HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 5 July 2016

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 ASSETS CONFISCATION (PRESCRIBED DRUG OFFENDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Conference

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (11:01): I move:

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

Motion carried.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (FILMING AND SEXTING OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

(Continued from 23 June 2016.)

Amendment No. 1:

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

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

We have a couple of amendments that have come here from the other place, and I just wanted to put on the record our position in relation to those amendments. The first amendment is to do with refining the aspect of the exposure of the breast. In relation to this, can I indicate that the government will be accepting this amendment.

The definition (as included by the bill) was deliberately broad, to cover any image involving female breasts which may be considered to be invasive, but measured by the propriety test in subsection (3). Context is, of course, critical when dealing with these images. It is the government's view that the determination of whether the image of breasts that are not entirely bare is invasive, should be left to the prosecuting authorities and the courts to decide. Having said that, though, we will accept the amendment.

Ms CHAPMAN: I indicate the opposition appreciates the government's agreement to this. Otherwise, it would be known as the 'bikini bill', and every poor girl who is brave enough to wear a bikini would potentially be the subject of inclusion. That would not have been acceptable to us, so we thank the Legislative Council for moving this sensible amendment and the government for accepting it.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 2:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 be disagreed to.

This is an amendment that we do oppose, and I would like to place on the record why. The act currently provides that in proceedings for an offence against section 26B—Humiliating or degrading filming offences—and it is important to bear in mind what we are talking about: humiliating and degrading filming—if the defender establishes that the conduct was engaged in by a media organisation as defined, the conduct will be taken to have been engaged in for a legitimate public purpose and thus be a defence to the charge unless the court finds otherwise.

I would like to make it clear right from the outset that this proposed amendment drastically expands the available statutory defence to a wider range of media organisations should they choose to publish humiliating and degrading images—I repeat: humiliating and degrading images; not images that are in the public interest, but humiliating and degrading images. The government has strictly defined 'media organisation' for these purposes so as to limit the types of media organisations that receive the benefit of this provision, media outlets that are subject to professional and ethical regulation and controls.

The original bill inserting this offence was the result of careful consideration and consultation and covers organisations that are regulated, licensed or otherwise formally recognised as professional media organisations. Nothing has changed since 2012 to support altering this definition in the present context. Indeed, if anything, the passage of the last few years has demonstrated what technology is doing in terms of providing completely irresponsible individuals with access to international broadcasting capabilities by means of something as simple as a phone.

The definition proposed by the opposition is based on a definition in the recently debated surveillance devices legislation. This legislation is entirely different to the surveillance devices legislation. The Surveillance Devices Act contains a broad definition of 'media organisation' as it specifically contemplates video or images being in the public interest, and therefore being publicly distributed. It is designed to protect people who expose things that are in the public interest.

Section 26B of the Summary Offences Act, however, seeks to protect victims from having humiliating or degrading images distributed—completely the opposite. There is no need for consistency between the two definitions, as has been suggested by the opposition, as the two acts are doing completely different things. It is a case of apples and oranges. There are very good and compelling reasons to keep the definitions inconsistent.

The government did not and does not intend to define what a media organisation is in contemporary society for all purposes with this definition. Rather, it defines 'media organisation' for the specific purposes of this bill being considered to be broadcasting for a legitimate public purpose and having a defence to a charge of distributing an image obtained by humiliating and degrading filming. The amendment is unhelpfully broad and could allow any YouTube, quasi news channel or faceless blogger to broadcast humiliating and degrading films while at the same time receiving, bizarrely enough, the benefit of being considered to be a 'media organisation', and their conduct being taken to be for a legitimate public purposes. This is a real fear.

While a court can find otherwise, as a matter of policy we must be clear which types of media organisations should be deemed by legislation to have engaged in actions for a legitimate public purpose and have a defence to such a charge. A person seeking to victimise another person through broadcasting of a humiliating or degrading image would in fact be assisted by this amendment, as it unwisely expands the net of potential broadcasters who may seek to claim they are broadcasting for a legitimate public purpose. We must not forget that, while a court may find that such a publication was not in the public interest, this would inevitably occur after the event and the damage would have already been done.

The opposition relies on the use of the term 'organisation' in the definition to assure us that their amendment does not extend to bloggers or irresponsible outlets. Given 'organisation' is not defined, it is unclear how the use of the term 'organisation' gives any legitimacy to the broad range of media and quasi-media groups that would be covered under the proposed new definition. 'Organisation' is not going to be limited to a company structure or a regulated body. The *Macquarie Dictionary*, no less, says that an organisation includes 'a body of persons organised for some end or work'. I do not think we can take any comfort from this.

The opposition's definition opens the door wide to every YouTube channel or blog to broadcast humiliating and degrading films while receiving the benefit of being considered to be a media organisation. It would not be beyond the realm of possibility for a group of three or four people to work together on their blog or website, titled 'Schoolyard Beatdown Media Online', and post images of schoolkids being assaulted, humiliated and degraded, contrary to the provisions in section 26B, under the guise of being a legitimate media organisation. This is surely not what parliament should be condoning or purporting to give any legitimacy to.

The Hon. Tammy Franks in the other place raised issues about media outlets that do not fall in this definition, including InDaily and *The Age* online. Whether or not these publications fall within the relevant definition is irrelevant. Does anybody really expect either of these websites to be inappropriately publishing degrading or humiliating images? I would not have thought so.

It is duly noted that the courts can determine if the publication was not for a legitimate public purpose, but I repeat: as a matter of public policy, we as a parliament must be clear which types of media organisations should be deemed by legislation to have engaged in actions for a legitimate public purpose and have a defence to such a charge. This is a privilege the parliament is extending to these people.

The government has confidence in the editorial discretion of mainstream media outlets that such images would be appropriately referred to police. It does not have the same confidence in certain forms of alternative media. Further to all of this, though, is a more pertinent question: why would it be necessary for any media organisation, legitimate or otherwise, to show images of a person being humiliated and degraded and thereby further contribute to the victimisation of the person depicted in the image?

Legitimate reporting of an offence by the media can surely be undertaken without publication of images constituting the original offence. I would hope this provision already has very little work to do so far as legitimate media organisations, as currently defined, are concerned. We should certainly not be encouraging this any further.

Ms CHAPMAN: The opposition has supported this amendment, and it is true that we considered the question of consistency in the definition of 'media organisation' and did look at the Surveillance Devices Act as a recent piece of legislation where this was the subject of considerable debate. That legislation was to provide for the publication and promotion of material that was published by a media organisation within certain circumstances, to enable that to occur in the public interest.

Whilst the government chooses to distinguish that legislation from the current legislation, which is to essentially protect against the publication of humiliating material, we do not accept that the definition needs to be different. In fact, there is a good case, as highlighted by outlets such as InDaily, for that to occur. So, we do not accept the government's position on that.

It seems that everyone in the other place understands the significance of this amendment and why it needs to be progressed in that form. It does not mean that there is no protection against someone who publishes in the terms that the Attorney has stated. A media organisation, in fact, still requires some definitional limits. If the Attorney wants to look at the question of defining 'organisation' in the statute, we are not averse to that. However, we consider that this is the appropriate course.

The Legislative Council obviously takes that view, so we remain in support of the amendment and are willing to accept it. Obviously, it is noted that the government's position is averse to that and, accordingly, it seems we are facing a deadlock position. After the message has returned to the Legislative Council, I will discuss with the Attorney nominees for that purpose, if they wish to proceed in that manner.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos 3 to 7:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 3 to 7 be agreed to.

These are essentially government amendments which were trying to deal with the question of multiple different ages being the age of 18, which is the age of majority, the age of 17, which is the age of consent, and so on. The amendments basically provide consistency for all of the part 5A offences with the Criminal Law Consolidation Act defence of unlawful sexual intercourse, which effectively provides that 17 is the age of consent. It is also consistent with the linked child exploitation material offences. It is appropriate to maintain consistency, we believe, with these types of offences in this section.

Motion carried.

CONSTITUTION (DEMISE OF THE CROWN) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 June 2016.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:17): I rise to speak on this bill, and I am almost too frightened to even record the descriptor of this bill for fear that I might be aiding and abetting the offence of treason.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I was just going to say, it is punishable by hanging still.

Ms CHAPMAN: There are some rather unsavoury penalties for treason, and I am going to refer to those in a moment, but they do include expulsion, transportation, and death, of course, by execution. May I just first indicate that, whilst we have been a little sceptical from our side of the house as to the necessity for this bill, we will accept the passage of the bill in an abundance of caution that it is necessary to extinguish historical common law.

Essentially, this bill will add a clause to our Constitution Act of 1934 and purports to dispose of any possibility, remote as that may seem, that a litigant may challenge the continuation of court matters in the event of the death of our sovereign—who, I remind the house, is The Queen of Australia under our Australia Act, as well as The Queen of England. It is the dissolution of parliament and the currency of court proceedings and the capacity for them to continue and conclude without interruption.

The origins of this, the Attorney suggests, are from the inquiry by the Legislative Council in Western Australia that reported in August 2015, the Standing Committee on Legislation in its Report No. 28. That report again confirms that, in a circumstance where the inquiry considered a number of matters and also the question of the transfer of sovereignty to another king or queen and how that may affect legislation, that had its origins in the United Kingdom, which had force in Western Australia.

What the Attorney-General did not tell us in his presentation to the parliament is that that recommendation came as a result of the Law Reform Commission of Western Australia 1994 report, that is 21 years before, entitled Project No. 75 on United Kingdom Statutes in Force in Western Australia. The identification of imperial acts that were relevant to this issue were considered, and this proposal emanated from that. In fact, in the standing committee's consideration of this matter, back in 2015, the Hon. Michael Mischin MLC, Attorney-General for Western Australia, gave evidence. He questioned whether legislation was required to deal with the circumstances, and he noted a number of complexities in relation to the imperial acts that were effective but about which there had been some mixed view as to whether they had been extinguished by subsequent legislation.

Again, on inquiry as to whether they acted on their own recommendation, it now appears clear that they have not and will not, and it may be considered after the next state election in Western Australia, which, as I am sure everyone knows, is in early 2017. So, from 1994 to 2017, they have not seen fit to rush this legislation, this protective envelope. However, they apparently had a meeting last year to suggest that they would consider advancing it, again to close the envelope of any possibility, remote as that may be.

It seems that New Zealand, as the government is aware, also had its origins from Britain legally and was run from Sydney for many years. It is now a country in its own right. It has its own parliaments and statutes. They did pass legislation. They have a slightly different system, but they

have passed it. The commonwealth has not seen fit to need it. Their constitution covers it. I have to say that it has been a long time since I have read the 1856 state constitution, which is our first South Australian constitution, but on my rereading, it appears to extinguish the alleged ill that we are apparently redressing today.

It seems as though other jurisdictions are advancing at a glacial pace the urgency of this. There are two events that give me some comfort (as I am sure it would give the house if we did not pass this). One is the death of Queen Victoria and her son's ascension to the throne. After the establishment of the South Australian colony all those events occurred. It did not appear to interrupt our legislative assembly or a court litigation at the time. Then of course we had the death of The King in 1954 and the elevation of Her Majesty Princess Elizabeth to become Queen Elizabeth II.

The Hon. J.R. Rau: And a couple before that as well.

Ms CHAPMAN: There were a couple before that, true, but I am talking now in more recent time. I am happy to go through the others if you would like me to, but I think I am making the point here that, if we fast-forward from 1954, when Princess Elizabeth was recalled from Africa to take the throne, she has served us so well, and she is now in her 90th year. She has continued to serve for more than six decades. She has that responsibility.

Whilst I was not alive at that time—I do not even think the Attorney was alive, possibly a few people in this house were alive at that stage—on reading accounts of the time, it appears that there was no major crisis in the state of South Australia. There were no challenges to the Supreme Court, people rushing down with petitions to have their litigation struck down as a result of the change of sovereign, or any rioting protests out the front of Parliament House to try to challenge the validity of legislation that was continuing to be passed in this forum.

I think South Australia took a bit of time off to welcome The Queen that year, have the Coronation Ball and all sorts of other happy events, but there was no challenge to these institutions which had some common law precedent. I am not personally persuaded that it is something that we need. It seems that Western Australia has not advanced past a glacial pace of consideration, nevertheless, in the abundance of caution, we will support it.

Let me return, however, to the criminal offence of treason. It is set out in our Criminal Law Consolidation Act as being confined to petty treason but, interestingly, just in case the Director of Public Prosecutions is listening in and wanting to charge anybody with treasonable behaviour, I just remind the Attorney that appendix 1 to our Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 makes provision, and I quote:

> When a Man doth compass or imagine the Death of our Lord the King, or of our Lady his Queen, or of their eldest Son and Heir…

etc., and it includes mistresses and various others which we have referred to before in this house. It goes on to say:

> …that ought to be judged Treason which extends to our Lord the King, and his Royal Majesty…

and further provision. Just in case the Attorney is worried, he can look at the provisions of the 1795 Treason Act, which came after the 1351 Treason Act, which is an appendage to our legislation even today, to find out what fate of penalties might attract him if the DPP decides to prosecute for his treasonable thoughts of the demise of Her Majesty by introducing this legislation.

I would not actually want him to be dragged away and shackled and charged or convicted for that. I could think of a number of other things that he should be punished for, but introducing this legislation is not one of them. I would even offer to go down as a character witness to say that he was just blindly ignorant when he came to the importance of issuing these proceedings; nevertheless, the bill will pass with our blessing.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the Attorney, I want to draw to the attention of the house that King George VI actually died in February 1952—

Ms Chapman: Sorry.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, we need to correct *Hansard* for you. The Queen ascended on 6 February 1952 but was crowned in June 1953. None of us could remember that, of course.

Ms Chapman: We weren't alive.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That's right—only by a few months in some cases.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:29): I rise to speak to the Constitution (Demise of the Crown) Amendment Bill 2016. Like the deputy leader, I certainly do not wish any ill will on Her Majesty in debating this legislation. I note the comments that the deputy leader made around the possible treasonous effects of the Attorney-General's bringing this to the house, but I hope he has no ill effects, apart from perhaps a session in the stocks. I would hope to see nothing higher than that.

This bill refers to the transfer of sovereignty from one queen or king to another upon their death, resignation, abdication or being deposed. You have to wonder whether we have to go through this process. As the deputy leader has outlined, certainly Western Australia and other jurisdictions have gone at a snail's pace. I certainly believe The Queen will live for quite a long time yet, and long may she reign. She has done an excellent job over her time as Queen.

I want to give a little bit of history on Queen Elizabeth II. She was born on 21 April 1926 and was the daughter of Prince Albert, Duke of York, who later became King George VI. As has been indicated in the house, she became Queen in 1952 but was not crowned until 1953. She is now the longest serving monarch in British history, having reigned for 63 years. Queen Elizabeth II is the 40th monarch since William the Conqueror obtained the crown of England. In June 2012, Queen Elizabeth celebrated her 60 years on the throne with the Diamond Jubilee.

Prior to ascending to the throne, Queen Elizabeth had the life of a royal family member. However, in 1939, during the Second World War, both Elizabeth and her sister were relocated to Windsor Castle for the majority of the time. It was at age 14 that Elizabeth made her first radio broadcast, when she reassured children with the words 'that in the end, all will be well, for God will care for us and give us victory and peace'. Furthermore, Elizabeth's father, The King, appointed Elizabeth Colonel-in-Chief of the Grenadier Guards. Her first public appearance was in 1942 and it was to inspect the troops. Elizabeth also participated in the Auxiliary Territorial Service in an attempt to help the war effort.

Queen Elizabeth is certainly extremely well travelled, and an example of this is her Silver Jubilee tours. It is estimated that The Queen travelled some 56,000 miles that year, which is somewhere a bit over 90,000 kilometres, as she wanted to mark her jubilee by meeting as many of her people as possible. It was noted that no other sovereign had visited so much of Britain in the short period of three months.

Events to mark The Queen's Golden Jubilee began in 2002, and six key themes surrounded these: celebration, community, service, past and future, giving thanks and the commonwealth. The Queen again travelled great distances for this jubilee and visited countries such as Jamaica, New Zealand, Australia and Canada, as well as every region of the United Kingdom from Falmouth, in Cornwall, to the Isle of Skye.

The Queen has provided royal assent to more than 3,500 acts of parliament. Queen Elizabeth has attended every opening of parliament, excluding two as she was expecting her children. She has a well-known love for corgis and has owned more than 30 corgis during her reign. She introduced a new breed called the dorgi which is a corgi-dachshund cross. She now only has two corgis, Holly and Willow, and two dorgis, Candy and Vulcan. The corgis and the dorgis have played a significant role in her reign.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You know of course, member for Hammond, that we are being really lenient here this morning, but we should put on record that her first corgi was actually from South Australia—well, not from South Australia, but the woman who bred the first corgi, the late Thelma Gray, actually came to South Australia. So, we have a connection to the corgis that perhaps people do not realise.

Mr PEDERICK: Well, that is fantastic news, Madam Deputy Speaker. I am glad you added to that great history of the corgis—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, it is about as relevant as everything else that we are hearing this morning.

Mr PEDERICK: —and The Queen. Getting to what happened in Western Australia, it was the Western Australian parliament that concluded that demise of the Crown provisions were required in that state to put beyond doubt the legal effect of the demise of the Crown, and it has been noted that they still have not moved down that path. This bill, no matter what happens, will ensure the continuity of parliament, public offices and legal proceedings. I guess it faces all of us, and obviously we are not sovereigns, but on the sovereign's demise all the functions, duties, powers, authorities, rights, privileges and dignities are transferred to the sovereign's successor but has no other legal effect.

Essentially, this would prevent parliament being immediately dissolved or a litigant challenging current court proceedings at the time of the sovereign's death. Certainly, I agree with the deputy leader that it is probably highly unlikely to have a legal case, but we have seen cases where there have been issues around GST funding in this great country, and that has been challenged and has caused effects down the line. I guess at the very least this blocks out litigants who may decide that they have a case and they want to push it. In closing my brief remarks, I wish The Queen all the best. Long may she live and long may she reign.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (11:36): I thank the member for Hammond for his thoroughly researched contribution on Her Majesty. If the house would bear with me for the next 13 minutes, I would like to speak about Edward VII, George V, Edward VIII and George VI. But I do not know all their dogs' names, so I would just embarrass myself if I did; I would show myself up to be not quite as well researched. I will let people know I will not be doing that.

I accept the point the deputy leader has made that we may be dealing with something here which could be put in the class of legal esoterica. It is true that when each one of those sovereigns I just mentioned moved on or abdicated, or whatever they did, the world did not end. What has happened to me, though, is at some point in time I had drawn to my attention the fact that however unlikely this matter might be it remains a risk and, in a litigious community, it is worth actually eliminating that risk. I must say my initial reaction was somewhat sceptical but after reflecting on it I thought, if the risk is small and it can be rectified so that it is reduced to zero, then it is probably worth doing. So, that is why we are doing this.

The comments made by the member for Bragg, the deputy leader, about the relatively esoteric nature of this, I accept, and to some extent I agree with, but having been presented with some advice about this matter it was worth resolving. As I understand it, some of the other Australian jurisdictions do not have the same potential problem we do because of the way their constitutional arrangements are framed. In fact, I think it is in the second reading speech that in New South Wales, Queensland, Tasmania and Victoria there are particular provisions which apparently deal with this matter. Whilst I accept that this is possibly not the most urgent or active piece of legislation we might pass, one day we may have saved ourselves considerable trouble.

On a lighter note, for the member for Bragg and the member for Hammond, at least we have not created a portfolio to deal with this matter as we did in the year 2000 situation when the then member for Bright saved the whole of the world, I think, from an absolute catastrophe where at midnight the world was going to come to an end, but fortunately because the then member for Bright was the minister for Y2K, that crisis was averted. The night passed as many other nights do. Trains continued, refrigerators continued to operate and aircraft continued to fly. Thank goodness we had him there to make sure that happened.

This is a far less expensive and time-consuming exercise than having the member for Bright deal with all of those difficult matters for a couple of years, and so I am sure in retrospect that it probably will be seen as being worth the effort.

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 Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (11:40): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 June 2016.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:40): I indicate that the opposition has considered the Legal Practitioners (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2016 and that we will support the passage of this bill. Essentially, it is to do two things; one is to remedy what I think could be described as an omission in drafting the previous bill, resulting in an unintended consequence, in any event, namely, to facilitate the allowance of incorporated legal practices to practice the profession of the law in partnership with another incorporated legal practice or with an individual legal practitioner. This was identified and has been incorporated in this bill.

I think it is fair to say that is the minor but necessary matter that needs to be tidied up and we accept that. It appears that the Law Society have been active in identifying this anomaly and that this amendment is consistent with their request. In respect of the balance of the bill, which is essentially to implement amendments at the behest of the Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner, Mr May, members will be aware that in the last two years or so he has operated as a commission to replace the old legal practitioners conduct board to deal with the misconduct of legal practitioners, usually resulting from some complaint by a party who feels that they have been unfairly dealt with, including everything from inconvenience to their being a significant victim, of either act or omission, of a legal practitioner.

Whilst the Supreme Court has a significant role in relation to the registration of legal practitioners and suspension, where appropriate and where necessary, it also gives a disciplinary role to the commissioner by virtue of the 2014 amendments. So, he has an important job to do. The amendments in this tranche of reform are to impose a three-year limit for complaints. It still enables the commissioner to retain the right to investigate matters outside that time limit, but it does impose that limit.

Secondly, it ensures that the commissioner is no longer required to investigate complaints where there has already been a declaration—that is, a court order of the Supreme Court—that the applicant has already been declared a vexatious litigant. At present, the commissioner still has an obligation to receive and assess that complaint for the purposes of dismissing it, reporting on it or of course conducting a full investigation of it. The third area of reform is purportedly to clarify the nature of an appeal to the tribunal against the determination of the commissioner. This provides that an appeal to the tribunal will be by way of rehearing, and the tribunal must, in reaching the decision, have regard to and give appropriate weight to the determination of the commissioner.

Finally, the bill makes some more minor amendments to allow the commissioner to publish on the register the name of any legal practitioner who has had their practising certificate suspended and, secondly, gives a discretionary power to the commissioner to cause information about the disciplinary action to be removed from the register in circumstances prescribed by regulation. I do not have any issue with the latter. I just want to make some comment in respect of the imposition of a time limit.

Whilst this may significantly reduce the workload of the commissioner by virtue of the stroke of a pen—the imposition of the three-year rule—members ought not be under any illusion that some of the people who feel aggrieved at, in their view, the injustice in not having their complaints heard against legal practitioners in relation to, as I say, the acts or omissions in the conduct, usually, of the

complainant's case, will not go away. Already, we receive as members of parliament, and probably the Attorney and I more than any, some very lengthy submissions from people who have felt aggrieved either by, in their view, the inadequacy of the previous Legal Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal determination of their matters or, more recently, by the commissioner himself.

They will come to us, and there will be an expectation that there will be some redress in this parliament, if they are not going to be dealt with as a conduct and disciplinary matter by the statutory office that we have now in place which, as I say, replaces the old tribunal. Be under no illusion, there are people in our community who feel aggrieved. They, at times, have put in multiple complaints and, at times, the Attorney has seen fit to appoint someone else—another party entirely—usually a retired judge or senior counsel, to try to independently make an assessment of the validity of concerns that have been raised.

Those concerns are very real for the complainants, who sometimes have some just cause, with the way they have been treated. Sometimes, even if one is sympathetic to the contribution that they put into these submissions to us or to other parties—they are feeling aggrieved and rightly so—there is no immediate way that we can remedy those past events. Certainly, as a parliament, we should always be alert to the concerns that are raised. Quite frequently, and probably the Attorney is in this position as well, we receive letters of complaint about judges or judgements. We now have a complaints procedure established by this parliament to deal with it. The Attorney is yet to appoint someone to deal with it, but—

The Hon. J.R. Rau interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: We are told that is imminent; nevertheless, there are some processes to deal with these things, so it is important that we remain alert to them. I do not think they will stem the amount of correspondence we as members of parliament receive from time to time, especially from prisoners. I got one this morning from someone in the Mount Gambier Prison who is very aggrieved about what he considers the determination of a judge and the conduct of criminal proceedings which resulted in him being imprisoned, he says unfairly, and his daughter continuing to be at risk of apparent further sexual exploitation.

These are very serious matters. It does not mean that we as members of parliament can easily remedy these matters. We have a legal process, we have an appeal process, usually, to deal with these matters. The introduction of a time limit will lighten the load for the commissioner but probably expand the role that we will have in trying to assist people through these matters. Secondly, in respect of the requirement not to investigate in the event that a court declaration has already been made, I am not sure that is the right way to go. I can see, on the face of it, the reason for doing it.

If an application is made to a court that someone is pursuing a trivial matter in a vexatious way, then that is a process which in itself is often quite lengthy. Sometimes the applicant who is the subject of a declaration represents themselves and they may feel very personally involved and aggrieved, but nevertheless they may not have had the benefit of some other independent advice, sometimes because they might have lost confidence, obviously, in the representation they have had previously. Nevertheless, again, this is a measure which will relieve the commissioner from having to review that again.

Then, of course, we have the question of the nature of appeal to the tribunal. On the face of it, I think that the legislation itself is deficient in the appeal process. Frequently, I come into this house on behalf of the opposition to raise concerns about the narrow opportunity for appeal, limited opportunity for appeal or, indeed, no appeal that is being proposed by the government in pieces of legislation. Sometimes, when they allow an appeal, there is no opportunity for the recovery of legal costs when an applicant is successful because of this obsession by the government in having legislation where there are no costs following the cause.

We continue to have those disputes, but they are not essentially the subject of the reforms in this legislation, so I am not going to go into the detail of them again. I think it is fair to say, though, that probably, by at least the first two measures here, we are going to be transferring the problem to members of parliament even more than they are now and, sadly, for a number of people, that is not going to provide them with any immediate joy because the capacity for the parliament to provide

relief is not individually within our power to do so. Limited as these amendments are, we do accede to them and support the bill.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (11:53): I thank the deputy leader for her contribution and thank her, also, for the indication of support from the opposition. There are just a couple of things I would like to say in response to her remarks. Firstly, in relation to her comment about the time limit, if you look at clause 9(3) in the amending bill, you will see that, yes, there is a three-year time limit, but under subsection (3c)—which is an amendment to section 77B(3)—it says that a complaint must be made to the commissioner within three years of the conduct or such longer period as the commissioner may allow.

So there is a discretion for the commissioner, in appropriate circumstances, to extend that three-year time limit. I think that is a reasonable compromise. If we had had an absolute time limit of three years, with no possibility of any sort of exception, that might have been a bit harsh, but given the fact that there is a discretion there I think that adequately deals with that matter.

The other points that were raised by the deputy leader are interesting points because essentially she is speaking about people who are vexatious litigants. There are people out there who, for reasons best known to themselves—these reasons perhaps initially starting with a grievance combined with a personality trait or perhaps people who could easily bring themselves within the provisions of section 269 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act—decide that they are going to make a career of agitating things. Initially, they usually use the courts as the vehicle for these agitations and typically these people have a lengthy history of self-styled court actions.

They are almost invariably self-represented because they have a habit of not being able to retain any legal counsel for any period of time because they sack them. Incidentally, as soon as they sack them, they then invariably make a complaint to the legal conduct board on the basis that the practitioner whom they have just sacked is somehow doing the wrong thing. If they take another lawyer up, the next lawyer is then invited to assist them and also to assist with preparation of the case against the lawyer who is now being complained of to the conduct board. When, inevitably, that lawyer falls foul of the individual they then have them added to the list of people against whom they are complaining to the conduct board and so on.

I do not think there is any point in my naming some of these people in here because I think the deputy leader is perfectly well aware of the sort of people I am talking about. These people derive some bizarre satisfaction from conflict and participating in the legal system. They relish the opportunity to make complaints and are basically making a nuisance of themselves. There is a process, a very difficult process, whereby these people can be declared vexatious. They have to reach a really high bar before they can be declared vexatious. They are not declared vexatious by me: they are declared vexatious by the courts on application, so they get a chance to be heard on that topic.

What had been happening was that all these people who had their capacity to clog up the courts with their spurious legal points restrained had transferred their activity from the courts—because they were not getting the easy access they were looking for in the courts because the courts had become quite aware of who they were—many of them decided to move their activities through to the legal conduct board. Sorry, the commissioner, who replaced the board—time gets away from me sometimes—so they would go to the commissioner. Of course, the commissioner, whatever he does, can never satisfy these people.

They then make a complaint against the commissioner because the commissioner has not done what they want in respect of another complaint they have, and because the commissioner himself is a legal practitioner who is going to investigate the commissioner in respect of a complaint about how the commissioner has dealt with another complaint about another lawyer, none of which complaints has any substance whatsoever?

The bottom line is that we have a situation where a very small number of people are wasting an enormous amount of time and money not just for the commissioner here but all over the place, in

the courts and everywhere else. Eventually, we must get to the point where we can say, 'Look, you have worn your welcome out. You have overdone it and you are actually wasting valuable public resources because you have either an obsession that you are not able to get over, or you have some medical complaint that should be dealt with appropriately'—whatever it might be.

I do appreciate the support of the opposition but I make it as clear as I possibly can that this is not just simply a matter of saying that the commissioner cannot be bothered doing stuff, let's make the commissioner's job easy—that could not be further from the truth. What we are talking about here is people who make that job extremely difficult to do by clogging the system up with completely unmeritorious or tactical complaints in order to pursue various agendas which have nothing to do with the merits of the case and everything to do with some other thing which is different for each one of these individuals.

As I said, I could name them. The member for Bragg, the deputy leader, is fully aware of who a number of these celebrity people are. I think if I were to name any of them that would just add to their celebrity. I do not wish to do that. We know who they are. These people are basically abusing the system. I think the system, ultimately, when it gets to the point where it is being abused to this extent, should have the capability of defending itself.

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 Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:00): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (DECLARED PUBLIC PRECINCTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 June 2016.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:01): I rise to speak on the Summary Offences (Declared Public Precincts) Amendment Bill 2016 and indicate that the opposition has considered the bill and we are supportive of the advancement of the two initiatives in this bill.

The first initiative is to allow the police to remove children from a declared public precinct, using the powers of removal under the Children's Protection Act, if the child is, in the opinion of an officer, in a situation of serious danger. The second initiative is to allow police to order a person or a group of people to leave a precinct if the police officer believes, or apprehends on reasonable grounds, that an offence of a kind that may pose a risk to the public order and safety has been or is about to be committed, or the presence of a person or group of persons poses a risk to public order and safety. A person who remains or who re-enters or attempts to re-enter during the declared period can be charged with an offence, with a $1,250 fine.

The bill itself implements a procedure where the Attorney-General, either on his or her own motion or on the recommendation of the Commissioner of Police, can declare an area a public precinct for a specified period of time. Essentially, it is proposed that this is to deal with events and places where there is reasonable likelihood, presumably in the mind of the Attorney-General, that conduct occurring in that area would pose a risk to public health and safety. It is also a regime proposed in this bill that such declaration would not be longer than 12 hours in any 24-hour period; essentially, it is consistent with covering significant events.

The other provisions of this bill I will come to in a moment, but can I say this: it is a matter of concern that there should be a declaration of a public precinct to be made on the determination of an attorney-general on his or her own motion.

For all of the matters that I raised regarding the necessity for this process, it seems that if it is to be confined to main events and the likelihood of there being a problem that needs to be addressed as a potential risk to public health and safety, then surely a declaratory process should only be in a circumstance where it is on the recommendation of the Commissioner of Police. There has been no example presented to the opposition which would suggest that this should be something that is entirely in the hands of the Attorney-General.

That said, with the agreement to allow for declared precincts and the amendments of the law, firstly to impose the penalty that has been referred to, which will facilitate a moving on procedure at and around these events, and secondly to enhance the protection under the Children's Protection Act for the protection of children, that is, enabling them to be removed, the opposition has a number of concerns.

We will look at this question of restricting the declaratory process being acted upon by the Attorney-General, currently to be allowed on his or her own motion, to circumstances where the police commissioner must recommend it. We will consider some of these other initiatives, but at present we are not inclined to support them. Obviously, the bill will traverse this house, and we will look at some other matters in the other place.

We remain awaiting some response in respect of stakeholders whom we consider ought to have an opportunity to present their views. Can I say that, in general terms, this regime of declaratory precincts, from which there are a number of proposed offences, barring orders and upgrading of the dealing of offensive weapons and use of metal detectors, is totally unique to South Australia. This whole process does not operate anywhere else in the country. It is a regime which is presented as being similar to the rules that apply around a licensed premises, and to that extent that is right.

We have very tight rules in South Australia, and indeed in other jurisdictions, in and around a licensed premises—this is for the purpose of selling alcohol; it is hotels, Adelaide Oval, and any other place that has a licence to sell alcohol. There are very strict rules which enable people to be removed, which enable them to be barred from entering those premises and indeed the immediate location, which prevent them from carrying offensive weapons, and of course subject to being detained, etc.

This regime is being expanded, I suppose, which the government suggests will be important for the management of persons who might be thinking about causing some trouble at an event, under the auspices of protecting others who want to have reasonable enjoyment of these events or activities within that precinct. That is not an objective that we would take issue with. It is obviously important to try to make sure, as best as possible, that when large crowds gather, whether they are watching a local cricket game or whether they are enjoying a barbecue or celebrating a certain event—New Year's Eve, major victories of sporting events, all those types of things—the people who are attending that event are safe and are protected against the unruly, offensive or illegal conduct of others. We say, however, that there appears to be no immediate justification for this.

Secondly, a number of issues have been raised by stakeholders who have had a chance to make a comment on this and, in particular, about how imposing this new regime may adversely and disproportionately impact on young people. Let me just look at the areas of concern: one is to allow police to bar a person from entering or remaining in the precinct if the person commits an offence of a kind that may pose a risk or, of course, behaves in an offensive or disorderly manner, and the capacity for the officer to choose to bar that person from entering any other declared public precinct specified in the order. So, it is quite extensive. It is not just to be barred from that precinct itself, but it could be all other areas that are under declaration at that time.

Secondly, they can serve an expiation notice on a person behaving in an offensive or disorderly manner, and this obviously adds to the lightening of the load for police officers. Thirdly, it makes it an offence to carry an offensive weapon or dangerous article in a declared public precinct without lawful excuse—$10,000 or two years imprisonment—as an aggravated offence, similar to what we have around licensed premises. Finally, it will allow police to carry out metal detection searches and general drug detection searches on a person who is in a declared public precinct.

In this area we have just had a most exhaustive debate in respect of biometric testing, which is fingerprinting, and the desire of the police, who apparently have been the requesting party for this

regime, for the government to progress this, and the parliament has rejected a circumstance where there is a proposal to introduce a legal process of excluding people or requiring them to submit to, in that case, fingerprinting, when they are just walking around doing their normal things. The parliament has said that is just not acceptable. There needs to be certain circumstances where people can be bailed up, held up, searched and, of course, then excluded from an area, which is the part of this regime that we are happy to present.

It is also important to remember that a lot of the areas that have been presented to us—major events (like at Adelaide Oval, for example), Hindley Street, Glenelg (which is a popular place on Christmas Eve, New Year's Eve and major occasions such as that), and major cultural festivals (which are sometimes held in beach areas where they attract a large crowd of people)—are frequently the subject of liquor licensing permits to be able to sell liquor for the event, or indeed within those locations are licensed premises, including hotels, restaurants and other outlets, that already attract a very substantial regime of powers to the police as a result of their being licensed premises within those precincts.

I do not know how many licensed premises there are in Hindley Street, but there would have to be a lot—20, 30, 40, I do not know, but a lot. It would be most of them, all the way along the street; you would probably have to count on one hand those that do not have a liquor licence, perhaps a dress shop or something of that nature. But, they are prolific in those precincts and, frankly, no justification has been put to us at this point that suggests that these are necessary.

The government briefing provided on this matter suggested that it was not necessary for this bill to go out to consultation directly to stakeholders, including the AHA (Australian Hotels Association). When we inquired (as we would) as to why there had not been a widespread consultation on this, the answer was that in March the Attorney-General put this on his website, and there was a press release. I did not read the press release, but there was certainly a bit of print media on this announcement that the government was considering introducing a new regime for event precincts as 'declared public precincts'.

It is possible that people who have an interest in this matter would have a practice (or someone in their organisation) of regularly sitting on the website of the Attorney-General and checking out what he is doing each day. I do not even do that, and I am the shadow attorney-general. He can be relieved to know that I do not sit and read all of the things he puts on his website every day, and I have a job specifically to shadow what he does. Of course, some of those things are pretty irrelevant, or peripheral and, frankly, are not worthy of looking at. But some of them are important, and mostly, when we make laws in this place, they affect someone's life, and they do require some consultation with the people whom they are most likely to affect.

As it turns out, when this idea was announced on the website the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia picked it up, and they provided a submission in April this year. Consistent with a number of other submissions, they rightly point out that the police already have considerable powers to deal with someone who is in a place of either committing an offence, or there is the likelihood of someone who, on reasonable grounds, is going to cause some disruption and/or commit a direct offence.

This point has been made to highlight that they already have summary offences that they can act upon and certain powers to deal with them, but they do not specifically have an offence that they can call upon to require that they move on that suspicion. That is something that we do not dispute. As I say, we are prepared to agree to that on the basis that it is probably reasonable in the circumstance.

Someone recently raised with me an interesting point on this review of the law and what is being proposed. That person is now in the military, but he indicated that he had previously been in a police force in Australia. Commonly, if they had a problem with young people—usually in a group causing some trouble, or looking for a bit of trouble—they would announce to the group that they would be doing a quick warrant search. That usually had the effect of dispersing them very quickly.

Sometimes, we change things on the basis that it is going to introduce a better reform, and we throw out good things with the bad things. Nevertheless, we are satisfied that at least the police ought to be able—if they have reasonable belief in relation to this—to ask that person to move on.

We are agreeable to that. What we are not agreeable to is introducing new offences and barring orders which are completely unnecessary and which will target young people. In respect of the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia, they said:

YACSA contends that the police already have extensive powers to intervene where young people may be involved in offending behaviour or likely to become involved in offending behaviour, and to call in care and protection authorities as necessary.

We are particularly concerned about the potential for young people under the age of 16 (whom we believe have the right to access public space) attracting unnecessary attention and contact with police and other authorities, particularly those who choose to access public space without their parents being present.

YACSA believes that young people have the right and should be free to exercise the right to access public space in South Australia. This includes public space in the city which includes parks, parklands, meeting areas, and Adelaide's five Squares. As such we do not support any legislation that has the potential to disproportionately impact upon young people.

Unsurprisingly, that submission was supported by the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement. I will not traverse the detail that they have outlined, but it is a similar concern. The Law Society of South Australia made comments in April this year in response to the invitation to make a contribution.

The Hon. J.R. Rau: They must have found it on the website.

Ms CHAPMAN: I think they were actually at least alerted to it. They made it quite clear that they considered that there were adequate safeguards under our current legislation. They went so far as to say that it was unnecessary to even have a power to request a person to leave a declared public precinct. As I said, we are not satisfied that there is necessarily a major problem out there, but we are prepared to agree to that extent.

The Children and Law Committee and the Aboriginal Issues Committee both considered the proposed bill and confirmed their objection to the same. In respect of young people experiencing homelessness or other forms of social disadvantage or marginalisation, they made the point that:

31. For many young people, being taken home by police is no safer than being permitted to remain in the declared public precinct where they can access services supports and their homeless peer group for support.

32. Young people in a state of primary homelessness tend to use the city as a safe place to stay awake and away from the deeply fractured environment of home rather than sleep rough. They then access specialist youth and homelessness support services upon opening in the morning; services such as Streetlink and Trace-A-Place.

33. Proposed [section] 66R would have a negative impact on the cohort of young people. In addition, many of these young people are declared to be independent of Centrelink and in receipt of the Unreasonable to Live At Home Allowance (UTLAH). UTLAH may be granted to young people aged 15 or over. In this instance, a young person is their own legal guardian and are not required to have a 'guardian' present as suggested by the proposed [section] 66R(1)(a).

34. If Police are to take children and young people removed from the declared public precinct home, we suggest that there must be accompanying support to the families of these young people.

35. Support is critical to assist families to begin to address the factors that led to their children and young people leaving in the first place. Simply taking them back home does nothing to address these reasons and may continue to place children in situations of (hidden) harm within the family home.

Quite possibly, the provisions under the Children's Protection Act that compete with this are already adequate, which does raise the question about the proposal, in any event, to allow police to remove children from a declared public precinct. Probably, under the Child Protection's Act, they have other powers to be able to deal with that in any event. Nevertheless, again on the abundance of caution, we are prepared to tighten child protection law if that is deemed necessary.

However, it does raise the question, doesn't it, when governments decide they want to look like they are tough in dealing with public disorder and purport to be out there protecting the public at large by imposing a web of obligations and restrictions on all those other law-abiding people in those premises, who can be searched and have metal detectors run over them, be unable to re-enter a premises, be barred from a precinct and/or have an expiation notice issued on them and also have massive extra penalties in respect of weapons.

I just highlight the fact that there are very strict laws already in respect of carrying weapons. This legislation has been in place for some time. I can recall there being a very strong and strict

upgrade of carrying offensive weapons after the tragic knifing death on Grenfell Street of a young man by another young man. So, the law has responded, and we supported the government to ensure that we have strict laws in relation to the upgrade of that. But here we are talking about treating a public event, under the declaration of the Attorney, at his own whim if he wishes to, purportedly to protect others.

The Chair of the SA Council for Civil Liberties, Ms Claire O'Connor, was reported in the newspaper as being supportive of these amendments and the reforms that had been announced by the government. The Attorney puts his hands up in horror here as though in some way he has reported—this is a report that is in the media suggesting that there has been support for these amendments. On inquiry with Ms O'Connor, her position is that, while she agrees with the enhancement of child protection and the moving-on provisions, which is consistent with what the opposition is promulgating here today, she does not support the other proposals by the government in this legislation, and she made that very clear.

Obviously, she understands, given her professional work as a barrister and her history in respect of civil liberties, the importance of protecting young people against what will be an unnecessary restriction on them and potentially bring them into a regime in which there will be a disproportionate impact on them. With that contribution, I indicate that we accept that the bill will be passed in this place. There has been no other demonstrable information presented to us as to why we would otherwise support these proposals. We will review the question of the declaration process being initiated by the Attorney of his own motion in another place.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call on the Attorney, or indeed the member for Heysen, who has sprung to her feet, I would like to acknowledge the presence in the gallery today of the student leadership team and teachers from Hindmarsh Primary School, who are guests of the member for Torrens. We welcome them to parliament. We are in a second reading speech and we know you will be enjoying it.

Bills

SUMMARY OFFENCES (DECLARED PUBLIC PRECINCTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (12:28): I wish to make a brief contribution, simply because I am somewhat dismayed at this government's continuous intrusions into the freedom of our society. We already, of course, have lockout laws. We already have quite extensive laws under the legislation supposedly going to control the bikies and all the other nefarious activities of organised criminal gangs and so on. Now the government has brought forward the Summary Offences (Declared Public Precincts) Amendment Bill, which seems to me to be an unnecessary further intrusion into the freedom of individuals.

Over the 14 years that I have been in this place, this government has managed to decimate the financial status of this state. Very few people realise just how much that new hospital is going to cost us once we move in and start paying $1.1 million a day for the next 30 years. We are not getting any more doctors out in the suburbs and in the regions, but we are going to be paying an awful lot of money for that building. That and many other things in which this government has supposedly invested have left us in a dreadful financial situation.

Mike Rann, when he was premier, used to refer to Adelaide as the Athens of the South and well may he have done so because he and his cohort will indeed turn us into the Athens of the South by absolutely decimating the financial situation in this state. But, with all of that, at least one could say that we lived in a free society. This government and, in particular, this Attorney-General seem bent on making sure that those freedoms are curtailed wherever possible—unnecessarily, it seems to me.

I understand that the Attorney may at some point wish to sit on the bench of a court, but I have to say that my discussions with many members of the legal profession expressed profound disappointment in the current Attorney's attitude to law and order because he continues to beat the drum of 'We're tough on law and order' rather than actually looking at what causes crime and what we might do both to prevent it and to rehabilitate those who become involved in a criminal cycle.

In that regard, I can say that I served with former Speaker the Hon. Bob Such on the juvenile justice select committee many years ago in this place and it was clear from the evidence given to that committee that, in fact, the cycle of criminal behaviour really was identifiable in most instances from a very young age. Indeed, we had much evidence before the committee to indicate that teachers can often tell as young as grade 1 which students were likely to end up going off the rails, to use that expression.

Having identified those youngsters, the trick was going to be intervening in a way which was appropriate but which did not label them and then force them to live up to the label that had been applied to them. A lot could have been done over the last 14 years in terms of addressing the problems of young people entering into criminal behaviour, some of which starts out with something quite minor, but this government has failed to address any of those issues and instead, over a period of many years, has taken it upon itself to simply beat the drum of being tougher and tougher on law and order.

I note that there have been a number of submissions in relation to the bill. In particular, the Law Society suggests that the bill as proposed will have a disproportionate impact on both Aboriginal people and young people. That view was in fact supported by the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia, which I think might have formerly employed the newly elected (but not yet sworn in) member for Mayo, Ms Rebekha Sharkie. I think she may have worked for the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia in recent years.

In any event, the Youth Affairs Council provides a submission on this bill and rightly points out in its submission that the police already have extensive powers to intervene where young people might be involved in offending behaviour and, like the Law Society, says that the bill will, in all likelihood, disproportionately impact on young people.

In a similar vein, the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement made a submission and, unsurprisingly, said that in their view both young people and Indigenous people would and could be disproportionately affected by this bill. For a government that supposedly stands for equality and reasonableness in its treatment of people, I cannot see how it is that this government can justify bringing in what it proposes.

The only part of the bill that I would say I support, and that only tentatively because I have not had time to check what other powers there might be, is the provision which allows the police to remove children from a declared public precinct. The bill is about declaring these public precincts. Police could be empowered to remove children, using powers of removal under the Children's Protection Act if the child is, in the opinion of the police officer, in a situation of serious danger.

I would have thought that, firstly, they probably already have that power and, even if they do not, that it would be a very surprising thing if in any event there was a child in a situation of serious danger a police officer removed from the situation and there was anyone who objected to it. Nevertheless, that is the one provision of the bill that I indicate I would be prepared to support. I do not know whether or not we are going into committee but, if we are not, I will be opposing the bill in any event.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:36): I have a few things to say about the contributions, and some of this is in no particular order. There is a difference between what this bill actually proposes to do and what those opposite are characterising it as doing and then criticising. It is the classic example of set up the straw man. I know I have said this before, but one thing you find consistent with a great many movies, usually science fiction ones, is that you start off with one tiny little premise which is

completely bogus—like it is possible to travel in time or to teleport from one part of the planet to another instantaneously—and after—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Attorney, sit down. The house is reminded of standing orders. It is very early in the week. Attorney.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: After you have accepted the bogus proposition that you can get into a blue phone—

Ms Redmond: Like privatising Medicare.

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —box and travel from here to another planet at a different time, everything else seems pretty logical. Let's get back to what we are talking about here. Let's be clear on what it is and what it is not. What it is is to say that if you have an area such as, for example—and I am using this is a very concrete example because I think it is likely to be the only area I can think of that is almost a certainty for this—Hindley Street, in particular between King William Street and Morphett Street, and you have a look at that area and, as the member for Bragg quite rightly said, it is chock-a-block full of licensed premises. It is no secret that that is also a mecca for yobbos and ne'er-do-wells and people who have had far too much alcohol who become very unruly and cause trouble and fights and all sorts of other problems on the street.

We are in a bizarre situation now where the police have powers to do all sorts of things—to question those people, to arrest those people, to bar those people, to wand those people with metal detectors, to put dogs on those people to sniff if they have illicit drugs in their pockets and all that sort of thing. They can do it if they are in a queue outside a licensed premises. They can do it if they are inside the licensed premises. If my memory serves me correctly, they can do it if they are in the car park of the licensed premises, but if they are just on the footpath, even a big mob of them, or they are congregating around, they cannot do any of those things.

We have this bizarre situation where every building down Hindley Street and a small bit out the front of it, where people might queue up, and the little roads down the side, like that one down the side of Red Square, the name of which I cannot remember, those little streets—Rosetta I think it is—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Rosetta is where they stab people.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, where they stab people.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader is called to order.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: What happens is that the police now have this honeycomb sort of situation: 'If you step over here into the queue line, we can do all sorts of things; if you step out of the queue line, we can't do anything. We have a completely different set of rules applying.'

All I am trying to establish here is that between certain hours on certain days there can be, by this mechanism, a gazettal to say that the police can interact with people in that street. Whether they are on the footpath, in a queue, in a licensed premises, walking up the middle of the street, whatever they are doing, they have the same power to deal with those people in respect of the following things: bad behaviour, checking whether they are carrying weapons—and, remember, there is no excuse whatsoever for people carrying offensive weapons anywhere, but particularly in an area which is chock-a-block full of licensed premises and drunk people. They can check for weapons and they can check for drugs; that is it.

I do not consider the idea that we can identify a place—and let's say it is Hindley Street on Friday night and Saturday night between 9pm and 9am, or whatever it might be—and I cannot see for the life of me how that is causing the catastrophic impact that everyone is wailing and carrying on about. It does not do that. What it means is that in periods of time when that part of the city is chock-a-block full of people, and we know and the police tell us that there is the highest probability of having

violent, unnecessary injury of people because of bad behaviour, the police should be able to say, 'Look, move on, you. Get out of here for the time being. Not forever, not for the rest of your life, but between these hours on these nights for a defined period of time.'

There is a completely bogus attack on this which needs to be set straight. We are on about having a safe city where people—not just the people who live here but the people from interstate and overseas we hope might visit here—are going to actually recognise that this city has a reputation for safety. I cannot see any reason why we should be trying to impede the ability of the police, particularly in these very limited areas where we have large numbers of licensed premises trading all night, and why the police should not have the capacity to try to eliminate people carrying weapons and people trading in drugs, or people who are so disorderly that they are making a nuisance of themselves and hurting other people, and get them out of there. I cannot for the life of me see what is wrong with that.

As for the consultation, it has been up on the website since 19 March and, as the deputy leader indicated, most people seem to have found it, at least most of those who have an interest in it seem to have found it since then. I am not sure who we are supposed to be consulting with who have not already offered their opinions—

Ms Redmond interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —but I assume that those people who want to carry weapons and sell pills to kids in places in Hindley Street will disagree with this legislation. I welcome their disagreement because if they liked it I would not have got it right. I am happy that those people do not like it because I do not want their support. I want them not to like it—that is the whole point.

Ms Redmond interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Heysen, do not cause me to call you to order again.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: As for this business about disproportionate impacts on various people, can I come back to the reality of this—not the *Doctor Who* version of it. The reality of it is that we are saying, 'Probably Friday and Saturday night between certain hours, if you go in this area, and if you behave badly, you will be booted out and you can't come back otherwise you will get an expiation notice.' How on earth is that singling out any person in the community, other than people who are behaving badly? How on earth is that picking on anybody, other than people who are behaving badly, or people who are carrying weapons, or people who are carrying drugs?

Are those opposite saying that all young people who come into the city fit into that category? They cannot behave, they are carrying weapons, and they are carrying drugs.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: And if they do it's okay anyway.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Newland.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, good point.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do not respond to an interjection.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Sorry. I thought it was a good one.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It can't have been because I'm not laughing.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Okay. Fair enough.

Ms Redmond interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Heysen.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: What a low opinion they must have of young people that they think they need protection from this sort of stuff because they will be offenders. Of course the Law Society does not like this. They have their opinion, I respect their opinion, but I am not surprised about their opinion. It is what they do to have this opinion, I understand that, and fair enough. It is fine. The

member for Bragg mentioned that we have all these tough rules about carrying knives and all that sort of stuff. Yes, we have, but—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: You have to find them.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: You have to find them, exactly. I am not sure about this, but I think if you spoke to most police officers, they would tell you that people who are carrying concealed weapons do not voluntarily say, 'You've got me, here is my concealed weapon.' They do not do that. They actually carry them in a concealed way for one reason, that is, they do not want to be detected. Guess what will make them feel really nervous about carrying a concealed weapon? The knowledge that if they go into that precinct with their concealed weapon and they look like they are up to no good the police might come up to them and say, 'Excuse me, sir or madam, do you mind if I run this metal detector over you?' That might actually make people think twice about carrying knives, 'namchakus' and all these other elaborate things people carry into these places.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Nunchaku.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Nunchaku, is it? I am sorry I am not familiar with the spelling. Let's stick with knives, I can pronounce that properly. That is what we are on about. This is not trying to change the whole world. We are just recognising reality. There are certain places which are like a honey pot for people who are up to no good. That is bad luck, but it is the truth. I use that example again of, say, Hindley Street, Friday and Saturday night between 9pm and 9am. You do not have to be Einstein to work out that, if you are looking for trouble, the most likely place in the city you can find it is right there. Everybody knows that, you do not have to be a genius. That is the reality. This is not the *Doctor Who* version: this is the reality version.

My last point is Claire O'Connor. I did raise my eyebrows when mention was made by the member for Bragg about Claire O'Connor supporting my legislation. I would have been devastated if she and I had agreed on something as profound as this, but I was relieved to hear that in fact that was a mistake. I can assure the member that I never thought Claire would have been a rapturous supporter of this legislation. If the media wrote such a thing about her, she should take it up with them because it certainly did not come from me. I certainly did not say Claire was supporting this. I respect her views and I know them well. I am certain that she would not be supporting this for a whole bunch of reasons about which she, like the opposition in my respectful opinion, are completely mistaken.

This is a limited, measured bill to provide an enhanced degree of public safety in limited circumstances for limited periods of time in limited places. I think we all should ask ourselves a question: if we have family, friends, children, whoever travelling to the city at night-time, do we want the city to be the safest place it can possibly be, where we do not have drunk, violent people hanging around, where we do not have people with concealed weapons hanging around, where we do not have people with pockets full of pills to sell hanging around? Is that not what we want?

If we do want that, what is wrong with actually saying to the police that just because you pass from this artificial construct of the queue outside of this premises and take a step away you can no longer use your metal detector and you cannot have the dog sniff the person's pocket to see if they have got pills in there? It is just madness. This is all about public safety. Contrary to, with respect, the quite bizarre submissions about picking on young people, this is about actually guaranteeing young people, and their parents who I know would be worried about them, that they can go into town and they can be safe in town because the chance of them being confronted with a drunken yobbo with a knife in their pocket has gone down a lot by reason of this new capability. For those people who want to get into town and behave sensibly, this is the best thing since sliced bread.

Finally, the proposition that homeless people, homeless kids, who want to come into town for safety reasons will be impacted by this, again another *Doctor Who* construct, even if what I anticipate might happen were to happen, it would simply mean that a young person who wants to behave badly, and insists on going to Hindley Street to do it, might be asked to leave. I am struggling to see the problem there.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Make no apology for it.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That is a bit of a cliché, so I am just struggling to see what the problem is.

The Hon. S.W. Key interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: True. I hope the opposition will reflect a bit on this between here and the other place. The issue of safety in our city and on our streets is a very important issue. I make it very clear that I have always had the view that this thing will be limited in time, limited not only by hours but by days, and limited in place. It is intended to say, 'Those of you who want to come into town and congregate in large numbers and get drunk and carry weapons and sell people pills and generally misbehave, this is not a good idea because the place you are going to is a place where you might just wind up either getting a spot fine or, worse, detected with a weapon—detected with a weapon, importantly—and then all those provisions we brought in about carrying weapons then click in and you wind up with a serious offence.'

I understand what has been said opposite. I hope people will reflect again on what this is actually about and what it is seeking to achieve. It is anything but picking on defenceless law-abiding citizens. It is actually saying to all law-abiding citizens whatever their age, whatever their ethnicity, 'You come to the city and have a good time, and you behave yourself and have a good time, and we welcome you. Good. Not only that, we are going to make the city a safer place for you to come in and have a good time.'

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 Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:52): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Sitting suspended from 12:53 to 14:00.

FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS (PARENTAGE PRESUMPTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

RAIL SAFETY NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (MISCELLANEOUS NO 2) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (YOUTH COURT) BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

APPROPRIATION BILL 2016

Message from Governor

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the house the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Appropriation Bill 2016.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I will not tolerate interjections today, especially from people Peta Credlin has referred to as bedwetting types.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Newland to order for interrupting the deputy leader's notice of motion.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Auditor-General—
- Department for Communities and Social Inclusion—Concessions Supplementary Report June 2016 [Ordered to be published]
- Enterprise Patient Administration System Supplementary Report June 2016

Local Government Annual Reports—Adelaide Hills Annual Report 2014-15 [Ordered to be published]

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

Remuneration Tribunal—Determination and Report No. 9 of 2016 Report Conveyance Allowance—Judges, Court Officers and Statutory Officers

Regulations made under the following Acts—
- Fees Regulation—
  - Incidental SAAS Services—Fees No. 2
  - Public Trustee Administration—Fees No. 2

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
- Associations Incorporation—Fees No. 2
- Bills of Sale—Fees No. 2
- Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration—Fees No. 2
- Burial and Cremation—Fees No. 2
- Community Titles—Fees No. 2
- Co-operatives (Adoption of National Law)—Fees No. 2
- Coroners—Fees No. 2
- Criminal Law (Clamping, Impounding and Forfeiture of Vehicles)—Fees No. 2—Fees
- Criminal Law (Sentencing)—Fees No. 2
- District Court—Fees No. 2
- Electronic Transactions—Miscellaneous
- Environment, Resources and Development Court—Fees No. 2
- Evidence—Fees No. 2
- Expiation of Offences—
  - Fees No. 3
  - Reminder and Enforcement Warning Notices—Fees
- Magistrates—Fees No. 2
- Partnership—Fees No. 2
- Public Trustee—Fees No. 2
- Real Property—
  - Fees No. 2

General
Registration of Deeds—Fees No. 2
Second-hand Vehicle Dealers—Fees No. 2
Security and Investigation Industry—Fees No. 2
Sexual Reassignment—Fees No. 2
Sheriff's—Fees No. 2
South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal—Fees
State Records—Fees No. 2
Strata Titles—
Fees No. 2
Record Keeping
Summary Offences—
Fees No. 2
General
Supreme Court—Fees No. 2
Work Health and Safety—Fees No. 2
Worker's Liens—
Fees No. 2
Miscellaneous
Youth Court—Fees No. 2
Rules made under the following Acts—
District Court—
Criminal—Amendment No. 3
Criminal—Supplementary—Amendment No. 2
Supreme Court—
Criminal—Amendment No. 3
Criminal—Supplementary—Amendment No. 2

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Development—
Fees No. 2
Open Space Contribution Scheme
Renewal of Social Housing
Electronic Conveyancing National Law (South Australia)—General
Private Parking Areas—Fees No. 2

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Dangerous Substances—
Dangerous Goods Transport—Fees No. 2
Fees No. 2
Employment Agents Registration—Fees—Variation
Explosives—
Fees No. 2
Fireworks—Fees No. 2
Security Sensitive Substances—Fees No. 2
Fair Work—Fees No. 2

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Freedom of Information—Fees No. 2

By the Minister for Consumer and Business Services (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
- Authorised Betting Operations—Fees No. 2
- Building Work Contractors—Fees No. 2
- Conveyancers—Fees No. 2
- Gaming Machines—Fees No. 2
- Land Agents—Fees No. 2
- Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing)—
  - Fees No. 2
  - General
- Liquor Licensing—Fees No. 2
- Lottery and Gaming—Fees No. 2
- Plumbers, Gas Fitters and Electricians—Fees No. 2

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
- Food—Fees
- South Australian Public Health—
  - Legionella—Fees No. 2
  - Wastewater—Fees No. 2

By the Treasurer (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
- Emergency Services Funding—Remissions—Land Amendment

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
- Land Tax—Fees No. 2
- Petroleum Products Regulation—Fees No. 2

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
- Mines and Works Inspection—Fees No. 2
- Mining—Fees No. 2
- Opal Mining—Fees No. 2
- Petroleum and Geothermal Energy—Fees No. 2

By the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
- Aquaculture—Fees No. 2—No. 57
- Fisheries Management—
  - Demerit Points
  - Fees No. 3—No. 55
  - Fees No. 2—No. 56
  - Miscellaneous Amendment—No. 54
- Livestock—Fees No. 2
- Plant Health—Fees—Variation
- Primary Produce (Food Safety Schemes)–
  - Citrus Industry—Fees No. 2
  - Egg—Fees No. 2
  - Meat Industry—Fees No. 2
  - Plant Products—Fees No. 2
  - Seafood—Fees No. 2

By the Minister for Local Government (Hon. G.G. Brock)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
- Local Government—Fees No. 2

Local Council By-Laws—
- Campbelltown City Council—
  - No. 1—Permits and Penalties
  - No. 2—Moveable Signs
  - No. 3—Roads
  - No. 4—Local Government Land
  - No. 5—Dogs
- District Council of Robe—
  - No. 1—Permits and Penalties
  - No. 2—Local Government Land
  - No. 3—Roads
  - No. 4—Moveable Signs
  - No. 5—Dogs
  - No. 6—Cats
- Port Pirie Regional Council—
  - No. 1—Permits and Penalties
  - No. 2—Moveable Signs
  - No. 3—Local Government Land
  - No. 4—Roads
  - No. 5—Dogs
  - No. 6—Cats

By the Minister for Ageing (Hon. Z.L. Bettison)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
- Retirement Villages—Fees No. 2

By the Minister for Education and Child Development (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Save the River Murray Fund—Annual Report 2014-15

Regulations made under the following Acts—
- Adoption—Fees No. 2
- Animal Welfare—Fees No. 2
- Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium—Fees No. 2
- Children's Protection—
  - Fees No. 2
  - Miscellaneous Amendment
- Crown Land Management—Fees No. 2
- Environment Protection—Fees No. 2
- Heritage Places—Fees No. 2
- Historic Shipwrecks—Fees No. 2
- Marine Parks—Fees No. 2
- National Parks and Wildlife—
  - Hunting—Fees No. 2
  - Protected Animals—Marine Mammals—Fees No. 2
  - Wildlife—Fees No. 2
- Native Vegetation—Fees No. 2
- Natural Resources Management—
  - Fees No. 2
  - Financial Provisions—Fees No. 2
- Pastoral Land Management and Conservation—Fees No. 2
- Radiation Protection and Control—Fees No. 2
- Water Industry—Fees No. 2

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
- Fire and Emergency Services—Fees No. 2
- Firearms—Fees No.2
- Harbors and Navigation—Fees No. 2
- Heavy Vehicle (General) National Law (South Australia)—
  - Expiation Fees Amendment
  - South Australia—Fees- Variation
- Heavy Vehicle National Law Amendment Regulation—No. 2
- Housing Improvement—Fees No. 2
- Hydroponics Industry Control—Fees No. 2
- Marine Safety (Domestic Commercial Vessel) National Law (Application)—Fees No.2
- Motor Vehicles—
  - Accident Towing Roster Scheme—Fees No. 2
  - Expiation Fees—Fees No. 2
- Passenger Transport—
  - Miscellaneous
  - Taxi Fares
- Police—Fees No. 2
- Rail Safety National Law (South Australia)—Fees—Variation—No. 58
- Road Traffic—
  - Expiation Fees—Fees No. 2
  - Miscellaneous—Fees No. 2
- Roads (Opening and Closing)—Fees No. 2
- Valuation of Land—Fees No. 2

By the Minister for Disabilities (Hon. L.A. Vlahos)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
- Disability Services—
  - Assessment of Relevant History Amendment
  - Fees No. 2—Fees

By the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse (Hon. L.A. Vlahos)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
- Controlled Substances—Pesticides—Fees No. 2
- Tobacco Products Regulation—Fees No. 2

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today students from Hampstead Primary School and their principal, who are guests of the member for Torrens.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I am reminded by the member for Stuart that we have students from Robertstown Primary School, who are his guests. I also welcome to parliament, students from Woodville High School who are guests of the Premier and member for Cheltenham, and I also acknowledge a delegation from Kenya: the Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission of Kenya, who are guests of the Minister for Multicultural Affairs.

Mr Griffiths interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Is the member for Goyder interjecting, or conducting a colloquy with himself?

Mr Griffiths: No, the Treasurer and I are having a conversation, sir.

Ministerial Statement

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT: CONCESSIONS REVIEW

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:13): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Today, the Auditor-General has released his report entitled—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: —Department for Communities and Social Inclusion—

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned a first time.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: —Concessions Review 2015-16. This report deals principally with the issue of concessions validation and reconciliation, with a particular focus on the energy concession.

During the six-year time period covered by the Auditor-General's report, DCSI was responsible for the payment of almost $800 million in concessions for council rates, energy, transport and water. Due to the limitations of DCSI's current computer system, the Auditor-General identified validation issues with some concession payments.

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: These amount to approximately 3 per cent of the value of the concession payments administered for council rates, energy, transport and water concessions during this period. This does not mean that these concession payments were not legitimate.

When paying concessions, it is important that they get to those who need them as fast as possible. Each year, more than 200,000 South Australian households benefit from energy, water and sewerage concessions, with the energy concession being provided to more households than any other concession. The energy concession is highly volatile and experiences a higher level of 'customer churn', more than other concessions administered by DCSI. A considerable number of customers may come in and out of eligibility each year, or change retailers during the year and, as well, new customers enter. Centrelink beneficiaries, such as Newstart recipients, may become eligible and also ineligible several times during the year.

In his report, the Auditor-General makes a number of recommendations regarding changes to DCSI validation processes, payment, and reconciliation of concessions. The Auditor-General is supportive of the upgraded energy reconciliation processes that the department has implemented since late last year. The department has indicated it would also welcome the opportunity to work with the Auditor-General's Department to further improve its processes.

The government has allocated funds in the budget for the implementation of a purpose-built and fully automated database, COLIN, which will enable validation, payment calculation and customer level reconciliation. While this system is currently focused on the new cost-of-living concession, I have instructed my department to examine its expansion to cover all concessions. The Auditor-General has also recommended changes to information sharing processes to improve processes and discussions with energy retailers. This is also being undertaken. We are focused on continuing to provide government assistance to those who need it in both a timely fashion and one that is fiscally responsible.

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphett is called to order, warned a first time and warned a second time.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:18): I bring up the report of the committee entitled Annual Report 2015.

Report received.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:19): I bring up the 116th report of the committee entitled Pinery Fire Regional Fact-Finding Trip.

Report received and ordered to be published.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:20): I bring up the 547th report of the committee entitled Torrens and Goodwood Rail Junctions Project.

The SPEAKER: The Speaker will read this with great interest.

Ms DIGANCE: Please.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Question Time

ENTERPRISE PATIENT ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): My question is to the Minister for Health. Why is it that, after years of implementing the electronic patient administration system, there is still no accurate cost projection or completion time frame for this project? In the Auditor-General's supplementary report tabled in parliament today, he states:

> Until EPAS is fully implemented at all in-scope sites, the full costs and benefits to be realised cannot be accurately determined. We remain of the opinion, however, that the Program's time frames, costs and estimation of required effort as specified in the original…business case were overly ambitious.

Mr Goldsworthy: What a shambles!

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

Ms Sanderson: Overspruiked and underdelivered.

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:22): I am very pleased that the Leader of the Opposition should ask me about the Auditor-General's Report because there is some salutary reading in there. The Auditor-General says—and I have not had an opportunity to read the report, but I did quickly—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I issued a warning earlier on and, in accordance with that warning, I call to order the members for Hartley and Morialta.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I did quickly open the report and there, at the bottom, the Auditor-General says:

> The implementation of EPAS at TQEH is a key indicator of whether EPAS will meet the functionality needs of all in-scope hospital sites.

And I will go on. He says:

> A May 2016 review by an external consultant to assess implementation readiness of TQEH implementation indicated that stakeholders were cautiously confident about the full EPAS implementation and preparations were largely on track.

He goes on to say:

The review stated that overall, staff were positive about EPAS and its potential to deliver long-term benefits to the hospital.

That is what the Auditor-General has to say about EPAS. Doesn't that contradict everything the nay-sayers of the opposition have had to say about EPAS and aren't they going to look stupid as they are exposed as being whingeing, whining, harping? They have absolutely nothing positive to say, no positive contribution to say about health care in this state.

The Auditor-General has had a very good look at EPAS. This has been something that has had review upon review upon review by the Auditor-General and there we have it in black and white. Mr Speaker, I can tell you now there is an enormous amount of enthusiasm about EPAS among the health workers in our state. I can say particularly that is the case with nurses.

The opposition pretend nurses don't exist. They are not actually interested in the important role nurses have in our health system. But, Mr Speaker, I can tell you this: on this side of the house, if I was to take the attitude the opposition leader does when it comes to nurses, I know there are at least two members of my backbench who would be baying for blood because nurses play such a crucial role. I can tell you that nurses are incredibly enthusiastic about EPAS and about its potential to improve patient outcomes.

This is about dragging the South Australian health system into the 21st century. I know that's something the opposition don't give two hoots about. I know that their vision for health care in this state goes back to the 1950s and hasn't progressed beyond that, but on this side of the house we are very, very proud of everything we are doing to reform our health system. We are very, very proud of EPAS and its potential to improve patient outcomes. Keep asking me about EPAS because I'm more than happy to talk about it.

Members interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: I'm appalled that the Minister for Health debated that answer, and I call him to order for that. I also call to order the members for Schubert, Hammond, Davenport, Elder, Stuart, Mitchell and the leader. The leader may be seated. I warn for the first time the members for Morialta, Kavel, Hartley and Newland, the latter for unduly loud sighing. I warn for the second and final time the members for Morialta and Hartley and the deputy leader. The member for Fisher.

NURSING AND MIDWIFERY AMBASSADORS

Ms COOK (Fisher) (14:26): My question is to the Minister for Health. Minister, how are you ensuring that the voice of nurses and midwives is being heard throughout the Transforming Health process?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:26): I thank the member for Fisher for this important question. I know that, unlike some members of this house, the member for Fisher is very, very interested and a very strong advocate for the nursing and midwifery profession, along with, of course, the member for Elder. It is something that I am very proud of, that on this side of the house we have not one, not two, but, in fact, three nurses who are members of the parliamentary Labor Party and are very, very good at holding me to account as the Minister for Health. They are members of a very noble profession.

As the house would be well aware, nurses and midwives make up the state's largest group of health professionals. Any member of the community who has spent time in a hospital, either as a patient or to visit a loved one, would have witnessed the incredible work of our nurses and midwives and would agree they are the backbone of our hospitals. Their knowledge and experience are crucial as our state faces the challenges posed by new technologies, an ageing population, and the steady rise in chronic disease.

In this complex healthcare environment, leading and advocating have never been more challenging or, indeed, more important. It is for this reason I am pleased to announce that I have appointed three Transforming Health deputy clinical nursing and midwifery ambassadors to provide expert advice and play a critical role in linking nurses and midwives and their practice to

Transforming Health. I acknowledge the presence of newly appointed nursing and midwifery ambassadors who are in the gallery this afternoon. I extend a very warm welcome to them.

The appointed ambassadors are Mr Stuart Smith, who is a nurse practitioner at the Modbury Hospital emergency department; Ms Gabby Vigar, the Clinical Services Coordinator in radiation oncology at the Royal Adelaide Hospital; and Helen Walker, the Clinical Services Coordinator at the current Daw Park Hospice. I would like to, as I said, acknowledge and welcome them to the chamber today.

Together with Transforming Health Clinical Ambassador, Professor Dorothy Keefe, as well as Adjunct Associate Professor Elizabeth Dabars, the Secretary and Chief Executive Officer of the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation of South Australia, I met with the three ambassadors today. I am confident that they are very well equipped to undertake these important roles. All three appointees have many years of experience between them and a wealth of expertise in the nursing profession. They have worked on the ground caring for patients in our hospitals as well as in strategic leadership roles in the public and private sectors both here in Australia and overseas.

Key responsibilities of these ambassadors will include professional leadership, talking to their colleagues about change, providing opportunities for nurses and midwives to become involved in Transforming Health. Ambassadors will have membership on the Transforming Health Ministerial Clinical Advisory Group and will also work closely with the SA branch of the ANMF (the nurses and midwives federation) to ensure appropriate support for nurses and midwives through Transforming Health's change process.

The ambassadors were selected by an expression of interest process, with 27 nursing and midwifery clinical leaders putting their hands up to be considered for these important roles. I am committed to ensuring that Transforming Health continues to be led by our clinicians, and I was very encouraged by the enthusiasm of so many of our clinical nursing and midwifery leaders wanting to take a lead role in this change process. I was also very impressed by the high quality of the applicants. Can I congratulate our newly appointed Transforming Health nursing and midwifery ambassadors, and I look forward to working with them to deliver the high-quality, safe and patient-centred health system that our community deserves.

ENTERPRISE PATIENT ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): My question is to the Minister for Health. What is the revised budget for the delayed EPAS project, and why did the minister claim recently that he did not know what the cost increase beyond the revised budget of $422 million was when the Auditor-General's Report states quite clearly on page 11 that multiple cabinet submissions, both in March 2015 and December 2015, advised of significant blowouts in the $422 million budget?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:31): I have been quite up-front about this for a very long time.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Mr Speaker, you called me to order for screaming over or engaging with the opposition. I'm more than happy—

The SPEAKER: No, I called you to order for debating.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I am more than happy to not debate, but it is very hard when I have barely got a word out and the Leader of the Opposition is already shouting out at me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is called to order and the leader is warned a first time. Minister.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I have been very up-front from the very beginning. From last year's estimates committee, I very well recall the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I'm just not going to answer.

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta will leave the chamber for the remainder of question time in accordance with the sessional order.

The member for Morialta having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurna.

COMPULSORY THIRD-PARTY INSURANCE

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:32): My question is to the Treasurer. Treasurer, can you provide an update on the implementation of the private sector provision of compulsory third-party insurance?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:32): Oil on troubled waters, sir. I am pleased to advise the house that the private sector provision of compulsory third-party insurance has as of 1 July this year successfully transitioned to the four private CTP providers: AAMI, Alliance, SGIC and QBE. Hens are still laying, the world has not come to an end, despite the concerns of members opposite. Under the new model, more than one million South Australian motorists now have been allocated to one of the four private providers who offer CTP insurance, private providers who employ South Australians in the private sector.

The transition occurred with no disruption to motorists, and the registration insurance certificate will now display the name of each motorist's nominated insurer. Motorists can still use the EzyReg system for registration renewals as well as other usual methods of payment. For motorists, the transition has been seamless. The CTP private insurers have now also paid an initial market share allocation fee of approximately $260 million to enter the South Australian CTP market. Together with the $1.34 billion that has already been returned from excess Motor Accident Commission capital and profits, this provides a total distribution of $1.6 billion which goes directly to the Highways Fund for the building, upgrading and maintenance of road infrastructure for all South Australians.

The commencement of the private CTP insurers coincides with the appointment of Ms Kim Birch as the specialist, independent and objective CTP Insurance Regulator to regulate the CTP insurance market and to ensure motorists are protected with the standing to engage with the insurance industry and key stakeholders. Ms Birch has extensive experience in the regulation of CTP insurance, having worked in senior roles for 12 years in the Motor Accident Insurance Commission of Queensland, where she oversaw the performance of the scheme and regulated six licensed CTP insurers. I welcome Ms Birch to South Australia and to this key role. I look forward to working with her and her office.

The South Australian government will continue to work with each of the approved insurers to ensure the transition to the new CTP insurance arrangements remains a success for South Australia. We have nothing to fear from the private sector. I would like to take this opportunity to put on the record my thanks to the Motor Accident Commission Board and in particular the current chair, Mr Bill Griggs, for their support and assistance during this process, as well as the dedicated team in the Department of Treasury and Finance, who worked tirelessly and dedicated themselves to meet this deadline for this important reform for the South Australian community.

Despite scaremongering, despite attempts in parliamentary committees to frighten people that the world would collapse and cease to spin on its axis if the private sector delivered compulsory third-party insurance, it has worked well. I say to the younger members of the Liberal Party: don't let orange be the new blue. Retake your party from the socialists.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: A point of order, Mr Speaker: debating.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned, although I don't think his booths were smashed.

ENTERPRISE PATIENT ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister explain to this house why the EPAS project is now showing a cost-benefit outcome to the state of minus $167 million and why there were writedowns of more than $150 million to the projected benefits of this project in January of this year undisclosed to the parliament?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:37): Mr Speaker, I am more than happy to take questions, but I will not be screamed at while I am attempting to answer questions and, if that is the course the Leader of the Opposition wants to take, I will just sit down. I won't have the Leader of the Opposition screaming at me while I am attempting to answer questions, so it is entirely in the hands of the opposition whether they want an answer or not.

Let me say a few things about EPAS. Firstly, EPAS is a 10-year project. It is a 10-year project and a significant rollout across all of our metropolitan hospitals as well as the South Australian Ambulance Service and our GP—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Well, don't worry.

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert, I warn him. Does the minister wish to continue?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I will. I will be more than happy to, Mr Speaker. We are talking about a 10-year program. I have consistently said from the beginning that it was expected that as we rolled EPAS out we would probably have to go to the budget at some stage over the next two years for additional funding. I have been saying that at least since estimates—

Mr Marshall: How much?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Okay.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned.

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Wright. The member for Chaffey is called to order, and I notice he is on the question list. It would be really good if he could survive to that point of question time. The member for Wright.

EXPORT INDUSTRY

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Investment and Trade. Can the minister explain to the house recent trends in South Australia's exports?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:39): I thank the member for Wright for the question. There are a lot of small businesses in her electorate. In fact, 65,000 South Australian jobs are supported by exports and that's why the government is committed to seeing that number grow. Continuing growth in trade and exports will lead to a strong economy and the creation of yet more jobs.

Recent sets of official data and economic analysis show that the state government's export strategy is having an impact. In the targeted areas of goods and services, South Australia's overseas export performance has shown a welcome improvement over the past year. Figures released today add to that trend. Exports of goods and services in real trend terms in the March quarter 2016 were up 17 per cent compared to the previous year's March quarter. Let's compare that to the national

exports of goods and services, which rose by 7.6 per cent over this period, indicating that South Australia has outperformed the national economy on exports.

My honourable friends with ministerial responsibilities in primary industries, health industries, education and tourism can all take a bow for their efforts in building a bigger export base for South Australia's businesses. Recent analysis shows that the figures are even better than they first seem. The latest economic briefing report by the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies shows that, due to global effects, prices for the state's overseas exports of goods and services in that March quarter for 2016 were 10 per cent lower compared to a year earlier in trend terms. Had South Australia's solid improvement in export volumes been matched by stability in prices or an increase in prices, the result would have been even better, the report shows.

The state's strong performance in areas where we can have an influence is helping to offset the global impact of a reduction in iron ore exports, particularly to China. I note that the economists at the University of South Australia suggest that the state has been successful in growing wine exports to China, with the value of alcoholic beverages exports up 89 per cent, or $120 million, in the 12 months to April 2016 relative to the previous 12 months. Exports of food and live animals also exhibited a healthy rise in these periods, up 36 per cent or $76 million.

The report concludes that results are consistent with the view that food and beverages offer significant long-term growth opportunities, given the potential for significant improvements in living standards in China and the ongoing shift in its economy to a more consumption and services-oriented growth path. Today, the ABS released broad figures for the month of May. South Australia's overseas goods exports in the year to May 2016 totalled $11.5 billion, up 0.7 per cent compared with the year to 2015. National exports for the same period, by comparison, are down 4.2 per cent. A breakdown of these numbers is again expected to show that South Australia is doing well in the areas where it can have an influence.

The results and the analysis endorse the state's export strategies that have targeted key markets in China, India and South-East Asia, and our re-engagement with traditional markets such as the United States of America and the European Union, which have also seen growth. This shows that the state government's export strategy, including trade missions, growing new markets and commitment to growing the premium food, wine, agriculture and advanced manufacturing sectors, is on the right track and delivering results in jobs and investment.

ENTERPRISE PATIENT ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister explain to the house when he was first made aware of the massive $152.4 million write-off on the projected benefits of the EPAS project and why he didn't make a proactive disclosure of this write-off to this parliament?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:43): In answer after answer on this issue I have been quite explicit about the fact that we have not been achieving savings out of EPAS and that there was additional cost associated with the fact that it was taking us longer to roll out EPAS and so we weren't harvesting the benefits. It also meant that we had to continue legacy systems for longer than we had originally anticipated, so I have—

Mr Marshall: It's a $150 million write-off.

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned for the second and final time. The minister's answer will be heard in silence.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: There is nothing at all new in this. I have said over and over again that this was an issue.

Mr Pederick: It's just a disaster.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The member for Hammond growls, 'This is just a disaster.' Mr Speaker, I can tell you that I have spoken to clinicians who are using EPAS at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, at the Repat and at Noarlunga Hospital and they are overwhelmingly enthusiastic about it.

Mr Marshall: Don't mislead the house.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: They are overwhelmingly enthusiastic about it. I recall a very good piece written by Dr Jim Holland, who is the director of the Noarlunga emergency—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is on two warnings.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —department. He is an excellent clinician and he has written very approvingly of EPAS and how he has seen it in the Noarlunga emergency department. I will have more to say about how successful the EPAS rollout has been very soon.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Health is warned for provoking the Leader of the Opposition and for responding to his interjections.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN WINE INDUSTRY, WORK SAFETY

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. How is the government improving work safety in the South Australian wine industry?

The SPEAKER: As the duty member for Schubert, I have a great interest in this.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:46): I thank the honourable member for his question. We all know he has these regions very close to his electorate and has a keen interest in these matters. Of course, I know the minister for primary industries is very interested in this topic as well. He, of course, represents many of these people.

South Australian wine is world renowned. The industry exports more than 750 million litres to 100 countries, generating around $1.79 billion in revenue. About 3,500 people work in this industry performing a myriad of tasks such as operating large equipment (often on hillsides and uneven terrain), pushing and lifting heavy bins, tubs, barrels, pumps, hoses and mixers, using pruning shears and picking knives, working with hazardous chemicals and entering confined spaces.

I am sure members will appreciate that, with much of the work being of a physical nature, it is important to manage workplace hazards through safe systems of work to avoid accidents and injuries. This is why SafeWork SA has teamed up with the wine grapegrowers' association and the South Australian Wine Industry Association to provide advice to employers and workers on strategies to achieve better safety outcomes in their workplace. Of particular focus are the smaller scale or boutique wineries that may not have the dedicated work health and safety officers like large-scale operations.

To help small wineries manage their work health and safety, SafeWork SA has been meeting and talking with business owners and providing them with practical advice and support on staffing induction and training, hazard reporting, emergency procedures and evacuation plans with drills, as well as firefighting equipment checks, the safe use of forklifts and requirements for operators to hold valid licences, and also simple safety procedures for people working alone.

To date, SafeWork SA has visited more than 80 boutique wineries across the Adelaide Hills, Barossa, Clare and Coonawarra regions. SafeWork SA has also presented at events organised by the industry, sharing information and simple solutions to improve safety for everyone working in the state's wine industry.

I wish to commend the wineries and grapegrowers for their commitment to safety as they continue to produce world renowned and award-winning wines.

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphett; he is still here despite his misconduct in the chamber.

COMMUNITIES AND SOCIAL INCLUSION DEPARTMENT

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:48): My question is to the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion. Does the minister accept full accountability and responsibility for the $7.4 million on the failed CASIS program, the $11.8 million DCSI did not approve for energy concessions, the $5 million for insufficient validation for eligibility for Centrelink clients, DCSI having no records of clients who were paid $2.8 million, the $1.8 million that was paid to clients that didn't have any concession application lodged with DCSI, the $1.3 million where the clients were not eligible under the Centrelink data, the $0.9 million DCSI did not have any records of, and the 4,000 clients who were paid concessions who were dead?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:49): I thank the member for Morphett for his interest in this area. We have discussed this in the past when the Auditor-General has raised concerns about this issue. The key focus here is this is a validation issue—that means that people weren't sufficiently validated before payment—and what we find is that the very vast majority of people were eligible for these energy concessions.

When the Auditor-General has worked with us about these systemic issues, I have taken it on board at every point, and we continue to work with him to improve our reconciliation and our validation process. We have increased the amount of people on the energy concessions and have a semiautomated system. The role of the Auditor-General is incredibly important in our system. I welcome his report—

Dr McFetridge: 4,350 were dead.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: —and I will continue to work—

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

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: —I will continue to work with him. As you have known, I have made announcements before about COLIN, our new database system that will fully automate the validation. Initially, we are going to start COLIN looking at the cost-of-living concession, with the intent to build on it for all the other concessions.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned a second and a last time.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Administration of concessions is complex. As you will see in the report, we have pensioners who continue to be concession holders, but we also have beneficiaries that come in and out of this system. We will continue to work on our reconciliation of the validation, but the key thing here is the vast majority of people were eligible—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: —and it's about making that eligibility—

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

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I welcome the Auditor-General's Report. We will continue to work to improve our validation reconciliation.

COMMUNITIES AND SOCIAL INCLUSION DEPARTMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): I have a question to the Minister for Social Inclusion. Can the minister tell the parliament what it's done to remedy the situation of making payments to dead people, including $2.81 million as disclosed on page 21 of the Auditor-General's Report?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:52): I thank the member for her interest. When someone has an energy concession and that's in their name—an energy bill—

and they pass on, we have a 13-week grace period because, often, when you have two people in a house, we find that the bill is only in one person's name. So, on the death of that person, we do have a grace period when people then change that bill into their name. What has been apparent here is that grace period has often gone on longer but, with our new concentration and the semiautomated system, obviously, we will be paying closer attention.

ENTERPRISE PATIENT ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister update the house about the activation of EPAS at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:53): I thank the member for Colton for his interest in this. Last Wednesday, SA Health's Enterprise Patient Administration System (or EPAS) was activated at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital. This is the third metropolitan hospital it's been brought into, as it already is in use at the Repat and Noarlunga. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital is now the biggest hospital using EPAS, and I am delighted to say its activation there has been a success.

This morning, I visited The Queen Liz and spoke to doctors, nurses and other staff who are now using EPAS for patient management. They are pleased to have an electronic system at their fingertips, which they described as being both logical and efficient, instead of having to use paper records. There are many benefits to this system which staff are already seeing:

- quicker access to patient information;
- reducing the chance of prescription errors because EPAS has a built-in alert system; and
- allowing doctors and nurses to spend more face-to-face time with patients.

I can't overestimate the importance of being able to order investigations, treatments and documents for patient history electronically, because we know that it saves lives. Already, less than a week after the most recent EPAS activation, the staff at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital emergency department told me about a patient who presented who already had a record on EPAS because of presentations at a different hospital.

The patient's health record was found within seconds because it had already been entered onto the system. There was no need to make a phone call to another place to get someone to dig into an office, or a filing cabinet—no need—and send that information from one place to another, no precious time wasted. This is just one of the many ways that EPAS improves patient safety.

I am very grateful to the EPAS team and everyone in both the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network and the Central Adelaide Local Health Network, who have been working diligently and enthusiastically to make this latest activation possible: doctors, nurses, administrators, and allied health staff, I should add as well. I am also pleased that despite a campaign of misinformation that's been conducted by a noisy minority, dedicated and professional staff have been getting on with the job of continuing to improve and modernise South Australia's health system.

The SPEAKER: The campaign in the federal division of Port Adelaide wasn't overly successful. The member for Reynell.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for the Status of Women. Minister, how is the government supporting women affected by domestic violence to achieve their learning and personal development goals?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:55): May I pass on my thanks to the member for Reynell for this important question. I have previously spoken in this house about the effects of domestic violence, which you know can remain with victims for a lifetime and can be passed on from one generation to another.

The underlying causes of domestic violence are complex. However, there is a general understanding that gender inequality and community attitudes influence the prevalence and reporting of this crime. It is a difficult matter requiring complex and coordinated responses from government, front-line services and communities. Domestic violence is everyone's business.

I am pleased to inform the house about the women's education program funded by the Office for Women and delivered through collaboration between the Central and Limestone Coast domestic violence services and TAFE SA. The program is designed to help women affected by domestic violence to achieve both learning and personal development goals. It is an innovative way to support women to heal, improve their confidence, strive for excellence and explore their gifts and talents. Seventeen women participated and graduated from this program, and I am pleased to advise that all graduates have enrolled in further studies, including two women exploring pathways to tertiary education.

When we allow evidence to drive our responses, we become more innovative and smarter in our approach. That's why this program (the first of its kind in South Australia) was successful in improving the participants' communication skills, financial literacy and time management. The women completed their studies in a confidential learning environment, with support from a TAFE SA lecturer and a domestic violence caseworker. I congratulate the graduates and commend them for their enduring effort to take control of their futures and magnify their full potentials.

Equally as important are the flow-on benefits from this program because improving women's access to education and employment is a win for their children, their families and our state. We know that when children see their parents study, it influences them to stay at school for longer and to continue their studies. Our government understands that addressing violence against women and, indeed, gender inequality, requires much more than one-off sporadic initiatives. That's why we have committed to continue our efforts to improve women's economic status through our blueprint, Investing in Women's Futures.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): My question is to the Minister for Women. Given the minister's express concern about domestic violence for women, what action has the minister taken to advance the issues paper in respect of domestic law reform, including Clare's law, which was promised by the Premier late last year?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:59): If I am understanding her correctly, the deputy leader is referring to a discussion paper on domestic violence which we are in the process of just finishing off—

Ms Chapman: I'm asking what she's doing about it.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —and that is—well, it's a government discussion paper, and the minister contributes, along with other members of cabinet, to this discussion paper, but I am the person who is charged with the responsibility of collating all of that and bringing it together and bringing it to cabinet.

It is very close, but it still has not been finalised. I am expecting it to be finalised soon. I can promise the deputy leader that this paper is intended to be a very informative piece of work that contains as much factual information as possible in an attempt to, hopefully, help to explain to members of our community the exact nature and extent and complexity of this problem.

It also is an interesting point that this is often seen as a stand-alone issue, but it is clear, when one looks at the statistics and looks at the material, that the children, who are the people we are very concerned about in this space, in the child protection area, often have a coincidence of living in an environment where domestic violence is an element of their home life. In fact, part of the reason some of those children wind up having an intervention is because of issues relating to domestic violence.

The more information the public can have, the more informed the conversation can be about how we collectively can put constructive policy initiatives into place which hopefully will have, at least

in the parliament, broad support. Obviously, not every member of the community will agree with every policy we come up with, but I think the starting point has to be that we are put in a position where we have as much accurate factual information as possible so that people can then consider the issues. After that, we can look at the appropriate responses.

Some of the material here is actually significant because it does emphasise the multi-agency aspect of this. It is the case that the government cannot be in every part of the city at every hour of the day all of the time. Terrible things happen, but we have to have initiatives which will minimise the chance of these things happening where the government has the capacity to interfere in a positive way—and that's what this paper is directed to trying to get a discussion about. As I said, I am optimistic that we will have that out there fairly soon.

Ms Chapman: After the budget. No money in the budget.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Well, I'm not going to comment on the budget.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is on two warnings.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am not going to in any way comment on the budget. We will see what is in the budget on Thursday.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: How many warnings are you on, member for Schubert?

Mr Knoll: Two.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. The member for Adelaide.

FAMILIES SA

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection Reform. Now that Commissioner Nyland has ruled out investigating Families SA's role in the Hillier case, will the minister appoint an independent investigator to assess the performance of Families SA in the tragedy? By the minister confirming in this house that he had referred the tragedy to Commissioner Nyland, the minister has implicitly acknowledged that the role of Families SA needs to be assessed sooner rather than later.

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide should know by now, having been in the house six years, that the explanation of a question may not contain argumentation. Minister.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:03): This is a question which the member for Adelaide has been floating around the place quite a lot for the last few weeks. I would just like to again respond to her and to the house and to the public, to the extent that anybody who is thinking about this thinks the independent inquiry line she is pushing has any value.

We presently have a police investigation into a triple murder. I have no doubt—and I have said this before as well—that when we have one of these incidents there are internal inquiries that occur within Families and Communities just to ascertain what has happened, who has been involved and so forth. We also have a royal commission that has been going for 12 or 15 months, or however long it has been.

Ms Sanderson: It's rejected this.

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide is warned.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: When I first became aware of this matter and the potential for it to have something to do with Families and Communities, there was an immediate decision made to actually take the raw material that was available to the minister. I remember asking the minister if we could organise this and we did. That raw material was made available to the royal commissioner. It was entirely a matter for the royal commissioner. Incidentally, I think everyone needs to understand, if

they don't already, that the royal commission is the highest possible level of independent inquiry a state can have. This is a completely independent person operating under their own act of parliament.

This person was given all of this material. If she determined that there was something in that material that was sufficiently different from other material she had seen or that was alerting her to new matters, it is my expectation that she would have contacted me and said, 'Look, this raises significant issues which I have not already seen, to which I have not already turned my mind, and I think it's important we have an opportunity to spend some time and look at this and I want the opportunity to do that, and I don't think I can make the August deadline.' But that is not what she did.

I ask this rhetorical question: given that there is an internal inquiry or internal review within Families and Communities, and given that the police are looking at this from the perspective of criminal conduct, and given the fact that we have a royal commissioner who has spent the last 15 or 18 months, or however long it is, looking into every aspect of Families and Communities and who is about to announce, I expect, a pretty fundamental change in the whole thing, what is the point of appointing another person to inquire into a single event which, at best—and I emphasise 'at best'—would go to prove that there are inadequacies in the existing way in which that agency is operating which require attention?

I am reasonably confident that we will get that message pretty loud and clear on or about 5 August. I cannot see how having another inquiry going off on this particular matter in circumstances where the police are already looking at it, where it is my expectation, as I said, that there would be an internal incident assessment, or whatever it is called, within the department, and—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —it has been referred to the royal commissioner and we are about to receive a royal commission report and, if the Coroner chooses, in due course, to have a look at the thing, he is perfectly entitled to do so.

Ms SANDERSON: Supplementary?

The SPEAKER: The member for Ashford.

ALMOND INDUSTRY

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:08): My question is directed to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Minister, can you update the house on the centre of excellence for the Australian almond industry?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (15:08): I thank the member for Ashford for the question. Of course, Australia is the largest exporter of almonds in the world after California. Last year, it was a great pleasure to open the national research centre for the almond industry in Loxton. It is a terrific development and one that we fought hard to get. There was a prospectus out and it was a battle between Victoria and South Australia.

I'm very pleased that South Australia came out in front, and we will continue to work with our colleagues across the state borders, of course, to make sure we take a national approach because there is huge demand for our almonds. In fact, for South Australia, almonds are the largest horticultural crop by export value, with more than $140 million worth of almonds exported from South Australia in 2015.

It was terrific to be up there a few weeks ago and see that, under the SARMS money that we have been putting into the Riverland, people are putting in different varieties of almonds, including more drought-tolerant varieties. Of course, almonds are what the world is looking for. Two new varieties have been developed and released by the Almond Board of Australia. They are self-pollinating, they have higher yields and they are incredibly exciting for the entire almond industry.

I can also report today that a suitable parcel of land in the Riverland has been identified and that work is underway to draw up the necessary contracts and agreements for the sale to proceed in

the coming months so that trials can be undertaken. We're looking forward to a new orchard being established, which will include semicommercial scale assessment of new varieties from the Adelaide University's plant breeding program.

I can also report that the state government's financial contribution to the centre, which is $1 million per year for four years, has already leveraged new money for the industry. The federal government's Rural Research and Development for Profit program recently announced it is contributing $10 million in research funding for both almonds and walnuts and, specifically, the importance of pollinating insects to these industries. Of this $10 million, approximately $2.1 million will be provided to the Almond Board to investigate productivity improvements in the almond industry.

Of course, Almondco is a great Riverland success story as well, and it's terrific. Back in 2014, the state government provided $1.9 million in funding to allow them to buy a new pasteurising machine. From that $1.9 million in funding, it has created $120 million of new business in the first two years. It's a tremendous approach. It is worth contrasting: when we go up and do things, there's fantastic returns; when the opposition leader goes up and talks to people up there—he's got the Midas touch—everything he touches turns into a muffler. He was up there during—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order. The minister will be seated. Member for Stuart.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Debate.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. Minister.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: It went back 15.2 per cent. It is terrific to see the great work that is happening in the Riverland in the almond industry, one of our really great contributors to our export figures that the Minister for Trade mentioned before and also contributing to that $1.1 billion lift in the value of our food and wine in South Australia. Last year, we took it from $17.1 billion to $18.2 billion.

We're going to continue to work with the agriculture sector to make sure that we are opening up new markets, but we are also helping them increase their productivity and increase the value of their produce so that we can get the best return possible on investment not only from a government point of view but from the private sector's point of view, and most importantly it's about creating new jobs right throughout all of regional South Australia. The food industry is tremendously important, and we are here to back in the industry—agriculture, food, fisheries—and make sure that we are a government that cares for the farmers of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

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

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:12): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection Reform. Can the minister explain how he thinks the Hillier case could possibly fit within the parameters of the Nyland royal commission and why he expects a murder investigation to uncover the involvement of Families SA? With your leave and that of the house, I will explain.

The SPEAKER: I think it does need a bit of explanation.

Ms SANDERSON: The Nyland royal commission was appointed in response to the Shannon McCoole incident, and the review is into sexual abuse of children in care under the guardianship of the minister.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Good question.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:13): It's a highly repetitive question, I know that. The situation—can I explain this again? We have a royal commission which has been going on, as I said, for some

considerable period of time. I think it would be crystal clear to everybody, including those who actually noted the comments made by the Premier a week or so ago about an interim letter we got from the royal commissioner talking about structures and suchlike, that the royal commissioner is looking at much more than whether a particular individual, who was employed by Families SA, behaved grotesquely and criminally in the context of their employment. To suggest that the whole business with Commissioner Nyland is all about McCoole is complete nonsense—total rubbish.

She is looking at the whole structure of Families SA. She is looking at all of their practices, all of their procedures, all of their structures, all of their administrative arrangements, all of their management techniques—everything. If we need any proof of the fact that she is doing that, her recent communication with the government saying, 'Look, there's one thing I'm happy to tell you in advance: I think we should have this in terms of a structure,' is an indication that she is looking way beyond anything to do with that horrible criminal behaviour of that individual. So, I completely discount that proposition.

The second proposition is the assertion that there is some fault on the part of Families SA which was causative or something else of what appears to have been a triple homicide. That is an assertion from which the opposition then goes on to launch the need for an inquiry in the face—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the minister is debating the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: No, I don't uphold the point of order.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am trying to explode this bogus question. The point is that there are already—I will say this again and I'm happy to keep saying it; if I keep getting asked the same question, you will get the same answer. I might vary it slightly for the member for Schubert, but otherwise it will be pretty much the same—

Ms Sanderson interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The police are looking at this matter from a criminal perspective. The Coroner is able to look at it from his perspective totally at his own discretion any time he wants, and the royal commissioner has been provided with all of the raw material in relation to this matter. If the royal commissioner is going to be reporting to us on 5 August, which we believe she will be, and she is going to be making a substantial number of recommendations to change the way in which the department is functioning, or is structured, or is configured, or the legislation is set out, which I would think is highly likely, then we are going to be dealing with a complete reform of Families SA.

My rhetorical question to those who keep pushing this barrow purely for not satisfactory reasons about an independent inquiry, I say to those people: if there were to be an independent inquiry, and if the independent inquiry is going to come out with the most damning possible outcome it could, what would the outcome be? There needs to be substantial change in Families SA. Well, hello! I think everybody accepts that there needs to be something done there. We accept that, we have a royal commission looking into that. In about a month from now, we will get a report from the royal commission, at which time the government will consider the recommendations of the royal commissioner and respond to them.

OUTBACK COMMUNITIES AUTHORITY

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:17): My question is to the Minister for Local Government. What skills and experience will be brought by recent appointments to the Outback Communities Authority?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:18): I thank the member for Giles for his question and also acknowledge his electorate includes large parts of the outback. The role of the Outback Communities Authority is to manage the provision and the improvement of public services and facilities in areas of our state that do not fall within a council area. In doing so, the OCA seeks to give voice to the interests and aspirations of South Australia's outback communities. The outback areas cover about 65 per cent of

the state, with approximately 4,000 residents dispersed across various service locations, pastoral and farming properties and small communities.

The board of the OCA has seven members, appointed for terms of either 18 months or three years to allow for business continuity and stability of governance as the composition of the board changes. As well as providing strong representation from outback communities, the government sought people with skills and experience in relation to water, financial and waste management, mining, transport and energy provision. The terms of the four members have expired and I am today pleased to inform the house that a new member has recently been appointed along with the reappointment of three other members.

Mark Fennell lives at Lambina Station, about 70 kilometres north-east of Marla, and has begun his first term as an OCA board member. Mark owns a pastoral contracting business and is respected for his practical understanding of remote service operations, including water management, the provision of power and road maintenance. Cecilia Woolford is an experienced board member who has been reappointed as a member and chair of the OCA. Cecilia is a farmer and pastoralist just out of Kimba and has a significant capacity in audit and finance, fundraising, community engagement, and strategic policy development and implementation.

Joyleen Booth is an Indigenous South Australian and a pastoral manager at Murnpeowie Station. Joyleen has been reappointed and is a strong advocate for community development, health, education and the wellbeing of women and children. Jan Ferguson has been reappointed as a member of the OCA board. Jan is from Beltana and a former managing director of Ninti One Limited, a not-for-profit organisation focused on promoting and delivering economic opportunities in remote communities.

Membership of the OCA provides an opportunity to help shape the future for outback South Australia. Some of the key issues currently being considered by the OCA include consultation with communities on the provision of community support for the year ahead, mechanisms for raising revenue for the maintenance of public services and facilities, the development of a long-term strategy for the provision of water and the development of strategies for waste management.

I am very pleased with the range and depth of the knowledge and skills among the OCA members. The members I have mentioned today join Mary Marsland, Chris Michelmore and Jo Fort on the OCA board. I take this opportunity to express my thanks to George Beltchev, who is not continuing as a member, for the valuable contributions he has made to the work of the OCA board since its inception.

There are many exciting prospects ahead for our outback communities and the OCA will continue to work with and on behalf of outback people to deliver new opportunities and also address the challenges that lie ahead. In closing, I also indicate that I am looking forward to getting up to the outback area as soon as I can, as the minister. I must admit I have seen some photographs of the outback and it is looking magnificent at the moment. It is looking good for the pastoralists up there.

Grievance Debate

NORTHERN FORESTS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:22): I rise today to talk about the ongoing challenges facing the people of the Mid North and the southern Flinders Ranges in regard to the northern forests. The northern forests are the Bundaleer Forest and the Wirrabara Forest near Jamestown and Wirrabara respectively. They are certainly mainstays of a very broad area, and one of the most important things they do is provide employment, not only for government employees who work in the forests but for a wide range of private enterprise contractors, and most importantly in regard to the volume of employment; 50 people are employed at Morgan Sawmill at Jamestown.

In the electorate of Stuart, in this particular part of the electorate, we have had four very serious fires over the last six years. One of them affected the Bundaleer Forest and two of them affected the Wirrabara Forest. Most of the plantation of the Wirrabara Forest has now been burnt out and, of course, that poses a very real problem for the supply of sawlog to the Morgan Sawmill which, as I said before, employs 50-plus people.

The government knows about this. I have raised this in parliament many times. I have written to ministers many times. I have raised it in the media many times to try to get the government's attention that way, but this issue just keeps dragging on. The government has not provided any positive way forward for all the people affected by this issue. It has put forward an expression of interest process, where they ask community members to provide suggestions for what they thought should happen, and they told the community at a public meeting at Wirrabara which I attended, in August last year, that by the end of last calendar year this would all be sorted out and everybody would know exactly what the government intended to do.

After that, the government then said that was not good enough, they then wanted to have a request for proposals process, in which case people, businesses and community organisations would put forward their suggestions for what should happen. The government would then consider those proposals, even though they had apparently already considered the expressions of interest which had previously been put forward.

One of the reasons this is so important is the economic benefits generated. There are many community, social and environmental benefits, but the most pressing for me is the economic impact. It would only cost a few million dollars for the government to replant these forests, and not necessarily all of the log and not necessarily everything that was there before, but enough to retain a viable forestry industry.

Deputy Speaker, let me give you some numbers to explain exactly how important this is. ForestrySA estimates that if they were to replant these forests it would cost them $11.4 million one-off net present value over the next 44 years. However, simultaneously, Regional Development Australia Yorke and Mid North has estimated that the economic benefit to the community is $9.4 million every single year if the forests are replanted. On those numbers alone, it is a very, very easy decision for the government to make, and yet it drags its heels.

There is an important issue that needs to be addressed and that is the issue of interim log. Of course, if the forests were replanted and the timber that is still there were harvested and processed over the next few to several years, we would need interim log to be made available so that the local sawmill would have other timber to process before the replanted wood became available. Morgan Sawmill has made it very clear that they would be very happy to purchase timber from ForestrySA on the open market to meet the price of the market of the day, transport the timber from wherever it comes from, most likely the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges, to their sawmill and process that wood.

Morgan Sawmill has a plan. They have been prepared and made it very clear that they are willing to do whatever is necessary. The community wants this to happen for many reasons. The government is dragging its feet. The government pretends this is a forestry issue alone, but it is not; it is an incredibly important regional development issue as well.

POLLOCK, MR J.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:27): Just over two weeks ago, I was invited by mayor Jim Pollock's family to speak at his funeral. It was an honour to be asked and this is what I said:

It is with a very heavy heart that I stand before you today. We are here to mourn Jim's passing and to also celebrate his life—to acknowledge all that he has done and all that he was.

Our thoughts are with his family and especially Jenny, Steph and Kerri. The days and months that have gone have been hard. The days and months to come will be hard but a whole community is here to embrace you and support you through this terribly trying time.

For nearly the last two decades of his life Jim had what could pass for another family, a sometimes fractious family, his local government family.

Those that came and went and those that stayed, people from Whyalla, the Eyre Peninsula, the Upper Spencer Gulf and elsewhere in South Australia, elected members and council employees.

Jim was elected to the Whyalla City Council in 1997. He served as the Deputy Mayor before running successfully for the position of Mayor in 2003.

As one of his strong supporters in that bid to become Mayor I and many others considered it a very happy and satisfying day when he was elected. We were confident that he would put the community of Whyalla first and that is what Jim did.

He went on to be the chair or president of a range of organisations including the Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association, the Upper Spencer Gulf Common Purpose Group and the inaugural chair of Regional Development Australia Whyalla and Eyre Peninsula. He was on the executive of the Local Government Association and served on the Provincial Cities Association and the Eyre Peninsula Natural Resource Management Board.

Jim always put his family first leading him to passing up the opportunity to become the President of the Local Government Association. The measure of Jim was not the positions he held; it was his character, that combination of qualities he brought to every role.

Over the many years I spent with Jim on local council, I came to both respect him and, in a blokey sort of way, to love him. He was a true gentleman and a decent man to his core. Jim had a deep well of tact and diplomacy to draw upon. He always played a straight bat. Jim was someone who you could instinctively trust and that is something that I really miss. In the years that I served on council with Jim, he always put the elected members, staff and community first. It was never about his ego; it was always about others.

Many people have approached me to talk about Jim and how they were treated by him. The picture presented was consistent—a down-to-earth bloke who treated everyone as an equal with no airs and graces or pomp and ceremony. He was a true grassroots mayor; a people's mayor.

The Premier and Treasurer cannot be here today, but they have sent their condolences. Both have said how they respected Jim and considered him a statesman-like representative for the council and for the City of Whyalla and both considered him to be a decent and honourable man.

It is good to see Geoff Brock, the Minister for Regional Development, here today. Geoff had a long association with Jim going back to his time in local government in Port Pirie. I also acknowledge the member for Grey, Rowan Ramsey. It is also good to see our northern neighbour here, the member for Stuart, Dan van Holst Pellekaan, and our southern neighbour, the member for Flinders, Peter Treloar, and of course the former member for Giles, Lyn Breuer, who was a very close friend of Jim's.

Jim was respected across the political spectrum. Jim was not perfect; he had his flaws. Two come to mind. One was minor and he can be forgiven—he was a Whyalla Centrals supporter. The other was far more serious—he was a Crows supporter, and this is when his almost non-existent cruel streak would come out. He would always take the opportunity to rub it in when the Crows defeated Port. Of course, when the boot was on the other foot, I would not dream of doing such a thing.

Whether you believe it or not, I would like to think Jim is up there now having a beer or a red, a fishing rod in hand, looking down on us. I can hear him say, 'Councillor Hughes, your five minutes is up. Time to resume your seat.' Before I do, a truly good man has gone too soon and he has left a hole in all of our hearts. Jim, you will not be forgotten. Vale, Jim Pollock, the people's mayor.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hear, hear!

WATER ALLOCATION PLANS

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:32): Today, I listened to the Minister for Agriculture get up and spruiks the benefits of agriculture and horticulture to South Australia's economy. As a member of this parliament, the minister often gets up and spruik the importance to South Australia's economy. But what he forgot to say was that last Friday irrigators had access to only 36 per cent of their water. Only 36 per cent of their livelihood is being distributed to them and many farmers will soon receive astronomical increases to their land and water NRM levies on top.

Today, the Minister for Water finally released a cost-benefit analysis on using Adelaide's desal plant to assist water offset for irrigators. The report found that River Murray allocation prices are not at a level that would make running the desal plant a cost-effective way of boosting allocations in the 2016-17 year. Effectively, this report confirmed that the state government will never run the $2.3 billion desal plant and interconnection system above eight gigalitres per annum. It did not need the desal plant in the millennium drought, so when are we going to need this huge piece of infrastructure?

What the report did not take into account was that many of our crops are permanent plantings. Water is still required now to ensure they can grow crops into the future. This is essentially a very short-sighted report. In recent months, as he announced the lowest opening water allocations for five years, many people in the Riverland have been asking: where is the Minister for Water? I did write to the minister and asked him to come to the region and speak to the people to address the concerns they have with the uncertain future, particularly with water allocations, high power prices and the ongoing taxes and levies that continue to rise.

The minister's office said, 'Yes, he is going to come up to the region. He is on his way. He will be there in a matter of weeks.' What happened was the minister then cancelled his appointment in the Riverland only for us to find out that the minister had met with the Bondi Vet, so the Bondi Vet seems to be more important than coming up and speaking to the irrigators who have just now been given a 36 per cent opening allocation. It just goes to show where his priorities are.

Many of the communities were expecting reduced allocations, with many thinking 36 per cent was too low, particularly with the inflows we have had in the catchment area over recent weeks, so what is the allocation going to be on 15 July when the next announcement comes? We wait with interest. Irrigators are frustrated. They are concerned about their future, particularly with many still feeling the effect of the real millennium drought before 2010.

Having met with the minister and his department several times, I have expressed concerns about his lack of interest, his lack of knowledge and his lack of consideration when it comes to water allocations, when it comes to NRM levies and when it comes to pipe breaks. I think what we need to see is a minister who is proactive. He needs to front up to the people. The previous water minister, the member for Colton, used to come and visit the irrigators. He used to visit the communities, and he used to give good reason why he would announce reduced allocations. This minister does not have the ability, does not have the gumption, to go up there and speak or he is just plain chicken—that is just what it is.

What I am very concerned about is there is no plan for this year's water budget. How will irrigators be guided? How will they be given good advice on scenario, weather prediction and water price forecast? Really, I am constantly appalled by the lack of care for our most productive assets—food producers—under the guidance of the water minister. Again, we have the government continuing to spruik the importance of the economic base of agriculture. We see a minister who continues to hide and will not come up regularly.

Maybe the Riverland irrigators and their communities could engage *The Advertiser's* cardboard cut-out and get some real answers. Maybe they could train that cardboard cut-out to come up and speak to the people of the Riverland. The government might get a better understanding of the impacts of the restrictions and NRM increases that are happening. That cardboard cut-out might even show some compassion with water pipe breaks that are currently happening. I really urge the minister to come out from behind the rock and face the people. Come out and speak to the real people. Do not just have meetings behind locked doors and speak to your friendly people who continually engage with you only.

GEOTOURISM

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:37): On Monday 27 June, I had the honour of representing minister Ian Hunter at a function to celebrate the execution of a memorandum of cooperation between the Geological Society of Australia (GSA) and the Geological Society of China (GSC). The memorandum of cooperation with the Geological Society of Australia seeks to promote a better understanding and closer cooperation between these two associations for the promotion and advancement of geotourism. I remember, when I first came into this place, being on the Environment, Resources and Development Committee and the project we did looking at ecotourism. I have to say that, since that time, I had not given it a lot of thought but understood how important these developments are.

I am told that China has at least 10 major geoparks, and five academic institutions are interested in collaborating with the parks and the institutions of Australian counterparts. I understand the memorandum was signed at the biennial 2016 Australian Earth Sciences Convention. I am also advised that the keynote address on geotourism was given by Professor Patrick McKeever, representing UNESCO; Dr Graham Carr, President of the Geological Society of Australia; and Professor Anze Chen, who is a distinguished member of the Geological Society of China. At the function I attended, I managed to meet these three gentlemen. Dr Carr is reported as saying:

> Geotourism is an emerging global phenomenon which fosters tourism based upon landscapes and geology. China is a major global player in geotourism [and it has] over 320 provincial areas set aside for this purpose in China, among which 200 have [been assigned] national status...With 33 of these areas (known as geoparks) having acquired global status, China manages by far to have the largest number of geoparks in the world.

With the increased number of Chinese tourists visiting Australia, it is hoped that tourists will continue to visit outside capital cities and coastal areas. One of the foci of ecotourism is to develop job opportunities in nature-based tourism industries and in natural resources management. Of course, being on the Natural Resources Committee links up with the interest that we will have on that committee.

According to the department (DEWNR), ecotourism is described as an emerging new tourism market—I am not sure how new it is: we did a project in 1998, so I am not sure what 'new' means—focusing on the geology and landscape of an area as the basis for providing visitor engagement, learning and enjoyment. Ecotourism, I am told, focuses on cultural heritage and biodiversity, but it includes geodiversity and showing links between these strands of our natural heritage and how our earth heritage (our geological heritage) provides for a truly inclusive, holistic, nature-based tourism experience. That was the advice I got from the department. I think most people would get the gist of what all that is about, but I thought it was a very wordy explanation. Examples, or ones I think we can seize upon, are the Flinders Ranges, Kangaroo Island and Australia's centre.

There is also a whole agenda with regard to UNESCO, and I had the opportunity to speak with Professor McKeever on that issue. He talks about the multiplying effects of both ecotourism and geotourism, and he is a big advocate for these geoparks. He emphasises the need for local people to take ownership of the whole process and talks about the development of employment and business opportunities and the multiplying effect they may have in a particular area. This is also, I understand, a highly political area, as the federal and state governments do not necessarily buy into geoparks but certainly support ecotourism and geotourism.

Time expired.

SUICIDE

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:42): I rise today on a sombre note to discuss data released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics in March this year on the causes of death in Australia in 2014. It is with alarm and sadness that I note the tragically high rate of suicide in this country, in particular in South Australia, by the numbers. In 2014, there were 2,864 suicides nationally. That is almost eight per day—one every three hours. In South Australia, there were 240 suicides in just 12 months. That means that every 1.5 days someone in South Australia takes their own life.

These numbers are disturbing, but even more disturbing is that the number of deaths by suicide in South Australia has remained relatively unchanged over the last decade. In 2005, there were 231 South Australians who, unfortunately, took their own life. Any death is devastating. That any person is suffering to such an extent that they are motivated to take their own life is indeed a tragedy. Behind every suicide is a sad story of trauma and heartache for mothers, fathers, sisters, brothers, friends, partners, colleagues and whole communities.

The personal and social impacts of suicide and attempted suicide on those affected cannot be quantified but are clearly enormous. The financial cost of suicide in Australia is also significant. Suicide imposes economic costs on a broad range of areas, including health care, law enforcement and emergency services, just to name a few. One death by suicide is one too many. The inability to achieve a reduction in the annual number of suicides in South Australia is extremely concerning. It shows that the current strategies are not working. Suicide rates have been particularly stark in men aged 40 to 44 years. Nationally, 18.3 per cent of male deaths in this age group are attributable to suicide.

It appears that the young men of the 1990s are taking suicidality with them. As these young men enter middle age, they are suffering unaddressed depression and mental health problems that are being exacerbated. Many of these men have been employed in manufacturing, construction, farming and mining, all areas experiencing high levels of uncertainty and job losses. Often with families to support and mortgages to pay, they are increasingly overwhelmed and no longer able to keep the black dog at bay.

We cannot continue to fail our most vulnerable by persisting with unsuccessful policies and programs. Unfortunately, the effectiveness of the state government's South Australian Suicide Prevention Strategy 2012-2016 has been underwhelming. There were 108 road fatalities in

South Australia in 2014 compared with 240 deaths by suicide. That is less than half. We certainly do a lot in terms of reducing road fatalities in our state. We must do more to help reduce the tragic loss of life through suicide.

As a priority, services to prevent suicide should be strengthened so that those at risk of taking their own life are given the support they need. We need the government to deliver on its promises. It promised to establish a mental health commission. This means more than just a press release: it means the nuts and bolts of the commission's structure, responsibilities and its powers under relevant legislation. The government promised to adopt a new five-year mental health plan, as the previous mental health plan and wellbeing policy of 2010-15 expired more than six months ago.

It promised to address the acute shortage of mental health beds in our hospital system. The SA Health dashboard continually shows mental health beds throughout the hospital network in negative territory, with occupancy rates in these beds greater than capacity. Mental health patients often wait extended periods in emergency departments, sometimes more than 24 hours, despite the government's goal of having no mental health patients waiting more than 24 hours in an emergency department from 1 January this year.

After 14 years in office, the Labor government has failed to deliver better outcomes for South Australians suffering with a mental health illness. Despite the evidence, suicide is too often a low priority for this government. We must prioritise suicide prevention on the public health and public policy agendas. It is a critical public health issue and one that definitely needs the urgent attention of all those in this house.

NATIONAL RECONCILIATION WEEK

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:47): I rise to inform the house about Reconciliation Week 2016 celebrations in our southern community. As I know you are aware, Madam Deputy Speaker, Reconciliation Week is held from 27 May to 3 June each year. The first date marks the anniversary of the 1967 referendum in Australia and the second date the anniversary of the High Court of Australia's Mabo judgement in 1992. As the Reconciliation Australia website says:

> As Australians, we are all here, woven into this country. As part of our reconciliation journey, there are truths to tell, stories to celebrate, and relationships to grow. Reconciliation is at the heart of our nation's future.

In Reynell, we joined our nation's reconciliation journey by bringing together our Aboriginal brothers and sisters and non-Aboriginal people of all ages to tell stories, share experiences, celebrate our steps towards reconciliation and contemplate how we can better engender it in our local community and beyond. Ably led by our local organising committee comprising members of the Joining Hands and Minds Taskforce, my office and others, the event was successful due to the willingness of our community to work together.

Our key event was our southern community gathering in Ramsay Place. It was the best attended southern event to date, with numerous young people from our local schools, many community members and a great number of organisations committing to work together to achieve reconciliation. It was particularly inspiring to see our youngest community members attending with their schools and kindergartens, performing and speaking themselves and also finding out more about reconciliation through discussions with Aboriginal elders and people who work and volunteer for the organisations who support our community generally and who are also committed to furthering reconciliation.

A special thankyou to Christies Beach High School students Jasmin Fraser and Talisa Scrutton for their outstanding emceeing and a thankyou to the many performers, speakers, stallholders, organisers and everyone who attended this very special day. There are many to thank for the incredible work that occurred to ensure reconciliation week in the south provided such a meaningful way for us to commit connect and commit to furthering reconciliation.

I cannot list them all, but I would like to make mention of Allan Sumner, both for his welcome to country and his enduring leadership in our community; Alice Leahy, Housing SA; Belinda Pollard, Anglicare SA; Chris Coomer, community volunteer and Aboriginal elder; Craig Cooper and Chris Martin, City of Onkaparinga; Darjana Nikolic, Taikurrendi Children and Family Centre; Hermione Wong and Kaleen Gurr, Uniting Communities; Jesse Hannam, Neporendi; Isaac Hamman,

community volunteer; Lauren Jew, Aldinga Children's Centre; Lorraine Gibson, DECD; Margaret Mitchell, Ninko Kurtangga Patpangga; Mandy Williams, Mission Australia; Pamela Strapp, Lutheran Community Care; Richard Schirmer, Community Health Onkaparinga; Ross Tanimu and Tracy Wagner, Hackham West Community Centre; and all at Southern Domestic Violence Service.

Thank you also to students from Morphett Vale and Calvary Lutheran primary schools who created and displayed beautiful message sticks to express what reconciliation means to them. Our Southern Football League also proudly embraced reconciliation week through our annual reconciliation round at the O'Sullivan Beach Lonsdale football club.

I thank Anthony Bernhardt and David Schultz of this club and Phil Wood of the Port Noarlunga Football Club for their efforts towards this initiative which enabled our league to bring together our local football community, players, coaches, officials and supporters to talk about how together we can achieve reconciliation and recognition for our Aboriginal brothers and sisters and to promote awareness of our national Recognise campaign.

This event made a difference. Football club members together with Aunty Leonie Brodie, other Aboriginal elders and excellent young didgeridoo player Isaac Hamman built understanding about our shared journey towards reconciliation. Thank you to everyone involved in making this event an important part of our Southern Football League calendar.

I also attended the Christies Beach High School Reconciliation Week assembly where students and staff, speakers and our Aboriginal young people who spoke up in their Australian Human Rights Commission *Racism. It Stops with Me* DVD instilled me with great hope for how we will write the next chapter of our reconciliation story.

It was also a pleasure to be part of Christies Beach Primary School's Reconciliation Week assembly together with Amanda Rishworth MP. We were enthralled with the beautiful acknowledgement of country in Kaurna by two young students singing in language and artistic evidence of much deep and positive exploration of what reconciliation means. Thank you to all at this school for their leadership towards reconciliation.

The week ended for me with a great deal of hope and energy about our future capacity to achieve reconciliation—so many young people, so many community members, so many great organisations all committed to acknowledging and apologising for past injustices and to working together to achieve reconciliation. This week is of course NAIDOC Week, a week to celebrate Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander history, culture and achievements and an opportunity to recognise the contributions that Aboriginal Australians make to both our country and our society.

Bills

INTERVENTION ORDERS (PREVENTION OF ABUSE) (RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ORDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 June 2016.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:53): I indicate that I will be the lead speaker on Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) (Recognition of National Domestic Violence Orders) Amendment Bill 2016. Members will be aware that we have, through the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009, as a parliament, rewritten the domestic violence order procedures in this state subsequent to a comprehensive report prepared by Maurine Pyke QC, which has helped to nourish the reform in this area.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I can't hear the deputy leader and I do want to hear.

Ms CHAPMAN: This bill, however, only deals with one small matter which has been the subject of discussions at the Council of Australian Governments last year. That was to advance the

National Domestic Violence Order Scheme by providing automatic recognition and enforcement of domestic violence orders in any other state or territory.

Essentially, at present we have an electronic program known as CrimTrac, which is serviced by and the subject of work by the South Australia Police who register orders on it. Instead of the current procedure, which requires a person who might seek protection under an order (when the offending party might move interstate) to go through a process of having that recognised in another state by an application to the court, the initiative in this bill would enable the central database, known as CrimTrac, to receive that information as a South Australian order onto it, and it would have automatic recognition and therefore would be enforced in our sister and brother jurisdictions across the border.

It may assist only a few people a year from our state. Arguably, it will assist a few people from our neighbouring states if they were to come into our jurisdiction. It has minor significance to the extent of the number of people it might assist, but it is not insignificant in the value that it will have for those parties. The opposition will support this further initiative. At present, all commonwealth jurisdictions have similar laws that allow for orders to protect victims of domestic violence, and at present a DVO issued, as I said, in one jurisdiction can be registered and enforced. However, this process, as I say, obviates the need for a victim, or at least the beneficiary of a DVO order, to have this as an automatic procedure.

The automatic recognition of DVOs across Australia was developed by the National Domestic Violence Order Scheme working group and the model provisions bill was subsequently endorsed at the national level I think in December last year. Essentially, the agreed policy principles are:

1. A DVO made anywhere in Australia or New Zealand can be registered anywhere in Australia and is nationally recognised and enforceable;

2. A DVO that is nationally recognised can be amended in any jurisdiction, but only by a court;

3. If a DVO made in one jurisdiction is enforced a new order can, if necessary, be made in another jurisdiction, but only by a court; and

4. The last order in time will prevail.

One would hope that other jurisdictions are following the agreed terms. I was advised at the government briefing on 28 June that to date New South Wales is the only state that has passed laws to implement this; however, Tasmania and the ACT have, apparently, introduced their bills. Queensland, Victoria, Western Australia and the Northern Territory are dragging the chain, it seems, but the Northern Territory is probably busy with the fact that they are having an election next month. I am not raising that as an excuse for them, but I make the point that we are not the first, but we are at least advancing it.

I understand that only SAPOL has been consulted on this matter. In this instance, I think, because this issue of recognition of other jurisdiction orders has been, in principle, both sought and expressed in a positive manner by other stakeholders who have to work with the women and children who are most predominantly the victims in these circumstances (some men, but predominantly women and children), this would be something that they will applaud and advance.

Most significantly, SAPOL is the party responsible for the registration process, making sure that the list is up to date, etc. They will enforce the obligations under this amendment and so, quite rightly, they are a significant stakeholder to be consulted. I think I read somewhere that it is expected that the funding necessary—and, of course, consequently the resources necessary to maintain this register and upload and update it—will be of negligible extra cost, so we are grateful that the government has agreed to advance it. I would say that on consultation with the Law Society, they have received the bill from us; they were not consulted but, nevertheless, we have not had any indication objecting to the same.

The most disappointing aspect of dealing with this legislation in the domestic violence arena is that it is the only thing before us. We have had a number of initiatives exposed by both the select committee in this parliament and their report several months ago and by other reviews that have

been undertaken which clearly indicate that there are initiatives that are effective in other jurisdictions and need to be addressed. One of those initiatives is Clare's law, which allows a registration list for people, with new partners particularly, to check if there are people with a prior record. It is operating in England, it has obviously been reviewed and it is able to be assessed.

Yet, even though we had the Premier's announcement late last year that he would ensure that an issues paper would be prepared and that this matter could then be discussed amongst other initiatives and recommendations—such as the videoing of material and the availability of that to be evidence in relation to these cases, and these are all the types of initiatives which are, at first blush at least, good initiatives—what has happened here? We get a bill that deals with only this infinitesimal small amount of law reform, when clearly a select committee populated by members of both parties and, I think, one of the Independents in this house put up a number of ideas, yet we are still waiting for an issues paper, let alone a draft bill or bills, to advance reform in this area.

Secondly, a number of the recommendations that have come from the select committee could be initiated with a bit of extra money. In two days' time, we are going to have a state budget, but we still do not even have an issues paper. I find that very concerning, when we know that under our domestic violence circumstances at least one woman a week is being murdered by a spouse or former partner. Some would argue on the statistics that it is close to nearly two, so it is three per fortnight on a national scale. That ought to be alarming enough to alert governments to the problem and put a bomb under them to carry out some initiatives in this area.

We have coronial report after coronial report in respect of people who have had intervention orders, supposedly as part of the umbrella of protection for them. We have had a MAPS plan, which is a coordinated approach from different agencies in government to try to make sure that we are ever alert around families that are in a high-risk category. This select committee was very effective in going through and identifying where there were good programs that could be advanced, where there were good initiatives that could be followed and developed, yet we have had no action by the government in this space other than this tiny bill.

We are grateful for this morsel, but it is a crumb in the loaf of obligation that we have and opportunity that we have to help remedy this appalling social ill and blight on particularly the women and children of this state. They will have our support, but get on with that issues paper, get it out and let's get on with the real job of protecting women and children in this state.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:04): I rise to speak on the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) (Recognition of National Domestic Violence Orders) Amendment Bill 2016. I note that this bill was introduced by the Attorney on 22 June, and it amends the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009. This bill is part of South Australia's undertaking as part of the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2015 to develop a national domestic violence order scheme to provide for the automatic recognition and enforcement of domestic and family violence orders in any state or territory.

It is noted that there is a central database known as CrimTrac that has been operated by the commonwealth under minister Keegan. In regard to intervention orders, they are orders that can be issued by a police officer or a magistrate if it is reasonable to suspect that the defendant will, without intervention, commit an act of abuse against a person, and the issuing of the order is appropriate in the circumstances. The act provides for protection fromphysical forms of violence but also from emotional or psychological harm and an unreasonable and non-consensual denial of financial, social or personal autonomy. For example, an intervention order may prohibit someone from being on or within premises at which the protected person resides or works.

In regard to the commonwealth, all commonwealth jurisdictions have similar laws that allow for orders to protect victims of domestic violence. At present, a DVO (a domestic violence order) issued in one jurisdiction can be registered and enforced in another. This is an additional process that the victim undertakes and involves additional court procedures, and this can put some victims off in regard to the fact that they have to have an extra court process.

Legislation to support automatic recognition of DVOs across Australia was developed by the National Domestic Violence Order Scheme Working Group, and a model provisions bill was subsequently endorsed in 2015. The model provisions reflect the following agreed policy principles:

1. A DVO made anywhere in Australia, or a New Zealand DVO registered anywhere in Australia, is nationally recognised and enforceable;

2. A DVO that is nationally recognised can be amended in any jurisdiction, but only by a court;

3. If a DVO made in one jurisdiction is enforced, a new order can (if necessary) be made in another jurisdiction, but only by a court; and

4. The last order in time prevails.

In regard to the model provisions, this bill is similar and it enables the automatic recognition and enforcement of interstate DVOs in South Australia. The automatic scheme, it is noted, only applies to domestic violence orders, not personal violence. It was in late 2015 that the government was going to conduct a review in respect of domestic violence laws and policies, including the implementation of Clare's Law, which the deputy leader has spoken about today.

We have run an inquiry in the Social Development Committee in this place on domestic violence, and I was part of that committee process. We heard a lot of confronting stories and a lot of confronting issues, and I salute all the people who reported to our committee. It took a lot of courage in a lot of cases for these people to present. One thing that has been highlighted to me time and time again is the fact that, because of the work of the Social Development Committee and work throughout the community, through our police force and people working in the field in non-government agencies, domestic violence cases are bring brought to light more often. It may not be the fact that there is an epidemic of domestic violence, but I think it is more the case that people are more comfortable in reporting it because obviously this can be a very personal matter.

I note that the deputy leader has introduced a bill in the past to provide a fixed date for intervention orders and this has been rejected by the government on the basis that they are conducting their own review. We have not seen the issues paper in regard to that, but we do note that automatic recognition of domestic violence orders is a good idea. However, the central database should not be clogged with orders that are no longer relevant or required. I think they do have a lot of consequences where these old orders basically stand for life and I think it is something that should be looked at.

In regard to the committee work into this and from the Social Development Committee inquiry into domestic and family violence, I want to make a few points. I quote from part 1, the executive summary of the report:

The committee noted the process underway at the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) to develop a National Intervention Order Scheme to ensure that an Intervention Order/Protection Order issued in one State, or Territory, would be applicable in others. The committee holds the view that there needs to be greater consistency across jurisdictions and, that this work should be expedited.

Page 92 of the report, looking at the 2010-2022 plan, states:

Commonwealth, State and Territory Ministers, accountable for reducing violence against women, are responsible for overseeing the implementation of the Action Plans by monitoring and progressing key cross-jurisdictional and national actions, sharing information and good practice, partnering with relevant ministerial colleagues within jurisdictions and at a national level and working with relevant councils under the COAG system.

In regard to the second action plan, which is on page 103 of the report, moving ahead to 2013-16, it states:

The committee endorsed the recent announcement of the commitment to develop a National Domestic Violence Order Scheme to ensure that an Intervention Order issued in one jurisdiction will be recognised in all Australian jurisdictions. This is especially important for women and children who cross borders to escape an abusive partner, or family member, and/or the perpetrator crosses State and Territory borders.

In regard to family violence intervention orders on page 151 of the report, I quote:

The Commonwealth Government has committed to making Intervention Orders, or Domestic Violence Orders (DVOs) as they are called in some jurisdictions, consistent across all Australian jurisdictions. They are currently working with all States and Territories to develop the legal framework that will enable the automatic recognition and enforcement of domestic and family violence orders. This will remove the current requirement for victims to register them in order to make them applicable in jurisdictions where they were not originally issued.

In regard to some committee comment on page 163 of the report, I quote:

The committee endorsed the work of the COAG Advisory Panel on Reducing Violence against Women and their Children to provide three reports leading to the development of a nationally consistent Intervention Order scheme. It is concerned that the timeframe for the completion of this work his yet to be established.

In regard to intervention orders on page 166 of the report, I quote:

It is recommended that the South Australian Government lobby the Commonwealth Government to ensure there are consistent and sufficient penalties across all jurisdictions for breaches of Intervention Orders.

It was certainly something that was highlighted to the committee in regard to the cross-jurisdictional powers that police may or may not have. It does create difficulties when dealing with domestic violence orders. We heard of pretty close relationships down at Mount Gambier with their colleagues in Victoria, as well as our police in either in the far north of the state or the west of the state working with their colleagues, whether they be in the Northern Territory or Western Australia.

The current situation does provide a lot of headaches for our police on the ground and I certainly think this legislation is very much a step in the right direction. It will certainly streamline the way intervention orders are managed across the country. I notice that SAPOL has lobbied this bill through to the Attorney-General and the parliament. I think it will only benefit the situation in managing domestic violence, not just in this state but across the country. It is a scourge and it has to be stopped.

We must do all we can to end this scourge because it is, essentially, killing our children and their mothers. It is a terrible thing and the more we can do and the more recommendations that can be taken from the social development report that was filed here in the last couple of months, the more we can do for the benefit of all our society. This includes perpetrator programs, but also, as I have said before, it is about education programs.

I note the advertisements that have been on television recently about getting to children and that is where you need to start—getting to children. It is not okay to be bullies in the schoolyard. It is not okay to beat up on someone of the opposite gender. People need to get it into their head that that is not the right thing to do. The more education we can do hopefully will mean that later on it is less money that we have to spend at the policing and protection end, because at the moment most of the money in regard to domestic violence goes to the crisis end of management.

Coming from a regional area, I know it is hard for regional areas to have safe houses because, like anything in a regional area, most people know what is going on virtually as it happens because that is the way the bush telegraph works. To have safe houses in regional areas is tough. I know they are there, but it is very hard to keep people safe, so a lot of the time motels are used at great cost.

I would also like to acknowledge the work of the Multi-Agency Protection Service. One of the highlights I saw, in being involved in the committee, was talking to not just the police, who are the lead agency, but to all of the agencies that work there on a shoestring budget. I hope that on Thursday we see some more funding go that way in the budget because I think they do excellent work.

It is something you do not see very often—multiple agencies in one room working together instead of the silo mentality. They are doing magnificent work, and I will certainly be pleased if I can see a positive outcome for MAPS in the budget because that is certainly where it needs to be. They are at the front line, receiving 400 or 500 contacts a week in regard to domestic violence. I know they are not the only way we can combat domestic violence, but certainly at that crisis end they are doing magnificent work and should be applauded for it.

With those few words, I think this will be good legislation for moving us on our journey against domestic violence. May it have a speedy passage through the house.

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (16:18): I rise to make a very brief contribution to this bill. Obviously, I support the bill. I want to congratulate the Attorney-General and the Attorney-General's gang on their initiative and on continuing this important work. It is a feature of our federation that people can move freely, trade freely and live wherever they like across our great country, yet, for historical reasons, our criminal codes have evolved along separate lines. We are rightly protective of those criminal codes, as our attorneys-general sometimes are.

We are increasingly seeing crime across borders generally, but we are seeing, concurrently, an increasing degree of cooperation, even though those criminal codes are not integrated. We are seeing that with terrorism, organised crime, drug-related crime and outlaw motorcycle gangs, and this is in that spirit, but in some ways more important, because it is about protecting innocent people and preventing criminal behaviour from happening across the border, even though it is in another jurisdiction. It is the same criminal behaviour, but happening to people across the border. It is a really important step.

We have obviously taken some important steps in this state in regard to intervention orders. They have always been an important tool to protect victims, but we have taken some steps so that the police who are on the front line can make significant and real-time decisions about protecting people, and can issue at least temporary intervention orders to protect victims even when those victims perhaps express that they do not want protection in that instance. The police can make that determination and bring it before a magistrate, and I think that is an altogether good move.

There has been some debate about whether we should introduce further police evidence such as first-on-scene camera evidence. I believe that will be a feature of the discussion paper that members have alluded to, and I will be speaking more about that at another time but, again, it was a very good move that we gave more power to the police in this respect. Various members have mentioned the Social Development Committee report. I was not on the committee, but I recognise the good work they did. I note, as has the member for Hammond, that this reflects at least the spirit of some of the recommendations, particularly No. 34. I also recognise of course, as the member for Bragg and the member for Hammond have done, that there is a lot more work to be done.

The member for Bragg particularly talks about the discussion paper that is working its way through government at the moment, particularly in regard to Clare's Law and those types of things. Like the member for Bragg, I look forward to its release. I look forward to that conversation, and I look forward to some really important reforms coming out of that but, unlike the member for Bragg, I recognise that this is a comprehensive piece of work that is coming out. It is not just a back of a napkin collection of ideas and thought bubbles: I am told and I trust that this is going to be quite a significant piece of work.

Importantly, it is going to bring together data and evidence. Part of the problem has been that this data has been very difficult to get hold of and very difficult to compare and contrast in any meaningful way, so that has been part of the rationale behind this discussion paper. I look forward to the release of this discussion paper, as I said. I look forward to being part of that public debate, particularly around Clare's Law, which I, along with the member for Bragg of course, was part of promoting early on. There is obviously plenty of work to do, and this is just one step in the right direction.

I am really pleased that in my own community, the Playford Community Fund, who are a charitable organisation who do a lot of good work in the north, have recently received a grant from Treasury enabling them to provide furniture, bedding, blankets and those sorts of things immediately, overnight, to victims of domestic violence through the Northern Domestic Violence Service. The Playford Community Fund operates on a shoestring. They buy things in bulk through donated money and through money from their volunteers simply because it is needed up there in the north. I want to commend Dennis Jarman at the Playford Community Fund for his good work.

Speaking of the Northern Domestic Violence Service, I am also working with them on options to help them with the chronic lack of short- and medium-term housing for domestic violence victims. They have been through a process where they, for historical reasons, had to move some of their housing, and they have found themselves in a situation where the housing they have is largely in the wrong area. They need housing in the City of Playford, in the Elizabeth area, where they tell me the vast bulk of their families in need come from. Those families do not necessarily want to move, and nor should they have to do, and uproot their kids and cause all of the problems that those movements entail, so I am working with them. I am working with the Minister for Housing and Urban Development on some options around that.

Finally, I just want to concur with the member for Hammond's remarks about MAPS. I had the good fortune to visit MAPS as well on some separate occasions. They do amazing work. I am

not privy to the budget, but if there were extra funds for the continuing operation of MAPS, it would be more than welcome from my point of view. With those words, I commend the bill to the house.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (16:24): I rise to add my voice to this bill because the electorate I represent is a wonderful electorate that has a whole heap of positives. We have high levels of employment, and we have high levels of social cohesion. As a result, we have some of the lowest crime rates—if not the lowest crime rates—in this state, and that is a great thing. Whilst we have not seen some of the worst excesses and worst scourges that drugs and drug-related crime have brought to our community, whilst we have not seen the rates of property theft, assaults and those types of things, unfortunately the Barossa is over-represented when it comes to domestic violence statistics, and it is an area of my community that needs a large amount of work.

I have met a number of times with key agencies within the Barossa that are on the front line of welfare service delivery. Recently, Junction Australia, which is a group that provides social housing and a whole heap of ancillary services all across the state and quite a bit down Victor Harbor way, convened a meeting of local service providers. People from Lutheran Community Care, people from UnitingCare, people from the council, and people from major community-oriented businesses within the area were there and they sat down to have a discussion about how we can coordinate those services better.

When we looked at the report that Junction Australia had done into what are the greatest needs within the Barossa, it talked about pockets of social disadvantage as they exist. One of the key things that it talked about (and we talked about, indeed), was domestic violence service provision, and it is an area that the Barossa lacks. The services we have are provided by the Northern Domestic Violence Service, and they are a fantastic group of people. I have met with them a number of times and toured through their place and had a lot of discussions with them about where they are at. Unfortunately, the service they provide in the Barossa is an outreach service and when it comes to the pointy end of those outreach services it is the crisis accommodation that is needed when women make that decision to separate from an abusive partner.

If they do that in the Barossa, if they are lucky, they can get a spot down at the centre run by the Northern Domestic Violence Service in Willaston, and there are 12 little apartments there—little homettes—that they run. If they are not lucky enough to get into one of those spots, then they have to go down to the northern suburbs of Adelaide because that is where most of the crisis accommodation is provided. What that does is exacerbate the issue and concentrate it around the northern suburbs. Indeed, the Barossa's perspective very much is that we would like to look after our own problems.

We think that it would be much better if we had some crisis accommodation in the Barossa so that, for those who need those services, we could look after them where they live. I think that is important because it means that children can stay within the schools that they are in, the woman fleeing violence can potentially stay with those community supports and those family supports that she potentially has around her, and it means that we can take pressure off the other areas, especially the northern suburbs, which have their own needs they have to look after.

We are not talking about huge numbers here. In fact, we have estimated that we are only talking about half a dozen places. Initially, we were excited by the 'One thousand homes in 1,000 days' proposal, and this idea that there were homes slated for subdivision, sale, and then smaller groups of units being built on the remaining land. We thought that was something great, but unfortunately it seems that the Barossa is not a target location for that. Certainly, Junction Australia seemed extremely positive about being an organisation that could have facilitated the development of that accommodation, and the Northern Domestic Violence Service were, again, extremely supportive in helping to run that accommodation and run those systems.

It is an issue. As an advanced economy and as an advanced society dealing with domestic violence and the fallout and the social breakdown that happen as a result, it should be very much at the forefront of what we do. In my view, it is behind road infrastructure funding and behind a new Barossa hospital. It is one of the areas of highest need for my electorate and something that I implore the government to help rectify.

Indeed, when country cabinet was on last year I asked the exact question of the minister, who at that stage was the Hon. Gail Gago. Her response was, 'Yes, we provide those services in the northern suburbs,' which was answering the question in a way that meant she did not understand the problem because what I was trying to say was exactly that: the services that are being provided are 20, 30, 40, 50 kilometres away from the communities these people live in. Her answer was, 'Yes, they should go down there.' I think that it concentrates issues in an area as opposed to helping to spread those issues out to potentially be dealt with much better in the communities that these people come from.

In terms of this legislation, I am extremely supportive. It seems a common-sense measure. The shadow attorney has had things to say in relation to other measures that may need to be taken, but certainly we are happy to support it on the basis that this is what is in front of us now. I urge the government not to let the urgent crowd out the important and, when looking at where services need to be provided, maybe to take that step further and look at the source of that need, as opposed to where that need is being fulfilled. On behalf of the Barossa, I implore the government to help us find a solution to this issue and thank the government for bringing this bill to us.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (16:31): I, too, rise to speak on this important bill, the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) (Recognition of National Domestic Violence Orders) Amendment Bill 2016. In doing so, I commend the Attorney-General for bringing this bill to the house. As members of this house would know, ending the scourge of domestic violence in our community is an issue which I am deeply passionate about. I know that many others in here are similarly passionate.

This is an issue that I believe we best address through determined collaboration focused on addressing the underlying causes of domestic violence and on prevention and effective intervention wherever possible to keep those experiencing domestic violence and their children safe. We must do everything we can, in every corner of our community, to ensure that people experiencing domestic violence are as safe as possible and provided with the supports to build a sustainable future away from violence.

That is why, together with the member for Stuart, late last year we initiated the Parliamentarians United Against Domestic Violence group. That is why shortly after coming to this house I moved for the Social Development Committee to inquire into all aspects of domestic violence and the services and supports and funding available both through the federal government and our state government. I am very pleased that the Social Development Committee has now handed down a comprehensive set of recommendations that I know we will look at deeply.

I have spoken in many forums and in this house about, amongst other things, the shocking and unacceptable statistics about violence against women and a range of strategies that are employed in relation to ending that violence. Clearly, we must do more, and this bill is a clear action that we can take in this house to support those experiencing domestic violence. Domestic violence orders are a key part of the system that protects victims of violence, and they are now used across our nation.

When we introduced intervention orders in South Australia I know that our domestic violence sector greatly applauded that step and that move. I know, through the women who come to my office in our community often in desperate situations, the difference that those orders have made to them. However, currently those who have a domestic violence order must apply to the courts to ensure that their orders apply in all jurisdictions, not just in the one in which they applied for them.

I strongly believe that we must break down the administrative barriers that stop women seeking help and assistance and being readily and quickly provided with that assistance. Even small tasks can seem insurmountable when life is fraught with stress, fear and worry about one's own safety and the safety of one's children. Contact with the court system can prove stressful in itself and this process, this contact, must be as seamless as possible.

Nationally and across all the states, we have committed, through COAG, to effect model provisions to form the National Domestic Violence Order Scheme (NDVOS) to enable the automatic recognition and enforcement of DVOs across the country and to develop a supporting national information-sharing system that police and courts will be able to use for evidentiary purposes or to enforce DVOs.

The purpose of this Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) (Recognition of National Domestic Violence Orders) Amendment Bill 2016 is to amend the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009 to give effect to the domestic violence orders model provisions bill within the existing South Australian intervention order framework and to enable the automatic recognition and enforcement of interstate orders in South Australia and vice versa.

This is a huge and very important step forward for us to address domestic violence together across our nation. It is a huge step forward for women feeling safe wherever they are in Australia and wherever they want to go and for women feeling able to easily access a safe environment. The model provisions reflect a number of agreed policy principles:

1. A DVO made anywhere in Australia is nationally recognised and enforceable.

2. A DVO that is nationally recognised can be amended in any jurisdiction by a court.

3. If a DVO made in one jurisdiction is in force, a new order can, if necessary, be made in another jurisdiction, but only by a court.

In addition to the model provisions, the NDVOS will also comprise a capability for sharing information on DVOs within and across jurisdictions. I know that a number of other members in speaking in support of this bill have spoken about the incredible success of our MAPS initiative. This bill engenders a step that upholds the principles that underpin the success of MAPS.

A national information-sharing system that will allow courts and police to share a broader set of information about DVOs is being developed by CrimTrac for all jurisdictions and it is proposed that the national information-sharing system will ensure the highest standard of data integrity regarding DVOs, their status and supporting information, allow greater functionality and information sharing, allow police and courts access to DVO information in real time, and present a possible platform for a future national capability for other types of court orders including bail and Corrections orders with future agreement and funding.

In the interim, enhancements are being made to the national police referencing system by CrimTrac that will provide police and courts with access to a minimum set of information about DVOs created in all Australian states and territories within 12 months. The aim of this bill and an NDVOS is to provide better protection for victims of domestic violence who move across jurisdictional borders, for example, in order to flee a situation of domestic violence. This amendment aims to make service and enforcement of an intervention order simpler and to avoid police officers having to unnecessarily track down a defendant for service where they were present in the court for the making of the original order.

I know how pervasive domestic violence is in my own community and the stats tell us of its tragic pervasiveness across the country. Women come into my office and I also hear through many discussions with organisations like Southern Domestic Violence Service the incredible negative impact this is having on those women, their children and, indeed, our broader community. I do not want to mourn another woman. I do not want any other child to go through what so many do. Women, men and children flourish in a world free of violence, and we as parliamentarians must do all we can to make South Australia a place where this will occur. This bill gives us an excellent opportunity to take a very small but very important step towards that end.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (16:39): I would like to say a few words on the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) (Recognition of National Domestic Violence Orders) Amendment Bill 2016. I will not speak for too long and I will not go into enormous detail because I know that other speakers have done that very well. I trust and believe deep in my heart that all members of the South Australian parliament are united in their desire to combat domestic violence in our state and other places to the very best of our ability. We all take this issue seriously. The member for Reynell and I have certainly formed a particular partnership, but we are supported by all members of parliament in this effort. The main principles of this bill are:

1. A domestic violence order made anywhere in Australia or New Zealand domestic violence order registered anywhere in Australia is nationally recognised and enforceable;

2. A domestic violence order that is nationally recognised can be amended in any jurisdiction, but only by a court;

3. If a domestic violence order made in one jurisdiction is in force, a new order can (if necessary) be made in another jurisdiction, but only by a court; and

4. The last order in time prevails.

They are the supporting foundation principles that we all agree to. Our deputy leader has added that we also believe that there should be an amendment with regard to fixing the term of DVOs, and I think that is important also. With reagrd to acknowledging the importance that within Australia DVOs should be able to cross borders, I would like to comment on why that is so necessary.

It is incredibly necessary because state borders are the least of the issues crossed over when it comes to domestic violence. Domestic violence crosses cultures, geography, income levels, religions, ethnic backgrounds and employment groups. Almost any demographic description that you can find unfortunately has its share of domestic violence. By that, I mean that it is found everywhere, and it is completely unacceptable. That is why at the very least we need to be able to cross state borders and work with New Zealand in relation to these orders.

The effort to address this issue needs to be just as strong in every corner of our nation. I know that we are united as members of parliament on this matter. Certainly, as a local MP I take it very seriously. As the shadow minister for police, I take it seriously. As a white ribbon ambassador, I take it very seriously. As a person and as a man, I take it incredibly seriously because the only demographic description that separates it from the others is men versus women with regard to domestic violence. It is not exclusively men, but it is overwhelmingly men who commit domestic violence against women.

With those few words, I support all members of this parliament who have spoken on this matter. I appreciate the fact that everybody is working so hard on this issue. We are unfortunately decades too late, but we should just start, get going and do everything that we possibly can in every way on this important issue.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (16:43): Can I say thank you to everybody who has contributed so far. This is one of those issues about which, happily, all of us in this place are very concerned, and all of us are very keen to see this move along as quickly as possible. I would like to thank all the members who have made contributions. I know that this is a matter that does not have any party boundary at all. I noted the stinging critique from the deputy leader on how little this bill is. Quite frankly, this little initiative is going to be very significant for a large number of people, so little in terms of its scope, but significant for a large number of people. I think it is an absolutely important thing that we do now, we do not wait for the balance of other fairly complex things to be dealt with, we get on with it.

Can I reiterate that the actual discussion paper—I am hoping and, in fact, I am reliably informed—is likely to be out there in the public domain with any luck before the end of the month. We are pushing it along, and hopefully that will add to an informed conversation about this. The member for Hammond made a very good point when he said that in all probability we are not facing an epidemic of this behaviour: we are facing a completely different attitude to the reporting and the prosecution of this behaviour. That is not to say it is not a problem.

This is one of the questions in the discussion paper: is what we are seeing now something that was not visible in the way that it is now but was going on the whole time? Is it something that is exploding in an exponential fashion, or is it more likely than not mainly the fact that, not entirely but mainly the fact that, it is now publicly encouraged and accepted for this sort of behaviour to be the subject of a report and that, when it is the subject of a report, people like police officers and others who get those reports act on those reports, note those reports and take the appropriate steps to make sure that something happens. Again, I thank all members for their contributions in relation to this matter and I trust the bill will pass speedily through this place and, hopefully, elsewhere as well.

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 Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (16:47): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (16:47): I move:

That Ms Cook be appointed to the committee in place of Ms Digance.

Motion carried.

Bills

SUMMARY OFFENCES (BIOMETRIC IDENTIFICATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

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

No. 1. Clause 4, page 2, after line 25—After line 25 insert:

(2a) Section 74A—after subsection (2) insert:

(2a) Despite subsection (1), a police officer may only require a person to submit to a biometric identification procedure under subsection (1)(d) if—

(a) the person has refused or failed to comply with a requirement under subsection (1)(c) to state all or any of the person's personal details; or

(b) after requiring the production of evidence by the person under subsection (2), the officer is not reasonably satisfied as to the identity of the person.

(2b) Before a biometric identification procedure is carried out in respect of a person, a police officer must inform the person of the following matters:

(a) that the police officer is exercising a power under this section;

(b) the grounds on which the person is required to submit to the biometric identification procedure;

(c) the manner in which the procedure will be conducted and what directions may be given to the person for the purposes of the procedure;

(d) that any biometric data obtained from the person may only be retained for the purposes of conducting the procedure;

(e) the right of the person under this section to request confirmation from the Commissioner relating to the non-retention of the biometric data under subsection (4c).

No. 2. Clause 4, page 3, after line 10 [clause 4(5)]—After inserted subsection (4a) insert:

(4b) The Commissioner must—

(a) establish guidelines for the conduct of biometric identification procedures under this section including the operation of prescribed devices and the handling of biometric data derived from biometric identification procedures; and

(b) ensure that a prescribed device used for the purposes of a biometric identification procedure under this section is properly maintained and operated

in accordance with the manufacturer's operating instructions and any guidelines issued under paragraph (a).

(4c) The Commissioner must, on application in a manner and form approved by the Commissioner made by a person who submitted to a biometric identification procedure, confirm in writing that the biometric data relating to the person derived from the biometric identification procedure has been deleted within the time required.

(4d) The Commissioner must, as soon as practicable after each 30 June, cause a report to be prepared about the operation of this section in respect of biometric identification procedures during the year ended on that 30 June.

(4e) Without limiting subsection (4d), a report relating to a year must include the following matters occurring under this section in that year:

(a) the number of biometric identification procedures undertaken;

(b) the number of positive identifications made using biometric identification procedures;

(c) the number of false identifications (if any) made using biometric identification procedures;

(d) details of prescribed devices used for the purposes of conducting biometric identification procedures (including operating procedures and the manner in which, and for how long, the devices retain biometric information obtained under this section);

(e) the number of arrests resulting from the identification of a person as a result of a biometric identification procedure;

(f) the number of prosecutions commenced for offences against—

(i) subsection (3)(a) involving a refusal or failure to comply with a requirement to submit to a biometric identification procedure under subsection (1); and

(ii) subsection (4a).

(4f) The Commissioner must submit the report to the Minister who must, as soon as reasonably practicable after receiving the report, cause copies of the report to be laid before each House of the Parliament.

No. 3. Clause 4, page 3, line 16 [clause 4(6), inserted definition of *biometric identification procedure*]—Delete 'by means of photograph or scan' insert 'using a prescribed device'

No. 4. Clause 4, page 3, after line 18—After line 18 insert:

(7) Section 74A(5)—after the definition of *personal details* insert:

prescribed device means a device, or a device of a kind, prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this section.

DOG AND CAT MANAGEMENT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Conference

The Legislative Council requested that a conference be granted to it in respect of a certain amendment to the bill. In the event of a conference being agreed to, the Legislative Council would be represented by five managers.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (16:49): I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council, regarding this highly contentious matter, granting a conference as requested by the council; that the time and place for holding it be the King William Room at 9.30am on Wednesday 6 July 2016; and that Ms Cook, Dr McFetridge, Mr Picton, Mr Whetstone and the Minister for Education and Child Development be the managers on the part of this house.

Motion carried.

MENTAL HEALTH (REVIEW) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

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

No. 1. Clause 21, page 13, lines 2 to 4 [clause 21(5), inserted subsection (7)]—

Delete 'A psychiatrist or authorised medical practitioner who has examined a patient to whom a level 2 inpatient treatment order applies may, once only, extend the order' and substitute:

A level 2 inpatient treatment order may, once only, be extended by a psychiatrist or authorised medical practitioner (other than the psychiatrist or authorised medical practitioner who made the order) who has examined the patient to whom the order applies

No. 2. Clause 25, page 13, after line 34—Insert:

(3) Section 29(3)—after 'to whom a' insert 'level 1,'

No. 3. New Clauses, page 34, after line 34—Insert:

67A—Amendment of section 79—Reviews of treatment orders and other matters

(1) Section 79(1)(a)—delete paragraph (a)

(2) Section 79(1)—after paragraph (c) insert:

(ca) a review of the circumstances involved in the making of an order to extend a level 2 inpatient treatment order (which review must be conducted as soon as practicable after the making of the order to extend a level 2 inpatient treatment order);

67B—Amendment of section 81—Reviews of orders (other than Tribunal orders)

(1) Section 81(1)—after 'review of the order by the Tribunal' insert:

under section 34 of the *South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2013*

(2) Section 81(1a)—delete subsection (1a)

(3) Section 81(2a)—delete 'not be constituted by a medical practitioner sitting alone' and substitute 'be constituted of at least 1 medical practitioner and 1 legal practitioner'

(4) Section 81(4) and (5)—delete subsections (4) and (5)

Consideration in committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Adjournment Debate

MAYO ELECTORATE

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (16:52): I would like to take the opportunity this afternoon to pick up on a couple of subjects. The first one is that clearly at this juncture we do not know who is going to be in federal government in Australia and that it could take days if not weeks to sort out. However, I would like to refer to the electorate of Mayo where Jamie Briggs has been defeated and Rebekha Sharkie has been elected. I congratulate Rebekha Sharkie on her election to the seat of Mayo.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: If I could have the floor, ma'am. I congratulate Rebekha Sharkie on her election to the seat of Mayo and no doubt we will see what unfolds over the next three years or so. It is going to be interesting to see what happens with the Nick Xenophon Team and just how they perform, whether they stick together or implode or whatever may happen.

In relation to Rebekha Sharkie, she has made a number of commitments during the course of the election campaign which I am going to push her on to make sure that she achieves. If Rebekha

Sharkie, as the member for Mayo, is in a position where she can actually do something—and I say 'if'—then she has a lot of pressure on her because the electorate of Mayo has spoken, and the electorate of Mayo may well speak again if things do not come into place.

Let me say that during the election campaign Rebekha Sharkie said that she would match the $500,000 promised by Mr Briggs and the federal Coalition towards the RSL at Victor Harbor. Unless she is on the government benches, she is going to have no hope and she has made that commitment. She had a photo appear in *The Times* of her surrounded by people in Victor Harbor. The headline was basically to the effect that Sharkie commits to the same funding regime as the former member, so she has left herself open there, and if she wants to discuss any of these matters with me, I will be pleased to discuss them.

The second thing she raised, in no particular order, was the issue of the Adelaide to Victor Harbor road, when she pledged to get that upgraded as well. I am delighted about that because I have been pressing for that for the last 10 years. If she would like to discuss that with me, she can and I will be raising it in due course. In three years, if she has not delivered that upgrade to the Adelaide to Victor Harbor road, she will be reminded.

Thirdly, she has committed, quite naively, I believe, to stopping oil and gas exploration in the Great Australian Bight to appease a group of radical lefties on Kangaroo Island—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do such people exist on Kangaroo Island?

Mr PENGILLY: —who seem to think that the world is going to end if they explore for oil and gas in the Great Australian Bight. It is worth putting on the record in this chamber that the government side and the Liberal side of the house both support oil and gas exploration in the Great Australian Bight, no more than the Treasurer. I am making a few other inquiries about that, I might add, as well.

I heard the Mayor of Kangaroo Island on the radio today gesticulating about his inner knowledge of the oil and gas exploration industry. I went on briefly and just reminded the radio station that the mayor would have had about as much knowledge about it as I have and that NOPSEMA are the appropriate authority. We will see whether Ms Sharkie and the Xenophon team can stop oil and gas exploration in the Great Australian Bight. I think not. Interestingly enough, there were people handing out how-to-vote cards for Ms Sharkie on Saturday at the booth I was at who were closely aligned with the Greens and the left side of politics.

I am delighted about this next issue because the new member for Mayo, Rebekha Sharkie, has said that she is going to pick up and sort out the transport link between Kangaroo Island and the mainland across the sea passage. If I have not been pushing for that for 10 years and many years before that, I do not know what I have been doing. I would have to say, and I put on the record, that Mr Briggs and I had quite divergent views on this: he did not want to know about it and I wanted to know all about it; he would not discuss it and I would. Anyway, that is politics and that is history.

However, I am delighted now that the new federal member for Mayo, Ms Sharkie, has said that she is interested in fixing it, so I challenge her to pick up the Watergap Project, to work on the federal aspect of that and do something about the sea journey between Kangaroo Island and the mainland. I will be absolutely delighted if she can actually achieve a fix of that particular issue. She will be a hero not only to me but to people on Kangaroo Island as well. I am going to hold her to it and make sure that she does do it because she said she will.

Changing tack, I would like to raise the issue of the Kangaroo Island airport. I am absolutely horrified and, after nearly two hours of having witnesses at the Public Works Committee—unfortunately, that is not going to get to the parliament this week—I have to raise what occurred last Thursday. Mr Whelan and Mr Hogben from DPTI are now part of a board of control with the CEO of Kangaroo Island Council, Mr Boardman.

Mr Boardman, when questioned at length by me, could not answer what is going to happen when the airport runway is closed for upgrading. He put on the record that the main runway on Kangaroo Island will be closed for up to six to eight weeks to large aircraft and to the Rex service that comes in. There are a few other matters that I can talk about later but, in essence, what is happening is that he had no answers. He could not answer. He had no fallback position. This is a real failing of what has happened with this whole project.

There has been no section 41 committee of the council overseeing it as elected members. It has all been done by the CEO in a secret squirrel move and he has completely forgotten about what is going to happen when Rex cannot land. They will not land on dirt strips. February/March is the period he is talking about, which happens to be almost peak tourist season. February is the KI Cup, when we have 3,000 or 4,000 people at the KI races and Cup Carnival. He said that small aircraft can do it. I am sorry, but they cannot.

On top of that, Regional Express has been treated extremely badly. I put on the record here my absolute disgust with this project's matter-of-fact plan that does not include having the ability for Regional Express to come in during that proposed six to eight-week closure. He said it, not me. This will really impact on residents. It will impact on people who need to go back and forward for health treatments. It will impact on public servants who move back and forward quite regularly. It will impact on me, for sure, but it will impact dramatically on the tourism industry.

There is no point in the Minister for Tourism and the Deputy Premier standing up and puffing and blowing about what they are doing for Kangaroo Island when the main runway is going to be closed for six to eight weeks. It is lunacy. There is only one option for this—that is, seal another runway to ensure that Regional Express continues to operate during the time when the runway is closed. That is the only option. I know it has to be closed, and I have said that in committee. I do not know where the funding can come from.

You can probably kiss goodbye to any more federal funding. The former member for Mayo got $9 million and the state is putting in $9 million. The council has stuffed it up completely. They may well have to find the money to seal the other runway while the main runway is upgraded and lengthened. It is not an option to have it closed. It is an absolute disgrace. The council have failed dismally to oversee this project. They have been howled down, I suspect, by the CEO, who seems to think that he knows everything and that no-one else knows anything. This is an abject failure.

I am delighted that DPTI are now the project managers in control of it with the overall say. It is the only way it could go. It is going to be watched very closely by me. What has to happen, I repeat, is that the other runway has to be sealed to accommodate Regional Express during the time that the main runway is being lengthened and upgraded. It is pure, simple common sense.

STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (17:02): I would like to take a moment to speak to this adjournment debate and take the opportunity to acknowledge and thank the work done by a group of volunteers, particularly over the last few days, but also over a longer time. I would like to thank SES volunteers and staff for their work over the last few days since we have had quite severe weather.

Having said that, I am really pleased that we had the rain. It is certainly helping people in my electorate and also in the agricultural areas, but some of the rain has actually caused some difficulties in the urban and other built-up areas. Up to 2pm today, SES volunteers have responded to 280 requests for assistance from the South Australian public since 5pm yesterday, and those requests for assistance continued to come in this afternoon. SES management expects that the tempo of operations will slow down later this afternoon and early evening as conditions improve.

I am advised that most of the requests have come from Adelaide's southern suburbs, particularly along the coast. In addition, there have been a number of callouts in the Mount Lofty Ranges and the Fleurieu Peninsula, as well as in the Port Adelaide area. A lot of the difficulties that have been experienced have been as a result of a number of fallen trees, storm damage and minor flood damage. There have also been a number of incidents when trees have brought down powerlines.

To date, over 150 SES volunteers have been involved in the response to this weather event. Many of these have worked overnight, with replacement crews taking over this morning. While many of us were last night tucked up in bed, many of our volunteers were out there keeping the community safe. The cold front brought considerable rain to the Adelaide metropolitan area yesterday evening. To date, rainfall was 37.6 millimetres in Adelaide, with much higher totals at a number of locations in the Mount Lofty Ranges.

SES volunteers have received considerable support from their sister agencies; that is, the volunteers at the CFS and also support from the Metropolitan Fire Service. I would just like to put on record the wonderful job that these SES volunteers do, and also put on record how I disagree quite strongly with the unfair criticism they received recently about the work they perform, particularly the criticism they received from the opposition which was very unhelpful and also lacked an appreciation of the wonderful job this group of SES volunteers does.

One thing of concern to the SES is that there are still people refusing to heed the safety message about not driving through floodwater. There have been a number of incidents over the last few days where people have tried to drive through floodwaters and got themselves into all sorts of strife, which means that they not only put their own life at risk but, more importantly, they also put at risk the lives of volunteers and divert important resources from the clean-up effort to helping people get out of the creeks, etc.

I would again like to acknowledge the contribution made by this group of volunteers and also, as I said, the CFS volunteers with the support of the MFS personnel. It is during these times when things go wrong when we perhaps appreciate the most the work the volunteers do in our community. I am also looking forward to the arrival of the day when the SES are able to establish a unit in Gawler. The closest SES units include one at Edinburgh, which is now moving adjacent to the new CFS command centre, joining with the Metropolitan Fire Service on Main North Road. The other SES unit is at Kapunda, which also has other capabilities for country areas.

I am looking forward to the SES having the ability and the capacity to set up a unit close to my town of Gawler. Their presence in Gawler would also help with recruiting volunteers because a physical presence makes the service seem much more visible and also important. With those few comments, I support the volunteers.

EYRE PENINSULA

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (17:07): I rise today to talk about a good news story which was highlighted in today's *Advertiser*. It was an article on page 4 that caught my eye initially, talking about the baby boom that is about to occur in the Eyre Peninsula town of Cleve. Cleve has a population of about 800 residents, with about 1,800 people in the district council area, and they are expecting a boom in births. In fact, the District Council of Cleve area looks like having the second highest birth rate in the nation of 4.8 per cent behind only Corrigin at 4.9 per cent. Corrigin, interestingly enough, is also in the wheat belt, in that case in Western Australia. It is a great story for a town in my electorate. It certainly secures the future of the local area school, and it certainly secures the future of the town for years to come.

One of the other things that Cleve is famous for is that it hosts the biennial Eyre Peninsula Field Days. In fact, the editorial from today's *Advertiser*, on the back of a number of articles in the business section of today's paper, not only talks about the field days but also describes Eyre Peninsula as 'an economic powerhouse'. I will quote very quickly a few of the words that were used in today's *Advertiser*:

> The approaching Eyre Peninsula Field Days remind us once again of the importance of our country regions.
>
> The Eyre Peninsula is a jewel in South Australia's economic armoury, holding substantial potential in the years ahead. The vast area is about the same size as Tasmania, but with fewer than 60,000 people, it is a place that few interstate Australians even know. Yet it is an economic powerhouse.

The Business Journal section highlighted the success stories of Eyre Peninsula Field Days, and the editorial goes on to say:

> As our Eyre Peninsula farmers have consistently shown, they have to be as good as any in the world to survive. They have been exposed to global economic forces for more than 50 years through Australia's policy of no agricultural subsidies.
>
> It is a brave approach that made the farming sector a model industry and placed it well in advance of many subsidised enterprises that have lost their way. There is no incentive as strong as the economic imperative for survival. It is a priority that is becoming foreign to an increasing number of Australians as we become hostage to a mendicant mentality, relying on government largesse to survive.
>
> The agricultural sector is an exceptional sunrise industry. As it continues to display its innovative and competitive approach to feeding the world, it is poised for further rapid advances and growth.

What a wonderful editorial. What a wonderful summary of the agricultural sector in this state. Of course, so much more goes on show at the Eyre Peninsula Field Days because Eyre Peninsula is so much more than just our farming regions. There is also a significant seafood sector made up of wildcatch fishing and aquaculture, and that will be on show at the Eyre Peninsula Field Days. Mining and tourism are not insignificant.

The field days will be held on 9, 10, and 11 August this year. The first Eyre Peninsula Field Day was held way back in 1973, at Cleve. It was initially established as a two-day field day, but nowadays it occurs biennially (every second year), alternating with Paskerville on Yorke Peninsula, where the biggest and best of the latest machinery, equipment and technology are on display. There is something for everyone. There is also significant art and craft and livestock section. The local schools are involved, and many of the local sporting organisations and community organisations also use it as a major fundraiser for them each year.

As I said, the first field day was held way back in 1973, when I was just a boy. Those must have been interesting times. It was on the back of a couple of years of wheat quotas, when the world was oversupplied with wheat and Australian farmers delivered wheat under a quota system. Also, I think that 1973 and 1974 were significant years for rust. Eyre Peninsula has gone on to bigger and better things. We now grow 40 per cent of the state's wheat, about 30 per cent of the state's barley and a significant portion of our grain legume crop. Livestock is also a significant component. So, well done to the Eyre Peninsula farmers, and we look like having—touch wood—another good year again.

Time expired.

At 17:12 the house adjourned until Wednesday 6 July 2016 at 11:00.

Answers to Questions

SHEEP INDUSTRY FUND

In reply to **Mr PEDERICK (Hammond)** (25 May 2015).

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing):

The Sheep Industry Fund is administered by the South Australian Sheep Advisory Group (SASAG), which met on 25 May 2016 to discuss its funded projects for 2016-17. Once the fund's 2016-17 budget is formally endorsed by the Sheep Advisory Group it is sent to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries for approval.

Given the Sheep Advisory Committee has only recently adopted its budget, and pending the Minister's approval of the SASAG proposed budget, the increase in the contribution rate, if supported, is likely to be in place within several months.

This time frame has been incorporated into the fund's budget and will enable all of the advisory group's current programs and future projects to assist and promote the South Australian sheep industry.