

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**Tuesday, 18 November 2014**

The SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson) took the chair at 11:00 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***CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (SEXUAL OFFENCES - COGNITIVE IMPAIRMENT)
AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 October 2014.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:02): I rise to speak on the Criminal Law Consolidation (Sexual Offences—Cognitive Impairment) Amendment Bill 2014. This is a bill introduced by the Attorney on 29 October this year, and I think it is fair to say that it has had quite a long gestation period in its development. I indicate that the opposition will be supporting the bill.

On our side of the house, we welcome this issue being resolved to the extent of providing some protection for those who are adults as far as the law treats them but who have some cognitive impairment which means that they are vulnerable to those who may take advantage of them. That may be someone of whom they are in the care of or someone in the broader community.

It is a difficult area because it is a question of balancing the rights and entitlements of someone who is an adult as far as the law is concerned—that is, over the age of 18 years—unless they are identified as having a significant mental disability or brain injury. They seek to have the same rights and entitlements as any other member of the community.

However, overlapping that is a circumstance where they may be placed in a position of exposure to risk either because they have a disability which makes it difficult for them to be able to escape the predatory and inappropriate conduct of another party or they are in some way beholden to that party. So, there is a dynamic of influence, there is a dynamic of imbalance in the power of the person who has a cognitive impairment.

It gets tricky when we move into the area of making provision for adults in these circumstances. I will say that various attempts have been made over the years to ensure that children are protected in these circumstances against someone who may be responsible for them at a sports club or a school or an activity where there is a very significant, known power imbalance between a child and a person who may have the supervision and responsibility for a child.

We have already ensured that that is incorporated in our criminal legislation to ensure that the full weight of the law is brought down against those who take advantage of children in those circumstances, because they are presumed, by the very nature of their being children, particularly if they are very young children, to be vulnerable in those circumstances.

Anyone can go to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and see that we treat harshly someone who abuses that position—for example, a teacher towards a student, and indeed persons who, as I say, have responsibility for children. It is fair to say that, given the focus in that area since the 1980s and the exposure of extraordinary abuse towards children, we now have in our prisons a fairly significant range of those who have been convicted of offences in that field.

We now move to the adult arena. It is tricky and it is difficult, but this bill proposes to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to introduce two new offences: the first is obtaining sexual

intercourse or indecent contact through undue influence between a service provider and a person with a disability (that is, having some cognitive impairment), and the second is the performance of an indecent act without the consent of a person with such impairment.

We are going down the line of having a criminal offence for this type of behaviour, and the penalties that are to be imposed for people who are guilty of these offences, unsurprisingly, depend on the nature of the sexual activity, and that is entirely appropriate. I suppose it will be the actioning of these offences, the putting into practice of what we do here today, on the basis that it is supported in the other place, that will determine how effective that will be and whether there needs to be reform in that area, but from this side of the house, we are certainly prepared to give it a go.

For reasons that are probably obvious, it excludes spouses and domestic partners. There is the general presumption that within that relationship there will be a level of understanding of the sexual activity between them, so we understand that. My reading of it is, however, that that does not exclude the opportunity for a victim within a marriage to be able to claim that they have been raped, for example. That is still within the criminal law; they are entitled to do that.

It seems that what they are not entitled to do, the way I read it, is to say that they are relying on their husband or partner—I will use that as the example—being convicted by virtue of having sexual intercourse in respect of an undue influence relationship. In other words, someone in that situation could still be charged with rape of someone who has a cognitive impairment to whom they are married. They will still have to prove all the elements of that offence, but they would not be charged with these offences, and I think that is reasonable in the circumstances.

The other matter I would just like to say a little about is the general consultation on this bill. Whilst it has a long period of development, the government had established and published a justice disability plan. We are looking at a number of issues that need to be dealt with in this area. That included the need to have protection for adults in these circumstances.

The consultation was on the basis of having a model similar to the one in New South Wales where a list is provided of people who can be charged in these circumstances, namely, the usual providers of care: doctors and patients, psychologists and patients, carers and patients, and one-off providers in regular transport for an adult with a disability. Rather than going into the category of identifying a particular profession or work relationship, it was decided to go on the more generous undue influence model, if I can describe it as that. On the face of it, it will have a broader application and is not as prescriptive as saying that you have to be able to prove a certain relationship within the category under the New South Wales prescriptive model.

With the assistance of David Plater and others who have done some extensive investigation into a model which has applied in Canada and which has been the subject of a number of criminal cases, I am assured that, after a couple of decades, it is apparently working quite well. On the face of it, I accept that. There were a number of cases provided in relation to the definition of 'undue influence' and it seems that the interpretation of that has been kept quite flexible as well.

I am not a great advocate of something that is not very clearly defined, and I think there are some general principles in respect of criminal law that require us to be pretty clear in our legislation about what is to be captured by particular conduct. However, as I indicated, we are prepared to give this model a go on the basis that it has had some positive application over the last 30 years in Canada.

Regarding the other aspect of consultation, my understanding is that, whilst there has been considerable consultation on the plan—and obviously it has been developed by a number of stakeholders—this has not occurred in relation to the bill. The problem with this approach is not that the government would be criticised for going out and consulting on the development of the bill but that, when it came to the actual bill being tabled, which had not been consulted on, it had changed the basis of the model upon which it would operate from the earlier discussions. Notwithstanding that, we were advised that people in the industry such as Robbi Williams, the Chief Executive Officer of the Julia Farr Association, and someone who has a wealth of knowledge in dealing with people with an impairment and being an advocate for their rights and so on, is supportive of this model.

The Attorney has very kindly provided me with a copy of a letter sent to me on the weekend. I have not yet received that but I am sure I will and that it will filter through the process. The letter

appears to respond to a number of questions that I had raised. I will have a quick read of this during the course of other discussions, given that this is a bill we are going to support. I am pleased to see, at first blush in any event, that there is a significant group that has been consulted and I assume, when I get to the fine print, that they have supported it.

The other thing I would say about the consultation is that it is my understanding that the Hon. Kelly Vincent, who is amongst us in the legislation role here in parliament and is a member of the other place, has been very active in contributing to the development of this bill and, indeed, the Disability Justice Plan generally. I am (as other members would be) appreciative of Kelly's insight and contribution in this arena. She is a consumer and a living example of someone who understands people with a disability. I do not think for one minute that Kelly has any cognitive impairment. I think one would be hard pressed to suggest that that is the case because she is an extremely intelligent member and we are very pleased to have her in this parliament.

Kelly would be well aware of the issues, having been a strong advocate for those with disabilities—for example, those with a brain injury arising out of a birth or accident trauma—and would fully understand their vulnerability. Equally, I value her advice and contribution after having looked at this bill because I am absolutely certain that she would be adamant that any government introducing legislation of this kind should maintain respect for the individuality and autonomy of people with a disability, and that they should be treated as people who can have intimacy or a sexual relationship without being judged adversely or presumed to be unable to have a fulfilling and intimate relationship with a partner. Kelly is exactly the sort of person who we need to be mindful of in what she is seeking to achieve here to ensure that there is that balance, and I thank her immensely for her contribution in that regard.

While others are making a valuable contribution to this debate, I will read through the material provided by the Attorney. We can perhaps go into committee briefly if I have any questions on these matters but I thank the Attorney for providing this material.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (11:18): I rise today to speak in favour of the Criminal Law Consolidation (Sexual Offences—Cognitive Impairment) Amendment Bill 2014. I commend the Attorney for bringing this bill to the house. It is a difficult and complex issue, and an issue that has been widely discussed for some time.

Everyone should be treated equally before the law. It goes without saying that everyone should be treated equally, but there is overwhelming evidence that people of the class we are talking about, who have a cognitive impairment, are particularly vulnerable to sexual exploitation and other forms of abuse, especially when those who prey on them are in a position of trust, power or authority.

We have seen many examples over many years in the civil arena: parent and child, guardian and ward; trustee and cestui que trust; solicitor and client, physician and patient, and also in cases of religious influence as well. This area of the law has been around for a long time and it is ample and apt that the Attorney seeks to update this part of the law to affect people in this case.

The Criminal Law Consolidation (Sexual Offences—Cognitive Impairment) Amendment Bill, I understand, is intended to operate with other forthcoming reforms by the government. We seek guidance and direction as to what those reforms will be into not only operational issues but also, I think more importantly, in terms of cultural and training issues as part of their disability justice plan, because it is important that we improve the position of people with disabilities not only in the justice system but also in other areas.

The aim of the bill, of course, is to better protect the vulnerable in society but also to respect the sexual autonomy of persons with such cognitive impairment. This balance was discussed in several papers but, as the Attorney alluded to, and the member for Bragg alluded to, the need to find this balance was highlighted in the Model Criminal Code Officers Committee in 2001. This was a committee of experts from a wide array of areas, so you had judges, prosecutors, defence lawyers, academics and lawyers from various attorneys-general departments.

I also note that the committee received many submissions from several parties and especially from the disability sector. So they certainly went out and the consultation was far and wide reaching, and this has not happened overnight; it has happened with much discussion and

community consultation. I note that the bill amends the act by introducing two new offences: one of obtaining intercourse or indecent contact through undue influence between a service provider and a person with a disability (or a cognitive impairment in this case) and, two, the performance of an indecent act without the consent of the person with such impairment.

I understand that New South Wales follows a prescriptive model which identifies various professions such as carers and doctors and, after consulting with many disability advocates, including the Hon. Kelly Vincent from the other place, I see that the government has decided to adopt the undue influence model. In terms of consultation, as the member for Bragg pointed out, this has gone out to consultation, and it is fitting to do so. It is extremely important with this sort of complex issue that you have to get it right, that is for sure.

It is fitting that it has gone to wide consultation, and I appreciate the feedback from the Hon. Kelly Vincent from the other place on what is an extremely complex and difficult issue. I also note that Robbi Williams from the Julia Farr Association supports the bill as well. I will be happy to support any bill that goes to ensure that everyone should be treated equally before the law. This is clearly an area where people with disability are extremely vulnerable and, I think that at the end of the day, the bill goes to that mischief and aims to prevent that from happening. I commend the bill to the house and I will support it.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (11:24): I thank the members who have spoken on this bill and I say to members opposite that I very much appreciate their support for this bill. Getting to this point has been a very detailed process of consultation. In particular, I congratulate Ruth Ambler from my department, who has done an absolutely terrific job with the Disability Justice Plan and with this piece of work, and her team, obviously, because she does not work alone. I think David Plater has been mentioned also by the member for Bragg.

So that it is very clear, the bill we have now is the product of a consultation that was quite involved. That consultation started off basically looking at the New South Wales model and the bill we have now is a bill that takes into account the feedback we got in that consultation. So we basically have the starting proposition of New South Wales and we then have this extensive consultation (and Mr Plater and others were involved in that). As a result of that consultation, it was felt that some modification was appropriate, and that was coming from the sector and not from me.

So, we made those modifications and, just to make it very clear on the public record (as I think the member for Bragg asked this question), did we then go back out and consult on the bill that had been produced as a result of the consultation? The answer to that is no. The reason is that at some point the consultation must come to an end. So, we put out a draft proposition, which was modified at the request of the sector, and the bill we put in front of the parliament reflects the modifications the sector has asked for.

My office has been in touch with the Hon. Kelly Vincent, and my indication from her presently is that she is supportive of this, but obviously I think she reserves her right to reflect on it between now and its being disposed of in the other place. I think I said in my second reading speech that this is a very difficult area. It is impossible to say that something is objectively the correct position or the incorrect position here. All that we can say, with some degree of confidence, is that the idea of vulnerable people being exploited by other people is unsatisfactory and should be discouraged.

But exactly where you draw those lines, who you describe as vulnerable, how vulnerable and what degree of exploitation or whatever is to be deemed to be a criminal degree of exploitation are matters of fact and degree, and that is partially why there has been this area of grey maintained in the draft, so that the courts can apply practical common sense to the circumstances of particular matters. My hope is that the general good sense of the courts will prevail and we will all be very pleased that this is the way we have chosen to go, rather than create some very prescriptive model that will perhaps produce anomalous outcomes in particular cases.

Thank you very much to all members who have spoken, and thank you very much to members of the opposition for expressing their support for this. It is one of those things where the government and the opposition can both say with some confidence that we are attempting to provide

some support and genuine engagement with the disability sector and trying to accommodate the particular concerns and requirements they have. This is one of the moments in the parliament that do not get reported a great deal in the media, namely, when the government and the opposition work together constructively on positive, progressive measures.

If there was somebody from the media here now, I would be wanting to celebrate the moment and say that that is the sort of thing they could write as part of the positive story about South Australia, because we read so much negative stuff, so many negative things about 'man runs over dog, dog bites man, dog loses newspaper'—terrible, sad things, and it is always on the front page of paper, all that sad stuff. Then there are happy moments—lakes and boats and noodle salad—times when people are happy and times when the parliament is being productive like this and doing good things. Thank you all very much, and let us hope that it gets an equally speedy passage through the other place.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (11:29): I move:

That this bill now be read a third time.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:30): I want to briefly make a contribution at this point to say that I have now perused the letter provided by the Attorney-General with respect to consultation. It answers the matters that I requested, and provides the stakeholders, as indicated. We are yet to see, as I say, whether the change of model actually works, but I will have a look at the New South Wales situation in the meantime and see whether there are any aspects that we may need to modify. Like a lot of these things, we sometimes need, in new laws, to be able to see how it progresses and whether there are any deficiencies, because we certainly need to get this right. It is a difficult balance, so we will be monitoring it, as I am sure the government will.

Bill read a third time and passed.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 October 2014.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:31): I rise to speak on the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2014 and indicate that the opposition will be supporting this bill. Consideration has been given to whether, in fact, other aspects of the current Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Act 2012 need amendment, and I think they do. I think there are a number of issues that have been raised (most recently by the commissioner in his first annual report in 2013-14) for which there are various advances as to how they are being looked at and resolved.

It is not our intention to advance amendments to this bill for two reasons: firstly, we are satisfied that the amendments that are being presented for our consideration in this bill are exclusively those that have been requested by the commissioner, and which we have considered and agree ought to be advanced; and secondly, that for the application of the duties of the commission, and for that to be more efficient and effective, it would be in the interests of the operation of that entity that we progress these reforms as quickly as possible.

I do not agree with the Attorney's assertion in his second reading that the progress of this bill needs to be dealt with as a matter of urgency. As usual, he exaggerates the position in his contribution, especially when he starts talking about the nature of the models of ICAC that we debated in the principal debate, and describes the model for New South Wales being 'like reality TV'. Going through all the flowery language of the Attorney, we are satisfied that these amendments

require attention, and now that the ICAC has been operating for some 12 months, it has actually been able to identify some deficiencies in the original legislation.

I will refer to one other area of transparency that I think does need to be considered in the future when we are dealing with this at a more substantive level, but in the meantime I will just refer to the principal areas of amendment that are the subject of this bill. The first is essentially to relax the strict confidentiality provisions which the commissioner claims have caused some confusion. There will be a new definition of 'publish', to allow for communications between two persons.

This has become abundantly clear in consultations that I have had, and in meetings that I have had in respect of potential breaches of the ICAC Act, and indeed in advising our own side of the house as to how they might conduct themselves in respect of ensuring that they are fulfilling any obligation that they have as members of parliament. In all these environments, it has been very difficult to advise sufficiently to give people protection against the current breaches that could occur in publishing or allowing any communications to another party.

The most obvious ones are if there is any information that might transfer between a person who is a witness or the subject of an inquiry and their spouse or personal partner. There is obviously the question of communication with someone in that circumstance and their employer, because it seems logical that when one is involved in any activity that might come under the microscope of ICAC, the two groups of people who are going to be somehow or other swept up in that are a personal partner or family and employment.

Sometimes it is just to make an appointment, to conduct an interview or to be available, and the secrecy surrounding the investigations of ICAC and those that they might touch in that process have made it very difficult for those who were receiving instruction. They, of course, are not just members of this house, but obviously people in the Public Service, because we are talking about potential corruption in public life.

Of course, we know from the commissioner's annual report that he has conducted extensive educative seminars and the like with various agencies to try to assist them in making sure that they are not in breach of any level of public integrity that is captured by the act. Clearly, it has come to his attention that the strict confidentiality provisions are too strict. There needs to be a measure of protection against publication for all the reasons that we have discussed, even though on our side of the house we have been completely at odds with the government in respect of the aspect of the public hearing of ICAC matters.

We are not here to traverse that substantive difference again, but we were always, I think, agreed that prior to the assessment and progressing of an investigation people should be protected against unfair public announcements about them being under inquiry of some kind, whether they are a witness or someone who is under scrutiny. In the case of our model, prior to any assessment of the Office for Public Integrity, which is the entity that is the gatekeeper for these matters, that should be kept confidential. We cannot have a situation where people can say, 'I have referred this to ICAC. It is on the front page of the paper,' by anybody out there who wants to cause mischief and the simple protection for that is to prohibit any publication of that at all prior to any assessment by the Office for Public Integrity.

As I say, we have a different view to the government as to the operations after that and, in particular, the issue of the transparency at the level of hearings, but we are agreed that there needs to be some protection against the mischievous, certainly vindictive and sometimes even lunatic, actions of those who want to hurt another, so let us be clear about that. The commissioner has understood it. The Attorney has now introduced amendments to give a fairer balance.

The second is to confirm that police officers, while working for the commission, retain their full powers, including their use of general warrants. This is an interesting area and I do not want to dwell a lot on it but, unsurprisingly, the people who work in ICAC and are often the valued employees, of course, can be existing and serving police officers. In some other ICACs around Australia, quite often we find in the employment of the people who are doing the work, in respect of the scrutiny of these investigations, retired police officers—people who have had some other investigative role in their lifetime and in their prior work life.

In our ICAC, of course, we are relying at present on a number of existing South Australian police officers who are then retained by the commission to undertake that work, but they have certain powers and responsibilities as existing police officers. My understanding is that the commissioner has accepted that they can be treated as retaining the powers that they have as existing police officers. As I said, one of them is this capacity to be able to have a general search warrant. It has been operating on that basis, but the legislation could be confusing and it could be challenged. It needs to be tidied up and we accept that.

It is fair to say that we have a situation where we have the South Australian police and the ICAC. They are both investigative bodies and they both have certain powers that certainly the general public do not have and they have them at different levels. The police obviously have powers to enter property, stop vehicles and exercise the powers they have under their general search warrant position. For a number of other categories they have to get approval either from a senior police officer or a court to deal with searches, or particularly where warrants are required with court approval.

We have that level and then we have the ICAC employees who have a different set of powers. I think it is fair to say that they can—for the very specific purpose of the nature of what they are investigating—have more invasive capacity against the general civilian population when they are undertaking those duties, so we have to be very careful about how they are carried out, but, for the purposes of these amendments, they are accepted.

There are a number of other practical amendments which have been brought to the attention of the Attorney which I want to summarise. One is to allow the commissioner, 'by written notice, to authorise an investigator to inspect and take copies of financial records'. This is, we are told, similar to the power under section 49 of the Evidence Act 1929. This is specifically to deal with the capacity to be able to take copies of financial records when investigating banks and the like, so we do not have an issue with that. There is also examination powers.

The next is to add in provision for the commissioner to have regard when he is considering whether it is in the public interest to make a public statement, and that expanded so that if, in the commissioner's opinion, it is appropriate to do so, he will make a statement in the public interest. This can often be in response to a public statement (that is, that has been made in the media), and it allows him to take into account whether a person has requested that the commissioner make a statement. I suppose that is to deal with the reactive circumstances, usually for something that is out in the public arena. It will allow for the commissioner or the Office for Public Integrity to request further information from an agency to make that assessment, which, of course, relates to the whole question of whether an investigation is to advance any further.

It also provides for the person leading an investigation to require, by written notice, the production of a written statement of information, which is a little bit like our interrogatories process in court actions. It will require then for answers, to be given in writing if necessary, to a list of questions that is provided. Like our interrogatories situation, it is not an offence not to answer these questions but, of course, there are consequences in respect of further inquiry that can happen if one does not. It allows for a more efficient process, we are told. It is a time-honoured practice in our court system to expedite matters and obviously to be able to identify the issues in dispute and sometimes to clarify matters so that there is not unnecessary investigation or waste of public resources.

There is also a proposal to provide for evidence or information obtained by the commissioner to be provided or used by other law enforcement agencies and prosecution authorities. I am told that current investigations or information from those have not been held back, but the commissioner has sought that this be absolutely clear so that it is beyond doubt as to making that provision available. It seems a logical step, as they are an investigative agencies just like the police, that they have the capacity to hand over the material that may be relevant to the DPP or police prosecutors, if appropriate.

The practical amendments provide for the extension of the period that a retention order applies, currently for six months, to a period of two years. Probably, the commissioner has found that wrapping up these investigations as quickly as he would have liked in some instances has not been achieved and that therefore, for practical purposes, there be a more realistic extension granted in the legislation.

Similarly, there is the removal of the application of the designated period for items that are seized and retained by an investigator for the purpose of an investigation into corruption in public administration. It also allows, by agreement with the police commissioner, the persons performing functions under ICAC to have access to confidential information and databases held by SAPOL for the purposes of ICAC's investigations and assessments. So, it is really just a question of allowing the sharing of that data. Again, they are both investigative agencies; one is obviously very much more targeted, namely ICAC, but obviously each has the same objective.

We then move to another more substantive amendment, that is, to amend the Crown Proceedings Act 1992 to remove the obligation to give notice to the Crown Solicitor before a summons is issued to a minister; currently, this is required. I had experience of this myself in practice, when it was necessary to serve a minister (under the Bannon government) and give notice of those proceedings before issuing the summons. In that instance, it was ultimately to apply for a warrant for the arrest of the minister, which was not necessary in the end because he turned up, I am pleased to say, or at least his representation turned up.

That, the commissioner felt, though, was giving an unreasonable and unfair advantage to ministers in the notice of inquiry, that every other civilian in South Australia does not have access to, a sort of notice of the problem coming. Therefore, his view was quite clear that notice should not be given, that ministers should be treated the same as everyone else. It is the taxpayer who often picks up the bill for some of these things, whether it is a defamation action or any other proceedings, where the conduct that is complained about is carried out in the course of ministerial duties, or at least it is claimed to be, so that there is a call on the taxpayers funds to meet that. It is not unreasonable in those circumstances that persons who are issuing proceedings give notice to the Crown Solicitor of their intention to do this.

In fairness, it is also a situation where the Crown has special privileges in limitations of being sued for the recovery of money owed and things of that nature. The Crown sits in a unique position, and its ministers, accordingly, have certain protections and support. In the ordinary course of litigation, it is not unreasonable that they know about it, but this is not a court action; this is ICAC undertaking its ordinary investigation. Here, we are talking about a summons being issued for the production of a document or the provision of information by a minister in an investigation as distinct from court action. I think it is reasonable that we support the initiative of the commissioner in seeking this amendment.

I think I said earlier that this is a bill that is exclusively to cover the provision of the matters raised by the commissioner. I think there is actually just one small amendment in this bill, which relates to the TAFE act. It is not necessarily something that the commissioner has brought to the attention of government but, if my recollection is correct, this was a matter that was identified in the briefing as needing some correction. It relates to the fact that in 2012, at the time a new TAFE act was passed in this parliament, a rather peculiar process was undertaken. I have never seen it before in the time I have been here, nor since, but it was a process where the new bill came in setting up the whole new structure for TAFE but attached to it, as a schedule, was the old act.

I still think it is bizarre; nevertheless, I think it was something to do with at least one of the unions being concerned that something might be missed when it was redone and, to make sure it was not missed, it was added as an attachment. So we now have this bizarre piece of legislation that sits in our statute books which is, firstly, double the thickness it needs to be and, secondly, just adds a lot of confusion when trying to read what is actually to apply. However, apparently that is what was insisted upon so that is the way it was done.

Having done that, they omitted to identify the question of application, because the schedule—the old reference of employees under the Technical and Further Education Act 1975—did not match up with the reference to an officer or employee, I think, in the new act. As a result we have a mix-up, and we need to fix it up. Of course, we agree to do that. I think I had something to say at the time about how ludicrous it was, and it is funny how things come full circle, but we need to resolve that. I thank Ms Barbara Tiffin from the Attorney-General's Department for the provision of her thorough briefing in respect of the bill, and indicate that we will be supporting the same.

I will just mention one other matter, and that is that there are still a lot of things to be fixed up, according to what the commissioner reported to us in his annual report. One is a question of the

use of social media, and apparently that is being looked at as best one can. We are not sure what the government is going to do about that; in any event, it is a problem.

The other issue is that of the claim by the commissioner that there is use of private emails to communicate official information by persons in the government, either members of government or employed by them. That is very concerning. We have asked a number of questions in this house about that, and I have to say that the 'head in the sand' approach is not one that we accept as being anything like responsible of a government. The fact is that it is weeks now since this report was tabled on 14 October—six weeks since it has been tabled—and we still have no indication from the government as to why they have not issued a direction to members of the government in respect of this practice, which the commissioner strongly recommended take place.

I am hoping that the government will suggest that that is imminent, but I make this point. Let us assume it goes out in the next few days, even. What possible action has been taken to ensure that there is not a breach of the State Records Act—which, of course, requires the keeping of records and making them available under various processes—in the last six weeks? The answer to that is: nothing. They could have easily, and it is not acceptable that the government should have dragged the chain in this regard and not have acted immediately.

Yet, with all of the proffering of the importance of having transparent processes, all the speeches we had just the other day in this place by the Premier about his need to have a new model of governance in respect of his boards and accountability to government, and all that contribution purporting to commit to the transparency of his government, this has been identified by the senior investigating officer of the state and six weeks later nothing has happened. I find that unacceptable and quite irresponsible of the government in that regard.

There is a third area in respect of lobbyists and there is a recommendation in respect of legislation to formalise what has been a relatively informal process here. There are some serious questions to be asked about how this is addressed. The statutory provision is one option, and that is recommended by the commissioner so we will look forward to further advice from the Attorney as to what he is prepared to do, but the real question is going to be what we are going to do with employees, rather than just retired MPs and the like, and what we are going to do with persons who take on another role, that is, in legal firms and continue to carry on lobbying work.

These are not easy issues to resolve but they clearly need to be if there is going to be any genuine consideration of ensuring that the lobbyists seeking to influence government are clearly identified, which reduces the risk of any unscrupulous behaviour in respect of that activity. It is a little bit like having political donations, which is, indeed, also referred to by the commissioner, and ensuring that there is a disclosure of political donations.

In essence, we have a situation where giving money to a political party—which I think should be to anyone who is running for parliament rather than to just political parties but, in any event, that is another matter that Independents seem to escape the scrutiny of. In itself, there is nothing wrong with the giving of money to a person who is interested in standing for parliament, whether they are a member of a political party or not. What is important, though, is that people know where there are relationships of gift; and, similarly, for lobbyists, that people have presented submissions and put persuasive arguments and, presumably, advocated presentations on behalf of parties and companies and the like, at any level where a decision should be made either in policy legislation or on funding. There is absolutely nothing wrong with that. What is unacceptable is if it is a secret, so we do need to tidy this up and, clearly, the commissioner has that view.

There are a few other matters which I will not refer to today, but one is the code of conduct for members of parliament. Interestingly, the Premier has made a statement to the parliament indicating that in response to the commissioner's annual report he has tabled a statement of principles and it is consistent with the statement of principles that was recommended arising out of the 2003 report—chaired, I think, by Mr Gazzola and which has been the subject of applications for support by a motion of the late Hon. Bob Such.

Again, I will not traverse that because it has been tabled, but what I wanted to say was that I am advised that recently the commissioner, in reporting to the parliament, has indicated, as the Premier had, that in some way this statement of principles is to be treated as a code of conduct. I do

not share that view. I was on the committee. It may indicate a list of things members of parliament should abide and which they should acknowledge are part of their responsibility as an effective member of this parliament, but neither the committee nor I on this side of the house accept that it is a code of conduct. It is not a code of conduct, and that was made very clear at the time of its publication from the report.

The reason it is important is that my understanding is the commissioner has made comment to the effect that, if he felt there were a breach of this code of conduct in some way, it could be the basis of a privilege motion back to this house. I think implicit in that was that it was something he would refer to us or to the Speaker. If that is the case, I think we need to make it abundantly clear that, if there is conduct (whether it is in breach of a statement of principles or indeed any other conduct) that a member of this parliament presents to the Speaker and the Speaker finds that there should be some precedence attached to that, then that is a matter for the Speaker and then of this house. It is not a matter for the commissioner of ICAC or anyone else.

On the basis that that is acknowledged and agreed upon, I think we can move forward on that and I would hope, as soon as the Premier is ready to deal with that matter, that we can move on. I think the commissioner needs to be clear about what his responsibility is in that regard or what limits he is at, because he is the investigator, not the arbiter. Perhaps his considerable experience in other fields and in previous occupations gives him certainly the learned experience to be able to assist the committee he was reporting to and indeed our parliament, but we just have to make sure that he does not overstep the mark in respect of what his responsibility is in that regard.

Finally, I just come to the situation for reporting. I thank the commissioner and the registrar of the commission, Ms Patricia Christie, who is active in the operations of the commission. Both the commissioner and Ms Christie have, I understand, given reports to the government from time to time and have generously provided time in briefings in respect of the bill and the progress of their work, and I have appreciated that. I appreciate that these reports are filled up with all sorts of statistics and glossy pictures, which is nothing new—I will not blame the commissioner for that—but what information is in it has been quite helpful and provides, obviously, the appropriate audited summary of the financial accounts.

What it does not provide, and I think this is something we need to have some understanding about in respect of the importance of the commission reporting to the parliament, is what has happened with the prosecution of briefs that have been sent to the DPP and the outcomes. This annual report is silent in that regard.

The Hon. J.R. Rau interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: I will use what occurs in New South Wales as the example in this regard. I know the government has not embraced everything in relation to the model that operates there, and we will agree to disagree on this, but the ICAC in New South Wales does provide a running schedule of ICAC prosecution briefs that are with the DPP and also a separate schedule on the prosecution outcomes. To the best of my knowledge, we do not have the ICAC commissioner stand up in other jurisdictions next to the police commissioner and give media conferences and things of that nature when they refer a matter off for prosecution; they do it quietly and they do it, obviously, as part of their duty.

However, there is a level of accountability that is published on the website and regularly updated, as to the progress of those matters. It includes names, but what it does not do, very appropriately, is identify where an investigation has been undertaken and there has been no outcome from that, to the extent of no indication of the need to refer it to prosecution, because there have been insufficient findings to advance it past that. Obviously, they disappear. They do not have a public component, and we would not ever be asking for that because, again, that is the nature of an investigation.

It is the same as with the police, to be honest. Where they are investigating matters and they find that someone has a rational explanation for their whereabouts, for example, and they are no longer a suspect in respect of a matter, that information disappears from the public point of view, and that is as it should be, in our view. However, where there has been an investigation by ICAC and it has resulted in a referral to the DPP, part of the process of accountability in respect of the

effectiveness of ICAC, in my view, is to have a regular publication of that information as to the prosecution and, secondly, the outcomes of those prosecuted matters. I think that is something we could learn a valuable lesson from.

We will continue to listen to the commissioner. Obviously, he has the capacity and responsibility to account to our committee that has been convened in the parliament. Of course, he also has access to the Attorney, myself and probably any other member of parliament, seeing as he is accountable to the parliament, but we will listen to his advice as to how this new entity is progressing. It is pleasing to note that, although we might have been a bit Johnny-come-lately as far as actually enacting an ICAC in this state, with the government kicking and screaming for the first few years, there is clearly a role to play and it has resulted in the uncovering of some concerning behaviour. I will not make any further comment on that, because obviously that is going through other processes. Nevertheless, the commissioner has also been invaluable in identifying in his annual report some very significant deficiencies of other areas that need to be dealt with, some legislative and some others.

I also place on the record my appreciation of the commissioner providing a report in respect of the Whistleblowers Protection Act, which has been tabled more recently. I am not quite sure why its tabling was delayed but, nevertheless, we have it. I was pleased to note that that report included a recommendation that, when someone who is in the whistleblower category has reported an act or conduct that is concerning, where there has not been action by the government in respect of that, in certain circumstances there will be a capacity to be able to report those matters to a member of parliament, and indeed the media.

It is fair to say that information sometimes goes to someone higher in the department, such as the chief executive, a minister, ministerial staff or the cabinet, so there are plenty of opportunities for behaviour that ought to be acted upon by a government to actually have some remedy. It is very concerning to me, and clearly to the commissioner in his review of this act, that there are circumstances where someone's plight in this regard in trying to expose some unacceptable behaviour is left covered in silence and there is not any remedying of the situation—and that is unacceptable.

It needs to be flushed out and there need to be mechanisms for that to occur when there has been either a serious neglect across to a cover-up of information that is legitimately brought to the attention of those in charge and it is not acted upon. We were so concerned about this type of situation prevailing that when we went to the 2010 election we even recommended this policy that there be the introduction of a provision for whistleblowers to go to the media after a fixed period of months when there has been no action and to be able to have some protection against a wrong being exposed.

The government must deal with these matters and, if they are without merit, they can easily be dealt with to the extent that at least there has been some action on them and they have been disposed of, but people have a responsibility to bring these matters to attention and they should have a reasonable expectation that the behaviour that they are reporting is actually looked into, considered and acted upon where appropriate. With those few words, I commend the bill to the house for its support.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I advise members that we had a tour group from the Independent Learning Centre with us this morning who were guests of the member for Mount Gambier. We hope they enjoyed their time with us.

Bills

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (12:16): I also rise today to speak in favour of the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2014. We have seen in the past, as the member for Bragg alluded to, that this government has a problem with releasing information. They have had a problem with shield laws, they have had a problem with whistleblowers protection. It seems to be a government addicted to secrecy.

Although we are supportive of the bill, the ICAC is still the most narrowly focused and secretive in the nation. I will talk a little bit about the reality TV metaphor that the Attorney uses. It seems that the only person to use metaphors better than the Attorney is Shakespeare himself, but I will tell you a little bit about the New South Wales model and how it is working and why we should learn something from our New South Wales colleagues over there.

The Hon. J.R. Rau interjecting:

Mr TARZIA: Yes, the Deputy Premier has made a couple of points in relation to that. I will talk about that in a second. Corruption should always be stamped out. I will give the government some credit; the amendments are important. I believe there are further debates that need to occur and that we could be having about the role of ICAC, because there needs to be more done in this area. As we heard from the Deputy Premier, he said, 'Wait. There's more.' I know that there will be more to come. Nothing would have been wrong with getting it right the first time.

We have a great example working interstate. If we followed through with that example, we probably would not be in this position. In relation to the New South Wales ICAC, premiers have been found out, ministers from Labor have been found out and there is even a Liberal backbencher, I believe, who was recently brought to the attention of ICAC. As at 20 June 2014, 22 people were appearing before courts in New South Wales as a result of referrals to the DPC from the ICAC, and in the last 30 months from 20 June 2014 in New South Wales, in addition to a few cases, 32 people had actually pleaded guilty or had been found guilty of charges arising from ICAC investigations. So, we see in New South Wales that the ICAC is performing its duty; the ICAC is working. It is doing its job.

I note that this bill was introduced on 29 October in response to Commissioner Bruce Landers' annual report and recommendations tabled on 14 October 2014. It amends the ICAC Act of 2012. I would like to reiterate to the house that the proposal for an ICAC was initiated by the Liberal Party, and I thank the tireless member for Heysen for her pursuit of this. We are much better off because of her work in this area to bring this to fruition, because we know that this government refused to have an ICAC for many years.

I understand the Attorney has called the New South Wales model a reality TV model but, as we have seen, that model in New South Wales is achieving results. At the end of the day, if it results in a more transparent, open and clean government, is that not a good thing? Absolutely it is a good thing.

The principal areas of this amendment, as we have heard, are firstly to relax the strictly confidential provisions, which the commissioner has claimed causes some confusion. It is important to listen to the commissioner, and I understand that there will be a new definition of 'publish to allow for communications between two persons'. Fair enough. Another principal area of amendment involves confirming that SAPOL officers, while working for the commission, retain their full powers, including the use of general warrants. Also, there are a number of practical amendments with respect to the inspection and copying of, and access to, documents.

In relation to amending the Crown Proceedings Act 1992 to remove the obligation to give notice to the Crown Solicitor before a summons is issued to a minister, at the moment this is required. The commissioner has said that ministers should be treated the same as everyone else.

The Liberal Party has consistently argued in favour of an ICAC and consistently argued that an ICAC should go further, and that confidentiality requirements at the moment are far too strict, far too severe. I would speak in favour of any act that goes to strengthen the ICAC. As I said, if it results in a more open and transparent government, I would be happy to support any such bill. With those comments, I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (12:22): I thank members for their contributions. I have a couple of very quick remarks on the matter. The first one is to say—this is largely in response to the comments of the member for Bragg; the member for Bragg mentioned lobbying—yes, it is our intention to bring a bill before the parliament relating to lobbying, and I think the Premier has already made statements to the effect that we think, for example, success fees are not a positive thing and should be outlawed. To that extent, there has been some clear articulation by the Premier of where we see that going, but I do agree with the member for Bragg that there are questions which do need to be thought out carefully.

I actually say to the member for Bragg that she and I should have a bit of a chat about this at some point because of the question of how far the net goes to talk about a lobbyist—who is a lobbyist, who is not a lobbyist. Sometimes it is easier to say who is and who is not, or vice versa. So, that is a bit of work that needs to be done; also, exactly what it is in lobbying that we are trying to do. Are we trying to prohibit things or are we trying to make things transparent? I lean towards the transparency side of that equation, although I think success fees, for example, is something that we should put in the prohibited category. Anyway, that is just by the bye.

The other comment is about the Electoral Commission. With all due respect to the commissioner, his remarks there were based on the Electoral Act as it was prior to the amendments that this parliament dealt with at the very end of last year. Members who were in the last parliament would recall that we spent some time and effort on the issue of disclosure.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Well, the effect of it was basically—and I am concertinaing this—that members of the opposition said that, for certain administrative reasons connected with the way the Liberal Party functions, it would be helpful if the actual implementation of these rules were put off for a couple of years, until 2016, to enable the Liberal Party, from an administrative point of view, to be able to deal with disclosure requirements, which is why these disclosure rules do not cut in.

As the members opposite would know better than me, I understand the Liberal Party is a many-splendored thing, with lots of little isolated units (perhaps hundreds of them, maybe even more), each having its own autonomous existence, each reporting to none other than themselves and each accountable to none other than themselves.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I have never been in the Liberal Party so I do not know it from the inside. This is just what I am told.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I suspect that is true. As I understand it, the Liberal Party is a mosaic of many little entities which jealousy guard their own right to be themselves. The Labor Party is more of a centralised show, which means, for example, that if the Labor Party is asked to produce a list of all of those people who have made donations to the Labor Party in the last six months it involves going up to one of those machines and pressing a button to say enter and out comes the information. I gather—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Look, I am just trying to explain something here.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am trying to defend the Liberal Party, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I know. They will provoke you shortly into a tirade on Catch Tim or something else, so let us all be quiet.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am just trying to say, Madam Deputy Speaker, that because they do not have that opportunity presently and because it is going to take them a little while to tool up for that, I do not criticise them for wanting the thing not to come in until 2016 because they do need a bit of time to get organised, but as from that time—

Ms Redmond interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I just remind members, the Speaker has already drawn up today's list and I can easily call someone to order now, or warn them, and I would hate to have to start that before lunch.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: So, that is all in train; the electoral bit that he mentioned is all in train. Member for Hartley: whistleblowers. The situation with whistleblowers is that I actually made the point, I think, when I introduced the ICAC legislation, that I intended to have him look at whistleblowers and I did ask him as soon as he was appointed, 'Please have a look at whistleblowers,' and his report has just been received. So, we have been on the whistleblowers reform caravan for a little while now. We will have a good look at what is in there and we will bring something back to the parliament in the new year.

As to the suggestions by the member for Hartley that a number of people have been prosecuted successfully by the ICAC in New South Wales, I was under the impression that their success rate was something like one in a hundred, or perhaps not that good, but he may know things that I do not know. What I can tell the member for Hartley, and other people, is I remember (for most of last year) reading the front page of *The Australian* and I got to know a great deal about Mr Tripodi, Mr Obeid and Mr Macdonald and I do not believe that any of them have even been charged, let alone put in gaol.

If one is to read what appeared in the paper, these individuals collectively have siphoned off something in the order of several tens (if not hundreds) of millions of dollars, either by taking public money or exploiting a position of authority in order to offer gifts or a preference to themselves or others. So, that, I think, is the most glaring indictment of that reality TV which is funded at great expense by the taxpayers of New South Wales called the New South Wales ICAC. Back to here—

Ms Redmond interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I call the member for Heysen to order.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Back to here, there is one further matter that I wanted to put on the record, and I say this for the benefit of the member for Bragg, who obviously is the most directly involved in this bill. Under section 46 of the legislation there is a requirement for the attorney of the day to appoint a person, and the way I read it is it is an annual appointment, to conduct a review of the operations of the commission.

As the member for Bragg would be aware, I have appointed the Hon. Kevin Duggan to do that, and the Hon. Kevin Duggan has made a report. In that report, he makes the point that perhaps that could be a little bit more robust than it presently is. I just wanted to say that I have taken that on board. We cannot have another ICAC to sit on top of ICAC—that would be an absurdity—but I do accept Mr Duggan's suggestions that we can be a bit more robust in section 46.

Through my officers, there has been a conversation with Commissioner Lander, and we have prepared some amendments to section 46 which pick up the comments made by Mr Duggan. I have not yet had a chance to discuss those with Mr Duggan; I will do that tomorrow. I was pleasantly surprised that our first bill went through so quickly, so I have been advanced a little more than I thought. I will provide the member for Bragg with a copy of our draft. I could introduce it now as a draft amendment in here, but I would be doing so on the basis that I have not yet spoken to Mr Duggan about it, and I think that would probably be premature.

Can I just say on the record that, first of all, I am flagging that we have that amendment. If we are still going on this bill in here tomorrow, then perhaps we will be in a position for me to move it, otherwise my intention would be to move it in the other place. Can I indicate to the member for Bragg that I will organise for her to receive an electronic copy of what the current thinking is on that.

I think probably, given that I have not discussed it yet with Mr Duggan and he has not seen it, it would be prudent for me to not actually introduce it as an amendment. It has not been filed yet. If the member for Bragg is content with that, I just wanted to have it on the record so there is no suggestion that, when an amendment arrives elsewhere, it has come out of nowhere.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes. If you just bear with me a minute, I will give you a little bit more insight as to what it might be doing. Just as a couple of general propositions, what we are talking about is making it a three-year term, not an annual appointment, so that there is more continuity. There are a couple of other sort of minor matters, but I think the best thing I can do is provide a copy of what I am intending to do to the member for Bragg, on the understanding that this has yet to be shown to and discussed fully with Mr Duggan. I just make the point again on the record that one could erect a whole other ICAC on top of ICAC to investigate ICAC, but that would be getting ridiculous.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Cacky.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, very cacky. What we intend to do is have this opportunity here as I have indicated. With those few words, I will conclude my remarks.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (12:34): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STAMP DUTIES (OFF-THE-PLAN APARTMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 October 2014.)

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (12:35): I rise today to speak about the Stamp Duties (Off-the-plan Apartments) Amendment Bill and I will indicate at this point that I am not the lead speaker. I want to make some remarks about this bill specifically and a bit more broadly about this type of incentive as a way to encourage or discourage behaviour.

The bill quite simply seeks to continue concessions for stamp duty relief that have been given to inner-city apartments. It is extremely straightforward and something that I am supportive of. As a Liberal, can I say that this is a fantastic measure to be brought to the house because it lowers tax. It is quite unusual that this government decides that lower taxes are the way to go, especially after our discussions last week of the Premier's talk about increasing charges as a way to increase productivity, but we can have that debate another time.

I would like to contrast this concession with other budget measures that the government has brought to this place, but mainly the car park tax. I want to speak about it in the general sense and not reflect on any vote that may have happened in the house. A car park tax, by its very nature, is trying to discourage behaviour. It is trying to make it more expensive for people to park in the city, therefore making alternative forms of transport into the city more viable.

I have a problem with those types of taxes because, if they work, then the revenue base that the tax would collect diminishes, rendering the tax inefficient, obsolete—anything you care to call it—and if it does not work, it becomes a beautiful, ongoing revenue mechanism for the government, punishing people who otherwise do not have alternatives to the behaviour that the government seeks to modify by the tax.

I do not think it is a good way to raise revenue because, by its very nature, if the tax does work, the revenue base is not stable. According to the 2012 Economic and Finance Committee report on state taxation, a tax should be stable in the amount of income that it delivers so it can deliver certainty to government and help with forward planning. This concession does the opposite.

This concession seeks to take away tax in order to encourage a behaviour and I think that is a more positive way to go about things. I think any measure this government brings forward to this place that lowers tax is something to be commended and the reason I think they have brought this back to the house is that it worked, and they need to extend it. From what I understand, they have been giving these concessions anyway and they are trying to get us to give some retrospective approval.

This bill is about trying to find ways to reinvigorate our city. Increasing urban infill is a great way to take pressure off the urban fringe and greenfield sites that require a lot of new infrastructure. It is a way to slow the ever-creeping boundary of metropolitan Adelaide and I think that is a good thing. I think that higher density living is good for more efficient government and, again, that is why I am happy to stand up here and support this measure because it is about trying to improve the efficiency of government service provision, especially in relation to public transport.

In South Australia the fares that are collected from our public transport system—i.e., the transport users' contribution to the public transport system—are only around 20 per cent of the total cost of providing that public service, and higher density inner-city living will help to encourage public transport use by a number of mechanisms.

It will mean that people living in inner-city apartments and city-fringe apartments will not have long distances to travel, and jumping on and off a bus will be a lot more time efficient than getting in a car and parking somewhere. I think that is a good thing, and helping to make our public transport system is a good thing.

It also helps to bring vibrancy to a city because it is only through population density that services and retail opportunities can make money. As somebody who has looked at opening up retail outlets in many shopping centres across the state and, indeed, across the country, population density or the number of people who visit a shopping centre is extremely important in understanding whether or not a retail outlet can be viable.

Increasing that density will be good for inner-city traders, for city-fringe traders and for increasing service provision by all the wonderful small bars which have popped up all over the place. I see a lot of positives by trying to increase the density of the city. Of course, I see a lot of benefits for that beautiful institution we call the Adelaide Central Market—I am sure it very much appreciates this bill.

The bill also helps to change the mindset around apartment living. South Australia is one of the least dense cities in the world. One report I read (and it is probably out of date now) said that Adelaide is the second least dense city in the world, behind Houston, Texas. That makes life very difficult for government and therefore, again, I think this bill is a good idea.

I believe that if we are to make housing more affordable we need to realise what our ambitions are for the type of house we live in. As someone whose family has travelled all over the world, and all over Europe, where high-density living is the norm, in Adelaide, in South Australia, and even in Australia, we still have a mindset around green open spaces. That is not necessarily a bad thing, but it makes it difficult for governments to be able to provide services to keep those dreams alive. It also increases the costs for people to live. So, again, this is a very good idea.

Urban infill developments are often less attractive to developers of greenfield sites because by their very nature they are smaller, they tend to run into a lot of planning difficulties, and certainly greenfield developments are easier for developers to just come through, block out whole areas and build new housing. Any measure this government takes that can help to ameliorate those expenses is a good thing.

I would like to highlight some comments that have been made from housing industry figures in relation to this issue which state that for South Australians, about \$80,000 is put on to the cost of a new home. So, for an average house-and-land package worth about \$450,000, approximately

\$80,000 goes directly to the government in the form of taxes, fees and charges—and that is a huge amount of money.

The Executive Director of the Urban Development Institute of Australia, Terry Walsh, commented that it is enough to buy two brand-new family cars or put four kids through private schools—\$80,000 is phenomenal and a huge disincentive to build a new home. Fully 20 per cent of the cost of building a new home goes to the government, so anything we can do to ameliorate that cost and stimulate development can only be a good thing.

I was a great studier of the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide and trying to understand the implications it had for my electorate, and for the city more broadly, especially in the context of the Barossa and McLaren Vale preservation zones that are in place. From that, the numbers are quite stark, and especially for Schubert and the surrounds of Schubert the 30-year plan has some very strong implications.

The plan breaks up Adelaide into eight different districts, and it shows what the developments will look like in each of those areas. By 'developments' I mean are they infill sites that are centred on a transport-oriented development, are they infill sites outside of those developing corridors, are they urban fringe developments, or are they developments within townships within country areas?

For Adelaide city over this time, they were only talking about 2,250 new dwellings. In eastern Adelaide, they were talking about 18,500 new dwellings, of which only about 8,000 would be centred on transport-oriented development corridors. In western Adelaide, the total figure is 42,500, with 33,000 to be around the TODs and the remaining 9,500 not to be. However, northern Adelaide is where things start to get a little bit more interesting, especially in relation to the urban growth boundary and the ever-creeping urban sprawl that creates difficulties for future governments.

In northern Adelaide, infill TODs new dwellings will be 20,500, with a further 6,000 outside those TODs, but fringe development in the northern Adelaide zone is 36,300 new homes and then townships are a further 4,800. So, fully half the new developments in the north of Adelaide will be fringe developments that contribute to urban sprawl.

In southern Adelaide, the figure is slightly less stark, with 19,500 new homes for infill around transport-oriented developments, with a further 12,500 outside of that, and 8,500 new homes around the urban fringe. So, in the south there is likely to be a lot less growth of metropolitan Adelaide, but in total about 40,500 new dwellings are to be built over the time.

Then we get to the Barossa area, which is actually wider than the Barossa; in fact, almost all the development they are talking about is outside the Barossa proper, but it certainly has plenty of implications for the outer north and the rural north, where over this time they are suggesting that 46,400 new homes will be built, of which 8,500 will be in the townships. The Barossa Council, which comprises the bulk of the Barossa, is the 10th fastest growing council in the state out of 68. I can very much see where those 8,500 new dwellings will go. It is fairly well identified in the preservation act, and the prescription of townships and the vacant land within those townships that are there to be built.

However, it is the 37,900 new dwellings that are due to be built on the urban fringe that are really going to have implications for the Barossa. Those developments come in the form of Roseworthy, Concordia and the expansion of Hewett, and Gawler East is put into that category, with the Springwood development. There is a lot of greenfield urban development going on in the outer Barossa area, and that certainly has huge implications for service provision.

We talk about the backfill and the backlog of maintenance on our rural roads, and that certainly would need to be addressed. If I look very specifically at the Gawler East, Hewett and Concordia developments, the main street of Gawler struggles now to deal with the volume of traffic that travels down that road. If we are to have this number of new dwellings, we need to see new infrastructure.

The first piece of infrastructure that would need to be built in order to facilitate this is the south-east link road that would link Barossa Valley Way, east of Gawler, and track through the gorge and meet up with Tiver Road, therefore bypassing all the Gawler main street traffic and bypassing the traffic centred around the STARplex and Trinity College. It would be a hugely fantastic

development not only for the people of Gawler and for the people who seek to go into these new developments but also, indeed, for the Barossa more broadly.

Since the bituminisation of Gomersal Road—and we will call that one of the crowning achievements of the former member for Schubert, Ivan Venning, which sadly only sits at 90 km/h and not 100 but that is a different argument—that road was built for 1,000 cars a day and has now been expanded and currently moves 8,000 cars a day. It has shifted the traffic from the Barossa and, instead of coming up through Gawler through the southern vales via Barossa Valley Way through Lyndoch to Tanunda, people go up the highway and get onto Gomersal Road, and it is a beautiful drive and I do it almost every day except when I have to come to this place.

It has moved traffic, people and visitors away from the southern vales, and I think the south-eastern link road is hugely important to be able to redress that balance because, unfortunately, Gawler is a block that stops visitors from easily passing through to get to the southern Barossa, and I think that that is a shame. Not that Gawler is not beautiful, and it is nice to drive through, but it certainly puts visitors in more of a frustrated mood when they manage to get through it and out the other side.

On that point, I urge ministers opposite and I urge the member for Light that anything they can do to bring forward that piece of vital infrastructure, not only for the electorate of Light but very much for the electorate of Schubert, would be very much appreciated, and I will continue my advocacy in that gentle prodding way in which I try to go about things to achieve that.

Lastly, and to bring my remarks back to the bill at hand, can I say that an ever-expanding footprint is a legacy that will burden future governments and it will make it harder to bring the budget back to surplus. I know that members opposite have had trouble bringing the state government's budget to surplus, and we on this side of the house are always here to give free tips, free bits of advice—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: They've never had a surplus; never actually delivered a surplus.

Mr KNOLL: Sorry, you have never actually delivered a surplus, was that, member for Newland?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I will start having to call people to order by the name of their seat shortly. Let's not do that.

An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not want to hear another word. Member for Schubert.

Mr KNOLL: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. We could talk about budget savings in the form of what types of hotels ministers who go on overseas trips stay in.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That really has nothing to do with the bill, so off you go or I will have to call you to order.

Mr KNOLL: Stamp duty concessions will hopefully incentivise and have incentivised the building of apartments and high density, inner city living. I think that is a fantastic idea because it takes the pressure off the urban fringe. I think it is something that will help to increase the vibrancy of business to improve service provision within the inner city area. As I said before, it will help people to stop off at these beautiful small bars and have a nice glass of Barossa shiraz before they catch the bus on their way home to Gilberton, and all the other places that will benefit from this policy.

Ms Redmond: Where will they go to the toilet?

Mr KNOLL: The member for Heysen asks where they will go to the toilet.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, you would not want to entertain that, would you? You would like to go on with your debate; you have two minutes left.

Mr KNOLL: This is a bill which we are happy to support and I would hope that over my time in this place, over the next 3½ years, we will see more of these types of initiatives from the

government as they realise that increasing taxes is not an effective way to improve vibrancy and, indeed, is counter intuitive. Whether it works or does not work, it does not seek to give the outcome and the social engineering that the government hopes it will, but instead uses tax cuts as a very effective mechanism to be able to increase the affordability of housing but also to have all sorts of other flow-on benefits for the City of Adelaide and the surrounds.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:54): I rise to speak to the Stamp Duties (Off-the-plan Apartments) Amendment Bill 2014, and note that it was introduced on 29 October 2014 and concerns amendments to amend the stamp duty concession for apartments bought off the plan to include the inner metropolitan area. I note that back in 2012 the current Labor government introduced some stamp duty relief for off-the-plan apartment sales in the city and also at Bowden and Gilberton. This provides a full stamp duty concession for off-the-plan contracts, entered into up to 30 June 2014, and these are capped at a stamp duty payable on a \$500,000 apartment, and that stamp duty is \$21,330. There is a partial concession for the ensuing two years.

It is noted that in 2013 the government announced a policy to revitalise the inner metropolitan area, allowing for up to 18,500 new homes. It was the government's intention that it would extend the stamp duty relief for off-the-plan apartment sales to rezoned inner metropolitan areas, saving people the stamp duty on the cost of purchasing a new apartment. This was effective from 28 October 2013 up to 30 June 2014. As I indicated earlier, this has partial concessions of between \$3,250 and \$15,500 of stamp duty for the next two years.

Applications currently submitted to RevenueSA have been catered for with ex gratia payments, and this bill is to confirm the legal authority to provide the concessions. The government has indicated that the expansion of the targeted stamp duty grants will cost up to \$7 million. This figure was confirmed in the 2013-14 Mid-Year Budget Review, and represents the amount for the three-year period up to July 2016. There is an estimation that around 260 applications have been processed so far, costing about \$4 million.

We have to be aware of the hit on the budget, knowing the state of the budget deficit. In saying that, it is a good idea to try to revitalise the city. We note that 100 years ago there were tens of thousands of people living in the inner city of Adelaide.

Ms Chapman: It was 46,000.

Mr PEDERICK: There were 46,000, I am advised by the member for Bragg.

Ms Redmond interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: I am getting different figures.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, you shouldn't be listening to them. The member for Hammond.

Mr PEDERICK: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. The member for Heysen indicates that it was over 100,000 about 100 years ago. There has been a steady population drift out of the central city area, and obviously a lot of that has come with better access to outer areas, and obviously better transport—we are not all riding horses, and thankfully we are not all riding bikes, but that is another matter.

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: You'd look good in lycra.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PEDERICK: Thank you for your protection, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Lycra is such a vicious fabric.

Ms Redmond: It is we who'd need protection, Adrian, if that happened.

Mr PEDERICK: Absolutely.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: He would need more than my protection in lycra, wouldn't he?

Mr PEDERICK: Are we just going to go to lunch now?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would you like to seek leave to continue your remarks?

Mr PEDERICK: I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

Petitions

PORT ADELAIDE MAGISTRATES COURT

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector): Presented a petition signed by 926 residents of the City of Port Adelaide Enfield and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to have the state Courts Administration Authority reconsider and reverse its decision to close the Magistrates Court at Port Adelaide and take into account the broader implications of the move.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Local Government Annual Reports—

District Council of Cleve Annual Report 2013-14

District Council of Grant Annual Report 2013-14

Murray Bridge, Rural City of Annual Report 2013-14

By the Premier (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

Premier and Cabinet, Department of—Annual Report 2013-14

State Emergency Management Committee—Annual Report 2013-14

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

Controlled Substances (Drug Detection Powers) Act 2008—Annual Report 2013-14

Courts Administration Authority—Annual Report 2013-14

Criminal Investigation (Covert Operations) Act 2009—Annual Report 2013-14

Freedom of Information Act 1991—Annual Report 2013-14

Legal Practitioners Conduct Board—Annual Report 2013-14

Listening and Surveillance Devices Act 1972—Annual Report 2013-14

Public Advocate, Office of—Annual Report 2013-14

State Coroner—Annual Report 2013-14

Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005—Annual Report 2013-14

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Director of Public Prosecutions—Powers of Director

Summary Offences—Prohibited Weapons

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

Development Act 1993, Administration of—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Housing and Urban Development (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Architectural Practice Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Finance (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Parliamentary Superannuation Scheme, South Australian—Annual Report 2013-14
SA Metropolitan Fire Service Superannuation Scheme—Annual Report 2013-14
Southern Select Super Corporation—Annual Report 2013-14
Super SA Board—Annual Report 2013-14
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Southern State Superannuation—Voluntary Insurance

By the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Technical Regulator—
Electricity Annual Report 2013-14
Gas Annual Report 2013-14

By the Minister for Disabilities (Hon. A. Piccolo)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Liquor Licensing—
Dry Areas—
Arno Bay—Robe—Spalding
Mannum

By the Minister for Disabilities (Hon. A. Piccolo) on behalf of the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Fisheries Management—
Prawn Fisheries
Prescribed Fishing Activities

By the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Animal Welfare Advisory Committee—Annual Report 2013-14
General Reserves Trust—Annual Report 2013-14
Stormwater Management Authority—Annual Report 2013-14

Ministerial Statement

CHINA-AUSTRALIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:02): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This week is a historic week for South Australia, as it is for the nation. The China-Australia Free Trade Agreement will open up outstanding new opportunities for South Australian businesses, and Prime Minister Abbott should be commended for concluding the ChAFTA. Building on yesterday's announcement, today I will be travelling to Sydney with a delegation of business and industry leaders to participate in the first China-Australia Leaders Forum to further develop our engagement with China. President Xi and Prime Minister Abbott will speak at this event. I hope to personally congratulate them both for the conclusion of the China-Australia Free Trade Agreement.

This agreement is the product of a long journey, beginning with Gough Whitlam in the 1970s. Subsequent prime ministers continued to build on the bilateral relationship, with the Hawke-Keating years and even the Howard government recognising the benefits of stronger links between our two nations. The current round of engagement commenced with prime minister Gillard and minister

Emerson, and the Abbott government can rightly be commended for the work they have done to secure the agreement. The ChAFTA—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: They haven't been in government 18 months and they think it is all their own work. The ChAFTA includes a number of measures that will make South Australian products more attractive to Chinese consumers. This is great—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: They are going to make it more expensive, are they? Is that your point?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: They can't take a compliment. This is great for our state, because not only will it mean the trade agreement supports business and generates jobs, it will support quality jobs. Statistics show that exporters pay 60 per cent higher wages than non-exporters. They provide better health and safety, better job security and better employment rights for women.

A key part of the agreement that directly benefits South Australia will be the establishment of a Chinese consulate general in Adelaide. The consulate general will further promote economic, trade, scientific, technological, cultural and educational ties between South Australia and China. The ChAFTA represents a significant opportunity for South Australia.

There are a number of measures included in this agreement that will make our products more attractive to Chinese consumers, from food and wine to resources, to our service industries, particularly mining services and education services, where we already have a competitive advantage. South Australian businesses will have great new opportunities for growth. We placed a significant focus on our engagement with China, and yesterday's announcement vindicates that focus. We are already growing our goods exports faster than any other state and are well placed to benefit from the ChAFTA.

Yesterday we released our economic priority to promote South Australia's international connections and engagement, which set ambitious goals for us to internationalise the South Australian economy.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

Question Time

JOB CREATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): My question is to the Premier. Does the figure announced by the Premier today of 6,000 new jobs in exports over the next three years include the 5,000 jobs in mining announced by the Premier last week?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:10): First of all, the opposition leader is not quite correct in his assertion that the government has said there will be 6,000 jobs from exports: it was 6,000 jobs from investment and FDI, not exports. It is an ambitious figure but, based on our performance to date with attracting investment, we think we can do it within three years.

We will come in with that information. We will table that information. We will be held to account for that information. But I will say this: one way not to create jobs in foreign direct investment is not to have a mining policy. One way not to create jobs from foreign direct investment is to say no to energy investment by having a moratorium on unconventional gas. One way not to attract jobs in defence is to propose building submarines in somebody else's country, not ours. If the opposition has a better idea, we would like to hear it.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Deputy leader.

Ms CHAPMAN: I thank you for giving me the call on the point of order, sir, but it is far too late: he has already screeched on with his debate.

The SPEAKER: What was the point of order?

Ms CHAPMAN: It was relevance to the question of whether the 6,000 jobs announced today or last week were in addition to the 5,000 last week—and we still didn't have an answer.

The SPEAKER: That, of course, is a bogus point of order. I call the Treasurer to order for beating his desk top, a matter for which I named the member for Adelaide before the last election.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir: I understand it is common practice in the House of Commons to applaud by tapping the table, but if it is not, sir, I accept your ruling.

The SPEAKER: I will have the Acting Clerk investigate the matter; meanwhile, the call to order stands.

JOB CREATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): Supplementary: given that the government only expects 6,000 jobs to be created in mining and investment, where does the Premier expect the remaining 94,000 jobs, committed to in his 100,000 jobs target, to come from?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:12): Just to recap on the contribution we made the last time we were asked these questions, back in August we launched an economic vision for South Australia. It was about South Australia, the place where both people and business thrive. We set out 10 economic priorities for five sectors of the economy, the fastest growing sectors of the economy, in our view, and the real opportunities for growth. To remind members of the house, they include mining and energy, the food industry, the health industries, tourism and, of course, the knowledge sectors, and then there were five enablers about how we would ensure that those sectors would grow.

All of those particular priorities are directed at growing jobs for our citizens. That is the whole and sole purpose of achieving that growth. We have set ourselves an accountable target within the period of the life of this government. It is a braver target, frankly, the one that was set in 2010, because that one had a 2016 target and so was actually beyond the life of the next election. We fully acknowledge that that will be a difficult target to achieve, given the circumstances of the international economy in the period between 2010 and now.

We have held ourselves to account with a plan. Not only is that plan one that has been demanded by the broad cross-section of the South Australian community—the business community, the academia, the community sector, all of those people who asked us to produce such a plan—but the overwhelming feedback we get when we speak to those groups is, 'For God's sake, stop the negativity and actually get on board with allowing us to achieve those things.'

The reason we publish these economic priorities, the reason we publish these objectives, the reason we publish our success stories and the initiatives we have taken thus far is to show and guide the South Australian community on the way forward. We have accepted the function of leadership, and what we see opposite is the abject failure of leadership, the inability to lead.

The SPEAKER: Premier, you are not responsible for the opposition.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Mr Speaker, I am speaking much more broadly than the opposition. This is about something that goes directly to the psyche of South Australia. It's about whether we are going to stand up and actually lead and shape our own future, or whether we are going to just sit back, slink back into the corner and allow South Australia to slide into some genteel decline. That is old Adelaide, old South Australia—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir: the question was where the other 94,000 jobs were coming from. The Premier's esoteric view of the psyche according to other people's point of view is not relevant.

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is called to order because that may have started out as a point of order but didn't finish as one, and the Premier will address the substance of the question.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The substance of the question is: where are these jobs going to come from? They will come from the ingenuity and talent of South Australians. That's where they will come from. With the guidance that we have provided with these 10 priorities, business will see where the commitments of this government are in terms of investment, where it's going to invest its policy effort, where it's going to direct the attention and energies of its bureaucracy.

They will be able to invest in the secure and certain knowledge that they will have a partner. They will have a partner in the South Australian government for growth and the creation of jobs. If those opposite think that the solution is somehow to get out of the way and allow business to do this by themselves, that is not the message we are receiving from the business community. They want a genuine partner for growth, and they have one in this South Australian Labor government.

JOB CREATION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): Supplementary, sir: the Premier has referred to his new plan. Can he make clear to this house whether this new plan, where part of it's been announced today—the creation of 6,000 new jobs in investment over the next three years—includes or excludes the 5,000 jobs that he committed to creating last week in the mining sector?

The SPEAKER: Before the Premier answers, the Acting Clerk has resourcefully found the reference to the member for West Torrens' point of order in *Erskine May* on page 450:

Members must not disturb a Member who is speaking by hissing, chanting, clapping, booing, exclamations or other interruption...

On 26 January 1693, when Constantinople had been under occupation for 250 years, it was resolved:

That Mr Speaker do call upon the Member by name, making such disturbance, and that every such person shall incur the displeasure and censure of the House.

Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:18): Thank you, Mr Speaker. As I said before, we will outline each of our 10 priorities. They will all have definable targets addressing each of the areas, and we are content to be judged; we are content to be judged in relation to each of them.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA'S STRATEGIC PLAN

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): Supplementary, sir: given that the Premier has outlined to the house today the new approach to new jobs targets, can the Premier update us on what the status of the State Strategic Plan is?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:19): The Strategic Plan covers about 100 areas of endeavour for the South Australian community. It is a plan that was compiled with the collaboration of many thousands of South Australians citizens. It covers social, economic and environmental issues, and it remains a guiding touchstone for the work of all our government agencies and, indeed, the work of everybody within the South Australian community.

What we are talking about here is a laser focus on the economic challenge facing South Australia. If there is one thing that emerged out of the last election which we have freely acknowledged it is that people in South Australia want to know the answer to the question: what is our economic future? What is the economic future for us; what are going to be the jobs that will support our children and make our families secure in the future? They were demanding of us greater clarity about what that vision looks like. We have listened and we have spoken to them.

We, unlike those opposite, have actually listened to the outcome of the last state election and sought to bring ourselves in sync with it. We have sought to be responsive to what happened at the last election with the way in which we have constructed this government, with the way in which

we have gone about listening to people and the way in which we have designed a program for action in the future.

Of course, these are not challenges that are going to be met solely by government alone. It will be the collaboration across the whole of the South Australian community that will allow us to supply the answer to these questions. But there is momentum building on each of these topics. I defy anybody in this house to say that there isn't momentum building in the mining and energy sector, there isn't momentum building in the health sector, there isn't momentum building in the food and wine sector, and we aren't seeing tremendous opportunities in tourism and, also, the education sector. All of those areas of endeavour are showing wonderful signs of growth and opportunity but we need to do more because we know that the world around us is changing very quickly.

The rate of transformation of the South Australian economy has to be accelerated. That is why we are putting our energies into those sectors of the economy that we, on advice, have been told are going to be the fastest sectors of the economy. If you don't believe us, believe the Business Council of Australia (Catherine Livingstone) who have chosen almost identical sectors of the economy. If you don't believe us, believe the Deloitte report that says that each of these sectors is likely to grow 10 per cent faster than the rest of the national economy. These are the areas of growth.

They also happen to be areas of competitive advantage for the South Australian economy. We believe that these are going to be the drivers in the future. That's why we are investing in them and that's why there is so much excitement about the possibilities that exist in this state. Just for once, if those opposite could lend a hand rather than just carping on and whining about what they see is wrong with South Australia. They can't see what is right with South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, leader.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA'S STRATEGIC PLAN

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): If the Premier is genuine about maintaining the State's Strategic Plan, why is the South Australian—

The SPEAKER: The leader will be seated. The question, 'if the Premier is genuine', imputes that he is not and, therefore, violates the rule against imputing improper—

Mr MARSHALL: I didn't mean to impute improper motive, but the Premier has announced that the State's Strategic Plan stands, so my question is: if it stands, why has the government sought to abolish the South Australian Strategic Plan Audit Committee?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:23): Because we are seeking to streamline government and do away with those arrangements which are unnecessary. If there are ways in which we can carry out the work of government without committee structures, we will seek to do that. That was the whole point of the exercise about the abolition of boards of committees that were not strictly necessary for us to continue the work of government. There is no reason why this work cannot be compiled by agencies as part of their usual reporting arrangements, and we expect that that will occur.

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): My question is to the Treasurer. What advice does the Treasurer have for the local government sector with regard to their increasing emergency services levy obligations?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:24): Far be it from me to tell the councils how to do their budgeting. That was the Leader of the Opposition's plan—to put a cap on their rates. We do not believe in telling elected governments how they should be rating their constituents. That is a matter for—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is called to order. The member for Unley is warned a first time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is a matter for councils and their constituents. The government believes in autonomy in the local government sector. We believe that elected members of parliament and elected members of councils should be held responsible to their communities. As we have said in the most recent council elections, some mayors were more successful than others dependent on how they perform. I suspect—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I suspect that councils have bigger fish to fry than the emergency services levy. The removal of the \$190 concession for pensioners—a direct result of the reduction of funding from the commonwealth which opposition members have remained silent on—\$30 million per annum taken away from our most vulnerable South Australians, where will they find that \$190? Where will they find it? Well, for year 1, this government stepped in after councils had already formulated their budgets and filled in the gap of that funding.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker. I suggest that the Treasurer is now straying. It is not relevant—

The SPEAKER: No.

Ms CHAPMAN: —to the question of advice given to the local government.

The SPEAKER: Look, I do not uphold the deputy leader's point of order. The purport of the question is how is local government going to cope with paying the emergency services levy, and I think it is germane to refer to local government being unable now to have its pensioner ratepayers and self-funded retiree ratepayers have a discount on their rates.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker. It has nothing to do with concessions. This was a question of emergency services levy and the question was—

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader will be seated. There is no validity in the point of order and, if she takes the point of order again, I will have to remove her from the house.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We protected pensioners from the cruellest cuts of the commonwealth, and the very reason councils have seen a larger emergency services levy billed because the remissions were removed is because of cuts made by the commonwealth.

Mr Whetstone: Rubbish!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The reason we are attempting to protect people is because those cuts are unbearable. I heard the senior tactician, the member for Chaffey, interject 'Rubbish!' and that there are no cuts from the commonwealth. I will give the house a rundown of what they are because I think it is important that when you have misinformation—

The SPEAKER: Alas, the Treasurer will not give us a rundown because the Treasurer should not respond to interjections. He should answer the substance of the question which is: how is local government going to cope with the changes?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So, Mr Speaker, I say to the Local Government Association—and I note that the head of the LGA and a number of mayors were on radio this morning on the Leon Byner program talking about roughly between an 80¢ to \$1 increase across every household in their constituencies. I say to them this: while at the same time you are fighting funding cuts for road maintenance, you are fighting funding cuts to pensioners for concessions and self-funded retirees that have been cut by the commonwealth. If they join with us and reverse these cuts, there will not be an issue at all.

EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (14:29): A supplementary, sir: in response to the Treasurer's answer, can I ask a question to the Minister for Local Government? Can the minister outline how the stated position of the government to no longer fund—

The SPEAKER: I do not think you can have a supplementary to—

Mr GRIFFITHS: It refers to exactly the same reference.

The SPEAKER: —a different minister.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I had to get your permission before, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Goyder will be seated. I will consider a ruling on that. If I am in error, I will come back to him. The member for Giles.

CHINA-AUSTRALIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:29): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. What is the likely impact on South Australia's minerals and petroleum exports of the China-Australia Free Trade Agreement?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:29): I thank the member for his question and his keen interest in growing our resources sector. I am sure most members of the house will already know that the government's strategy to grow our exports to China has been delivering great results. The government regards our relationship with China as one of our most important. It is a relationship that is based on shared interests and mutual respect.

Our ongoing engagement with the People's Republic of China has been built on the solid foundations of the Australian government's national commitment to our friend and trading partner. In making stronger partnerships, we can and we must do more. We know that there is more to be done to reap the full reward of our state's natural advantages, to engage and grow our opportunities and to allow us to truly maximise the flow of investment and exports.

The recently announced China-Australia Free Trade Agreement is an important step to enhance our government's strategy by delivering a significant reduction in tariffs that are currently applied to South Australian exports in the resources and energy sector. Significant tariff elimination in the new agreement includes removal of tariffs on refined copper and alloys—good news.

South Australia was founded on copper mining. It played a vital role in our past and will into our future. As a state, we produce enough copper to meet the demands of building more than 1.3 million homes each year, fulfilling the requirements for plumbing, roofing, fittings and appliances. Copper is a commodity of the middle class and, as China embarks on rampant modernisation, this state and South Australian copper will play an important part.

Copper, as is the case with the state's resources sector, is only part of the story. The agreement sees the removal of tariffs on resources and energy products and provides greater certainty for Australian exporters by locking in zero tariffs on major exports such as iron ore, gold, crude petroleum oils and liquefied natural gas.

This government recognises the importance of the resources sector and we recognise the importance of this historic agreement. We congratulate the commonwealth government on negotiating it. We know that this agreement will allow us to further build on our relationship with an important trading partner and underpin the continued expansion of our state's resources sector.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Mineral and petroleum exports now make up 39 per cent of the state's total exports or \$12.1 billion, where 10 years ago it was only 16.3 per cent or \$7.7 billion. Around half our state's mineral and petroleum products are directly exported, many to China, and this agreement will have a profound effect on our state's economic prosperity and the ability to attract investment and expand. Our state's economy has always been driven by exports. There can be no doubt that the mineral and petroleum sector—

The SPEAKER: Alas, the Treasurer's time has expired.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is unfortunate, sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: It seems the Treasurer has had a reprieve.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There can be no doubt that the mineral and petroleum sector is making a significant and expanding contribution to the prosperity of our state, a contribution that will be further enhanced and advanced by this historic agreement, a contribution that members on this side of the house appreciate and not one that they want to see jeopardised by misinformation and sabotage by extremist groups and their allies opposite.

NOARLUNGA HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:33): My question is to health minister. Given that the Noarlunga Hospital's emergency department's statistics are not being updated to the dashboard due to problems with the Electronic Patient Administration System, what is the current performance of Noarlunga Hospital's emergency department?

Ms Redmond: What, EPAS isn't working?

The SPEAKER: The member for Heysen is warned. Minister for Health.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:34): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. Last week, *InDaily* ran a story about Noarlunga Hospital which mentioned that the doctors' union had inspected the hospital twice in the last month. The story also mentioned that the union had given the inspection report to SafeWork SA, accusing the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network of several breaches of the Work Health and Safety Act.

After the doctors' union inspection, it met with the chief executive of the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network and her senior staff to discuss the inspection. I understand that at this meeting the doctors' union was told that some of its claims were factually incorrect. Since then a SafeWork SA inspector has conducted a thorough investigation of the Noarlunga Hospital emergency department following claims from the doctors' union of breaches of the Work Health and Safety Act.

I am pleased to say that the SafeWork SA inspector confirmed that there were no breaches of the act and the emergency department complied with all legal requirements. Noarlunga Hospital is a safe environment—

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Noarlunga Hospital is a safe environment for patients and staff, and the southern community, like all other South Australians, can be reassured that patient care is never compromised at our hospitals. We provided this information to *InDaily* and the opposition raised this matter last week, and I thank them for the opportunity to correct the record.

The SPEAKER: The member for Colton.

Mr MARSHALL: Sir, I have a supplementary.

The SPEAKER: You may do, but we are going to the member for Colton.

CHINA-AUSTRALIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:35): Bad luck, yeah.

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

The Hon. P. CAICA: Sorry, sir, I apologise again for being very naughty. My question is to the Minister for Investment and Trade. Can the minister inform the house about the recently finalised free trade agreement between Australia and China and how it will benefit South Australian trade?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:36): I thank the member for Colton for his question because yesterday the Australian Prime Minister, Tony Abbott, and the

Chinese President, Mr Xi Jinping, signed the China-Australia Free Trade Agreement which we are discussing today.

It is a historic agreement. Many of its key areas will involve South Australia's most important industries and our key export market, because China is by far Australia's biggest trading partner and South Australia's biggest trading partner, accounting for 28 per cent of the two-way trade, and this free trade agreement will build on this already substantial figure. There is no doubt that the China FTA will bring considerable benefits to our local economy, in particular for agriculture and seafood. In 2013-14, according to the ABS—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: In 2013-14, according to ABS figures, South Australia exported nearly \$3.4 billion worth of merchandise to China, representing 27 per cent of all the state's goods exports. South Australia's trade with China has grown by nearly 52 per cent over the past 12 months and a future—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert is called to order.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —FTA will build on this growth. This growth, and the signing of the FTA, underscores the importance of South Australia's market engagement strategy with China. Paul Evans, from the Winemakers Federation, has welcomed the FTA stating it will mean South Australian wine producers 'are able to compete on a level playing field by value and by quality'. A range of South Australian sectors will benefit most from the FTA including:

- the services sector: with South Australia's exporters of higher education and tourism services expected to benefit from the closer economic and political relationship with China that would result from the FTA, and which is followed up by actions initiated by this state government;
- wine: with the related tariffs scheduled to be eliminated in four years, our industry will no longer face import duties of nearly 50 per cent and, importantly, they will be able to compete on a level playing field with New Zealand and Chilean wines;
- meat: also due to lower tariffs that are on par with the New Zealand product;
- seafood: again due to lower tariffs, South Australia's premium product can now compete with the New Zealand and Chilean product; and
- investment: the raising of the threshold in the China FTA to over \$1 billion is likely to add to the amount of investment that is already on hand to fund the expansion of the state's mining and energy industries.

The China FTA could also result in greater opportunities in a number of mining service areas, such as engineering, construction, mine safety, environmental management and mine site rehabilitation. The agreement is significant for Australia and I congratulate the Prime Minister and the federal Minister for Trade and Investment, Andrew Robb, for successfully finalising it.

The government will work in close partnership with South Australian industry sectors to leverage the benefits of the FTA, thereby enhancing our export, investment, economic growth and employment outcomes. We are reviewing the China and India strategies to optimise them. We are developing a South-East Asia strategy. We are waiting for the opposition's contribution to that process. We are developing a North Asia and US strategy, along with an Atlantic strategy. If the opposition has something to contribute we would like to hear it, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The minister is not responsible to the house for the opposition.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Thank you, Mr Speaker. In the meantime, the state government will get on with the agenda.

The SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired. I would say to the member who taps the glass to alert me to the expiry of four minutes, in much the same way that spectators at a soccer match start blowing whistles at the 90-minute mark, I will tolerate it if that person is correct. However, if they tap short of four minutes they will be removed from the house. In response to the member for Goyder's supplementary question, I refer to Erskine May, 24th edition, page—

Mr Marshall: What page, sir?

The SPEAKER: —366:

A supplementary question may refer only to the answer out of which it immediately arises, must relate to government responsibility, must not be read or be too long or quote from letters, should contain only one question, must not refer to an earlier answer or be addressed to another minister...

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Disappointed house. Leader.

NOARLUNGA HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the Minister for Health confirm that the Noarlunga Hospital ED data is available on the SA Health intranet and, if so, why isn't it being publicly made available, and can the minister in fact update the house as to what the current performance is?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:42): I would have thought that having been caught out twice now peddling mistruths about the Noarlunga Hospital, the opposition would be very, very careful about bringing the Noarlunga Hospital into this place. Twice now—

Ms REDMOND: Point of order. The commencement of the minister was hardly appropriate and relevant to the question and imputed improper motive.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I am more than happy to talk about the dashboard because the dashboard, of course, is a wonderful Labor initiative, something that we brought in to bring transparency, whereas the last time the opposition was in government, and admittedly it was in distant memory, but the last time the opposition was in government they conducted our health system secretly. They didn't want the public to know what was really going on. Can I commend the former minister—

Mr PISONI: Point of order. The minister is not responsible for the opposition.

The SPEAKER: Yes, that's true, and also the minister has adopted an unduly combative tone which is why I am allowing members on my left to interject at will.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Fire at will. Can I commend the previous health minister whose initiative it was to have the dashboard because he wanted to make sure that the sunlight was shone on our health system, that it could drive performance, and I am at this very moment looking at ways we can expand the amount of data that is made publicly available so the South Australian public can have a complete understanding of how our hospitals run, where blockages occur, why they occur, similar to what the NHS has done in the United Kingdom, where they have a broad range of data that's put on the internet and made publicly available—

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order. The minister is also not responsible for the United Kingdom's health service. I would ask him to answer the question.

The SPEAKER: I don't uphold the point of order because the minister is entitled to make comparisons with health systems in other jurisdictions and may yet harbour the ambition to be a member of the House of Commons.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The Treasurer is saying, 'Which party?' Sir, the NHS has a great thing where they have a broad range of data which gives the public a broad understanding of what is happening in the UK health system, and I see that the data we've got is just the first step to having a broad range of data. Now, Noarlunga—I will have a look at the claims made with the opposition and am more than happy to get back to the house with a report.

NOARLUNGA HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:45): Supplementary, sir: will the minister confirm that the emergency department clearance rates have fallen by more than 10 per cent in the past 12 months to March, which includes the rollout of the EPAS system at Noarlunga?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:45): I am happy to get a report back to the house.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I don't suppose that is out of order. Great as the temptations are, the member for Stuart.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Now that the minister has had nearly one week to find the answer, can he advise how many companies have been granted a petroleum exploration licence in the past five years without having had prior relevant operating experience?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:46): I've not got that information at hand as yet, but I will bring back an answer and give it to the opposition because I think it is important that they try to get an understanding of exactly how the petroleum industry works. As I said earlier—

Ms Redmond: We are getting an understanding.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, I know what your policy is: a moratorium below Goyder's line. What I will do is, because petroleum retention licences are granted at a distance from the executive—that is, the way—

Mr Knoll: That's not what we're asking.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What did you say?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We make it up? Obviously the opposition is attempting now to put into question the way the department issues petroleum retention licences by a shadow minister yelling out that we just make it up. It shows you the contempt they have for the industry. So—

Members interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Given that the process is not done by me and it is done independently by the department, and I am only made aware of the successful candidates after the tender process has been completed, I do know that the department takes into account the personalities and the people who are applying for the licences, but I will come back with a more detailed answer for the member.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:47): Supplementary: given the minister's answer, will he also come back and advise the house whether it is necessary for companies that successfully win petroleum exploration licences to complete work plans?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:48): I think it is important for the house to understand what the shadow minister is attempting to portray here.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, I'm not.

Mr PISONI: Point of order: the minister does not speak for the member for Stuart.

The SPEAKER: I don't uphold the point of order. The minister is allowed to say what he thinks the question means, what its sting is.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am happy to stand in the parliament, with all the consequences of misleading the house, and say: I play no role in the involvement of allocation of petroleum retention leases.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have complete faith in the way the department handles this, and if the Leader of the Opposition has an accusation to make, make it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order and the Treasurer is warned.

CHINA-AUSTRALIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister advise the house what the China–Australia Free Trade Agreement means for education in South Australia?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:49): One of Australia's largest exports to China is education services, worth around \$4 billion in 2013. In South Australia, we have a proven track record of exporting education services, and I am advised that in 2013 it was worth close to \$1 billion in export earnings for the state's economy.

Education is our largest service export, greater even than tourism. Having recently made a trip to China, it is obvious that the potential market for our goods and services is almost boundless. We visited five cities in five days: Guangzhou on Monday, Shanghai on Tuesday, Changzhou on Wednesday, Jinan on Thursday and Beijing on Friday. There were around 20 school visits, meetings and official functions involved in this trip. A new school, the Beijing Bacui Bilingual School, signed up to teach our SACE to their year 12 students. They already have around 90 students lined up to undertake the SACE and are aiming to have around 500 students in the next few years.

Chinese educators are attracted to the SACE for a number of reasons including: VET counting towards the achievement of SACE, English as a second language subject specifically tailored towards success at university, recognition of the SACE by universities worldwide, and, importantly, the critical thinking skills embedded in subjects like the Research Project. It is possible that the new free trade agreement will provide the means through which Chinese students can study SACE-accredited VET, as it guarantees market access for Australian education providers to China's higher education market, including vocational and technical education.

As a result of my trip in early September, a delegation from the Shandong provincial education department will be in Adelaide later this month, and the vice-chairman and executive director of the Shanghai Xiehe Education Institute is currently in Adelaide further exploring the possibility of adopting our SACE in their schools. He is very well briefed, very interested and here to have a look at the quality control and moderation of our SACE while it is underway.

To give the house some idea of what the potential is, this company owns about 30 high-end private schools of around 5,000 students each. The company opens a new school every year or so. The free trade agreement states that Australia and China will continue to discuss options to facilitate student and teacher exchanges between both countries and increase the marketing and recruitment opportunities for Australian education providers in China. We will obviously be pursuing these opportunities.

What was very apparent in our discussions was the strong interest and recognition of the Research Project. That has been the subject of some criticism and attempts to diminish the impact of the Research Project in some quarters. We know it reflects 21st century learning and is reflected in many jurisdictions around the world. Let's hope that this criticism diminishes and let's hope these achievements go some way towards silencing these naysayers.

OIL AND GAS SECTOR

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:53): My question is again for the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. At the time of its release in 2011, how many and which companies bid for petroleum exploration licence 570?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:53): I will ask the department and give the member a full briefing.

CHILDCARE SERVICES

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:53): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Why did the government not follow through with the commitment it made to Childcare SA in November 2011 to move the ratio of childcare workers from one worker for every 10 children to a ratio of one worker in every eight children in 2016?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:54): I thank the member for Unley for his question. This has been a matter of national agreement and a matter of legislation passing both houses of this parliament, as I understand it. I think, from recollection, that the member for Unley, in fact, supported the legislation as it passed this chamber.

This is about national standards and they have not been introduced overnight. I think it goes back to 2010-2011. I am told that half of the nation already meets the 1:5 requirement—the ACT, Tasmania, Northern Territory, Western Australia and Victoria. New South Wales, Queensland and South Australia have until 1 January 2016 to do that.

I am informed that our assessors generally report that our childcare centres are currently operating well above the ratio staffing when it comes to childcare services moving towards the new ratio, so we are well on track. I am told that generally our childcare centres are not operating at 1:10 but are more likely to be currently around 1:7 or 1:6. So they have until 2016 to comply and certainly they have known about this since 2010-2011.

There were a number of statements made by some providers when reducing the ratio was flagged some time ago. Goodstart Early Learning CEO, Julia Davison, said that higher staff to child ratios were a critical component of ensuring high quality learning and one area where we need to improve here in South Australia. This is about the development of our children at the most critical time. I would challenge anyone in this chamber to be able to effectively care for and help 10 two to three year olds develop appropriately. What you have in a 1:10 child ratio is child minding, not child development.

CHILDCARE SERVICES

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:56): Supplementary: why then did the government agree in November 2011 to a ratio of 1:8 in 2016 if this is not the government's view of best childcare practice?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:57): I would pose the question: why did the member for Unley support the legislation in this chamber?

Mr PISONI: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: I doubt whether there is a point of order. Member for Florey. Member for Florey?

COMMON GROUND ADELAIDE APARTMENTS

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:57): Sorry, they just scream all the time. I can't keep concentrating with them. My question is to the Minister for Social Housing. How is the state government providing housing support to some of the most disadvantaged members of society?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:57): I thank the member for this important question. I have spoken to the house previously about the invaluable work undertaken by Common Ground Adelaide Limited, a not-for-profit organisation with a primary purpose of addressing homelessness through the provision of affordable rental accommodation.

In May 2013, Common Ground Adelaide submitted a proposal to the commonwealth government's National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness Development Fund with support from the South Australian government. The development fund provides capital funding for approved initiatives which are targeted at addressing the housing needs of those experiencing homelessness.

The project submitted by Common Ground was for the development of supportive housing accommodation in the central business district of Adelaide on Mellor Street. It included utilising land and non-government partner contributions to fulfil the requirement for fifty-fifty state matching of any bids. I am extremely pleased that commonwealth government approval for the project was obtained in August 2013, offering funding support of \$6.75 million.

The Mellor Street project comprises a seven-storey building which will contain 52 apartments in total, 39 one-bedroom and 13 two-bedroom units. I am advised that the ground floor will have four apartments and the other six floors will have eight apartments on each floor, three of which will be disability accessible. The project will house a combination of clients, including frail, aged, disabled, and sole parents, either already experiencing homelessness or at severe risk of homelessness due to their current housing circumstances.

On 26 September 2013, development approval was granted by the Development Assessment Commission, and on 24 December 2013, Hindmarsh Construction Australia was awarded the building contract following a tender process conducted by Common Ground. Construction commenced during February 2014, and the project is scheduled for completion during November 2014. In a demonstration of their support for this project, the Adelaide City Council agreed to sell council-owned land on lots 45 and 46 Mellor Street at the discounted price of \$1 million to the South Australian Housing Trust, which then novated its rights to Common Ground through a deed of novation.

The total estimated project cost is \$15.5 million, comprising \$1 million for the land acquisition and \$14.5 million for construction and other associated costs. This project also received approval under Shovel Ready, which is round 5 of the National Rental Affordability Scheme, to assist Common Ground in financing the costs associated with its funding contribution. Common Ground has invited me to attend a function at their Mellor Street building this month to thank all their major supporters and sponsors, and I couldn't be happier to attend.

The Mellor Street project was made possible with support from many South Australian organisations such as Santos, which not only committed funding but also people power, with a group of the company's international drilling team just yesterday volunteering to assist in readying Mellor Street for tenancy at the end of this year. This project is a shining example of the positive difference that can be achieved when the commonwealth and state governments work together with companies and not-for-profit organisations to make our communities a better place.

LICENSED VENUES

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:01): My question is to the Premier. Will the government amend regulations to enable South Australians to stand up and have a beer in proximity to a licensed venue?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:01): Why not? What an excellent idea to be able to stand up and have a beer in close proximity to a licensed premises. I think they can in certain circumstances, but I think they are limited in others. I've always found it a source of curiosity, I must say, to be standing outside a pub and then someone ticking me off about having to sit down as I've just left the front door of the King's Head. Apparently, you cannot even stand up on the rooftop bar on one of our hotels. I think that is mildly ridiculous; I agree with the honourable member. I have asked the relevant minister to review the liquor licensing laws to prevent this shocking infringement on the rights of drinkers in and around our licensed premises.

PORT ADELAIDE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:02): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house on the government's commitment to move a government department or agency down to Port Adelaide, given that this commitment was first made at the 2012 Port Adelaide by-election?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:02): I thank the leader for his question. This is an initiative that the government is very keen on. There was a market sounding event, a request for expression of interest last year, I think it was, and what came out of that process was that some government land had been identified, which wasn't previously identified, as potentially being available to the market when that EOI process was first conducted. So, in order to give people a better and more even opportunity at finding the right solution down at Port Adelaide, attention is specifically being drawn to that parcel of land for the purposes of the project which the leader mentioned.

AUSTRALIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:03): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house of the effect of the proposed federal government cuts to ABC operations in Adelaide?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:03): I was alarmed to see the speculation about cuts to funding for the ABC, especially given that the federal government had specifically—

Mr Williams: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr WILLIAMS: I'm struggling to understand what responsibility the Premier has for this—

The SPEAKER: It's a bogus point of order. The member for MacKillop will leave the house for an hour.

The honourable member for MacKillop having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It's sad that this isn't a matter of bipartisan support because this is a matter of protecting the integrity of South Australian stories being told not only to South Australians but also on a national stage. I think in the mid-1990s, there were current affairs which were locally based every night of the week in South Australia. Sadly, that was something that was abolished. There was, in fact, a rearguard action fought to retain just the one night, Friday night, of local current affairs television.

The reason this is important is not just because of the jobs that are at risk, which itself I think is a matter of concern. I think we sit now at something like 6 per cent of the ABC workforce nationally when our population share would suggest it should be higher than that. Obviously, that is an unfair distribution of resources around the nation. But it is a more important issue, and that is protecting the capacity of the national broadcaster to reflect Australia in all its diversity to the nation.

At the moment, we have a very Sydney-centric ABC and the truth is Australia is not a uniform cultural experience. There are important regional differences that need to find their expression and, if they don't find their expression through our national broadcaster, where will they find their expression? An example that I gave on radio the other morning I think is a really powerful one. We are bombarded with images out of Western Sydney about the state of relations between Muslim and

non-Muslim Australians which do not reflect the state of relations between Muslim and non-Muslim Australians in South Australia.

In fact, we should be proud of the multicultural community we have established. In fact, we should be a pattern for the nation so, rather than these stories being presented as truthful, they are not truthful for South Australia but they are the images that come through the national bulletins and they are the images that come through the national current affairs arrangements, so it is only in a very small way at the end of the week we get to redress that balance with great stories like the one that was shown about a month ago on the 7.30 report.

It doesn't just rest there. The truth is that the Sydney-centric ABC editorial analysis is that South Australian stories only get up on the national bulletin when they fit into a stereotype about South Australia—macabre murder, rust-bucket state, whatever is in the mindset. I have to say, the mindset of the rest of the nation about South Australia is fundamentally—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's a very good idea, a Q&A based—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Mr Speaker, there is something important about the South Australian story. It is different. It should be represented. South Australians should see stories about themselves on their own local media. That is why we strongly support the retention of the resources here in South Australia to tell these stories.

PORT ADELAIDE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:08): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Does the government remain committed to moving 7,500 square metres of government office space to Port Adelaide and, if so, when does the minister envisage that this will take place?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:08): I think our commitment was to move 500 public servants down there. As for the square metreage, I would have to take that on advice. The figure of 7,500, off the top of my head, does ring a bell but it will depend on what solution is provided by the private sector in providing a building which is capable of housing that many public servants.

I should add, as a bit of background for this, that I am advised reliably by a very active local member for Port Adelaide that this was an initiative which came out of a very large public consultation which occurred in October 2012. Along with other ideas such as the refurbishment of the precinct around Hart's Mill, improving parking and the traffic treatments on St Vincent Street, improving parking and traffic treatments on Commercial Road, and improving some of the heritage buildings such as the Visitor Information Centre and also Customs House, these projects, funded by government (some jointly, in part, by the City of Port Adelaide Enfield) demonstrate a very strong commitment to the Port and also to the precincts which surround the Inner Harbour of Port Adelaide. That has been an ongoing focus of this government. We demonstrated that through—

The SPEAKER: I think the minister has more than adequately answered the question.

PORT ADELAIDE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:09): A supplementary, sir: have tenderers for the expression of interest in this project been informed that this government project has been put on indefinite hold?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:09): That is not my understanding that the project has been put on hold at all. What I explained in my first response to this series of questions from the leader is that there has been a change in focus about how this project is to be delivered. Perhaps another way of asking that

question for the leader might have been to ask whether the original proponents or the original respondents to that EOI process have been informed about the availability of that land. I do not have that information in front of me. I will take that on notice and come back to the parliament.

Ministerial Statement

SITE CONTAMINATION, CLOVELLY PARK AND MITCHELL PARK

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:10): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to site contamination in Clovelly and Mitchell Park made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation.

Grievance Debate

WIRELESS ROAD-PENOLA ROAD INTERSECTION

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:11): I rise today to talk about the Wireless Road-Penola Road intersection in my electorate, which is rated by the RAA as the riskiest intersection in South Australia. This issue has gone unresolved for almost 10 years now, and I am the local member representing a community that is demanding a solution to be found.

Traffic volume estimates according to DPTI in March 2014 show 10,800 vehicles per day along the Penola Road and Jubilee Highway intersection and between 9,600 between Wireless Road and Allison Street. According to RAA traffic counts, we are getting close to triggering government set warrants. The issue is that many people avoid that intersection due to the risky nature as outlined previously. RAA Senior Road Safety Manager Charles Mountain said his main concern was that there was inadequate crossing or turning opportunities and also flagged poor visibility as there is a rise in the road coming up to this intersection.

This intersection is of great concern to me, and I have taken it up with the Minister for Transport who has kindly called a meeting and we have had a very brief meeting on this. In addition, there are over 700 signatures sitting on my desk in Mount Gambier in the form of a petition indicating that something needs to be done to rectify this intersection. I note that the Minister for Transport has indicated that he will be down in the South-East before the end of this year and I am hoping that holds true going forward where we can work together to look at some solution to this notorious intersection.

I also want to praise the new mayor of Mount Gambier. His name is Andrew Lee. Andrew Lee is of Hong Kong descent and led a good campaign through doorknocking and face-to-face interaction. Andrew has been on council for four years and felt that he owes a debt to Mount Gambier and the community due to the wonderful life that he and his family have had in our region. Mr Lee left Hong Kong in June 1998 when he applied to live in Australia to pursue a better life for himself and his family.

Two years later Mr Lee moved to Mount Gambier where he established his own restaurant, the Mandarin Restaurant. Although apprehensive about starting his own business, he has received great support from our community and has raised his three girls: Vivian, a psychiatrist; Vanessa, a bank consultant; and Vernice, a lawyer. Mr Lee has contributed a lot to our community, and I would like to publicly acknowledge him for the work he has done and the offer of working together in the near future for our community.

On the same note, I would also like to acknowledge our elected councillors: Steve Perryman, who is our former mayor; Penny Richardson, who has been re-elected, together with Ian Von Stanke, Hanna Persello and Des Mutton. I welcome new councillors Frank Morello, Sonya Mezinac, Christian Greco, Josh Lynagh and Mark Lovett.

Our election campaigns for the council of Mount Gambier were unprecedented. Eight people nominated for mayor and over 15 nominated for council positions, and it shows that there are a lot of people interested in serving our community and getting involved, and I congratulate all those people who took the time to nominate. Even though they were unsuccessful, their contribution was greatly appreciated. With that, I close my remarks.

VOLUNTEERS

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:16): Often in the past, I have been asked by people what is, in my view, Australia's most significant and important piece of infrastructure. I have always responded by saying that our most important piece of infrastructure is our natural environment. As a species, it sustains us and it sustains every species in this country and indeed on the planet. Of course, our welfare and wellbeing as a species are inextricably linked to the welfare and wellbeing of the environment in which we and other species live.

I have also been asked: what other pieces of infrastructure are there? I do not necessarily like referring to humans in this way, but our next most important piece of infrastructure is our population—the people of Australia, those people who work in a small way, but collectively in a huge way, to make sure that this country remains at the forefront with respect to the delivery of a quality of life and standard of living that are the envy of many other parts of the world.

Importantly, within that component of human infrastructure that makes sure that our place operate better than it otherwise would—our place called Australia and, indeed, in this instance, South Australia—is the role of volunteers. Recently, I have seen a press release from minister Bettison highlighting the continuation of those many South Australians who volunteer and freely give up their time to contribute to our community.

The most recent survey that was undertaken and promulgated on volunteering in South Australia shows that about 900,000 people are volunteering annually across this state, and I pay tribute to each and every one of those people who make an outstanding contribution to our community. But in this instance what I want to highlight is an initiative undertaken by the Minister for Education, Jennifer Rankine, in ensuring that every school in South Australia will have available to it a plaque to acknowledge an outstanding volunteer in their school.

That award is called an Award for Outstanding Volunteer Service and is going to schools, preschools and kindergartens. I was lucky enough only yesterday to drop off half a dozen plaques at some schools and preschools in my electorate and, of course, I still have another bundle that I am going to be fortunate to deliver to the schools and in turn be able to recognise those volunteers who are determined by their schools as being outstanding in the contributions they have made to their school and their school community.

This is a terrific initiative, and it is aimed to be an annual award and to formally recognise the efforts of one outstanding volunteer each year, as well as to allow the minister and broader community to publicly thank them for their work. An engraved plaque has been arranged for each school to display the name of the recipient. As I said, I delivered half a dozen yesterday, and I look forward to delivering personally the rest of those at some functions that the schools will undertake.

It must be very difficult for the schools to recognise only one volunteer, and I know that in some instances they will look at a collective because there are so many people within our community who contribute in so many different ways through volunteering within our education system. As I said, I congratulate minister Rankine on this fantastic initiative. It is great to recognise the immensely positive contribution volunteers make to children and students in our community.

We have had a fantastic response from the schools in our community. Recipients include long-serving couples helping out in canteens, and with maintenance, to young people aspiring to work 'one day' in early childhood education. It has been lovely for me to hear the stories of how valued and appreciated volunteers are by teachers in my electorate, by other members of our community within our electorate and, indeed, the entire school community.

The upcoming presentations at several schools to formally present and acknowledge this year's recipients is something I am looking forward to over the next couple of weeks. It is always a busy time for local members at this time of the year, particularly those who have a lot of schools in their electorate. I am planning on further recognising recipients in the *Colton Connection*, my newsletter, as we all have a newsletter, and I will be recognising each of those recipients in the next issue that goes out to the people of Colton, and playing my part in recognising the contribution and importance of the volunteers and the role they play within our community.

I would like to finish off by saying that this is a fantastic initiative from minister Rankine, and I congratulate her on this initiative. More importantly, I thank her for allowing a mechanism whereby we can thank the volunteers who operate within our schools, kindergartens and preschools.

CAMPBELLTOWN ROTARY OUTBACK EXPERIENCE

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:21): I rise to inform members about the existence and success of CROE, the Campbelltown Rotary Outback Experience, which has just completed its fifth adventure. It is a fundraiser for charity and the fifth CROE raised \$40,000 for the Royal Flying Doctor Service, \$6,000 for Angel Flight and \$8,000 for Australian Rotary Health.

These five events have been run as an eight-day mystery adventure into the outback, with up to 39 participants and 15 vehicles at a time from the Campbelltown Rotary Club and friends experiencing extraordinary things in the outback. They are the brainchild of Rotarian Mal Hansen and his wife, Val. They have been organised and run by Mal and Val with the assistance of a small group of Rotarians, including the late David Tuckwell who played a large part in organising the first three.

All meals, accommodation and entertainment have been provided for the group by those areas visited, who very often donated the cost of such provisions to a charity of their choice or back to CROE for the Royal Flying Doctor Service. Initially, the idea was to take city folk out of their comfort zone, show them our wonderful outback and to raise funds for the RFDS, but over the years many participants have returned to do it all again.

At this stage, at the completion of the five events in 2004, 2006, 2010, 2012 and 2014, over \$347,000 has been raised and spent through CROE, with \$146,625 being donated to the RFDS, \$13,500 to the Rotary Foundation, \$17,500 to Australian Rotary Health, and \$6,000 to Angel Flight. In addition, \$112,000 has been left in the outback for the provision of food, accommodation and entertainment and an estimated \$52,000 paid out for fuel—a wonderful outcome and a significant contribution to those local economies.

The five CROEs have taken participants to many places and remote towns, such as: Tibooburra, Innamincka, Kingoonya, Maree and Marla. Historical places visited included Anlaby, Milparinka, the Loveday Internment Camp, Mirikata, Woomera, and Loxton Historical Village. Stations visited and enjoyed have included Quondong, Sturt's Meadow, Theldarpa, Erudina, Edeowie, Clayton, Welbourn Hill, Billa Kalina, Wirrealpa and Alpana. Lakes visited include Lake Bonney, Torrens, Everard, Sturt, Eyre and Cadibarrawirracanna.

Members interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: I think I need to have a chat to the person who put some of these notes together! The tracks travelled on have included the Strzelecki, Birdsville, Oodnadatta, Borefield and old Stuart Highway. The ranges explored have included Flinders, Gammon, Gawler and Benlaby. Aboriginal Communities provided meals and entertainment at Mimili and Iga Warta. The mining towns toured have included Roxby, Andamooka, Leigh Creek, Moomba, Mintabie and Coober Pedy. They have enjoyed Flinders, Danggali, Gawler Ranges, Dutchmans Stern and the Sturt national parks.

Participants have been catered for by numerous organisations and establishments, including sports clubs at Thevenard, Minnipa and Carrieton; the hospital auxiliaries of Hawker, Booleroo Centre and Cleve; the Maree, Blinman and Yunta progress associations; and the Rotary clubs of Roxby District, Broken Hill South, and Northern Yorke Peninsula. The Campbelltown Rotarians, of course, did some of their own meal provision, which is to be expected.

They were catered for at the highest town in South Australia (Blinman) and underground at the Serbian church in Coober Pedy. Other organisations have benefitted from the CROE trips, including the Nature Foundation, Isolated Children's Parent's Association, the RFDS (as previously described), School of the Air and Bush Australia. Those are just a few of the great experiences and places visited by dozens of Campbelltown Rotarians and also Rotarians from Magill Sunrise, Blackwood, Berri, Waikerie, Encounter Bay, Melbourne, Drouin, Frankston East and, indeed, a visiting Rotarian from Malaysia also participated in the Campbelltown Rotary Outback Experience.

There have been difficulties along the way. CROE2 in 2006 was organised and run while Mal and Val Hansen's daughter underwent treatment for leukaemia and CROE4 in 2012 was undertaken as Mal was undergoing treatment for oesophageal and prostate cancers. Both Mal and Val were very passionate about CROE and the communities and charities that they supported, so they strived to make them a success despite those personal challenges.

Campbelltown's Rotarians have driven through dust, mud, rivers, creeks, mountains and plains. Beds have been provided for those who have needed one, generally in shearer's quarters, but many participants camped in their tents and swags. Entertainment was provided by Peter Coad and the Coad Sisters, John O'Dea, Jasmine Kimber, Tiffney Reynolds, the Loxton Lutheran Band and our own participants.

As a member of the Campbelltown Rotary Club, as is the member for Hartley, I am very proud of their achievements and the support they have given to so many communities. I recognise in particular the organisers of the five CROE events.

CRY FOR HELP PROGRAM

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (15:26): It was my absolute privilege last night to attend the official launch of Anglicare's Cry for Help program at the beautiful St Peter's Cathedral. Cry for Help is essentially a holistic counselling program aimed at preventing suicide by engaging both the person attempting suicide and their family, colleagues and close friends, around the time of the first attempt. As the Reverend Peter Sandeman (who some of us here may know) noted in his introduction:

Suicide doesn't just affect the person making the attempt. It has a social, emotional and financial effect on their loved ones—friends, family and the entire community.

This was also the view expressed by Jackie Howard, General Manager, Active Living for Anglicare. She explained some of the background to the program, and I will paraphrase her quite extensively. I hope I do not misrepresent her in any way because her speech was quite inspiring. The Cry for Help program was born out of Anglicare's Living Beyond Suicide program, which was designed to offer support and guidance to the families and loved ones of those who have committed suicide. The program heard time and time again that early on, when their loved ones made their first attempts to take their own lives, they did not know where to turn for help. Either that or they chose to try to ignore it as a coping mechanism, put it behind them and accept their loved ones' assurances that they were just going through a bad patch and it would not happen again.

Obviously, the overwhelming message that Anglicare got through this program was that, if they could go back (that is, the client's family and friends), they would have done things very differently. They universally expressed the view that any first attempt should be taken seriously and that they wished they knew where to turn to and who to speak to at the time. Obviously, a lot of those people felt a lot of shame and guilt about not acting with the wisdom of hindsight. But again, obviously and tragically, you cannot go back and so recognising those first signs is so important.

So, the concept of Cry for Help was born. Anglicare began the concept by approaching the Flinders Medical Centre to establish a partnership and program which would define itself by taking the first attempt at suicide seriously enough to act decisively and immediately, not only with the individual concerned but with the friends and family and, in some cases, co-workers and work contacts of that individual, with the ultimate aim of building confidence and resilience and support networks so that, hopefully, that first attempt is indeed the last.

Under this program, once a person who has made their first suicide attempt is discharged from the Flinders Medical Centre emergency department, Anglicare will have already been in touch with them. They will have worked with the individual—who for shorthand I might just refer to as 'the client' I think—to identify who the key support people and networks for that person are. They will have spent enough time with the client to find out what sort of intervention and resources they may need, whether it is home visits, phone calls, other social interaction or other resources. Anglicare has also worked to establish partnerships with other agencies to meet identified needs for both clients and their supports. For example:

- provision of support through listening and other types of companionship;

- education and information on managing the risks and triggers for suicide, including working on suicide risk plans;
- information for loved ones on what to expect, how to handle suicidal people and how to ensure their own safety;
- providing contact with peers and also, importantly, with those who have experienced a suicide attempt in the past;
- the provision of links with professional and community services and a basic case management service to ensure that suitable follow-up has occurred. There is an understanding that no system is perfect and that some services do have significant waiting periods. Anglicare seeks to fill that gap and provide support while clients are waiting for more specialised services; and
- Anglicare, of course, as it has always done, advocates on behalf of clients when for whatever reason services do not seem to be being provided as quickly or as efficiently as they might.

There are also the very practical issues that clients and their families and loved ones need at times like this, and the Cry for Help program tries to address some of these needs that traditional services may not. This may be as simple as telling the boss that you might need some time off to deal with childcare or other issues. It might include financial planning, parenting programs, and directions on how they may get more involved community activities to deal with loneliness and disconnectedness.

Finally, among the other guests, including former governor Kevin Scarce (who of course is an Elizabeth boy who has gone on to be the Chancellor of Adelaide University) and the Leader of the Opposition, it was also really good to see the Hon. John Dawkins from another place in attendance. Credit where credit is due: Mr Dawkins has been a long-time and passionate advocate for suicide prevention and a supporter of this program from its inception, as well as a supporter of the MATES in Construction initiative, which provides suicide prevention training right across the construction and mining industry. I urge all members to familiarise themselves with the great work that Anglicare is doing.

GOYDER ELECTORATE

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:31): I commend the member for Little Para on his grievance; it is a very important issue. I wish to speak about something a little bit happier today: history that has occurred in the electorate of Goyder. On the past two Sundays, I have had the great pleasure of attending events at Dublin and Mallala where issues of historical significance have been recognised, and I want to pay tribute to the communities and groups that have made that possible.

On 9 November, we attended a solemn ceremony to recognise the 21 young men from Dublin and the surrounding area who served in World War I and did not return. While 100 years ago is an enormous time, most of those men still have family members residing in the area, and the decision had been made to have a physical demonstration of remembrance for those people and the sacrifice they made by way of a tree planting. It was a bit more than that; the trees were quite mature in size, and I commend them on what they had done.

We had representatives from various religious groups, such as the Salvation Army, there to speak and offer their thoughts. One really solemn moment occurred after the afternoon tea, and people in the area who had family who passed in World War I were invited to read some of the letters from the boys. You could sense the absolute—and I use the word loosely—excitement in their words about the thought of travel and going off to defend Australia and to be involved in a conflict that they had no comprehension of what the impact was going to be.

We all know, with sadness, what actually did result, but the mood change existed throughout. Some of them were rather long letters, and they talked about the boat trip over there, being at Gallipoli and on the Western Front, the change of thought of, 'God, what have I got myself into?' and what the impact was going to be on themselves and the friends around them. All of these people did not return.

Indeed, there was a lot of emotion on the day, and I do not think it is stretching the facts to say that every family member who stood there and read a letter was crying at the end of it. While

they are not directly connected anymore, they paid their respects to their family members and the sacrifices they made. The hall was full and everyone listened very solemnly, and paid their respects.

Mr Ian Telfer is the chair of the Dublin History Group. I have had an association with the group for around eight years, primarily driven by Mrs Pat Thompson, who is an outstanding worker for that community. They have invigorated the place enormously, and it is a wonderful full-time display of the sacrifices made and the innovative things that have been done in the community over the last 150 years. I go there every chance I get, but Sunday 9 November was a special day. I commend them on what they have done.

I have written a support letter on their behalf for a Community Event of the Year Award as part of the District Council of Mallala's Australia Day celebrations, and I do sincerely wish them well, because they deserve to be acknowledged for what they do, not just in the last year or for that last event but for what I have seen them do in the last eight years, and probably for the last 15 years that they have been in operation.

The second event I wish to talk about was held at the Mallala Museum last Sunday. It was part of an operation previously known by the East family, where equipment was manufactured. In the paint shop, as it was identified, the local Lions Club had built two rooms to show what it was like to exist in a regional community during the First World War. They had spent 590 hours of volunteer time to construct the rooms and then it was fitted out and it was an additional exhibition space opportunity.

The East family was there in strength from all over the state, and it allowed them to come together and understand what their own forebears had done in the past. It was a great opportunity also to pay respects to Mr Ray Earl. Ray has been president for 25 years of the some 43 years of the operation of the Mallala Museum committee, and he retired only last week after being a foundation member of the committee and serving it wonderfully in that time. I was given the great honour of presenting him with his framed photo of the museum and his certificate from the Minister for Volunteers, I believe it was.

It was another great day and an example of how, when a community comes together, it can provide a forum for those of us who are travelling through or do not live there full-time and do not know the history of what has occurred in that community to pay our respects and to be excited about what it has done. Mallala, for those who do not know, is significant for the racetrack that is there, which was formerly the air training facility during World War II, so a large focus of the museum is on that air training facility. There are interactive videos, uniforms on display, the history of the area; some amazing things are being developed there. I pay tribute to Mr Marcus Strudwicke, the chair, and all associated with all the museums in the electorate. Well done.

EDWARDSTOWN PRIMARY SCHOOL

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (15:36): I would like to speak today about a well-patronised community event that occurs in my electorate annually. With spring well upon us, we saw the Edwardstown Primary School Strawberry Fair making the most of the fantastic weather. The strawberry fair sees people from miles around flock to this extremely popular and free event. The school and its oval are packed with families having a great day out and enjoying the great weather, with loads of fun and things to do for all ages.

Each November the school community comes together on a Sunday to enjoy the excitement and exhilaration of a fair filled with something for everyone. The strawberry fair brings all ages together and offers a chance to eat, drink, dance, be entertained, buy a basket or put your feet up with a cappuccino. Visitors can follow the strawberry trail, which takes you to all points of the fair and introduces you to the fun, food and frolicking involved in Edwardstown Primary's Strawberry Fair.

The school's first strawberry fair was held on 24 October 1982, and it continues to be organised by a subcommittee of the school council, which includes staff and parents. Glenys de Wit, Edwardstown Primary School's finance officer, has been involved in 30 of the school's 32 fairs. She says that the fair has not just grown every year; it has also become better and better, year after year, and is now a well-known event to the locals. This year it was held on Sunday 2 November.

On this fun day, the oval and courts are transformed into a riot of colour and activity. There are stalls selling numerous goods of books and home wares to gifts, cakes and jewellery. There are games to keep the children busy and food stalls that offer delicious lunch and snack foods. The café and a bar cater for those seeking a change of pace, with a wonderful Devonshire tea of delicious homemade scones and refreshments garnished with strawberries, both being popular favourites, while for all fairgoers there is vibrant and ongoing entertainment that everyone can enjoy.

It is always a big day with a great community feel, which is helped by the number of volunteers from the school, local churches and other community groups. Old scholars, past teachers and neighbours all make appearances and enjoy the camaraderie. Also deserving of recognition are principal Suzanne Clark and deputy principal Kathy Papps, whose tireless work, commitment and passion contribute to the success of this event.

The strawberry fair is the school's biggest fundraiser of the year, with funds supporting important programs and facilities for the school. This year, the fair raised \$33,000, which went towards the activity hall loan. With the ongoing support of local residents who come year after year to the event, every year the funds raised increase.

The school currently has 360 students from reception to year 7. There is a broad range of socioeconomic and cultural diversity amongst the student population, adding to the richness of the school community. The strawberry fair has enabled schoolchildren's learning to flourish in many direct and indirect ways. The fair has provided a venue for students to display their skills and talents. It has provided an opportunity for students to perform in front of large audiences; plan, establish and operate stalls at the fair; and showcase their literacy and numeracy skills through operation of successful stalls. These real life, innovative and fun activities provide opportunities for students in a supportive environment which complement and facilitate further learning while teaching them the value of community.

It takes an enormous amount of work and commitment to ensure the strawberry fair is the featured highlight of not only the school but, indeed, the local community. It makes it so much more satisfying knowing that fun and friendships are forged through active participation of an event such as this. I always thoroughly enjoy this local event as it is a warm and inclusive community event. Anyone can walk into this fair and feel part of it. It is well thought out, well run, well managed and well attended thanks to the hard work of parents, teachers and students alike. I thoroughly recommend this event. It is one not to be missed.

Bills

STAMP DUTIES (OFF-THE-PLAN APARTMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:40): We were having a bit of debate before we adjourned about the population of Adelaide about 100 years ago and I was relying on information passed to me while I was speaking, whether reliable or unreliable. At last I can now say that I believe it to have been that in 1915 the population of Adelaide was around 46,000.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Someone said 100,000, didn't they?

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, someone did, but I will just place that on the record now. I do not think it was a hanging offence to put that other one up.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not know. That was misleading the house.

Mr PEDERICK: I am correcting the record and from memory—and the *Hansard* can be checked—I did say that I was advised. What I was saying before the break was that we do not have anything like that population in central Adelaide at the moment and I believe there is certainly lots of scope for room if that is the way you want to live.

Obviously for someone like me who comes from the country, living in a small apartment in a block of flats would not be my idea of a lifestyle, but for some people it is ideal, especially with regard to double income no kids (DINKs) and professionals. These days a lot of professional people and

their partners work and they are keen to save money and put things away for when they change their lifestyle into the future. It certainly suits many people but, as I said, it would not be for me.

What we see nowadays, not just with apartment living but in urban living and in larger towns, is that a lot of the blocks are subdivided into smaller and smaller blocks where you see houses with very limited garden, if any at all. In fact, in some areas there is barely enough room to park a spare car on the lawn, but that is the way we are.

I think as a population in South Australia—especially people who are living in the more urbanised centres and the larger towns as well—we are busy. With many couples, I should say, both people work and so people do not have too much spare time on their hands. I do applaud the people who still like living in the broader areas and also the ones who have the older traditional style of urban living, but when the quarter-acre block can be subdivided into four blocks or more at some stages, it is a different arrangement.

Under this bill, the extended area of the stamp duty concession will apply to developments within Adelaide City Council, Bowden, and Park 45 Gilberton, as well as around the inner metropolitan area bounded by Regency Road, Hampstead Road, Portrush Road, Cross Road, Marion Road, Holbrooks Road, East Avenue and Kilkenny Road. If you look at the bill, it is mapped out quite clearly for people to see.

One interesting thing I note from the minister's second reading speech is that the extended area also includes sites that are contiguous to the boundary of that area; for example, it will include sites on both sides of the bordering roads. I think that if I was on the other side of any of those roads I would be getting good advice to make sure I was getting the stamp duty concession. The minister may like to help us out with that during his closing remarks.

I note the Housing Industry Association have indicated that they welcome any stamp duty relief, and they would like to see that extended to other areas. They also indicated that multi-unit apartments make up only around one quarter of new constructions and that conditions in the building industry are quite tough at the moment. I think, as has been outlined throughout the notes, that this will allow for more of a mix of commercial and residential developments to these targeted areas in the inner city, and that is why this is being extended to areas close to the centre of Adelaide.

Applications for these eligible off-the-plan apartments within the extended boundary are currently being submitted to RevenueSA to be paid by way of ex gratia payment until the Stamp Duties (Off-the-plan Apartments) Amendment Bill 2014 comes into operation. I figure the government thought there would not be too much trouble getting this bill through the house to become an act. In speaking to the bill, I note that we support the bill and note that it does come at a cost to the government. I hope that developers do not take it into their sights, that just because they know that people are getting stamp duty relief they add that to the cost of construction, so in the end the purchaser does not really win. I hope that does not happen.

Certainly, in close urban planning this works really, really well. I think as a state we really need to look at our housing developments to make sure that with urban sprawl we do not keep building on the state's best prime agricultural land. The city will extend from Aldinga and Seaford all the way up to Freeling. The country around Gawler and Freeling I know fairly well because both sets of grandparents came from that way. It is a shame to see that land being developed as it is, whereas I think there are some far better opportunities in different areas.

One place that I have been championing in here is the Gifford Hill development at Murray Bridge, with the racecourse project which, apart from the racecourse facilities, will unlock 3½ thousand housing sites on that area and up to 500 more on other areas closely associated with that project in the Murray Bridge area. The new Murray Bridge council will be looking at plans into the future. Before it went into caretaker mode, with the local government elections, the council was having a very good look at what areas could be developed if Gifford Hill does not go ahead. I think we really need to have a look. We have seen the debacle at Mount Barker—and it was a debacle—with development going in and services still catching up. We note the Bald Hills interchange is finally going to go in one day—thanks to the federal government—and we just need to have things planned a lot better.

I look at areas in my electorate like Murray Bridge where you are an hour from the centre of the city, with very good value-for-money housing and it is very quick to get into Adelaide central on the freeway. I know a lot of people do that: they get value-for-money housing in Murray Bridge and travel into the city.

In regard to other housing and planning and looking at the development of not just the city but the state, there needs to be a lot more work done on where the better spots are to house the growing population, and we need a growing population to develop the economic base so that we can get the right outcomes for this state into the future. I certainly think in regard to this bill, even though it does come at a cost to the state—and, hopefully, some of that will be recouped in other rates and taxes that people who will live in the apartments will pay—it will open up a real opportunity for Adelaide to get a more thriving populace here and make Adelaide an even better place than it already is. With those few words, I commend the bill.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:51): I rise to speak on the Stamp Duties (Off-the-plan Apartments) Amendment Bill 2014 and indicate that I will be the lead speaker for the opposition. As has been suggested by other speakers, the opposition will support this bill. It is not without criticism, and I have criticised this program before, not because it offers relief to those who are proposing to invest in off-the-plan apartments within the metropolitan area (within a more restricted area as applied up until 1 June but now we will be expanding it under this bill), but because it is not universal. It is not across South Australia. It is not even across the whole metropolitan area.

I have been critical of that in the past, and I have also been critical of the fact that it is curious to me that I think the biggest single beneficiary of this type of legislation is not just those who may avail themselves of some stamp duty relief as a concession within this geographical area, but the owner of property within this area (which is owned by the South Australian government) is significant, very significant. With the expansion of the boundary under this bill, it will be so even more, and I want to refer to that in a moment.

The revenue that is lost as a result of these types of initiatives is actually very much less than what had been budgeted for when it was announced several years ago and, again, that gives an opportunity for, I suppose, that saving to be better utilised to continue to make this benefit available. As I point out, it is a stamp duty concession of which the state government is the biggest beneficiary.

The Stamp Duties Act 1923 itself essentially makes provision that certain instruments, namely, documents, are stampable and that a duty applies to them, worked out on the basis of the value of the consideration of the transaction in the document. It is something we have had for a very long time. It is a very significant income earner for the state, and it applies, as we used to say at law school, on just about everything except the letter to your mother. Anything in writing, pretty much, is stampable except certain exceptions, and certain concessions are allowed in a schedule of concessions under the legislation.

I should go back to say that a couple of years ago the government introduced this concessional stamp duty relief for off-the-plan apartments within the city plus the Bowden and Gilberton zones, if I can describe them as that. The Bowden zone covered a major government development, the Bowden Village on the old Clipsal site in the north-west precinct just off Port Road. The Gilberton site was earmarked already for a development which has limped along a bit since, but I am assured by various developers who have interests in it that it is going along pretty well for the sale of apartments there.

The government had decided not just to say, 'We want to support the vibrant city and increase population within the city square but we are going to add on two little bits that suit us.' Why? Because they want to fast-track the sales for a property at Gilberton and they certainly want to get some stimulus into what was otherwise a staggeringly slow cumbersome development of the government. By that stage, I think something like \$100 million of taxpayers' money had been already spent on that site to prepare it for development, and the government was desperate to try to recover some money for it.

They provide these little initiatives, concessions as it were, I think to hasten their own sales. Remember that the government had got into the business itself of building apartments as a result of

the nation-building money, the stimulus money that the government had showered us all with. Some of it had gone to some good projects, some of it had gone to some shocking projects like pink batts and school buildings and all sorts of things that were a disaster but, in relation to applying money to give the opportunity for people to build apartments, the government got into the apartment-building business big time.

Where did they build them? They built them in the city of Adelaide. Unsurprisingly, in 2012, when it wants to tell the world that it is going to do this great new thing of giving a concessional advantage, guess what? It gives a big concessional advantage to itself—a very significant and I would suggest the single biggest owner of assets within the precinct that we are talking about. Having done that, they said this would be a stamp duty concession. It was capped, payable on up to a \$500,000 apartment, and there were partial concessions over the next two years.

In October last year, the government announced the policy was to revitalise the inner metro area, allowing up to 18,500 new homes. The government announced that it would then extend the stamp duty relief for off-the-plan apartment sales to rezoned inner metropolitan areas. Again, this would offer a saving to the public. It was all pre-election. It was all the hype around how we were going to expand the boundary of this and now take it out to the area bordered by Cross Road, Portrush Road, Regency Road in the north, and essentially along Marion Road and Holbrooks Road in the west. That is quite a significant expansion.

It is a very big area, now from the state electorate of Bragg, Norwood, in the state seat of Adelaide, West Torrens—the Treasurer's electorate gets a big kick-along there—and the seats of Ashford and Unley. I will skip over the Treasurer's electorate and the benefit it has to his constituents, although he might have thought he was under a bit of pressure before the last election, so he might have needed to prop up his vote out there. In any event, I have absolutely no doubt whatsoever about what was being propped up in the seat of Ashford.

While I mention Anzac Highway, where development plans have been done and amended to provide for development, I got a report today under FOI in respect of the Wayville train station. It had a staggering number of people who were going to the Wayville train station in the last two years—a daily pickup of some 300 people a day. Can you believe it? We have just spent I do not know how many tens of millions of dollars on a new station for such a small number. I concede that it will probably increase a bit. There is always the show—you have to add this extra provision for the show.

But let me say that this report, now it has finally been disclosed of course, tells me that what it is hoping to do is to have a major development down in the Ashford area on the Keswick site, which I actually think is a very good idea. There are lots of good transport initiatives right next to it—Anzac Highway, trains, trams, beautiful new stops—and you have proximity to the city, you have proximity to parks. It is a brilliant area to develop except that the federal government owns it, so unless it is actually going to become available for development for housing, that sort of infrastructure build down there is, frankly, a bit of a waste at this point.

Nevertheless, I detract from the importance of what was happening here. Prior to the election, the government wanted to say, 'Yes, we're still into vibrant cities. We're still into bringing people into the city, but now we're going to expand it around. We're now going to talk about providing that benefit to a whole lot of inner metro areas.' Guess where one of the other big property sites is? Of course, along Greenhill Road, Housing Trust—owned by the government. Then there is that magnificent Caroma site, which was bought under the former infrastructure minister Patrick Conlon.

We have very significant asset purchases by the government within the metropolitan area of the city square itself. They are big investors in this. They are the ones, of course, who are going to be the greatest beneficiaries of whatever stimulus comes from this initiative, so I am not under any illusion as to who is really the beneficiary here. I am just hopeful that those out in the real world who are investing their money in an attempt to have some benefit and provide stimulus to the general economy will at least get some benefit. We are not opposing it, but I point out who is actually getting the stamp duty relief in a huge lick.

The other thing is that the expiry date for this is 30 June, so we need to deal with this bill to be able to cover the ex gratia payments that the government has been giving to people, as I understand it, either as some benefit up or as a refund to enable them to continue to have the benefit

of this. Obviously, the legislation needs to be dealt with. I am not sure whether it could have been dealt with by regulation or whether, in fact, the ex gratia payment that it is currently giving is under regulation. All I know is that obviously we were at least advised that it needs some legislative cover to provide for the legitimate relief that has been offered to those who have benefited under this scheme as of 30 June 2014—so, over the last four months.

Industry generally in the housing sector obviously welcomes something like this because it does mean that they have some chance to have some stimulus in the lower end of the market. It does not help those who are trying to build houses or rebuild or upgrade or sell property that is already developed, but at least in this small niche of under \$500,000 apartments, as I say, it provides some relief.

Whilst the government has a 70:30 brownfield-greenfield development policy within its 30-year plan—and I do not have any objections to that—my biggest concern is that the government keeps saying they will support some greenfield in their 30-year plan and, next thing, when something like the proposal at Roseworthy comes along, they just want to crush it because it is politically expedient to do so in an election campaign. After stringing developers along for a couple of years, they just say, 'No, we don't need it; we've got 15 years' supply of available land for greenfield development, so go away. We're not interested in approving your proposal.'

The reality is that they do make these decisions and provide these incentives and you can bet your bottom dollar that, when they do, it is for their benefit directly as it is in this case and indirectly if they are able to stimulate other people, real people, to invest in these projects. Then they want to be able to get the land tax and the benefit of all the other costs of developing a dwelling and then living in it. Unlike previous governments which, since the Hon. David Tonkin's day, have protected the right to be able to live in your own house without paying land tax, the Treasurer's great new initiative for this last budget is to give us a backdoor land tax and give them a huge whack when it comes to their own home.

I think that is shameful, because the government was not even up-front prior to the election to allow for it, to actually tell the people of South Australia that it was going to tax people to live in their own home, which is a disgusting approach given the commitment the government says it has to South Australians. Not only that but with the cars that everyone is driving around, most people have not even got their renewal of registration yet. Wait until they get it and find the emergency services levy on that.

So the tsunami is coming on this and I am only thankful that our Leader of the Opposition has had the initiative to come into this parliament and say that, for all of the appeals, for all of the reviews that we are going to have to have on emergency services levy assessments—whether it is on aggregates or whether it is on the assessment or whether it is on the categories on which the emergency services levy is to apply—we must have a review process, an appeal process, different from going off to the Supreme Court at great cost, and be able to have an accessible and affordable review process, and he was instrumental in bringing that to the parliament.

The government finally agreed to take up the valuation review on that, and our leader has taken up the initiative to present to parliament that all of the reviews in respect of this area be able to have an expedient process of appeal, which they richly deserve, especially given the government's disgraceful approach in hitting the people. Do not be fooled by this government who comes in here and gives some relief on this basis. It is like saying, 'We are going to give you a new asset or we are going to give you something that you can thank us for, and then we are going to rape and pillage you for the rest of your life on that asset.'

Do not be fooled by this. It is a small relief, it is a start. We do not say no to some tax relief but, on its current form, it is inequitable in not applying to all South Australians. All South Australians should have the right to be able to acquire a property with some stamp duty relief, not just those chosen few who the government is trying to stimulate to come and buy one of their apartments.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (16:07): Broadly, today I will speak in support of the Stamp Duties (Off-the-plan Apartments) Amendment Bill. I will support the bill, firstly, because I think it is necessary to support a struggling construction sector. We have heard comments from the Property Council of Australia recently in support of this, but one thing I will note from the report that I have in front of me

from 2010-11 is that the property industry is South Australia's largest private sector industry adding \$8.1 billion to the state's economy in 2010-11.

It generates 10 per cent of the state's gross economic product and, of even greater importance, the property sector is also the state's second largest employer after the public sector, employing 73,000 South Australians. I have them in my electorate and, if they are not their own proprietors, they are employing people. I talk to these small to medium business owners, especially in the construction sector, and they are all struggling at the moment. The margins are thin, the work is slowing down and we need to support them, and so I will certainly support any incentive that gets behind the struggling construction sector.

Secondly, as the member for Schubert pointed out, I believe this is also going to be positive for inner-city traders. Again, with the ones who are struggling at the moment, I think if we can support them that would also be beneficial and have wider implications for the rest of the state. Thirdly, I will also be supporting it because I think we have to try to keep people in South Australia. We need an incentive for young people to want to invest in South Australia. We need an incentive for young people to buy in South Australia, to buy houses in South Australia and to stay in South Australia.

I am running out of friends from university. Do you know why? Not because I am unpopular but because they are leaving, they are going interstate, because the jobs are not here and the opportunities just do not seem to be here like they were. I think we as policymakers and lawmakers need to incentivise our youth especially in these days of rising property prices. If we can incentivise them to stay here, then why not?

Fourthly, it is also important for a vibrant city—and we have heard those arguments time and time again. If you have more people in the city and if you have more people coming into the city, that also flows onto other parts of the economy, and it makes more opportunities and prospects for things like public transport in the city. If you have more people in that central business district that is a good thing.

I was reading a paper recently with regard to the inner-city model. This is not the way out forever, but I think in the short term we should all be focusing on creating a sustainable inner city model where businesses can grow and residents can prosper, but not only into the city, we want to grow them so that they can then export out of that central model. There has to be that little bit of, I suppose, economic self-interest. Without that economic self-interest where is the incentive to invest? Where is the incentive to grow? There has to be a genuine competitive advantage. I think this is a good initiative that will at least start that.

In terms of criticism, you could always criticise this bill as well. The main criticism that I would like to make on it, and to be as constructive as possible, is that it does not go far enough, it definitely does not go far enough. The Housing Industry Association has indicated that whilst it does support and welcome any stamp duty relief, it should be extended to other areas. So, I say to the government: go out to consultation, talk to a few more groups and if there is opportunity in the budget moving forward I think we should do this for more than just multi-unit apartments because I note that they only make up around one-quarter of new constructions, and industry conditions are certainly very tough.

When the government introduced the Stamp Duties (Off-the-plan Apartments) Amendment Bill in 2014, I was keen to look at it. I note that it does introduce the legislative amendments to extend the stamp duty concession for apartments bought off the plan. There are always arguments concerning the extent of that zone, and we have heard some very good ones from the member for Bragg. At the end of the day, we do need to, at least initially, draw a boundary somewhere. Perhaps that could be reviewed down the track.

I think that, all in all, this bill does go to the heart of creating a much more vibrant city. I think it is a much-needed aid for the property sector that we should all be supporting. I commend the bill to the house.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (16:11): I too rise today to speak about the Stamp Duties (Off-the-plan Apartments) Amendment Bill and to put my support forward for it. The bill introduces legislative amendments to extend the stamp duties concessions for apartments bought off the plan to include the inner metropolitan area. In 2012, stamp duty relief for off-the-plan apartment sales in

the city and Bowden and Gilberton was introduced. Then, in 2013, stamp duty relief was announced for off-the-plan apartment sales to be rezoned in the inner metropolitan areas. It is estimated that there have been about 200 applications to date, costing the government about \$4 million.

The additional concession applies to developments within Adelaide City Council, Bowden and 45 Park, Gilberton, as well as the inner metro area bounded by Regency, Hampstead, Portrush, Cross, Marion, Holbrooks and Kilkenny roads and East Avenue. So, while I support the initiative, it is clear that the stamp duty relief does not stretch far enough. As the member for Hartley has said, stamp duty relief is not inclusive of all South Australians. It is there for a minority group in the metropolitan centre. Where is the wider, broader support for many more South Australians? Stamp duty has been described as a necessary evil, but the extent of stamp duty in South Australia, on a national scale, is certainly not encouraging, and it is certainly not encouraging growth.

A stamp duty calculation on a \$300,000 residential property in South Australia, and I have not been into the real estate sphere for some time, is \$11,330. If we go to Western Australia, it is \$8,800 and in the ACT it is \$7,500. If we go to Queensland, how can Queensland do it for \$3,000, on a \$300,000 home? Stamp duty on a median average house price of \$390,000 in Adelaide in 2000 was about \$4,200 but today, for that \$390,000 home, stamp duty exceeds \$15,000. So, in the year 2000 it was \$4,200, today it is more than \$15,000. That is outrageous. That is one of the biggest disincentives. My son recently purchased a home in metropolitan Adelaide and I was gobsmacked at what stamp duty cost him. Many people, particularly young ones, are saying, 'Why buy? Why not just continue to rent? Renting is the easy option.' Obviously, in many cases, banks do not lend money for stamp duty.

In the Riverland and the Mallee, there are many 30 to 40-year-old houses on the market, and a number of those properties have been for an extended period of time. People are being told the stamp duty costs and, as I said, they continue to rent. One thing that I have picked up, particularly in regional areas, is that there are very few houses for rent, because people cannot afford the extension of payment on buying a house when they have to pay stamp duty and all the other associated costs. The result is that we have people who are under increased financial pressure.

Let's face it, it is the Aussie dream to own a house, but these huge financial burdens on top of the house price is something that is turning people away. This is a scenario which we do not want to see continually happening for families looking to purchase homes. Do they continue to rent? Do they move interstate? Do they look at other ways? I know of people who cannot afford to buy a home and cannot find a place to rent, so live in caravans or in tents until they can actually find accommodation. This is too common a theme.

Industry bodies have condemned the government's exorbitant and debilitating stamp duty, and have said that the state government's reliance on stamp duty was incarcerating and blocking potential investment into South Australia. I say that the stamp duty component is just a drug that the government are relying on; they are addicted to this high stamp duty.

When first home owner grants of up to \$23,500 ended, we obviously saw the impact on the construction and housing industries. That incentive helped offset the high cost of stamp duty, so where is that incentive now? To look outside the metropolitan Adelaide square, where is the incentive in regional South Australia? Is this about building the pointy end of Adelaide and making sure that the rest of the state is less relevant? We need to build on South Australia's economy by providing affordable housing, particularly in the agricultural sector of regional South Australia, which is the heartland of the economy in this great state. Why isn't there some form of incentive or attraction to purchase a property outside the pointy end of metropolitan Adelaide?

To continue to have a strong housing construction industry in those regional areas there has to be something there to give people a sweetener, to give people some form of comfort that investing outside of the Adelaide metropolitan area is a good incentive, and that the government is prepared to acknowledge that. Housing is obviously one of South Australia's largest industries: it makes up around 40 per cent of the state's generated revenue, around 11 per cent of the gross state product, and represents around 10 per cent of the state's employment.

Government fees on purchasing an established residential home in South Australia are also astronomical and must be reviewed. The transfer fee is just blatant thuggery. In South Australia—

and this is relevant to house prices of \$300,000—the transfer fee is \$2,146. In Victoria, the transfer fee is \$873; in Queensland, it is \$532; in New South Wales, \$214; Western Australia, \$210; and in the Northern Territory, it is \$137. How do we compare a transfer cost in South Australia of \$2,146 to \$214 in New South Wales? That is outrageous. That is an addiction that this current state government has to this extra tax burden on trying to buy a house here in South Australia. For the young ones, when dreaming where they would like to go, it reinforces the thought, 'Why here in South Australia?' 'Why do we buy; why not rent?' 'Why don't we move interstate? The cost is cheaper.' As I say, South Australia is a great state, but it is becoming the bleeding obvious that the cost of buying a house in South Australia is burdened with too many taxes and charges.

The Real Estate Institute of South Australia has previously called for first home buyers purchasing at or below the metropolitan median house price to be exempt from paying stamp duty. I wonder if the Treasurer will look at that. Stamp duty also hinders investment and therefore stalls the economy. I do support this bill and I look forward sometime soon to some amendments to give people an incentive to buy a home.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (16:21): Can I first thank all the speakers in the house for indicating their support. I listened to members' contributions intently. I do not think the government charging stamp duty is an addiction, but we have some tough choices to make in the upcoming tax review about how we tax transactions in this state.

The entire country has an identical system for transacting. That is, if you want to enter a property, we tax the duty, the conveyancing, on that property. You are taxed while you hold it, and then someone who wishes to purchase it from you pays a fee as well. We have to ask ourselves, as a growing economy, whether that is the most efficient way of taxing people.

I agree with members that lowering conveyance duties does stimulate the housing property market, but again I caution, if I am shown concrete evidence that cutting stamp duty will generate more growth across the sector and a corresponding hit to the government and therefore the corresponding lowering of services and revenue that we get, what is the bang for our buck that we get?

We know that by targeting first homeowners and targeting apartments we can stimulate one part of the economy. The real question is, if we cut conveyance duty across the board, as some members have articulated, what is the outcome of that? Will we see the entire housing market stimulated and overheated? Will we see that money, those cuts to conveyance duties, reflected in increased property prices, or will we see that benefit go directly to the homeowner? These are difficult questions to be answered, although I believe that when you target a section of the housing construction industry you can make a very big difference.

Members opposite also raised other questions about why we are targeting just the city and not rural areas. That is a very valid point. Why would we not want to stimulate some regional towns to try to consolidate regional communities, to have a higher density so people can get services closer to the centre of town? It is more efficient; it is cheaper to provide those services if people live in close proximity to each other. I point out that some property values are lower in some regional areas, so the stamp duty impost is less, but I accept what members opposite are saying. Again, it is a question of cost and its impact on the budget.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition talked about the emergency services levy. I remind her that it is a tax that was introduced while she was president of the Liberal Party. It is a tax that was designed and implemented by the former Liberal government, and I heard no complaints from candidate Chapman, or the member for Bragg, at any stage that the Liberal Party had abandoned South Australians by imposing on them a tax on their principal place of residence. Instead, what the former Liberal government did was introduce a levy which abolished levies on insurance policies to cover emergency services. Every dollar raised by the emergency services levy goes towards our emergency services.

What the Liberal Party did when it was last in office was create a remissions scheme, and that remissions scheme gave the highest remissions to people in rural areas. On top of remissions,

there were already factored-in discounts. What the government has done is remove those remissions and allow the discounts to remain in place.

I note that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is outraged by this tax, but at no stage has she said that if they are successful in 2018 they will reinstate the remissions. I look forward to her actually backing up her outrage with some action. If she is legitimately outraged by this she has two avenues: the first is to contact her colleagues in the commonwealth and ask them to reverse the dramatic cuts to our hospitals, schools and South Australian pensioners, and option two for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is to announce that if they are successful in 2018 they will immediately reinstate the remissions. Of course, on both those fronts the opposition is silent.

While it is okay to take a swing at me in this debate—she is entitled to do that—I think it is also appropriate that we point out what I think is a flawed argument by the opposition. You cannot claim injustice but offer no solution. That is not a viable political argument. It is probably why members opposite keep on losing elections, because all they do is point out a problem and offer no solution.

The government is doing what it can to try to stimulate activity. I am concerned about the housing construction industry, but I do think there are some very good signs in our economy. The clearance rate at auctions has been very, very good, and there are benefits to extended periods of sunshine in South Australia, with the housing market doing exceptionally well in November and December (we should see those figures come through in Treasury predictions in January and February). I think the clearance rate is very good—speaking to local real estate agents they are telling me that it is an exciting time to be selling or purchasing property—so I will be interested to see what happens.

Of course, ultimately the Premier has announced tax reform. In my view tax reform is best done when you know that it is going to actually mean a decrease in the total tax we take. Making tax reform revenue neutral is very difficult; it can be done, but that is a conversation we are going to have to have with the people of South Australia.

Regarding the map we have chosen, I know the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is calling conspiracy on it, saying that we were trying to campaign in certain seats because she felt that we were trying to take advantage and win those seats. I can give her my assurance that at no time do we take winning the seat of Bragg seriously—

Ms Chapman: You ran a candidate.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, we ran a candidate, because there are people who live in the seat of Bragg who would like to have—

An honourable member: Name them all.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There is a good 35 per cent, I think. What is your margin?

Ms Chapman: A lot more than yours.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What is your margin?

Ms Chapman: I'm not telling you.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will look it up. I think that argument falls on—

An honourable member: How much money did you spend on the campaign?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Hopefully, none. If we did spend any money in the seat of Bragg I want to find out who did it and sack them. We run marginal seat strategies on this side of the house, and we do not spend money on seats we cannot win.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That's right, because we focus on the main game, and, quite frankly, we do not want to lose you. You are one of our secret assets.

We were talking about the maps. There is no perfect line that we can draw on a map that gives the best outcomes. You can shrink this or make it as large as possible. What we are trying to do is make a few decisions about where we want to see higher density living. It makes common

sense that if you have a lot of existing infrastructure in place—the north-south corridor, the ring route around the city, the O-Bahn taking nearly 100 buses every hour off that intersection of North Terrace and Park Terrace to try to open up the arteries of the city—then the strategy the government has in place is to try to get as many people as we can living in and around the CBD.

The reason we do that is that there is plenty of infrastructure in place already. We are building a brand-new city school and we are investing in public transport. Of course, this was part of a larger strategy which involved the transport development levy. Unfortunately, members opposite voted against that, which means that a lot of the infrastructure that we would have built to try to move those people to and from their place of work, without forcing them to drive there, will not be built. People who might have wanted to do commerce in the CBD could have freely driven in and utilised those car parks, rather than city workers. Of course, members opposite have been frustrating that because they want to support—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We want those nurses not to spend money on car parking; we want those nurses to have very cheap travel time and cheap fares on high-quality public transport that is safe, clean and world class. I am just getting the latest figures in from Bragg: 68.8 per cent, so there is a good 30 per cent there who vote Labor. Of course, we run a candidate to make sure that they have a voice; 31.3 in Bragg is a bit high for my liking. What is the swing to lose?—18.8. I would be worried about that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It's doable.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is doable. A good by-election could do it.

Ms Chapman: Your vote went down when you handed out how-to-votes at the Rose Park Primary School.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are we back on stamp duty? I think we have lurched.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is right; her seat is a safer Liberal than mine. There is no perfect line in the sand that we can draw. To answer the question from the member for Hammond: yes, contiguous land is available. It was designed to have both sides of the border be eligible for a concession. We took this to the election, so people know what the zoning laws are. People know what height and density we are chasing. We have told them that we are going to incentivise it. We had that conversation with the people—

Mr Pederick: Their blocks have to connect with the road to be contiguous, is what you're saying?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, yes. We want people on both sides to be able to take advantage of it. If members opposite think that is a bad idea, they can express that through their democratic rights here.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I understand. As a growing city, where we cannot make our roads wider, where we cannot increase the footprint of our arterial roads, what we need to do is have high density and try to work out a way to get those people to and from their place of work with as little interruption as possible to the traffic network—that is complicated—and at the same time stimulate growth, stimulate activity and stimulate people who live close to the city. We do not want people being pushed further out south and further out north. Affordability is a very big issue in this country, and it is important that people are able to get affordable housing close to where they live, close to where they grew up and close to where there is existing infrastructure and existing schools.

What we used to do as an area urbanised and people started having children is we built a school, and what would happen is that people would not move out of that area. So we had very good infrastructure in place to cater for young families but, of course, the people living in and around that infrastructure did not have young families. What this enables us to do is to create a renaissance of those inner-city schools, where people can live in higher density and have access to existing

infrastructure which we can upgrade, which is cheaper than building on greenfield sites further out north or further out south, not push infrastructure further away from where the higher density population is.

What we do not want to see are these large, vast areas of suburbs where there is no work. We want people close to where there is employment. That is what this bill fundamentally is attempting to do. It is attempting to: (1) give young family homeowners the ability to be able to afford property close to the CBD so that they are not priced out of the market like they are in some other capital cities across Australia; (2) keep the diversity of the people who are living in and around our inner city and make sure they are close to existing infrastructure; and, most importantly, (3) stimulate our building sector. That is why we are doing this.

I know that the building industry is very supportive of this. Do they want more? Of course they do. Do members opposite want us to cut more taxes? Of course they do. Do we want to cut taxes? Of course we do. We always do, but there always has to be a corresponding price and a corresponding cut in service whenever you do something like this or, of course, you reduce your surpluses or increase your deficits.

I commend the bill to the house. I thank members opposite for their support. I understand the opposition has some questions for us in the committee stage, and I hope the bill has a speedy passage through both houses of parliament.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

Ms CHAPMAN: At the time of the announcement of this initiative, which was in October last year, it was estimated that there would be a cost to the government to provide this of some \$7 million and this was reiterated again in the Mid-Year Budget Review. How much of that has been lost in revenue so far, or at least to 30 June this year, and is there any update from then as to whether that \$7 million is still the expected loss of revenue?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: To date, the cost of the concession is about \$4 million, but I am advised that we have a contingency in place for a further \$3 million. I can get those figures to the house as they come in.

Ms CHAPMAN: That is the information we have so far, but what I am saying is—and this has been going from October 2013 to June 2014, which is part of a financial year—there must be a figure that relates to that. Is that the \$4 million or is the \$4 million to November?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Are you asking us what we have budgeted for, or are you asking us what we think the take-up will be of the option in the extended zone?

Ms CHAPMAN: No, I am just talking about the money at this point. You announced it in October last year, so for the part year of October to June this year, which is a part of a financial year, there must be an identified amount that you have actually missed out on. Is that the \$4 million or is it the \$4 million up until November that is forgone?

Bear in mind that my understanding of this scheme is that it was a \$20,000-odd benefit for the first period and then for the next two years, up until 2014-16, it is actually only a partial benefit that one gets. I am assuming that that explains why it would be a big up-front amount that people have gone in and applied for and that has been at a cost to the government. Is the \$4 million effectively to 30 June this year or is it to November?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The advice I have is that that figure of \$4 million is up until 7 November. That is the advice I have.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is it still your estimate that the total amount, on the basis that there is a reduction of available amount per dwelling, will still be around \$7 million?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The advice I have is yes but, of course, that is subject to change. We do not know how many people will take this up, for example, depending on fluctuations of the rest of the market and what is happening with other types of properties. So, there is a lot of guesswork involved here.

What I will attempt to do between the houses, for the benefit of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, is to get some further advice from RevenueSA, so that I do not give you arbitrary numbers here, and try to give you our best estimate of what we think it may go up to or whether it will make costs. Ultimately, what we are attempting here is not so much to try to meet a budget figure; we are trying to stimulate activity.

Ms CHAPMAN: I appreciate that, and I will come to that aspect. I thank the Treasurer for indicating that he will make that available. Can we go to certain assets that are within the zone? First, the site at Bowden, which is otherwise known as Bowden Village, under the management of Renewal SA as an asset of the government, which is in the process of developing: what is the total value of concessions that has been made available for sales on that property since the inception?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We do not have that figure here. From memory, I remember attending a debate, when I was housing and urban development minister, with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, when she spoke of our competing with the private sector. I think that I know where the member is going with this, but I will endeavour to get the member those figures between the houses; I just do not have them here.

When you have these large blocks of land, whether it be the Tonsley site or the Bowden site, the government does play a role in trying to develop that land. Are we seeking a financial return? Yes, we are. But, more importantly, what we are seeking is a demographic change to try to encourage people to live closer to infrastructure and higher-density living, with higher energy ratings, experimental types of building, experimental types of energy efficiency, to try to encourage and incentivise new industries, and there are some in the sector who do not like it when a government locks up, in their mind, parts of that land.

I suppose the question we will never know the answer to is: what would have happened to that land had the government not developed it? What would it have been had we not intervened and encouraged and, indeed, directed a type of development? What would we have there now: would it be industry, would it be residential? Yes, we can control all of that, but the government has attempted to get an outcome, but it is, of course, trying to get a return. That is why we are making these concessions available to the private sector on a much broader footprint.

We are not just saying that it is just our land; we are expanding it so that other people who have private property can indeed take full advantage of it. Gilberton, the old Channel 7 site, is a very good example of that. They were not initially in the zone; now they are, and of course we have expanded it even further. We are doing our best to try to incentivise private owners and private development as well. I think I know what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is attempting to do, and I will get her those figures between the houses so that she has an exact number.

Ms CHAPMAN: While we are on 45 Park Terrace, Gilberton, which is the second site which has special significance in this program of concessions, can you advise the committee how much has been provided in the concessions for sales of property at that site? Again, I appreciate that you may not have it with you, but can that be provided between the houses in writing?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, I will provide that between the houses.

Ms CHAPMAN: Can you tell the committee what the basis was for adding 45 Park Terrace, Gilberton, which, as we know, is a private development, and not others?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Madam Chair, that is not before the house, but I will give the member an overview. I am not sure that I was the minister responsible for it at the time of that decision, but what I suspect was occurring is that there was a spine down the middle of the city, and we should not have allowed one development at one end to be disadvantaged by a development at the other end.

I think the decision process at the time—and I am at a disadvantage because I am not sure I was even in the room when the decision was taken, but I will have to check—was that we had

Bowden at one end, a whole series of infrastructure programs going on between the NRAH site right up through to the universities past the Casino, past the Festival Centre, going right up to Gilberton, and why would you not include two developments at the end of it to try to encourage this sort of spine development. That is what I think the thinking was, but I would have to find out for you because I was not the minister responsible at the time—I think.

Ms CHAPMAN: It is just that outside of the then boundary, which is now being incorporated in this but expanded, as we know, they were the only two sites outside of metropolitan Adelaide as such—City Living. You may be able to clarify this, but there appears to have been no inquiry, invitation or offer to have an expression of interest from any other developer on the peripheral area of Adelaide, in the west, south or east, as to whether they might want to be incorporated, and, of course, correspondingly, nothing was included for relief in that regard.

I appreciate you taking it out again now that we have another new boundary, which, on the face of it, just looking at the map, does not appear to particularly go around any little site as the other one did, but I would like to have some understanding of the opportunity that was given to any other developer outside of the ring or, indeed, whether there has been any invitation on the current boundary for anyone else, or any basis upon which the boundary is currently drawn, or whether it was just simply followed that in a metro boundary it is as per the planning laws.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It think it probably was about the maturity of the developments at that time. Bowden and Gilberton were quite advanced in terms of sales and planning. What the government, I am advised, was attempting to do was that there were two developments that looked as if they could have been disadvantaged by the previous economic climate. Whether any other developers were spoken to about their area or their development, I am sorry, I cannot give any light to that other than to say that I do not think there were any other developments nearby in that precinct that stood out, but I will go back and check, but I cannot remember.

The important thing here—and this goes back to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's initial complaint—is whether we are just favouring a government development. I cannot speak for the former minister for housing and urban development (Hon. Pat Conlon), but I am assuming that what he was attempting to do was to say, 'We cannot disadvantage one government development. There's another private development that is almost in exactly the same position but at the other end of town; it would only be fair.' That is what I am guessing happened. I do not know what other discussions were taking place with other developers.

I do not know what other developers were doing at the time, but to deal with all of that we have now expanded the zone quite dramatically to go from Regency Road and, indeed, all of the City of Prospect council boundary right through to Cross Road. So there is ample opportunity for developers there, and, of course, from the eastern suburbs, from Portrush Road and Lower Portrush Road right through to Hampstead Road right through to Holbrooks Road and Marion Road in my electorate.

We dramatically expanded the footprint to make sure that, first, it takes into account a large number of existing developments that are already on the books to try to incentivise them and get to the next stage; and, secondly, to encourage all those people who are sitting on a property, and unfortunately in Adelaide—and my father is as guilty of this as everyone else—people buy a piece of land and do not touch it ever again. My father's property can be given only to my daughter. He will not let me anywhere near it and he will not let my brother anywhere near it; it is for his grandchildren.

I understand that, but, with the imperative that the state has, we want those properties developed now. We want activity now, we want those houses built up with higher-density living, we want them turned over and we want people transacting. That is why we have increased this zone to take in a larger area. It is a valid question the deputy leader is asking. I do not know the answer to it, because it was probably pre my time, but I have to say, looking at it now, it makes intuitive sense that you would not just benefit the one government operation, you would benefit the private one as well.

Ms CHAPMAN: Have any other parties or councils made an application since the announcement for the stamp duty relief for other areas in South Australia, either regional or metropolitan?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have just heard the member for Hammond call for one in his electorate. I heard the member for Chaffey call for one in his. I am sure every member would like one. I am sure the member for Giles would like to have stamp duty relief in the City of Whyalla and Coober Pedy. I am sure the member for Reynell would like to have more in her community. I do not know whether there have been any unsolicited proposals put to government on this or whether there has been any other correspondence. I assume there has been. I do not have that information with me, but it would not surprise me. If I was mayor of a council outside this area, I would say, 'Me too, please'—of course they would. But the government has limited resources and we have tried to choose a boundary which we think makes economic sense. I will try to find out for the member and get back to her.

Ms CHAPMAN: Have you done any assessment of the applications that you have granted to date as to the value of sales they have generated as a result of this initiative? That is, rather than just the cold facts of how many might have been sold within that zone, what has been sold as a result of this initiative being offered as at least a factor in the purchase.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Very good question. I am very interested in the answer to it as well, because in the scheme of tax reform I really want to know what the impacts are for this incentive. From the discussions I have had, it is still too early to get any accurate details that make any meaningful sense about what the impacts of it are. I can give you raw numbers about how many people have taken it up, etc., but we will do a deeper dive as this process rolls out to try to understand exactly what type of developments we are stimulating: who are the people buying these homes, where do they work, what are their education levels? We will do a bigger assessment later.

I suspect that will take probably a bit of work from the tax review, because what I want to know as Treasurer is very simple: out of all the levers I have—payroll tax, land tax, stamp duty, and any other transactional taxes and levies on insurance policies—which one of those levers would for me as Treasurer (1) generate the most economic activity, (2) give me the most stable form of revenue and income to the state, and (3) give people the ability to transact and maintain a level of profitability? I am just as interested in that question as the deputy leader of the opposition. I think it is a very smart question and when I find out the answer I will share it with her.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is that assessment happening at present? My understanding is that, of the \$4 million odd that has been provided in concessions to date (in other words, money forgone in stamp duty), that is as a result of some 260 applications. So, you have the raw data. I appreciate that you do not have the answers yet, but is anyone actually assessing this? We have now moved out of the big incentive period, we have smaller incentives tapering off in the next couple of years, and surely that October to June period would be identified as the most effective in identifying benefit.

I appreciate the economic benefit for the building industry, but we are really talking about residential housing here, and it may be for an investment purpose. I just want to know at this point whether any of that modelling and assessment has actually been undertaken yet or whether you are interested to find out.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, that work has not commenced, but we do collect the data so we can begin that work at any time. The reality is that the government's tools are very blunt. I know exactly what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—I think I know what she is thinking.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes. I suppose, in a broader sense, the more information we find out about this is a very useful tool for the government to have, and the data is not going anywhere any time soon, so we can always do it.

I suppose the next question is: once you have that information, what do you do with it and how can you better target tax concessions and can we legally actually do it? The question then is: rather than linking the tax concession to the physical property, the other way we could do it is why don't you link the tax concession to the individual? Why don't you link it to a demographic? Do you

link it to an age group? Do you link it to a professional cohort? How do you offer these tax concessions? Obviously, there are some legal issues about how you do it but the government's tools are fairly blunt. I am just as eager as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to get that work started. Like I said to her in my answer, I would like an analysis to begin once we begin the tax review.

Ms Chapman: That's going to be years away.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, the tax reform is not years away. The government's term is four years. We are now in November. I am very keen to get my skates on.

Ms CHAPMAN: Unless somebody does the work to review this, it is not going to provide any information which you will be able to use for the assessment of your reform in relation to taxation overall. I am really just asking when your department is going to get started on that aspect? Is it going to be in this financial year? When is it going to happen? You are the minister and you tell me you are keen to get an answer. You have got the data. We have gone past 30 June now. It just seems somebody needs to action it. If you are keen to get it, you are the minister, I would have thought somebody would be opening a file now. My question is: do you expect to have that material, that is, the answer of any assessment or review of the effectiveness of this program, this calendar year or in this financial year?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I cannot answer that question accurately for the deputy leader. I am not trying to be frustrating. It is just that I need to take a bigger view. This is only one tool in my arsenal. This is only one form of tax cut that we have offered. We have offered other tax cuts. We have offered payroll tax cuts, for example. Those payroll tax cuts that we have offered have also had an impact. I want to do an assessment of all the measures that we have done thus far to see what their impacts are. But, yes, I agree with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that the sooner we begin, the better.

Clause passed.

Remaining clause (4) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (16:58): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Adjournment Debate

NORTH EASTERN COMMUNITY HOSPITAL AUXILIARY

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (16:58): Last night, I had the pleasure of attending the North Eastern Community Hospital Auxiliary meeting, which comprises of 14 hardworking members and, let me just say, you will never meet a more hospitable, warm, positive and tireless group of people who do fantastic work for the local hospital (the North Eastern Community Hospital) as well as the adjacent nursing home.

Over the past 25 to 30 years, they have raised in excess of a quarter of a million dollars, which has provided many extras for both the hospital and the aged-care facility. They meet on the third Monday of each month and they are always inviting more and more people to come on board and partake in the great community initiatives that they undertake, one of which is fundraising. They have a kiosk at the local hospital and all proceeds from the kiosk go towards upgrading the equipment for the hospital and the adjacent nursing home. I saw last night that the kiosk sells a variety of new baby gift baskets, a selection of newborn clothes, toiletries, magazines, cards—all kinds of goodies. There is something there for everyone.

They also organise a series of events throughout the year. Last night, they were good enough to have a bit of a meet and greet with coffee, tea and scones afterwards. It was a delightful night.

They also arrange many other things, like fashion parades, quiz nights, theatre evenings, Chinese banquets, and lamington and slice drives—delicious, I must say. They also raise a lot of money through Entertainment Books, and they do a whole heap of fundraising by way of selling raffle tickets throughout the year.

They are a fantastic local community group. Without groups like this, we simply could not have the fantastic fabric that we have in our society. Obviously there is a time and a place for government to provide services but, without these voluntary community groups, we would not be able to move forward, especially in that hospital. It is a private hospital, but let me say that private hospitals are not necessarily all affluent, and this community group does wonderful fundraising work to support not only the staff but also the families whose family members attend the local hospital, and anyone who frequents the hospital.

I want to thank the North Eastern Community Hospital Auxiliary ladies and, as the local member for Hartley, I will certainly do whatever I can to advance their cause in whatever way, shape or form I can.

FINNISS ELECTORATE

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (17:02): I would like to spend a few minutes talking about a couple of the educational facilities in my electorate. Firstly, I would like to talk about Victor Harbor Primary (R-7) and the outcome from the disastrous fire there early on 8 November. It was devastating for that school community and for the wider Victor Harbor community. It has been handled admirably by the principal, Mr Brenton Robins, and the governing council through Ms Kylie Love. I am also grateful that the minister actually went down on the Saturday. She paid a visit to Victor Harbor to see the damage and things are coming together quite quickly. The school is open again today and the students are being looked after.

I do need to comment on the enormous effort that has been put in by the local community by way of assistance to the school and forthcoming fundraisers. I do not want to make the quotes at the moment, but I am aware of some of the moneys that have been promised in fundraising by service clubs, and let me tell you that I am involved with the business group in organising a rather large fundraiser early in December. Out of what was a disaster on the night, we hope to get a lot of good things happening down there for that school.

In addition, it was terrific to see the staff and some students come to the Remembrance Day service at Victor Harbor the other day. They could not teach. They had had a staff meeting, so they came down en masse with Brenton Robins and attended the Remembrance Day service, which was significantly noted. We look forward to Victor Harbor R-7 getting up and about again and I look forward to assisting the school, and working with the minister and the department, on replacing those buildings. Hopefully by the start of 2016, if we are lucky, we might have something in place to accommodate them.

The other issue I want to talk about relates to the three campuses of the Kangaroo Island Community Education, which operates through three heads of campus and a principal, Mr Ian Kent. It is worth noting that Mr Kent in his time on the island has turned around what was a disaster and created something very special. He is a unique principal, highly experienced and skilled. A couple of weeks ago he received the John Laing Award, nominated by his peer principals through the Principals Australia Institute, which is an extremely prestigious award for service to educational leadership. It was an outstanding effort by Mr Kent. As I said, along with his heads of campus in Peter Philp at Parndana, Maxine McSherry at Kingscote and Leanne Woods at Penneshaw, Mr Kent has a unit over there which is a great joy to see.

The Premier, in his former life as education minister, visited the schools. I think we visited all campuses that day, from memory, but he was highly impressed with what was going on. They have things to contend with. There are never enough resources in public education anywhere, as you well know, Deputy Speaker. Children with disabilities create problems in an area like Kangaroo Island and there seems to be a rising number of children with autism who provide even more problems to the extent that staff physically feel the brunt of what is going on. I know that it has been extremely difficult for staff who have spoken to me in dealing with some of those situations.

The island is very fortunate to have Mr Kent as the principal. I am of a different political persuasion to him but the thing about Mr Kent is that you can have a blue or a difference of opinion with him and then you get on with it, so I am pleased with where it is going. I believe that he should be congratulated on receiving that John Laing Award a couple of weeks ago. I hope it is brought to the minister's attention and that she may write to Mr Kent.

The schools over there are going ahead in leaps and bounds, as I said. I attend different things there. The school communities are functioning particularly well. Indeed, at the Kingscote campus the first farmer's market was held a couple of weeks ago which was a rip-roaring success. It is very much a part of the community and, Deputy Speaker, there are probably schools in your and other electorates which are the same. I am delighted that it is all going so well. If we go back a few years when I sat down with former education minister Hon. Jane Lomax-Smith when things were in a complete pickle to where it is now, we can take pride. With those few words, I finish my contribution, but I think it is most important that Victor Harbor Primary R-7 and KI Community Education were picked up on today.

AUSTRALIAN LABOR PARTY STATE CONVENTION

Mr GEE (Napier) (17:08): I want to talk about the ALP State Convention on the weekend. I have to say, as the outgoing state president—

Members interjecting:

Mr GEE: I know, it is sad for everyone—it was probably the most united I have ever known the ALP to be. In terms of so-called factions and faceless men, I saw everybody make enormous effort to reach compromise positions which everyone could live with.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Not in one particular case.

Mr GEE: Well, I have to say that is the most unified I have ever seen the ALP. Also, on Sunday I was at a sod-turning ceremony in Munno Para for a new Woolworths which will see some thousand jobs—300 in the construction, 300 ongoing, with some additional specialty shops, and a further 400 which will come through with the introduction of Big W, as well as some other specialty shops. There has been a lot of sod turning in that area lately. We have a new Uniting Church happening and also we have new supermarkets coming with ALDI, so it is good news for the north.

One thing I would like to spend a fair bit of time talking about, perhaps not today but in a future griever, is the latest enterprise agreement. This is the last of the enterprise agreements that will occur at General Motors Holden, and it will also be their closure agreement, but that is for another day.

There are a number of things I want to talk about that came out of the convention. These are achievements of our current government that I have to say are very important:

- the increased investment in regional South Australia, plus investment in Nyrstar;
- a \$26 million upgrade of the Mount Gambier hospital;
- a new Mount Gambier ambulance station;
- improved dental clinics at Murray Bridge and Port Lincoln;
- the most significant return-to-work reforms in 25 years;
- changes to the CTP lifetime support and work-related compensation for our CFS volunteers;
- six new wards at Lyell McEwin Hospital and a new rehab ward at Modbury Hospital, along with progress on the new Royal Adelaide Hospital;
- electrification of the Seaford rail line, with passengers enjoying a quieter, smoother and more environmentally friendly ride. The government has also delivered expanded park-and-rides at Mount Barker and Smithfield;

- increased investment in South Australia through tourism, conferences, sport and mining; and
- two new special schools, plus two new children's centres. South Australia now has 41; in 2002, when Labor came to power, there were none, so this is a good example of where you can see how much unity there is in the Labor group.

I know we have finished with condolences, but I never spoke on the condolence motion for Gough Whitlam. I would like to say that, for me, no single man has done more for the cause of Indigenous people, women and the disadvantaged than Gough Whitlam. Gough stands alongside Bob Hawke and Paul Keating as one of the great Labor legends.

Unlike Bob and Paul, Gough totally changed the nation: the progressive Australia of 1975 was nothing like the conservative Australia of 1972. The start of universal health care; more funding to schools, not less; free tertiary education, not university degrees costing up to \$100,000; and a Racial Discrimination Act are a small number of the hundreds of reforms introduced by Gough Whitlam. A legend and a reformer, he will forever be remembered.

At 17:12 the house adjourned until Wednesday 19 November 2014 at 11:00.

*Estimates Replies***TORRENS PARADE GROUND**

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (22 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs): I have been advised:

The following table shows a breakdown of the current rental arrangements for veterans organisations.

Tenant	Lease Expiry	Total Areas	Rent review	Total annual rental
Vietnam Veterans Associations	2023	66m ²	CPI p/a	\$ 4,186
RSL	2023	495m ²	CPI p/a	\$ 26,178
RAAF Association	2023	275m ²	CPI p/a	\$ 15,023

Ex-service organisation tenants are liable for:

- Rentals per rates above.
- Electricity charges—steadily increasing common area electricity rose 20 per cent in 2013-14.
- Cleaning expenses—annual increased approximately 3-5 per cent.
- Miscellaneous tenant maintenance.

Maintaining Torrens Parade Ground, including place management, for continuing increased venue and grounds use is a liability to government of approximately \$350,000 per annum.

ANZAC CENTENARY MEMORIAL GARDEN WALK

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (22 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs): I have been advised:

State government funding of \$3.0 million for the ANZAC Centenary Memorial Garden Walk project was announced by the Premier on 30 January 2014.

The \$3.0 million funding from the state government has been included in the state budget for 2014-15 and is held centrally for allocation to the relevant department on receipt of the commonwealth contribution.

MINERALS RESOURCE RENT TAX

In reply to **Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart)** (17 July 2014). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business): The Department of State Development advises that Arrium has never accrued any mineral resources rent tax liability and has never paid any mineral resources rent tax.

GRANT REVENUE

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (17 July 2014). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business):

The change in grant revenue (including GST, specific purpose payments, national partnership payments and other contributions and grants) between the 2013-14 Mid-Year Budget Review and the 2014-15 budget over the period 2013-14 to 2016-17 is a reduction of \$423 million.

Table 1.3 shows the decisions made by the commonwealth government which have reduced the level of grants to be paid to South Australia compared to that previously agreed (\$498 million).

Table 1.14 shows parameter changes in grant revenue since the 2013-14 Mid-Year Budget Review. Total grant revenue includes funding from the commonwealth (GST, national partnership payments, and specific purposes payments) and other sources.

The other reconciling item is the movement in grants received for specific expenditure items. These are disclosed as policy items and presented as revenue offsets in the Budget Measures Statement.

The table below provides a reconciliation of the movement in grants between the Mid-Year Budget Review and budget, and where they are presented in the budget papers.

The decline in commonwealth grant revenue of \$202 million between 2013-14 and 2016-17 referred to by the Leader of the Opposition in the estimates committee hearing is the parameter change in commonwealth national partnership and specific purpose payments since the 2013-14 Mid-Year Budget Review. It does not include any policy changes to grant revenue, or changes (policy or parameter) to other grant revenue lines.

Total grant revenue—2014-15 Budget compared to 2013-14 MYBR estimate (\$million)				
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Total grant revenue—2013-14 MYBR	7,925	8,274	9,191	9,841
Total grant revenue—2014-15 Budget (table 1.11)	7,855	8,270	9,064	9,620
Change in total grant revenue—2013-14 MYBR to 2014-15 Budget	-70	-4	-128	-221
Breakdown of change in total grant revenue				
Commonwealth budget cuts—table 1.3	-13	-101	-160	-224
Parameter adjustments (GST, commonwealth grants and other grants)—table 1.14	-48	30	-79	-128
less				
Parameter adjustments included in table 1.31	8	-1	-3	-4
Grants received as contributions to expenditure items—table 1.12 2	-1	66	109	127
Change in total grant revenue—2013-14 MYBR to 2014-15 budget	-70	-4	-128	-221
1. The adjustments in the other Commonwealth Budget impacts line in table 1.3 are treated as parameter adjustments and are also included in table 1.14. All other items in table 1.3 are classified as policy adjustments and included in table 1.12 in the line revenue measures—other. All policy items are also separately identified in the Budget Measures Statement.				
2. These items are separately disclosed as revenue offsets in the Budget Measures Statement and included under the revenue offsets line in table 1.12. Includes funding received for the North-South Corridor Darlington upgrade, South Eastern Freeway—Mount Barker Interchange, Project Agreement on Improving Trachoma Control for indigenous Australians and the National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness. Also includes a reduction in grants associated with the transfer of Centre for Cancer Biology Research Fellows and their teams to the University of South Australia.				

CARRYOVER EXPENDITURE

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (17 July 2014).
(Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business):

The following information is provided on behalf of all ministers. The enclosed tables list carryover expenditure approved by cabinet into 2014-15 and future years and amounts not approved by cabinet as part of the 2014-15 Budget.

Carryovers Approved (\$000s)

Minister	Agency Name	Carryover expenditure approved into 2014-15	Carryover Expenditure approved into future years
Premier	State Governor's Establishment	140	—
Deputy Premier Attorney-General Minister for Justice Reform Minister for Planning Minister for Housing and Urban Development Minister for Industrial Relations	Attorney-General's Department	2,693	543
	Administered Items for the Attorney-General's Department	3,735	16,275
	Courts Administration Authority	278	—
Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills Minister for Science and Information Economy Minister for the Status of Women Minister for Business Services and Consumers	Attorney-General's Department	574	—
	Department of State Development	—	300
Minister for Health Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse Minister for the Arts Minister for Health Industries	Defence SA	1,230	110
	Department for Health and Ageing	9,440	—
	Health Regions and Other Health Entities	52,151	12,686
	South Australian Ambulance Service	344	—
	Arts and Cultural Development	4,600	—
Minister for Education and Child Development	Department for Education and Child Development	29,332	6,118
	SACE Board of South Australia	569	—
Treasurer Minister for Finance Minister for State Development Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy Minister for Small Business	Department of State Development	50	—
	Department of Treasury and Finance	4,099	—
	Support Services to Parliamentarians	240	—
Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation	Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources	12,782	890
	Environment Protection Authority	200	—

Minister	Agency Name	Carryover expenditure approved into 2014-15	Carryover Expenditure approved into future years
Minister for Water and the River Murray Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation			
Minister for Disabilities Minister for Police	Department for Communities and Social Inclusion	735	—
Minister for Correctional Services	Department for Correctional Services	15,000	—
Minister for Emergency Services	Country Fire Service	1,657	—
Minister for Road Safety	South Australian Fire and Emergency Services Commission	2,700	—
	Administered Items for the South Australian Fire and Emergency Services Commission	250	—
	State Emergency Services	150	—
	South Australia Police	824	—
Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries Minister for Forests Minister for Tourism Minister for Recreation and Sport Minister for Racing	Department of Primary Industries and Regions	17,789	—
Minister for Regional Development Minister for Local Government	Department of Primary Industries and Regions	2,885	360
Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion Minister for Social Housing Minister for Multicultural Affairs Minister for Ageing Minister for Youth Minister for Volunteers	Department for Communities and Social Inclusion	6,127	—
	Administered Items for the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion	1,120	—
	South Australian Housing Trust	21,467	11,044
Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation Minister for Automotive Transformation Minister for the Public Sector	Shared Services SA	—	402
	Services SA and the Office of the Chief Information Officer	650	—
Minister for Transport and Infrastructure	Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	92,396	21,312

Minister	Agency Name	Carryover expenditure approved into 2014-15	Carryover Expenditure approved into future years
Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development	South Australian Government Employee Residential Properties	2,740	—

Carryovers Not Approved (\$000s)

Minister	Agency Name	Carryover expenditure not approved into 2014-15	Carryover Expenditure not approved into future years
Deputy Premier Attorney-General Minister for Justice Reform Minister for Planning Minister for Housing and Urban Development Minister for Industrial Relations	Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	365	—
Minister for Health Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse Minister for the Arts Minister for Health Industries	Department for Health and Ageing	1,257	—
Minister for Education and Child Development	Department for Education and Child Development	2,600	—
	Administered Items for the Department for Education and Child Development	1,742	
Minister for Transport and Infrastructure Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development	Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	4,210	—