

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 14 November 2018

The **SPEAKER (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)** took the chair at 10:30 and read prayers.

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

Matter of Privilege

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER (10:31): Before I call Mr Clerk, I wish to speak on the matter of privilege regarding the Attorney-General on the Sentencing Act. I make the following statement with regard to the matter of privilege raised by the member for Enfield in this house yesterday. However, before addressing that matter, I wish to outline the significance of privilege as it relates to the house and its members. As I have said before, privilege is not a device by which members or any other person can seek to pursue matters that can be addressed by debate or settled by the vote of the house on a substantive motion.

As we have seen, the test in McGee in *Parliamentary Practice in New Zealand*, in my view makes the test for whether or not a matter is a matter of privilege by defining it as a matter that can 'genuinely be regarded as tending to impede or obstruct the house in the discharge of its duties'.

Generally speaking, any act or omission which obstructs or impedes the house in the performance of its functions, or which obstructs or impedes any member or officer of such house in the discharge of his duty, or which has a tendency, directly or indirectly, to produce such a result, may be treated as a contempt and therefore be considered a matter of privilege, even though there is no precedent of the offence.

I refer to the matter raised by the member for Enfield in relation to an answer given by the Attorney-General to a question in the house yesterday. More specifically, in response to the question asked by the member for Croydon concerning the Sentencing Act, the Attorney answered by saying:

—we argued, from the opposition position at the time, the importance of ensuring that home detention should not be available to murderers, terrorists and people who commit serious sexual offences. For two years, the then government made it very clear that they would not agree to that.

The member for Enfield alleges that the Attorney-General's answer has misled the house. The member for Enfield stated:

The member has actually been misrepresenting, making a false statement to the house about the law.

I have had the opportunity to read the whole answer provided by the Attorney-General to the question asked by the member for Croydon. In the context of the entire answer provided by the Attorney-General, it is clear to me that the Attorney-General in her answer was referring to the opposition's position at the time and not making a statement on the current state of the law.

Therefore, in the Chair's opinion, this is not a matter of privilege for the reason I stated above. In the Chair's view, to apply the test, the matter could not 'genuinely be regarded as tending to impede or obstruct the house in the discharge of its duties'.

Therefore, I also decline to give the matter the precedence that would allow the member for Enfield to immediately pursue the matter. However, my opinion does not prevent any member from pursuing the matter by way of substantive motion.

*Bills***SENTENCING (HOME DETENTION) AMENDMENT BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:33): On behalf of Mr Malinauskas, obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Sentencing Act 2017. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:34): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: Where is your leader?

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier knows that it is not in order to reflect on members who may or may not be in the chamber, and I call her to order.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: Sorry.

Mr ODENWALDER: Kick her out. Ask her to leave, sir. It is the most important job of government to keep its community safe. Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition attempted to suspend standing orders in order to introduce this bill. It was stymied by the government then, and I take great pleasure in introducing it now. I hope that it has a speedy passage through this house, not only for the residents of Pasadena but for the residents of South Australia generally.

All of us who care about law and order in this state, all of us who care about community safety, will be aware of Mr Vivian Deboo and his threat to the people of Pasadena, and indeed to the children of Pasadena. We need to take urgent action now. We need to take action in this place. I read yesterday that the Attorney was taking some action of her own. I look forward to seeing that, but we could solve this problem here and now.

We could pass this bill, which builds on the foundation of the last few years of parliament in reforming the Sentencing Act and in making sure that the people who should be on home detention are on home detention and that the people who should be in prison are in prison. We are tidying up that act again. We are doing a bit of extra work. It is a very simple change.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right, please!

Mr ODENWALDER: It is as simple as the drug offences bills that I bring to this place, which could overnight change police powers in order to investigate serious drug offences. It is as simple as the bill that would dramatically increase the penalties for people who deliberately threaten life by dropping rocks off bridges. It is as simple as that, but it is much more important than any of those bills. This is about—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: Perhaps you should have been a minister in the last government.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would like to hear the member for Elizabeth, please.

Mr ODENWALDER: I will not comment on that. I hope to hear other members speak on the bill and support it. I know that members of the government will support it. What it does is simply change the Sentencing Act so that people who have committed a certain class of offences, i.e. serious child sex offences, do not go free into the community, do not get home detention and are not, in fact, at risk of dropping off the radar for 30 hours, as we saw several weeks ago regarding people on home detention on parole. We do not want a situation where people like Mr Deboo drop off the radar for 30 hours. I commend the bill to the house and urge the opposition to rethink its position, to support it today and to pass it quickly through this house.

Mr Murray interjecting:

Mr ODENWALDER: Sorry, I am getting ahead of myself.

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

Mr ODENWALDER: This bill deserves speedy passage through this house. I hope that it gets speedy passage through this house and I hope that the government sees sense and supports it.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

MOTOR VEHICLES (OFFENSIVE ADVERTISING) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (10:38): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act 1959. Read a first time.

Mr Pederick: They won't second it. We will second it for the process.

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Hammond, be quiet.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: We were saving the bill.

The SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, please.

Second Reading

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (10:39): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise today to introduce the Motor Vehicles (Offensive Advertising) Amendment Bill 2018 and to wholeheartedly commend the bill to the house. It is absolutely incumbent on each of us in this house as community leaders to speak up, to act and to do everything within our power, within our sphere of influence, to ensure that our South Australian community is free of violence, of sexism, of racism and of paedophilia. As community leaders, each of us has a deep and abiding responsibility to act against material that absolutely does not accord with community standards and that offends so many South Australians.

Many of us on both sides of this chamber have spoken over many years about our collective responsibility to rid our community of that which incites violence against women and of language which demeans and discriminates against women and against people of diverse cultural groups. Just last week, when we debated the bill about domestic violence in this place, I pleasingly heard many speeches about the need to call out and stamp out derogatory comments about women. I was heartened to hear of members' resolve in this regard, to hear of their understanding of the connection between language and violence and to hear of their genuine passion to do what they could to make a difference.

We have an opportunity before us today to do just that, to make a difference, to take a meaningful step forward as a parliament to rid ourselves of messages in our community that are so deeply offensive—slogans that are not funny, slogans that are not smart, slogans that go way, way beyond what is acceptable. In fact, to many, they are slogans that are deeply distressing and engender fear.

The slogans on the Wicked Campers' vans promote and traverse violence against women, sexism, racism and paedophilia, and they are utterly, utterly unacceptable. I am determined to do whatever I can to ensure this offensive material does not appear on our roads, or in our caravan parks or camping grounds. Violence, sexism, racism and paedophilia must always be fought against. I am not alone in having this determination and a deep passion about this. Campaigning against these slogans began when an 11-year-old girl, offended by a Wicked Campers' slogan that referred to girls as 'sluts', initiated a petition that attracted 126,000 signatures.

Many have persistently called out their slogans since that time—slogans that include, but sadly are not limited to, 'Drink till she's pretty!', 'A wife; an attachment you screw on the bed to get the housework done,' 'I can already imagine the gaffer tape on your mouth,' 'I've often wanted to drown my troubles but I can't get my wife to go swimming,' '70% of priests who've tried Camels prefer young boys,' and, 'Save a whale, harpoon a Jap'. These slogans and their accompanying imagery go way beyond what is acceptable; they are just plain offensive by anyone's standards. Their horrendous content must be driven off our roads.

Wicked Campers are a national company that provide rental vans targeted at backpackers and tourists. They are well known for their highly visible van paintings that are accompanied by these deliberately offensive slogans. Their slogans are causing immense offence and hurt across our community and indeed in neighbouring jurisdictions.

The support for such a change is widespread. At Plan International's International Day of the Girl breakfast in Adelaide just a few weeks ago, Melinda Tankard Reist, well-known founder of the organisation Collective Shout and writer and advocate for girls and women, raised this issue and encouraged our parliament to take action, as did event sponsor KPMG via partner Tim Sandow in his closing comments.

Just a few days ago, Cairns locals also joined the chorus of people calling out for the banning of these vans, when vans registered in South Australia were seen in their area—South Australian vans which include the slogans, 'Are you still a virgin if you take it up the—?' and, 'If you want to toughen up, grow a vagina, those things can really take a pounding.' Outrage about the company's slogans rightly continues to grow, as it has over many years. Many report that it is particularly difficult when you have a child in the car who proudly reads everything they can see and who reads out one of these offensive slogans. How do you explain something so awful and offensive to a young child? We should not have to, and by supporting this bill we can ensure that we do not have to and that no child nor parent has to make sense of what is senseless and degrading.

The bill makes amendments to the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 to expand the powers of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to take action against a registered vehicle owner when notified by the Advertising Standards Bureau that a complaint has been upheld in relation to the vehicle having offensive slogans and/or images advertised on it.

In the past four years, most complaints to the Advertising Standards Bureau for offensive advertising on vehicles have been against Wicked Campers, which have around 900 registered vehicles Australia-wide. During 2016, the Advertising Standards Bureau received 11 separate complaints, all upheld, regarding offensive vehicle advertising against this business. Of 13 complaints against them in 2015, three were withdrawn and 10 upheld, and, of 22 in 2014, three were withdrawn and 19 upheld.

The Queensland government introduced a bill into its parliament in November 2016 following complaints from members of the public about vehicles that displayed sexist, discriminatory or otherwise offensive advertising in breach of an advertising standards code. The bill passed the Queensland parliament on 14 February 2017. The Queensland Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports has urged state and territory transport ministers to adopt legislation corresponding to the Queensland bill, which provides for an enforcement mechanism for the chief executive of the Department of Transport and Main Roads, the equivalent of South Australia's registrar, to address vehicles displaying offensive material.

The Queensland bill provides for the cancellation of a vehicle's registration if it displays advertising material found to breach the code, prevents the refund in part or whole of the registration fee paid, prevents the transfer of a vehicle's registration where cancelled, prevents renewal of registration unless the offending advertisement is removed and purports to prevent judicial review of the decision to cancel a vehicle's registration. Our bill is based on this Queensland legislation.

The Tasmanian and ACT governments have now enacted legislation. Some local councils in New South Wales have taken action, with the Blue Mountains City Council telling Wicked Campers they were not allowed to enter two popular council-owned caravan parks at Blackheath and Katoomba. Staff were given the power to eject vehicles they deemed to have misogynistic, racial and degrading slogans and imagery. Byron Shire Council banned the vehicles in 2016.

By providing an enforcement mechanism against this activity through amendments to the Motor Vehicles Act 1959, we can discourage the display of offensive advertising material on business vehicles. This bill gives power to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to cancel registration or refuse to register or re-register vehicles that have had complaints made against them that have been upheld by the Advertising Standards Bureau.

The bill is of course not about family cars or a sticker on a sedan or ute. It is about commercial vehicles that have had complaints against their slogans and imagery upheld. The bill means that our

registrar will now have the power to do something about them. It means that we, as a state, send a message to Wicked Campers that they and their reprehensible messages are absolutely not welcome here.

It is imperative that all states legislate so that the loophole for Wicked Campers to simply register in other states is closed. It is nonsense to say that we need to discuss a national approach. The national approach is every state doing their bit to close down avenues for these utterly offensive vehicles to be registered anywhere. If we are actually serious about treating women, and indeed everyone, with respect and about creating a community free of violence and racism, we need to act immediately to get these vans off our roads. South Australian girls and women deserve better, as does our community at large.

In closing, I heartily thank Melinda Tankard Reist and all at Collective Shout for their leadership on this issue, for their relentless calling out of that which demeans and objectifies women and for their support. I also thank the legions of Australians who are signing petitions and standing up against this utterly offensive material, and I thank parliamentary counsel for their assistance in the drafting of this bill.

I commend the bill to the house and urge those opposite to stand with me and all of us on this side of the house in ridding our roads of these horrendous slogans to ensure that we live up to those values that we so often espouse in here about doing what we can to respect women and all people by speaking up and out and acting against language that encourages violence and objectifies women.

The bill, if those opposite do support the eradication of violence against women, sexism, racism and paedophilia, must be supported. It is a clear action we can take together as a parliament to make our community a better, safer and more respectful one.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

Motions

INTERNATIONAL DAY FOR THE ELIMINATION OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:55): By leave, on behalf of the member for Reynell I move:

That this house—

- (a) notes that Sunday 25 November marks the International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women;
- (b) notes the unacceptable, shocking and persistent prevalence of violence against women across the globe; and
- (c) resolves to do all that it can to address gender inequality, to empower women and girls and to prevent violence against women.

I am happy to move this on behalf of the member for Reynell. I look forward to her contribution and thank her for bringing this important motion to the house. I am proud to have been part of a government which, over the last 16 years, has done so much in the area of domestic violence. I know the current government is doing all it can to continue that work, and I do not for a minute want to denigrate that.

It goes without saying that domestic violence and family violence are completely reprehensible. It has taken some time—over the last 10, 20 or 30 years—for our major services to really recognise the prevalence of domestic violence and to stop it from being a hidden problem, a problem, as the name suggests, that is domestic rather than a problem of society and a problem of primarily men's violence against women.

It has also taken some time for the police to come on board. Their attitude towards victims of domestic violence and complaints of domestic violence has certainly changed since I was a member of the police force. As I understand it, the police now take claims of domestic violence extremely seriously. They are investigated to the nth degree, and police do all they can not only to

look after victims but also to prosecute offenders. There was some recent legislation, which I am probably not allowed to refer to—

Members interjecting:

Mr ODENWALDER: Excellent; it is all good stuff. In recent weeks, we have seen some enhancements of some of this stuff but, primarily in terms of policing at least, the extension of the intervention orders regime into the policing role and into the realm of interim intervention orders has made a dramatic difference.

I also think things like video evidence will make a dramatic difference to the way perpetrators are dealt with. It is very important that we have this video evidence and it is very important that police, in the face of victims who, for whatever legitimate reason, shy away from going through with a prosecution, can continue that work. They can continue to have evidence, which means that they or the DPP can bring a prosecution without the direct assistance of the victim.

That is important, of course, because (a) the perpetrator needs to be punished and (b) we need adequate records for the purposes of the new Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme. I congratulate the government on bringing that forward, and I congratulate the member for Elder on her work, as well as the Attorney. It is something that our government was talking about, that the previous premier spoke about. I spoke about it to the previous premier several times, and towards the end I think both parties had a bipartisan position on it and I am very proud and happy to see the Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme up and running.

I look forward to seeing how it works, and I look forward to seeing how it works in conjunction with MAPS—another excellent police initiative during the period of the last government—in terms of bringing together services primarily for victims but also with the greater goal of punishing perpetrators and, hopefully, over time lessening the prevalence of domestic violence.

I want to congratulate the government without reserve on their recent bill that focuses on domestic violence. It has some excellent measures, most of which were canvassed in the past parliament but are seeing fruition now. As I said the other day, I think the strangulation element of that bill is an important addition. It is one that I certainly had not considered seriously in the last parliament, but I think it is a very important addition.

I wish the government well in the future. I hope that we can come to bipartisan positions generally on combating domestic violence. I think we all recognise the importance of not only looking after the victims of course but, as I said, properly punishing the perpetrators and properly recording the activities of the perpetrators for the purposes of the Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme and protecting future potential victims. I commend the motion to the house.

Mrs POWER (Elder) (11:00): Violence against women and girls is one of the most widespread, persistent and devastating human rights violations in our world today, including Australia. Whilst Australia may be known as the great or lucky country, it is not immune from it. Violence against women and girls manifests itself in physical, sexual and psychological forms such as intimate partner violence, sexual violence and harassment, human trafficking, female genital mutilation, and child marriage. According to Our Watch, on average one woman a week is murdered by her current or former partner, one in three Australian women has experienced physical violence since the age of 15, one in five Australian women has experienced sexual violence, and one in six Australian women has experienced physical or sexual violence by a current or former partner.

From 25 November through to 10 December, which is Human Rights Day, the UN has marked a 16-day campaign to galvanise action to end violence against women and girls around the world. The 16 days of activism provide a focal point for work relating to gender-based violence, which we know is most often experienced by women and girls and most often perpetrated by men who are family members or intimate partners of their victims.

This is so important. Violence and abuse thrives only in silence and so we must all continue to shine a light on this issue, ensuring it remains front and centre. For us as a government, this issue is indeed front and centre. We are absolutely committed to achieving tangible and significant outcomes that work to prevent violence against women and girls and domestic and family violence.

Sometimes I think it is really difficult for anyone to actually grasp the scope of how immense this issue is in our society. To have had seven women recently murdered in an eight-day period in October is horrific. I think terrorism or intimate violence, as domestic violence is sometimes described, is indeed a more accurate and confronting label for this confronting issue. It is also particularly frightening when we consider the frequent under-reporting that exists, not simply because that means we do not have an accurate picture of the level and breadth of violence against women and girls but because it means there are women out there who constantly live in fear of being abused in their own homes, whether that is physically, verbally or emotionally.

Of course, violence does not only occur in homes; it also happens in public places, educational institutions, organisations and workplaces. That is why we must put in place a range of interventions, from educating the public to intervening early in violent situations when there are warning signs through to providing crisis response for those who are currently experiencing violence.

It is my absolute pleasure to share with you what we are doing as a government to address the issue of domestic, family and sexual violence. We took a range of commitments to the March 2018 state election that related specifically to domestic and family violence and we are delivering on all of them. Commitments we have delivered on include a funded peak body for domestic violence services.

The South Australian Coalition of Women's Domestic Violence Services is currently an unfunded peak body for South Australian domestic violence services, but as a peak body they will now receive funding of \$624,000 over four years. This will enable the South Australian Coalition of Women's Domestic Violence Services to coordinate its activities across South Australia, provide advice to government, support its members through sharing information and experience, and work with the community to prevent violence against women and girls.

We have also established a 24-hour crisis hotline. Currently, the South Australian Domestic Violence Crisis Line operates during business hours only. This line has been in operation for almost 30 years and I find it unbelievable that the line has not been funded to operate 24/7 before now. We know that domestic violence does not only occur during business hours, so the new Liberal government has provided \$1.6 million over four years to Women's Safety Services to enable the crisis hotline to expand its services from business hours to operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

This initiative will help hundreds more women living in a violent or abusive relationship to access immediate and specialist support from experts trained in the field. We are expecting it to be operational by the end of November this year. The Marshall Liberal government has also recently announced funding of \$150,000 for a personal protection app which we are delivering in consultation with the women's safety sector.

We have allocated \$4 million for 40 new beds in crisis accommodation, \$5 million for no-interest loans for women's shelters, and we are also looking at data collection and communication methods to ensure that information is more accessible to front-line workers. We have also made a commitment to hold a domestic violence round table, which we wanted to do within the first 30 days of forming government, and we certainly did. Because that first round table was such a success, we have gone out to the regions and continue to hold regional round tables so that we can work with those specific communities to address their needs.

We are also working, led by the Attorney-General, on our other commitments including targeted rehabilitation for perpetrators, reviewing police guidelines, improving disclosure and keeping victims informed. Work is progressing well, but these are complex issues and it is important that we get it right. One of two other key initiatives that we are delivering on is our Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme, which commenced in October as a 12-month trial. SAPOL has the lead role in this work in partnership with women's specialist domestic violence services. Already there have been multiple applications under this scheme. I hope we have many more and that the scheme works as it is intended, reducing the risk of violence against women in this state.

Our other key commitment is in the area of legislative reform, which we debated in this house last week, and it is well underway. These reforms further strengthen domestic and family violence laws and are important in sending a clear message to the community that we do not tolerate such

violence against women and girls. In addition, a new framework for the prevention of domestic, family and sexual violence is currently being developed. The framework includes our election commitments as well as a host of other actions. The framework will be action focused and reflect the diverse needs of different population groups. It is expected to be finalised before the end of 2018, so not too long to go.

There is indeed an unprecedented community momentum behind the call for Australia to be a place free from domestic, family and sexual violence. We now have the opportunity to build on the work that has been done and the work that is currently underway. Clearly, no one government or group can address this problem alone, but by working together as a community united in our common cause for genuine change, I believe we can create a state where women feel safe in their homes and on the streets and where children can grow and develop in safe, secure environments.

Together we can continue to challenge the ideas and behaviours that allow domestic and family violence to occur and together we can create the cultural change in our state that is needed to end violence against women and girls. Together we can make our homes and our streets the safe places they should be. Freedom from violence is everyone's right and everyone's responsibility, so I commend the motion to the house.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (11:09): I rise in support of this motion and commend the member for Reynell for introducing it. On 25 November, the International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women also marks the start of the 16 Days of Activism Against Gender-Based Violence campaign. This global movement was originally started by activists at the Women's Global Leadership Institute in 1991 and is now coordinated by the Centre for Women's Global Leadership. The campaign is designed to unite organisations and communities across the world to increase awareness of and advocate and share knowledge on this important issue. The colour orange, which is the theme colour for this campaign, represents a brighter future for all women and girls, free from violence.

In my electorate of Mount Gambier, there will be a different event for each day of that time frame, whether it is a community breakfast or networking or morning tea events. One of the main principles of this campaign is recognising that everyone in society has a role to play in ending violence against women and girls. Domestic violence not only has a devastating impact upon victims and families but has a tremendous impact on entire communities. I would like to take this opportunity to talk about the positive work that is going on in this space in my electorate of Mount Gambier and in the surrounding Limestone Coast region. Before I do that, I have to begin by talking about a tragedy.

In 2007, South Australia was shocked by the senseless murder of Glenys Heyward, a Mount Gambier mother who was murdered by her former partner after enduring years of abuse at his hands. The repercussions of that crime highlighted the isolation that women living in regional areas face when dealing with family violence and highlighted the gaps in the state system. Statistics show that women in regional areas are more likely to experience domestic and family violence and that they face different pressures to those living in metropolitan areas. Their isolation makes them less likely to seek intervention and help.

As an aside, it was brought home to me that, particularly for women who are on farms where there are licensed or sometimes unlicensed firearms, the presence of firearms increases the risk, as well as the isolation, of those suffering from domestic violence in remote and regional settings. I think this is a very important point to make, along with the lack of services. Again, their isolation makes them less likely to seek intervention and help.

The year before Glenys's death, Susie Smith began working with the Limestone Coast Domestic Violence Service. If you are fighting for something, Susie is someone you want in your corner. She is a passionate advocate for proactive change. In her words, we need to be loud and proud on this issue, not silent. Every month, the Limestone Coast Family Violence Action Group meets. Around the table with Susie are Sonya Meziniec from the Victim Support Service (she has just been re-elected as a councillor in Mount Gambier—congratulations, Sonya); Jane Smith, a victim liaison officer from SAPOL; Brooke Wilson from ac.care; Craig Wood from Centacare; and Nik Tilley from the Limestone Coast Domestic Violence Service.

The group raises awareness of and provides education about the harms of family violence and also works together to facilitate the prevention of family violence by discussing individual cases and how each organisation is assisting. This collaboration, and information sharing between local services, is critical. The group's work feeds through to the Limestone Coast Violence Against Women Collaboration, which is a strategic group of key operational staff who meet a few times a year to discuss initiatives, monitor service gaps in the region and identify where funding can be best allocated. Susie said that, in the 12 years since the tragic Glenys Heyward case, she has seen sweeping changes in the way domestic violence is tackled and addressed in South Australia. She said, 'We can now have faith in the system.'

When a woman approaches the Limestone Coast DV Service in a crisis situation, her case manager can put her in touch with a range of support systems and networks designed to help her, not only in the short term but, crucially, also in the long term. In short, there are frameworks to support her, including the Family Safety Framework, an integrated service response to high-risk cases of domestic violence that was introduced statewide in 2013.

In 2015, the domestic violence serial offender database was introduced so government and non-government agencies can share information about serial offenders. The database and the framework were the outcome of coronial inquests into murders in this state. Now the opportunities for safer and more sustainable outcomes are greater for those dealing with family violence. Susie is very pleased that the Marshall Liberal government is consulting and working with groups in the sector to direct funding to where it is needed most.

Susie and I believe that this government understands implicitly that the issue of domestic violence in the Limestone Coast has to be tackled differently than in Adelaide or, in fact, other regional areas, such as Coober Pedy. I join Susie in commending the Minister for Human Services, the Hon. Michelle Lensink, and Assistant Minister for Domestic and Family Violence Prevention, Carolyn Power, for listening to regional spokespeople in the DV roundtable series conducted in the South-East not that long ago.

I congratulate the Marshall Liberal government on its significant funding investment to tackle this issue, including expanding the Women's Safety Services SA crisis hotline and the development of a personal protection app. Last week, I spoke in support of the Statutes Amendment (Domestic Violence) Bill, which amends legislation to support victims, broaden definitions and expand police and court powers.

In the memorial garden at the back of the Limestone Coast Domestic Violence Service office is a bench with a plaque with Glenys' name on it, and Susie says that as the service does its day-to-day business Glenys is always in their minds. The women she is able to help escape the cycle of family violence bring her back into the office every day, just as much as the women who, unfortunately, have slipped through the cracks.

Everyone in society has a role to play in the elimination of violence against women, but it is people like Susie Smith who can inform and guide the state government on how to best tackle domestic violence, both now and into the future. I encourage all people in the community to participate in the 16-day campaign.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (11:17): I thank the member for Reynell for her motion on what is a serious blight on society and one that significantly impacts my portfolio as Minister for Child Protection. On 25 November 1960, three sisters—Patria, Minerva and Maria-Teresa Mirabal—of the Dominican Republic were murdered. The sisters were engaged in political activism and opposed the regime of the then president. On the day that they were killed, they were travelling in a vehicle to see two of their husbands, who were incarcerated. The vehicle was stopped by henchmen, linked to the president, who strangled and clubbed the sisters to death before driving their vehicle off the road in order to make their murders appear an accident.

As a tribute and honour to the Mirabal sisters, in December 1999 the United Nations General Assembly designated 25 November as International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women. Violence against women is despicable, indefensible and repugnant. Sadly, it is a truth to which society often turns a blind eye. It does not discriminate based on age, race or culture. Violence

against women occurs against the poorest and richest, the famous, the unemployed, the professionals. The statistics are shocking.

In Australia, violence against women is recognised as being widespread, with enormous individual, community and social costs. On average, one woman a week is murdered by her current or former partner, 37 per cent of women have experienced physical abuse since the age of 15, while close to one in five has experienced sexual violence. One in six Australian women has experienced physical or sexual violence by a current or former partner.

Emotional abuse cannot be underestimated. One in four Australian women has experienced emotional abuse by a current or former partner. Women are more than twice as likely as men to have experienced fear or anxiety due to violence and are four times more likely to be hospitalised following violence. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women report experiencing violence at three times the rate of non-Indigenous women and are 32 times more likely to be hospitalised due to family violence.

The impact of violence against women ripples wider than the immediate victim. Even if the violence is not seen or heard, the stress of the violence can lead to problems with children's emotions, behaviour, brain development and learning. Violence can result in an unpredictable home life for children, causing anxiety, developmental and behavioural difficulties and increased aggression. Children can carry guilt, stress and worry for people they love being hurt or upset. Parents who are stressed and worried have less energy for warm, loving relationships with children. Children suffer and can experience mistrust, shame, anger, low self-esteem, self-blame and fear, and physical symptoms of stress, including stomach-aches, sleeping problems and toileting issues, such as bedwetting.

Children grow up believing that the violence they are witnessing is a normal part of family life. They consider force and violence as mechanisms to achieve a desired outcome. They miss school to care for the person experiencing violence or do not perform well when in attendance. Both impact their educational development. They run away, turn to drugs and alcohol, become aggressive or themselves become a bully.

Frequently, where there is violence in the home, children are also abused and neglected. This can be due to a number of reasons, including women choosing to remain with violent partners, as they consider it too dangerous to leave. The effects of violence on the parenting capacity of their caregiver, as a result of mental or physical injury or substance misuse problems, emerge as a consequence. Domestic violence can result in mothers being emotionally distant, unavailable or unable to meet their children's needs, prioritising their partner's needs over the children in an attempt to minimise or prevent a violent outburst.

In August this year, I visited the Multi-Agency Protection Service (MAPS). There, I was shown examples of the work done by the participating agencies, including the Department for Child Protection, which reviews approximately 2,000 high-risk domestic violence reports in this state per year. It was alarming to learn that approximately 70 per cent of their case load had the Department for Child Protection involved. The very important work being undertaken by MAPS can be used by the Department for Child Protection to make applications in the Adelaide Youth Court for removal of a child where the environment presents a risk of harm.

The impact of violence on an unborn child also cannot be underestimated. The benefits of intervening early in vulnerable families identified in pregnancy are considerable. By extrapolating the sample data results across the entire cohort of children subject to an unborn child concern in 2014, it was determined that intervening before or during pregnancy had the potential to prevent 2,220 reports to child protection and 180 children entering out-of-home care before the age of two.

I am proud to be a member of a Liberal government that has a strong plan to address violence against women. Election commitments will be met through an \$11.9 million injection over four years, delivered through the 2018-19 state budget to address family and domestic violence in South Australia. Initiatives, such as funding the Coalition of Women's Domestic Violence Services so it can be established as a peak body, access by NGOs to no-interest loans to fund capital projects to provide facilities for women escaping domestic violence and improving the personal protection app, are all underway.

The Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme, launched last month, allows a person at risk to seek information about a current or former partner's violent offending history and provides support to plan for their safety. As recently as last fortnight, the Ask for Angela program, working to combat violence and antisocial behaviour at venues across the state, was being rolled out. Statewide round tables with domestic violence providers have been held, resulting in real action, including funding for the Women's Safety Services crisis hotline to operate 24 hours a day, increasing the availability and quality of crisis accommodation and co-locating services in safety hubs across the state.

The Statutes Amendment (Domestic Violence) Bill 2018 creates an additional offence for strangulation, a presumption against bail in certain circumstances and expands the definition of abuse under the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act. I am proud to be part of a government that will work collaboratively and cooperatively to ensure that there is a community conversation in relation to violence against women, that there is no stigma attached, that women feel empowered to reach out and that the message is clear that violence against women is not acceptable and will not be tolerated. As former United Nations secretary Ban Ki-moon said:

...there is one universal truth, applicable to all countries, cultures and communities: violence against women is never acceptable, never excusable, never tolerable.

I thank the member and commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (11:25): I rise to speak in support of this motion, and I thank the member for Reynell for bringing it to parliament. This motion notes that Sunday 25 November marks the International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women and that we resolve to do what we can to address gender inequality, to empower women and girls and prevent violence against women.

Today, I would like to touch on the significant changes within South Australia over a period of time, looking at state government initiatives for violence against women. The one thing we know is that it is a serious, prevalent but preventable issue. When we look back at the history of this issue in South Australia, a key part of South Australia's Women's Policy was Achieving Women's Equality. We identified that we needed to improve women's safety and wellbeing, which was one of the three pillars of action of Achieving Women's Equality. Within that are concerns about the gender pay gap, and we heard just yesterday that it is at 21 per cent, so we know we have a long way to go in the area.

In late 2011, we launched 'The next phase of South Australia's women's safety strategy 2011-2022: a right to safety', which built on the reforms of the previous women's safety strategies to improve legislation and services and strengthen community understanding of the effects of violence against women. We had significant commitments leading up to the 2014 election and, in October 2014, the premier at the time released 'Taking a stand: responding to domestic violence', which outlined the South Australian government's response to the Coroner's recommendation regarding the death of Zahra Abrahamzadeh.

We also released the Domestic Violence Discussion Paper in October 2017, which at that time included a commitment to trial the Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme. I recognise the work of the member for Elizabeth, who raised that idea and pursued that opportunity as a way to support people. I recognise the passing of the Statutes Amendment (Domestic Violence) Bill last week in parliament and the work of the Attorney-General and the minister for women in taking this to the next stage. We must continue, across policy and within legislation, to support women against violence.

We have heard some of the statistics here today and this means that we must continue to challenge and recognise what is within our culture and how that impacts us. The fact that one in three women aged over 18 years has experienced some form of violence since the age of 15 is a hard fact for us to realise as a culture. We have also seen work with the federal government at this time.

When we launched A Right to Safety 2011-2022, it outlined our commitment as a state to the National Plan to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children. When I was minister for the status of women, we held regular hook-ups to discuss how that would progress. People may recall that we had a significant campaign with quite confronting advertising to eliminate forms of violence against women.

Specifically, it was to do with some of the attitudes that are quite ingrained; for example, 'Boys will be boys,' or, 'It's okay, don't make a fuss.' It reminded people to take a moment and think about what they were saying. When we say that these things are okay, what are we telling our girls? We are telling them that this is something they just have to accept.

I note that there was recently an additional round of commercials regarding these attitudes. These commercials are confronting. They challenge what we have heard from time to time—I certainly did while growing up—about accepting certain behaviours. While we still have a long way to go, I recognise the work of the state and federal governments in this space.

I want to highlight some of the initiatives under A Right to Safety, including the Family Safety Framework; the research and investigation of domestic violence-related deaths, through a senior research officer position at the Coroner's Court; Violence Against Women Collaborations; and workplace domestic violence policy. The Family Safety Framework ensures that families most at risk of violence are dealt with in a structured and systematic way. Predominantly, it is through agencies sharing information and taking responsibility for supporting families to navigate the system.

Family safety meetings are held at a local level, focusing on individual high-risk cases and utilising a common risk assessment, which is incredibly important. I assume that the Family Safety Framework continues to operate in 19 locations across South Australia. The role of Senior Research Officer (Domestic Violence) researches and investigates open and closed deaths related to domestic violence. This includes identifying domestic violence issues, relevant service systems and investigating the adequacy of responses. This advice forms part of the coronial brief and builds the capacity of the coronial inquest to explore and inquire into system responses to domestic violence and make recommendations for improvement with a preventative focus.

Violence Against Women Collaborations was established with multi-agency partnerships to focus on the development of regional primary prevention strategies to prevent violence against women. The Office for Women, in partnership with Housing SA, brought together local service providers to develop strategic regional responses to homelessness and violence against women. Fifteen collaborations were established and were operational across South Australia.

Workplaces are a key environment for preventative action to reduce violence against women and to support women affected by domestic violence. All South Australian government departments implemented a domestic violence workplace policy. Some of the other changes included the introduction of the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009, which commenced in December 2011. The act provided South Australian police with the power to issue immediate intervention orders under some circumstances. This was a key change in South Australia to enable that to happen immediately.

We know some of the issues covered in the Statutes Amendment (Domestic Violence) Bill took things to the next level after that as well. The Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act also addressed the option for courts to require defendants to attend the Domestic Violence Abuse Prevention Program delivered by the Offenders Aid and Rehabilitation Service (OARS). The abuse prevention programs also include the Women's Safety Contact Program run by Women's Safety Services SA, which aims to increase the safety of female protected persons.

One of the areas that I think stands out significantly for South Australia is the development of the Multi-Agency Protection Service (MAPS). South Australia Police partnered with what was then the department for communities and social inclusion, the department for education and child development, the department for health and ageing and the Department for Correctional Services. They developed and implemented MAPS, which co-locates staff, enabling people to share vital information faster and to identify victims and emerging patterns of behaviour before they escalate.

I had the opportunity to attend the COAG meeting where our premier at the time was a key speaker. We spoke about both the Multi-Agency Protection Service and the Family Safety Framework. Other states, showing great interest, came to see how MAPS worked and then replicated it in their own states. I am very proud of the work that we did. Most important I think for MAPS is the ability to look at emerging patterns of harm and then be able to assist people before they escalate.

Turning to other areas I would like to talk about 'Taking a stand: responding to domestic violence', a policy announced in 2014. There were three direct policy responses, including the

Women's Domestic Violence Court Assistance Service, the Domestic Violence Response Review, formerly known as an early warning system, and White Ribbon accreditation.

All departments in South Australia have received their White Ribbon accreditation. That was a significant focus by the state government at the time because this was something where we knew we could help provide more understanding and awareness about how we could support people who may be experiencing domestic violence—how we can support them in the workplace but also in the wider community and to take seriously White Ribbon accreditation and its importance in South Australia.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (11:36): I rise to support the motion and thank the member for presenting the same. Other speakers have outlined significant demand for us to be alert and active in remedying this scourge on our community, particularly women and children.

I want to acknowledge today and thank Lauren Novak, a journalist with *The Advertiser*, for her work not only in understanding this shameful behaviour in our community but in committing to provide real and impressive pieces of journalism in the publication of this important social issue. That is not say that other journalists are not interested in this topic, but I have to say that she has been a leading light in this regard, and I want to personally place on record our appreciation here in parliament for that.

I want to also say that, as we speak, a coronial investigation is being undertaken in relation to the murder of Graziella Daillér and the suicide of her then partner, Dion Muir. I can comfortably say that because I do not think there is any question about how they died. What is important about this coronial inquiry relating to this murder-suicide in May 2014 is that, when we receive the recommendations of the Coroner or a representative from his office in relation to the report that is expected, I want there to be a comprehensive list of recommendations that will be, again, a reminder to government—in this case a new government—as to what must occur.

It was not acceptable to me that I read, when I came into this parliament, the coronial inquest report of Mrs Heyward, murdered in similar circumstances by a partner where there had been repeated occasions of alert and alarm about the circumstances that she was living in. This was a murder that occurred in the Riverland. The coronial inquest set out a number of recommendations.

I do not want to have to read again the plight of the circumstances of Zahra Abrahimzadeh in the last evening before her death—murdered by her husband—and, again, the lengthy coronial inquiry about the failings in this case of authorities who had not acted. The former attorney-general (the former member for Croydon) and I were at the occasion that Mrs Abrahimzadeh was celebrating with the Persian community—their national day. Really, within minutes of the former attorney and I leaving that function, she was murdered. I commend her son particularly, but all her children, for the work that they have done in trying to bring this issue to the forefront of the attention of political leaders and the public generally.

These are repeated; these keep going on and on. We hear the responses: 'Yes, we have implemented this policy, we are going to do this and we are going to be more alert to these issues.' They are not addressing the problem, and that is that as a community, members of the police force, members of welfare agencies, health people, people who come across these circumstances—all of us—have a responsibility to deal with this issue. Mrs Daillér's murder is a long list.

She was 48 years of age. I recall when her daughters Natasha and Adelaide came to see me, with the support of their father, the former husband of the victim in this case, all keen to say, 'We need to have this properly investigated and we don't want our mother's life to be lost in vain.' I look forward to that report. I undertake to the people here in this parliament that, as a member of the new government, I will be doing everything possible to be alert to the deficiencies that will inevitably be disclosed in that matter and which need to be remedied.

I am confident that the domestic violence developments, including legislation which the new government has put in place and which I have appreciated other speakers' recognition of, will be very helpful and, frankly, would have been very helpful in the deaths I have just referred to if they had been implemented a long time ago. The strangulation offence is a pretty new concept in Australia

and I think it will be important. Broadening the definition of 'abuse' can always be helpful, but we need to make sure that we act on all these other new areas, including dowry abuse and the like.

The police body-worn camera evidence of victims is a very important initiative in relation to evidence and protecting, where possible, the need for victims to have to give evidence, because I think we will see a significant level of guilty pleas entered in circumstances where this evidence has been recorded and is available for the prosecution. Tougher laws on the breaching of intervention orders are just common sense. With the support of other members of the parliament, we have seen those pass this parliament recently.

The Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme is now in its second month of operation and things are going well. I want to thank all those who are working hard on it, including members of SAPOL. As spoken about by the member for Elder, the Women's Safety Services now has a 24/7 crisis hotline, which is a really important initiative. I do not know why it has taken 30 years, but we have put it in place and extra money has been allocated for it to occur. It is just like saying to the Coroner, 'We know you need extra money to finish off these awful cases and to properly investigate them and give us the guidance that will come from your reports,' but we also need to make sure that the services for our current victims are available.

What else do we need to do? There are lots of things, but can I mention one today in the four minutes I have left. I was privileged not to grow up in a household where domestic violence was in existence. I had a marriage in which it was not present, and I do not wish it on anyone. Other members on all sides of our own parliament have not had that same happy experience.

That is not to say I have not gone through life without either representing people in this circumstance or, as a child, having people come to stay with us—usually a wife and children; many in those days when we used to have lots of kids—and looking after them in our home while things were sorted out, usually by the men, to deal with the perpetrator. All too often, these families would then reunite without support, and it was an ongoing concern and a tragedy for those who either lost their life or, in fact, suicided in a circumstance like that.

What do we do? I can tell you what we do. We make sure that we not only support women who are in this situation and make sure they have protection but say to our own sons, brothers and male friends that this is a responsibility for them.

I am usually pretty tough with my kids; I have only had sons, and I am lucky enough to have granddaughters. I have made it very clear that it is not just being cut out of the will if I find out about any misconduct. They also have a very clear understanding that if there is a circumstance where a member of their family was a victim of abuse at their hand, then do not come home to me: I will be supporting them. I think it is important. Sure, I have said to my kids, 'I will pay for one uni degree and I will pay for one marriage; the rest is up to you.' But I will say this: I will not tolerate that in my own family. I am confident that they have listened to me so far in life—that does not mean they always will.

I make this point: we have a responsibility as parents to make sure that we teach our women and young children to be resilient, to be able to demand that they have respectful relationships and have protection when they do not. We need to have a responsibility to educate our own families, particularly the males, in the benefits of having a respectful relationship with their partners in due course and, when they are in them, to give them support.

Everyone needs some help from time to time, and we know the responsibility we have in that regard. But we cannot allow this to happen in our own homes and in our own families. If we do that, in addition to continuing to support those who do not have someone to help them, then we will make a difference. I commend the motion to the house.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (11:46): In rising to speak in support of this motion, can I start by thanking all those who have spoken so far. There have been wonderful speeches that clearly speak to the passion and determination that exist on both sides of this house to finally prevent and also end domestic violence. Can I also echo the member for Bragg's comments in relation to Lauren Novak. I agree that she should be commended for her passion and for her relentless commitment to continuing to raise the issue of domestic violence however she can through the media.

Many members have spoken today to outline the facts that we know about violence against women, facts that are deeply unacceptable and deeply shocking. But they are facts that I think are also deeply motivating for each of us to think about how we can do more, how we can act more and how we can act wherever and however we can to prevent and end violence against women. They are a persistent and an urgent call to action, and they are also a call for all of us to keep speaking up wherever and wherever we can about this scourge that is violence against women.

Like many others in this place, I have a relentless and lifelong commitment to preventing and ending violence against women and children. As I have spoken about in this place before, when I first had the deep privilege of being elected to represent my community here in parliament and I was preparing for my inaugural speech, I was deeply hesitant to speak about my own childhood and my personal experiences of repeatedly witnessing domestic violence and all the emotions, the shame and the embarrassment, that the experience brings.

Despite this, I know that, even when it is uncomfortable, to end the cycle of violence we must speak up and out and, in doing so, encourage women who are experiencing violence to speak out, men who do not know what are appropriate behaviours in relationships to seek help and to show our daughters and our sons a different way of interacting. I absolutely echo the member for Bragg's sentiments in that regard in terms of our responsibility to engender conversation not just in our community but also in our own family. It is certainly something that I do with my own sons and that I know that many people in this place also take the responsibility to do.

As are a number of us in this place, I am a long-term advocate for survivors and, sadly, victims of domestic violence in our community. I have worked with some extraordinary domestic violence service workers. I have represented them in their workplaces and worked alongside them in a number of ways for many years. We all absolutely wish that their work did not have to continue, but we all know that currently it does, and I know that we are all committed to ensuring that work continues in the right way until we see an end to domestic violence. It is work that I will absolutely continue as shadow minister for the status of women and, of course, as the member for Reynell. It is work that we all have to commit to continuing.

The prevalence of domestic violence is absolutely devastating and unacceptable. Already this year, 58 women have been killed by men, and sadly we continue to hear about repeated instances of abuse causing psychological, mental and physical injury. We have to keep speaking up about that prevalence and acting on it. I fear that as a community, despite these shocking statistics that we all know too well, because there is such a prevalence of domestic violence, somehow the shock wears off or, as the member for King spoke about in the media the other day, somehow there is a mood amongst some people that perhaps it is something that we should stop talking about.

Well done to the member for King for standing up against those comments. Can I say that we must never, ever become immune to that prevalence; we cannot let that immunity happen. We have to keep speaking up and acting for as long as it takes to end violence against women. I know that, with the incredible people who work in this space in our community in so many different ways, and the incredible community members who lead work at a local level, we will keep speaking up and acting until domestic violence ends.

As has been spoken about, domestic violence can take many forms, including emotional, psychological, financial and verbal abuse. A significant component in the cause of any kind of abuse is a lack of awareness and education about what constitutes a respectful relationship and the abiding gender inequality that sadly persists in our community. Unfortunately, there is something that our community teaches our young men and women that leads them to believe that it is okay to control a person who they are with, or have been in a relationship with, through violence.

It was positive to see the government's promises in the domestic violence space during the election campaign, a number of which mirrored ours or added to work that we had already progressed as the former Labor government. I truly hope that those promises are effectively delivered in a timely manner, and I look forward to considering the various proposals that will come forward. My only concern is that, when reading through the government's policy, I really could not find any mention of the word 'prevention' nor any funds specifically committed to prevention.

Of course, it is crucial to continue to provide services to support and protect people currently experiencing domestic violence, but we have to keep working to address the root cause of the problem. We need to educate our peers and our children if we are ever to end domestic violence. We must teach our young men that violence is never an option, and we must teach them a more respectful and hopeful future. We must do whatever we can to end the terrible gender inequality which plagues our community and which lies at the heart of domestic violence and indeed at the heart of all violence against women.

We have to work together to shift the way men's and women's roles are perceived, and we have to address the other issues that prevent the advancement of the status of women. When I speak with survivors of domestic violence, I always encourage them to seek the support of professional services and professional workers. Of course, I always encourage their sense of self-worth and seek to empower them to live an independent life free from violence. There are services available, and we will all fight to keep them available until the day they are no longer needed, but it is a day that cannot come soon enough.

On that note, I want to echo in this house the comments of the member for Mount Gambier in relation to the need for strengthened services in regional areas. I will certainly fight alongside him to make sure that there are adequate resources for the Limestone Coast Domestic Violence Service. I will always fight alongside my dear friend Susie Smith—whom the member for Mount Gambier spoke about—who said that we should always fight for the right services loudly and proudly.

On this side of the house, we will also fight to ensure that resources are expended on prevention, shifting that terrible gender inequality and creating a more respectful future. This shift, this smashing of gender inequality, will also go to address the awful instances of violence against women beyond the home. As I spoke about in the house a couple of weeks ago, I attended and spoke at a community vigil three weeks ago at the Colonnades Shopping Centre, in my electorate of Reynell, to honour a woman who was killed there a few weeks before.

The vigil was organised by Melanie, and I take this opportunity to again thank her for her enormous passion to end violence and gender inequality and her willingness to work at such a difficult time to bring our community together following that horrific killing. She is passionate about a community free of all violence against women. Her preparedness to use her voice however she can to speak out against domestic violence and all violence against women is indeed inspiring. Melanie's voice and her stepping forward has already made a difference in our community and it will continue to make a difference.

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:56): I thank the other side for their indulgence to allow me to speak prior to attending a meeting. I want to speak about this because time and again we hear of the violent death of a woman, usually at the hands of someone she considered a loved one, even at one time, and occasionally at the hands of a stranger, but almost always at the hands of a male. As saddened and shocked as we all always are, I for one am also angry. I am angry that women are being killed by men today.

As much as we have equality before the law, we do not have equality in the way in which we are treated. That is why we are still subject to male rage, to male power and to the exercise of control over us, and it must come to an end. Many of us have children, and we long for their adulthood not to be poisoned in the way in which all our adulthoods have been: by the truth of male rage directed against women.

There is an aphorism—and I do not know to whom to attribute this—that men are afraid that women will laugh at them and that women are afraid that men will kill them. I do not know if men are afraid that we will laugh at them. We are probably all a little afraid that someone will laugh at us, male or female, but I do know that deep truth of the fear that women carry around with him: the fear of the random stranger; the fear of what happened in Colonnades; the fear when I walk home from the train station and it is dark and I allow myself that thought, 'What if there is someone waiting there for me?'; and the fear that the person you are attracted to, who you want to spend your life with, might not be the trustworthy and loving person they may appear to be.

That fear sits inside women in a way that I suspect most men do not really understand. They can empathise, they can appreciate what we tell them, but I do not think it is possible for them to feel

the comparative weakness that has been forced on us, in part by our biology but largely by society. Every person has to do something about this if we are to stop it. Every parent, of course, needs to tell their children the truth about what has happened and what must never happen in the future. More than that, as colleagues, as lawmakers and as citizens walking in the street, we cannot allow ourselves to let this pass us by.

We all see things that we know are not right. We all observe power relationships where one person does not appear to be able to exercise their power and their autonomy because they are subject to another person's. That is not always gendered—of course it is not—but all too often it is because all too often we have still allowed the relationship between men and women to be dominated by what men want, what men think is in their control and under their subjugation, and too little by the fact that women, as I say, are equal before the law, are equal human beings and are autonomous, with spirits and desires and anger of their own.

I pay tribute to the advocates who keep reminding us of this great truth. Katrine Hildyard, the member for Reynell, is one of them because she is brave enough to share her story with strangers in order to help people she does not know. I pay tribute to the people who have survived as children or as partners of someone who is violent because it takes real courage to admit what has happened to you, what you have seen and what you have been subject to but nonetheless be generous enough to be an advocate. That takes true courage, and I take my hat off to them.

How we speak about each other really matters. I have talked about this before in this chamber, largely from this side of the house, having been unleashed now as a member of the opposition and not confined largely to my portfolio. What people see when they come here, in how we speak to each other, matters. What we saw in Canberra, when former prime minister Abbott—he may have been opposition leader at the time—was prepared to stand next to a sign that said 'Ditch the witch', and when a former member of this chamber referred to the female prime minister as a 'dog', matters.

I do not bring this up to be partisan, because I absolutely accept that we are as one on this issue, but I bring it up to remind us of people who are no longer either in this chamber or in a leadership position in Canberra, to remind us that they can be powerful in the most negative way, and we need to be powerful in the most positive way we can be. We need to treat each other as human beings first and belonging to different groups second.

It is right and proper that we have disagreements on policy. It is what the public expects; it is what our system demands. It is not right and proper to treat each other as if we are not equals. That is all part of the continuum that leads a young girl to be in a relationship with someone to whom she is subject, either economically, physically or emotionally. I call on us to say, 'This is enough. This generation is the last one that has to deal with this; our children will not.' I commend the motion to this house.

Ms LUETHEN (King) (12:02): I rise to support the motion, which recognises that Sunday 25 November marks the International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women. I think it is absolutely fantastic that today in this chamber we have heard a huge amount of support on this motion from both sides.

I am passionate about speaking up about domestic and family violence because I believe with all my heart that it is preventable if together we take action to stop it at the start. Each time I doorknock in my electorate, I come across homes where I suspect disrespectful relationships or violence could be present, and I certainly come across disrespectful behaviours. Each time, I am concerned for the people living in fear in my electorate, and I am concerned for the children growing up in this environment.

The United Nations 2017 report on progress towards sustainable development goals highlights that in 2012 almost half of all women who were victims of intentional homicide worldwide were killed by an intimate partner or family member, compared with 6 per cent of male victims. In Australia, 37 per cent of women aged 18 years and over have experienced violence from the age of 15. Australian women are most likely to experience physical and sexual violence in their home at the hands of a male current or ex-partner. Violence against women is the leading risk factor contributing

to the burden of disease—mental health, problems during pregnancy and birth, alcohol and illicit drug use, suicide, injuries and homicide—for Australian women aged between 18 and 44.

The Marshall Liberal government is committed to reducing violence against women through its ongoing support of the National Plan to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children 2010-2022 and the adoption and delivery of a range of commitments taken to the 2018 election that aim to reduce domestic and family violence in South Australia. I am so proud that I have so many colleagues and friends who are actively advocating to eliminate violence against men, women and children.

Today, I commend one of my friends, Jayneen Sanders, who is a mum of three and an educator who is creating awareness in the community on the topics of child protection, protective behaviours education and gender equality. Jay recently provided me with some of her research and thoughts on the relationship between gender equality and violence against women. Jay told me that the 2015 Royal Commission into Family Violence concluded that family violence is a gendered crime and that ending violence against women requires addressing gender equality in all its forms—in the workplace, schoolyards, on television screens and on sporting fields.

It is now frequently suggested that gender inequality and community attitudes towards women are contributing factors to domestic violence, violence against women and children. Children often become what is modelled to them, what they read in books and what we reinforce every day as norms. If a girl shows interest in what we typically deem a boy activity, such as playing with trucks in a sandpit, she may be deemed a tomboy. If a boy shows interest in what we typically deem a girl activity, such as playing with dolls or dancing or not wanting to play football or soccer, some of us become really worried for our sons.

We each need to ask ourselves if we are reinforcing gender stereotyping. Have you ever deliberately paid close attention to and looked out for the ways that we and other people talk about men's and women's roles and how we often unconsciously reinforce gender norms and stereotypes in our home, in our workplace and in our community? As a mum, I have become very aware of how toys are laid out in shops, with boys' sections and girls' sections, the boys' Lego and the girls' Lego, the blue and the pink packaging.

Certainly, local government was an eye-opener for me after working at Westpac, which is a leader in diversity initiatives and is steadfastly supporting women into senior positions. In local government, I was told by one elected member not to let the boys know I wanted to take their jobs away. I was asked to wear red lipstick for the first council meeting and I was told that I had a great figure, that I looked good in my black pants, and I was asked if I could wear the same outfit again next Friday. I share these comments because I would be extremely surprised if these same comments were made to my male local government colleagues.

Sometimes we play down disrespect towards girls and women and say things like, 'Oh, it's only a bit of fun'. This teaches girls and women that they should be flattered rather than upset when they are insulted. Alternatively, I have heard people suggest that a woman is not tough enough for the job or not up to the robust debate, if comments offend her. Recently, a University of South Australia student, Ashleigh Bone, completed a research report for me on women in politics, identifying the barriers, and in her report she wrote:

There have been many international studies and surveys that have revealed that around 60 percent of women in politics experience gendered discrimination at work by male colleagues.

On bullying and gendered discrimination she wrote:

Many articles related to Australia discussed Julia Gillard's treatment in federal Parliament during her run as Prime Minister. The main point that was used in these discussions of Gillard's treatment was the way in which women are often penalised for transgressing gender stereotypes and norms, for example, if a female politician is outspoken she is a 'bitch' and if she is compassionate she is 'too weak'.

I am very grateful to my colleagues in this house and this government, and my experience has been that I am treated as an equal and I am encouraged every day by my colleagues to speak up.

When we look to the media and the language used to communicate violent acts against women and children, there often appears to be a watering down of crimes against them. I am encouraged by the hashtag #FixedIt headlines by Jane Gilmore that she posts on Twitter. One of her

recent examples was the headline, 'Vic man denied bail over alleged car rape'. Jane Gilmore changed this to, 'Vic man denied bail over allegedly raping a woman. The woman is not a car.'

With violence affecting so many women—an estimated one in four in Australia—we have to ask where the problem starts. As we have heard from advocates for eliminating violence against women, we have to stop violence and disrespect right at the start. Pleasingly, there has been a great deal of conversation focused more recently on an agreement on the importance of primary prevention and early intervention.

It is often said that domestic and family violence rely heavily on one gender believing they have power over another and the cycle of violence starts with disrespect. Minister for Women, Kelly O'Dwyer, has said, 'While not all disrespect ends with violence, the cycle of violence certainly starts with disrespect.' Why is paying attention to disrespect so important? Trying to stop domestic and family violence with more resources at the crisis stage, such as our commitment to provide more beds in more shelters, is very important, but this solution is not sustainable.

The idea that we can stop it at the start is about changing our culture, changing the way we teach children to interact with each other and changing what children will grow up believing is normal. Changing attitudes, changing our language and behaviours early on is primary prevention, helping people recognise that if we practise and teach respectful relationships there is far less likelihood that things will end up in violence. This change requires us to recognise and construct new messages that we will share with our kids and adults that we do not tolerate, condone or excuse disrespect. It is not always going to be easy, but it is a conversation worth having and it is education worth teaching. This change will save lives.

Primary prevention activities in a range of places, including schools, workplaces and sporting organisations, are essential to addressing disrespect and gender stereotypes and imbalances. Our children form their beliefs from the world around them, what they hear, see and talk about, and from the stories, people and experiences that are an integral part of childhood. Today, we are unintentionally part of the problem. The good news is that we can all be part of the solution. In our everyday interactions, we can pull people up and pull ourselves up to stop disrespect and stop gender stereotyping. I thank the member very much for moving this motion.

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (12:13): I rise to support the motion of the member for Reynell and thank her for raising this important issue. More than that, I thank her for all her work on domestic violence over many decades. We have worked together on things over quite some years, so I really appreciate everything that she has done.

It was not so long ago that, as a court reporter, I would go to the news desk and pitch my stories, and it was not so long ago that I described a case before the courts to my news director. It was a case where a man had killed his ex-wife. I got the response, 'That's just another domestic. People aren't interested in that. It doesn't rate. What else have you got?' That was not an unusual response. I had had that response from news desks since I started reporting in a regional radio newsroom when I was 16. At that stage, I would ring the police and get the local crime report. I would be told by the cop at the end, after he had listed off all the car thefts and break-ins, that, 'All the rest of the jobs we have attended are just domestics.'

There are a lot of pretty callous things about newsrooms, but I have to say the response that I got in those days from them was really a reflection of the wider community's response at the time to domestic violence. Among news bosses, there was this feeling that domestic abuse cases were so common that they did not really meet the benchmark of news—they were not new. There was also the sentiment that these were private matters that were not for public consumption and that that was the feeling in the wider community, too. There are similar tensions that still exist around reporting familial child abuse and suicide, although these, too, are now being challenged, which is a good thing.

I remember fighting hard at the Ten newsroom to report on the murder of Zahra Abrahimzadeh. All murders are horrendous. All domestic violence is shocking, but this crime stood out. It stood out for me as a journalist and it stood out for people across our community pretty soon. Zahra's estranged husband was frustrated that his wife had left him. He terrorised her and her

three children for many, many years and continued to antagonise them once she had made the very brave decision to leave.

Zahra and her children went into hiding while also trying to start again and establish a new safer life. It is a story so familiar to so many people fleeing domestic violence. His anger grew and grew. His frustration at the loss of control grew and grew and it culminated in his taking a knife and his will to kill to the Convention Centre on Persian New Year. He knew she would be there. Zahra was there with her daughter and, before the whole Persian community, he coldly walked up to her and stabbed her to death in front of hundreds of people—members of their own community and members of their family.

In the police videos taken immediately after the attack in the kitchen of the Convention Centre, it was clear he thought he was entitled to take Zahra's life. He was unapologetic. I remember watching that video over and over again. No matter how many times I watched it, the calmness, the calculation, the complete lack of remorse and the overwhelming idea that his wife was his property were shocking to me every single time. This is not a problem of the Persian community or other ethnic groups. It is a problem that affects every culture—our culture.

I am glad to say that by the time I left my life in newsrooms last year things had changed quite remarkably. Domestic violence had become an issue that newsrooms took seriously and that is because they know that our community cares about it, that it is a prolific crime, a scourge on our society and something that affects so many of us.

It is wonderful and, I have to say, a bit inspiring to know that, within about 10 or 15 years, there has really been quite a remarkable change in the attitudes not just of journalists and newsrooms but of all of us in the community of how we think about this crime. There is still a lot of work to do and the stigma is still crushing for many people. The fear of what could happen to them if they raise their voice about violence or if they leave a relationship is even worse, and that needs to change.

Women in particular have been raising the issue of violence against women and children for decades and they deserve our thanks and appreciation for their decades of work in scraping together the dollars for women's shelters and forcing policy change. From more recent times, though, I would also like to thank organisations such as the Victim Support Service, who I have of course had a lot to do with, and their Women's Domestic Violence Court Assistance Service; the Commissioner for Victims' Rights, both previous and current; the police; the Women's Legal Service; Catherine House; and many others.

I would also like to commend the Abrahamzadeh family—Arman, Atena and Anita—for the work they have done to raise awareness of the need for action. I note that others on the other side have also recognised the contribution that that family has made. They have done a wonderful job in a very, very personally stressful situation to lobby for change and actually achieve that change. They trusted me and others with their story and I am forever grateful for their insights, their advocacy and also their friendship.

I would also like to pay tribute to the White Ribbon movement and, in fact, the broader movement of men who are standing up against violence against women and children. I am pleased to have been an organiser of the very successful annual White Ribbon Breakfast. I have hosted the event for many years, along with Ron Kandelaars, who is a great advocate for men being part of the conversation and part of the solution. The involvement of men, to me, has been a turning point in the campaign and the shift in public awareness. This is not just a women's issue. It is a community safety issue and a crime.

There are so many men—men who have had female loved ones who have been victims, men with high profiles in our community and men who are leaders in our society—who are now standing up and are not just putting on a little white ribbon on White Ribbon Day but are having important conversations and influencing others every day of the year, and that is what is creating change as well. I encourage all men to take the time to understand domestic violence and its deep impacts, to ask the hard questions about domestic violence. Do not be ashamed to ask a few questions if you do not know and advocate loudly for gender equality and stopping domestic violence.

As some of you would know from my maiden speech, my father's life was impacted by domestic violence in his home, and it had lifelong effects. Some would also know of my mother's

volunteering at women's shelters over many years, and that had an impact on me in terms of raising my awareness of it as an issue. I remember her coming home one day, and I asked her what it was like volunteering at the shelter that day. She told me about the breadth of people who would come in. She did not name the person, but I remember her telling me that it was not just people from disadvantaged backgrounds, that in fact the wife of our local bank manager had been in and was grappling with how to leave a violent relationship.

I think we all in this place now know that it is not simply a matter of disadvantage but an issue of power, and that can affect anyone's relationship. However, it does not take a personal experience to know that domestic violence is wrong and that we should all stand up against it. I commend the previous Labor government, the Weatherill government in particular, for the steps it took to address domestic violence, and many of my colleagues have detailed those measures. Indeed, I also commend the commitment of the new government and wish it well in everything it tries to do in this space.

I hope we never return to a place where domestic violence is a secret or seen as someone else's issue. I hope we continue to break down those barriers because only by doing that can we have a safer society for everyone. I look forward to again joining the many White Ribbon events this month—the breakfast, the march and other events—with my colleagues and those on the other side of the chamber, and I look forward to doing what I can in this place well beyond that. I thank the member for Reynell for her important motion, I thank members for their contributions and I commend the motion to the house.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:22): I rise to support the motion moved by the member for Reynell:

That this house—

- (a) notes that Sunday 25 November marks the International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women;
- (b) notes the unacceptable, shocking and persistent prevalence of violence against women across the globe; and
- (c) resolves to do all that it can to address gender inequality, to empower women and girls and to prevent violence against women.

Everything has been said and articulated so well in the house, but I would like to make a few comments. I want to say that I agree with everything the member for Port Adelaide said. The member for Port Adelaide and I are very distant politically, but I think we are friends across the divide—and not just because we both support Port Adelaide.

What she said was absolutely right: it is not right for men to bully and inflict violence on women. It is absolutely outrageous. It is absolutely gutless, and men who involve themselves in this are, in my mind, just the scum of the earth. To take something out, usually on a loved one—their wife or their partner—is absolutely disgraceful. Women should not have to be in fear. They should not have to make excuses that they have a sore shoulder or a sore arm, or say that the black eye they have is because they walked into a door.

I know they can be in very difficult situations because of the fear they live in, but these situations need to be outed. The perpetrators cannot get away with this. They think they are so empowered yet they are just the most evil scum of the earth and the most gutless people I could ever think of. It is gutless, it is absolutely gutless, not only inflicting the physical pain but, for instance, stopping their loved one, their wife or their partner, from being able to have their car keys or to have access to their phone just as a method of control. It is an absolute disgrace that these so-called big men think that doing this makes them a so-called big man.

I fully endorse this motion. I know it is tough for women involved in these situations, but they do not have to accept it. They need to call it out and they need to hold these men to account, even if they say that they love them. They need to call them to account because it is not right. As we have heard here today, there are far too many deaths and acts of violence against women. If you do not call it out, sadly, you could become one of those victims.

I just want to comment on what the previous government have done and what we continue to do in regard to the Multi-Agency Protection Service which is set up here in South Australia. It started back in 2014 and coordinates the efforts of police and various government and support agencies. About 400 high-risk cases are referred to this protection service. Certainly, as a former member of the Social Development Committee in a former parliament, I know we had a reference in regard to domestic violence. We had a look at and a good briefing on what the MAPS team does. Because staff are under one roof, they have direct coordination with the departments. It involves the police, state education and child development services, SA Health, Correctional Services and Housing SA.

I really want to commend the service that these people and other domestic violence services across this state provide to help stamp out this terrible activity, and these grisly crimes that happen because of it. I urge people, especially women, not to be silent. Stand up. Look after yourselves. It is okay to speak out. I commend the motion.

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (12:27): I rise today to wholeheartedly support the motion from the member for Reynell. Violence against women in our community is shocking in its prevalence and cancerous in the degrading impact it has on our society as a whole.

There have been a number of truly awful cases in recent years where women have been killed in random attacks where they are unknown to the perpetrator. These kinds of attacks often drive fear into many people about walking out alone or out late at night. There is something wrong about women having that fear, as though somehow, if an attack were to occur, it is their fault that they are out there on their own. That is clearly unacceptable. However, whilst those particular kinds of attacks are terrifying and horrific, they are actually quite unusual in general terms.

It is actually much more common for a woman to be attacked by someone known to them—in fact, someone who is very well known to them: a current or a former partner. On average, one woman is murdered a week by a current or former partner, and one in five women will experience physical or sexual violence from the age of 15. This is absolutely disgraceful and needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency. As many of us have often said in this place, all violence against anyone, irrespective of gender, is wrong, but the fact of the matter is that by far and away women are much more likely to be the victim of violence than men.

It is interesting. Recently my wife and I had a conversation at home with our daughter. She is early primary school age. It came up because I was organising a quiz night for a domestic violence shelter recently. She did not really understand what this was about. It was actually quite difficult to convey the fact that there are some people in our community—in fact, many—who are scared of their dads. That is a truly undermining factor for our society because we often see the family unit as the most basic and important unit of our society.

That is what we are really talking about here: violence, far and away, occurs in people's own homes, in our own streets and neighbourhoods, and quite often where we would not even know. When I say that it is a cancer on our society, I use that term very deliberately because, like cancer, it is hidden from view, it undermines from within, it spreads and ultimately undermines the fabric of our society as a whole. But I do believe there are some green shoots, and I say 'green shoots' in the sense that it is a little bit.

The fact that we are talking more about this is certainly a big step forward. There are some important things that the state government is doing around greater protections. Some of the important measures deal with the offence of strangulation, given that that is a high indicator of risk that someone will murder someone else, and a number of other issues around how evidence can be used in court and expanding the definition of abuse. Other important measures in the state budget will help with crisis accommodation, the crisis hotline and the Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme and similar things. Of course, that particular measure is quite important nowadays given how common online dating is.

I also acknowledge the increasing community awareness of the issue of domestic violence. We are seeing a lot of organised events such as breakfasts. I was part of a fundraiser recently where we did not have to work hard at all to get a really strong turnout from the community or to get substantial donations from the community. It took very little work on our part, which I thought was

quite heartening. The important thing to emphasise is that these are early green shoots and that is because, whilst there is a lot of good work going on, the fact of the matter is that violence against women is not going down. As we heard earlier, already 58 women have been murdered by men this year, so we cannot be satisfied with the work we are doing until violence against women is eliminated.

As others have said this morning, I would also like to stress that ultimately to deal with the issue of violence against women we need to deal with the cause and we need to deal with it at its source. It is about attitudes of men towards women. It is about the example that parents set for their children. It is about the way a father treats his daughter, the respect he provides for his daughter, the interest he takes in what his daughter is doing. The example a father sets for his son is also important in how he treats women, how he treats his mother, how he treats his sisters. That all matters.

The other important issue that needs to be addressed, and I think it needs to be addressed by society as a whole, is the incidence of sexual harassment within our community and the importance of calling that out, in particular the importance for men to call that out when they see it. I have seen some statistics, and I think some of these are probably a little rubbery, but they show that one in two women has been a victim of or experienced sexual harassment. To be honest, I suspect that is actually quite low compared to the reality. I think there are probably different definitions that people would have around sexual harassment.

What I would say is that any behaviour that is disrespectful, demeaning and creates a sense that a person has power over another is wrong and should be called out. Also, the fact of the matter is that whilst that behaviour is unacceptable, irrespective of the gender of the recipient, again, it is much more likely that it will happen to women.

In a previous speech here I talked about a number of examples of different cases that have been shared with me by people I know, whether it be a creepy old man giving someone their business card and asking them to keep it under their pillow or someone yelling out disgusting comments from a passing car about a woman's body when she is just minding her own business and walking along the side of the road, all those kinds of things.

For many women I know in my life, and have known throughout my previous careers, almost all of them have some kind of story like that. Most of us men do not have such stories, and I think we as men have a big role to play in calling it out when we see it and in setting the right example. Most men do not do that. Most men do not behave like that, but unfortunately a lot do, and it is up to us to do something about that.

To summarise, I think that this is a very important issue, as violence against women affects or has a big impact on half of our community. That is a significant issue. We need to continue to work hard to ultimately eliminate violence against women. It is something we all need to be involved with. We can lead it from this place. There are other organisations that can have a big role in helping to drive change, but ultimately all of us, right throughout society, need to be involved in this. I am certainly committed, and I know many in this place are, to ensuring that that happens.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (12:35): I wholeheartedly place on record my thanks to everybody who has spoken in this debate. It has truly moved me and truly given me a sense of hope that together we really can make a difference. It has given me a great sense of hope about what we can do together in this parliament—and also about the leadership here in this parliament—and how that can be used in our community to finally prevent and end violence against women.

When I was speaking earlier, just before I ran out of time, I was referring to the vigil that was held at Colonnades to honour, mourn and pay respects to the woman who was tragically killed there a few weeks earlier. When I was speaking about that, I was also reflecting that, tragically, that was not the first vigil I have attended in the south to honour, mourn and pay respects to a woman who was killed in our community. Just three years before I also spoke at a vigil organised in Hackham West following the murder of Jackie Ohide by her then partner.

Those vigils were deeply upsetting and deeply moving, but when I think about the hope that I have had here today in terms of us working and acting together to end violence against women I also think about the hope that came from those vigils—not from the terrible, tragic killing, of course, but from the fact that, at the end of those vigils, every single person in our community who had

attended, and every person who had hoped to attend, left those vigils with a deep and collective resolve to work together at a community level to make a difference in relation to this scourge that is violence against women.

Everybody who was at those vigils resolved to work out how they could feel more confident to go and check on their neighbours and their friends and to ask questions of family members and people they saw in shopping centres, hotels and wherever else they encountered treatment that was not appropriate and was offensive to women, and wherever they encountered disrespect.

Whilst speaking about these issues is deeply distressing for many of us and brings up a lot of anger and emotion about what we are dealing with, it is also always a call to action. I do feel hopeful from our debate today—from our discussion today and from everybody's words—that together, here in this place, we will all heed that call to action. I hope that, as community leaders in those communities that we have the privilege of representing, we will encourage and empower the voices and actions of our fellow community members to also heed that call to action and to do what they can at a local level to end violence against women. Again, thank you to everybody who has participated in this discussion today.

Motion carried.

LIFESAVING WORLD CHAMPIONSHIPS

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (12:39): I move:

That this house—

- (a) notes that the Lifesaving World Championships 2018 are being held from 16 November to 2 December at Glenelg Beach and the South Australia Aquatic and Leisure Centre;
- (b) welcomes the many competitors, officials and volunteers from South Australia, interstate and overseas;
- (c) acknowledges the efforts of Surf Life Saving South Australia and Glenelg Surf Life Saving in attracting the world championships to Adelaide for an unprecedented second time; and
- (d) highlights the significant volunteer contribution made by all surf lifesaving clubs in South Australia to increase beach safety.

I move this motion because, while the primary role of surf lifesaving is to save lives, the other aspect of surf lifesaving is competition, with lifesaving sport intended to encourage lifesavers to develop, maintain and improve the physical and mental skills needed to save lives in an aquatic environment.

A lifesaving competition such as this consists of a variety of competitions that enables the surf lifesavers to practise their skills and improve their fitness. Every two years, the International Life Saving Federation organises the lifesaving world championships. The championships mostly alternate between the northern and southern hemispheres, with the first lifesaving world championship being held in Canada in 1986.

The last one held in Australia in 2012 was the Rescue 2012 championships, which were held here in South Australia, with the pool events at the world-class state Aquatic and Leisure Centre in Marion, and the beach and ocean events split between Christies Beach and Glenelg Beach. I was fortunate enough to compete in the 2012 championships, and it was a friendly atmosphere, with competitors learning from each other. Many of those competitors came from countries across the globe, such as Great Britain, Argentina, Egypt, Japan and Iran, to name a few, where surf conditions are not as big as experienced on many Australian beaches.

Being in Gulf St Vincent, the conditions at Glenelg Beach are a lot calmer, and our pristine beaches made for excellent conditions for competition, especially amongst those newer countries. Added to this, the location, with its tourist attractions and restaurants along Jetty Road, and the hospitality at Glenelg in particular and in South Australia as a whole, provided a compelling experience, with many competitors wanting to return.

These factors were a key reason why Adelaide was selected again to host the event this year, starting in two days' time from 16 November to 2 December. Adelaide is the only city to have secured this prestigious event twice since the championships began. This speaks volumes about our

event-hosting capacity, the pristine beaches in metropolitan Adelaide and the fantastic lifestyle on offer in South Australia.

For these two weeks, Glenelg Beach and the state Aquatic and Leisure Centre will welcome 5,000 athletes from 44 countries and over 800 teams. Add to this the volunteers and officials and that number swells to 6,200 athletes and officials. The championships will deliver 500 competitions across the beach, ocean and pool, and the event is expected to inject \$18 million into the state's economy. For many, this will be their first visit to South Australia, and it will be a chance to explore Glenelg and the wider city and immerse themselves in high-quality food, wine and tourism experiences.

Whereas in 2012 Surf Life Saving Australia was the primary body, Surf Life Saving South Australia is the peak body in 2018. Recognising the opportunity to host the event for a second time since 2012, Surf Life Saving South Australia worked with the then government, Events SA and SA Tourism to secure the funding required to host a successful event, with the bid ultimately successful. Significantly, the beach and ocean events are to be consolidated to Glenelg Beach in 2018. Responsibility for organising this event has fallen solely on the resources of Surf Life Saving South Australia, rather than on the larger Surf Life Saving Australia.

CEO Clare Harris and her staff started the planning process over three years ago, and alongside this Sally from Events SA and the Holdfast Bay council have been heavily involved in the planning process. Events SA is the major sponsor of the event, whilst the Holdfast Bay council general manager of community services Marnie Lock, who prior to working with the council ran the Rescue 2012 event, has also helped work on the executive committee. A local organising committee has utilised the expert knowledge of, among others, members of the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club: the president, Georgina Cole, Pete Tidswell, and Adam Luscombe, to name a few.

In preparation for the event, the building of the site commenced on Monday, and when I visited the area last night I could see the competition venue starting to take shape. Wigley Reserve has been fenced off to store gear and the volleyball nets on Glenelg Beach have been taken down and in their place grandstand seating is being constructed for the sprint and beach flags arenas. The ocean events will take place in two areas. The swimming, board and ski events will take place to the north of the jetty and the inflatable rescue boat and surf boat events will be held to the south of the jetty.

The Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club itself is looking fantastic, with new signage certain to draw many competitors back to the club after a hard day's competition. The apron outside the club's entrance has been converted into an alfresco experience. Inside, the storage area of the club is adorned with many international flags, the Australian flag taking pride of place. Upstairs is the main restaurant. While some people may think that the club is for members only, this is not the case. These areas are open to the public and welcoming. I encourage the local community to attend events, support the athletes and then take advantage of this entertainment precinct.

Qualifying as a competitor requires each volunteer lifesaver to qualify for the surf bronze medallion, which consists of a series of tests, including first-aid exams and simulated rescues. It also consists of a fitness test called the 'run, swim, run', which is a 200-metre run, 200-metre swim and a 200-metre run, all of which must be completed in eight minutes. Each season, volunteer lifesavers must perform a proficiency test to recertify their skills.

In addition to holding the bronze medallion, the lifesavers must compete a minimum number of patrol hours each year to be eligible for competition—and there are no exceptions to this. In conjunction with the beach events, the pool events are being held at the state Aquatic Centre at Marion and it is where the championships will kick off this Friday. The pool events are freestyle events but, rather than just straight-line swimming, they involve obstacles, diving and retrieving dummy patients in rescue scenarios, requiring outstanding lung capacity. As an example, the 200-metre obstacle swim has competitors swimming 200 metres during which they swim under eight immersed obstacles.

The beach and ocean events at Glenelg start on Monday 19 November and involve exciting events on the sand, including beach sprints and a beach relay, when competitors run up and back along the same straight line and hand the baton to each other going at speed in opposite directions.

It is certainly spectacular to watch. The beach flags competition has competitors lying face down on the sand in a prone position and on the whistle rising and racing to a flag 20 metres away. There is always one less flag than competitors, so the competition is run over a series of knockout races until only one competitor remains.

In the ocean, there are board and beach ski races. The blue-ribbon event is the ocean women and ocean men events. These races test competitors as ultimate all-rounders, as some of the best athletes in the world go around doing a different discipline, with each lap of swimming, boarding and surf ski broken up by runs along the beach to start each lap. The other side of the jetty will see the fast-paced action of the inflatable rubber boats, IRBs or rubber duckies, as they are colloquially known, that race out from shore to the sea to pluck a patient from the water while not stopping and then performing a U-turn before racing back to shore.

The beach and ocean series will kick off with the official opening ceremony on 20 November, with the Premier in attendance. First the masters will compete, including myself, in the beach sprint relay and flags before the national youth and open team competition starts on Thursday 22 November, running through to 2 December.

I want to take this opportunity to welcome the many competitors, officials and volunteers from South Australia, interstate and overseas who will descend upon Adelaide over the coming two weeks. I hope they achieve a personally satisfying result. I hope they get to enjoy a fantastic time in Glenelg with their families and are welcomed with open arms by the local community. I would also like to thank the hundreds of volunteers who will be vital to the smooth running of the championships. Past president of the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club Shane Daw will be a safety officer. Others, but by no means all, to thank are Craig Burton, Steve and Tony Dalton, Anthony Merchant, Justin Ganley, Rob Warne, Gordon Clifford and former Somerton Surf Life Saving Club presidents Steve Cornish and Mark Strachan.

Many of these volunteers will be from the 22 South Australian surf lifesaving clubs and, when the championships have finished, they and their fellow volunteer patrolling club members will still be present keeping our popular beaches safe over the upcoming summer—a service for which the Morphett community is very appreciative.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (12:49): It gives me great pleasure to rise today to provide a little bit of commentary on the Lifesaving World Championships, which are being held in South Australia from 16 November to 2 December this year. It is a great testament to Surf Life Saving South Australia and our lifesaving movement in this state that we are able to host the world championships again after doing so a few short years ago in 2012. Through the experience and opportunity of hosting the championships in 2012, we have clearly demonstrated not only that we have great beaches, great athletes and great lifesavers to put these events on but also that we can build on what we learnt in 2012 to have a really great event this year.

I pay tribute to Clare Harris, chief executive officer of Surf Life Saving South Australia, her board, ably led by John Baker, and the team that they have around them in being able to secure the championships, because it is not only great for beach sports and surf sports in this state but also a great little economic boost to the state, bringing hundreds of visitors to South Australia to enjoy what we have to offer at this time of year. The championships are obviously an opportunity for our surf clubs at home here in South Australia to demonstrate their prowess on the beach as well, and it has been a great pleasure of mine to be able to be involved in the surf lifesaving movement in our state for a number of years.

Under my previous electorate boundaries, I had the great privilege of representing three surf clubs: Somerton Surf Life Saving Club; Brighton Surf Life Saving Club, which, as I have mentioned many times, is my home surf lifesaving club; and Seacliff Surf Life Saving Club. Under the new boundaries, I have lost the representative side of Somerton and Brighton surf clubs, but I do keep that very strong connection with all the clubs and particularly now, in a representative sense, with the Seacliff Surf Life Saving Club.

It is Seacliff Surf Life Saving Club that I want to dwell on and celebrate for a couple more minutes this morning for the contribution it makes to the community I represent. Their contribution was recently recognised at the 2018 Surf Life Saving Awards of Excellence, where Seacliff Surf Life

Saving Club took home so many of the prizes and was named 2018 Surf Life Saving Club of the Year. It gave me immense pride as someone who has involvement in that club as their local MP, and I really enjoy being part of the community that club represents and creates along the coastline in the south-west of Adelaide.

I would like to acknowledge that, in attaining club of the year, Seacliff Surf Life Saving Club achieved a number of other awards, including community education program of the year, which was a partnership with Suneden Specialist School around the Beach for All access mat. I had a great opportunity to partner with Seacliff Surf Life Saving Club a couple of years ago in creating that accessible beach at Seacliff, with the mat that runs over the soft sand down to the sea, but the surf club has gone on and built so much more than just that piece of infrastructure. They have created a whole movement around disability awareness within their club and are able to contribute to the broader understanding of and services for people who have a disability, for them to be able to access that beach environment, which is so much more difficult when living with a disability.

I also want to congratulate the following winners from Seacliff Surf Life Saving Club: coach of the year, Brian Bayliss, otherwise known as 'Bly'; trainer of the year, Ashley Clarke; assessor of the year, Karen Wilmot; nipper parent of the year, Jacinta Day; and youth surf lifesaver of the year, Tom May. Of course, that built up to the momentous award of 2018 club of the year. I want to congratulate the leadership of the club, particularly Andrew Chandler, who recently left the presidency after, I think, six years in that role. He was replaced by Dr Glen Patten, who takes on the leadership of the club in the president's role.

Seacliff Surf Life Saving Club is one of quite a number of clubs providing a service around South Australia's metropolitan and regional coastline. It has really demonstrated what a surf club should be: a place where community is built and nurtured, and where skills are provided to the community, while of course ensuring that our beaches are kept a bit safer, thanks to the service they give. Congratulations to Seacliff, all their members and their leadership team.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (12:55): I rise to welcome all those who are coming here from around the world to compete in this fantastic competition. Adelaide is the first place to hold the Lifesaving World Championships twice, which is a great achievement for our state. I want to commend all those involved in surf lifesaving and also the team at the South Australian Tourism Commission who worked hard to get this.

Our government funded this bid, which will bring millions of dollars of economic activity into South Australia. I just hope that the cuts this new government has delivered to the South Australian Tourism Commission do not mean that we miss out on these sorts of events. We have had eight months of the new government and no new major events have been announced in that time, which is pretty worrying to a lot of the people I speak with in the visitor economy.

One thing we know about mass participation events such as the Lifesaving World Championships and the Masters Games is that so many people come here and have a great time then go home and tell their families that they should come back for another stay in beautiful South Australia. That is after they have already pumped millions of dollars into our economy. I wish them all a great competition and a safe competition, and I hope that competitors from South Australia, around Australia and indeed around the world have a terrific time in Adelaide.

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (12:56): I rise to support the member for Morphett's motion. I also extend my congratulations to the Glenelg Surf Club and the South Australia Aquatic and Leisure Centre, as they are set to host the Lifesaving World Championships for the second time in six years. There are two fantastic surf clubs in the Colton electorate: the Henley Beach Surf Life Saving Club and the West Beach Surf Life Saving Club. Both clubs have teams entered in the competition.

We have an incredibly strong history of surf lifesaving in our local community, and that is highlighted by the number of competitors from both clubs competing in the world championships this week. The West Beach Surf Life Saving Club has 103 athletes competing: 51 are participating in the boat categories, 27 in the masters competition, 13 in the opens and 12 in the youth category, which is very exciting. If you look at that list of names, you will see that a number cross over within families. There are mothers competing next to their daughters, fathers next to sons and husbands and wives

competing together. This highlights the strong family nature that exists within surf clubs in South Australia.

The Henley Beach Surf Life Saving Club also have a large number of competitors entered this year, with five surf boat crews, 16 masters competitors and 12 seniors. It is also worth noting that they have a 17-year-old Indigenous student from Wiltja Boarding college, who took part in the club's Indigenous program and has gone on to formally compete at the surf lifesaving championships. They are a passionate group at Henley and they do a fantastic job in ensuring there is an equal opportunity for everybody in our community to get involved in surf sports if they so wish.

As we get closer to the summer months, it is exciting for many in our community. They have the opportunity to dust off the boardies and the bathers and get ready to come down to our beach. It is at this point, as we move into summer, that we really need to recognise the number of volunteer hours that our surf lifesavers provide each and every year. We thank them for their service. I know at times they are potentially overlooked and not recognised in the same way as other emergency services such as the SES, CFS and MFS, but they are a vital emergency service. They keep our beaches safe and our coastal communities stronger and healthier each and every year.

On behalf of our community, I wish the West Beach Surf Life Saving Club and the Henley Beach Surf Life Saving Club all the very best as their competitors line up for the Lifesaving World Championships later in the week. I am sure they will make our community very proud.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (12:59): I thank all those who have spoken to the motion. I wish all the competitors the best of luck over the upcoming two weeks.

Motion carried.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

Petitions

SERVICE SA MODBURY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Presented a petition signed by 100 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government not to proceed with the proposed closure of the Service SA Modbury Branch announced as a cost-saving measure in the 2018-19 state budget.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. V.A. Chapman) on behalf of the Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Electricity Industry Superannuation Scheme—Annual Report 2017-18
 Essential Services Commission of South Australia—Annual Report 2017-18
 Return to Work SA—Annual Report 2017-18
 SA Metropolitan Fire Service Superannuation Scheme—Annual Report 2017-18
 State of the Sector—Annual Report 2017-18

By the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development (Hon. T.J. Whetstone)—

ForestrySA—Annual Report 2017-18

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

Coast Protection Board—Annual Report 2017-18
 Native Vegetation Council—Annual Report 2017-18

*Parliamentary Committees***LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:11): I bring up the 11th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

*Question Time***MINISTER FOR POLICE**

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): My question is to the Deputy Premier. Can the Deputy Premier explain why the Minister for Police, corrections and road safety is not present in the chamber today, given that the opposition has questions for him? I understand that he doesn't have a pair.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:12): Mr Speaker, I suggest that the question is actually disorderly. Nevertheless, I am happy to indicate—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —to the Leader of the Opposition, who may not be entirely familiar with the rules and standing orders of our house; I know he is newly here—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have allowed the question. Let us hear the answer, please. Deputy Premier. Thank you.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —that we as members of the government, of course, take responsibility—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —for the government in relation to answering questions, as we should. As is well known to you, Mr Speaker, if not to those on the other side, we are here and of course we will be happy to take questions.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens has been called to order and now he is warned.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Should the Leader of the Opposition have any questions specifically in relation to matters in the portfolios of the Minister for Police or corrections or indeed sport and racing—I will be really good on those. Nevertheless, we will be very happy to take those questions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader is called to order. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

NOARLUNGA CENTRE INCIDENT

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General advise whether the 20-year-old man now charged with the murder of a mother of two at Noarlunga Centre on 25 October recently completed a term of imprisonment?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:13): As the Leader of the Opposition would well know, the death arising in respect of the Noarlunga Centre matter is a matter—

The SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, I also caution the member that if a matter is before the courts, obviously the sub judice rule may apply. I will allow that to be to your discretion, Deputy Premier.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will just conclude my sentence by saying that, accordingly, it is a matter before the courts and therefore it isn't proper that we provide detail in relation to either—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I realise that some on the other side—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We have the question. Let's hear the answer.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —may not understand why we have the sub judice rule, but perhaps let me explain to them. They have been ministers. Some of them have been ministers—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! We have the question.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —and one of the things that is very important is that the antecedents of the alleged offender must not be compromised in relation to public statements that are made that might in some way prejudice either the successful prosecution or, indeed, the unfair acquittal of a matter that is before the court, so I won't be answering a question—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: I bet you won't.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Even the member for West Torrens, who frankly should know better, who has been a minister in various portfolios in government, would understand the significance of this—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The member for West Torrens JP—

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, please! Please, Deputy Premier, do not respond to interjections. I'm listening to this answer. Let's hear the answer, please.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Whatever the qualifications of others, I make it very clear on behalf of the government that, should there be a circumstance where commentary is made publicly either in this parliament or otherwise that might adversely affect the proper administration of matters before the court, we would—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Again, they clearly don't understand the rules. The antecedents, which refer to the prior history, including the criminal history of a matter, including—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier has the call.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —any alleged prior criminal history, are not a matter that should be properly—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Alleged.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens, please!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —before a public arena whilst this matter is being dealt with in the courts. The Leader of the Opposition has the benefit of a senior counsel in his own team. He can get advice on this, but I don't think I can make it any clearer.

NOARLUNGA CENTRE INCIDENT

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General advise if the 20-year-old man has ever been denied parole?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:16): Again, that is a matter which, for the reasons that have been said in the previous answer, I won't be making a comment on. I would ask the Leader of the Opposition, if he is not prepared to get advice on this matter and understand the significance—the gravity—of the consequences of proceeding with public statements—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: It's a bit rich coming from you, isn't it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —when there is a matter before the courts, including the antecedents—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: It didn't bother you in opposition.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens has been warned.

Mr Picton: Let's talk about that Hillier murder. When did you ask questions on that?

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I would ask him to get advice. If, as there have been on occasions in the past where there are existing matters, a private briefing on a confidential basis is appropriate, I will make some inquiry about that, but I just point out to the opposition—

Mr Malinauskas: You gladly spoke about Deboo yesterday.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —the importance of not prejudicing what would be the otherwise lawful and appropriate prosecution in a case.

TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:17): My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister update the house on the Northern Connector project and how many jobs have been created in the north?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:17): Thank you—

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

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —Mr Speaker. I was going to say that, in relation to my portfolio, especially long-term infrastructure projects, there is a degree of bipartisanship that needs to exist in this portfolio.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: It's necessary because these projects exist for longer than the lifetime of governments. What the South Australian people really want to see is that, when a new government comes in, instead of just scrapping all the things that were happening before because it was what the former guys were doing, we actually take each project on its merits and continue forward to make sure that we don't—in the case of the Andrews Victorian government—spend billions

of dollars trying to wind up projects before they begin or ones that are in construction and actually continue to move forward and help grow South Australia.

The Northern Connector project is part of the continuous north-south corridor, which has been a bipartisan objective of not only this state parliament but also the federal parliament for the better part of a decade.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens has interjected at least three times between the first warning and this second warning. He is now warned for a second time.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: It's exciting that this project does continue to move forward. I was lucky enough to go out on site with the Premier a couple of weeks ago and look at the first pouring of the concrete slabs that are going to make up the 15½ kilometre road, with the vast majority of that being concrete. What is also exciting is that last Friday, at the Transport and Infrastructure Council, there was some discussion of this project and the fact that the procurement model and—

Mr Malinauskas: I'm sure you gave us due credit.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Actually, I did, and I was just about to. This project and the model under which it was procured and the local outcomes that have been achieved have been fantastic, and it is something that this government has sought to continue. Also, the ability to help second and third-tier contractors to be able to move forward and actually contribute to this project and to help improve the base of skill and talent to be able to deliver these projects in the future is extremely important. I am really excited to see the work of LR&M and CATCON, two companies that have been able to be part of this project, being able to build their skill base so that as we move forward into new projects we have greater competition in this space.

What we need to understand is that this project is underway and it is doing a great job, but we need to understand what comes next. That is a question that this government has progressively sought to answer since coming into government and why in the budget this year \$11.3 billion worth of projects—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition is called to order.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —have been put on the table: a pipeline unrivalled and unmatched in South Australia's history. Securing the funding for the Regency to Pym section of the north-south corridor is extremely important, as is looking at other projects like the Joy Baluch Bridge and Port Wakefield Road. The Gawler electrification is another project where it has needed successive governments to take a bipartisan approach to be able to complete this project. It is one that this government took its responsibility for seriously to ensure that we secured, again, the \$220 million worth of federal funding.

The real question is: what comes next? For these workers on the Northern Connector, the skills that have been created by Lendlease and the way that it has developed that skill base, what comes next? That is why the next stages of the north-south corridor are so important, and it's why we have engaged the best, brightest and smartest in the country to tell us the best way to move forward on the next stages of the project.

This work could have been made easier and done more easily if more homework had been done since March, but since that time we have moved at an extremely quick pace so that we can continue to build and grow that pipeline that is going to secure jobs here in South Australia in the construction industry for decades to come.

NOARLUNGA CENTRE INCIDENT

Mr PICTON (Karna) (14:22): My question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PICTON: My question is to the Attorney-General. Did the Attorney-General receive any advice that the 20-year-old man charged with the murder of a mother of two at Noarlunga Centre on 25 October should be considered as a high-risk offender, as defined by the Criminal Law (High Risk Offenders) Act 2015?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:22): Not that I'm aware of, but I would again urge the member to appreciate that in respect of matters as to the antecedents of the current accused in relation to this matter, it is one that we must ensure we do all that is possible to ensure the lawful—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —we will come back to that another day—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —prosecution, competently executed so that whoever is responsible for this young woman's death is brought to justice. It is a matter that was raised formerly by another member in the house and, again, information has been provided to her but on the clear understanding that this matter should not be in the public arena. I think it is important that where members of parliament have a genuine interest in these matters, and they may be concerned about them, where possible we provide confidential briefings, but what is not appropriate is that there be public statements made about an accused that would in any way—I can see nods from people sitting behind the member about the importance of this—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —that there be a protection of the integrity of that process to ensure that those who are guilty are brought to justice and those who are innocent have proper representation.

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is also—has stopped interjecting. The member for Kaurna has the call.

NOARLUNGA CENTRE INCIDENT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:23): My question is again to the Attorney-General. Did the Attorney-General make an application to the court seeking an extended supervision order before the release of the 20-year-old man who went on to be charged with the murder of a mother of two at Noarlunga Centre on 25 October?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:24): I refer to my previous answer.

NOARLUNGA CENTRE INCIDENT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:24): My question is to the Attorney-General. Did the Attorney-General seek or receive any submissions or briefings from the Parole Board, the correctional services department or any other body or person before the release of the 20-year-old man who went on to be charged with the murder of a mother of two at Noarlunga Centre on 25 October?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:24): I refer to my previous answer.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens can leave. Members, be seated for one moment. The member for West Torrens can leave for 30 minutes under 137A. If he doesn't leave in silence, he will be named.

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

The SPEAKER: The member for Narungga and then the member for Kaurana.

PORT WAKEFIELD OVERPASS

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:24): My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister inform the house on upgrades to Port Wakefield Road in my electorate of Narungga?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:25): I certainly can. I would like to thank the member for Narungga for the question and note his continued interest in roads in his electorate. Before the election, he took the opportunity to take me around parts of Yorke Peninsula that are in desperate need of upgrades to their road network.

This government has listened. As part of our Regional Roads and Infrastructure Fund, we have put \$5 million in the 2018-19 budget to upgrade Port Wakefield Road, a road that is extremely important. It's the gateway to the member for Narungga's electorate and part of regional South Australia that is in desperate need of greater investment. The \$5 million to be able to upgrade that road for all of those tourists, all of those locals, all of those businesses and farmers that use that road, to now have significant funds spent to make sure that it is up to scratch, especially on those sections south of the Port Wakefield township, is really important because it helps to show regional South Australia that they now have a government that is willing to invest in them.

We know that, outside of telecommunications in regional parts of our state, roads are the number one issue because in country South Australia there aren't too many ways to get around unless you've got your own car, and roads are what we use. This government has had a strong focus on making sure that after 16 long years of neglect we are putting money back into regional South Australia and especially for those people who live on Yorke Peninsula.

The member for Narungga and I have been discussing many other priorities that he has for his electorate and that this state government also has for his electorate, not the least of which was the \$90 million that has been put towards finally fixing the Port Wakefield township after so many years. Every single long weekend that I can remember, TV crews will go out and sit there and look at the north of the Port Wakefield township and film the long queues of people trying to get home after a long weekend away. Like clockwork, you can set your watch by the fact that that's a story that's going to run on the nightly news on the last day of a long weekend holiday about residents and tourists coming home and being stuck in massive long queues. That is going to be a thing of the past under this government.

A duplicated Port Wakefield Road and overpass over the highway to make sure that those people coming home to Adelaide from Yorke Peninsula can get home quickly and safely is another example of how this government is investing in regional South Australia. These investments are the first of what are going to be many and significant investments that we make in regional roads right across our state, especially for the member for Narungga and for the people of Yorke Peninsula and the Copper Coast. They can know that they have a government here in South Australia that listens, that is willing to invest money and willing to see the value that exists in regional South Australia.

What we have in Yorke Peninsula is a productive farming area like almost no other in the state. Its ability to continue to churn out consistent crops year after year is a phenomenal boon to this state. The biggest issue is about how we get those export products to market. Again, providing the road infrastructure that's going to support the movement of that produce is extremely important.

I thank the member for Narungga for his advocacy and the fact that we now have a state government in South Australia that regional South Australians can rely on. I look forward to updating

this house further about the many and varied commitments and investments that we're going to continue to make over the life of the Marshall Liberal government.

NOARLUNGA CENTRE INCIDENT

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (14:29): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the Attorney-General instigate an independent investigation into the decision not to apply for an extended supervision order before the release of a 20-year-old man who went on to be charged with the murder of a mother of two at Noarlunga Centre on 25 October?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:29): In respect of the question asserting certain facts, we will check whether that is even the case. But, even in the assumption that there may be some accuracy in relation to them, I will not be.

QUESTION TIME

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): My question is to the Deputy Premier. To whom should questions be addressed regarding the portfolios of police, corrections, emergency services and—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right! I didn't even catch the end of the question. The Deputy Premier has risen. I will give her the call. I would like to hear the answer in silence, please.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe and the member for Playford are called to order. The Deputy Premier has the call.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:30): To the government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: At the moment, I think all the questions—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Industry is warned. The Deputy Premier has the call.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —to date have been addressed to me as Attorney-General or deputy, and I am happy to continue to take those questions.

NOARLUNGA CENTRE INCIDENT

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:30): My question is to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Correctional Services. Did the Minister for Correctional Services seek or receive any submissions or briefing from the Parole Board, from Corrections, before the release of a 20-year-old man who went on to be charged with the murder of a mother of two at Noarlunga Centre on 25 October?

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is warned. Deputy Premier.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:30): Well, I don't know the answer to that question, but what I can say is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! It is unparliamentary to reflect on a member who may or may not be in the chamber.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! The Deputy Premier has the call. I am listening to the answer.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —that even if I did, I would repeat the concerns raised in the previous questions—that is, to assert allegations in relation to a matter, in particular an accused, before the criminal courts, I don't want, and I don't think anyone in this chamber would want, there to be grounds for a mistrial in relation to a matter as a result of irresponsible public statements being made—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —by anyone in this house. So I make it quite clear that, even if the opposition members want to ask questions that offend that principle, our government won't be.

RURAL BUSINESS SUPPORT

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:32): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on how funding for Rural Business Support will assist agricultural and horticultural industries in South Australia?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:32): Yes I can, and I thank the member for Kavel for his very important question. He, like many on this side of the house, understands the importance of Rural Business Support here in South Australia and the great work they are currently doing with the farming sector. The state government has provided an extra \$260,000 to Rural Business Support to continue providing important rural financial counselling services to farmers beyond 2020.

By providing the funding in the recent state budget, South Australia's commitment aligns with the federal government's agreement for regional business services. By way of background, Rural Business Support is a not-for-profit organisation providing services to help South Australian and Northern Territory farmers make business decisions. It is headed up by Brett Smith, who is doing an outstanding job, I must say. Brett has assisted me in going out to regional communities and providing essential information that farmers are looking for to get themselves through some of the tough areas in our state.

The government is supporting our farmers during these tough times. As well, the government has recently passed the Farm Debt Mediation Bill, a great initiative that is long overdue for our farming businesses. I have recently announced eight Family and Business Support mentors to complement the RBS. I experienced the FaB Scout program myself during the Millennium Drought, and there is no doubt that the FaB scouts save lives, marriages and farming businesses, and they also keep communities and small regional communities together.

RBS undertakes a number of important initiatives, including the Rural Financial Counselling Service and the Farm Business Strategic Review, covering over 328,000 kilometres to meet with families in the 2017-18 year, which is equivalent to 18 laps of the Earth. I think that's an outstanding achievement.

During the last financial year, the RBS staff visited 148 postcodes, 543 families and provided over 7,500 hours of direct farm support, sitting around the kitchen table, giving those farming businesses the help that they need. RBS welcomes the state budget announcement, coupled with the provision of additional federal government funding. It's also cementing certainty in the Rural Financial Counselling Services with South Australian farmers.

The RBS has increased the team to include 13 full-time equivalent rural financial counsellors and support staff to ensure the ongoing strong demand for services is met and managed well. RBS is also assisting oyster growers after the impact from POMS. I note that this state government has put money into the budget—\$1.6 million in fee waivers in the recent state budget.

Mr Hughes interjecting:

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: We put the money in the budget. You talked; we acted. What I would say is that the financial counsellors across the state are assisting farmers with their

paperwork, processing applications for the Farm Household Allowance. Again, the RBS is also involved in working with the SA Country Women's Association to help eligible families apply for the assistance held by the Australian Red Cross and the Country Women's Association for all donations. On this side, we care, and hashtag #RegionsMatter.

Mr Hughes: Unless you're in the Flinders Ranges Council area.

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

NOARLUNGA CENTRE INCIDENT

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Police. Did the Minister for Police seek or receive any submission or briefing from SAPOL before the release of the 20-year-old man who went on to be charged with the murder of a mother of two at Noarlunga Centre on 25 October?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members of the opposition! The member for Badcoe, please, will cease interjecting. Could you please repeat the question.

Mr ODENWALDER: Why?

The SPEAKER: Because I didn't hear it, because there were a lot of interjections, member for Elizabeth, by you amongst others. Member for Elizabeth, please.

Mr ODENWALDER: My question is to the Minister for Police.

Honourable members: Welcome!

Mr ODENWALDER: Welcome. Did the Minister for Police seek or receive any submission or briefing from SAPOL before the release of the 20-year-old man who went on to be charged with the murder of a mother of two at Noarlunga Centre on 25 October?

The SPEAKER: Deputy Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! The member for Cheltenham is called to order, the member for Giles is called to order, the Leader of the Opposition is warned, the member for Lee is warned for a second time, the member for Kaurana is warned and the member for Playford is warned. Deputy Premier.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:37): Thank you, Mr Speaker. As the member has—

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: Muzzled!

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —I think been listening to carefully, and as a former member of the police force, I think he would be well aware of the importance of ensuring—

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: 'Of parliamentary, yes she's—' what?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —that conduct—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members will be departing shortly if this continues; I put you on notice.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —either in this house or publicly anywhere doesn't act to prejudice the proper administration of the prosecution of a case before the courts. The comment has

been made, 'Well, what about other cases like the case of Hillier?' That's a concluded matter, so let me just—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No, let me just raise the distinguishing—

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Let me just raise the distinguishing feature that seems to have either inconveniently escaped the memory or attention of members of the opposition. The case of Hillier, which as some would remember is a circumstance where a man was prosecuted and convicted, ultimately, on his own admission—

Dr Close: 'Ultimately.'

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —that's what I said—of the murder of Mrs Rigney and two of her children, is a gruesome reminder of circumstances that went wrong in a number of the protective agencies that we rely on in South Australia. The questions that were asked in this parliament, subsequent to the time of the arrest but prior to the conviction of the accused in that case, exclusively related to the conduct, or lack thereof, of the agencies that were responsible for the care and protection of those children.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee can leave for half an hour under 137A.

The honourable member for Lee having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: They were not questions about the circumstances surrounding alleged—

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite will be joining him shortly.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —prior criminal activity and/or imprisonment and/or parole applications—

Mr ODENWALDER: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: I am not going to take points of order while there is this constant interjecting. I'm sorry. I will listen and ensure that the minister keeps to the substance of the question.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —of the accused in this case. I hope that, even if members of the opposition haven't been listening to that explanation, they will take the time to read it and understand how prejudicial their behaviour is in relation to this matter.

Mr ODENWALDER: Point of order, sir: the point of order is relevance, sir. I asked the minister—

The SPEAKER: Debate. Is the Deputy Premier finishing? She's finished. The Deputy Premier has finished. I'll switch to the member for MacKillop. I'll come back to the member for Elizabeth.

COAST PROTECTION BOARD

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister update the house on how the recently delivered Coast Protection Board grants will benefit regional coastal communities?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:40): Thank you, member for MacKillop, for your interest in our coastal environment. Obviously, your electorate has a substantial coastline, and it is a coastline that will benefit from the recently announced Coast Protection Board grants. Of course, this government has made, prior to becoming the government of South Australia, a very clear commitment to coastal protection and a substantial increase in funding for coastal protection activities, whether that be our research and development fund, which

we are setting up to pilot projects and programs around coastal protection, or our creation of natural reefs or sand replenishment activities on the metropolitan coastline.

We have identified that our 5,067 kilometres of coastline in South Australia not only contribute significantly to the lifestyle enjoyed by South Australians and the economic input potentially through tourism activities but also form the front line in the defence against climate change in this state with increasing storm events, the potential to see sea level rises and erosion that is a consequence of that, combined with the ever present impact that human activity has on our coastline.

We have identified particular vulnerabilities and we have made it very much our commitment during our time in government to tackle some of these big challenges. Often those challenges are characterised along the metropolitan coastline, around 100 kilometres of metro coastline that have particular challenges. But of course the vast majority of our coastline in South Australia is found in regional communities and plays such an important role in that regional lifestyle, the regional quality of life and the regional environmental resilience that is so important.

The coast protection grants, \$325,000 in total, leveraging about \$650,000 in investment overall, will see the vast majority of funding go to regional communities to help regional councils undertake, in some cases, practical works and, in other cases, research and development studies in order to understand the coastline better. In your own district that you represent, member for MacKillop, we have funding going to Kingston council, Wattle Range Council and Robe council to tackle coast protection matters there. We are also seeing funding going over to Whyalla council, Streaky Bay council on Eyre Peninsula, and also being directed towards Mount Remarkable council for a project there.

One of the projects that is receiving funding in the South-East of the state is one that I referred to last week in parliament, which was the Wattle Range Council's work that has been done around Southend Beach and which recently won a Premier's climate change award for the adaptation and planning work that has been undertaken there around the coast to ensure that coast has the resilience to deal with the change in climate and the particular impacts that are associated with our coastline with regard to this. This government's commitment to coast protection is strong and practical, and no doubt there will be many other opportunities to share with the house about some of the actions that we are taking to protect our state's coastline.

NOARLUNGA CENTRE INCIDENT

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Did the minister or his department consult with the Parole Board before the release of the 20-year-old man who went on to be charged with the murder of a mother of two at Noarlunga Centre on 25 October?

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Kaurna is warned for a second and final time.

Mr Hughes interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles is also warned.

Ms Stinson: I can see why you didn't bother coming earlier.

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe is also warned.

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Cheltenham is surely not interjecting? The Deputy Premier has the call. I would like to hear the answer, please.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:44): Whilst the member continues questions such as this, it is disappointing to note that it appears he hasn't fully

understood the gravity of the potential consequences of public statements in relation to a man who is currently—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —accused—

Mr Picton: This is about your actions, your government's actions.

The SPEAKER: Member for Kaurna, I am sorry, I will ask you to respectfully leave for half an hour, please, under 137A.

The honourable member for Kaurna having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —in relation to this matter. And to even assume that someone who is currently charged with the contemporary offences that he is, that there has been some antecedence of prior criminal conduct before that trial is concluded can be prejudicial, and I would ask the member to please respect the reason we have the principle of not dealing with matters in the public arena while something is sub judice. It is there for good reason. We want the people who are guilty to be properly and lawfully prosecuted, and we want the people who are innocent—

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hurtle Vale is called to order.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: We don't want the prejudice, and even the question, which continues to assert that there is some antecedence of the current accused, may fall foul of that principle, and that is the concern that we continue to raise. I do not think I can make it any clearer. I am happy to give a briefing to the member.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The members of this government, as I have said, are not going to breach—

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —that principle in a circumstance where it could prejudice the lawful prosecution of someone who is before the courts. That is our position. I can't stop other members of the parliament making statements, but let it be clear: we will not be responsible on this side for a mistrial or a failure to lawfully prosecute someone who may or may not be innocent or guilty in this case, but I want that person to be lawfully prosecuted.

I want the person who is responsible for this young woman's death in Noarlunga Centre brought to account, and I don't want it interrupted or prejudiced by the irresponsible conduct of anyone, let alone people who are in this parliament who should know better.

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hurtle Vale is called to order and warned. The member for Elizabeth and then the member for Elder.

NOARLUNGA CENTRE INCIDENT

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:47): My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Was any assessment made by the department or any other body into the potential for reoffending by the 20-year-old man who went on to be charged with the murder of a mother of two at Noarlunga Centre on 25 October?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:47): The member full knows the matter has been traversed many times—I thought clearly; it seems not. If the member continues to ask questions about the 20 year old currently charged with the murder of the woman at Noarlunga Centre that in any way serve to prejudice the lawful and proper trial of that matter, this government will not be complicit in it. We will not answer a question while the matter is sub judice that will affect that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —and will offend it. Now, the member is well aware—

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —and I would have thought his own training as a former police officer would be helpful, more than any other member across the other side except the member for Enfield SC, who might be able to give some advice.

HOME BATTERY SCHEME

Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:48): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister please update the house on how the priority period for local manufacturers is going as part of the Home Battery Scheme?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:48): Thank very much, member for Elder—a terrific question. It is very important to fully understand all the many benefits of our energy policy. Of course, our highest priority is to make electricity more affordable and more reliable, but it is not the only thing we hope to achieve through this policy.

As the member would know, we are offering subsidies of up to \$6,000 per household for the purchase of a new battery attached to solar, and of course, importantly, low-interest loans for the balance of the purchase price, plus the purchase of new solar for their home if they would like to have that as well. It is an outstanding opportunity by any measure.

Not only do those homes, those families, those households that take up this opportunity benefit themselves directly with regard to their energy consumption and cost but, by doing that, all other South Australian electricity consumers will benefit as well by taking demand away from peak demand times, thus reducing the pressure, thus reducing the price, which will then flow through to all other energy consumers.

While this is one of the planks of our energy policy, we are doing everything we possibly can to achieve more from this component of our policy. As the member for Elder quite rightly points out, there is a priority period attached to this policy, which we announced about three weeks ago. As part of that announcement, we made it very clear that for the first nine weeks of the four-year program—keeping in mind that we intend to have an additional 40,000 households equipped with battery and solar combined over four years through this policy—we are offering a priority period to battery manufacturers and/or assemblers who do the manufacture or the assembly here in South Australia.

We think that's very fair for those businesses that are contributing more than just the supply of the batteries, but also the assembly or the manufacture of them here in South Australia, to have that bit of a head start. Nine weeks out of four years do not significantly disadvantage other suppliers, and we have about 20 of them waiting to join the program in early December, but, very importantly, we want to contribute to the South Australian economy in as many ways as possible, not only through cheaper electricity.

As members would know, the German company Sonnen was announced as going to start assembly and manufacture here in South Australia, but today we have announced that another international company, Alpha ESS—and, for those who are interested, ESS stands for 'energy storage system'—has also met the criteria for local assembly and manufacture, so they join in the three weeks. For them, they only have about six weeks left because they weren't here at the initial

time. They weren't able to be there at the start, so they don't get the full benefit. They will, importantly, manufacture from mid-2019, but in the meantime they are using Minda to help them with assembly here in South Australia, which is absolutely terrific in many, many ways. Let me just share some information from Mr Dong Lin on behalf of that company:

As one of the earliest pioneers in energy storage market, Alpha ESS was naturally interested in South Australia's Home Battery Scheme.

We believe it is one of the most ambitious government led schemes we have seen and it was a major draw card in attracting Alpha ESS to South Australia.

We are very pleased to announce Alpha ESS will be supplying batteries to South Australian households during the nine week priority period.

NOARLUNGA CENTRE INCIDENT

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:52): My question is again to the Minister for Correctional Services. Did the Department for Correctional Services or any other body conduct a mental health or any type of assessment before the release of the 20-year-old man who went on to be charged with murder at Noarlunga Centre on 25 October?

Mr Ellis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Narungga is called to order and warned. The Deputy Premier has the call.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:53): On behalf of the government, I refer to my previous answer.

The SPEAKER: Member for Elizabeth.

Mr Odenwalder: I missed the answer, sorry.

The SPEAKER: Well, you have to listen more carefully—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: —and members should cease interjecting. You have the call, sir. Member for Elizabeth.

NOARLUNGA CENTRE INCIDENT

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:53): I could have had a supplementary, sir. But, in any case, I will go on to my question for the Minister for Correctional Services.

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite can leave for half an hour.

The honourable member for Waite having withdrawn from the chamber:

Mr ODENWALDER: He's been doing it all day, sir.

The SPEAKER: He has.

Mr ODENWALDER: Do I have the call?

The SPEAKER: The member for Elizabeth has the call.

Mr ODENWALDER: My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Was a case management coordinator appointed prior to the release of the 20-year-old man who went on to be charged with murder at Noarlunga Centre on 25 October?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:54): On behalf of the government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I would like to hear this answer, please. The Deputy Premier has the call.

Ms Hildyard: Why don't some of you come forward and answer?

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: On behalf of the government, I refer to my previous answer.

NOARLUNGA CENTRE INCIDENT

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:54): My question is again to the Minister for Correctional Services. Minister, prior to the release of the 20-year-old man charged with the murder of a mother of two at Noarlunga Centre on 25 October, was any assessment conducted to determine a priority category in relation to housing?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:54): On behalf of the government, I do refer to my previous answer but, in an attempt to assist the member, any reference to the assertion—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —that the person currently charged in the case that has been identified as being in custody, having any prior record, or having any approach in that regard is all potentially prejudicial. These are not matters that can be assumed and they are not matters that can be properly before a court, especially a jury, which may or may not occur in this case, for the proper administration of justice for that trial. Any antecedents of the accused in this matter which could prejudice the both lawful and effective trial of this matter are being put at risk by continuing to ask questions in relation to the antecedents of the accused.

HOME BATTERY SCHEME

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister update the house on the local partnerships and opportunities being created by the Home Battery Scheme?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:55): Thank you, member for Colton, who again, like other members on the government side, takes a deep interest in this. Members are familiar with the program; I won't go through the details of it again.

The member asked specifically about local partnerships, which are very important. The Marshall Liberal government is trying to get as much value as possible for all South Australians through this Home Battery Scheme. It is one of the reasons why, through the Home Battery Scheme, we are offering higher subsidies for lower income households. We think that is very fair. The households on lower incomes typically deserve a bit more support, so we are offering \$500 per kilowatt hour capacity for the battery for most households and offering \$600 per kilowatt hour capacity for those households that have an energy concession.

In that same spirit, we were very happy to hear that Alpha ESS, one of the priority partners, as I just described in my last answer, is partnering with Minda to assemble their battery. They have qualified to be a priority partner and reap the benefits of the early period by virtue of the fact that they are going to have their batteries assembled immediately here in South Australia and then manufactured here from the middle of next year.

Isn't it outstanding that Minda will partner with Alpha ESS? Not only will we have local economic boosts and additional jobs here in South Australia that didn't exist before, not only do we look forward to the benefit of 100 to 120 jobs from the middle of next year when they start their manufacturing, but immediately people working at Minda, an outstanding organisation that supports people with a range of particular challenges in their lives who might find it difficult to get employment in the mainstream market opportunities, will be involved in assembling these Alpha ESS batteries.

I think it is a great credit to the company forming that partnership here in South Australia. It is really wonderful. Just as we have offered a greater subsidy to lower income households, they are offering additional employment to people who find it more difficult than most to find employment. It is

truly outstanding. Our other priority partner, Sonnen, the German company, are setting up their manufacturing facility in Elizabeth on the site of the old Holden factory, and they are actually employing 400 people, perhaps up to 450 people, over the next period as they ramp up. Many of them will be very highly skilled, capable, motivated, local former GMH workers.

I think this is another outstanding partnership that is being formed out of our Home Battery Scheme in addition to the core priorities of reducing electricity prices and making it more affordable. To have people working at Minda being given greater opportunities, to have people who formerly worked at GMH and, of course, many other people from around metropolitan Adelaide, and primarily from the northern suburbs and the Elizabeth area, being given new and greater employment opportunities as one of the many additional benefits that we always intended to deliver through the Home Battery Scheme is truly outstanding for the people of South Australia. We also intend, in the spirit of the question from the member for Colton, to develop a very positive productive supply chain, which will contribute to our economy enormously over the next decade or two.

NOARLUNGA CENTRE INCIDENT

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:59): My question is to the Attorney-General. Why was the 20-year-old man charged with the offence of murder at Noarlunga Centre—

Mr TEAGUE: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: I don't think I can have a point of order until I have heard the entire question, member for Heysen, with all respect. I would like to hear the question, and then if the member—

The Hon. A. Piccolo: That's a bogus point of order.

The SPEAKER: It's not a bogus point of order, member for Light, and you can leave for half an hour, please. I will not hear any points of order until I have the entirety of the question. The member for West Torrens is entitled to ask a question, just like any other member is. I will listen to the question. Member for Light, you will leave for half an hour, please.

The honourable member for Light having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, I would like to hear the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My question is to the Attorney-General. Why was the 20-year-old man charged with the offence of murder at Noarlunga Centre on 20 October not subject to a supervision order under the Criminal Law (High Risk Offenders) Act available to the Attorney-General?

Mr TEAGUE: Point of order: standing order 1.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr TEAGUE: 'Usages of House of Commons to be observed, unless other provision is made.' I observe that the UK House of Commons has declared, by resolutions of that house in 1963, 1972 and 2001 at least, a convention that is born of the desire of parliament to 'prevent comment and debate from exerting an influence on juries and from prejudicing the position of parties and witnesses in court proceedings'. I ask you, Mr Speaker, to rule the question out of order.

The SPEAKER: It is the sub judice rule. I uphold the point of order. Would the member for West Torrens like to amend the question? I will give him the option to. I will give him the option. We have been talking about this today. The member for West Torrens has the call. If not, I will come back to him.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Despite the precedent, sir: why didn't the Attorney-General make an application for a supervision order under the Criminal Law (High Risk Offenders) Act in relation to a 20-year-old man charged with murder at Noarlunga Centre on 20 October?

The SPEAKER: Would the Deputy Premier like to take that question?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:02): I will—

The SPEAKER: I will allow it.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —to the extent that I appreciate that the member for West Torrens may not have been listening attentively to all of question time today. But for his benefit can I just say two things. Firstly, no-one in this government will act in a manner that will breach the sub judice rule that will in any way affect the proper application of justice in relation to a matter that is currently before the courts—that is No. 1.

No. 2 is that the distinguishable feature about the Hillier case, which I will repeat for the benefit of the member for West Torrens, is one that involved the charging and subsequent conviction on admission of guilt of a person for the murder of a mother and her two children. It was a most gruesome case. People are familiar with it. During the course of that matter, but prior to the conviction of the then accused, questions were asked in this parliament about the application in respect of the particular contact that the victims in that case may have had with agencies of the Crown.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir: relevance and debate. The question was very specific.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right! Member for West Torrens, I have the point of order. The deputy—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, I take it there's a moot motion of dissent from the government in respect of—

The SPEAKER: I have the question—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No? Okay.

The SPEAKER: I have the question. Minister for Industry, I will rule whether the question is out of order or not. The first one was definitely; the second one I have allowed. The Deputy Premier has answered the question or started to answer the question. I have the point of order from the member for West Torrens. I will listen attentively to ensure that the Deputy Premier sticks to the substance of the question, but I will rule that that question is also on the cusp.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: And in relation to questions about the victims of a case and their association or contact with any criminal case that might be pending, in some circumstances can affect the sub judice rule, I agree.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: But in relation to whether a child who has been a victim in a murder or unexplained death, may or may not have had in relation to government agencies—in the Hillier case in relation to the department of children's services—and I think police questions were asked in relation to that, as to the protection or lack thereof in respect of those children in the lead-up to their deaths. They are very serious issues.

Can I just urge members, all members here today, to read the Child Death and Serious Injury report that was tabled in parliament yesterday. It's a sobering read in relation to the deaths of children that occur in South Australia and the incidence of which is known to agencies, which frankly should have been there to protect them. It's incumbent on all of us to do two things here: one is obviously to protect those who are vulnerable and ultimately victims in our criminal system and, secondly, to make sure that those who are guilty are prosecuted and that they don't escape by some idiot in a parliament asking questions that would fracture that opportunity.

WINE INDUSTRY FUNDING

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:06): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on how the state government is supporting innovative technology to help wine grapegrowers?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:06): I certainly can, and I thank the member for Hammond for his important question. I know that he is at the forefront of technology in agriculture. We are looking at how we can also use some of that technology in the vineyards of South Australia.

The state government has recently approved \$134,000 in funding from the South Australian Wine Industry Development Scheme to Riverland Wine for a project focused on real-time technology in vineyards. This technology and this trial will benefit the wine industry statewide. Riverland Wine put this project up, and it has been awarded to them for the great work that both Chris Byrne and all the Riverland Wine growers are undertaking as we speak. Riverland Wine has partnered with Wine Australia and the University of Adelaide to create a digital vineyard guidance system. The pilot project will utilise existing vineyard devices, such as soil moisture monitoring, evaporation sensors, and use a digital platform to filter the data.

This could be a game-changer for the wine industry. For a number of years, the wine industry has been under severe pressure to be globally competitive, and the South Australian wine industry in particular generates over 70 per cent of the nation's premium wines. I know in the Riverland that of the 460,000 tonnes of premium wine 98 per cent is exported. It's an outstanding achievement. However, what we are going to see is changing technology in how we can monitor vineyards, how we can use data and how we are going to help inputs into vineyards but, just as importantly, it is about improving the quality of our fruit in the vineyards to even better the product that we put onto shelves.

The project came about after leading academics from the University of Adelaide's School of Engineering, Computing and Mathematical Sciences—titled as 'The thinking 10 meets the nerdy nine'—met in the Riverland with wine grapegrowers. That was the turning point, where the university, the wine industry and Riverland Wine came together and brought feedback that was received and is now generating technology and bringing that to the fore.

I look forward to seeing the results of this project, but what is really important to me, as a previous wine grapegrower, is that we now have to reduce our carbon footprint. We have to reduce tractor hours in a vineyard. We have to decrease man hours and tractor hours as well as our inputs into growing the grapevine products that we do. Being globally competitive, driving innovation, keeping the South Australian wine industry at the cutting edge of a global wine sector is critically important to the future of the wine sector here.

I know that many of us enjoy a drop, but more and more people globally are taking advantage of free trade agreements. More and more people in our trading nations are now tasting the great product that comes from South Australia. I commend all of the wine industry—the winemakers, the grapegrowers, the promoters and the wine industry at large—for the great work they're doing in promoting an industry that is rapidly growing to be one of the great commodity drivers to South Australia's economy.

QUESTION TIME

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:10): My question is to the Minister for Education. In future, will the government advise the opposition of ministers who will not be present in question time, as has been the past practice of the house as a courtesy to the opposition, so we know how to formulate our questions and to whom they are to be formulated?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:10): The opposition will be advised of ministers who aren't going to be in question time. I make it clear that the Attorney-General has been, for a period during question time today, representing the Minister for Police. The opposition, however, is yet to ask a question of the Minister for Police that would be appropriately asked of him.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elizabeth.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

NOARLUNGA CENTRE INCIDENT

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (15:10): My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Is the minister aware of what living arrangements the 20-year-old man who went on to be

charged with the murder of a mother of two at Noarlunga Centre on 25 October entered into upon his release?

Mr Hughes interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles is warned. The Deputy Premier has the call.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:11): I despair at the persistence of a matter which could prejudice the proper administration of a case, which attempts—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: What about giving \$2½ million to an accused murderer?

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Is that not prejudicial?

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: That's a good point.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —to join up the accommodation arrangements of an accused in a murder case with some knowledge by a Minister for Correctional Services, the presumption being that in some way there must be some association with the accommodation arrangements of this particular person, whether he is known or otherwise, to the Minister for Correctional Services. Again, I urge the opposition to exercise some level of responsibility in this matter. If they have sensible questions—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —in relation to—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —matters other than this particular case in relation to the operation of the government's enterprise, then we are happy to consider them.

Grievance Debate

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS

Mr GEE (Taylor) (15:12): I rise today to talk about the recent council elections and also Remembrance Day. I think most people, especially most people in my community, are pretty glad now that the council elections are almost over. I want to congratulate all the successful councillors and mayors who have been or will shortly be elected in the Adelaide Plains, Playford and Salisbury council areas, and commiserate with all those who were unsuccessful in gaining or retaining a position.

One of the things I found interesting to see this time around was the number of posters that candidates had displayed on poles around the areas. Some candidates must have spent a small fortune. Many would now be questioning the wisdom of purchasing those posters. I have to question the value of posters in general in elections if candidates are not also campaigning on street corners and in and around shopping centres and going from door to door, talking to residents.

Most of the residents I have spoken to during this election indicated that they would be more likely to vote for candidates they have met than those they had just seen in photos on a pole. Not only is it more enjoyable to doorknock and meet the real characters who tell you all the great stories that inspire us and that we often talk about in this place but it is where we find out the main issues that residents feel strongly about. It is also where we find our community activists.

I think this is one of the most brutal council campaigns statewide, with accusations of racism and gender politics, stealing and vandalism of posters and other materials. A real concern is the rise

of online activists, whose only strategy appears to be to destroy a person's reputation with one post and the subsequent comments attached to that post.

In some areas of Playford, you would have been forgiven for thinking that a state or federal election was underway, based on the amount of advertising and activity. It appears that it has become the norm now for local government elections. I believe that candidates in future local government elections should declare their political affiliation or their independence. I look forward to working with and assisting the new council members wherever possible.

I want to talk about the promises. I think I can confidently say that most candidates promised lower rates, but lower rates will mean fewer services if extravagant spending is not reined in: no more trips overseas or interstate, unless there is a demonstrated benefit, and no more funding for golf memberships. I want to see how the new councillors deliver these lower rates. There are also the perennial promises of better roads, footpaths and reserves.

Let us hope that the basics are delivered for the benefit of all residents not just a few. Given that voting is voluntary, those who did vote expect councillors to deliver on those promises. I was pleased to see the rise in nominations across the state, especially from women and our multicultural communities, and the success that female candidates enjoyed in the elections, particularly in mayoral contests.

Last Sunday, it was an honour to attend a special Remembrance Day service at Smithfield in my electorate to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the signing of the armistice to end the war that was to end all wars. Sadly, it turned out not to be the case, and we continue to have our young men and women deployed across the world. The service was organised by the Royal Australian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers Association of South Australia. It was a fitting service, with the Angle Vale and Edinburgh Park scout groups, students from Sacred Heart College and the Playford City Concert Band attending. I thank them all for their participation, and I thank RAEME chairman, Allan Weeks, for the invitation to attend.

I also attended the armistice dinner last Saturday night at the Salisbury RSL. I would like to thank President Don Prider for what turned out to be a very enjoyable night, chatting with many veterans about their experiences.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:17): I rise today to speak about the police graduation ceremony for Course 30 that has just completed. I congratulate all those who have signed on to be in our police force; that is, the 23 graduating cadets who are now probationary constables and are going to work tirelessly hard to help protect South Australia.

I am not sure whether I should thank the member for Elizabeth, who agreed to pair and come along to the ceremony but, at the last minute, he decided not to attend the graduation ceremony, which is disappointing. I will talk more about that in a second. His absence was noted by people at the ceremony. However, I would like to thank the member for Mount Gambier, who covered that pair for me so that I could attend that graduation ceremony. It is disappointing when someone says they are going to go to an event and they then withdraw at the last minute and fail to attend. I can understand the frustration of the people who were organising the event at being let down by that. Some might say that it was very slippery and very tricky, but that is the wont of those on the other side of the chamber.

On my way back into the chamber for the last 34 or 35 minutes of question time, I heard the questions that were being asked by the member for Elizabeth and others. I note that every question was actually meant for the Attorney-General. They were all questions that related to the Attorney-General and, as always, the Attorney-General answered them impeccably. What the Attorney-General did explain—and the member for Lee had no idea; you think he would be better, but he is not—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Do you even know what happens in your portfolio?

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Is that why you don't turn up—

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Lee!

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: —because you don't have a grasp of your portfolio?

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee, please!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It is disappointing that the member for Lee struggles with this concept—

The SPEAKER: I know that the member for Lee would like to speak shortly. I would like to hear the member for Lee speak shortly.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I commend the Attorney-General for making it abundantly clear that, when there is a case before a court, you do not want to prejudice that case. The Attorney-General made that point over and over again, and it is a point that I think anyone would have made in the same situation. The point she made was spot on, and she made it more than once, but those on the other side did not think they would heed the advice of the Attorney-General and the way she answered the question. I commend her for that, and it is how I think anyone would have answered the questions that were asked today.

I go back to the graduation of the 23 cadets and say how wonderful it was. As police minister, I am very proud to attend these graduation ceremonies and I am very proud to do so in a bipartisan manner with the shadow minister. Whenever he says he wants to attend, I will take him at his word, and I hope he does attend. I know he has in the past, but he obviously chose not to today as a political stunt and political circus.

Again, we should not be surprised because that is the way those on the other side operate. Do we genuinely go out together and thank these graduates, who are going to be part of our police force and protect South Australians, for their great work? They are a diverse range of people who are going to head out into the community. In the wake of what we saw in Bourke Street in Melbourne, we know that these people are going to a very tough job. It is a very challenging job, and one that all South Australians should be grateful for.

I am very honoured to hold this position, as, I would presume, is the shadow minister. If we have the opportunity to say thank you to those who are putting their lives on the line, we should dip our lid to them. I make no apologies for going to do that because that is what this job is about. Those on the other side wanted to play tricks and change their mind at the last minute. They thought they were being clever. I say to you, Mr Speaker: that is actually being disrespectful. It is disrespectful to the people who have undergone 12 months of hard training.

Today, they were graduating as police officers in front of their families and friends, ready to go out and serve our state. They should be duly recognised and acknowledged. Again, I say that I am very proud to attend those services and say to those people, 'Thank you very much.' In fact, I was lucky enough to present an award to Madison Davies, who was awarded the Minister for Police Excellence in Communication Award, and Jayden Cross, who was awarded the Commissioner of Police Leadership Award. In fact, Madison Davies also picked up the Police Association of South Australia Academic Award.

To all the award winners and graduates, again I say thank you. To our entire police force, again I say thank you. This is not something we should play games with, yet those on the other side continue to do so, and I do not think anyone in this place is surprised—

Time expired.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:22): All members of parliament work hard inside this place and also out in our electorates. I do not think there are too many people—certainly not in Mawson—who go through and check how many speeches I have made in this place. The Leader of Government Business told us last week that he was very, very excited about a statistic that will show how many speeches government backbenchers have made this year. He cannot wait until the end of the sitting year so that he can release those statistics.

I just want to say to the Leader of Government Business: no-one out there in the real world gives a toss about how many speeches are made by backbenchers on either side about bills going through this place. It is—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: It's the same speech, too.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: It is the same speech on the government's side. It gets handed around and some poor, unwitting backbencher has to read it out. You can tell it is the first time they have seen it, and we are hearing from government backbenchers that they are unhappy with that. It is also keeping us from the communities that we represent. I will stay in here for hour after hour, and I will be in here every day if that is what is required to pass legislation that will make a difference to South Australia. But if it is just about vanity—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: —for the Leader of Government Business, it is time he grew up. When you are in primary school, you enter the walkathon or spellathon and raise money for the number of words you spell or how many kilometres you walk—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, you two!

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: That is where it belongs: in primary school, not in here. This is the place where we come to debate legislation and to pass bills so that we can make South Australia a better place—

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister, please.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: When we are not in here, we should be out at the year 7 graduations like at Rapid Bay, where I intend to be tonight, or tomorrow night at the Willunga Farmers Market Wilmark Awards. We need to be out there with the people because if we get back to democracy, it is of the people for the people, and that is where we need to be spending our time, not wasting it in here with repetition and needless and useless contributions from people opposite who have been handed a script just to fill in the time.

We had an example a couple of weeks ago where the Leader of Government Business made us take a break of 90 minutes. We came back here at 7.30pm. Everyone had finished talking after about 25 to 30 minutes and then there was a flurry of speeches handed out to backbenchers on the government side to keep us here for another 90 minutes. I am a really hard worker. I work my absolute guts out. But sitting here for 90 minutes so that we can come back for a further 90 minutes defies reason. It is disrespectful to all the staff in parliament, it adds cost to the people in parliament and it is disrespectful to the people out in our electorates whom we should be out there joining in with at meetings and community organisations.

I hope that this little juvenile, vanity pursuit of the Leader of Government Business will finish now. His game is over. I know that he is going to come out with these statistics and try to get an unwitting journalist to write about how wonderful this new government is and how many speeches backbenchers have made. People out there do not give a toss about how many speeches are made in this place. What they want is a better economy. What they want is more jobs. What they want is a better health system. What they want is a better education system. That is what we should all be working towards—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: —looking after the people who vote for us to represent them in here. I know the Leader of Government Business is a new father, but we all have families as well, so when he gets a pair to go home to be with his child he needs to think about all the other families in here who are not getting that or the right to be able to go and spend time in their local electorates.

I am hoping that, as we draw to a close for this first parliamentary sitting year with a Liberal government, when we come back next year we will see a different approach, an approach where we can come in here and work effectively and efficiently to get the legislation through so that we can spend time out in our electorates where it really counts, with the people who have elected us to come in here and do the work. I am looking forward to winding up this year and seeing a better attitude from the government next year.

Time expired.

JOHNSON, MR B.R.

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (15:27): I rise to pay tribute to the late Brian Johnson who passed away on 14 September at his home in Naracoorte, aged 81. I acknowledge and thank Brian's son Graham who has gathered together most of the words that I say today. Brian has been described as a true giant of Naracoorte and the surrounding districts. He was imposing in stature and a leader in the agricultural industry. He was also a staunch member and supporter of the Liberal Party for well over 40 years.

Brian Ronald Johnson was born on 20 January 1937. He was the first of four children to Lawrence Stanley Johnson and Dorothy Olive (nee Stevens). He grew up on the family farm, Springbank, north of Naracoorte, a prominent lamb producing property whose success continues to this day. In 1950, Brian attended King's College in Adelaide, which is now known as Pembroke. He developed a keen interest in football and baseball.

Brian left school at the age of 15 to start work on the farm, clearing large parcels of land, ready for ploughing. Over time, his father purchased more land at Lucindale, Conmurra, Biscuit Flat and Willalooka to further extend the family's holdings. It was a strategy that continued throughout Brian's life. He was always on the lookout for more land. Brian married his local sweetheart, Barbara Bourne, in 1961 and the couple began their lives at Springbank. They had three sons: Ian, Peter and Graham.

Brian loved his sport, especially football. He played for his local team, Kybybolite, from 1952. In 1959, he was drafted by Norwood. He would work on the farm on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, travel to Adelaide on Thursday, train on Thursday night, help with school coaching clinics on Friday, play on Saturday, then return home on Sunday to start the week again. In 1960, he received £5 per game, which included travel money. Brian kicked the first goal of the 1960 grand final between Norwood and North Adelaide. Unfortunately, they lost by five points in front of a crowd of 54,000 at the Adelaide Oval.

His teammates read like the who's who of South Australian football, including Ron Kneebone, Peter Aish, Alan Killigrew, Haydn Bunton junior, Wally Miller and Bob Fosdike. His opponents that day were the likes of Barrie Robran and Bob Hammond. He returned to Kyby and played in the 1961 premiers team, coached for several years and played in the undefeated premiers side of 1966. In 1968, he took on the job of coaching Naracoorte and finished his football there in the early 1970s. Later, he became patron of the Naracoorte Football Club, a position he held for 30 years. He was passionate about football and loved watching the young ones coming through. His proudest day was when his son, Peter, got his first league game for Norwood in 1985.

Tennis was also a big part of the family life growing up. Countless weekends were spent at working bees turning the Naracoorte parklands scrub into the magnificent football/netball/tennis complex of today. Brian found lawn bowls later in life, which he loved. He met lots of new people, but he also played with the men he had played football and tennis with and against. He thoroughly enjoyed the mateship he found at the bowling clubs throughout the South-East.

Politics was a passion of Brian's, and he was a member of the Liberal Party and state Electoral Commission dating back to the Fraser years. His hero was former prime minister John Winston Howard. He has been described as the rock that the Naracoorte branch was built on, and he served as president of the Naracoorte branch numerous times. Brian received a meritorious service award in 1998, an acknowledgment of his commitment and contribution to the party.

Brian was an influencer of the Liberal Party, not just at a branch level but at a state and federal level as well. He was a team player but was not afraid to voice his opinion on an issue. He

brought rural issues to the attention of those whose lives were cemented in the city and was modestly responsible for preselection recruitments and policy improvements. He was extremely well connected and had the mobile phone numbers of many of our state and federal politicians, including Nick Minchin and Grant Chapman.

When it came to fundraising for the party, he was not afraid to make a call, and such was his personality he always got results. As one of his old mates, Andrew Downward, has said, 'You just never said no to Spaz.' Brian loved the friends he made at meetings. Such was his dedication to the party, he attended 23 annual general meetings over 25 years. The only reason he missed a meeting was when he was sick or travelling. He was renowned for his communication skills, and his engaging personality helped him enlist and encourage young members to the party.

Brian had eight grandchildren. His family say that he loved them all completely and equally. He always had time for them. He was interested in all that was happening in their lives and was very proud of every achievement. Brian Johnson was a true Naracoorte icon. He was well known and well liked. He worked hard to grow his business and was not afraid to take risks. He was social. It made no difference to him whether you were a farmer, shearer, rousie, truck driver, sparky, stock agent, bank manager or the boss of BHP, he treated everyone with the same respect.

Brian Johnson will be long remembered as a leader in the South-East. He was generous with his time and his knowledge. On behalf of the Naracoorte branch of the Liberal Party and all other branches across the South-East, we honour him for his unwavering commitment and involvement in the Liberal Party of South Australia. Thank you, Brian. Vale, Brian Johnson.

QUESTION TIME

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:33): Not the only thing to run over time in recent days. I rise to talk about what we witnessed today not an hour ago, and that was the dreadful and deplorable performance by the Deputy Premier and Attorney-General, the member for Bragg, repeatedly refusing to answer legitimate questions put to her on behalf of the absent minister, who, of course, has just erroneously claimed that he was granted a pair by the opposition. I am happy to correct the record on that: that is not correct.

The Hon. C.L. Wingard interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: And if he complains about what I have just said, Mr Speaker—

The Hon. C.L. Wingard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —he should stand up and move a matter of privilege, but of course—

The Hon. C.L. Wingard: You are a disgrace.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —we know the composition of his spine would not be strong enough to allow that to happen.

The Hon. C.L. Wingard: You're a disgrace.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The fact that repeatedly questions were refused to be answered—

The Hon. C.L. Wingard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee and the Minister for Police are interjecting.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —by the Attorney-General is not good enough. These are exactly—

Mr DULUK: Point of order: it is not appropriate for the member for Lee to reflect on the member for Gibson. I am offended and I ask the member for Lee to withdraw that last statement.

The SPEAKER: Would the Minister for Police like the member for Lee to withdraw any of those comments?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I would be pleased to if I could understand—

The SPEAKER: One moment. Stop the clock.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —how the member for Waite was offended by how I offended the member for Gibson.

The SPEAKER: Would the Minister for Police like those comments to be withdrawn?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, I would, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee withdraws. I ask that 30 seconds be—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: No. He did not rise. He did not take exception to them; another member did, and you have warned—

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —repeatedly that that is insufficient.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I have the point of order. The member is correct. The member for Waite, the objection must be taken to from the point. However, it was thereabouts, member for Lee. I have then asked the Minister for Police if he—because there were some interjections back and forth—has taken offence. Do you take offence to those words that were uttered?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, I do. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: He has taken offence, member for Lee. I will add 30 seconds to the clock, member for Lee.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I would appreciate it if you do add that time.

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I withdraw, and I will come to this in a minute, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Lee.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: This is an absolute outrage, how this house is being treated during the hour of question time. Today, we had the Deputy Premier repeatedly refusing to answer questions by bogusly claiming that the questions were being put in a manner to threaten some sub judice behaviour of this parliament. That is just wrong, and we know it is wrong because the Deputy Premier herself put these same questions to a government during a question time previously in regard to the Hillier matter.

We know that her point today was bogus because even in her explanation about why she would not answer these questions and why it was somehow separate from the Hillier matter, she tripped herself up with our own reasoning. She claimed today that the Hillier matter was different because her questions then related to the behaviour of departments and government agencies. Well, today there was question after question after question about what the department of corrections had done, what the Parole Board had done and what other agencies of the government had done, namely, the Attorney-General and the Minister for Police—for the short time that he was here.

It is not the only occasion when we see the government thumbing its nose at the most critical part of the parliamentary sitting day—that is, question time. Just for one hour a day we expect those ministers to perform the basic tenet of responsible government and they repeatedly refuse to do so. They do so for varying reasons. It is clear obfuscation by the Deputy Premier, and we have become used to that. It is almost like after 16 years in opposition she has become so verbose and so prolix that she cannot even engage in any plain speaking and answer a question that is put to her.

As for the Minister for Police—well, he keeps his own counsel on why he is incapable of answering questions. I am sure we could all put a theory as to why, but I am sure it will go straight through to the keeper, to use one of his sporting analogies. Time after time today, we have had questions about what these ministers knew, what these ministers did, what their departments did

and what the Parole Board did. None of those matters is sub judice—none of them whatsoever. We were not down there trying to ascertain what happened at the crime scene. We were not asking questions that went to the accused killer's character. We were asking about the behaviour and the performance of this government in light of this event happening—precisely the same line of questioning about the Hillier matter.

Unfortunately, it is not the only way that this government continues to obfuscate question time. They refuse to answer questions. They are protected from answering questions by the number of Dorothy Dixers and government questions that are taken. Even those are usually out of order. They are usually the read repetition of material that has been published by the government in media releases, especially from the Minister for Energy. Of course, when the opposition raises points of order, there is nothing really to see here. When the government continues to interrupt proceedings by raising points of order—and I have to say that the extraordinary point of order raised by the member for Heysen was beyond the pale. To say that any proceeding of this house, should it so differentiate from his understanding of what happens in the House of Commons, must therefore be out of order is an outrage.

We have one hour a day when we expect the responsible ministers of this government to answer questions and they continue to refuse to do so. It is not good enough, and it is not good enough on this matter, and I am sure the behaviour of departments, agencies and perhaps even ministers may have contributed to what happened at Noarlunga Centre.

SCOUTS SA

Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:40): I rise today to speak about the importance of local scouting in our community, and in particular those active scout groups in my electorate: Blackwood, Eden Hills, Belair and Mitcham. Scouts SA encourages children and their families to head outdoors and try new activities. It gives young people a chance to make a contribution to society and adults can also play a part by taking the chance to become suitable role models.

In my electorate, I have several scout groups. Probably one of the biggest scouting groups throughout the entirety of South Australia, Belair Scout Group involves boys and girls aged six to 26. They engage in peer to peer mentoring and healthy, outdoor, adventurous activities. The young people gain confidence, learn problem solving and risk management, as well as life and leadership skills. They understand the importance of honesty, integrity and community service and, as a result, become healthy, active citizens, business leaders and role models in their local community.

Over at Blackwood, the Blackwood Scout Group runs a range of great programs packed with fun, action, adventure and challenge. By joining the Blackwood Scout Group, children are given the opportunity for an educational experience that forms a bridge between what they learn at home and at school. The group is well staffed with skilled and trained leaders who deliver great scouting programs. This year, four Blackwood Scout Group volunteers were recognised in the Adult Recognition Awards for displaying the dedication and hard work of the volunteers who help run this valuable program.

The Eden Hills Scout Group enjoys membership of over 130 Joey, Cub, Scout and Venturer members, aged six to 18. The club offers children and young people a fun, active and rewarding scout experience. Due to the popularity of what is offered, various age groups meet each night of the week at the scout hall on Karinya Reserve.

I had the pleasure of being at the scout hall on Sunday as part of the Blackwood Rotary Christmas Fair, together with my federal colleague, Nicolle Flint, the member for Boothby. We were chatting to the group officers from Eden Hills Scout Group and they were telling us about where most of the kids were that weekend—over at mud activities—and also about the need for the upgrade of the hall facilities. The Eden Hills Scout Hall at Karinya is about 50 or 60 years old and in need of much love and attention. That is a project that I hope we can all partner with to deliver for the local community. Eden Hills Scout Group actively encourages current, past and prospective members, as well as parents, to join in the group and participate in activities.

Mitcham Scouts meet down in Mitcham near the Edinburgh Hotel and are also known as the 2nd Adelaide Scout Group. Mitcham Scouts teaches club members about independence and how to build great friendships. Members learn by using the Scouts method, including learning by doing and

working in small groups. As part of a worldwide organisation, Mitcham Scouts engages and inspires young people to develop confidence, resilience and leadership.

I was recently invited to attend their annual Tom Gilchrist Awards Ceremony. It was a chance to acknowledge the youth members, leaders and parent helpers who have made an outstanding contribution over the past 12 months. I would like to thank their group leader, Natalie Steward, for her hard work and commitment to the Scouts in her care.

All these groups make a great contribution to the education of young people, who then play a constructive role in society. Scouting delivers real-life benefits to young people and this is enthusiastically recognised by South Australian parents and their children. Scouting is a growing organisation worldwide, with over 25 million members, of which 7,000 are in South Australia. Each group, both in my electorate and across all electorates, is doing wonderful work in its community and I am pleased to stand here today to recognise the work of the volunteers, leaders, parents who make themselves available for their children, and young Scout members.

I would also like to make special mention of the sad loss in my community of Mr Brian Langsford of Hawthorndene. Brian made an enormous contribution to the Scouts in the Mitcham Hills and was recognised over the years for his dedication, passion and vision for engaging young people. In 2013, he was presented with an Australia Day commendation for his contribution to the Scouts and the Red Cross Blood Service.

One event that he will always be remembered for and was integral to starting was the ANZAC Eve Youth Vigil at the Soldiers' Memorial Gardens at the Blackwood roundabout. The ANZAC Eve Youth Vigil stems from the military tradition of 'holding ground'. It was Brian who involved community groups, the Scouts, the CFS, St John cadets and Girl Guides in leading that service. Brian was a wonderful passionate community man and a truly dedicated leader.

Auditor-General's Report

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:45): I move:

That the timetable for the consideration of the report of the Auditor-General be amended by postponing the examination of the Premier from 4pm today to Wednesday 28 November commencing at 4pm for 30 minutes.

Motion carried.

Bills

SUMMARY OFFENCES (LIQUOR OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 September 2018.)

Mr PICTON (Kaurana) (15:46): I rise to speak on the Summary Offences (Liquor Offences) Amendment Bill and indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition. The bill deals with a very serious issue in terms of our state. Very significant powers and restrictions are being proposed in the bill, but that is for a very important reason. Sadly, it is because of the abuse of alcohol within communities in our state—something that I think we all need to take very seriously and have very appropriate responses to.

This is the second time that this house of parliament has debated and will have passed this legislation. The bill was introduced in largely the same form by the previous government. It was introduced on 27 September 2017, passed this chamber of this parliament and went to the other place on 14 November 2017. Sadly, it did not pass before the election and we have had it now reintroduced into this house. It is yet another sign that the apparently 'strong agenda for real change' from the government is actually about reintroducing bills that we had from the previous parliament to the point that we rose early last night because there was not enough business for the government to deal with.

However, I am glad that the government has reintroduced the bill, although it is now seven or eight months down the track since the election, because this is an important reform. It was introduced originally by the member for Enfield, the former attorney-general, and, in doing so, was a device to help manage what is the serious issue of alcohol abuse in this state.

Unfortunately, we do see the unlawful distribution and sale of alcohol in remote Aboriginal communities. This is more commonly known as 'grog running'. The unlawful sale of liquor and supply of liquor into remote Aboriginal communities have significant side effects and often leads to serious alcohol-related harm, including violence, disorder, antisocial behaviour and medical problems for those communities.

Deputy Speaker, as you particularly would know, given your electorate, we have a number of dry communities in this state for very important reasons, and those people who seek to get around those dry restrictions in those communities are the target of this legislation. Unfortunately, those people who seek to get around those restrictions are led to those social harms, violence and health effects.

As I said, this legislation was introduced but unfortunately did not pass previously and, as the Attorney-General in her contribution has indicated, this is largely similar to the bill that was introduced by the Labor government that did not pass. However, there are two differences between the bills. Firstly, this Liberal bill sets the designated area boundary at 20 kilometres. The designated area boundary in the Labor bill was 100 kilometres. Secondly, the Liberal bill does not include the power for police to stop, search and detain vehicles without suspicion within certain areas. That is a provision that was originally in the first bill; the Attorney-General has taken it out of this bill.

I think it is not the first time that we have seen from this Attorney-General a reluctance to give the police more powers in carrying out their duties. I am minded to think in particular of what happened in relation to the previous drug-driving bill that this parliament dealt with and also the bill that we are seeking to have debated by this parliament, which, sadly, continues to be adjourned by the government, in relation to giving police the power to search vehicles where there is a positive drug test. It seems very straightforward and very sensible.

The community has given broad support for that but, sadly, the Attorney-General is vehemently opposed to that measure. It is something that we know that the police want; I can attest to that as the former police minister. The police want, need, and think that it is very important for them to have that power. I will ask about the removal of this power for the police in relation to this bill when we come to the committee stage. Also, in the committee stage we might unpack the consultation that the Attorney-General has undertaken to ensure that these measures have the support of all stakeholders, and why this amended version of the bill is preferred to the original one that was passed by this chamber only a year ago.

Unfortunately, we all know the damage that alcohol does in remote Aboriginal communities. That is why it is important for us to pass this legislation which, as I said, is very serious in terms of the penalties that would apply, very serious in terms of the powers the police would have and very serious in terms of the restrictions that would be in place. It is important that dry communities stay dry and that people do not find a way to work around them.

What this means is that the current powers that the police have, and the current provisions in the APY Land Rights Act, the MT Land Rights Act and the ALT Act are not sufficient. The bill before us introduces new measures that should assist police and communities to deal with grog running. With those words, I once again indicate my support and the opposition's support for this bill, as it was when we previously introduced it when we were in government, and commend it to the house.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (15:52): I rise to commend the bill to the house. I have listened carefully once again to the remarks of the member for Kaurua as the lead speaker for the opposition on this bill. The member for Kaurua has described the bill, appropriately in my view, as one of seriousness and one involving matters about which we all ought think carefully and deeply about in this place.

It is appropriate in addressing those remarks that reflection might be had upon the contribution just a few moments ago of the member for Mawson who, as one voice on the opposition

benches, seems to think that debate in this place is—and I think I am not inaccurately quoting the member for Mawson—not worth a toss to people out there. That is not a view that I take and it is not a view that members of the government take. I hope it is not a view that the member for Kaurna takes, but it seems to be the view of at least the member for Mawson. Serious debate, reflection on legislation, is indeed necessary and debate in relation to this bill is no exception.

Secondly, it is appropriate that mention be made, in the context of the seriousness of legislation that is brought before the house, of the bill that was rushed into the house yesterday by the opposition. It was a bill that would have the effect of amending one of the most important pieces of legislation in the state, the Sentencing Act, to be done at a moment's notice in an atmosphere of frenzy and anxiety and really very much the opposite of the—

Mr PICTON: Point of order: firstly it is irrelevant. Secondly, it is also referring to another bill currently before the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Heysen, you will contain your remarks to the bill at hand.

Mr TEAGUE: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I will confine my remarks to the bill at hand. We have, I am afraid and sorry to say, examples that exhibit a lack of attention to the necessary seriousness of debate in this place and an atmosphere that has been whipped up of reaction and anxiety, both of which are entirely inappropriate.

It is entirely apposite to the circumstances in which this bill comes before the house. This 2018 bill that was brought to the house promptly in the early months of this new government differs in material respects from the 2017 bill that was brought before the house by the previous government. That includes, as the member for Kaurna has referred to, proposed section 21OE that would have granted police with powers to stop and search a vehicle within the designated area.

In my view, those powers and that provision that was contained in the 2017 bill are appropriately not included in the bill that is before the house. Just to be clear for those who are following the debate and for those who were not engaged in the debate last year, the bill in 2017 would have granted powers to police to require the driver of a vehicle to stop their vehicle, to detain the vehicle and to search the vehicle, and any persons or property in or on the vehicle, for liquor.

Those powers were to have applied where a vehicle was in a designated area and for the purposes of ascertaining whether the provisions of the relevant part—the relevant liquor being transported or supplied—were being complied with or contravened. Importantly, those powers were to have applied without police having formed any suspicion or ascertained any reason other than those threshold tests.

In my view, in the passage of time and in the course of further consideration, it has appropriately now come to a point where the bill that is currently before the house, containing the range of serious, onerous and special provisions that will affect citizens of this state and in ways that are particular and special, goes no further than is appropriate. Insofar as they have the effect of curtailing freedoms and liberties, they do so no more than is reasonably necessary.

So to the extent that the member for Mawson and the member for Kaurna would reflect upon these questions—indeed, about the seriousness of debate or its necessity or the appropriateness of it—I say to them and to those opposite that we are not here to play rhetorical games or take some sort of superficial advantage in relation to what is legislation of a very serious nature in regard to very serious subject matter. We are here to legislate in order to improve outcomes for all South Australians. We ought not be legislating with a view to any other outcome. We ought not stand up and speak in this place with a view to scoring cheap points one way or the other. If we are going to engage in debate, we should do so in a spirit of seriousness and inquiry.

The member for Kaurna raised a difference between the contents of the 2017 bill and the bill that is presently before the house. It is an important difference and, in my view, it is a difference that is properly brought about and the result of reflection. I commend the government for the contents and shape of the bill as it is presented.

The bill is titled in terms of its being an amendment to the Summary Offences Act insofar as it relates to liquor offences, but it might just as appropriately have referred to the three other pieces of legislation to which it contains amendment, those being the Criminal Investigation (Covert Operations) Act 2009, the Criminal Law (Clamping, Impounding and Forfeiture of Vehicles) Act 2007 and the Liquor Licensing Act 1997. I will come to each of those in a moment. The amendments to those acts are contained in the schedule to the bill.

The bill has the effect of creating a number of new summary offences for conduct relevant to the designated area in relation to the unlawful sale of liquor. I understand that this is commonly known as 'grog running'. It is a matter that has sadly, over a long period of time, blighted the areas and the communities that are the subject of the bill. Endeavours have been made over a long period of time to do more and to do all that is possible, via a range of measures, to address and improve the situation. They have included social initiatives, health initiatives and community engagement. To this extent at least, those initiatives—properly, in my view—include enforcement measures that find voice in the Summary Offences Act and would find further voice as the result of the bill.

The bill creates a new summary offence in relation to possession/transportation of liquor for sale. That is under new section 21OB. Secondly, in relation to the supply and related matters of liquor in certain areas, which will be under new section 21OC, the bill sets out the scope of the designated areas and makes provision in relation to evidence and evidence-gathering in the act, and contemplates further regulation being made.

Before I reflect on the effect of those new offence provisions, as I referred to at the outset, it might also properly refer to the other three pieces of legislation that are also amended as a result of this bill. The first is the Criminal Investigation (Covert Operations) Act 2009. The effect of the amendment in this regard is to bring within the definition of 'serious criminal behaviour' an offence against section 29 of the Liquor Licensing Act 1997 and, further, to bring the new offences that are the subject of this bill, which will be contained in the Summary Offences Act, within the definition of 'serious criminal behaviour'.

Further, the bill amends the Criminal Law (Clamping, Impounding and Forfeiture of Vehicles) Act 2007 by ensuring that the conduct that is the subject of the new offence provisions in sections 21OB and 21OC is also caught. Importantly, the third of those affected pieces of legislation is the Liquor Licensing Act 1997. Section 29 of the act is amended so as to ensure that an occupier or a person in charge of premises who knowingly permits the sale of premises is guilty of an offence.

Secondly, if a prescribed person sells liquor to another person while reasonably believing that person intends to sell the liquor, in contravention of subsection (1), and that other person in fact sells the liquor in contravention of subsection (1), then an offence will have been committed. This will mean that one piece of legislation is coherently speaking to the other.

The overall effect of this omnibus extension of the Summary Offences Act and its related legislation is not only to create the additional offences but to add practical investigative tools to assist in the investigation and prosecution of offenders. Those further investigative tools are provided for judiciously in the sense that they speak to the newly created offences.

As I said at the outset, they do not go so far as to create what might very well be, in effect, a de facto rod for the back of police who had the provision the subject of the 2017 bill carried forward been finding themselves in circumstances where there was no threshold and where anybody driving a vehicle in a designated area was, or would have been, without further reference, potentially the subject of powers of search and forfeiture and so forth, as I have outlined at the commencement of these remarks.

So we have new offences coupled with new and practical investigative tools and together they make a regime—and I feel that I have found myself repeating these remarks in relation to a number of different subject matters—now designed and structured to ensure as far as possible that we are not in legislating in this place concerned with appearances, superficiality or rhetoric. We are concerned to know that the measures that we take are directed towards real outcomes for real people in real communities for the daily lives that people are living—in this case, in the designated areas that are the subject of the legislation.

If there is any message of broad application that might be drawn from the contribution we have heard in relation to this bill today from the member for Kurna, or more particularly the reflections by the member for Mawson a few moments ago, it is that serious consideration of legislation by a government committed to outcomes for the community in South Australia is what this place is all about. It is what the purpose of debate in this place is all about. That is the outcome of that process in this case, and I commend this bill to the house.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:12): I rise to support the Summary Offences (Liquor Offences) Amendment Bill 2018. What we are doing with this piece of legislation is to reform the unlawful sale of liquor and the supply of liquor to vulnerable communities where the consumption of liquor is prohibited. What we have seen over time is what has been called grog running, and that has been the term used for the unlawful supply and sale of liquor in dry areas.

The grog running trade often leads to alcohol-related harm, including serious violence, disorder, antisocial behaviour and medical problems for vulnerable communities. Only this morning in this house we were talking about the scourge of domestic violence. Domestic violence is not just attributed to these communities we are talking about here in regard to grog running and the sale of alcohol illegally. We know it is a scourge right across society.

What we are attempting to do here is to reduce that harm, whether it is violence and disorder or domestic violence. We have already learnt from trials of the welfare card, especially around Australia and certainly in the Ceduna area. I want to acknowledge former mayor Alan Suter, who did not renominate. He served 12 years in that council area, in the member for Flinders' electorate, and bravely stood up for the rights of his citizens when he fully supported the trial of the commonwealth welfare card.

My understanding of that card is that 80 per cent of Centrelink money can go to buying goods at designated stores and then 20 per cent goes as cash for the person to have some free money. Some people thought that this was a rather harsh measure, but it is interesting as time goes on how it has been trialled in other areas, and my understanding is that it has worked.

I have travelled through the outback on many occasions, and I have travelled through the West Coast and Eyre Peninsula heading to Western Australia and back multiple times. I have also travelled through to the north of Australia, and I have seen the effects on people having free range to buy alcohol and what the effects can be on society.

Obviously, what the commonwealth welfare card has attempted to do and what we are attempting to do as another process here is to put some management in place so that we can have better outcomes for society as a whole. It does not matter where the community is, wherever a community is impacted, if there are measures that can be put in place so that we have better outcomes in that localised community it will mean better outcomes for society as a whole.

We are talking about the issues of domestic violence. Obviously, if we can reduce that at any level with the hope of wiping it out one day—no matter where it is—it would be a great thing. When it comes to any antisocial behaviour where people are not able to manage their alcohol and are tempted to commit other crimes, and just general antisocial behaviour, we need to do what we can to make sure that we can assist the good citizens of this state on getting the right outcomes.

Another issue we have is the medical problems that can come with the abuse of alcohol, whether it is direct brain health or kidney failure. We have had various programs with dialysis all around the state to assist people who need access to kidney dialysis machines. People have renal failure, and we see this right across communities. I know that there are programs in the Far North and outback areas to service these communities.

I reflect on the call that we have on issues around the availability of dialysis, and even in my own electorate of Hammond where we have some units at Murray Bridge, which are utilised by people from the local area, from the Mallee, from Strathalbyn and up around Mount Barker. What I see there and what I see throughout all our communities, including our outback communities, is the need for more dialysis as we see more medical problems through various factors that have affected people's kidney function, with one of them certainly being the abuse of alcohol.

The South Australian government certainly does have legislative restrictions to reduce the incidence of alcohol-related harm in regional communities. These restrictions are focused on the Aboriginal communities predominantly, and include conditions on high-risk liquor licences under the Liquor Licensing Act 1997, which limit the amount of specific liquors that can be purchased per person, per day and restricts the type of liquor sold completely for off-premise consumption, with specific communities being prohibited under legislation from possessing and consuming liquor on the lands, with some exemptions, mind you. These communities include the APY lands, the Umoona community and the Yalata Reserve.

Certainly, discussions with the relevant agencies highlight that current strategies designed to combat grog running are not sufficient. I am aware that in certain places around Australia, including Darwin, if you go there and you want to buy some alcohol you have to produce your licence and they keep a record of what you have bought, and this is replicated across communities in a similar fashion through South Australia. It is one way of reducing that harm to people in these communities.

We are creating new offences in the Summary Offences Act 1953 relating to possessing or transporting liquor for the purpose of sale with a rebuttable presumption that possession above a prescribed quantity of liquor is for the purpose of sale. If someone is driving through the outback with a ute or a small truck or a larger truck fully loaded with alcohol, they are obviously not just going away for a weekend of relaxation on their own. There is a fair chance that they might be having a look at grog running and being a reseller without a licence.

That is where we get to a new offence in the Summary Offences Act 1953 for a person who supplies liquor or possesses or transports liquor with intention to supply it to a person in a dry community. That is the nub of the question. The reason why we have these designated dry communities is so that we know exactly where the liquor is not supposed to be. If it is there, it should be a reasonably transparent case that someone is breaking the law. The designated areas are determined by the minister and must not be more than 20 kilometres from the boundary of a prescribed area.

There is another new offence that will be created in the Liquor Licensing Act 1997 for a holder of a licence who sells liquor to a person reasonably believed to be an unlicensed seller intending to sell the liquor and the unlicensed seller then sells that liquor on. Another new offence to be created in the Liquor Licensing Act 1997 is for an occupier or person in charge of premises who knowingly permits the unlicensed sale of liquor on those premises. With this legislation, we are trying to cover all the bases of this unlicensed management of liquor sales, whether it is someone transporting it, whether it is someone unselling it or whether it is someone trying to market this liquor from an unlicensed premises.

This bill does differ from the one the former government introduced in a few ways. Firstly, the limit in relation to a designated area of land, referred to in proposed section 210D(3), has been reduced from 100 kilometres to 20 kilometres. We saw the 100-kilometre limit as excessive and unnecessary, as it would obviously encompass a very large geographical area.

In regard to going back to 20 kilometres, South Australia Police have stated that this area is still entirely workable and will assist in stopping grog running. Obviously, it would have been much more difficult to manage areas of up to 100 kilometres, which is five times what the legislation is bringing it back to now. I think that is where we have to be absolutely realistic in moving legislation like this, so that the regulators, being the police force in this area, have a designated and realistic area to manage amongst all the other duties they must perform in these outer areas of the state.

Secondly, some of the additional police powers have been removed, in particular the police power to stop a vehicle, detain and search a vehicle and direct a person to open any part of the vehicle without reasonable suspicion. As I indicated, that has been removed from this bill. We on this side of the house believe that these powers are excessive and that the power of police to stop, search and detain should be the same for every other offence, which can already be managed with the powers as designated under the Summary Offences Act 1953.

As the government, we on this side of the house believe that the current powers in the Summary Offences Act 1953 achieve an appropriate balance between the need for police officers to enforce the law and for community members to go about their daily activities without fear that they

will be stopped and searched without reasonable suspicion. In regard to that, South Australia Police have stated that the powers they already hold are sufficient.

I think we have to be careful with this legislation in that we do not go over the top and people think that it is a total police state, that they cannot leave their community without fear or favour and that, for virtually no reason, they can just be pulled over, detained, have their car searched and go through the process. As I have already indicated, we already have those powers under the Summary Offences Act 1953, so we certainly do not believe there needs to be a duplication in this legislation to put those powers into place.

This bill addresses issues that are still current after previously being tabled in the parliament. To round up my contribution, as I indicated before, the reforms that this bill contains create new offences and provide additional investigative powers to reduce the incidence of the unlawful sale of liquor and supply of liquor to vulnerable communities. I think that is the most important part of this legislation, and that is in place where the possession and consumption of liquor are generally prohibited. As has been indicated in contributions here today, this is colloquially known as grog running, and the grog running trade often leads to alcohol-related harm.

I discussed this earlier in my contribution. It includes serious violence, which obviously can be and is domestic violence at times; general disorder; antisocial behaviour; and the resultant medical problems for many who live in vulnerable communities. That is a cost to all society. The antisocial behaviour is a cost for the police force. The social cost is a cost for families. Obviously, there are medical costs for these communities to get the appropriate requirements for the medical needs of the people affected by the abuse of alcohol, either directly or indirectly, through antisocial behaviour, whether that be violence or just being generally antisocial. Part of what we are doing with this legislation is to offset a lot of those issues.

There has been consultation over many years—well over a decade—where community members, particularly parents, are concerned about the consumption of liquor and the criminal activities that often arise with such behaviour. It has become clear that these communities are seeking protection for children and protection from the family and domestic violence that often follow the excessive consumption of alcohol. It is good to see that a lot of the people in these communities acknowledge that there is a need to protect the vulnerable in their communities, whether it be the children, partners, wives, girlfriends or anyone else who suffers the after-effects of grog running. It is good to see that there are elders and senior people in these communities who want to do what they can to help themselves.

In regard to the consultation with relevant agencies, it is very sad that these current strategies designed to combat grog running are falling short—in some instances, a long way short—of meeting these challenges. Existing measures include those under the Liquor Licensing Act 1997, such as offences, restrictive licence conditions on the sale and supply of liquor, and barring orders. In addition, both the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Land Rights Act 1981 and the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act 2013 contain provisions regarding the possession and consumption of liquor in specific areas.

In closing, it has become clear that new and different solutions need to be found in order to address the issue and effects of grog running in many remote communities, and the bill seeks to do so. I commend the bill.

Mrs POWER (Elder) (16:33): I am pleased today to rise in support of the Summary Offences (Liquor Offences) Amendment Bill 2018. The bill reforms the unlawful sale of liquor and supply of liquor to vulnerable communities where the consumption of liquor is prohibited. Grog running, which refers to the unlawful supply and sale of liquor in dry areas, is a trade that often leads to alcohol-related harm, such as violence, disorder, antisocial behaviour, medical problems and domestic violence, and this is the case for some of our most vulnerable communities.

The South Australian government currently has legislative restrictions to reduce the incidence of alcohol-related harm in regional communities. These restrictions are predominantly focused on Aboriginal communities and include conditions on high-risk liquor licences under the Liquor Licensing Act 1997 that limit the amount of specific liquors that can be purchased per person, per day and restrict the type of liquor sold completely for off-premise consumption. Specific

communities are prohibited under legislation from possessing and consuming liquor on the lands, with some exemptions. These communities include the APY lands, the Umoona community and Yalata Reserve.

For some of us living here in metropolitan Adelaide, it is hard to perhaps grasp what it might be like on the lands or in certain communities that experience a high prevalence of alcohol-related harm. For me, as somebody who grew up in Alice Springs and spent most of my life there until I was a teenager and, as an adult, who visited the APY lands multiple times—which was an absolute honour that I am really grateful for—I have seen the devastating impacts that alcohol-related harm can have on individuals, families and communities. This bill, in looking to reform that and to reduce the supply of alcohol, is absolutely crucial.

What are we doing exactly? We are creating a number of new offences in the Summary Offences Act 1953 relating to possessing or transporting liquor for the purpose of sale. We are creating an offence for a person who supplies liquor, or possesses or transports liquor with the intention to supply it to a person in a dry community. We are also creating offences in the Liquor Licensing Act 1997 for a holder of a licence who sells liquor to a person reasonably believed to be an unlicensed seller, intending to sell the liquor and the unlicensed seller then sells that liquor.

In that same Liquor Licensing Act 1997, we are creating an offence for an occupier or a person in charge of premises who knowingly permits the unlicensed sale of liquor on those premises. We are sending a very clear message to the community, to those who are thinking about grog running or to those who want to benefit from the profit of the sale of alcohol to those who might intend to grog run, that this is not okay. It will not be accepted and, accordingly, it will be illegal to do so. Notably, this bill differs from the one the former government introduced in a number of ways.

First, the limit in relation to a designated area of land, referred to in proposed section 21OD(3), has been reduced from 100 kilometres to 20 kilometres. I know that there has been some debate about this and whether or not it goes far enough. It is important to keep in mind that when we are talking about communities on the APY lands they are so far from one another, they are so far from metropolitan Adelaide or towns such as Alice Springs, that the sense of distance is perhaps quite different from our sense of distance living in metropolitan Adelaide. We see that the 100-kilometre limit is excessive and unnecessary, as it would encompass a large geographical area. SAPOL has stated that this 20-kilometre area is still entirely workable and will assist in stopping grog running.

Secondly, some of the additional police powers have been removed. In particular, the police power to stop a vehicle, detain and search a vehicle and direct a person to open any part of the vehicle without reasonable suspicion has been removed. As somebody who has had the honour to visit the APY lands, I think it is probably quite good for those who have good intentions and who want to abide by the law to know that they are supported in that way. The reason we have done this is that we believe that these powers are excessive and that the power for police to stop, search and detain should be the same for every other offence, being powers in the Summary Offences Act 1953.

The government believes that the current powers in the Summary Offences Act 1953 achieve the appropriate balance between the need for police officers to enforce the law and for community members to go about their daily activities without the fear that they will be stopped and searched without reasonable suspicion. As I mentioned, I have certainly been in that situation myself, as I know a number of community members who live on the lands have been. They are there with good intentions and they should be respected, as anybody else would expect to be when living in metropolitan cities.

In short, alcohol restrictions can and do play an important role in any strategic approach to preventing and managing alcohol problems. Such strategies, however, raise at least two further questions: first, what else needs to occur to ensure that the restrictions genuinely enhance community capacity to manage alcohol? Second, what additional measures, apart from supply reduction, are required?

As I mentioned, as someone who has grown up in Alice Springs and has been very fortunate to visit the APY lands—I have visited Murputja, Pipalyatjara and Amata a number of times—I have witnessed firsthand the devastating impacts of alcohol in Aboriginal communities and on the lands. I

understand it is a complex issue. It is a very important issue and it does need to be addressed, but it needs to be addressed at multiple levels.

I support this bill as one necessary measure to support communities to thrive. I look forward to seeing it being implemented and enforced in conjunction with those it impacts. I think the best outcomes are achieved when we work with the community—not for them, not against them, not imposing our way but working with them—to deliver positive outcomes. I commend the bill to the house.

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (16:40): I rise today in support of the Summary Offences (Liquor Offences) Amendment Bill 2018. Unfortunately, the strategies that have been employed in our state so far to reduce the instances of grog running have not been sufficient, so there is a real need for new measures that law enforcement agencies can have at their disposal to combat grog running. Just to be clear, grog running is a general term for the sale of liquor in communities where liquor is generally prohibited, such as remote Indigenous communities.

I think it is important to understand the context around why such bans exist. Of course, particularly on this side, we obviously believe in personal freedoms and the freedoms of individuals, but there are occasions when some people take those freedoms in a way that can severely impinge on the freedoms of others. That is why it is important that we as a government step up to the plate and help support communities to protect the freedoms of others, often those who are more vulnerable.

Remote Indigenous communities face many challenges, of which alcohol is a significant one. The harmful use of alcohol contributes significantly to the burden of disease and social disadvantage for Aboriginal people. This harmful use contributes to community breakdown, violence, crime and incarceration, financial burden, poor mental health and wellbeing, hospitalisation, premature death and suicide. Risky drinking remains high among Aboriginal South Australians, with recent surveys finding that as many as 19.9 per cent of Aboriginal South Australians over the age of 15 drank at levels that put them at risk of disease over their lifetime. The mean age at which death in alcohol-related hospitalisations occurs in Aboriginal people is around 35 years.

Also, the rate of alcohol-related hospitalisations among the South Australian Indigenous population is three to four times higher than the overall South Australian population. Something that is important to note is that there are some very direct impacts of alcohol—drunken behaviour and the impact that that has, but there is also the impact that alcohol consumption, particularly at very extreme levels, can have on other health conditions. I certainly know through some of the previous work that I have done in my old career that alcohol has a very significant impact on the severity of some infectious diseases, some that are particularly prevalent throughout Australia but are much more likely to cause disease in remote Indigenous communities.

One I was familiar with was pneumococcal disease. This is a very serious condition that can manifest itself in a number of different ways. It is generally carried without causing any disease in the nose. Given there are such high rates of carriage, it means that, in effect, there are quite a lot of cases of pneumonia and invasive diseases such as blood infections, meningitis (an infection of the brain) and other very severe diseases that can very quickly lead to death. The rate of invasive pneumococcal disease in Indigenous communities, based on some of the more recent figures that I can recall, is roughly around one in 40 children, compared with more than one in 500 in the non-Indigenous populations.

Another thing to note here is that there are vaccines available to protect against some of the different types of this disease. In fact, the most common one used for children now covers about 13 of the most common types responsible for invasive disease, but there are more than 90. Whilst in the non-Indigenous population that vaccine does cover the vast majority of those cases, in Indigenous communities they tend to have different types. So the vaccine coverage is not quite as good, and you get many more outbreaks of types that are not necessarily covered. This is particularly the case with the seven-valent vaccine, which was the original one released in the early 2000s and which only covered seven diseases. The increase to 13 improved that a little bit, but it is still very much a risk in those parts of our country.

Another important disease that alcohol certainly facilitates is that of middle ear infections. Middle ear infections are described by some as being at epidemic levels in remote Indigenous communities. It is quite a big deal right across the country, with an enormous economic impact. Most kids will get a middle ear infection at some point in their life, but they tend to be acute and short lived and children move on relatively unscathed. Unfortunately, though, this is not the case in remote communities, where sometimes as much as 30 per cent of kids there can have chronic ear infections leading to hearing loss, which obviously contributes to significant disadvantage over the course of their life.

In fact, in the aftermath of some of those things we saw happening at the Don Dale Youth Detention Centre in Darwin, a survey of Indigenous prisoners in Darwin and Alice Springs found that 90 per cent have hearing loss ranging from mild to severe. Some of these childhood infections, significantly enhanced by alcohol, have very serious and long-lasting impacts on these communities, so it is important that we do whatever we can to back up and support these communities.

Of course, as others have mentioned, too, the issue of domestic violence is also very significant. It is fuelled by alcohol in many Indigenous communities and has 34 times the rate of hospitalisation for domestic violence in non-Indigenous communities. Clearly, it is a very big deal. It is a very big difference from what the rest of the community suffers and is very significantly impacted by alcohol. There is also the issue of child abuse, which also occurs at very high rates and is very much related to alcohol consumption.

It is important to note that some of the most recent alcohol restrictions and bans were initially driven by Indigenous communities and their leaders, generally in the smaller communities. I think one of the first of these was in the late seventies. Often they do work very well when they are driven by local leadership. It is also important to recognise the significant impact of these restrictions and improvements on many of these communities, which have been reported in a number of different surveys.

For example, there have been significant reductions in alcohol consumption in those communities, particularly in parts of Queensland and northern Western Australia. They have seen reduced violence and much quieter communities. They do not have as many drunk people wandering around the streets, particularly on pay days, and there is less humbugging for money, cigarettes and other things.

Following these restrictions, there has also been a reduction in alcohol-related harm. Fitzroy Crossing Hospital saw a 36 per cent reduction in alcohol-related emergency admissions, as well as fewer alcohol-affected teenagers, and increased birth weights. There is also the issue of alcohol-related crime. There were surveys of rates of assault in Cape York Peninsula and areas of the Kimberley, and there has been quite a significant reduction in reported assaults, ranging from 10 per cent up to as much as a third in some jurisdictions. There has been reported better care of children and even a greater sense of hope.

Parts of Queensland have seen an increase in the number of families declaring their homes 'dry houses'. This reflects the growing awareness in the community of the issues around excessive alcohol consumption. Many people in these communities want their children to be safe and not to see drunken violence, and this has also been associated with an increase in school attendance.

This bill does a number of very important things. It creates several new offences in both the Summary Offences Act 1953 and the Liquor Licensing Act 1997. The insertion of part 3B into the Summary Offences Act creates offences relating to the possession and transportation of liquor if the possession or transportation is for the purpose of selling at an unlicensed venue, as well as offences relating to the supply of liquor to a person in a dry community.

Under this bill, it would become an offence for a person to possess or transport liquor for the purpose of selling it at a place where it would be unlawfully sold. Importantly, the person on whose behalf the liquor is being possessed or transported would also be committing an offence, as would someone who would derive an indirect financial benefit from the unlawful sale of the liquor being possessed or transported. There would also be a presumption, which an alleged offender would have the opportunity to rebut, that if the amount of liquor that is possessed or transported is more than a prescribed amount, it is presumed that the intention of the alleged offender was to sell the liquor.

Combined with a new provision contained in this bill that makes it an offence for a person to supply liquor to a person in a dry area or transport liquor with the intention to supply it to a person in a dry area, these two new categories will help to stamp out grog running in dry areas and can therefore reduce the devastating effects that alcohol can have in certain communities.

Further, this bill makes it an offence under the Liquor Licensing Act for an occupier or a person who is in charge of a premises on which liquor is sold without a licence to knowingly permit the sale of liquor. It will also be an offence for a person who is authorised to sell liquor to sell liquor to a person who the licensed seller reasonably believes, or ought reasonably to believe, intends to subsequently sell the liquor without a licence and then that person does so.

The measures in this bill significantly strengthen the laws that are intended to reduce, and ideally eliminate, instances of alcohol-fuelled violence and other problems in many remote South Australian communities, as I described earlier. I think that, given the strong support of many people in these communities, it is important that we do everything we can in this place to back them up with the appropriate legislation. I commend this bill to the house.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): The member for Flinders.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (16:54): Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker, and thank you for taking the chair to give me an opportunity to contribute to this bill. I am very pleased that this bill has made it back to this parliament. We, of course, debated it last year under the previous government. There have been some slight changes to that bill, but we supported it then and obviously we are putting it forward now, with changes, as a very important bill.

The bill is entitled Summary Offences (Liquor Offences) Amendment Bill 2018. It reforms the unlawful sale of liquor and the supply of liquor to vulnerable communities where the consumption of liquor is prohibited. In particular, it relates to some of the more remote communities in our state, including the APY lands, which have been mentioned already; the Umoona community, near Coober Pedy; and the Yalata Reserve. The Yalata Reserve is within the electorate of Flinders and is of particular interest to me.

Grog running is a problem; it is a continuing problem. The communities that I have mentioned have chosen to be dry communities. They made a decision as a community to be dry, not to have alcohol on the community and on their premises, so we have to respect that. However, some have decided that they still need a drink and others have decided that they are prepared to supply that need, so therein lies the problem. 'Grog running' is the term used for the unlawful supply and sale of liquor in dry areas. It often leads to alcohol-related harm, including serious violence, disorder, antisocial behaviour and medical problems for vulnerable communities.

We are all familiar with the havoc that is wrought by alcohol and drug abuse, but in this case we are talking about alcohol abuse. Alcohol destroys lives. It could potentially destroy these communities. We need to give our service providers, and there are many—and I know Ceduna particularly well, where there are many service providers who are dealing with the issues raised by substance abuse within that town. Yalata is about 200 kilometres further west of Ceduna, but the draw is towards Ceduna for its services and the demand is particularly on the social services and the health services in that town.

SAPOL has been looking for extra abilities to counteract the grog running that occurs. The South Australian government currently has legislative restrictions to reduce the incidence of alcohol-related harm in regional communities. These restrictions are focused on the Aboriginal communities predominantly and include conditions on high-risk liquor licences under the Liquor Licensing Act which limit the amount of specific liquors which can be purchased per person per day and restricts the type of liquor sold completely for off-premise consumption.

Those alcohol outlets in and around Ceduna—the Ceduna Foreshore Hotel Motel, the Thevenard Hotel, the Penong Hotel, and I think it might extend even further than that but I stand to be corrected—certainly are under restrictions as to the sale of alcohol. For me, to buy alcohol at the Ceduna hotel, I need to provide identification. They view that ID and make a record of my purchase, so it is one in all in. Complaints that I have had in my office in relation to this are in regard to the online delivery of alcohol. Obviously, some have tried to order bigger quantities from bigger retail

outlets that have online service delivery. I will not mention them, but the names will be familiar. Quite responsibly, those online outlets have chosen to respect the restrictions that have been put in place by this government.

Specific communities being prohibited under legislation from possessing and consuming liquor on the lands, with some exemptions as I mentioned before, are the APY lands, Umoona community and Yalata Reserve. Consultation with relevant agencies highlights that current strategies designed to combat grog running are not sufficient. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Auditor-General's Report

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In committee.

The CHAIR: I declare the examination of the report of the Auditor-General 2017-18 open. I remind members that the committee is in normal session. Any questions have to be asked by members on their feet, and all questions must be directly referenced to the Auditor-General's 2017-18 report. I welcome the Attorney-General and also the member for Kaurana, and I call for questions. The member for Kaurana.

Mr PICTON: I refer to the Auditor-General's Report, Part B, Agency Statements, page 19, significant events and transfers, and in particular the transfer of the \$146 million to SAicorp for the Victims of Crime Fund for the National Redress Scheme in 2017-18. I ask the Attorney-General: why was it necessary to allocate this against the 2017-18 budget?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In short, the Keogh settlement, as is well known, arose from a redress—

Mr PICTON: I was not asking that: I am referring to \$146 million.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: That is why I am trying to find it. It is the same page.

The CHAIR: Attorney, would you like the question repeated?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: We are on the Victims of Crime Fund for the Redress Scheme?

Mr PICTON: Yes.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: That's alright; I'm waiting for it.

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I have them all marked ready.

The CHAIR: Attorney, do you need the question again?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No, I think that is clear. We are now referring to \$146.4 million paid to SAicorp from the Victims of Crime Fund for the cost associated with South Australia participating in the National Redress Scheme and people who have experienced institutional child sexual abuse.

One of the first acts of the new government was to attend the next available meeting, which was within weeks of the new government coming into office, so that we could sign up. We felt that this was an important scheme that South Australia should have at all times been participating in. It had not been. The previous government's view on this was well known. In other words, it provided a redress scheme itself and that was it.

We felt that this was a priority as a new government, and we moved to attend the meetings and conclude the outstanding issues that we had been left behind on in the negotiations. The Premier signed up to the Redress Scheme and it was paid across. If it were not for that progression of the matters as soon as possible after coming into office, I fear that we would not have been able to pass the legislation that was necessary and set up the scheme ready for commencement in early 2019.

We are still on track to do that. In fact, during the week I addressed a number of personnel in the Attorney-General's Department, who are taking up the responsibility to support those with applications foreshadowed for the purpose of this new scheme, and had a consulting meeting with three representatives from the commonwealth agency to assist them in that occurring. It was a matter that needed to be dealt with as soon as practicable, and it was.

Mr PICTON: What difference would there have been if the payment had been made in the 2018-19 financial year as opposed to the 2017-18 financial year? I understand that no victim has received any payments in the 2017-18 financial year. The scheme is not established or operational yet, so why did it need to be paid out before 30 June, and was that more about the accounting than actually setting this up?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The question is: why was it necessary to pay it in that financial year if it was not going to be accessed by prospective claimants in respect of a specific payment? The very simple position is that we made a commitment to honour this agreement. We did so. We set aside the money and made it absolutely clear that that money was quarantined as a consequence of the sign-up. From memory, it was in about April that the Premier signed the agreement to participate. I do not actually have the date with me, but it was not long after the first meeting that took place at a national level with the federal minister.

He signed it on 25 May. We had the meeting, the agreement was signed on 25 May and we honoured that commitment by doing two things: one was to allocate the funding to be available for that purpose and make sure it is quarantined by placing it in the fund; secondly, pass the state legislation, which we then progressed as a matter of haste; and, thirdly, get all the machinery arrangements in place, which we are doing.

Mr PICTON: Can the Attorney outline what is going to happen to the interest accruing on the funding that has been set aside for the National Redress Scheme?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am advised that all the fund, including any interest on that fund, that is not utilised for the purposes of the scheme at the expiration of 10 years will revert back to the Victims of Crime Fund.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Now we are on to Keogh.

The CHAIR: So you will refer to—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Page 18, section 1.11 in your pre-prepared answer you have there in front of you.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Sorry, which part? They are in both.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is in Report 5 of 2018, the Executive Summary, Part A.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Part A, yes. So you have missed the other one.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, I have the other one here, too. Do not worry; I have them all, but we will start slowly and then work up.

Mr Teague: Is that a reference?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I do not know what you do in your spare time, but I am trying to do parliamentary business. In the report, we learn that the government had commissioned two pieces of legal advice, not the one. You might recall that I asked questions of this in the chamber in question time. The question is: the advice the government received in December 2017 from Wells QC and Doyle—and I am not asking you about the contents of the advice because I understand you will claim legal professional privilege, which is fine—who wrote the later piece of advice that was delivered to the government in May 2018?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Can I just clarify a couple of things that the member for West Torrens has asked, and it relates to the questions that have been asked in question time, which were I think to suggest that in some way there had been some concealment of further advice obtained after the change of government in March 2018. I would like to invite the member for West Torrens to review questions that I have answered in this parliament. I do not know if he has done that yet or not,

but I did as a consequence of this. I suggest he review the evidence of Mr Wait, the Crown Solicitor, and I think, from memory, the SAicorp representative from Treasury, and I think possibly even the chief executive, all of whom gave evidence to the Budget and Finance Committee.

It has been absolutely no secret—we have made it very clear throughout this matter—that in the lead-up to the election there had been 12 months or so of negotiation, correspondence and obtaining the Wells and Doyle report that had been referred to. Indeed, the member for West Torrens, as the former treasurer, had approved \$250,000 in legal costs. There had been correspondence.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: To fight Keogh.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: He says to fight Keogh, but he might want to confer with the member for Enfield about what correspondence their government entered into. I hope he is given the full picture there. In any event, to the extent that it might help the member for West Torrens, at a recent attendance at the Budget and Finance Committee a letter was tabled, I think via Mr Keogh's own statement, a letter of claim that his solicitors had presented. It set out a number of matters, including an acknowledgement of the appreciation of the former attorney-general, not wishing to take advantage of any delay that might have occurred as a result of the government getting advice to in any way prejudice the right of Mr Keogh's prospective claim.

It might have been a matter where the member for West Torrens was hopeful that his \$250,000 was going to be well spent in fighting Mr Keogh. Let me just make this clear by concluding on it: a letter that says, 'Dear Mr Keogh, get lost. I'll see you in court' is a lot cheaper than \$250,000. Nevertheless, his government obviously did not elect to do that and a lot of money was spent. After March, the further—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: the question was who provided the advice in 2018.

The CHAIR: The question was about the advice, absolutely. Attorney.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The continued negotiations with those senior counsel, Mr Wells and Mr Doyle, representing the new government in relation to the advice given and their assistance in the negotiations included the advice given, dated May 2018.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So to be clear, the May 2018 advice is from Wells and Doyle?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Correct.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Auditor-General says in his report that he was given access to the legal reports. In what form was that? Was it a written request to the Attorney-General or was it provided to him in the normal scope of his audit?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The Auditor-General wrote to our office—I think it was directly to me—to inquire as to the consent required for him to view any of the material that was otherwise legal professional privilege and whether in fact that could be available. I confirmed to him that he was at liberty to view it, as is consistent with previous practice, on the basis that there was no release in relation to legal professional privilege and the contents were not to be disclosed.

I was trying to think of one of the other cases that involved something like this in previous years, again with the dates of certain reports that either went to cabinet or had the umbrella of protection under legal professional privilege. I cannot recall them specifically, but I am pretty sure that the plaza development inquiry by the Auditor-General was one of the latter inquiries in relation to the member for West Torrens' former government's activities—that is the kindest way I can describe it. That was, again, respected by the Auditor-General, even though he had scant access to very much by that stage of the former government's activities. Nevertheless, he has, of course, respected that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: When did the Auditor-General write to the Attorney seeking a copy of or access to the legal opinions, and in what manner did the Attorney respond?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I can answer the second question: in writing. Dates I cannot recall specifically, but obviously it was prior to the publication of this report. It was made available to

him for the purposes of reviewing the process, which, of course, the member for West Torrens will see is without incident.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Have any other agencies sought access to the legal opinions referenced in the Auditor-General's Report?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Not that we are aware of.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So the Attorney-General has received no correspondence from any other agency seeking to access the legal opinion of December 2017 and May 2018 that the Attorney-General has relied upon?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Not that we are aware of.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What was the cost of the second piece of legal advice provided by Mr Wells QC and Mr Doyle?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: As has been identified, probably by questions of the member for West Torrens to the Crown Solicitor when I think the same question was asked of him and he explained then—if the member for West Torrens has not read that transcript and/or refreshed his memory on it—the particulars of costs in relation to legal expenses are included in the legal professional privilege.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: When the Auditor-General wrote seeking legal opinion, did he also seek access to the Crown Solicitor's opinion on the matter?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Not that we are aware of.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So the legal opinions relied upon were the two given by Wells and Doyle, two renowned lawyers, but the Crown Solicitor's opinion was not sought on the Keogh matter and the Auditor-General did not have access to any Crown Solicitor's opinion on whether the payment should or should not be made?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Not that I am aware of, but let us be clear about the question. When you say 'the only legal advice sought', perhaps the member misunderstands the role of the Auditor-General, which is surprising seeing as he was in charge of this division for a number of years. The Auditor-General is obviously entitled to review documentation and, from time to time, will seek permission to look at documents that usually no-one else can, such as cabinet resolutions, legal opinions and such.

My recollection is that the only matters that he sought permission to look at related to the legal opinions that were commissioned of Doyle and Wells. Whether he reviewed other documents, which he may have but he just has not specified them in here, as to other considerations that were given, I cannot answer as to what are the legal matters that came to the attention of the Auditor-General during his review of all the documents that were during this period, presumably from in or about May 2017, across the previous government, and then, of course, during the negotiations, which culminated in the payment from SAicorp.

I do not think it is reasonable that the member for West Torrens makes the assumption that these were the only two matters containing legal advice that were before him when he considered this matter. That is not specified.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Had the Crown Solicitor provided the Attorney-General with an opinion on the payment to Henry Keogh?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I consulted with a number of office bearers, including the Crown Solicitor.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Did the Crown Solicitor prepare a piece of advice for the Attorney-General to consider before making a recommendation to the South Australian Government Financing Authority?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: If he did, I do not think I am in a position to make any comment about it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am not asking what it says.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I realise that, but I am just saying to you that any meetings or advice or consultations or information that are conveyed from the Crown Solicitor to me are privileged and I do not waive it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: How did the Attorney-General communicate to the South Australian Government Financing Authority her view that Mr Keogh should be paid \$2.57 million?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I did not personally write to SAicorp to advise them of that. I think some memoranda were prepared to advise of the negotiated arrangement once concluded, but I cannot recall signing any particular letter. Some kind of memorandum has gone from the Attorney-General's office to the Treasurer and/or SAicorp to obviously implement the matter.

It seems to me that one of the things that has perhaps confused the member for West Torrens in this whole exercise is that whilst Mr Keogh, through his solicitors, sought from the previous government favourable consideration of an ex gratia payment, in fact what was achieved in the resolution of this matter was a payment to Mr Keogh but in full settlement, as per the deed, which has been tabled in this parliament, of any civil liability.

We are very pleased with that because, as the member for West Torrens would well know, people have secured millions of dollars in some of these settlements around Australia, sometimes without the shield of protection against civil liability. This was an important matter to us, as was the view that the amount should be public and the terms of the deed should be public.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I just point out that earlier the Attorney-General asked me to refresh myself with the Budget and Finance evidence. I would ask her to refresh herself with the evidence of the South Australian Government Financing Authority to Budget and Finance about what advice they received about how to make this payment. It is important to note that the Attorney just told the house that she sent no letter—

The CHAIR: Yes—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —to the South Australian Government Financing Authority apart from a memorandum, which is a very interesting—

The CHAIR: Member for West Torrens, you need to ask a question.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: It might be interesting, but let's get to the facts.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, we will. We will, one way or another. Once the memorandum by the Attorney was signed, I assume that the memorandum was addressed to the Treasurer and attached to it was the legal opinion and a precis of a recommendation by the Attorney-General for a payment, and then the Treasurer made an independent assessment about whether or not that payment was justified and therefore authorised SAFA to make the payment. Regarding the memorandum that the Attorney has referenced, can she give the committee of the house the date that she signed that memorandum?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No, I cannot give that to you, and I have not indicated that I have signed a memorandum. I have indicated that my understanding was that a memorandum had gone from the Attorney-General's office as such to SAicorp and/or the Treasurer. I do not recall signing a letter. I think it was in a memorandum form of advice but, as to the dates, I could not tell you.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So if the Attorney-General did not sign a memorandum, the Attorney-General did not—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Okay, I am guessing you are going to go and check and get back to the committee.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am happy to do that if you ask for it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you very much. I do ask that the Attorney-General go back and check because I think it is important to the parliament to know who in AGD informed the South Australian Government Financing Authority and the Treasurer of an opinion that this payment should be made. If it was not the Attorney-General, we would like to know who it was. I would like to get an undertaking from the Attorney-General to bring that back to the house.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am happy to accommodate whatever information I am able to provide to the committee in respect of the notification, as to the format and when, of the considered resolution on the legal advice that we had from the senior counsel, if that is available. If it is cabinet in confidence, then I will not be able to. Nevertheless, if it is available, it will be provided to the committee.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Attorney-General has mentioned cabinet and has in previous answers said that this was a cabinet process. Was the Auditor-General given access to any cabinet documents in relation to the Keogh payment?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I do not think so, but it is not my recollection that he ever asked to. This is something that the Auditor-General has made comment about in his report generally as to access to cabinet information. I think it is fair to say that, in his previous reports, he has been a little upset about the treatment that his office was given by the former government and the denial of access to information that was prepared for the purposes of cabinet. He has made no secret of his requests for there to be a mature and respectful relationship restored for the purposes of considering whether government agencies are doing the right thing. That is his job.

I know that the former government had a big change of heart as to how this would operate post the Gillman decision of the Auditor-General. In fact, very quickly the former premier announced a new set of guidelines for unsolicited bids and then also announced his new regime that was going to apply in relation to access to cabinet documents.

In this matter I do not recall there being any request by the Auditor-General, or his representative, presented to me or our department to access cabinet material, but I do specifically recall him making a request to be able to review the material. He has confirmed in here that it was subject to legal professional privilege, and that was not waived.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Could the Attorney-General again confirm that she will check to see if the Auditor-General did indeed make any request for any cabinet documents or cabinet submissions or cabinet notes regarding this payment and get back to the committee?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes, to the extent that I have already indicated, that if there had been any request made or that the conveying of information as I have previously said was the subject of cabinet in confidence, if that was available, I would make that available to the committee.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Who prepared the deed of settlement that Mr Keogh and the government signed?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The Crown

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Was it at the request of the Treasurer or the Attorney-General?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: We will have to check that, to the extent of where instructions for the preparation of the actual deed had come from. But certainly a number of the terms on it, which are here in the parliament, had been the subject obviously of negotiations that were in the Attorney-General's side of things. We are pretty focused on how things get prepared and done properly. I can tell you, after I first sighted the Nyrstar agreement, it reminded me of how important that was.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am glad there is a paper trail we can follow to find all this out. It is important to know who prepared the deed because the Attorney-General has told this parliament that she was not the decision-maker, as has the Crown Solicitor. So it is important to know who prepared the deed. Did the deed that was prepared go through various drafts, or was there one presented to Mr Keogh as a final?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think that is a matter that is subject to privilege. But as has been made clear to the member, the final deed is tabled.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: When the deed was being prepared, were any drafts of that deed made available to the Auditor-General?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am afraid I will have to claim privilege in relation to that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Given this matter was considered by cabinet, as the Deputy Premier has said—I am not interested in what the deliberations inside the cabinet were—were any draft cabinets submissions made available to the Auditor-General?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: As I indicated, I do not recall there being any request by the Auditor-General to inspect documents. All I can recall is that the only thing he asked permission to do was to look at the legal advice. On the basis of not waiving privilege, he was granted that, as has been recorded in the matter. I thank the Auditor-General for concisely setting out what happened in this matter. In case the member is interested, he also did so in Part B, under the SAicorp division, which I am sure he has read. It reaffirms exactly what we have said: we sorted out this matter, we did it properly, we have paid the money and it is the end of the matter.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You certainly did pay an accused murderer a lot of money.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Again, I ask that that be withdrawn, Mr Chair. There has been precedent on this. Each time the member for West Torrens—

The CHAIR: I take your point of order, that—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will not withdraw.

The CHAIR: You are not going to withdraw?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, he is an accused murderer. He is. The court found that he should be charged with murder and—

The CHAIR: Your comment was, 'You certainly—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I withdraw that. But the Attorney-General of the government paid an accused murderer \$2.57 million. I stand by that.

The CHAIR: That is not what you said earlier. That is not what you were asked to withdraw.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What was I asked to withdraw, sir?

The CHAIR: From memory, I think you said, 'You certainly paid a significant amount of money.'

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, \$2.57 million is a significant amount of money to an accused murderer, yes, sir.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The member for West Torrens has repeatedly come into this house and made reference to the settlement of this matter in relation to a convicted murderer. When challenged, he has withdrawn it. His modus operandi now is to refer to the party to these proceedings to be an accused murderer. The situation is that there are no current proceedings—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: He's a prime suspect, according to the police.

The CHAIR: Order! Continue, Attorney.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —in relation to Mr Keogh. Sadly, in a case like this, we may never find out what happened to Anna-Jane Cheney, but the reality is for the member for West Torrens to keep coming into the house and referring to this person as an accused murderer is not correct, and I think that he should withdraw that. He can make a complaint according to his view in respect of the history of this matter; plenty of people do.

He can say, as a matter of fact, that Mr Keogh has been the subject of proceedings, he has been convicted, the conviction has been quashed and there has been a further charge laid and a

nolle prosequi entered, but to come into the parliament and misrepresent the circumstances now—to say that he is an accused murderer—is totally unacceptable and I suggest it be withdrawn.

The CHAIR: Attorney, I have had discussions with the Clerk, who is suggesting that the terminology used is not unparliamentary nor has it caused you offence personally, so there is no necessity for it to be withdrawn. The committee is concluded.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Bills

SUMMARY OFFENCES (LIQUOR OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (17:34): I resume my contribution on this very important Summary Offences (Liquor Offences) Amendment Bill, and I have been talking particularly as to how this relates to the community of Yalata in the electorate of Flinders.

We are creating new offences in the Summary Offences Act 1953 relating to possessing or transporting liquor for the purpose of sale with a rebuttal presumption that possession above a prescribed quantity of liquor is for the purpose of sale. We are also creating a new offence in the Summary Offences Act 1953 for a person who supplies liquor or possesses or transports liquor with intention to supply it to a person in a dry community. Of course, the main driver of this activity is that there is money in it. There is great profit to be made in running grog to a dry community.

Designated areas are determined by the minister and must not be more than 20 kilometres from the boundary of a prescribed area. I know that this has caused some discussion, and under the previous government's proposal it was suggested that the boundary must not be more than 100 kilometres from the boundary of the prescribed area, but ultimately that is a fair stretch. The 20-kilometre boundary gives SAPOL and police officers quite a clear indication of what might be occurring within that relatively small district.

We are creating a new offence in the Liquor Licensing Act 1997 for a holder of a licence who sells liquor to a person reasonably believed to be an unlicensed seller intending to sell the liquor and the unlicensed seller then sells that liquor. This relates to a licensed liquor outlet in a town somewhere relatively nearby, although it does not have to be, but ordinarily it would be in close proximity to a community. Sales are made from that liquor outlet to a person whom they can reasonably believe to be intending to onsell it. This potentially leaves the licensed outlets in a difficult situation because ultimately they can never really know the intention, I guess. They need to act on suspicion.

We are also creating a new offence in the Liquor Licensing Act 1997 for an occupier or person in charge of premises who knowingly permits the unlicensed sale of liquor on those premises. In other words, they deliberately do so. Notably, this bill differs from the one the former government introduced in the following ways, and I mentioned the prescribed area, which is reduced from 100 kilometres to 20 kilometres, and 100 kilometres from Yalata brings it back to Penong, whereas, if a vehicle was under suspicion and within 20 kilometres of a community, the police are more likely to pull it over and investigate what is inside that vehicle. SAPOL has stated that this area is still entirely workable and will assist with stopping grog running.

We have to remember, and the member for Elizabeth would be familiar with this, that there are just four police officers west of Ceduna: two based at Penong and two based at Yalata, and beyond that there is nothing until Eucla, which is actually a Western Australian station. SAPOL is adequately represented, but it is not as though they are thick on the ground in the Far West, so they need to be given the ability to make this workable.

Some of the additional police powers have been removed from the bill we saw presented last year, in particular the police power to stop a vehicle, detain and search a vehicle and direct a person to open any part of the vehicle without reasonable suspicion. In other words, there needs to be reasonable suspicion before they are asked to open the boot. The government believes that these

powers were excessive and that the power of police to stop, search and detain should be the same for every other offence, being those powers in the Summary Offences Act.

The government believes that the current powers in the Summary Offences Act achieve the appropriate balance between the need for police officers to enforce the law and for community members to go about their daily activities without fear that they will be stopped and searched without reasonable suspicion. It is all about getting the right balance, and SAPOL have stated that the powers they hold are already sufficient.

I believe this goes a long way towards addressing some of the issues that we find rife within these communities, and it is well overdue. I admit that the previous government had intentions of introducing this, but the previous parliament ran out of time. There have been some other moves within the Ceduna area and within Yalata to address some of the social issues around grog running.

The cashless welfare card, which was introduced by the federal government, has been very topical and has not suited everyone, but I can guarantee the house that Ceduna is a different place for it. It means that those who are issued with a cashless welfare card are able to access just 20 per cent of their government payments in cash. This limits the amount of money that is available for grog, cigarettes and any other substance, gambling or anything else they may care to pursue.

Yalata is an interesting community. It is inhabited by around 250 or 300 Anangu people, who were originally desert people. They were a tribe of the Pitjantjatjara and were caught up in the Maralinga test site in the early 1950s. In 1952, they were relocated from their Western Desert home down to Yalata, west of Ceduna, as a result of the British bomb testing. They found themselves relocated to a camp that was not their home, and it became very difficult for them. Sixty-five years on, any original inhabitants would be elderly and would barely have a memory of their homeland, but the call of home is strong.

Oak Valley was established in 1955 and some of the Anangu people left Yalata to set up a new home there. It is further north and closer to their land, and they are much happier there. I have only visited Oak Valley once; I have of course visited Yalata on a number of occasions. My first official visit to Yalata was in 2011 when the previous government opened a new police station. Unfortunately, the previous station had burned down, so we ventured out and opened the new police station, which still stands as a beacon amongst the community.

The Australian Army has been active at Yalata during the past year. Yalata was visited by prime minister Turnbull and minister Scullion prior to the Army's visit. Over the past 12 months, Yalata has received assistance from Army personnel and will also be receiving \$7 million—including \$1.1 million from this state government—for improvements in infrastructure, health and education services. It is a dynamic community. I would urge anyone who is driving past to ask, knock on the door and go in and say hello.

Desley Culpin is CEO of the Yalata Anangu Aboriginal Community and she does a sterling job. She is well known amongst Adelaide people as she was a local and friends with a few of the MPs in this house. Pastor Russell Bryant, Chair of the Yalata Aboriginal Community, visited this place not too long ago, and we were lucky enough to meet with the Premier. The Premier is of course also the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and intends to visit Yalata and the Far West as soon as he can.

They are doing a lot of work to reinvigorate tourism within the community. They manage the Head of Bight tourism attraction, which is growing in popularity each and every year. It is whale calving season from around May through to September, and thousands of people visit on an annual basis to see that activity. All in all, the community is going particularly well at the moment, and I think this piece of legislation will assist in the management of that community. Grog running will be less likely to occur, and if it is undertaken it is more likely to be caught. As such, it will have less of an impact on the lives of the people within the community.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (17:44): I thank all speakers for their contribution to this debate and indication of support from the opposition. I am confident that this legislation, if passed by this parliament, will do good for those people who are most vulnerable. I am pleased it is a matter that essentially has the blessing of those who are sought to be protected, those who have self-determined that they will be a dry area and they want to have protection.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr PICTON: In relation to clause 1, can the Attorney outline the following. Obviously, this bill was one that was previously passed by this chamber and this bill has now been presented with a number of changes. Can you outline what consultation has happened with the police in regard to the search and seizure powers being removed from the bill, and are the police supportive of that change of removing it from the bill?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: From memory, I think I had two meetings with the police in relation to this matter, the original and their requests; some further consultation on another draft; and ultimately, they wrote confirming their support of the bill.

Mr PICTON: Can the Attorney outline what consultation process she went through with other stakeholders and what bodies were consulted in the drafting of this legislation?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I cannot account for those that were drafted when this bill was first presented—

Mr PICTON: The second time.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —yes, the second time—but I am aware that submissions were received from SAPOL, the Law Society, the ALRM and the Aboriginal Lands Trust. I remember now writing to 12 different Aboriginal groups that we felt had an interest in the matter. Whilst there were the usual suspects, we felt this was a matter sensitive to a number of Aboriginal communities, so their representative bodies should be consulted. I think to the best of my knowledge there was no objection from them.

Mr PICTON: Can the Attorney provide between the houses the list of the organisations that were consulted, those 12 organisations?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes. They are not government agencies, so it does not apply to the normal arrangement with that, so I am happy for a list to be provided.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 and 3 passed.

Clause 4.

Mr PICTON: In relation to clause 4, can the Attorney outline what constitutes a designated area and does this capture all dry zones currently in place within South Australia? Is it possible to remove dry zones from being impacted by the provisions within the bill?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Looking under clause 4, the definition of 'prescribed area means', I am advised that under (a) that cannot be changed by regulation but that (b), (c) and (d) could be.

Mr PICTON: Thank you. I am not sure if that answers all my questions, but I am limited to three questions so I will move on. In new section 21OD—Designated areas, the boundary has been reduced from 100 kilometres to 20 kilometres. Which stakeholders represented this need to occur? Why has the Attorney-General decided to make that change and has it received the support of all the stakeholders?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The area essentially was originally presented by SAPOL. We had discussions about that. The member might recall, if he participated in the debate when the bill was before the parliament under the last government, that the issue of the area was an issue of concern. We had that as the subject of our discussions with SAPOL and ultimately they agreed to this.

Mr PICTON: In relation to 21OF, what regulations is the Attorney-General currently considering?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: If the member views subsection (6) of the proposed 21OB of this section, you will see that there is a reference there to what the amount of liquor possessed or transported is to be prescribed, and so it is necessary for us to have regulations to deal with that, and otherwise, as will be advised once the passage of the bill is determined.

Mr ODENWALDER: I will go back to 21OD(3) regarding the reduction of the distance from 100 kilometres to 20 kilometres. You mentioned there was some unrest. I cannot remember your exact words, but there was some concern about that in the previous iteration of the bill. I wonder if you could tell me what those concerns were, assuming I did not read all the second reading speeches from the previous bill?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The general feeling was around the extent of the application of the area—I think, from memory, it was 100 kilometres—and that was in the original bill of the previous government. We had discussions with SAPOL personnel about that and, as a result of that, they presented to us an alternative. This is the resolution of the amount.

Mr ODENWALDER: I am sorry. I do not want to harp on about this, but I still do not understand what the concern was. I understand there were concerns that you discussed with SAPOL, but what were those concerns? Why was it changed? I understand that SAPOL ended up supporting it. I believe you.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The extent of application of the act that this would apply to was greater than we thought should apply. We made that point when the bill was originally before the parliament. For whatever reason, obviously, I suppose it is a bit of an ambit claim with these things; nevertheless, SAPOL accepted that they would support the bill in its current form.

Clause passed.

Schedule 1.

Mr PICTON: I wonder if the Attorney can explain why defences for the new provisions included in part 3, section 29(3)(a) and (b) were not included but were similar to those provided for in the new section 210B—Possession, transportation of liquor for sale, which introduces defences in subsections (4) and (5)?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Could you repeat the question?

Mr PICTON: I can. Can you explain why the defences for the new provisions included in part 3, 29(3)(a) and 29(3)(b) were not included but were similar to those provided for in the new section 210B—Possession, transportation of liquor for sale, which introduces defences in subsections (4) and (5)?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: They are different offences; therefore, they do not need the same defences.

Schedule passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (17:56): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (RATEPAYER PROTECTION AND RELATED MEASURES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

*Parliamentary Procedure***ADJOURNMENT**

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (17:57): I move:

That the house do now adjourn.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 22

Noes 15

Majority 7

AYES

Bell, T.S.

Cregan, D.

Gardner, J.A.W.

Luethen, P.

Patterson, S.J.R.

Power, C.

Teague, J.B.

Wingard, C.L.

Chapman, V.A.

Duluk, S.

Harvey, R.M. (teller)

McBride, N.

Pederick, A.S.

Sanderson, R.

Treloar, P.A.

Cowdrey, M.J.

Ellis, F.J.

Knoll, S.K.

Murray, S.

Pisoni, D.G.

Speirs, D.J.

van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

NOES

Boyer, B.I.

Cook, N.F.

Hughes, E.J.

Mullighan, S.C.

Picton, C.J.

Brown, M.E. (teller)

Gee, J.P.

Koutsantonis, A.

Odenwalder, L.K.

Stinson, J.M.

Close, S.E.

Hildyard, K.A.

Malinauskas, P.

Piccolo, A.

Weatherill, J.W.

PAIRS

Basham, D.K.B.

Wortley, D.

Rau, J.R.

Whetstone, T.J.

Marshall, S.S.

Bettison, Z.L.

Motion thus carried.

At 18:03 the house adjourned until Thursday 15 November 2018 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***AMBULANCE STATION CLOSURES**

414 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (16 October 2018). Are there any plans to close the ambulance station at Morphett Road, Camden Park?

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

SA Ambulance services which were based at the Camden Park station have now been moved to the new Glengowrie ambulance station.

The Camden Park station is continuing to be used by the Metropolitan Fire Service.

AMBULANCE STATION CLOSURES

415 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (16 October 2018). Are there any plans to close the ambulance station at Alexander Avenue, Ashford?

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

There are no plans to close the Ashford ambulance station.

OUTPATIENT APPOINTMENTS

416 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (16 October 2018). Can the minister advise how many outpatient appointments were provided in 2017-18 in the following areas:

- (a) Overall?
- (b) Breast speciality?
- (c) Cardiology speciality?
- (d) Cardiothoracic speciality?
- (e) Craniofacial speciality?
- (f) Dermatology speciality?
- (g) Ear, nose and throat speciality?
- (h) Endocrinology speciality?
- (i) Gastroenterology speciality?
- (j) General medicine speciality?
- (k) General surgery speciality?
- (l) Geriatric medicine speciality?
- (m) Gynaecology speciality?
- (n) Gynaecology oncology speciality?
- (o) Haematology speciality?
- (p) Hepatobiliary speciality?
- (q) Immunology speciality?
- (r) Infectious diseases speciality?
- (s) Medical oncology (consultation) speciality?
- (t) Nephrology speciality?
- (u) Neurology speciality?
- (v) Neurosurgery speciality?
- (w) Ophthalmology speciality?
- (x) Orthopaedics speciality?
- (y) Paediatric medicine speciality?
- (z) Paediatric surgery speciality?
- (aa) Pain management speciality?

- (bb) Palliative care speciality?
- (cc) Plastic and reconstructive surgery speciality?
- (dd) Psychiatry speciality?
- (ee) H radiation therapy (consultation) speciality?
- (ff) Rehabilitation—medicine speciality?
- (gg) Respiratory speciality?
- (hh) Respiratory – cystic fibrosis speciality?
- (ii) Rheumatology speciality?
- (jj) Sleep disorders speciality?
- (kk) Spinal speciality?
- (ll) Urology speciality?
- (mm) Vascular surgery speciality?

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

The member is referred to the publicly released document SA Health Metropolitan Specialist Outpatient Clinics Median and Maximum Outpatient Waiting Time by Specialty and Hospital with particular reference to the data caveat therein.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

417 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (16 October 2018). For each of the following months how many mental health patients waited longer than 24 hours in emergency departments for a bed:

- (a) January 2018?
- (b) February 2018?
- (c) March 2018?
- (d) April 2018?
- (e) May 2018?
- (f) June 2018?
- (g) July 2018?
- (h) August 2018?
- (i) September 2018?

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

- (a) 111
- (b) 96
- (c) 100
- (d) 97
- (e) 89
- (f) 159
- (g) 126
- (h) 146
- (i) 149.