is a transitional facility, and under Dr Duncan McKellar's leadership, who will still have clinical oversight across the Clements ward and the Northgate aged-care facilities, I am sure those people are going to have the very best quality of care and the dignity and respect we would all expect for elderly South Australians who are in such a frail and vulnerable state in their lives.

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Mitchell to order for interrupting the minister's answer.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:24): A supplementary: is the minister comfortable that Clements can operate as its own stand-alone facility into the future?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:24): When I have spoken to Dr McKellar, he has been confident that he can operate both of those sites—

Mr Wingard interjecting:

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: —within his purview with the appropriate clinical support.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mitchell is warned. Member for Davenport.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:25): A supplementary: minister, have families of residents of Clements been consulted about the continuation or future closure of that ward?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:25): SA Health and the team on site at Oakden across all the different wards there have been talking to consumers' family about the future of that site. Those conversations are ongoing and very, very regularly people are having interactions with the clinical team and the—

Mr Duluk: What about the closure?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: —leadership at NALHN about the future of this site. We expect those conversations to be ongoing.

Mr DULUK: A supplementary, sir?

The SPEAKER: The member for Davenport is called to order for interjecting and called to ask a question.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:25): Thank you, sir. Minister, have any families whose loved ones are in the Clements ward been told of a future closure date of that ward by your department—yes or no?

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:25): I'll have to—

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is warned.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: I'll have to check with SA Health, but not to my knowledge, no. There is no date for the Clements ward closure at this point in time because we are waiting on the transitional committee to give us that information, as I stated earlier in question time.

Mr Wingard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mitchell will cease carrying on. The member for Davenport.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:26): My question again is to the Minister for Mental Health. What has been done to implement the Chief Psychiatrist's recommendations that capital planning for the purpose-built replacement of Oakden should occur immediately?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:26): I know that we continue to have conversations with SA Health about the appropriate allocation of resources and possible sites about how we care for people with these unique needs across our state. Again, the transitional committee will look at a variety of different sites in the coming months about the options that will be considered.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:26): Can the minister outline to the house what sites are being looked at at the moment?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:27): At this point in time, I will wait for the committee to give me that advice. I haven't had a briefing on that, but when I have an appropriate piece of information that I can share with the house of course I will be happy to do that.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:27): A supplementary: why is the minister ignoring the Chief Psychiatrist's advice that capital planning should commence immediately?

The SPEAKER: I am going to rule that out of order because I am weary of questions being asked in an inflammatory and prejudicial way. That question can be asked forensically and sensibly. The member for Newland.

NORTHERN ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (14:27): My question is to the Minister for Health. How have service realignments in the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network changed the health care provided at both the Lyell McEwin and Modbury Hospital?

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:27): I would like to thank the member for Newland and acknowledge his passionate advocacy on behalf of his constituents within the catchment area of Modbury Hospital.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I can tell you one thing: he has never said we should privatise Modbury Hospital. There is one thing the member for Newland has never done, and that's advocate privatisation of the Modbury Hospital. We have made significant improvements to the delivery of public health care in South Australia and these improvements have been yielding excellent results, and doesn't the opposition love it! You can hear the joy on the other side of the chamber.

One year after health services in the north and north-east were realigned, local residents are spending five hours less in hospital and getting faster access to elective surgery. Despite 3,450 more presentations to the Lyell McEwin Hospital since the realignments started, patients are spending 19 minutes less time waiting to be treated in the emergency department than they did the year before our modernisation. Modbury Hospital continues to see more than 100 patients a day in its ED, which

is here to stay under this government, operating 24 hours a day, seven days a week, staffed by emergency medical specialists and capable of providing emergency assessment and treatment to all patients.

Modbury Hospital and the Lyell McEwin Hospital have also seen some remarkable outcomes in their delivery of surgical services. Our latest figures show an increase of 44 per cent in the number of day surgeries performed at Modbury Hospital. There have also been improvements in waiting times for elective surgery. Back in November 2016, there were 40 overdue elective surgeries for Modbury Hospital and the Lyell McEwin Hospital. At the end of May, we are scheduled to have no overdue elective surgeries.

Concentrating complex and emergency surgery at the Lyell McEwin Hospital also means fewer surgeries at Modbury Hospital were cancelled at the last minute, as the operating theatres don't need to be used for emergency patients; in fact, our data shows that 99 per cent of elective surgery patients at Modbury Hospital were admitted on the day that their surgery was planned. The work of our skilled and dedicated staff, as well as investments made by the government, such as the \$32 million for the new state-of-the-art rehabilitation centre at Modbury Hospital, has enabled more services than ever before to be provided locally. This means far fewer northern residents are now required to travel into the city to receive the treatment that they need.

The first wave of specialist services moved north in October last year, including orthopaedics, renal and vascular. More recently, stroke services were expanded, and medical oncology, cardiology, ENT, urology, breast endocrine, haematology and rehabilitation services will be transferred in coming months. The installation of a second CT scanner at the Lyell McEwin Hospital is eliminating the outpatient waiting list for scans. The purchase of a second catheter lab is providing more patients with access to interventional cardiology services.

In addition, the introduction of 24-hour orthopaedic coverage at Lyell McEwin Hospital has drastically reduced wait times from when patients arrive at the emergency department to when they are operated on. Thanks to the improvements the government has instigated in our northern suburbs, patients are receiving better care close to home, and they are waiting less time to be treated and they are getting home quicker.

Members interjecting:

Ms BEDFORD: Supplementary, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Before we come to the supplementary, I call to order the members for Chaffey, Hammond, Mount Gambier and the member for Heysen, and it's good to hear her in full cry. I warn the members for Hammond, Chaffey and Mount Gambier. I warn for the second and final time the member for Mount Gambier, and I note that the leader has been on two warnings yet interjected on two occasions in the minister's answer.

Mr Marshall: I apologise, sir.

The SPEAKER: I accept your apology then. Supplementary, member for Florey.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:32): My question is to the Minister for Health. In light of his answer, can he advise the house now on a date for the introduction of the extended stay in the emergency department at Modbury Hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:32): Not yet, but we will have more to say very, very soon.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned for the second and final time.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland is warned also.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Yes, I know. Member for Davenport.

OLDER PERSONS MENTAL HEALTH SERVICE

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:32): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Is the government committed to having one or more purpose-built tier 7 BPSD facilities within the public health system, as recommended by the Chief Psychiatrist?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:33): One of the most important things that's been missed in the conversation today is about the importance of establishing an appropriate model of care that will determine the right facility mix, or singular. We are not sure until we have that information provided to us by the transition committee.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned for the second and final time. There will be no further warnings to the member for Unley. The member for Davenport.

OLDER PERSONS MENTAL HEALTH SERVICE

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:33): Given the Chief Psychiatrist's estimates that the current demand for a tier 7 facility is at least 21 beds and the space available at the Northgate facility will accommodate 16 at the most, where will the other beds be located?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:34): Yes, it is like *Groundhog Day*, except none of them are like Bill Murray, who learned from the experience.

The SPEAKER: The minister will not respond to interjections.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. What we do know about this space is the number of residents at this type of facility is complex, and their wellbeing and their mental wellbeing flexes up and down. It's not a static thing. Someone might start with a seven, they may recover, they may go down to a six and they may go back to a five. It's up to the clinicians on that site to decide the right mix of consumers at any one space.

We do know, and we have made it very clear, that Northgate has two pods that we're preparing for people over the coming weeks to become new residents at this new facility. We're looking forward to sharing that with their families shortly and taking them through this facility. I believe the Hon. Stephen Wade in the other place has already had a tour of this facility recently, and I'm sure he would comment on how good the Northgate facility is that is available. It will give them quality of life.

The number of consumers who are suffering from the different tiers of dementia treatment in this state will move according to the number of people who are coming into our service at any one time. But tier 7, yes, is the most severe level, and when people are in that state they are treated in the appropriate clinical settings. That is a matter that Dr McKellar provides advice to us on about on a regular basis. My understanding is that the quantity that the opposition is putting forward today wouldn't necessarily be actuarially correct with the population of South Australia, but again I will rely on the advice in the model of care piece that we are developing and for the transition team to give me that information.

OLDER PERSONS MENTAL HEALTH SERVICE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:35): Supplementary: is the minister indicating to this house that she does not accept the Chief Psychiatrist's recommendations regarding the number of tier 7 patients that are contained in the Oakden review?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:36): What I have said is that the model of care and the appropriate site development will be considered by a transition team. I have said that a number of times today. They

will make the appropriate recommendation, and I'm sure the Chief Psychiatrist will be speaking to that group as they develop this transition piece.

OLDER PERSONS MENTAL HEALTH SERVICE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): Can the minister update the house on how many beds she believes are required for tier 7, or whether or not she will accept the recommendation from the Chief Psychiatrist in the Oakden review?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:36): Could I—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader had two warnings, and I have told him twice that he is on two warnings—and now I have told him a third time—and I am reluctant, as he knows, to suspend him under the sessional order. Minister.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: As I have made it clear, the model of care, the possible sites we will consider, the right mix of where consumers reside in the future are part of the transition space that we are developing at the moment, and I will rely on clinical advice and evidence from a variety of sources that are technically skilled in this space to make that decision. It's not a case of what the minister believes; it's about what the experts indicate. Evidence-based decision-making is at the heart of what we should be doing in health care.

OLDER PERSONS MENTAL HEALTH SERVICE

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:38): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. On average, at any one time how many tier 6 BPSD patients and other older patients with mental health issues may need a bed in a specialist unit in South Australia?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:38): As I have stated before, the wellbeing status of a variety of consumers in this space—whether it's in the private sector or the public sector—in aged-care services, particularly in the mental health services, can change. They are clinical assessments. I am not going to hazard a guess on any one day what the right clinical mix for those levels is. I will rely on clinical advice and expertise to provide the decision-making that I reach with their support.

NORTHGATE AGED CARE SERVICE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:38): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Does the Chief Psychiatrist consider that Northgate is an appropriate long-term facility for the ongoing care of the patients in tier 7?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:39): The Chief Psychiatrist is responsible for the quality and safety across our mental health system in our state. He has been aware of the Northgate aged-care decision and has not objected and, with the implementation team led by Dr Duncan McKellar, we are moving in that space. We have updated the house a number of times about our plans on this, and how we have moved to expedite that move recently. We are close to completing the renovations on that site. I look forward to working with the families as they embark on this new chapter in their family member's life at the Northgate Aged Care facility.

SPORTS VOUCHERS

Mr GEE (Napier) (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Recreation and Sport. Can the minister update the house on the sports vouchers program?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:40): I thank the member for Napier for his question. This has been one of the great results out of an election commitment that the Labor government made at the last election to provide every primary school student in South Australia with \$50 towards club fees or some organised sporting activity. I want to thank the Premier and the Treasurer for their support of this wonderful program, and wherever I go in the state I get great feedback about it.

So far, more than 115,200 sports vouchers have been redeemed since the program commenced, worth a total of \$5.72 million. In the member for Napier's electorate more than 2,855 vouchers have been redeemed since 2015, worth more than \$142,300. Aussie Rules is the most popular sport, with more than 1,147 vouchers used, and the SANFL's Auskick is the most popular provider, with more than 360 vouchers.

A couple of weeks ago, I was at the McLaren footy club at an Auskick clinic, and a lot of the parents I spoke to were very grateful for the \$50 sports voucher. I must mention the member for MacKillop because, of course, he is a Mount Burr supporter. I was at the Glencoe footy club on Saturday, and I am proud to tell the house that Glencoe beat Mount Burr, our archrival, by four goals in a pretty wet match that had to be called off because of lightning.

I do not think that either Glencoe or Mount Burr are having their best season, but I am sure that Fred Smith, from *The South Eastern Times*, will be reading this and reporting on it. He goes through *Hansard* with a fine-tooth comb and any mentions of Glencoe, Mount Burr or anywhere else in the South-East Fred gives a really good write-up about. It was a really good win—only the second win of the season for Glencoe—and it was great to be down there with grassroots footy. I wish all the clubs, whatever sport they are involved in right around the state, all the very best because in so many cases they are the one piece of the community that keeps everyone together and brings people together for training, for matches and for functions.

I thank the Treasurer for the \$40 million additional money that went to sport in the current budget. It was a terrific use of taxpayers' money, in particular the \$10 million women's sports facilities grants being rolled out across the state. We had \$4 million worth in the first tranche and about 100 applications, and the second lot of those grants, worth \$3 million, are in and being decided on at the moment.

When you go to places like the Dudley United Netball Club on Kangaroo Island and see the facilities that the women have there, they have at tiny room that both teams have to get changed in. Their rub-down table and strapping table was covered in pigeon poop when I was there, and it is out in the open—and it gets pretty cold down on the island. That's just one example. We have been at West Lakes Shore with the Minister for Transport to have a look at some development.

There are some really great projects that are being funded by this additional money in this sports budget. When people look at this era under the current Treasurer's guidance, this will be known as a very pro-sport government.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Of course, that leadership comes from our Premier. It's great to be out wherever we are in the state talking to sporting organisations and seeing what a difference this vital money makes to local communities.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call to order the member for Schubert.

NORTHGATE AGED CARE SERVICE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Given that the Groves review highlighted as a key aspect of the design future for the purpose-built facility for the replacement of Oakden, firstly, that there should be private bathrooms—

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader will ask something interrogative.

Ms CHAPMAN: How can the Northgate facility, which doesn't have these, satisfy the Groves recommendation?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:44): The transition model of care and the full implementation of the six Oakden review recommendations are part of the scope of the transition committee that I have spoken about today numerous times in the chamber. The Chief Psychiatrist will of course be involved in that ongoing piece of work.

NORTHGATE AGED CARE SERVICE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:45): Supplementary: given that the recommendations were that there be a line of sight to the communal areas and that this doesn't apply to the Northgate facility, how can it still possibly be an appropriate site for the relocation of those consumers?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:45): I am advised by the clinical leads in the space that are responsible for this area of delivery of service that everyone is happy with the quality of the Northgate facility that is being renovated and changed to meet the needs of SA Health. At this point in time, those concerns are being dealt with, and as far as the renovations are concerned, we understand that they meet our needs.

NORTHGATE AGED CARE SERVICE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): Supplementary: given that a further recommendation of the Groves review which they highlighted was the provision of multisensory rooms at the facility and that Northgate doesn't have them, again how can that possibly be compliant with what is recommended?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:46): My understanding is that there is going to be a variety of different breakout spaces apart from bedrooms. I have walked through the Northgate facility in its old state before it was renovated. I'm not currently aware, because of the workmen being in there, of the actual floor plan for the design and allocation of those different spaces, apart from the consumer bedrooms, but I am happy to check that out and come back to the house.

NORTHGATE AGED CARE SERVICE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): I have a further question to the Minister for Mental Health. Did you discuss at all the Northgate option with Mr Groves?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:47): The Chief Psychiatrist and I meet on a regular basis to discuss a number of issues.

NORTHGATE AGED CARE SERVICE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:47): Supplementary: during these meetings on a number of occasions with the Chief Psychiatrist, did he express any concern to you about your decision to remodel Northgate as the replacement premises?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:47): I would have to check my records, but not that I recollect.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:47): My question is to the Minister for Planning and Deputy Premier. Can the minister tell the house what the government is doing to encourage good design outcomes for infill development?

The SPEAKER: The Speaker is very interested in this answer, given that the minister accompanied him to a development of deplorable design in Woodville Park.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:47): I thank the honourable member for his question. I also thank you, Mr Speaker, for inviting me and officers of the department to come and speak with you and your constituent. I can indicate that the members for Kaurua and Reynell have also taken the opportunity to take me for a look around and a chat with constituents and local government people. This is a very important issue, and I thank again the honourable member for asking the question.

There has been a significant change in taste in the marketplace in Adelaide and in particular towards infill development, and if you think about it, Mr Speaker, this makes sense. People want to live closer to amenities. They want to live near employment, schools, hospitals and so forth. In fact, in recent years, around \$738 million worth of projects and 2,700 new dwellings have been approved or are under construction since the introduction of the first inner metropolitan growth DPA in October 2013.

Both you and the members for Kaurna and Reynell can take some comfort in having brought to the attention of the government that some infill development can give rise to local issues. These issues include things like overshadowing, noise and effects on neighbouring properties. I think the member for Torrens, in particular, has raised parking as an issue. So, there is a whole range of issues which can arise in this context, and the vast majority of these can be dealt with through very good design and through thinking in a respectful way about neighbours and their properties when designs are being considered and also having regard to the streetscape in which these designs are being brought forward.

It is important, I think, Mr Speaker, for you to know that we have listened. In fact, you, as often is the case, were in the vanguard of drawing this matter to our attention and we have listened. As a result, there are a couple of things going on simultaneously. First of all, a great deal of work has been done in respect of design guidelines, and one of the pillars of the new planning system is good design. A great deal of work is going on in that area. That work is continuing and you will be hearing a lot more about that in due course.

But, of course, we are not content, as you wouldn't be content and the members for Reynell and Kaurna certainly aren't content, to wait for that work to be finished because that could take some time. So, in the last few days we have actually introduced on an interim basis, which means effective immediately, a significant raft of changes which overlay the inner metropolitan DPA—in other words, supplement the existing inner metropolitan DPA—and these add significant additional robustness to the questions about design, questions about streetscape, questions about neighbourly interactions and questions about overlooking.

It is really important that as we go along we do get the feedback that we have been getting from members about this because, Mr Speaker, if it wasn't for you and the members for Kaurna, Reynell, Torrens and others who have spoken to me and to members of my department, some of this feedback would not be received, and that is a great service that you are doing for your communities.

The really good news is that not only have these issues been brought forward but there has been a change to the metropolitan DPAs dealing with the inner rim of the city within the City of Adelaide proper, the Corporation of the City of Adelaide, and also in Onkaparinga to deal with these issues as they have come up. I thank members very much for their assistance.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER (14:52): Minister, a supplementary: has the minimum sill height been raised from 1.5 metres to 1.7 as part of this initiative?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:52): As usual, Mr Speaker, you ask a very, very good question and I will have to take that one on notice, but I can say this. One of the things that we have discovered through this process is that some people who develop properties are very clever at utilising a set of prescriptive rules to achieve what they want, which somehow doesn't seem to achieve what the prescriptive rule was intended to achieve in the first place, if that's not completely double-dutch.

What we are trying to do with the design guidelines is to have them more focused on the outcome. For example, if you are talking about overlooking, rather than saying, 'All overlooking problems will be solved by having a balcony that is 1.7,' for example, we would rather say, 'The requirement is that from your balcony you cannot look over your neighbour's backyard,' for instance. That might mean in your particular street that's a 1.7-metre balcony; it might mean in someone else's

that it's 1.9, depending on the proximity of the properties and so forth. We are looking to get performance orientated design guidelines—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Oh, what a shame.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:54): My question is again to the Minister for Mental Health. What steps did the minister personally take to assess Ward 18 as a medium to long-term option for current residents of Oakden Older Persons Mental Health Service?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:54): I had a conversation, as I have said previously to the parliament, with senior officers of the Southern Area Local Health Network who are responsible for Ward 18 and they were quite emphatic that Ward 18 was not suited to the sort of long-term accommodation required for residents at Oakden. Ward 18 is designed as a short-term acute care facility and is not suited to the sort of long-term care that would be required from residents of Oakden. But in any case, the Minister for Mental Health has already put out there how we will accommodate residents of the Oakden facility, and I think it is a far better resolution than what the opposition propose.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:55): A supplementary to the Minister for Mental Health: has the minister personally discussed the Ward 18 options with the Chief Psychiatrist and the new clinical lead?

An honourable member: How can you answer that?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:55): I have.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:55): A supplementary to the Minister for Mental Health: has the minister personally discussed the Ward 18 option with the Chief Psychiatrist?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:55): I have responsibility for the Repat site, and when the issue was first canvassed by the opposition that Ward 18 (the old Ward 18) might be a suitable place to put the Oakden residents, I spoke to senior officers in SALHN about its suitability for that purpose to which they have responded emphatically that it is not for the reasons I described.

You can keep running this flag up the pole as much as you want. The simple answer is that it is not suited to the sorts of long-term requirements for patients at the Oakden facility. It is a short-term acute care facility for relatively short periods of stay. It doesn't have the facilities which are required for people needing the sort of long-term care that residents of the Oakden facility have. You can keep going on as much as you want about it, but they are the clinical facts.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. Given that all the rooms in Ward 18 have a private bathroom, and the Groves review highlighted this aspect as a key design feature for a purpose-built facility, does the minister agree that Ward 18 would be a better long-term site for ongoing care at Northgate?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:56): No, we don't, and the member for Davenport might think he knows better than clinicians who are experts in this area, but when the experts in this area tell us—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart is warned.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: When experts in this area tell us that Ward 18 is not suited to the long-term requirements of residents, as are required for the Oakden residents, that is something this government takes on board. The member for Davenport can harp on about it as much as he wants. We won't be taking the advice of the opposition above the advice of experts in this particular area. We have been—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Who? The member for Davenport is the expert? You've got to be joking! I have known the member for Davenport when he was knee high to a grasshopper.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: When he had hair.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I knew him when he had hair, indeed. I can tell you one thing. As much admiration as I have—and I look at him as a little brother actually. There are many things on which we agree but there is one thing about the member for Davenport and that is he does not have any particular expertise about the requirements of people in the Oakden facility and what is the best way to accommodate them, and the simple answer—

Mr Wingard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mitchell is warned for the second and final time.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The simple answer is that we are advised that Ward 18 is better suited to a short-term acute type of accommodation and would not meet the needs of the residents of Oakden—not to mention the fact that we would be shifting them from one side of the city to another, putting that aside—the facility itself does not lend itself to the needs of the Oakden facility. The member for Davenport can wish all he wants, but nothing will change that fact.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:58): My question again is to the Minister for Mental Health. Considering that the Minister for Health says that he has previously said he has received his advice on the suitability of Ward 18 from David Morris, a NALHN administrator, will the minister now ask the Chief Psychiatrist whether Ward 18 will be a better long-term option than Northgate for tier 7 patients?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:59): The answer is no different. Given how much the Liberal Party have been out peddling this idea of Ward 18, I am in no doubt that the Chief Psychiatrist would be of exactly the same view that Ward 18 does not lend itself to the care of these sorts of patients. Knowing the Chief Psychiatrist—and I know him very well—he is not one to be held back when he has a strong opinion on something. I am in no doubt that if the Chief Psychiatrist held the view that somehow Ward 18, despite everyone else's view, was better suited to the needs of these residents he would make that view very well known.

POWER INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Can the minister advise whether the cost to taxpayers of the 200 megawatts of diesel generation capacity currently being sought by the government is part of the \$550 million cost announced in March, or will additional taxpayer funds be required?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (15:00): It is part of the \$550 million—

Mr Bell: It's a clean future, is it?

The SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier is on two warnings.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, the \$550 million does include the procurement of the temporary generation to be put in place for this summer. We are out to the market now, and final costs are only indicative, so we will wait to see what the market comes back with. Hopefully, we will be able to get a good deal for the people of South Australia.

POWER INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:00): A supplementary: given that the minister said he has indicative costs, can he advise the house how much he expects to spend on the diesel generators?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (15:01): No, I will not be making that public as we are in a procurement process now, and I do not want the market participants who are bidding to provide us with this generation to know exactly where they should be. This is a complex issue. We are not out procuring Singapore noodles for a Wokinabox; we are actually out there buying serious pieces of equipment. That way we can get the best price for taxpayers. If I flag in advance what the price will be, I suspect that would be the flaw, so we have not revealed the price of the temporary generators because you want to get the best competitive market possible.

POWER INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:01): A supplementary, sir: given that the minister says he cannot divulge the price he expects to pay for the diesel gas generators because it is going to public tender, why has he divulged that he expects to spend \$360 million on a gas peaking plant and \$150 million on batteries? They are both also going to public tender.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (15:02): First, we have not divulged how much we are going to be spending on the battery. We have a renewable technology fund that is made up of \$150 million, half loans and half grants, and we have said that we will use that pool of money to go out and not buy a battery but we will be procuring services. The battery will be owned by the private sector and we will have a contract with it, so I don't expect all those funds to be used for the battery. The remaining money in place is for the diesel generators and the hybrid generators, and we want to make sure that we have sufficient funds. What I am not going to do is go out to the market and tell the market exactly what we are prepared to pay.

Again, members opposite do not understand this, and that is why they are finding it difficult. It is not like running a Wokinabox, it is a lot more complicated than running a Wokinabox. It is amazing when we say 'Wokinabox' the reaction the public has. 'Wokinabox' has this reaction. They relate Wokinabox immediately to one person, it is amazing—Wok-onomics.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart is warned for the second and final time for continuing to interject, and the Treasurer is called to order for debating the answer.

POWER INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:03): A supplementary, sir, for the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy: does the minister intend that the government will own the diesel generators like the gas plant or lease the diesel generators like the batteries?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (15:03): There are some fundamental misunderstandings about what we announced. It seems that everyone other than the opposition has read the government's energy plan, Our Energy Plan. What we said, first of all, was with the renewable technology fund we ought to help underwrite a battery. That means that the private sector would bid to build a battery and operate that battery, and the government would have a call on that battery perhaps 24 hours or 48 hours in advance, perhaps for ancillary services to bid into the market.

We would use that when we believed there might be load shedding or some other service required on behalf of the taxpayer that the market could not provide. That is not to say that we would spend all the money building the battery. We will be contracting with the owners of the battery to provide us a service. We said that on day one. Fundamentally, from day one, the opposition have misunderstood what that means.

Then we get to the diesel generators. We said we wanted to procure diesel generators over summer. We are not going to go out and buy diesel generators. We are asking for a service. We have gone out to the market to provide us a service and we are getting offers back. As we get offers back, I imagine that the assessment panel that is looking at the offers being offered to us by providers, some may have provided us options to own, some may have provided options for us to rent or lease. Of course, that will be considered independently of government.

We are going to own a generator. A generator is something that the government believes is very important for the long-term security of the people of South Australia. Importantly, I note that the opposition haven't ruled out privatising that generator if they are elected. With less than 10 months to the election, perhaps the opposition could tell us whether they will keep that generator in public hands or whether they will just revert back to form and privatise that generator.

POWER INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:05): Supplementary for the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy: how long does the minister expect the diesel generators to be needed to operate to avoid more blackouts in South Australia?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (15:06): AEMO put out some indicative shortfalls over this coming summer. They are estimating that south-eastern Australia including the Victorian market will be short. We expect to offer our diesel or hybrid generators in lieu of load shedding to meet that shortfall that the market can't supply. I think the fact that the government is having to intervene in this way shows a fundamental market failure.

Even with the price signals that are in place, the market is not responding and the government needs to act. In fact, I think the commonwealth government have admitted it as well by investing in Snowy Hydro. In fact, the only investment in generation that is occurring outside renewables is between the commonwealth government and their Snowy scheme and the South Australian government. Hopefully, by the time the procurement is completed, we will get through this summer and it will be the one summer we need the generators for, but if we need them for longer the government will assess those options then.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:07): My question is to the Minister for Health. How long do patients at risk need to wait for an answer on extended-stay beds at the Modbury Hospital ED? Is this a primary health initiative or an election sweetener timed to assist the minister in his contest with the member for Florey?

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta will be suspended from the service of the house for the next hour under the sessional order.

The honourable member for Morialta having withdrawn from the chamber:

Grievance Debate

OPERATION FLINDERS

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:07): I rise today to speak about a trip I was very fortunate to be able to take in recent weeks to Yankanimna Station in the Far North Flinders Ranges to see firsthand the outstanding work of the Operation Flinders Foundation. Operation Flinders is a leading provider of quality wilderness programs for young people at risk, and I commend the team headed by CEO, John van Ruth, on the outstanding work they do. I was lucky enough to travel up with Jonathan Robran who, again, does some wonderful work for Operation Flinders.

I will talk more about how he got there, but I was fortunate enough to fly to Leigh Creek and get the bus out to the station where we went out to meet lots of wonderful volunteers and wonderful young people as well. CEO John van Ruth and his team of staff, which consists of an incredibly important volunteer network, not only transform the lives of kids who participate but provide a service where the outcomes will benefit the whole of society. As I said, we met some of these young people from different areas of Adelaide and across South Australia and it is amazing what happens.

These young people are bussed up there and they are dropped literally in the middle of nowhere. There is a base there. The young people do not get to see the base, but obviously the base is set up to give them protection and make sure that they have the services and emergency requirements if any are needed. They are dropped out in the middle of nowhere and they pick up a 15-kilogram backpack. They put their own gear into that backpack and off they go, with a couple of support officers and a team leader.

Teams of seven, eight or nine young people go off with these three guides, and these young people often get the experience to clear their head, is probably a nice way to put it, in the wilderness. People volunteer to take these young people out on this trek, which lasts about 10 days from when they are first dropped off and off they go. They get to the different campsites at night-time and have to prepare their own food. As I said, they carry all their goods with them. Food is dropped off so, wherever they end up each night, the food is there for them. It is just a marvellous experience.

We were lucky enough to go out and see a couple of the campsites and chat to a couple of the young people. To see their leadership really come to life before our very eyes as they were out there trekking around and surviving, if you like, in the Flinders Ranges was absolutely outstanding. I cannot name everyone who was involved with this operation because there were so many wonderful volunteers; some come from a military background. There were some STAR Force officers, police, teachers, principals and many from other professions who give up their time to go and be a part of this throughout the course of the year.

What it gives back to these young people is quite outstanding, some of whom are having troubles in society and having troubles in their local community. The responsibility they are given and the learnings they obtain from being out in the wilderness, trekking around, getting themselves from station to station and campsite to campsite, and fending for themselves during this time really does fulfil them. It is amazing to see these young people grow.

There was a group from Brighton Secondary School supported by Perks. It is great to have corporates involved in this as well. There are a lot of corporate sponsors who get heavily involved, which is exceptionally good. I was lucky while I was there as well. I mentioned Jonathon Robran. I flew up, and my wife came as well, along with the CEO from Marion council and his wife. Didi and Joan were also on our trip, and it was great to have them all there.

Jonathon Robran was part of a 17-person Epic Impact Bike Riders group that arrived just before we did, and they rode their pushbikes, if you can believe it, 700 kilometres from Port Adelaide to Yankaninna raising funds along the way. A couple of people I know, Dr Chris Barnett and Bomber Whelan, were part of the group, and there was a number of people there I know. This crew did a marvellous job to raise funds to keep this Operation Flinders going. To date, the ride has raised \$115,000 to support the important work of Operation Flinders, and I commend everyone who participated in the gruelling project.

Back home, I have endeavoured to raise funds to establish a local chapter in our community, and that has been fantastic, and so far we have raised almost \$3,000. The Lions Club of Marion have been good supporters of Operation Flinders as well, and we are hoping to work with other local chapters, service groups and businesses in our area to help contribute to this. The student leaders at Seaview High School, Jake Beaumont and Rachel Rattus, have also contributed to what we are doing, and Marion council is discussing getting involved with our chapter and getting on board and supporting this. We hope that will happen, and I commend Operation Flinders to the house.

HAPPY VALLEY FOOTBALL CLUB

Ms COOK (Fisher) (15:13): I rise today to talk about the Happy Valley Football Club, which is situated within the Happy Valley Sports Park in the heart of Fisher. My son Sam started his footy career there, and I really love the deep connection that I feel when I am there. The modern Happy Valley Football Club was born in 1952, wearing blue and gold in the Hills Central Football League, and Wal Baxter, who was honoured on Saturday night, wore these colours. In the early sixties, Valleys left the Hills to join the Glenelg South West Football League, and it was to avoid clashing with Glandore that the Vikings made the adjustment to black and gold, the colours by which the club is now known.

The Valley won premierships with their top side in both 1970 and 1974 under the captaincy of Wayne Baxter, but this was in the third division of the league. The Happy Valley and Aberfoyle Park area was mostly vineyards or sheep paddocks, and the club was a little known and rather insignificant power right up until the eighties when it joined the Southern Football League. In the SFL, the club is always a highly respected force to be reckoned with.

Many attribute the success of the club to the development of the area. Having a high school right next door certainly helps, without question. To be the best, though, requires more than just numbers. You also need the best coaches, the best trainers, the best support staff and volunteers and the best administration possible. Valleys have been very fortunate to have had a large number of exceptional and quality personnel involved as part of the club. Our forefathers at the Valley have left a legacy that we can all be proud of, and we can all walk taller on the back of their success. Our standards are high, the expectations are high and the rewards so far have been worth the effort.

The club has a deep sense of mateship and pride, which was very evident on Saturday 27 May, when the club held its 65th anniversary gala weekend and a black and gold night. The club really made sure it honoured the people who had laid the foundation of the club that has made it as successful as it is today. I was there on the gate from 8.30 to 9.30, but others were there much earlier. Cake stalls, barbecues and sumo suits were all underway, as was the first game of the day. I was joined at the gate by a resident koala and a very fresh valley breeze.

The Hall of Fame presented at the black and gold gala was a wonderful end to the day. Seeing the Baxters and Mannings at the club and knowing that the Shurgotts are still heavily involved is heartwarming and shows the true Viking spirit. The inaugural inductees to the 2017 Hall of Fame range from inaugural players, presidents, life members, committee members, canteen managers, league delegates, medallists, sponsors, trainers, best and fairest and coaches to even the builders of the original clubrooms.

I congratulate Brian Schurgott, Wally Baxter, Bill Manning, Colin (Paddy) Schurgott, Stan Turner, Steve Turner, Barb Baxter, Allan Tydeman, Peter McWilliams, Neville Schurgott, John Twigden, Peter Willoughby, Gilbert Wilson, Ross Schurgott, Hank Middleton, Judy Kraveskis, Denise Schurgott, Darren Twigden, Nathan Gill and Bill Taylor. They are an incredibly dedicated and inspiring bunch of Vikings. Congratulations to all of you.

We have seen the future movement at the club this year with the introduction of ladies and girls' teams that are hugely involved and a true breath of fresh air around the place. I am also really excited about going out to watch the Valley ladies this Friday night. They will be playing against Adelaide University. We are seeing a lot of success also for the juniors at the club through the current SANFL pathways, the multicultural team and the AFL Next Generation academies. This is truly a credit to the coaching staff we have onboard.

Over the course of a usual weekend, three senior men's teams, a senior women's team, two girls junior teams, four boys junior teams and eight sub junior teams all get out to play their games. It really is a true credit to the club to get so many players out on the weekend. The Happy Valley club is not far from many other football clubs; some have greater numbers, but the south is a very competitive area, so it is a real credit to the Valleys to keep those numbers on the park. The total number of players at Happy Valley is 380.

No games would be played without the volunteer team. There are approximately 100 volunteers involved at the Valleys on a weekly basis. They hold fundraisers throughout the year. This year, they have tried to take a bit of a different direction with their fundraising, and I wish them every bit of luck with that. One of the most respected and longstanding trainers, Hank Middleton, was given an award the other night. I know he is going through some health battles, so we all wish him well. Valleys live by the motto, 'Respect all and fear none,' and I am sure Hank has that in his heart as he fights his battle.

FRIENDS OF MARINO CONSERVATION PARK

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (15:18): It is my pleasure to tell the house about the great work of the Friends of Marino Conservation Park, one of the most active environmental groups in my electorate. The Friends of Marino Conservation Park is an energetic and committed group of local volunteers

who care for this park, which is Adelaide's best quality remaining example of remnant coastal heath vegetation. The park was declared a conservation park in 1989 and has become a unique place of tranquillity within metropolitan suburbia. From its elevated position, visitors to the park can enjoy impressive views, both north and south, along Adelaide's coastline.

On 11 May 2017, I attended the 25th annual general meeting of the Friends of Marino Conservation Park. It was good to catch up with the group, with many familiar faces among the gathered. The guest speaker at the AGM was the director of the Wilderness Society, Peter Owen. The AGM was an opportunity to hear about the group's work over the past year, including the successful application for an environmental grant through the City of Marion to solarise a strip along the southern edge of an old landfill site that is within the park.

Unfortunately, the park had a dump located within its boundaries prior to it becoming a protected site, and this landfill continues to cause problems today, with extra weeds growing around it and over it. It is worth noting that I have written to the environment minister seeking the department's help with the restoration of this site and I hope that help is forthcoming.

At the AGM we received an update on the conservation park's botanical trail. The botanical trail has been a focus of the friends group for the last 12 months and, to date, work has been undertaken on trail construction, removing weeds from along the edges to allow regeneration and, where appropriate, to plant up areas with local species. So far, around 50 ID signs have been installed along the trail, and these will be added to over time. There is more work to be done on the botanical trail, and this will continue in the coming year.

I would like to thank Friends of Marino Conservation Park office-bearers and committee members for their ongoing passion and commitment to the park's environment. That includes the group's president, Alan Wilson; vice president, Gary Bowen; secretary, Bev Bowen; treasurer, Nancy Higgins; and committee members, Alan Brokenshire, Geoff Thompson, Lynda Yates, Barbara Randell, Rob George and Georgia Saxty. All these office-holders were re-elected at the AGM. It is also important to thank Chris Waugh for her contribution to grant applications which are, of course, a vital part of furthering the work of any volunteer organisation.

The friends group is ably supported by Jodi Woof, the environment department's volunteer support officer who works alongside the group, and also Jae Ellis, the ranger who is responsible for the park. I would like to congratulate long-serving volunteer Dr Barbara Randell on her appointment as the friends group patron. Barbara's passion and long-term commitment to Marino Conservation Park makes her an ideal person to fulfil this role. It is also important to pay tribute to renowned botanist Enid Robertson—the group's original patron—who sadly passed away on 10 July 2016. At the AGM, the friends discussed how Enid's work and contribution could be recognised locally.

It is worth mentioning that Marino Conservation Park will become a key component of Glenthorne national park—the Liberal Party's vision to create a 1,500 hectare national park in the heart of Adelaide's southern suburbs. Linking the hills with the sea, Glenthorne national park will preserve and revitalise incredibly important open space from Happy Valley Reservoir to the coast at Hallett Cove and Marino. It is intended that the park will incorporate existing protected areas in O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park, Hallett Cove Conservation Park and Marino Conservation Park saving the 208-hectare Glenthorne Farm, which is all too often under the threat from urban sprawl, and also include the environmentally significant but heavily degraded Field River Valley behind Trott Park, Sheidow Park and Hallett Cove.

Marino Conservation Park's status as the most pristine remnant coastal heath in Adelaide makes it a critically important site within the proposed national park, and I am committed to ensuring that, under the creation of the national park, Marino Conservation Park and the friends who support it so passionately and so ably get the attention and resources that they deserve to further enhance their work. This is an exciting vision for our city and a flagship policy for our state's environment, and I look forward to seeing it implemented in the event of a Liberal win at the 2018 state election. I commend the work of the Friends of Marino Conservation Park to the house.

BULGARIAN COMMUNITY

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:22): Last Sunday, along with several others from this chamber, I was fortunate enough to attend an event at the Bulgarian Hall on Tapleys Hill Road. This

event is the annual celebration and commemoration of the creation of the Cyrillic alphabet by St Cyril and St Methodius in the ninth century.

We were treated to many wonderful and excellent speeches and, in particular, a most interesting speech by our Speaker, who outlined the work of the saints, what it has meant to the Bulgarians and, indeed, to other Slav nations. But I digress—this is not a grievance about our Speaker's amazing knowledge in matters such as this. Today, I grieve about the Bulgarian community of South Australia and, in particular, the positive influence this outstanding ethnic community has had in the western suburbs.

As I understand it, the history of Bulgarian migration to South Australia commenced in 1928 when a contingent of Bulgarian immigrants arrived in Australia. This group was all male and their objective was to earn good money and after several years return home. Global events thwarted this objective and, thankfully, South Australia, and particularly my electorate, became the beneficiary.

Unable to return home, these hardworking men, when economic conditions improved, purchased land in and around Fulham and Fulham Gardens at reasonable prices, made this land suitable for agricultural purposes—and everyone would remember the outstanding market gardens that existed throughout that area—and arranged for their families to come to South Australia. Hence, the second wave of Bulgarian migration commenced and continued until the last great wave that occurred after 1990, following the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe.

With this brief potted history of Bulgarian immigration, I will briefly speak about other related matters. Amongst the many great achievements of the Bulgarian community perhaps the most important was the establishment of the Bulgarian Education and Friendly Society Inc. The origins of this society date back to May 1949—an interesting date, given that the 24 May is the date of the celebration of the Cyrillic alphabet. The society gave great purpose to and for the Bulgarian community, and what exists on the site of the Bulgarian Hall on Tapleys Hill Road today also includes the Bulgarian Orthodox Church and the Bulgarian language school.

The society's actions over the years and what it has achieved are testimony to the perseverance, commitment and vision of our Bulgarian community and this community's desire to ensure that their rich cultural heritage is not lost. It is safe to say that those of Bulgarian heritage are a very important part of what it is that makes South Australia such a great multicultural state. To this end, in relation to ensuring that the cultural heritage is not lost, and confirmed by Sunday's celebration, this has been a successful pursuit.

This does not mean that their future is not without challenges. At a personal level, and having lived in the western suburbs at Henley Beach and attending Henley High, it is safe to say that you could not not have known a Genoff, a Kopcheff, a Marinoff, a Mancheff, a Spiridonoff, a Vasileff, a Stoyanoff, a Popov, a Petrov, a Lazaroff or any number of members of the many wonderful Bulgarian families who lived and continue to live in our area.

My father was of Romanian descent. Romania, of course, as you would know, is just across the river and forms the northern border with Bulgaria to the south of Romania. My mother used to say to me, 'Paul, the Bulgarians were very good to us when daddy and I first got married.' I can say that the Bulgarians have been very good to me. I would like to think that as the local member I have been good for the Bulgarians, but the Bulgarians have been good for our broader community as well.

Back to last Sunday, I thank the society president, Ivan Nevov, and vice president, Ian Stefanoff, their executive and the members of the society for their kind hospitality. I very much enjoyed the dancing and the other performances of the Bulgarian language school students. To finish off, it is the objective of the Bulgarian Educational Friendly Society to run a cultural event, a festival, in February 2018 to highlight aspects of Bulgarian culture, to re-engage with the third and fourth generations of Australians from a Bulgarian background and, indeed, to spread that culture throughout our broader community. They expect to get a thousand people there.

I will continue to work with the society to make sure that we, as a government, with the support of the opposition, provide the necessary support to the society to ensure that this festival is a success.

CITTASLOW INTERNATIONAL GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:28): I rise to speak on the Cittaslow International General Assembly. Between 9 and 12 May 2017, Goolwa hosted the 10th Cittaslow International General Assembly. The assembly is held each year hosted by one of the 230 Cittaslow-accredited towns across 30 nations. The purpose of the assembly is to discuss issues related to the principles of Cittaslow and projects that enhance the philosophy of local identity, sustainable practices, social programs, heritage preservation, infrastructure development and developing a strong relationship between the council, the community and businesses.

The name Cittaslow is derived from the Italian word 'citta', which means town or city, and 'slow', because it developed from the slow food movement. There were 115 delegates who attended and they represented 41 towns from 13 nations—China, Finland, Iceland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, South Korea, Taiwan, Turkey, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and the United States of America—as well as the three Australian Cittaslow towns of Goolwa, Katoomba, Blue Mountains, New South Wales and Yea Murrindindi, Victoria.

Delegates were introduced to the Australian culture and way of life by a Ngarrindjeri smoking ceremony and Welcome to Country by Major Sumner and basket weaving by the Aboriginal women. There was a flag ceremony by Goolwa primary students and presentations by students of Victor Harbor High School and the Flexible Learning Options group. Grow Free was introduced by Andrew Barker, and delegates from Iceland and the Netherlands will be taking this philosophy back to their home towns.

Delegates attended an Aussie barbecue in the home of one of the Cittaslow members and the mayoral reception was attended by His Excellency, the Hon. Hieu Van Le AC. There were opportunities to have dinner with families hosting delegates in their homes or at local restaurants. At a final dinner, they were treated to a snail lantern parade by Goolwa Primary School students, teachers and parents, and a fairy light parade by vintage wooden boats on the River Murray.

An expo showcased local producers and artisans, with opportunities for both members of the community and delegates to taste and/or purchase their products. There were also lunch experiences using local produce, including a packed lunch prepared by the Aquacaf, and guides to take on board the Cockle Train. A sit-down fish lunch was prepared by Bombora and held on Goolwa Wharf, and a pop-up world of food lunch offered a range of foods. Morning teas with cakes, slices and sandwiches supported the good country traditions of catering.

Over three days, they were treated to tours covering the multitude of opportunities available in the historic Goolwa region, including travelling on the Cockle Train, exploring the Port Elliot Historical Museum and shops, travelling on the iconic horse-drawn tram to Granite Island and travelling on Big Duck Tours to Seal Island. Some travelled on the paddle steamer, *Oscar W*, while others were introduced to the Coorong.

The Mundoo Island Station welcomed the international guests to their farm. Investigator College opened its doors to the Environmental Centre in Currency Creek, and members of the Goolwa-Wellington Local Action Planning group helped delegates explore Goolwa beach. Others tasted the Alexandrina Cheese products at the Cittaslow Goolwa Community Garden before meeting Australia's unique animals at the Urimbirra Wildlife Park. Langhorne Creek winemakers welcomed another group to their wineries, as well as to Newman's Horseradish Farm.

Delegates rated this assembly as the best organised event hosted so far. The friendliness of the local community and businesses was a highlight for delegates, who had plenty of opportunities to explore the historic river port of Goolwa. The Alexandrina Council and their staff played a vital role in the success of this event; however, it was the efforts of the unpaid volunteers, who gave so much of their time and talents, that made this event. It would be a challenge to set a financial value on the work they did. Local businesses also strongly supported the assembly and gained substantial benefit from their involvement. The strong representation of delegates from Asia showed the potential for furthering our connections with this region: 22 per cent of delegates were from China and 38 per cent were from Korea.

The organisers would like to thank PIRSA for their support. They also acknowledge the commitment and enthusiasm shown by staff and students of Goolwa Primary School and Victor

Harbor High School. The dedication of students from Victor High was impressive and the work done by the FLO students with their bike restoration project was outstanding. This group of volunteers from Goolwa has certainly set a high standard for other international assemblies to follow.

HAMPSTEAD PRESCHOOL

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:33): Last Thursday, I had the honour of opening the new facilities at Hampstead Preschool. The official opening was followed by a morning tea with families, students, teachers, supporters and care workers of the children there. We know that the relocation of the preschool will improve access for families and make it easier for staff to utilise indoor and outdoor play areas. It will also strengthen links with the primary school. There is already a buddy system set up and the children visit the school library.

We know that including play in learning is a vital way of connecting with children in this crucial period of their development and that the learning opportunities during a child's formative years are vital. Children and young people who are supported during this time are better equipped to lead fulfilling, productive and satisfying lives. Research shows that investment in the early years before children start school has the greatest return for human development. In turn, this improves outcomes and overall wellbeing for each child and young person and for society as a whole.

We recognise that South Australia has a proud history as a national leader in early childhood development. We recognise also the value and potential of every child and young person, the primary role of parents and carers in their child's development, the importance of the first five years of a child's development and the need for services and the broader community to work together to achieve the best outcomes.

The South Australian government has invested significantly in early childhood over many years through the engagement of Dr Fraser Mustard and Professor Carla Rinaldi, through the Thinker in Residence program, as well as significant investment in the development of Children's Centres for Early Childhood Development and Parenting, among other programs. The redevelopment of Hampstead Preschool will give the approximately 60 enrolled children access to modern facilities they need to explore and learn and give teachers more opportunity to engage these children and set them up for a future of discovery.

The staff at the preschool do a wonderful job, which is highlighted through the preschool having achieved an exceeding National Quality Standard rating from the Australian Children's Education and Care Quality Authority. This preschool delivers a service that goes beyond the requirements of the National Quality Standard in six of the seven areas assessed, and this is in some part due to the multicultural nature of the preschool. The students benefit greatly from the preschool's inclusive philosophy where every child belongs and secure and respectful relationships are encouraged.

Children are encouraged to discover differences in culture, language and background and they are presented as learning opportunities. This not only gives children a rich environment in which to develop and learn but it also sets them up for becoming a productive member of their community. The children attending the Hampstead Preschool hail from many different backgrounds and places of birth, including India, Greece, Italy, Philippines, China, Korea, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Liberia, Poland, the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland.

Today, I would like to acknowledge the hard work of Ms Melanie Ellison, director of the Hampstead Preschool, and her team. I would also like to congratulate the teachers, staff and parents on their hard work and wonderful, warm community spirit. The children at the preschool are a testament to the rich environment in which they develop and learn.

As a former teacher, I understand the value of building strong foundations at this young age to support lifelong learning. I can truly say that the teachers and staff at Hampstead Preschool and primary school, along with the parents and governing councils work hard to develop this, and that the children are benefiting from their dedication and contribution.

*Personal Explanation***PORT GAWLER CONSERVATION PARK**

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:37): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Ms CHAPMAN: Yesterday, in the contribution I made to the parliament in respect of the motion to abolish the Port Gawler Conservation Park, I indicated that at the annual Burnside Rotary Club event, which the Minister for Environment is invited to, only minister Gago had attended one year. I was reminded this morning that the member for Colton, the then minister for environment, did also attend on one of these occasions and we welcomed him and thanked him for his attendance. I did not wish there to be any personal reflection by omitting to mention him yesterday.

*Bills***STATUTES AMENDMENT (ELECTRICITY AND GAS) BILL***Final Stages*

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

(Continued from 28 March 2017.)

Amendment No. 1:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be disagreed to.

The government initially opposed this amendment after taking advice on the proposed requirements from SAPN. SAPN had previously advised that a requirement to provide advance notice of an inspection of a property owned in two months was unduly restrictive. The initial time frames were considered to be unworkable due to various factors beyond SAPN's control that may affect the inspection work and cause unforeseeable delays with severe weather conditions (fire danger season) being a dominant factor.

Such delays raised concern that the fire danger season could be in operation before SAPN had the chance to adequately inspect power lines to proactively assess any potential fire danger and maintain public safety. However, in subsequent discussions with SAPN, SAPN acknowledged community concerns and endeavoured to work with all stakeholders to find a suitable balance between the requirements to inspect their assets in an efficient manner and the expectation of landowners to exercise control over their property.

SAPN has subsequently advised they consider the compromise of one month's notice period for an inspection to occur will strike an acceptable balance. SAPN has also agreed to publish at least one month before a prescribed notice in a newspaper circulating within that particular area and conducting the inspection during the specified time period outlined in the prescribed notice. This is in lieu of the original amendment proposed by Mr Lucas to publish notices in two separate newspapers and broadcast on two separate radio stations within the area of council, which was deemed to be excessively onerous.

I am advised that SAPN officers always exercise a high degree of common sense and provide clear information to a home owner prior to entering onto premises. Also, it is most likely that SAPN officers would undertake this work during ordinary business hours. These safeguards are intended to strike the right balance between the maintenance of important property rights and the necessity to ensure that vegetation is well maintained ahead of the summer bushfire season. On that basis, we are prepared to accept the amendment, although my last-minute plea is that opposition not proceed, but if they insist, the government will accept.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I move the following alternative amendment:

Amendment No 1—

Page 7, lines 10 to 32—Delete the clause and substitute:

11—Amendment of section 48—Entry for purposes related to infrastructure

- (1) Section 48—after subsection (2) insert:
- (2a) Despite subsection (2), an electricity officer may exercise a power of entry referred to in that subsection without giving notice in accordance with subsection (2) in relation to electricity infrastructure situated on land that is in the area of a council and in the bushfire risk area if—
- (a) the purpose of the entry is to conduct an inspection of the infrastructure; and
- (b) —
- (i) the electricity entity gives reasonable written notice of the date and time of the proposed entry to the occupier of the land; or
- (ii) if it is not reasonably practicable for the electricity entity to give notice in accordance with subparagraph (i), the electricity entity—
- (A) publishes, at least 1 month before the proposed inspection of infrastructure in the area of the council, a prescribed notice in a newspaper circulating within that area; and
- (B) conducts the inspection during the period specified in the prescribed notice.
- (2) Section 48—after subsection (7) insert:
- (8) In this section—
- prescribed notice*, in relation to an inspection of electricity infrastructure by an electricity entity in the area of a council, means a notice that specifies the period (of up to 1 month) during which the entity proposes to inspect its infrastructure in the area.

Let me say at the outset that I am very grateful to members of the Legislative Council who supported the amendment, which was passed, dealing with this issue. I am very grateful that they supported that amendment. I have had discussions with SAPN and, while they would have liked, as the minister has made clear he would like, to have no change to the initial bill in this regard, I was not prepared to agree to that. But I can happily say that representatives of SAPN and I have come to an agreement.

I have that agreement very clearly from them—and it has been passed on to the government as well—that they are comfortable with this amendment. It is very important that land occupiers are given advance warning when SAPN wants to come onto their property for inspections. I think it is perfectly fair that they get that warning. I accept that what I initially asked for would have been onerous for SAPN to implement. It would not have been an unreasonable level of advice for the land occupiers to receive but it would have been more difficult than I anticipated for SAPN to implement.

We have come to an agreement that they will do one of two things: they will either give direct advice to individual land occupiers in advance of an intention to enter their property for inspection or they will give them reasonable notice and advice of exactly when they plan to come. If that is not possible, they will give at least one month's notice of a subsequent one-month window when they would enter those properties.

For your benefit, Deputy Speaker, and for the benefit of those who might be following this, the reason we have both those opportunities in there is that we want what we are deciding here in this chamber today—which, hopefully, will be supported in the other chamber shortly—not to need change for quite a long time. Ideally, we want all land occupiers to receive advice, but right now SAPN is not able to provide that advice directly. They have a database that has records of meters on properties, but the owners of those meters are not necessarily the land occupiers.

You can imagine a situation where you have a farm, and someone lives on that farm and they have a meter registered in their name. They live in the farmhouse, but they lease all the working land out to someone else. It is actually that other land occupier who needs to receive that advice, not the person who lives in the house but who no longer does the farming. We hope that one day technology will allow us to do that, and we hope that SAPN's database will improve so that it can be done, but until that time landholders and land occupiers will receive one month's notice in advance through the relevant local newspaper.

The SPEAKER: If this question is agreed to, amendment No. 1 of the Legislative Council will be negated and the alternative amendment proposed by the member for Stuart will be inserted in lieu thereof, so we are voting to disagree with amendment No. 1 of the Legislative Council and insert the member for Stuart's amendment.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos 2 to 15:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 2 to 15 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Sitting suspended from 15:48 to 17:00.

Sitting extended beyond 17:00 on motion of Hon. S.C. Mullighan.

ELECTORAL (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Long title, page 1—After 'Electoral Act 1985' insert:

and to make a related amendment to the *Local Government Act 1999*

No. 2. Clause 2, page 3, lines 4 and 5—Delete the clause

No. 3. New clause, page 4, after line 5—Insert:

8A—Amendment of section 42—Registration

Section 42(2)(e)—delete paragraph (e) and substitute:

(e) comprises or contains the word 'Independent'.

No. 4. Clause 11, page 4, after line 25—After subclause (2) insert:

(3) Section 53—after subsection (10) insert:

(11) In this section—

prescribed amount means—

(a) in the case of a candidate nominating for election as a member of the House of Assembly—\$1,000, or such lesser amount as may be prescribed by the regulations; or

(b) in the case of a candidate nominated for election as a member of the Legislative Council—the amount prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this paragraph.

No. 5. Clause 12, page 4, after line 28—After its present contents (now to be designated as subclause (1)) insert:

(2) Section 53A—after subsection (4) insert:

(4a) If a nomination paper lodged under subsection (2) does not fully comply with the requirement under subsection (3)(a)(ii), the relevant district returning officer must, if practicable, give the nominated candidate notice of the non-compliance sufficient to enable the candidate to fully comply with the requirement before the hour of nomination.

No. 6. Clause 12, page 4, after line 28—After its present contents (now to be designated as subclause (1)) insert:

(2) Section 53A—after subsection (5) insert:

(6) In this section—

prescribed amount means—

- (a) in the case of a candidate nominating for election as a member of the House of Assembly—\$1,000, or such lesser amount as may be prescribed by the regulations; or
- (b) in the case of a candidate nominated for election as a member of the Legislative Council—the amount prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this paragraph.

No. 7. Clause 14, page 5, lines 8 to 11—Delete the clause

No. 8. New clause, page 5, after line 11—Insert:

14A—Amendment of section 66—Preparation of certain electoral material

- (1) Section 66(2)(f)—after subparagraph (i) insert:
 - (ia) by use of a word or set of words that comprises or contains the word 'Independent' and—
 - (A) the name, or an abbreviation or acronym of the name, of a parliamentary party or a registered political party; or
 - (B) matter that so nearly resembles the name, or an abbreviation or acronym of the name, of a registered political party that the matter is likely to be confused with or mistaken for that name or that abbreviation or acronym; or
- (2) Section 66(2)(f)(ii)—delete '(2)(e) or'
- (3) Section 66(2)—after paragraph (f) insert:
 - (fa) must not identify a candidate by use of the word 'Independent' if the candidate is endorsed by a registered political party; and

No. 9. Clause 16, page 5, lines 15 to 36—Delete the clause

No. 10. Clause 18, page 6, lines 11 to 14—Delete the clause

No. 11. New clause, page 11, after line 3—Insert:

27A—Amendment of section 112A—Special provision relating to how-to-vote cards

Section 112A—after subsection (5) insert:

- (5a) If the Electoral Commissioner is satisfied that a how-to-vote card has been distributed in contravention of this section, the Electoral Commissioner may request that the person who authorised the card do either or both of the following:
 - (a) immediately cease distributing, or causing or permitting the distribution of, the how-to-vote card;
 - (b) publish a retraction in specified terms and a specified manner and form,

(and in proceedings for an offence against this section arising from the distribution of the how-to-vote card, the authorised person's response to a request under this subsection will be taken into account in assessing any penalty to which the person may be liable).

No. 12. New clause, page 11, after line 3—Insert:

27B—Amendment of section 112B—Certain descriptions not to be used

- (1) Section 112B(1)—after paragraph (a) insert:
 - (ab) by use of the word or a set of words containing the word 'Independent' and—
 - (i) the name, or an abbreviation or acronym of the name, of a parliamentary party or a registered political party; or
 - (ii) matter that so nearly resembles the name, or an abbreviation or acronym of the name, of a registered political party that the matter is likely to be confused with or mistaken for that name or that abbreviation or acronym; or
- (2) Section 112B(1)(b)—delete '(2)(e) or'

- (3) Section 112B—after subsection (1) insert:
- (1a) A person must not publish or distribute an electoral advertisement or a how-to-vote card that identifies a candidate by use of the word 'Independent' if the candidate is endorsed by a registered political party.
- Maximum penalty: \$5 000.
- (4) Section 112B(2)—delete 'Subsection (1) applies' and substitute '
Subsections (1) and (1a) apply
- (5) Section 112B(3)—delete 'Subsection (1) does' and substitute:
Subsections (1) and (1a) do

No. 13. Clause 28, page 11, lines 4 to 6—Delete the clause

No. 14. New clause, page 11, after line 6—Insert:

28A—Insertion of section 115A

After section 115 insert:

115A—Automated political calls

- (1) A person must not make, or cause or permit the making of, a telephone call consisting of a pre-recorded electoral advertisement unless, immediately after that part of the call consisting of the advertisement, the following statements are made:
- (a) the name and address (not being a post office box) of the person who is making, or who authorises the making of, the call;
- (b) if the call is authorised for a registered political party or a candidate endorsed by a registered political party—the name of the political party;
- (c) if the call is authorised for a relevant third party—the name of the relevant third party.

Maximum penalty:

- (a) if the offender is a natural person—\$5,000;
- (b) if the offender is a body corporate—\$10,000.
- (2) In this section—
- relevant third party* means an organisation or other person, other than a registered political party, candidate or natural person, who—
- (a) as at the day on which the automated political call to which subsection (1) relates is made, intends to spend more than \$2,000 on electoral advertisements—
- (i) if the call is made in an election period—during that election period; or
- (ii) in any other case—during the election period for the next general election due to occur; or
- (b) spent more than \$2,000 on electoral advertisements during the election period for the general election immediately preceding the day on which the automated political call to which subsection (1) relates is made.

No. 15. New clause, page 11, after line 6—Insert:

28B—Amendment of section 117—Candidates not to take part in elections

Section 117(2)—delete subsection (2)

No. 16. Clause 29, page 11, lines 7 to 22—Delete the clause

No. 17. New clauses, page 11, after line 36—Insert:

31—Amendment of section 130A—Interpretation

- (1) Section 130A(1), definition of *capped expenditure period*—delete '(subject to subsection (9))'

- (2) Section 130A(1), definition of *designated period*—delete '(subject to subsection (10))'
- (3) Section 130A(1), definition of *political expenditure*—delete the definition and substitute:
political expenditure means expenditure incurred—
- (a) for the purposes of the public expression of views on a political party, a candidate in an election or a member of the House of Assembly or the Legislative Council by any means; or
 - (b) for the purposes of the public expression of views on an issue in an election by any means; or
 - (c) for the purposes of the production of any political material (not being material referred to in paragraph (a) or (b)) that is required under section 112, 115A or 116 to include the name and address of the author of the material or of the person who takes responsibility for the publication or authorisation of the material (as the case requires); or
 - (d) for the purposes of the carrying out of an opinion poll, or other research, relating to an election or the voting intentions of electors; or
 - (e) for any other prescribed purpose,
and includes expenditure of a prescribed kind, but does not include—
 - (f) expenditure that is a GST payment; or
 - (g) expenditure of an electorate allowance or another allowance, expense or benefit (as determined by the Remuneration Tribunal) under section 4(1)(c) of the *Parliamentary Remuneration Act 1990*; or
 - (h) administrative expenditure; or
 - (i) expenditure of an allowance or benefit of a kind contemplated under section 6A(1) of the *Parliamentary Remuneration Act 1990*; or
 - (j) expenditure of a prescribed kind;
- (4) Section 130A—after subsection (1) insert:
- (1a) For the purposes of this Part, if the disclosure period for a return required to be furnished under this Part by a candidate or group has not commenced, a requirement in this Part that a return be furnished at a prescribed time during a designated period is not to be taken to require the furnishing of a return by the candidate or group at that prescribed time.
- (5) Section 130A(5)—delete '(other than Division 3)'
- (6) Section 130A(6)—delete 'For' and substitute 'Subject to subsection (6a), for'
- (7) Section 130A—after subsection (6) insert:
- (6a) Political expenditure on electoral matter in relation to a candidate or group for election that is incurred—
 - (a) after polling day for the last preceding general election and before the commencement of the capped expenditure period for the election; and
 - (b) for the primary purpose of publication, use or display of that electoral matter during the capped expenditure period,will be taken to have been incurred during the capped expenditure period.
- (8) Section 130A(9) and (10)—delete subsections (9) and (10)
- 32—Substitution of section 130C
- Section 130C—delete the section and substitute:
- 130C—Application of Part
- A registered political party is only required under this Part to disclose donations and amounts received or applied for State electoral purposes.

33—Amendment of section 130L—Gifts to be paid into State campaign account

Section 130L—delete 'the gift is made or received in contravention of this Part or is otherwise a gift that must not be paid into such an account in accordance with this Division' and substitute:

—

- (a) the gift is made or received in contravention of this Part; or
- (b) in relation to a gift received by or on behalf of a registered political party—the gift is not intended by the registered political party to be used for State electoral purposes; or
- (c) the gift is otherwise a gift that must not be paid into such an account in accordance with this Division.

34—Amendment of section 130M—Payments into State campaign account

Section 130M—after subsection (1) insert:

- (1a) If a registered political party keeps an account with an ADI for federal electoral purposes, the agent of the registered political party must ensure that no amount is paid or transferred from that account into the State campaign account.

35—Amendment of section 130Y—Application of Division

Section 130Y(2)(b)—delete 'the capped expenditure period commences in relation to the candidate or group for the election' and substitute:

—

- (i) the capped expenditure period commences in relation to the candidate or group for the election; or
- (ii) the disclosure period for a return required to be furnished under this Part by the candidate or group in relation to the election commences,

whichever period commences later

36—Amendment of section 130Z—Expenditure caps

- (1) Section 130Z(1)(c)—delete '(or, if different amounts are so allocated to the candidate at different times, the amount so allocated at the end of the capped expenditure period)'
- (2) Section 130Z—after subsection (2) insert:
 - (2a) For the purpose of subsection (2)(a), the amount agreed between the candidate and the agent of the party may vary at different times, provided that the candidate and agent may not vary the amount agreed after notice of the agreement has been given to the Electoral Commissioner under subsection (3).
- (3) Section 130Z(3)—delete 'within 3 days of the agreement' and substitute:
at least 8 days before polling day for the election
- (4) Section 130Z—after subsection (3) insert:
 - (3a) The Electoral Commissioner must not publish an agreement given to the Electoral Commissioner under subsection (3) until after the end of the capped expenditure period for the election to which the agreement relates.

37—Amendment of section 130ZF—Returns by certain candidates and groups

Section 130ZF—after subsection (5) insert:

- (5a) Despite section 130ZZ, if no details are required to be included in a return required to be furnished under this section by the agent of a candidate or group of candidates endorsed by a registered political party, the return need not be furnished to the Electoral Commissioner as required by this section.

No. 18. New Schedule, page 11, after line 36—Insert:

Schedule 1—Related amendment and transitional provision

Part 1—Amendment of Local Government Act 1999

1—Amendment of section 226—Moveable signs

Section 226(3)(c)—delete 'on the issue of' and substitute:

at 5pm on the day before the day of the issue of

Part 2—Transitional provision

2—Political expenditure on electoral matter

Section 130A(6a) of the *Electoral Act 1985* (as inserted by this Act) applies to political expenditure on electoral matter incurred on or after 1 May 2017 (but does not apply to political expenditure on electoral matter incurred before that date).

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

I will be very brief because I know that it has been an exhausting process for members. I have had a quick perusal of the message and the amendments suggested by the other place and, in my opinion, they have 90 per cent of it right.

The CHAIR: So close.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I do not want to allow perfection to be the enemy of the good, so I am indicating that we will be supporting this.

The CHAIR: All 18?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The whole thing, even though in a perfect world there could have been more stuff about pre-polling. Can I say on the record that I do appreciate the constructive way in which the various members of the parliament, both here and in the other place, have engaged on this topic. It has been a very complicated matter, but everybody has entered into this in the appropriate spirit, a spirit of embracing the notion of more disclosure in terms of parliamentary expenditures and donations.

We have also been able, I hope, to clarify a few matters that were potentially vexing for the Electoral Commission, where there are a number of alternative views about what the act, as it is presently, is requiring people to do. Hopefully, we have clarified some of those murky areas so that everybody, from the Electoral Commission down to us, is in no befuddlement about what is expected. That is good because we want everyone to participate in the election in good faith and not make mistakes on the basis that they have tried really hard but just cannot understand what is going on.

Hopefully, we have dealt with those potential problems and, hopefully, this assists the Electoral Commission in doing their very important job of making sure that the transparency and accountability the disclosure and public funding rules require runs smoothly. Even though the legislation changed back in 2013, this is the first time that legislation is actually starting to engage in an electoral process, because at the last election it was far too late in the piece for everyone to be ready to go. With those few words, I recommend that we endorse and support the suggested amendments.

The CHAIR: Before the deputy leader speaks, I do not remember anyone speaking to me about any of this, but there you are; that is another story altogether.

Ms CHAPMAN: Madam Chair, I am concerned if you did not have an opportunity to read the amendments. I suppose if one had been following the debate it can be fairly quickly identified what has been varied. I appreciate that there may be members, not just you, who will not have followed the debate in full to appreciate the amendments and identify them as they have come back from the other place.

In short, the bill was originally prepared and presented by the government based largely on recommendations of the former electoral commissioner and, I think it is fair to say, largely identifying areas of reform that in her view needed to be attended to if we were to have a functional operation not just for electoral matters generally but also for the management of her role or the role of an electoral commissioner during campaigns. In addition to a number of her recommendations, some

of which I must say were not taken up by the government, the bill was complemented by some rather novel initiatives of the Attorney.

His view in respect of fines that should apply to people who breached the act and his view in respect of the right of people to undertake their vote as a pre-poll—that is, prior to election day—were rather novel. I can say that I am very pleased that the other place has determined our pre-polling arrangements, and in particular the right for people to exercise their vote prior to polling day, has survived.

The rather novel approach of the government, in particular the Attorney, would have resulted in the denial of people being able to vote other than for a period of four days prior to the election. We all know what the ALP's tactics are in respect of election campaigns and their conduct in the last week so, firstly, I think it is important that we ensure that as much as possible we give people an opportunity to vote before they are hit with a barrage of negative contributions in an election campaign. However, more importantly, we support the principle that people ought to have the right to vote when it suits them, not when it is committed to by a determination of what the Attorney-General thinks.

People have different and busy lives. People have commitments to young children and older relatives, and people have employment which is perhaps different from ours in this house and which means being available on election day on a particular day—the third Saturday and the fourth anniversary in the month of March for elections—does not always suit. Our side of the house is of the view that people should be able to maintain the opportunity to still vote, again within a time frame but considerably greater than the government had intended.

I welcome the upper house consideration and the amendments it has presented. I have quickly scanned what I see as a change in the prescribed amount for House of Assembly members nominating for election which, as I understand it, is a compromise position after a number of discussions. I have quickly scanned some other material which relates to, as the Attorney has quite rightly pointed out, tidying up. Hopefully, it will make the Electoral Commissioner's role in the forthcoming election, particularly relating to disclosure and funding, a more practical way of being implemented. I applaud the amendments that have been finally presented to us. It is unusual for me to do so, but in this case I acknowledge the Attorney's most gracious acceptance of them.

Motion carried.

ANANGU PITJANTJATJARA YANKUNYTJATJARA LAND RIGHTS (SUSPENSION OF EXECUTIVE BOARD) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

At 17:12 the house adjourned until Tuesday 20 June 2017 at 11:00.