

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 19 March 2019

The **SPEAKER (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)** took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

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

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (11:01): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith.

The SPEAKER: There being an absolute majority present, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

Mr Pederick: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: The question is that standing orders be suspended.

Motion carried.

Motions

CHRISTCHURCH MOSQUES ATTACK

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (11:02): I move:

That this house—

- (a) expresses its deepest sorrow and abhorrence at the senseless killing of innocent men, women and children in the Al Noor Mosque and Linwood Islamic Centre in Christchurch on Friday 15 March 2019;
- (b) mourns the tragic loss of life and hopes for the a full recovery of those injured;
- (c) expresses its deepest sympathy to the families and friends of all those who are affected by this appalling event;
- (d) stands in solidarity with the people of Christchurch—Adelaide's sister city—New Zealand, and South Australia's Muslim community;
- (e) condemns terrorism and extremism in all its forms; and
- (f) reaffirms its commitment to an inclusive and harmonious multicultural society.

Since my election to this house, I have visited New Zealand on several occasions. I have done so particularly to learn more about New Zealand and their economic recovery. On every occasion, I have been welcomed as a friend by a nation prepared to share the reasons for its economic success with others.

That is New Zealand: a society that is open, a society that is generous and a society that has respect for all people. Like Australia, it is a nation prepared to offer many people from elsewhere the opportunity for a better life, but it is a society now having to deal with an act of unimaginable horror, an act so despicable as to be beyond any comprehension whatsoever, an act showing utter contempt for innocent human life.

Yet, out of what New Zealand's Prime Minister has called her nation's darkest day, has come another lesson. The calm, firm, courageous resolve of Jacinda Ardern shines a light for us all on how political extremism in all its forms must be confronted and condemned, not by expressions of hate and lust for revenge but by remaining comfortable with diversity and determination that the extremists will not turn people against each other as they seek support for their depraved ways. Out of the very worst in human instinct, in her response, the Prime Minister has demonstrated the very best of

humanity. We stand in solidarity with her, Adelaide's sister city Christchurch, all New Zealanders and people everywhere of the Islamic faith.

This is not the first time in recent years that the people of Christchurch have been sorely tested. We all remember the terrible earthquake of just eight years ago and how resilient that city has been in its determination to recover and rebuild. Now our sister city is challenged by tragedy again. There may have been fewer victims this time, but this was no indiscriminate act of nature: it targeted men, women and children in their place of worship.

As we grieve with Christchurch, we have reached out to our sister city to offer any support it needs and we are able to provide. What happened on Friday is a reminder to us all that terrorism can occur anywhere and at any time, even in the most peaceful and compassionate of places. We must all be vigilant and alert and remain true to our values.

The devastating ramifications of the act of evil, the act of terror, the act of violence that occurred in Christchurch on Friday last week have been felt far beyond New Zealand's shores. On Sunday evening, I attended, at the invitation of Ahmed Zreika, a vigil at the mosque on Marion Road. I did this to stand in solidarity with the Muslim community here in South Australia. I wanted to send a very strong message that the government, the parliament and the people of South Australia stand with the Muslim community in our state as they try to understand the horror of what occurred on Friday.

What I heard in the various speeches that were made by the Muslim community in South Australia was not talk of revenge or hatred but of tolerance, diversity and respect for diversity here in our state. It was a very uplifting set of speeches from Muslim leaders in South Australia. We have much to learn from our Muslim community in South Australia. I commend the motion to the house.

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (11:06): I would like to thank the Premier for moving the motion. I take great pleasure in being able to second the motion and to speak to it. The Premier referred, quite rightly, to the unique relationship that the City of Adelaide has with the City of Christchurch. Indeed, in an official sense, that sister city relationship has existed for 47 years. We have seen that relationship evolve over time in a number of ways.

Certainly, it has been the case that there have been cultural exchanges. We have seen exchanges occur on the basis of education, with literally hundreds of primary school students from our state taking part in exchange visits with Christchurch students. We have seen deep economic connections between our city and our state and Christchurch with South Australian businesses for over 20 years, through delegations to and from the city of Christchurch in conjunction with their Chamber of Commerce. Examples of that include the old Perry Engineering site at Mile End having workers who exchanged with Mace Engineering in Christchurch around the Anzac Frigate build and, of course, there have been cultural exchanges as well. So for that reason, amongst others, the motion is appropriate.

There is also another element to consider in the context of our state in the fact that our state, probably unlike many others, has a long history with the Islamic community. The first Muslim mosque built in this nation was in South Australia in Marree, in our state's Far North, where from 1861—1861, Mr Speaker—religious traditions of the Islamic faith have been observed by the Afghan camel drivers. We have also seen the first significant mosque in any Australian city be built in 1888, that being the great Adelaide Mosque in Gilbert Street—an incredible tradition unrivalled in our federation.

When we think about the Islamic faith in the context of what occurred last Friday, it helps us grasp why the events are so shocking. It is because all of us in this place—and I think the overwhelming majority of South Australians who have familiarity with the Islamic faith—understand that the Islamic faith is one of compassion and love. It teaches those themes not just to other Muslims but indeed to every human being. The whole underlying idea of Islamic morality is that of love, and of course the word 'Islam' originates from the word 'peace'. The truth is that Islam is consistent with the best traditions of everything that our state and our country believe.

The Premier is right: what happened on Friday is truly sickening. It was so deliberate. The violence was truly savage. It was aimed at innocent, peaceful people, and the raw nature of injustice makes it hard for it not to have an impact on one's heart. I think it can put hate in your heart and, in many regards, that is a human response that we must be alive to.

When you think about the events that happened last week, it is interesting to think about why they are so newsworthy, because when thinking people—as all of us here aspire to be—challenge ourselves to contemplate the events that occurred in Christchurch last week, in many ways those events were not too dissimilar to what we also see on the news every now and then. Deliberate acts of violence targeted at a particular minority in one particular country, which are aimed at peaceful people, which result in multiple deaths, do occur, sadly all too frequently, but they do not always capture the attention in the way that this Christchurch massacre has captured the attention of our state and the world generally, and I think we should challenge ourselves to think about why.

When I do that, and when we all collectively do that, I think one of the reasons that we may be drawn towards why this has captured so many people's attention throughout the world is the place in which it occurred, because New Zealand and Australia are not too dissimilar in being places in the world that have not fallen foul of the intolerance and polarisation and the sense of division that seem to have intoxicated so many other countries around the world, including other countries that we would normally be compared with.

The UK is being torn apart at the seams over Brexit. France and western Europe are clearly going through massive troubles with the yellow vests. In eastern Europe, nationalistic governments are not just forming but have waves of popularism behind them, and then of course in the US we see an extraordinary state of division and polarisation best embodied by the now President of the United States, an office that we used to attribute to being 'the leader of the free world'.

Here in our little pocket of the globe, our little quadrant, we have not had that, and I think we really have been a source of hope and inspiration for the rest of the world. When violence comes to our own shores, despite our commitment to multiculturalism, it shocks everybody. It hurts us at home, but it shocked the whole world, and I think it presents a very substantial test for us. Are we going to respond to the events in Christchurch with the emotions that I felt on Sunday in the lead-up to thinking about the vigil that the Premier and I attended—those emotions of hate and anger—or do we rise to the test and instead respond with other things that are far more powerful: the virtues of compassion, hope and love?

I had the pleasure of being with the Premier on Sunday night at that event, and I think all of us who were there would attest to the fact that we are going to pass this test, no problems, because on Sunday night there was a cross-section of our community from multiple faiths, multiple ethnicities and people of no faith at all, really coming together to rally behind not just the Islamic community but the idea of multiculturalism in our society.

It is a virtue that transcends all politics, and it is one that has been accepted, I think, by both sides of politics: it is supported by everyone in this house. For those reasons, amongst others, I think multiculturalism in this nation has a prosperous future. Despite the remarks of Senator Anning in the federal parliament, the truth is that this has always been and always will be an immigrant nation.

Fraser Anning cannot claim lineage of over 40,000 years. To the best of my knowledge, unfortunately nor can anyone else in this chamber, which means we are all immigrants and must do everything we can to ensure multiculturalism not just survives but thrives. This means that the next immigrant who comes to this nation is looked at not just with tolerance but with wholehearted compassion.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (11:15): I support the motion. I cannot overestimate the significance of a motion such as this and why it is so important that we stand beside our sister city of Christchurch: for the people of that city, and indeed the whole of New Zealand, in the pain that they are currently suffering; for those who are currently tending to the wounds of those who have been injured; and for those families and loved ones of the 50 innocent men, women and children who were slaughtered in the events of last Friday. These are adults who will never again see their partners, they are people who will not see their children grow up and they are children who will not grow up, all as a result of being peacefully in prayer at a time when their only guilt was to be in the wrong place at the wrong time.

As grotesque an act as this has been, in respect of the killing by one person, and as puzzling and as distressing as this is for us, it is important to remember the innocence of the victims to appreciate what has happened. It is important that we stand beside our colleagues and the people

in Christchurch during this difficult time and wish those who are injured a full recovery. Some will live with the scars of this forever. We need to send a very clear sign to the civilised world on the matters that the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition have both acknowledged, that is, the importance of our countries having been built on a diversity which has given us strength and advancement.

This has been a callous act of murder—multiple murder. Whilst I look with some interest at the question about whether the offender in this case is charged with murder or other terrorist offences, the significance of this should not be underestimated. In my view, there has been murder. Certainly, there will be aspects of this case that identify questions about the mental competence of the person involved, the circumstances in which this has developed and his attempt to place it on social media and gain attention for himself. There will be questions about whether the police did or did not know about this. These are all the aspects that go with being confronted by a senseless murder and questions then being asked.

It is difficult to imagine, when we go through the sorrow stage to the blame stage, how we are going to get through this, but we are here with New Zealand to assist them and support them to do that. It is a country which, on the face of it, has not been plagued with the same level of terrorism that even Australia has faced in recent decades, and therefore we ought to be extending a hand both to the Prime Minister and the members of the opposition and their parliament, who will face the inevitable questions and considerations of gun laws. They themselves have had inquiries into these matters. Again, they will have to draw a line in the sand and carefully consider how they might deal with it.

When they do, I invite them to look to Australia and consider what we in Australia had to face post the Martin Bryant massacre at Port Arthur in Tasmania. I think most people, even if they were not around at the time, would know of this circumstance. It changed the face of Australia. It changed the face of our gun laws. I did not always agree with everything John Howard did, but I can tell you that I have repeatedly commended his bravery in going around the country and standing up in relation to gun laws that related to repeat weapons and saying, 'This must change.' There were riots in country regions, and there were great concerns about what was going to occur, but he did stand up to that. It can be done.

I say that to the Prime Minister of New Zealand: there can be change to accommodate this. We need to support them to do that.

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:19): Too often over the course of my adult life I have had occasion to be moved by the death of people I do not know. As my leader said, people die all the time in violent circumstances, but when we contemplate a mass killing motivated by hate there is something profound in all of us that responds to that tragedy. The overwhelming sense is of grief and of sympathy for those directly affected: those who died, those who are injured, their families and all the community that was under attack collectively.

In many ways, this was a senseless tragedy, yet it was not without context. It was perpetrated by a monster, not a fictional one but a human one, a human monster who in fact grew up on our shores. He holds the entire responsibility for what occurred, but we cannot allow ourselves to not ask the deeper questions about the environment in which this hate and intolerance have become so strong in various parts of our world and from which we are not immune. While we grieve, we must understand how we can be active in challenging those messages of hatred, in challenging those messages of saying that certain people, by virtue of their grouping, do not belong, are not equal and have no merit.

All the blame is attached to action, but there is a moral weight to words and to ideas. As a nation in the great Australasian family, we must consider the complicity in the way in which some of our leadership in the community and politically can facilitate and encourage that level of hatred and intolerance. There is a quote that I believe originated with Dr King—if not, he certainly made it very well known—about the arc of history being long but bending towards justice. President Obama has also expressed that concept of a sense that life eventually gets better, even when you see great injustice on the path. I think Dr King came from a position of an expression of his faith. I would not speak for President Obama, but it may have been a combination of his faith in his god and his faith in humanity.

I have always been very attracted to the idea that we live in a world where, although we go back and forth, largely we get better, more progressive, more compassionate, more open. When I spend time with young people I can allow myself to feel that that is true, but we cannot allow that to translate into complacency about our culture, our country, our state. There is no historical determinism, as some of my progressive comrades ideologically in the past may have felt. There is only the action that we take individually and collectively.

We must find a way to not be passive in our celebration of cultural, linguistic and faith diversity. It is not enough to say that we are a multicultural nation. We have to demonstrate that that is something to be celebrated and that people who are critical and full of hate cannot have their words and ideas go unchallenged by us.

On Saturday night, several members of parliament and I attended a magnificent ceremony celebrating young Muslim students who had gone through year 12 at the end of last year and who had done extremely well. It was such a bringing together of how we are all feeling in this chamber today: a sense of absolute pride and joy in these magnificent young people, who had done so extraordinarily well, but a sombreness and almost inexpressible sympathy for their feeling that because of their faith they were not welcomed and not loved. Everything we can do to tell them that they are, and everything, importantly, that we can do to challenge those people who dare say that they are not is exactly what it is to be in public life, and we all need to step up to it.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:25): The parliament has a feeling of weight upon itself today when we confront an issue such as this for several reasons. I think the onus on us all is to reflect on our relationship with the people of Christchurch, Adelaide's sister city, and the people of New Zealand. The Leader of the Opposition made the point, 'Why is it that this feels so much closer to home than other tragedies in so many other places?' It is that we have such a shared history with the people of not just New Zealand but Christchurch in particular.

I remember so many people who came here to Adelaide after the earthquake to spend some time in our educational institutions while institutions in New Zealand were rebuilding. There is that shared history and sense of understanding of each other. 'If it can happen in Christchurch then it can happen here' is a genuinely concerning fear that I think many people have expressed.

In the act of horror which has been identified and which we are responding to today, we also have a sense that there is a group in our community—individuals within that community—who already sometimes feel alienated and isolated, feel themselves victims of racial or religious oppression or acts of isolation. That community in South Australia need our support at this time, when they see people not unlike themselves worshipping in a mosque in Christchurch and being attacked in such a way. It is important for our parliament to identify their needs and support them at this time.

There is a third group that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition identified that I would also like to talk about in particular, and that is young people in our community—young people of Islamic faith and young people not of Islamic faith in our community—because their future is our future on both fronts. The young people of Islamic faith need our reassurance, our support and our love. Young people not of Islamic faith we of course meet in our schools every day, and the diversity that they grow up with defines who they are. Their understanding of not just tolerance but of celebration of the multicultural community they live in and the opportunities that gives them is tremendously important.

For all those reasons, it is very encouraging that the parliament has suspended other business until we can talk about this a little bit and make sure that we send a strong message to our community as we not only confront the issues in Christchurch that have horrified us but also contemplate how they impact on our community, how we celebrate those good things in our community and how we celebrate the diversity and multiculturalism in our community so that that can help as being our ballast as a community to grow and continue to grow.

Words have been used in relation to the shooter and people who feel the way that he does—words like 'hate', 'intolerance' and 'anger', and it is completely understandable that they are. The concept that one person is less a human being than another person is in my view the root of where every evil act starts, going back to mass killings, going back to genocide, going back to war. The idea that one group of people is somehow more human, more chosen, more special than another

group of people and that another group of people is less than human is abhorrent to me and I think it is abhorrent to our community. But that is where evil begins: the placing of oneself as a better species than another. We are all humans, and we must share this earth and share it well.

Instead, our parliament stands firm, and we call for love and we call for justice when there is an atrocity. But we call for love in our community, and we call for the celebration of diversity. The things that our Muslim community in South Australia does are significant, going back to the 19th century when they helped build modern South Australia to what it is. In particular, I think the contribution made by Muslims in South Australia today, the people we meet in our lives and the way they contribute to our community, is also significant.

In public life, we get invitations to celebrate Iftar dinners with Muslim families or Muslim schools, to celebrate festivals of Eid, to get an understanding of the beautiful story of Ramadan and what that fasting and sacrifice mean to an individual as they operate in our society. These invitations are privileges and I think having an understanding of each other, our background and the stories of our antecedents is important.

As our children grow up and visit the schools, as many do, I think we can have great confidence that they are talking to each other. They do not see the veil of hatred in the classroom and the schoolyard or even the fear of the unknown that may have pervaded so many former generations. That is to be encouraged. I do not think there are many young people in our schools who have that same experience, but it does exist.

Muslims are not just community leaders; Muslims are our children, our workmates, and they are in our communities and contributing greatly. I remember when I had one trainee in my electorate office who was a refugee from Africa. The story that keeps coming back to me when I think of his contribution in our office is that two people, at different times, asked him on the phone if he was a Muslim and did not want to speak to him as a consequence of that. We must confront that at every turn and we must understand that there is still hatred and intolerance in our community. It behoves us all, as community leaders, to always speak up and not be a bystander when that occurs.

I continue to give my commitment that I will seek to do that in my role as a community leader. We must seek to educate, share compassion, share understanding and not be blind to the challenges but celebrate the strengths in our society. That is why in my speech today I focus on the strengths in our community and the optimism for the future. There is good reason for optimism, but we must also be vigilant and ever searching for justice.

We stand today with the victims and we pray for their speedy recoveries if they have been injured. We understand that they and their families have been affected and the families of those who are lost deserve our remembrance and our sorrow. The state of South Australia will continue to stand with the people of New Zealand but also with those South Australians in our community who feel isolated or alienated in any way. To those who have ever felt the victim of racial discrimination, the very strong message from this parliament is that you are welcome in this state and we are lucky to have you.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (11:32): I commend all the speakers who have come before me and I commend all of those who will come after me. I am assured that in this parliament there will be unanimous agreement on this sentiment we are all about to express of our horror about what occurred in Christchurch at two mosques, the Al Noor and Linwood.

I cannot imagine what it would be like to be preparing for prayer, only to hear gunshots at the door. I take my children to church every week, as my father took me. It is a solemn tradition in our family. We go to worship and we go to pray. My kids often get bored, run around and do not really want to do the observance, and I try to keep them quiet for everyone else. It never occurs to me that they will not be safe in a church. It does not occur to me that they might be in danger if they are outside playing with the other kids. It is a safe place where we go to think, where we go to pray, where we go to console a loved one, maybe at a funeral, or celebrate a wedding.

Mosques are no different. These people were attending prayer on Friday and preparing for it communally, as they always do, never even considering that it would not be safe. I can imagine the same scenario in a household such as mine when my father would say to me, 'Come on, get ready, let's take the kids to church.' How many grandparents on Friday in Christchurch were nagging

their children to bring their grandchildren with them to mosque to learn their traditions and to pray, not to lose who they are and their identity in a new country?

They wanted to adapt and become New Zealanders but also maintain their faith and their traditions from their former country, only to find that they had put their grandchild at risk because a madman, who had been radicalised on the internet, decided that he would murder people because of their ethnicity and their faith. Imagine the feeling of knowing the danger that they were in.

I cannot begin to contemplate what made this man feel as if what he was doing was just, but he was not born that way. Growing up in Australia, reading the same newspapers that we read, going to the same types of schools that we all go to, he became radicalised. He may have been alone—

Mrs Power: Maybe he got the 'Can you trust Habib' flyer.

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Maybe he saw something on the internet that triggered something. Whatever it was, social media needs to take greater responsibility for what it is that they allow to be published on their websites. The idea that this could be a live broadcast on Facebook and still available on some YouTube channels is horrific. It is horrific to the memory of the families and it is horrific in its impact on the victims and other people. I think when there is this type of darkness in the world, we need to unite to ensure that there is one common response from all political leaders. Thus far, we have had it. Thus far, the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition have been as one. Thus far, the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition have been as one. Hopefully, this parliament will be as one, and I am sure it will.

The idea that this could occur in Australia may be surprising to a lot of us, but I have visited the Coptic Orthodox Church in Cowandilla. The door to their main place of worship is basically on the footpath. When I visited them for one of their feast days, I was shocked at the level of anxiety that they felt at the potential for danger. I am sure this is going through the minds of Islamic communities across Australia as well, thinking about the security of their places of worship.

I think it is important that we say to all of them with one voice that their places of worship are secure, and it is all of our responsibility. All South Australians take this issue very, very seriously. We take seriously the issue of making people safe in their places of worship and safe in the places where we gather as communities—whether it is a park, a festival, a school, a church or a mosque—and we do all we can to let people know that the South Australian community will not tolerate this type of intolerance in any way.

The South Australian Islamic community has done an excellent job since this terrible shooting, but also previously. South Australia is a very tolerant and accepting community. I think the current Deputy Lord Mayor of the City of Adelaide is a person of the Islamic faith, and that is not only a credit to him and his family but a credit to the people and constituents of the City of Adelaide. I agree with George Megalogenis that, as new waves of migration come through and integration and acceptance occur, that is occurring at a faster rate today than it did previously.

I think it took longer for the Irish to assimilate than it took for the Greeks and Italians to be accepted. Assimilation is probably the wrong term. I think the Vietnamese communities and the South-East Asian communities that migrated in the 1970s were accepted a lot faster, although that caused some angst and some political dog whistling. But every wave gets better and better and better, and we are a richer country for it.

I leave this condolence motion in the parliament with this thought: I think no child who has a sense of what occurred in Christchurch can find any way to rationalise that in their mind, but I bet you there are some adults, even in Australia, who are rationalising it in their minds. This is a case where the children have it right: there is no way of rationalising this. This is not payback. This is in no way acceptable.

The comments from Fraser Anning and his ilk are so offensive and hurtful to those communities. The question for us as a society and as a western liberal democracy is: how is it that the man who holds those views, who received 19 votes, sits in our nation's parliament, yet no-one growing up in Australia can possibly rationalise his thoughts as being anything any Australian should

hold? Whether we are prepared to stand up to that type of intolerance and whether we are prepared to call it out are tough questions for our democracy. I think the Leader of the Opposition is right in saying that we have passed that test here in this state and will continue to pass that test. The question is whether the rest of the world is.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills) (11:41): I thank the Premier for moving the motion and the Leader of the Opposition for seconding the motion, and those who have spoken so far. Mr Speaker, in my observation over my 50-odd years in life, respect derives through reputation—like yours, for example, as the Speaker: the Speaker has a reputation of having respect—or is earned through relationships. I reflect on some of the stories that my father told me of when he arrived from Italy in 1952 to a very different Australia from the one we have today. It was a very Anglo monoculture where you could only buy olive oil at the pharmacy for medicinal purposes. Imagine that today.

At first, there was an enormous intolerance for those Greeks and Italians. They were often confused with who they were. There is a saying, 'Una faccia, una razza,' which means, 'One face, one race.' They were not accepted until Australians learned that they were no different from those who were born and bred here from the English stock who had been here for 100-odd years. That was through relationships: relationships in the workplace, relationships on the sporting field, relationships in the community.

The irony of what happened in New Zealand is that that is exactly what the Muslim community were doing in New Zealand: they were building relationships with the broader community. They had an open day late last year and, from what I understand, this terrorist went to that open day at those mosques to case the place, to work out where the exits were and to work out when the greatest number of people were there so that he could plan his attack on that community.

It is a sad indictment on that act of giving of their culture in opening their mosques to the general community in order to remove some of those barriers that were there either by perception or as real barriers in the general community. I think when you are a member of parliament, you are exposed to many more communities and groups than when you are not. We know, as members of parliament, how friendly and loving the Muslim community is in South Australia because we are exposed to them; we have relationships with them.

Unfortunately, for many people, the only relationships they have with minority communities, particularly ones they do not know or have not experienced themselves personally, are what they see on social media, and of course we all know about fake news. It is time that all of us, as leaders, call out dog whistling when we see it and that we call out ignorance when we see it. We do not need to be rude about it. We can simply say, 'I do not think you are right in making that claim.' It is every leader's responsibility to do that, and that is something I have been doing and will continue to do. I encourage other members of the community to do the same.

South Australia is the state and community it is today because we opened our doors after the Second World War. The catchcry was 'Populate or perish'. We still had the White Australia Policy. I think my father just scraped in. I think after he had been a week at Glenelg, he might not have got in after the tan, and that is how specific the White Australia Policy was. It did not matter where you came from; it was about how you looked as to whether you got through.

I think we should be proud as a nation of how far we have come and how broad we are as a multicultural community, and we are the most successful in the world and we should not be embarrassed about that. We are the most successful multicultural community in the world. We are a culturally wealthy country and we are an economically wealthy country because we said yes to multiculturalism and immigration.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (11:47): I commend the Premier's motion to the house for us to reflect on this horrific incident last week in Christchurch. We were all deeply shocked at the news of the massacre last Friday.

While it means a lot to many, it means a lot to us. Our countries, of course, are geographically close. But more than that, we are very close in our shared histories, the people of New Zealand and Australia. Our experience is very similar as British colonies on the far-flung antipodean ends of the earth in the 1700s and onwards. Our experiences are very much shared in supporting each other in

the war efforts pursued by the British Empire, most notably establishing the ANZAC tradition. More recently, our experience is shared as a growing, thriving multicultural community on both sides of the ditch, as we might express it. Our experience has been shared as we have sought respectively to carve out our places in what has been an increasingly complex and globalised world.

As we have had more than one member already remark to the house, Adelaide and Christchurch are sister cities, and we have shared much since that sister city relationship was established—and other members might know this better than I—in 1986, if not earlier, at least over decades ago.

But today we share the horror of that most awful incident, which occurred less than a week ago. The circumstances are deeply shocking. As the member for West Torrens said, what could be more shocking than this, already a most shocking incident, than for it to occur in a place of worship, where people were going about their day, seeking to better express or come closer to those important tenets of their religion—tenets of love, of compassion, of justice, of acceptance—and for this act to occur amongst those people in such a sacred place.

It is awful to have to reflect not only on those individuals' experiences—those people who were killed, of course, and those people who were injured—but on all those other people who were immediately affected by the incident last Friday: those victims' families, their friends, their loved ones, their colleagues, their acquaintances, all of them directly touched by this act of terror, as well as the police and emergency services—those people who are expected to be the first responders in this incident—and the broader community of Christchurch, having to realise that this shocking act has been conducted within their own community and, similarly more broadly, the experience of the people of New Zealand, their country's government, its leadership, having to come to terms with this act.

If we allow ourselves time to put ourselves in the place of any of those people, if we can perhaps try to demonstrate some direct sense of empathy by imagining what it must be like to have had any one of those experiences, then the full horror of this act of terror becomes apparent. The Deputy Premier and the deputy leader are right: there is much to contemplate for all of us in the wake of this act.

The Deputy Premier made reference to the conversation about gun laws that is now beginning in New Zealand, a conversation our country had to contemplate in the wake of the Port Arthur massacre in 1996. There will be ongoing contemplations, as the deputy leader stated, about how an individual could allow themselves to be warped to the extent that they could possibly be capable of such a horrific act.

There will need to be an ongoing and deep reflection on our shared commitment to diversity, to multiculturalism, and on how we can begin repairing the damage this act has done to the perception of our community's commitment to this. The Muslim community is an integral part of our community here, in Christchurch and across our two countries, and both the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition are right: we will work harder to promote our commitment to multiculturalism in the wake of this and our shared values of peace, love, justice and compassion.

There will be reflections and investigations on the specific circumstances of the incident, of course, and there will be, as the member for Unley has said, those important questionings of the role of social media, both within this incident and what it facilitated for the perpetrator, but, more generally, as message boards for the exponential growth in abuse, in hatred, in vilification and in extremism. These are only a few of the pertinent issues that will be canvassed in the coming days, weeks and months and, hopefully, acted on.

But, like all acts of terror, it is the responsibility of all in our community to be resilient in the face of them, to be compassionate, to be positive about the future and together to send a message that our community stands united in the face of such acts. I commend the Premier's motion to the house, I commend those members supporting it, and I commend those members speaking in support of it and providing this important opportunity for community leadership.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:54): I strongly support the Premier's motion and acknowledge the unanimous support for the motion in this chamber—and I am not in the very least surprised by that. As I have said in this

chamber before, any loss of life is sad, any unexpected death is confronting and any avoidable death is tragic.

I believe that is true, but what we are talking about at the moment is something so much more. You take those very human, very natural, very real feelings and multiply them by 50 at once—50 people killed. You consider the fact that they were deliberately, hatefully killed in a pre-planned way. You think about the fact that this has happened unexpectedly in our part of the world; not in our nation, but certainly in our part of the world and in another country that we would all think of as the most similar to Australia.

Overlay that with the fact that it was perpetrated in a place of worship. Forget Muslim, Christian, Hindu, Sikh, non-believers; it was a place of worship, whatever your choice of worship might be. My place of worship is in the Flinders Ranges. It does not matter; it is a place of worship and people were massacred, 50 of them at once. It is hard to absorb all that when you think about what we feel and understand when one person dies tragically, unexpectedly. Of course our initial reactions are incredibly strong and incredibly confusing: sympathy, anger, fear, support, care, in some cases hatred, as has previously been said.

It is not unnatural to think that one of your first responses could even be hatred for a person who would do that. What really counts is what our long-term reactions will be. What will we do as regular men and women on the street, what will we do as elected leaders, what will we do as a government, what will we do as a parliament, in the medium and the longer term? That is what really counts: how we react, how we decide who we are, what we stand for, what we will accept and what we will not accept whilst still retaining our freedoms, our rights, our individuality, our democracy, our open community.

I believe very firmly—and I am sure that others do, too—that you are allowed to think what you think. We can have different views about what people think, you are allowed to think what you think, but you cannot harm others based on your thoughts, based on your beliefs. As a state, as a nation, as a world, we should never, ever accept that people can be hurt based on the thoughts other people might have.

When I think of open community, freedom, rights, individuality, democracy I think of Marree, a very small town in my electorate of Stuart. It is a very small town with a population of 80 or 90 where, as has already been mentioned today, I am very proud to say the first mosque in Australia was established. It still stands. It is not used much, but it still stands and it is a very important symbol in that wonderful small town. It has a thatched roof and is next to some palm trees, some date palms. It is open, no walls, with wooden pillars or columns just holding up the thatched roof, and it is right in the middle of town. It is a precious place for everybody in Marree.

There are still Afghans in Marree, there are still Aboriginals, there are still pastoralists, there are still tourists. Every type of person you can imagine comes through Marree—rich, poor, young, old, men, women, foreigners, Australians—but for the local people in Marree who are Aboriginal, non-Aboriginal and Afghan, this is still an incredibly important place.

This mosque that was established in Marree 158 years ago—the first one in Australia—is still an important place today, and that community is open, friendly and robust. People are willing and able to share their views very openly. They are from all different walks of life, and it is a very harmonious place as well. It is not perfect. No community is perfect, but I cannot think of anywhere where people of so many different backgrounds who live there get on so well. Full credit to Marree, and full credit to Marree for being the first place to have a mosque and for still being such a shining example.

There is another element to this issue, which is very difficult, I am sure, for all of us, and that is the fact that the alleged murderer of 50 people in a place of worship in our part of the world is an Australian. Who among us does not feel some shame about the fact that it seems that it was one of us who committed this horrible, inexplicable act?

Over the last several days of trying to absorb all of this, learn and think what I could do, how I could help, what it really means, etc., I have not been touched by anything more than a radio interview that I heard. It was a radio interview with an Islamic man, and I am sorry I just cannot remember the station. An Islamic man was being interviewed in Australia and he said that so many

Anglo-Australians have come up to him and said, 'I am sorry. I am really sorry that it was one of us who did this to your broader community, albeit in New Zealand. I am really sorry that it was one of us, it seems, who did this to your people.'

The response was, 'Don't be sorry that it was an Australian who did this. Think about how we as Muslims feel when Muslim extremists in other parts of the world do things like this and how it reflects on us unfairly. Don't be sorry that an Australian did it. Think about the fact that we are Muslims, we are good Muslims and when a bad Muslim does something it reflects on us in the same way that you think it reflects on you. Don't think about the reflection. Accept, please, that we are good as you are good.' I am paraphrasing, of course, but that had a profound effect on me. I thought that was incredibly instructive.

It is extremism and intolerance that cause these things. It is not any walk of life, it is not a race, it is not a religion, it is not an age: it is extremism. It is the belief that your opinions are so valid that you are entitled to harm people. That is what we have to fight against. That is what we need to rail against, and I am confident that our parliament can do that. I am confident that we can do it. There is not any skerrick of hesitation in any member in this chamber—and I am sure it is the same in the other place—to support this motion from the Premier.

Also in this parliament we have a Malinauskas, we have a Koutsantonis, we have a Pisoni, we have a van Holst Pellekaan, and do you know what? We have a Habib. We have a Habib, and I cannot tell you how proud I am of the member for Elder for not changing her maiden name until after she was elected, to prove that she was good enough, to prove that her electorate was good enough, to not accept the scandalous, racist imputations that were placed on her.

I cannot tell you how proud I am of her. That is quite consistent with her decision to adopt her married name after being elected. She was strong enough to say, 'I was born a Habib. I am an Australian. I turned up here. I want to run for parliament and I am not changing my name until I get there.' It is absolutely outstanding. Let me tell you also, we have a Marshall, we have a Chapman, we have a Close, and we have a Hughes. Our parliament can do this. We can be united leaders in this effort.

Let me finish by passing on my thanks and my care to all the emergency services workers, the first responders, in New Zealand, who would have had to deal with something that they would never have imagined. I am in the CFS. I am not a professional by any stretch of the imagination, but I know that even for professionals—MFS, police, etc.—the idea that they might go to support people when 50 people have been massacred in a place of worship is a long, long way down the track in their training. Sure, it is contemplated and addressed, but it really is not the sort of thing they would have expected to have to do in their work.

Thank you to those people. Let's not underestimate the long-term impact upon them. Of course, I give my condolences to the family and friends of the people who have passed away—the 50 people who were massacred—and my support, care and love to those who were injured, who I hope will make a speedy and very long-term recovery.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (12:05): I rise to speak in wholehearted support of the motion. In doing so, I acknowledge all who have spoken and are speaking in such unity on this motion. I also acknowledge the many, many people who gathered in our South Australian community on Sunday evening at the Park Holme Mosque and the mosque in our southern community in Morphett Vale. I acknowledge the communities who have gathered around the world to mourn, to connect, to offer prayers, to offer comfort to one another and to promote love, peace, understanding and welcome: things that deeply unify us, things that should always drive all that we do, things that provide comfort at this incredibly sad time, things that must define us and things that are always and always have been the antidote to hatred and all that threatens to divide us.

I particularly pay tribute to our local Muslim brothers and sisters, led by Ahmed Zreika in Park Holme and Khalil Shahin in Morphett Vale, for the incredible way they brought people together with such strength, dignity and compassion at such a difficult time. I also thank them for their outstanding and generous contribution in so many ways to South Australian community life.

Like billions of people across the world, our hearts are heavy as we contemplate together the horror of the senseless, abhorrent violence that tragically claimed the lives of women, men and children simply practising their faith in Christchurch on Friday. It left so many others injured and has left so many to deal with the ongoing terrible effects of this horror for many long days, weeks, months and years ahead.

Today, together as a parliament, we offer our condolences, our love, our sympathy and our solidarity as we stand shoulder to shoulder with all who have lost loved ones in such horrific circumstances, with our local Muslim community, the New Zealand Muslim community and the wider New Zealand community. Indeed, we stand with all communities around the world, all who are affected by these circumstances and with one another. As well as offering that support and love, I think that together, with steely resolve and determination, we must commit to continuing to speak out and reach out together into our communities in a way that shows that love, peace and togetherness is the only way forward for our world.

Love and peace must be at the very core of our future and what we teach and show our children. Together, we must—and I know that together we will, as we do today—utterly reject the hatred, fearmongering, racism and extremism that motivated those who committed these atrocities. We as parliamentarians and community leaders must relentlessly say that hatred and racism have no place in our community, nor in our media, our discourse, our parliaments, our council chambers or anywhere else. We must now draw a line under the hatred and racism causing these terrible events and relegate them to our past with an abundant outpouring of love in every corner of our globe.

As the New Zealand Prime Minister, Jacinda Ardern, put so well, hatred and racism is not New Zealand, and nor is it us. We know that, sadly, not everyone in our community believes that welcome, understanding and peace are the way forward. We know that there are those who wish to peddle hatred and division, but we know that this is not and nor will it ever be our future. Our future is deeply strengthened by our cultural diversity, and this diversity has made our own state so much stronger, fairer and better, as it has all over the world. A different way forward must be born from this tragedy. Together, with understanding, acceptance and a rejection of hate, we can and will walk that new path forward.

We must relentlessly call out those who do not speak positively about the need for social cohesion, with positivity about diversity in religion and immigration. What is publicly said never exists in a vacuum. Together, we must speak loudly and relentlessly about how positive our cultural diversity is. In doing so, together we can demonstrate what our community is about. We can demonstrate who we are and what we stand for and value, and what we absolutely do not.

Looking around the vigils that I attended on Sunday and hearing us speak in unity today, I remain deeply saddened by the impetus for bringing us together and for this motion today, but I am also deeply hopeful about the future of love and peace that we must and will create. I say thank you to the many local community members who gathered at Park Holme and Morphett Vale for their presence, for their compassion, for their prayers, for their enormous hearts that, whilst filled with such sorrow, are also filled with love, and for their willingness to commit together to a different future. Together, we will not let this define us. We will be defined by love, unity and hope.

In closing, over the past few days I have been thinking of the prayer of St Francis. It is a prayer that is known around the world as the Peace Prayer. It is a prayer that speaks to me and I think to many at this time, whether you are a person of faith or not. It is a prayer that His Excellency the Governor Hieu Van Le so beautifully referred to in his speech on Sunday, and I share it with the house:

Lord, make us an instrument of your peace.

Where there is hatred, let us so love.

Where there is discord, union.

Where there is doubt, faith.

Where there is despair, hope.

Where there is darkness, light.

I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (12:12): I rise to support the Premier's motion. Tragically, Friday 15 March 2019 will be indelibly imprinted on the minds of those in our sister city of Christchurch in New Zealand and the world. Through the hatred of one man, at least 50 people have lost their life and countless others have had theirs changed forever. Those directly impacted were simply attending communal prayer in their place of worship, engaging in peaceful reflection with God.

The tragic loss of children and adults from a number of different nationalities who were present at the Al Noor and Linwood mosques is incomprehensible. No matter what your religion, everyone has the right to meet safely and without fear to practise their faith. Any act of terrorism and extremism should be condemned. In what New Zealand's Prime Minister, Jacinda Ardern, has described as one of New Zealand's darkest days, my hope is that New Zealanders find some solace in the outpouring of grief and support from world leaders and people across the globe who stand together denouncing such hatred.

From great tragedy comes the opportunity to make significant changes such as were reflected by the significant changes to the gun laws after the Port Arthur massacre in 1996. For those of us not in Christchurch, the images of the traditional haka being delivered by a Christian group of Maori men, the sea of flowers and candles at the mosques, and the letters of support for our Muslim neighbours provide us here with insight into the shock, grief and pain of those left behind.

Closer to home, the prayer vigils and services that were held over the weekend in South Australia I hope provide comfort to those in our Islamic communities that we, as a community, are here for them. My electorate of Adelaide is home to the Adelaide Mosque, the oldest surviving and first-built mosque, erected in 1888. The City of Adelaide is the sister city of Christchurch and has been since 1972, almost 50 years.

As public figures elected to this place, it is important to remember that our voices, our deeds and the way we participate in public life are a reflection of both the society we represent and the society we wish to represent. I am proud to embrace cultural diversity and to actively participate in multicultural events throughout my electorate and the state. To do so opens our minds and our hearts to what the world has to offer and permits us to live in harmony with one another. To all those affected in our sister city of Christchurch, we stand with you today, united and resolute in condemning the attack on the mosques in your city and we extend our sincere and heartfelt sympathies. To those in Christchurch: *kia kaha*—be strong; we are with you. I commend the motion to the house.

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (12:15): Friday started with such hope: I watched hundreds of kids start their day with laughter and energy at sports days around Hurtle Vale and I spoke to young people and their parents who were heading off to have their say regarding their global environmental future.

But then there was a cold-blooded act of murder, an act of terror, with 50 innocent lives gone: children, mothers, fathers, family members, all meeting for their regular prayer. There are still dozens of people in hospital and some in a critical condition. These people, their families, their neighbours, their communities, along with millions of people, are scarred for life. Again, our world is never going to be the same because of another life-changing event where our trust, our sense of fun and our carefree spirit have taken a beating.

By nature, we are a loving and nurturing race. In the main, we conceive, carry and raise our children out of love. Children are not born pure evil, like this perpetrator; he became this way. We can only imagine what must have happened to him to send him down this path. How can people have so much hate in their hearts and so little respect for human life? I have asked myself this so many times, but it has never been more important to find the answer than now. It is certain that the full blame lies on the shoulders of the perpetrator, but what contributed to this? We can blame the availability of firearms. Yes, this must be addressed. We can reflect on the person's childhood, a traumatic youth. Yes, this must also be addressed.

What has worried me more over the past few days is the vision and the way that news reports have shown this terrorist's live video of him assassinating people in cold blood, innocent people and

children joined together as families on their regular day of prayer, shot in cold blood. To screen this vision is appalling. I call on media outlets to have a good look at themselves in terms of what impact they have on our community's attitude towards violence and the desensitisation that occurs when vulnerable children, young people and vulnerable adults are exposed to such vision. The psychology is fact. We must push for change.

Free press is vital, but it has to be moderated in some way. For this vision to be shown on prime-time television, at a time when families sit together and talk about their day, when impressionable kids are exposed to it without explanation, is atrocious. I did not know how to explain it. It is one of the only times I have ever turned off the news. Like free press, I value and vehemently defend our right as a community to free speech, but free speech is not hate speech. What are these vile comments, memes and even parliamentary releases that we are seeing?

I have had enough. Pauline Hanson, Fraser Anning and others, I call you out. I call on my parliamentary colleagues, the public and leaders in our community to call them out. The racist, hate-filled rhetoric designed only for their own stupid political purposes has to stop. We must insist that it stops now.

One of our own elected members within the City of Onkaparinga, Councillor Sandra Brown, has overnight been exposed in our local media for having a personal Facebook account—unlocked and open to the public, so it is not that personal—filled with racist and Islamophobic rubbish. There is absolute garbage spewing out from her Facebook page. The City of Onkaparinga has made swift statements distancing themselves from those comments and disseminating the difference between a personal and professional Facebook page. I commend this, but I also call on Councillor Brown to immediately seek some help and counsel around this.

I am happy to take her and introduce her to our loving Ahmadiyya Muslim community. I am happy to take her and others to visit the Noor Mosque in Morphett Vale—a welcoming and beautiful place. I call on Councillor Brown to either stop spreading vile content or resign. She does not represent our community—the south that I know.

On Sunday, I, along with the member for Reynell, addressed this wonderful community in the home of our Ahmadiyya family in the Noor Mosque. The mosque was full of a wide representation of people, and it was very heartening to see over 100 people in a very small room. The Ahmadiyya community was very emotional and they were very thankful to see the community turn out in force; they were not expecting such a crowd.

The leadership of Rasheed Khalid, Vice President South Australia of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Association of Australia; our mayor, Erin Thompson; the Lay Preacher of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints congregation, Lane Rochow; and Reverend Douglas of the Noarlunga Uniting Church, was just wonderful. They all shared their stories of grief, togetherness, love and inspiration. People were invited to come up from the audience. Philippa Rowland, President of the Multifaith Association of South Australia, had very inspiring words, as usual.

Mr Jimmy Tapara, a local Maori man who is the father of one of my son's friends and former partner of a good friend of mine from my nursing career, sang a beautiful song of healing and prayer. Everyone was touched and many tears were shed when he did so. I apologised to the local fellow, a Polish migrant, who got up and spoke. He said that he understood, coming from a childhood surrounded by hate. He understands what happens when bigots and racists take control of a community. He was inspiring. We can travel that journey, like he did, in our community.

Then there is Jacinda Ardern. What more can be said about this young woman—a young mother? I know that there was no way that when my son was that age I could have spoken as strongly as she did without being a wreck and in tears. What a strong leader. She has been commended by all sides of politics, and rightly so. She is taking swift action, she is doing so with compassion, and she will bring New Zealand together on this journey.

Thank you to my nursing sisters and brothers. I know a little of what you are going through, but not to that extent. I have no concept of what came through your doors on Friday. Thank you to the hospital workers, the emergency services workers, the police, the pathologists, the scientists, the investigators—the people who have to put on a brave face—and the community members and volunteers, many of whom who have travelled from Australia to help, to support the faith, to wash

the bodies of the dead. To those who will clean the mosques and to those who will clean the community and prepare for healing, thank you so much.

I am truly sorry for our friends over the ditch: the victims, families and friends. It is right for us to say sorry, but he is not one of us. I condemn the act of terror. This act, on one of New Zealand's and in fact our world's darkest days, was set to divide us. He intended to divide us and cause hate, but what he will do is cause love and strength and together we will get through this. Kia kaha.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (12:25): I rise today also to speak on this motion put forward by the Premier. As we all have pointed out in this place, Adelaide has a very special relationship with Christchurch as our sister city. Our two cities participate and collaborate in cultural, education, business and technical exchange.

I was fortunate enough a few years ago to visit New Zealand and to go to Christchurch and one of the things that stood out amongst the beauty of New Zealand was the people. Whilst New Zealand is a neighbouring country, we have that wonderful close kinship and my heart goes out to the people there as they deal with this tragedy.

My stepdad is from New Zealand, as are my stepsisters. My stepson is living there now and he also speaks very highly of the people. He is over there playing Aussie Rules football, of all things, and the people he is working with, engaging with and living with are absolutely wonderful. My wife and mother-in-law went to visit him a few weeks ago and when they returned I asked what they thought of New Zealand the first time they had been there. Without hesitation, they said, 'The scenery is beautiful. It's a lovely place and the people are just wonderful.' Again, our heart goes out to them.

A few here have mentioned the vigil that was held at the Islamic Society of South Australia on Sunday evening at Park Holme, at the mosque on Marion Road, and I was fortunate enough to attend. The mosque sits in the member for Morphett's electorate, just metres away from my electorate and a stone's throw from the member for Elder's electorate. It was great to be there with the Premier. The member for Davenport and the member for Unley were also there, as were a number of members from the other side of the chamber.

It was great to be a part of the vigil and to offer some condolence to the people whose hearts were really breaking. It was mentioned that someone who was in the audience—they were not mentioned by name—had three family members who were killed in the shootings in New Zealand and it really did just drive it home.

I would like to commend the people who put together the vigil because, as I said, it was a first step hopefully in the healing process, but, as the Premier so eloquently pointed out on the night, it was more an opportunity to take stock and to try to comprehend what had happened because I think at that time, and potentially even now, it is hard to take in.

Ahmed Zreika, who is President of the Islamic Society of South Australia, was wonderfully warm and welcoming. We know Houssam Abiad, the Deputy Lord Mayor of the City of Adelaide, did a lot in organising this event. More than 2,000 people were there. They were literally spilling out onto the streets. It was quite phenomenal to witness. Charlie Shahin also spoke, as did Ms Dora Abbas, who is President of the Muslim Women's Association. Professor Mohamad Abdalla also spoke at the end. I will talk more of him in a few moments' time, but I thought he made some wonderfully pertinent points.

At the mosque, it was heartwarming to see the letters of support and the tributes on the walls outside, as well as the number of people who came to pay their respects. As I walked up Marion Road to the mosque, a variety of people were walking towards the mosque to be a part of this vigil to show their love and concern for a community that was clearly hurting. There were families with babies and the elderly, you name it—every person in society was covered and they were walking a long way to get there. It was wonderful to see.

A few people have mentioned this, but I will mention it as well: in my position as Minister for Police and Emergency Services, I would like to recognise the hard work of the police and emergency services personnel in Christchurch and throughout New Zealand during this time. There is an element of me that does not want to think about the scenes that these people would have confronted,

but it is hard not to think about it. Through the tyranny of distance, we have the luxury of only imagining what they would have seen and what they would have had to deal with. If you take a moment to consider that, your hearts will go out to all those emergency services personnel who had to deal with what they were confronted with.

The Police Federation of Australia has also acknowledged the tireless work of first responders, the investigators, the armed response officers, the crime scene examiners, the police media officers and others who played a crucial part in establishing exactly how this terrible tragedy unfolded. I note that paragraph (e) of this motion condemns terrorism and extremism in all its forms. I concur with what others have said, that these actions clearly stem from hate.

This act and others like it stem from hate. As a society, and as members of this place, we need to keep working to end hate and to push love because we are all people living on this earth together. We might have differing opinions and differing views and this parliament, perhaps, is a great example of that. We can often disagree with people on the other side, but there is no hate.

Fundamentally, we all want to achieve the same outcome: to make a better state, to make a better environment for the people who live here. We might have differing views on how it should be done and we can debate and argue over those, and we can disagree vehemently, but there is not hate. There is no place for hate in this world; love is what we need to strive for. I strongly push for everyone in this place to have that in their mind as we go forward. I truly believe that everyone in this place is about promoting love.

I mentioned Professor Mohamad Abdalla, who made a couple of very poignant points at the end of the vigil that were very thorough and covered a lot of key points. Again, there was that theme of love. Professor Mohamad Abdalla raised the point that perhaps a lack of social interaction was at play with these extreme acts of terror that we have seen in society over a period of time. I want to leave this parliament with those points the professor made for us to think about—about how we can grow social interaction in our society and make sure that people are not in a position to be influenced by, in particular, online extremists who capture vulnerable people and impart on them a will to do what we saw in New Zealand recently.

It is something we can work towards collectively as a parliament because it is an area of policy we can help deliver and remove that isolation and bring people together. Professor Mohamad Abdalla probably made the point more poignantly than I did but I thought it was a really great takeaway from his endearing speech at the vigil.

In finishing—and I think it is clear—we say to the people of New Zealand that we know the actions of this individual do not represent New Zealand, and we know they do not represent Australia, despite an Australian being at the fore of what happened. It is important that we offer our support to our sister city at this devastating time. I stress again that we must remember that love will always triumph over hate.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (12:34): On Friday, in our sister city of Christchurch, New Zealand, an Australian entered a mosque and opened fire on unarmed men, women and children at prayer. He then went to another mosque and did the same. Fifty people are dead and dozens more are injured. A lone person with hate in his heart and hate in his mind destroyed lives within a matter of moments. All of us have felt shock that this terrorist act happened in our own backyard, to our cousins across the ditch. The fact that the perpetrator was Australian makes me feel that we collectively feel a sense of shame for his actions, but what saddens me the most is that our Muslim community is not surprised that this has occurred.

Since September 11, 2001, an event that shocked the world, our Muslim community has been persecuted through the actions of extremists and fundamentalists. They have been forced to explain their faith as it was attacked. They have been forced to apologise for the actions of a few. They have been questioned on choices of culture and commitment to a religion that is practised throughout the world. Rather than conversations about Islamic contributions to art, science, mathematics, writing, music and poetry, all the talk has been about not being aligned to Australian values, not being welcome in Australia and that Muslim immigration should be banned.

Much has been said about hate speeches and a vexed understanding about freedom of speech. However, the reality is that this is about the fear of change. While Australia is a country of

migrants, with one in two of us having a parent born overseas, there is a mentality that the door should shut behind the last group of migrants. I remember the eighties, when it was 'the Asians out'. Now we have people calling for a stop to Muslim migration and limiting migrants from particular parts of the world. Every new group suffers from the commentary of not being complementary to Australian life. Yet, if we look around in parliament, where we are representing the South Australian community, we count members with Italian, Greek, Polish, Dutch, Vietnamese, Chinese, Malaysian, Lithuanian and many other heritages.

Our parents, our grandparents and our great-grandparents all came here for the same reason: to give their children a better life. People come to Australia because we need their skills, for safety, to invest in our economy and because we have blue skies and clean air. Whatever the motivation, people come to build a life for the future.

Today, I want to talk about our Muslim community in South Australia. Many speak proudly to me of our long history of people of Muslim faith living here, as witnessed by the building of the first Australian mosque in Marree in 1861. Our Muslim community is young, dynamic and diverse. They are from more than 20 countries, many born in Australia or starting their life here as international students, as skilled migrants or as humanitarian migrants seeking safety. Many of the community are leaders in business, medicine and academia.

From the celebrations of Eid and Nowruz to Iftar dinners during Ramadan, our Muslim community has reached out to the wider community to join in. The creation of the Al Salam festival, a peace festival now in its fifth year, evolved from a lack of knowledge, from the population, about the Islamic faith and the desire of leaders to enable questions to be asked and answered. Open mosque days welcome South Australians to spend time in mosques in order to forge stronger connections with the wider community.

Our Muslim community is your neighbour, your workmate, your child's friend at school, the person who kicked the winning goal. Our Muslim community is not the other: they are us. It is not the first time they have been made to feel afraid by the actions of one man. It is not the only time they have been abused, but his actions make being vigilant an everyday act—looking over your shoulder, checking who is nearby, experiencing an everyday sense of fear. This is not the Australia I want. A line in the sand has been drawn. We must see ourselves and accept ourselves for who we are. We are a multicultural country. As our anthem says:

For those who've come across the seas
We've boundless plains to share
With courage [now] let us all combine

These words continue to be true. Our hearts are broken by the act of terror in Christchurch. As we heal, let us do so with the belief that we are a shared humanity. Far more unifies us than divides us.

This week, we will be celebrating the 20th anniversary of Harmony Day, although the celebration is now being referred to as Harmony Week. Let us remind ourselves that harmony, together as a community, is what we must all strive for. To the people of New Zealand, we are thinking of you as you heal from the trauma of this act. To those who are burying loved ones this week, we stand beside you. I support the motion.

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (12:42): I rise today to support the motion moved this morning by the Premier, and I thank him for bringing the motion to this place. As a number of others have reflected, in Adelaide we have a special relationship with Christchurch. Whilst I have not been there, I used to work with a very proud expat of Christchurch, so in many ways I feel like I have been there. It is certainly a beautiful place, a peaceful place and a place filled with people who are friendly and compassionate.

Last Friday, the lives of innocent men, women and children were taken whilst they prayed at the Al Noor Mosque and the Linwood Islamic Centre in Christchurch, New Zealand, at the hands of terrorism born out of a toxic and evil ideology that has no place in any civilised nation. I would like to express my deepest condolences to the family and friends of those affected, but also to the New Zealand and Muslim community more broadly.

I would like to send my best wishes for a full recovery to all those injured in last Friday's attack. I would like to commend the emergency services of Christchurch, including the police, whose job it was to confront the violence head-on and conduct the following investigation, and also those working in the health system, including the paramedics and other services involved in treating the victims of the attack.

It is with great pride that I am able to stand with others in this place in solidarity with the people of Christchurch, New Zealand, and South Australia's Muslim community. As the Prime Minister reflected in recent days, an attack on one of us is an attack on all of us, an attack on a section of our community is an attack on our community as a whole, and the evil ideology of extremism that seeks to divide our community, in whatever form it takes, must be rejected in the strongest possible terms and without qualification. An attack such as we saw last week in a peaceful city in a peaceful nation is a sobering reminder that violent extremism can rear its head anywhere and at any time and that we must always be vigilant whilst also ensuring that we do not allow our way of life to be altered through fear.

Importantly, though, it is also a sobering reminder that the poisonous ideology that underpinned this atrocity can also spring up anywhere and at any time. We must make sure that we always stand against this world view and call out those who push it but also call out those who may not necessarily take that view themselves but nevertheless fan those views within our community for their own purposes. We must continue to celebrate and protect the incredible cultural diversity that has made our state and indeed our nation so rich and so much stronger.

We can never allow the actions of a few depraved individuals to weaken the inclusive community that has been built peacefully for over half a century. As I am sure all people in this place would agree, whatever your race, whatever your creed, if you are here to be part of our community, then you are welcome here. I commend the Premier for bringing this motion to this place, I commend all those who have spoken or will speak in favour of this motion and I commend this motion to this house.

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (12:46): I certainly support the motion moved by the Premier and seconded by the Leader of the Opposition. I think this is the toughest subject that I have had to talk about in the five years that I have been in this parliament, and I am sure that is shared by many other members. I am sure that we have all had a very difficult four days since this tragedy, since this terrorist act, since this atrocity, coming to terms with what has happened, coming to terms with what it means, coming to terms with what it means about our society.

We certainly stand with the victims. We stand with the people of Christchurch. We stand with those Muslim people who were at their place of worship, peacefully praying, when this awful atrocity occurred. We cry with them. We pray with them. Jacinda Ardern, the New Zealand Prime Minister, I think put it very well when she said, 'They are us.' They are peaceful people who sought to move to a country that is peaceful, that does have a harmonious community they wanted to contribute to.

Of course, New Zealand and Australia share so much, and particularly Christchurch, Christchurch being the sister city of Adelaide. Anybody who has been to Christchurch will know and feel the similarities between Christchurch and Adelaide. A lot of the city's design was based on the principles Adelaide was based on, and that makes it even more raw and makes it even more gnawing and completely difficult to comprehend what has happened.

As has been said by many leaders, this was a right-wing extremist terrorist action. It was something that none of us thought was coming, but looking back you can certainly see that some of the signs were there, brewing for this. I would like to make clear as well, though, that this was a particularly cowardly act. To walk into a place where people were praying, where people were joining together in a solemn moment of prayer, with those sorts of weapons shows no strength, shows no guts. It is completely cowardly.

I certainly support what Jacinda Ardern said in that she will not ever use the name of the person who committed these awful terrorist crimes, because what he is clearly seeking to do is to seek fame and infamy, and we should not let him seek that. We are, of course, in Australia, as is New Zealand, stronger through our diversity. We are stronger because we are a multicultural society. We are stronger because different people have brought their experiences, cultures, food, languages,

traditions from around the world and brought them here to South Australia, and we need to be continually welcoming of people from around the world because that is part of the strength we have as a society.

Sadly, we do have racism in our country, in our state and in our city. I cannot begin to imagine how difficult it would be to be faced with racism day in and day out. In particular, as a white, male, straight person, it is even more difficult in that I do not have to face so much of the prejudice faced by so many people in our society. We all need to join together and say that prejudice of any kind, stereotyping of any kind and hatred of any kind are not acceptable and will be condemned by all of us.

I was shocked not only at the event but also at what we saw afterwards in comments from one senator, in particular, and comments from many people on social media who were encouraging, who were sympathising and who were apologising for what had happened. I had some of those comments on my own Facebook page, which particularly shocked me. I think that is a minority of people, but it is something that we do have to grapple with. There are people in our community who feel such strong racism that they would sympathise and encourage murder and terrorism. It is a scary proposition that we have people like that in our midst.

After seeing some of the comments on my Facebook page, I perhaps foolishly looked at some of the right-wing blogs, Facebook pages and things like that. I just could not believe what some of the people were saying—people who, if you look at their profiles, look normal enough, but were coming out with the most disgusting and scary things. I just could not believe it. We all need to join together, as we have done in this parliament, but we are also going to need to grapple with how we combat an active, vocal minority of people who hold such deplorable views.

Certainly, another element that deserves mention is firearms legislation, something that we, over the past 20-plus years since Port Arthur, have significantly improved in Australia. That is not to say that it makes an attack like this impossible in Australia or South Australia, but it certainly makes it a lot more difficult. New Zealand have signalled that they will be updating and bringing in significant changes to their legislation.

I think it is important that we on both sides, as a parliament, resist any calls from anybody to weaken our legislation or to weaken those regulations—those calls do happen. Certainly, I was aware, in my brief period as police minister, that you do get people who want to reverse those changes to the gun laws. We need to be strident in our opposition to that, but we also need to look at what is happening in New Zealand now and see, out of the changes that they are about to make, whether there are improvements that we need to make now to our gun laws to make sure that we keep up to date and that we are doing everything we possibly can.

Like other members, I want to thank and sympathise with the emergency services workers who had to face what would be unfathomable, ghastly scenes in dealing with this incident, whether it is the police, the scientists, the paramedics or the people who work in our hospitals. They were absolutely gruesome scenes. They will need very significant support, not just over the coming days and weeks but over years, to deal with what they have had to confront in this situation, as will all the victims' families. All the victims' families have lost people dear to them—their children, parents, brothers and sisters—and they will need a huge amount of support over coming years to deal with that. I want to thank all those people who will do that, all the counsellors and support workers who will provide that support.

I think it is important that we think about the outcome we need to strive for now. Our former prime minister Julia Gillard said it quite well in her message on this: we all need now to recommit ourselves to compassion and to love. That is the outcome we should be seeking out of this ghastly, horrible crime.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (12:54): On Friday 15 March, a dreadful, terrible tragedy occurred in our sister city of Christchurch in New Zealand, Aotearoa, our near neighbour in the South Pacific, a country with which we have longstanding and lasting ties and so much in common. Many in Australia have family connections to New Zealand. My family has close connections, particularly in Dunedin. I was in Wellington only 16 weeks ago, commemorating their close suffrage ties with this state and celebrating their commitment to equality for all. On behalf of the electors of Florey, I extend

condolences to all the family, loved ones and friends of the victims of the shootings at the mosques. Your grief has been cruelly compounded by the suddenness and very nature of this senseless slaughter.

Also, we send our hope and very best wishes for speedy recoveries to all those injured, some still fighting for life. To witnesses of the horrendous events and scenes that followed, our thoughts are with you. The lives of all these people and the wider community of Christchurch and the people of New Zealand have irrevocably changed forever. As we all know, if New Zealand can be the scene of such a catastrophe, then it could have easily been one of us called to face such an event. In the days and months ahead, our hopes for the people of Christchurch are that you will be comforted by the love and support of family and friends and the millions of people throughout the world who care deeply about what has occurred there—and to you. They are events with which all people of peace are now grappling.

To the first responders, emergency workers, health and medical professionals, you have done an amazing job under terrifying circumstances and continue to tend to your community. To say thank you for doing your jobs so well seems totally inadequate. We admire and respect your courage and service. You will not be forgotten during the time of recovery.

To Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern, your leadership in the hours that followed, and now the long days as things become clearer, has drawn your people closer together. Maori leaders have also acted quickly to unite the spirits of those at the centre of the tragedy and all the people of Christchurch. As has been mentioned, this is not the first time that Christchurch has been tested so grimly. Your courage and resolve is being tested again. Our hopes for you are that you will come to the other side of this calamity with the same resolve that you have shown in the face of natural disaster.

At the annual Al Salam Festival held in Veale Gardens on Sunday 10 March, the Islamic community of South Australia came together to celebrate their commitment to peace. As I have done for many years, I joined friends and talked happily, looking at the exhibitions and watching children play. How quickly life can change.

The Wandana Avenue mosque was, until last election, in the electorate of Florey, and a mosque will soon be constructed in the new part of Florey. The Wandana Avenue mosque was firebombed in October 2001. I remember too vividly the devastation among the fledgling Muslim community and acknowledge how they worked in unity of purpose and harmony to successfully become part of the north-east and the wider South Australian society.

Let us all work now and do our jobs in and among our communities. There will be much debate in the months to come, and leadership in this debate will be important. It is up to each person to decide how to use their power and influence for change for the good. Let's delay no longer in making peace, as a concept, part of our lives as we go about our day-to-day activities. We cannot become desensitised to dreadful acts or the pain of others.

We have to be kind to ourselves and help wherever and whenever we can and take notice of others, especially those who appear to be loners, who are alone or unsupported. We need to be empathetic. In treating others with respect, especially in the face of extremes, just as all the people of Christchurch are demonstrating now, there will be change. We must be the change we want to see. I acknowledge the contributions of all other speakers and commend the motion of the Premier.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Bills

LANDSCAPE SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL

Message from Governor

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the house the appropriation of such amounts of money as may be required for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

*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.

SPEED LIMITS

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development): Presented a petition signed by 1,166 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to make significant alterations to the intersection at Twentyfirst Street and the Sturt Highway, Renmark, such as the installation of a roundabout and relocation of speed-limit signs to create safe and efficient movement of traffic at all times, regardless of traffic volume and vehicle type.

SCHOOL ZONING

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Presented a petition signed by 263 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to immediately reverse its decision to exclude from the Adelaide High School and Adelaide Botanic High School zone the children of the families residing in Torrensville, Mile End, Hilton, Richmond, Marleston, Kurralta Park, Black Forest, Glandore and Clarence Park, and to recognise the immediate and adverse impact of its decision on families, students, educational outcomes and property values in the impacted suburbs.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today Mr Nick Minchin, former senator and minister, who is in the gallery. Welcome to parliament today to you, sir.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Get down here and sort out your faction. They are losing.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is called to order. If he continues that, I will throw him out.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Auditor-General—Consolidated Financial Report Review—Report No. 3 of 2019
[Ordered to be published]

By the Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Country Arts SA—Annual Report 2017-18
State Opera of South Australia—Erratum of page entitled 'Notes to and Forming Part of the Financial Statements' Annual Report 2017-18
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Public Sector—South Australian Housing Authority
Work Health and Safety—Blood Lead Removal Levels
Codes made under the following Acts—
Work Health and Safety—
Abrasive Blasting SafeWork SA Code of Practice—March 2019
First Aid in the Workplace SafeWork SA Code of Practice—March 2019
How to Manage Work Health and Safety Risks SafeWork SA Code of Practice—March 2019
Managing Risks of Hazardous Chemicals in the Workplace SafeWork SA Code of Practice—March 2019

Managing the Risks of Plant in the Workplace SafeWork SA Code of Practice—March 2019
 Managing the Work Environment and Facilities SafeWork SA Code of Practice—March 2019
 Preparation of Safety Data Sheets for Hazardous Chemicals SafeWork SA Codes of Practice—March 2019
 Welding Processes SafeWork SA Code of Practice—March 2019
 Work Health and Safety Consultation, Cooperation and Coordination SafeWork SA Code of Practice—March 2019

By the Attorney-General (Hon. V.A. Chapman)—

Summary Offences Act 1953—Dangerous Area Declarations Authorisations Report for Period 1 October 2018 to 31 December 2018
 Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Sentencing—Arraignment Date
 Rules made under the following Acts—
 Magistrates Court—
 Criminal—Amendment No. 70

By the Minister for Energy and Mining (Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Health and Community Services Complaints—General

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

Dog Fence Board, South Australian—Annual Report 2017-18

By the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services (Hon. C.L. Wingard)—

Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission, Board of the—Annual Report 2016-17

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
 National Parks and Wildlife—Marine Mammals

By the Minister for Planning (Hon. S.K. Knoll)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Planning, Development and Infrastructure—Transitional Provision—Code

ANSWERS TABLED

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

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today some guests of the Premier: Mr Rajesh Ramloll, the Deputy Solicitor-General of Mauritius; and, Mr Yandraduth Googoolye, Governor of the Bank of Mauritius. Welcome to parliament today.

Question Time

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier explain why jobs growth has stalled under his government and is currently in negative territory this financial year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:09): I thank the honourable member for his question. The fact of the matter is we are doing everything we possibly can to grow our economy in South Australia. We were left a complete and utter mess by those opposite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —when we came to government. Sir, you might have seen the statistics that were published last week—

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that showed the growth of the South Australian economy as measured by state final demand.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: It's slowing down.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That state final demand has increased very considerably in the December quarter. The member for Lee, of course, is interjecting saying that it has slowed down. I don't know whether anybody is giving him a briefing anymore.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They are so excited in his office about the recent poll that was covered in the *Sunday Mail*. That's all they are talking about in the office for Lee. They were looking at that poll on the weekend with the opposition leader down at 26 per cent. That's all they are concerned about in the office of the member for Lee.

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

The SPEAKER: Is the Premier finished?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No.

The SPEAKER: You weren't finished. I will take the point of order from the father of the house.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Premier is overachieving in debate, sir.

Mr Pederick: You're an underachiever.

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I haven't got to the Premier. The question was about alleged stalling in jobs growth from this financial year. I have allowed the Premier some time to roll his arm over. I expect him to come back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I was providing some information to the house about the very significant—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —economic growth occurring in South Australia at the moment. We look at the December quarter figures for state final demand, and South Australia grew by 0.8 per cent in that quarter. That was much more than those opposite achieved in some full years. Sometimes in two years—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —they didn't get 0.8 per cent economic growth. We did that in the December quarter alone, a three-month period when the South Australian economy actually grew at four times the rate of the Australian economy. Those opposite, of course, want to complain.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They want to complain, they want to whinge, they want to carp, they want to complain. The reality is that they had their time on the treasury bench, and they failed the people of South Australia. That is exactly and precisely why—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I would like to hear the answer.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —they were chucked out of office at the most recent election. We are doing what we can to stimulate economic growth in this state. There are some nice green shoots starting to emerge, but there is much, much more work to be done. On 1 January this year—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —we embarked upon a very significant reform, taking the axe to payroll tax in South Australia, a tax on jobs here in South Australia. What we did was make a new arrangement so that any business with a payroll of up to \$1½ million will no longer pay a cent in payroll tax. The threshold under those opposite was down at \$600,000. That's when they started paying tax when the Labor government was in office. We do this because we want to stimulate economic growth. We do this because we want to create more jobs for South Australians and keep them here in this state.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The reality is that there is a huge amount of work to do but, every single day that we are in office, that is exactly and precisely what we are going to be focused on: the people of South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Before I come back to the Leader of the Opposition, I call the following members to order for interjections: the members for Ramsay, Badcoe and Lee, the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Playford, the member for Hurtle Vale, the member for Waite and the Minister for Industry and Skills. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier explain why there are 6,600 more unemployed South Australians since he took office in March 2018?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:13): I certainly can, and that's because there are a lot more people who were long-term unemployed under the previous government who decided to give up even looking for a job. Under the previous regime, there was a whole pile of people who weren't wanting to participate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, there was a slight pick-up in the unemployment rate, but there was a massive increase in the participation rate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Those opposite wanted to grind the people of South Australia into the ground at every single opportunity so they gave up hope of ever finding a job. They did that because they wanted to remove them from the unemployment statistics. We have a completely and utterly different motivation. Our motivation is to allow every single South Australian to fulfil their full ambition. That's why we have embarked upon a massive scale of tax reduction, regulatory reform and skills for young people in this state: because we have a much greater ambition than those had while they were in office and those delivered while they were in office.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The reality is that South Australia now has an unemployment rate that is much lower than we had seen under the previous government during the last five years—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —of their hopeless maladministration here in South Australia. We are getting on. We suggest that you over there maybe dig up some better questions for the second part of question time. Kevin Naughton is obviously—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Please do not provoke the opposition. The Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sorry. He is still at lunch. He should be texting you some new questions fairly soon.

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee and then the member for King, who has been patiently waiting.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:14): I have a supplementary question for the Premier. Can the Premier advise of the change in the participation rate he claims is causing the rise in the unemployed in South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:15): I don't have those statistics with me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms Stinson: Just making it up as you go along.

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: But it just shows you where we are at at the moment.

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Those opposite want to take every opportunity to talk down our state. The reality is, on any measure, we are doing far better than this state was doing after 16 years of your hopeless mismanagement.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I was very interested the other day to take a look at the ANZ Stateometer report. The ANZ Stateometer report—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Your mates, the banks.

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —showed us in the top right-hand quadrant. I will tell you where we were under those opposite—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Ramsay!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —in the bottom left-hand quadrant. The entire time you were in office: underperforming, holding this state back, a massive handbrake on our economy. Well, we are releasing that handbrake. We are building business confidence. We are building consumer confidence. The people of South Australia—

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —feel far more confident than they did under the regime that you presided over after 16 years. So it's time for you guys—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to change your tune. I thought this might have happened after Sunday morning's poll. I thought they might have gone back and maybe reflected on their constant negativity.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I thought they might have reflected on their constant negativity. The Leader of the Opposition at the moment is less popular than Bill Shorten. The only people voting for Bill Shorten are friends and family. The reality is that constant negativity—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —is not what the people of South Australia want. They want ideas, they want to move this state forward, they want jobs and they want a reformed economy and that is exactly and precisely what this united, hardworking, dedicated Liberal government is delivering every single day that we are in office.

The SPEAKER: If I am not mistaken, the votes for the major parties went up. The member for King. I will come back to the Leader of the Opposition.

ELECTION COMMITMENTS

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:17): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier please—

Ms Hildyard: Is it about Service SA?

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

Ms LUETHEN: Can the Premier update the house on specifically what actions this government has taken over the last 12 months to create more jobs, to lower costs and to deliver better services?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:17): Well, sir—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Premier, please be seated for one moment. I am going to ask the member for Playford to leave for half an hour for leading that cacophony of noise.

The honourable member for Playford having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: I know it's hard, but please. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That's all they have, sir: fake laughter. That's all they've got. They don't even have any fake policies, only fake laughter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I answer this question with a great deal of pride. We have just commemorated the first anniversary of the government coming into power on 17 March last year—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —when we took to the people of South Australia our strong plan for real change in South Australia. We promised more jobs, lower costs and better services—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and that's exactly and precisely what we did deliver.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Elizabeth is warned and called to order. The member for Reynell is warned for a second and final time.

Ms Hildyard: I haven't been called to order.

The SPEAKER: You have been upgraded.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Don't argue with the Speaker; it never does you any good. We delivered to the people of South Australia a comprehensive policy agenda which we took to the election, a strong plan for real change in South Australia: more jobs, lower costs, better services and that's precisely what we have delivered.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: And the reality is—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, please!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —this state is feeling more confident in getting on with it under this government than we saw after the last 16 years—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Ramsay!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —of fake fights with Canberra, picking fights with everybody and talking down this state. It's been like a massive burden lifted from the people of our state.

Earlier, I talked about our massive payroll tax relief for businesses in this state, designed to stimulate further economic activity in South Australia. We also delivered \$200 million to go into new apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia. Those opposite had allowed our vocational education and training to really dissolve into a quite worrying mess. Since then, there has been \$200 million worth of new money to create 20,800—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Unemployment's up.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia. I would like to commend the minister for innovation and skills for his hard work in this particular area. We have been working very hard to lower costs—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —on households, families and businesses in this state. One of the principal things that we did was deliver on our election commitment to halve the emergency services levy in South Australia, providing massive relief—\$360 million worth of relief—which is stimulating economic activity in South Australia. I would like to commend the Minister for Energy and Mining for the great work that he has been doing—

Mr Hughes interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —with the home battery storage system—money which is going to support people—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —putting in storage systems for their rooftop solar PV so that they can lower their costs and, most importantly, lower the total cost of energy consumption in South Australia. I read with great interest today in the paper that a parliamentary inquiry heard yesterday that energy prices in South Australia are trending down. They hated that. The only thing that was ever trending up in South Australia under those opposite was energy prices. There was never any good news whatsoever.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Minister for Sport and Recreation has been doing what he can to provide relief to families to provide them with an increase in the sports vouchers program, and I know that that has been fantastic. Also, the Minister for Human Services has abolished those screening costs and fees for our—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —hardworking volunteers in South Australia. We have been reactivating—

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Elizabeth is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —the Repat. Those opposite said, 'We will never close the Repat.' That was until they signed a deal to close the Repat. We tore up that contract. We believe in health services and building up our health services—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —so we are regenerating the Repat. We are putting money into Modbury. We are putting money into The Queen Elizabeth Hospital and we are doing every single thing we can to put the people of South Australia first.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The SPEAKER: Before I switch to the Leader of the Opposition, I welcome to parliament today three MPs from Queensland, the only state unicameral parliament in Australia: Mr Aaron Harper MP, member for Thuringowa; Mr Mark McArdle MP, the member for Caloundra; and Mr Michael Bergman MP, the member for Maiwar. Welcome to parliament today.

*Question Time***EMPLOYMENT FIGURES**

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier explain why South Australia's employment growth rate since the election in March 2018 is lower than all other states bar Tasmania?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:22): I'm happy to put your last five years up against my first year. This is an opposition which love to find—

The SPEAKER: You mean the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —the narrow slithers of statistics to try to mount their argument. The reality is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We have the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that South Australia is working hard to clean up the mess that we inherited from those opposite. Over 16 years, we saw unemployment trending up and up and up and up against what was happening on a national basis.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This is the important point to make.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader! The member for Wright is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: When we look at the massively high employment growth rate that we saw right across the rest of Australia, South Australia was the state that was going against the trend under those opposite. Now, of course, we are seeing statistics where South Australia is continuing to go against the trend. When there is a slowing in the Australian economy, there is actually an increase in the —

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —South Australian economy, yet still they want to complain. They still want to say, 'We had one week in the sun.'

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hurtle Vale is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The reality is that, if you look at the statistics of your 16 years in government, you should all hang your heads in shame.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. S.S. Marshall: I saw the member for Lee get up. It's not your turn yet. It might come as a surprise, but it's not your time yet.

The SPEAKER: The Premier is called to order. I bet this doesn't happen in Queensland. Leader of the Opposition.

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier aware the ABS published data showing South Australia's employment growth is now a third of the nation's growth since he became Premier?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:24): I refer the honourable member to my last answer.

BUILDING APPROVAL VALUES

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:24): My question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I would like to hear the question and the answer.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —is to the Premier. Why have total building approval values in South Australia dropped from \$521 million in March 2018 to \$362 million in January 2019 under his government?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:25): Well, there is a slowing; there is no doubt about that, and that's something that we need to keep a very—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —close eye on. I have made a commitment to make sure that we will do that, but we won't be making knee-jerk reactions. We are satisfied with the overall economic performance of the state to date. It doesn't mean that every—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —single sector of our economy is firing at exactly the same time. That was never the case whilst the Labor Party was in government. It's never been the case for any government. So we will look at every sector very carefully. We will do what we can, but the reality is that we are satisfied with the performance of our economy, as evidenced by the state final demand figures for 2018 and, more particularly, the most recent figures, which were for the December quarter, where South Australia massively outstripped the national growth rate. I just refer the honourable member to those statistics.

POLICE AND CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (14:26): My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister inform the house of some of the Marshall Liberal government's achievements in police and Correctional Services over the last 12 months?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:26): I thank the member for the question—and what a perfect person to ask this question. The member for Finniss is a champion of his electorate, a hardworking local member and, like everyone on this side of the house, a very high achiever. I only have four minutes to answer this question, Mr Speaker. I have a lot to get through, so please bear with me. Since coming into government, I can't believe what a wonderful time it's been and how much we have been able to achieve. After 16 long years of dark Labor rule—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —the people of South Australia voted for change. After 16 years of let-downs and disappointments, they voted for more jobs, lower costs and better services. I have been immensely proud—

Mr Hughes interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles is warned.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader will cease interjecting.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —to serve South Australia as a cabinet minister, but more so I have been proud to have delivered for the people of South Australia on projects, reforms and initiatives that have delivered more jobs, lower costs and better services. The past year saw the Marshall government deliver on their election commitments. We delivered the extended opening hours, of course, at Norwood, Glenelg and Henley Beach police stations, improving services in that area. In the area of counterterrorism, we came to the election with a seven-step plan, and we are delivering on that as well. SAPOL has undertaken a vulnerability assessment of public places and events.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The Terrorism (Police Powers) (Use of Force) Amendment Bill, which was introduced into the House of Assembly by the Attorney-General on 21 June 2018, was well received. SAPOL are in the final stages of their new rapid response capability model, which will enhance South Australia Police's ability to safely resolve and respond to domestic crime and terrorist-related incidents. The trial of light-armoured vests for front-line police is progressing well, with locations identified as to where the vests will be trialled and finalising acquisition planning. SAPOL are also in the final stages of developing a hoon hotline app, which I look forward to reporting back on to this house very, very shortly.

A review of all aspects of police work is underway by the Hon. Justice Kevin Duggan and is aimed to reduce red tape. What we hear from the workers on the front line and a recent survey is that more than 71 per cent of employees said there was too much red tape within SAPOL—too much red tape. Seventy-one per cent had that response, so we are going about the work of reducing that red tape for people on the front line.

In the area of road safety, the Marshall Liberal government has delivered on its commitment to conduct an audit of safety cameras to ensure that they are operating for safety purposes and not there to raise revenue. We have also delivered a new website, giving South Australia motorists details—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —of the locations of the state's speed and red-light cameras.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Kaurna is called to order.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: There are better services, and I know the member for Kaurna appreciates them—he's on that website all the time; it is fantastic. In Corrections, at the 2018 budget I announced a major shake-up of the prison system. Better prisons—we needed better prisons—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —because of how the Leader of the Opposition left them. They were a disgrace. We were on track by 2020 to have more prisoners than prison beds—no plan in place. We had to fix that mess, and we are going about it and we are doing the job. And we are—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister for Industry, do not provoke the opposition.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —working very hard at reducing reoffending: a bipartisan approach, the 10by20, reducing reoffending by 10 per cent by 2020.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Kurna!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As part of our Better Prisons project—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Kurna is warned.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I hear the Leader of the Opposition yelling about the 10by20 project. That is a bipartisan project. We both agree that this is what we need to strive for, but what he wanted to do, without having beds to put people who needed to go in prisons in—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: His theory clearly was just to rack, stack 'em and pack 'em. He wanted to go back to that, and it is a shame. We need to have the blend, and he knows better than anyone. We need the blend.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We need the blend of rehabilitation as well as delivering for the people of South Australia. I apologise; I ran out of my four minutes. I will be back with more very shortly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left will be quiet.

HOUSING INDUSTRY

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:30): My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier aware of views of housing industry representatives that their industry is in serious trouble?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:30): Of course we are in touch with all of the industry associations in South Australia. I spoke at the Master Builders Association lunch earlier this year. We are aware that in the lead-up to the state budget they would like to see a further reduction in taxes, but I remind this house that we have delivered the largest quantum of tax reduction—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: Relief.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —relief in the state's history in our very first budget, when we slashed emergency services levies—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —stamp duty went down, of course payroll tax went down on 1 January and we've got land tax relief coming through on 1 July next year. So we are acutely aware that our taxes—the taxation rates we inherited under the previous government—were way too high. We are reducing those, but we are doing that in a very sensible way to try to massively increase the economic activity in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We are not going to do it to damage our economy. I know some of those opposite and some of their friends always want to advocate for increasing taxation. We are not doing that.

Mr Malinauskas: No, you are taking on debt. You are increasing debt.

The SPEAKER: Order, leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I note with great interest that the previous administration, when they were in government last, talked about significantly increasing the tax burden on South Australians. In fact, for a very long time the leader of the Labor Party in South Australia was advocating for a 50 per cent increase in the GST. This was probably the single largest increase in taxation in the history of the state.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: He said this was sensible economic policy. I have not heard from the current leader of the Labor Party as to whether they are moving away from that position that was held by the Labor Party for a long period of time. On this side of the house, though, we are very clear: we don't want to see a massive increase in taxation. In fact, what we would like to do is drive down taxation rates. We would like to provide relief to businesses that were just bashed every day of the week by those opposite with increased costs, increased taxes and of course a government that often referred to people who were putting their hardworking savings on the line to employ people as 'the employer class'.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Get back to the question.

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am happy to address the question. The reality is that we are working with every single part of our economy, but the reality is we don't have a massive agenda for further taxation relief over and above what we have already provided in the budget—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that was handed down in September last year. When the budget provides an opportunity for us to put further taxation relief into place, that is exactly and precisely what we will do.

HOUSING INDUSTRY

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:33): My question is to the Premier. How many more home builders have to collapse before his government takes action?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order: that question was clearly rhetorical, with argument.

The SPEAKER: It could be seen to be rhetorical, yes. Would the member for Lee like to amend the question, or I will come back to you?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: My question is to the Premier. Given more than six home builders have already collapsed, how many more must collapse before he takes action?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier appears to want to have a go at that one.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:34): I don't accept the premise of the question. Our action in terms of tax relief is not predicated on business failure; in fact, we will be

doing everything we can to stimulate economic activity in this state. It is interesting that those opposite—

Mr Hughes interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —have been out there in the first part of question time today, telling us that there has been a massive freefall in terms of job creation in South Australia, so I thought what I would do is just check what the ABS statistics actually provide. It is interesting, when we look at the trend terms between January last year and January this year, that apparently there was a freefall in terms of the number of jobs.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Let me update the house on exactly what the situation was, because it would be terrible if those opposite—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee has been warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —were misleading the house, making it up and telling fibs. It would be terrible if that was the case.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: the Premier has accused the member for Lee of misleading the parliament. You cannot do so without a substantive motion.

The SPEAKER: I didn't hear that.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Mr Speaker?

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee, are you trying to assist here?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: He accused me of telling fibs and I ask him to withdraw and apologise.

The SPEAKER: I didn't hear that; there were some interjections. I will have a look at the—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am sure if you read the *Hansard*, sir—

The SPEAKER: Premier, I will do. Can we please get on with it?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and I am sure if those opposite listen, they would be very clear on what I actually had to say. I am very clear about what I had to say. It would be terrible if a fib was told in parliament and somebody misled, so it is important for us to check the veracity of some of the comments—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that are made by those opposite. Let's just check what actually happened January this year versus January last year, so our first January in office versus their last January in office.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Transport is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Did jobs fall as those opposite have suggested? The reality is no. There were 7,000 more jobs—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Lee!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —January this year versus last year and 9,600 more full-time jobs this January versus last January. This is the problem with the opposition that we have in South Australia at the moment. They are like the boy who cried wolf. Everything is a disaster, everything is a calamity—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —everything is going in the wrong direction, but the reality is that the people of South Australia feel far more confident under the government that we are operating. There are more jobs in South Australia. There are more full-time jobs in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There are more young people employed in South Australia and we are getting on with delivering even more of that in 2019.

The SPEAKER: I will come back to members on my left. Member for Davenport.

GLENTHORNE NATIONAL PARK

Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (14:37): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Water. Could the minister please update the house on the progress of the Glenthorne National Park and, in particular, the open days that are occurring in the coming months?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:37): It is always good to be able to update this house on the progress towards one of our flagship environmental projects, that is, the creation of Glenthorne National Park. How much happened with Glenthorne after 16 years of Labor? Nothing. In fact, cosyng up to their developer mates, they were probably looking to flog big chunks of it off and preserve a little component for the public. Under this state Liberal government, we are preserving this incredible 208 hectares of open space—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Leader of the Opposition!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —working with the University of Adelaide to bring that into public ownership at the moment, and opening those gates on 5, 6 and 7 April 2019 to stakeholders, members of our community, and people who are passionate about the environment and keen to see the recreational opportunities and environmental restoration opportunities that will be created as a result of bringing these 208 hectares of open space into the public realm and investing in it for both recreational and environmental opportunities.

We know that this piece of land, which sits between Main South Road and the Southern Expressway, has so much value. It forms a much broader open space corridor from Happy Valley Reservoir, moving through Glenthorne, O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park, Marino Conservation Park, Hallett Cove Conservation Park, the coast along there as well, and the Field River valley—some 1,500 hectares of open space. We know that for biodiversity to survive and thrive, it needs space, and that is the critical component of the creation of Glenthorne National Park.

It is winding together important areas of open space. For the first time, at the beginning of April, the broader community can get in and explore that. They can have their say as to what they want to see occur at Glenthorne National Park, whether that's walking and biking trails, camping opportunities, an interpretive centre perhaps, a nature playground and adventure opportunities. All of these things will have the opportunity to unfold at Glenthorne National Park.

We have already invested \$300,000 of additional funding in the creation of mountain biking trails, and that is making O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park, just to the north of Glenthorne Farm, a go-to destination for mountain biking in our state. We know that's a growing sport, a sport that people will visit South Australia to partake in and, in the mountain biking precinct that we have established at O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park, there are incredible views of the city and the sea, as well as \$300,000 worth of new trails that have been implemented.

We have established the Glenthorne Partnership so that this new national park is not handed down to the community by government but is developed by the community from the grassroots up. That is led by local businesspeople, representatives from local schools, environmental groups that have a long history of working on the site, young people, people with a background in heritage who are putting forward ideas and helping us to manage and create and curate that vision for Glenthorne National Park.

This is an incredible opportunity for our state. It's a flagship environmental project. Of course, I look forward to inviting everyone who is a member of this chamber to come along on 5, 6 and 7 April to see the possibilities.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is called to order and warned for a second and final time. The member for Lee.

STATE BUDGET

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:41): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier commit that his government will deliver a budget surplus in the 2018-19 and 2019-20 financial years?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:41): Certainly, all will be revealed in June this year. Obviously, we are subject to what happens in the federal budget, which comes down in April. I think there has been some very significant revaluation of the forward projections for the GST distribution as provided in the Mid-Year Economic and Fiscal Outlook which those opposite should have access to but, if not, we are happy to send them through.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned. He has been particularly vocal today. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I feel confident that we will post a surplus this year. That's exactly what we are working towards, as for future years. I think we need to wait to see what happens in the budget when it comes down in June.

Mr Hughes: More cuts.

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles can depart for half an hour under 137A, and when he does the member for Lee can have a question.

The honourable member for Giles having withdrawn from the chamber:

STATE BUDGET

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:42): My question is to the Premier. Will any expenditures be reduced to offset the reduction in GST grants this financial year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:42): I refer the member to my previous answer.

STATE DEBT

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:42): My question is to the Premier. Given budget papers show the government is increasing debt by more than \$3 billion over the forward estimates, can the Premier rule out any further increases to government debt?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir: that question doesn't comply with standing order 97 in relation to introducing facts without leave of the house.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. Is there a point of order on the point of order?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, indeed, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: It's not for me to really weigh in to the veracity of the facts but, if the member for Lee is introducing facts, he might want to consider asking for leave of the house.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Mr Speaker, I submit to you that both Blackmore's *Practice of the House of Assembly* and Erskine May allow the provision of facts in the asking of a question in order to provide context for the question.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir: those are, of course, subject to the standing orders that we are operating under.

The SPEAKER: Yes, and standing order 97 says:

In putting any such question, a Member may not offer argument or opinion, nor may a Member offer any facts except by leave of the House and only so far as is necessary to explain the question.

So would the member for Lee like to seek leave of the house?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, of course, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

An honourable member: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is not granted. The member for Elder. I will come back to the member for Lee. I was trying to help. Member for Elder.

SPRINGBANK ROAD INTERSECTION

Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister inform the house about the state government's plans to fix the Springbank intersection?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:44): I thank the member for Elder for her question and for her advocacy, along with the member for Waite's and the federal member for Boothby's advocacy in relation to this project. Can I say that this is a project that typifies the difference in approach between the former government and the current government in relation to infrastructure. There could not be a more stark example.

The first fact is that when we say that something is funded it is because it is funded, and no amount of rhetoric and commentary and press release can cover off on the fact that if it's not in a budget line it's not in the budget. What the former government was trying to do was use a few fancy words at the top of the page to say, 'No, that's okay. We've already funded the Springbank Road intersection. We can't tell you how much it's going to cost and we aren't going to tell you who is going to fund that, but just trust us—the money is there.' Well, it quite seriously and quite factually isn't there because it wasn't explicit in the budget. If it was funded, it would have been explicit in the budget, alongside every other new investment project that was outlined in the 2017-18 budget statement.

The second reason, and perhaps the most important reason that this government takes a different approach, is that we actually listen to the facts and the experts we hire to tell us what the best thing to do is. What we've got is a government that is more interested in wasting taxpayers' money on inferior proposals when the facts do not stack up. It would be interesting to know whether or not the facts as they have been presented to me in government are the same facts that were presented to members of the opposition when they were in government.

The truth is that the former government's design for the Springbank Road/Goodwood Road/Daws Road intersection—get this—would actually have made traffic worse in the morning peak. I don't know what sort of incompetence there is—

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —that you go and spend tens of millions of dollars to actually make traffic worse. If the former government and current Labor opposition want to continue to push an argument that making traffic worse is the best way to go, then be my guest. What we said quite clearly when we went to the election is that we were actually going to listen to the facts, we were

going to listen to the experts, we were going to listen to those who we pay good money to tell us what the best way is to spend taxpayers' money.

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: To give you a clear and stark example, in the a.m. peak the former government's design would have made traffic worse by four seconds on average. That is not a good outcome. In fact, one would suggest that maybe you shouldn't do the intersection if you are going to actually make traffic worse. By contrast, ours is actually going to save about 40 seconds in the a.m. peak, but what we are going to do in the afternoon peak is deliver 2½ minutes of average time-saving for the 60,000 people who use this intersection every single day.

That's what governments do: they go out and fight for good policy based on fact rather than on innuendo or some deals that may or may not have been done at a minister's office in relation to who gets what.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: We are actually listening to the evidence and the science, and we will stand up and fight for what is right and what is the best use of taxpayers' money every single day of the week.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson has been interjecting, but I was a bit harsh on the last day of sitting, so I will let him off. The member for Lee.

STATE DEBT

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:48): My question is to the Premier. Does the government have any plans for debt reduction and, if so, what are they?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:48): All our projections with regard to debt are included in the budget, which I am sure the honourable member can take a look at.

ADELAIDE BOTANIC HIGH SCHOOL

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:48): My question is to the Minister for Education. Was the official opening of the Adelaide Botanic High School held today?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:48): Yes.

ADELAIDE BOTANIC HIGH SCHOOL

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:48): My question is to the Minister for Education. Was the media discouraged from attending the official opening of Botanic High School by anyone in government?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:48): I'm aware of some requests from media outlets as to whether the opening was taking place today. The answer that was provided by my office was yes. They were asked if media were being invited and they were advised that the event was designed for students and the school community, as is not unusual around many of these occasions.

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: Secret state.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The media attended. They were welcome to be present at the school.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Secret? It's a matter of reflection. But it's for students—

Ms Stinson: Since when do you open a school and not tell anyone about it?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —and for the community at the school.

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe, please!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Those opposite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —may or may not be familiar with this, but the school has actually been operating for—

Ms Stinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —seven weeks—

The Hon. S.S. Marshall: In secret!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —apparently in secret, and we have had several media opportunities where we have spoken to the media. The Leader of the Opposition was able to talk with families and the media at the school on the first day of school this year. It may be a mischaracterisation of the situation, but we assumed that the media event to open the school had been done enough.

SKILLS TRAINING

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Industry and Skills. Can the minister update the house on how the state government is aligning the workforce and skills needs of the state with targeted population growth?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills) (14:50): I thank the member for MacKillop for his question. Many of his constituents have all these lambs that need to be slaughtered at the local meatworks, and of course the population growth policy has kept that work in South Australia. The money has kept the shops open in Naracoorte and Bordertown, and the economy is growing down there.

The Marshall Liberal government is growing South Australia's economy. We are providing new training and employment opportunities for more South Australians. We are supporting businesses through tax cuts, reducing red tape and lowering business costs. As a result, business confidence is at a 10-year high—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —and the job figures reflect that: 9,600 full-time jobs over the last 12 months. Businesses don't employ full-time if they don't think there is a future in the economy.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, be quiet.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Full-time jobs show the confidence that is out there in the business community. Part-time jobs converted to full-time jobs is good news for South Australians. They can now go to the bank and apply for mortgage because they have a full-time job. We all know they are much more secure. It's very good news for South Australians.

We are rebuilding the training system to deliver a skilled workforce and encouraging targeted skilled migration to address skill shortages across the state that are restricting growth. I was in Port Pirie just last Wednesday, and there are so many—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —empty shops in the main street of Port Pirie. They want more people to live in Port Pirie. They want more people, and the businesses and the agricultural

industries want the labour to operate their businesses. This is vital to take full advantage of the massive opportunities on the horizon here in South Australia, particularly through new and growing industries: defence, space, cybersecurity, health, disability and aged care. There is a huge demand in health and aged care.

On 6 March, the Premier released findings from the Joyce review—a major review undertaken to support growth of the South Australian economy. I am excited to be charged with driving key aspects of the South Australian economy through innovation, skills and population growth.

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Ramsay is warned.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: My refocused innovation and skills agency will be the lead for driving innovation, commercialisation, entrepreneurship and development of a skilled workforce across industry here in South Australia. Population growth is a key focus, particularly in regional South Australia. We have great news coming our way, with Mr Gupta in Whyalla, because 80,000 people is the predicted size of Whyalla over the coming years. The infrastructure is already there to deliver more people living in regional South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The realignment will match skills with industries needing to grow their workforce. My department will lead the establishment of innovation precincts with a focus on start-ups, high-tech and innovation-led industries.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: My department is working closely with the cross-government Machinery of Government—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is on two warnings.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I will just repeat that, Mr Speaker. My department is working closely—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —with the cross-government Machinery of Government Taskforce to implement the required changes by 1 April. I think the important thing here is that we heard comments from those opposite about housing. One of the key issues that was raised by Mr Markos was population growth.

PRIVATE LEGAL MATTERS

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:54): My question is to the Premier.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier is called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Are ministers or public officers authorised to use government resources to pursue private legal matters?

The Hon. S.S. Marshall: Could you say that question again?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sure. My question is to the Premier. Are ministers or public officers authorised to use government resources to pursue private legal matters?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:54): No.

PRIVATE LEGAL MATTERS

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:54): My question is to the Deputy Premier. Did the Deputy Premier use government resources to issue a concerns notice to the member for Lee on 28 February 2019?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:55): No.

PRIVATE LEGAL MATTERS

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:55): Did the Premier issue a concerns notice to the member for Lee on government letterhead?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:55): Yes.

PELVIC MESH CLINIC

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (14:55): My question is to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Did you pay for the letterhead?

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee, you are on two warnings.

The Hon. S.S. Marshall: You are majoring in the minors, my friend.

The SPEAKER: Premier!

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Deputy Premier! The member for Frome has the call.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: My question is to the minister representing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Sorry, member for Frome. If this continues, I am going to be ejecting more members. The member for Frome has the call.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister please advise what input the consumer advisory group had in the overall design and recruitment of professionals in the Pelvic Mesh Clinic at the new RAH, and can he also advise whether pelvic mesh is still being implanted into women in the public system in South Australia?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:56): I certainly respect the question that has come from the member for Frome. This is a topic that was debated in some detail here in this chamber a few weeks ago. The member for Torrens brought forward a motion. Many concerning issues associated with pelvic mesh were raised. With regard to your specific questions about the consumers' advocacy group being involved and also whether pelvic mesh is still being provided, let me get a very detailed answer from the Minister for Health and Wellbeing because, while any question about health is important, this is also a particularly sensitive area of health service provision. I am very happy to take that on notice and get an answer for the member from the minister.

COLLABORATIVE FOOD AND BEVERAGE BUSINESSES

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on how the government is supporting collaborative food and beverage businesses in the Adelaide Hills?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:57): I thank the member for Kavel for his question, and it is an important question. He and I were both joined by the Premier over a week ago now as we made our way up into the Adelaide Hills and visited Lot 100 just out of Nairne. It is a great collaborative model. The Lot 100 group is on the Ceravolo family farm. What we saw was the Adelaide Hills Distillery, Mismatch Brewing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: —The Hills Cider Company, Ceravolo natural beverages and Something Wild. They came together as a collaboration, as a cluster, to create more jobs and a larger economy within their business model. The Premier went up there to meet them and understand exactly how they are going to expand their production line. The project is there to increase production capacity from about 120,000 litres of distilled spirit up to 180,000. It's going to create another 15 jobs.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: It is a small collaboration of like-minded businesses that have come together—

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Premier!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: —and are doing an outstanding job, particularly in the beverage sector.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leader, please.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: Recently, the Lot 100 facility was opened. They have state-of-the-art water reticulation systems. They have state-of-the-art natural brewing capacity as well as their distillation facility. Many of you might know, if you like to try a local gin, that the Adelaide Hills Distillery was awarded the world's best gin.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: 78 Degrees is an outstanding example of what South Australian brewers are now doing on a world stage. Mismatch Brewing is a nationally awarded brewery for some of the fine lagers and ales that they produce.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is on two warnings.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: What we are also going to see is developing a native market garden through one of the consortium partners, Something Wild. That is a strategy around complementing the brewers and the distillers about putting some of the natural products, indigenous products, on the menu at Lot 100. For those of you who have been up through the Adelaide Hills and called into Lot 100, it is a great example of what collaboration can do with small businesses in South Australia.

Again, what it's doing is paving the way. Not only is the Something Wild initiative there but it's also about education. It's about educating consumers that some of our native foods are complementing some of our major dishes. The Premier, the member for Kavel and I were up there. We saw what South Australia is doing so well. It is producing first-class, world-class products for the world. Lot 100 is a great example. The previous government was in partnership with what Lot 100 has done. We have complemented Lot 100 now to expand to a world-class facility. They have done an outstanding job.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Deputy Premier!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: The \$150 million Regional Growth Fund is there and it is a long-term commitment to regional South Australia. It's a commitment that the previous government couldn't give. They didn't know where regional South Australia was. In many instances, that 10-year commitment that we gave to regional South Australia has now—

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: —created confidence. It's changed the thinking of businesses coming together, collaborating. It's not about picking winners, it's not about dividing small regional communities: it's called collaboration.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: Do you know what collaboration is?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: No, you don't.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I do.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: We all know what collaboration is, sir. What I would say is that here, in regional South Australia, collaboration, cluster and community are the three Cs that we put around the Regional Growth Fund.

PRIVATE LEGAL MATTERS

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:01): My question is to the Deputy Premier. Why did the Deputy Premier's ministerial staffer Ms Madeleine Church transmit the Deputy Premier's correspondence pursuing a personal legal matter on government of South Australia letterhead to the member for Lee's electoral office?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:01): Why did she do it? She did it because I requested her to do it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The member, I am sure, is aware of the fact that notice was given to the member for Lee for his inaccurate assertion in relation to a tweet arising out of a report that had been tabled here in the parliament suggesting that the Auditor-General hadn't had—that there had been a change of heart in respect of the government's position on accessibility of cabinet material. As was identified in the report—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —he hadn't even asked the cabinet at that stage to provide the information.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The member for Lee, though, obviously hadn't read the next paragraph, or whatever his excuse is; nevertheless, he provided inaccurate information asserting the circumstances were different—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee can leave for 20 minutes under 137A.

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

The SPEAKER: I have been very tolerant today.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: So the member for Lee did receive—

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Primary Industries will be quiet.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —a letter from me—

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee, please, 20 minutes.

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —to ensure that he was informed of the inaccuracy—

The SPEAKER: Will the Deputy Premier please be seated for one moment. Please stop the clock. Just before I hear the member for West Torrens, I heard the member for Lee interject. I asked him to leave. I do accept that there were other comments. I don't know what those comments were, but I will hear the point of order. It had better be a good one. Member for Lee, please leave.

The honourable member for Lee having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Minister for Primary Industries uttered a profanity across the chamber at the member for Lee. I ask him to withdraw and apologise immediately.

The SPEAKER: Does the minister have something to say?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: I did hear the member for Lee asking the Deputy Premier if she was going to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I will hear the point of clarification. Be quiet on my left.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: He asked the Deputy Premier if she was going to use her global allowance to renovate her home.

The SPEAKER: Yes, and I asked him to leave.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: That is highly inappropriate.

The SPEAKER: Yes, and I asked him to leave. Would you like to—

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: And I withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. The minister has withdrawn. The Deputy Premier has finished her answer. The member for West Torrens, then the member for Mount Gambier and then the member for Heysen.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

PRIVATE LEGAL MATTERS

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:04): My question is to the Deputy Premier. Who drafted the letter the Deputy Premier signed on a government letterhead, and then sent to the member for Lee through her ministerial staffer, of 28 February 2019?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:04): You might be shocked to know, Mr Speaker, and I'm sure the member for West Torrens will be shocked to know, but I did.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

COUNTRY ROAD SPEED LIMITS

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:04): My question is to the Minister for Transport. How long do the people of the South-East need to wait for you to honour your election promise of increasing speed limits on Port MacDonnell and Carpenter Rocks roads, given that it's now 367 days and my sixth question on this issue?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Kurna and the Minister for Police, if this continues you will also be leaving. The Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government has the call. Member for Kurna and Minister for Primary Industries, please! Minister.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:05): I would like to thank the member for Mount Gambier for his question. He is a passionate and consistent advocate for his community and for the promises that we took to the state election that we are going to honour in his electorate. We are extremely concerned about the state of our country roads—extremely concerned—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —and we took to the election not only—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, be quiet.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —a policy around restoring speed limits on eight country roads but also about making sure that we make investments in them: \$315 million for the Regional Roads and Infrastructure Fund, which was part of our first budget. We have been using that money, member for Mount Gambier, to help improve roads right across South Australia, and the \$10 million-odd that we have put into roads on Eyre Peninsula in relation to the Tod Highway—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —the Birdseye Highway and the Lincoln Highway, and going across to Yorke Peninsula to talk about some resealing work that is being done at the moment, as well as a significant upgrade of Mines Road in Wallaroo.

We went into the South-East, in the member for MacKillop's electorate, and announced about \$5 million for road upgrades, including some upgrade work to Clay Wells Road and also some other works on the various highways around there. We are putting money back into roads in regional South Australia. We will continue to do that. We will continue to make sure that we are delivering the best road safety outcome that we possibly can.

We had a good year last year and I say that in comparative terms in the fact that we saw a reduced number of deaths on our roads, compared to the previous year. This year has started off as an absolute horror. Every time I hear on the news or the radio the fact that there has been another fatality on our roads, it really hits home that there is so much more that we need to do. Interestingly, those statistics from last year—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —show that, of the 81 deaths on—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —South Australian roads 61 came from regional South Australia, and of those 61 about half came from our major highways. That's why we are pushing and working every day to work, for instance, with the federal government to make sure that they understand that road safety is our top priority and also for us to put the money in to make sure that we can see those roads improved. The member for Mount Gambier will get an answer. As soon as I can give him the answer, he will get it. I'm not being coy or facetious. We take this very seriously.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: We reject any assertion that there has been a reduction in funding for country roads. I must admit, I do not know where that comes from. I honestly do not understand where that figure comes from. When we say regional roads and infrastructure money, what we are talking about is state government contribution, not federal, and we are talking about roads, not necessarily associated marine infrastructure. This \$315 million is being spent on country roads.

The other commitment that South Australians can understand is the fact that we want to help upgrade roads, such as the Penola bypass, again in the member for MacKillop's electorate, that the other guys were too cheap to take the money from the feds on. We are also putting \$90 million into fixing a long bottleneck crash corner at Port Wakefield and the associated duplication through the township and the Joy Baluch Bridge—\$200 million—a project that the other guys wouldn't have looked at because it wasn't in an electorate that they cared too much about. We understand that this has been a longstanding problem and it creates significant safety issues in that part of South Australia. We are putting the dollars on the table and we will get the job done.

RIVERLAND COMMUNITY JUSTICE CENTRE

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (15:09): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney provide an update on the numbers of locals and those in need using the newly re-established Riverland Community Justice Centre?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:09): I thank the member for Heysen for the question. It is a very important initiative that the new government has reinstated in the Riverland and, in particular, at Berri. It was pleasing to attend, with the Minister for Primary Industries (member for Chaffey), in Berri last year the reopening of the Riverland Community Justice Centre, which the previous government had closed. They thought that it was adequate and satisfactory for the people of the Riverland region living in the towns of Renmark, Berri, Barmera and Loxton to have to travel to Christies Beach to get legal services, or they could get it by telephone—but that was it. That was adequate for the former government but it wasn't adequate for us.

We made a commitment to reinstate the service. In December last year, I had the pleasure of attending the reinstatement of a full-time, on the ground, legal community service for the Riverland. In January this year, I'm pleased to say, 40 legal advice services were provided out of the office in Berri, a staggering increase in service appointments that, under the previous government, totalled 16 the year before, a 150 per cent increase in services in the region compared to last year. On this side of the house we are very proud that this service has been reinstated. There were a number of people in attendance to celebrate and welcome the return of that service.

Berri is a significant regional town, which also has a courthouse, a police station and a number of other agencies, including Relationships Australia, the Department for Correctional Services and SAPOL, all of whom provide services to the regional community in real time, with real people at real places. This is what the people of these regions deserve. This is what the people of these regions need, this is what they require, this is what they have sought, and this is what we have given them.

*Grievance Debate***MINISTER FOR HUMAN SERVICES**

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (15:11): The people in our community who have difficulties under the human services portfolio are often very vulnerable. In fact, it would not be an overreach to refer to that portfolio as the vulnerability portfolio. It is a challenge to get people to come forward, even in complete anonymity, to tell their stories and to use their names or speak in public about their journey. It is often a bridge too far. However, because the story cannot be public and attached by face to a name, it does not mean that it does not happen.

Stories are delivered to us out in our communities, and they are very real. However, during question time in the other place, it was clear that the minister does not like being held to account for her decisions and she does not like scrutiny. The minister has spent the past 12 months dog whistling her way through question time, fashioning herself as an advocate for South Australians living with a disability, when in fact she is not. This rhetoric is not supported by the reality of the minister's actions. When under pressure, the minister seeks to accuse the opposition of playing political games and selling false hope to the electorate and also makes allegations that questions asked of her are not based on actual constituents.

The minister does not actually have the luxury of having an office out in the constituency—mind you, neither do I, nor do the members for Mawson and Wright. Is there anyone else on this side? We are still waiting to get into our electorate offices.

Aside from that, bad decisions are made, and this government has made a lot of them already, particularly around the people in our community who are vulnerable.

Mr Duluk interjecting:

Ms COOK: The member for Waite may laugh at that, but he just does not understand, as a banker, what it is like to be vulnerable and not know where the next meal is coming from. These people band together. They write letters, they make phone calls, they organise and they protest to let their will be known to their elected officials.

Just because the minister says it is so does not make it thus. The constant insistence by the minister that to disagree with her short-sighted agenda is to sell false hope to the public is an absolute nonsense. Indeed, in my time as shadow minister for human services I have supported many people on this side and many constituents in our communities who are experiencing difficulty living with a disability or with their NDIS plans to achieve a better outcome. I have done this not through blame shifting and scapegoating others but by working hard every day for those South Australians who need a voice.

I have successfully managed to help dozens of South Australians, as have other members on this side, to launch plan reviews for inadequate or insufficient NDIS plans. I have worked hard with individuals one on one, these people needing all forms of assistance, from renovations to bathrooms to power generators for critical medical equipment—

An honourable member: Thank you.

Ms COOK: —you're welcome—to drawing the government's attention to alleged incidences of abuse and neglect. We act swiftly and we respond rapidly to these questions. In fact, recently I received a request, along with a number of other people cc'd into the same email, by a young constituent who was aged 10 and who needed support to get his electric wheelchair back up and operating. I can tell you that we had that wheelchair up and moving within the week, and that was before the minister's office even answered that constituent.

Last week, we held a round table that was attended by 50 providers on very short notice. In fact, because the federal shadow minister was coming to visit and we wanted to put the providers in front of her to share their concerns and issues about the NDIS, we sent out the email at 5 o'clock on a Friday afternoon, and after the public holiday Monday we had 50 RSVPs to that round table. I think that shows that there are some real concerns out in the community, and these providers were very happy to come in and be able have an ear around that table.

Just because individuals do not feel comfortable putting their name to their concerns does not invalidate their anxieties, nor should it disqualify them from government assistance and parliamentary representation. I, along with others on this side, will continue to advocate on behalf of all South Australians, whether or not they choose to publicly identify themselves.

PAIRING ARRANGEMENTS

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:16): During the division on the suspension of standing orders on 12 February, the opposition requested that one of their members who had been granted a pair, to be absent from the chamber due to illness, have that pair recorded for that vote.

The government's view was then and remains now that the pairing conventions that have been operating in this house for decades and that have been applied as far as I am aware since I have been here—although the question has rarely arisen—do not apply to votes that require an absolute majority of 24 members any more than they do for quorums. It has been said:

The reason for this arrangement is straightforward: pairing exists to prevent—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: And—

an artificial majority from being formed when members are absent for legitimate reasons. There is no risk of an artificial majority being formed when an absolute majority...is required because that number represents a majority of all...elected members of the house...not simply a majority of those members present and voting.

Members may be interested to know that this articulation of the reason for the different treatment is actually not my words but those of Tony Burke, Labor's Manager of Opposition Business in the federal parliament, in describing why the federal Labor Party wished to so adopt this practice in their chamber that in my view we have had for an extended period of time.

The Labor Party in this house has presented a different view. Later on 12 February, the Opposition Whip wrote to the government characterising the situation as the government having 'actively disregarded the pair' and identifying that the opposition would 'no longer be assisting the government with pairs'. The Member for West Torrens spoke about this in the house on 13 February:

...it is very important that those votes and the reflection of the will of the people at that time is maintained for those four years, so that we cannot lock people out and we cannot trick them into not voting; so that if you are sick, your community is still represented in this parliament; so that your voice is heard here, regardless of whether you are pregnant, or ill, or have a sick father, mother or child; and so that pairing arrangements mean something.

He and the Leader of the Opposition have characterised the government as having disregarded a practice of over 100 years.

The government disputes this. Indeed, for the first two sitting weeks of the parliamentary year I had assumed that the leader and the member for West Torrens were carrying on in the manner that they were in an attempt to score political points and that things would return to normal once they had made their point. That, indeed, has been the case in the Legislative Council, where I understand that normal relations have resumed.

It is now clear that in the assembly Labor members propose to maintain their position. I urge those members to reflect on the points I will now make and to reconsider their position.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The question in dispute is whether absolute majority votes should be treated differently from other votes on substantive motions and also whether a convention of the house has been breached.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens! Calm down.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Pairs, and particularly their technical detail, are not often discussed here formally, but I note that in 1969 former Labor premier Don Dunstan described matters relating to absolute majority votes, as they applied to constitutional issues in his case, by saying 'pairs do not operate since it is an absolute vote and not the relative vote which counts'.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Deputy Premier and member for West Torrens, please!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I further refer to correspondence between Des Corcoran and David Tonkin in 1975—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, please; I am trying to listen.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —when an agreement between the parties was articulated. The correspondence talks about the nature of issues that might lead to a pair: illness, bereavement, government business, Commonwealth Parliamentary Association affairs and study tours. It goes on to identify that all official pairs will apply in the case of votes of no confidence but not in the case of votes on constitutional matters. This relates to votes requiring an absolute majority.

To my and the government's understanding, the application has always considered a suspension of standing orders. There have been other negotiations from time to time about how private members' time, conscience votes and other such matters are handled as they have come up, but those are the key issues. Pairs are important for some of the very reasons that the member for West Torrens articulated on 13 February.

The will of the people of South Australia should be reflected in the expression it receives in votes of this parliament, but we are also mere humans. Illness, bereavement, or indeed from time to time serving the best interests of the people of South Australia by being somewhere else on government business, may mean that we wish for one or some of our members to be granted leave during sitting days without removing their community's vote from the house.

I therefore encourage the opposition in the coming period to reflect on their approach and play a constructive role in the operations of this parliament through again participating in pairing arrangements in the usual fashion. The government will operate in good faith in this matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leader, do not point.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: In the meantime, since the opposition has withdrawn from pairing practices for the present, I thank the three Independent members for continuing to assist the house by allowing this to happen. I thank them also for allowing the Minister for Transport a pair tomorrow to attend a funeral.

As has been noted, the custom of this house has been, preferably, to seek a pair from the opposition for a minister to be absent from question time. As the opposition is not at present granting any pairs, I therefore instead give notice, and will continue to do so for as long as they do not wish to participate in pairing practices when such occasions arise, that the minister will be absent tomorrow for the reasons outlined and questions may be taken by another member of cabinet.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: Mismanagement of opposition business.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Industry and Skills is not assisting right now.

PAIRING ARRANGEMENTS

Mr BROWN (Playford) (15:21): I was not intending to speak today and I am not on the list but, given what we just heard from the minister, I felt that I needed to. When I first became the Opposition Whip in this place, it was a duty that I took on very solemnly for my caucus colleagues and one that I have always tried to do with the utmost honour and respect for this place. One of the things that I am required to do is, when the bells ring and a vote takes place, to check to make sure that pairing arrangements have been properly adhered to.

Pairing, whilst it does not exist in standing orders, is very important for this place. It is steeped in tradition and, in my view, it is steeped in honour. I freely admit to the house that one of the things that I have always been frightened of every time those bells ring is that we will accidentally renege on a pair arrangement with the government. I would regard it as something that would show that I have failed in all my responsibilities.

So, when it came time to suspend standing orders, which the government was keen to do to try to protect one of their ministers, I immediately went over, as I normally do, and spoke to the Government Whip. I said to him, 'Jon Gee, the member for Taylor, is paired, right?', to which he replied yes. I then walked over and stood where I normally stand and waited for the vote to finish.

Later on—as you may recall, Mr Speaker, I was removed from the chamber for a variety of reasons—I came back in and waited to get the pair sheet that I normally receive from *Hansard* to tell me who the government had paired. Lo and behold, there was no pair sheet. I checked the list of people who voted, and I can tell this house that I must have checked that voting sheet six different times because I was convinced that I had it wrong. There was no way the government would have reneged on that pairing arrangement but, lo and behold, I found that that was indeed what they had done.

The minister talks about how he wants to restore relations. Well, relations can be restored. There is only one thing required: admit you got it wrong. Admit you did the wrong thing. You tell this house—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BROWN: —that you broke the arrangement and then we will talk. Be the big man. Why do you not just admit that you got it wrong?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Playford has the call.

Mr BROWN: You can come up with reasons afterwards as much as you like, but you know you did the wrong thing. Just admit it to this house. We on this side of the chamber are compassionate about people who need to go out of the house for a variety of reasons, but we are not the ones who broke the arrangement. That was you and on your head it should lie. All you need to do is just say you did the wrong thing and then we will talk. That is all. It is just your pride that is preventing it from happening. You are the one—you are responsible, not anyone else.

I know it is unparliamentary to refer to people in the chamber or not, so let's just say that someone else is not here. You are the one who is here, and I am glad you are here, because you can listen to what I am saying. You are responsible—no-one else—just you, minister. So do the right thing and then we will talk, and do not come in here trying to fill everyone's head with fairy stories about who is right and who is wrong.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition and the Minister for Education can leave for 15 minutes under 137A. They can cool down outside.

The honourable members for Croydon and Morialta having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development has the call.

RIVERLAND SPORTSPERSON OF THE YEAR AWARDS

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:25): It gives me great pleasure to stand to talk about one of the great sporting events in the Riverland. Last Friday night, I was privileged to go along to the Riverland Sportsperson of the Year dinner to acknowledge the great feats and dedication, not only of sportspeople but of coaches, volunteers and the community at large, and what that meant to the Riverland. The Riverland has a long, proud sporting tradition. We have nurtured, coached, trained and committed to a number of Olympians, AFL players, national champions and world champions on a number of occasions.

The Riverland has a rich sporting culture and passion, and I was there to witness the Riverland Sportsperson of the Year Awards, now in its 54th year. These awards promote the advantages of being part of a local sporting community. As I said, whether you are a coach, competitor, umpire or volunteer, the awards recognise the sporting individuals who make an outstanding contribution to the sporting scene, particularly in the Riverland and greater district.

The Riverland Sportsperson of the Year is decided by a panel of judges and those three judges are themselves outstanding sporting contributors and have been for a number of years. The finalists for Riverland Sportsperson of the Year included Andrew Hume for golf, Brad Rosenzweig for cricket, Christina Glekas for hockey, Delaney Lueth for tennis, Ellee Eleftheriadis for netball, Gemma Letton for softball, Hannah Lehmann (wife of Troy Lehmann) for basketball, Jake Spencely for football, Jesse Frazer for baseball, Josh Ryan for dirt karting, Katrina Topperwein for tenpin bowling, Lee Stevens for cycling—he is a veteran and he just keeps on keeping on—Martin Barber (Barmera identity) for soccer, Mitchell White for basketball, Rebekah Thompson for gymnastics, Sean Herbert for hockey and Toby Whateley for off-road racing.

Our hall of fame has been renamed. It is now called the Graham Charlton Riverland Legends of Sport. It is an absolute dedication for a man who has dedicated not only his life to the sporting field but his afterlife on radio in promoting and giving every sportsperson an opportunity to be recognised on local radio. We had our two inductees into the hall of fame, one of whom was Sam Fisher, one of the AFL legends. As I understand it, he is a four-time All Australian. Life after footy sees him start up a clothing range and playing golf. He is a pretty handy golfer; I think he plays off a handicap of four, and it shows you his dedication.

We also saw Shannon Nettle, one of the great Cobdogla (Cobby) identities in tennis. Cobby continues to live the tennis dream. Not only are they continuing to win many back-to-back championships and premierships but they are now consulted and mentored by Shannon's brother, Shane, who continues the family legacy.

We also saw Sean Herbert named Riverland Sportsperson of the Year for the second year in a row for hockey. It is a great accolade for him. He has won a number of national and state championships. He has been selected for the Australian country team to tour New Zealand. He is also the first back-to-back winner of the award since 2004 when we saw Billie Jo Hammerstein win the award consecutively, also for hockey.

The Magic FM Peter Frankcom Junior Sports Star of the Year Award went to Arron Nitschke for athletics. He is ably coached by Richard Coote, who also received an award on the night. Arron had a fantastic year, including representing South Australia at school sports awards, and the list goes on. There was the 5RM Almondco Steve McFarlane Contribution to Sport Award.

Mike Horsman is a great advocate for coaching. Not only is he a footy umpire but he is also a tennis coach. My son, Nic, was under his guidance for a number of years and went on to do very well. The 5RM Almondco John Ormsby Coach of the Year Award went to Richard Coote, a primary school teacher at Berri Primary School who coaches athletics. He has a great stable of dedicated athletes.

I congratulate all the nominees, the finalists, the sponsors and the award winners on their contribution to Riverland sport. They are all notable models. The Riverland has a proud history of Olympians and national champions. I have run out of time but I will take the opportunity to mention them in another contribution.

SCHOOL ZONING

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:30): I rise today in the parliament to again inform the house of the great concern and deep hurt that the government has caused to the people of the south-western and western suburbs. I cannot tell you the anxiety caused to families by the minister's decision, without consultation and without notice, to change the zones, arbitrarily removing the western suburbs from the zones for Adelaide High School and Adelaide Botanic. The parents and families of Torrensville, Mile End, Hilton, Richmond, Kurralta Park, Glandore, Clarence Park and Black Forest are waking up every morning feeling greater anxiety and hurt about what the government has done.

When we arranged a walk to demonstrate to the government exactly how close the affected suburbs were to this western suburbs school that we had been excluded from, I was expecting maybe 50 to 100 people, but on that day police were overwhelmed by the numbers and blocked Henley Beach Road and Glover Terrace for the protesters. I congratulate and thank South Australia Police for their work. The parents who were there that day were not all Labor voters. Indeed, I spotted three Liberal Party volunteers who handed out how-to-vote cards for my opponent at the last state election. They were there in solidarity with their neighbours and their friends because this protest is not about the Labor Party or the Liberal Party: it is about fairness and equity.

This is a decision that grates at the very core of who we are as a state. Are we a fair and equitable state? Are we an egalitarian community, or are we ones who pick winners and losers in communities? Are we a government and a people who decide to divide people on the basis of their postcode rather than their ability to get to a school? The government can allow 85 international students into Adelaide High School but not zones' children. Those families growing up who can see the school from their homes have been excluded.

The minister was faced with a choice, and the choice was this going forward: there are 85 enrolments in the Adelaide High School from students internationally, and we encourage international enrolments in our public schools. There are plenty of schools that are not full or at capacity who could accept those international students. But rather than satisfy the zone first—that is, our citizens first—the government changed the zone.

You have to ask yourself this question: is it fair on the people of the western suburbs? Is it fair on any South Australian to see people who have not paid taxes in South Australia, and who have not lived here, be able to pay and use their wealth to get into a school at the expense of our local residents? I cannot think of a single South Australian other than the Minister for Education, the Premier and all the members opposite who think that is a good idea. Otherwise, they would be joining us on this side of the parliament opposing these arbitrary zone changes.

How would members opposite feel if at Norwood Morialta High School an international student were given preference over someone residing in the seat of Hartley? I know what the Speaker would do. What would the member for Unley do if a constituent of his were excluded from Unley High School for an international student? It does not make sense. Again and again we plead with the government: reverse your decision. You are hurting ordinary people. You are hurting ordinary families. You are dividing classrooms.

I posted a video of young Oliver, who is lucky enough to remain in the zone, living in the same suburb of Mile End as his classmates who cannot attend the same school because they are a few metres away from the zone that the minister has now redrawn without consultation. This is breaking the hearts of those young kids. Our entire culture is built on the idea that your classmates become your friends for life. My friends still to this day—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —are my friends from Adelaide High School. Why? Because we all grew up in the western suburbs.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Deputy Premier does not show me disrespect today: she shows the western suburbs disrespect today, again.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: No, you did nothing for our people in 16 years.

The SPEAKER: Order, Deputy Premier!

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, I am trying to give the call to the member for Waite.

DISABILITY SERVICES

Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:36): Thank you so much, Mr Speaker. There is a growing trend in how members of the Labor Party, and in particular at the moment the member for Hurtle Vale, are using community organisations and vulnerable individuals for their own political purpose, so let's look at a bit of the record so far.

Firstly, in May 2018, the newly elected Marshall Liberal government reintroduced Labor's 2017 Disability Inclusion Bill. There was only one minor change between the two bills and that was the date. Rather than allow the bill through, Labor decided in opposition to introduce a range of amendments to mandate the establishment of an independent disability advocate within the office of the equal opportunity commissioner.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir: the member is reflecting on votes of the house within the same session.

The SPEAKER: Sorry, was it of the last parliament, member for Waite, or the current parliament?

Mr DULUK: The bill has passed the house.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully. Will the member just repeat the last couple of sentences.

Mr DULUK: Sir, during debate in the other house, on a bill which has now passed the parliament, common sense eventually prevailed and I am glad to see that the Legislative Council saw fit to pass the bill.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: That is not what he said.

The SPEAKER: Is the member for Waite talking about a bill that is still before either place?

Mr DULUK: No, sir. The bill has passed the parliament.

The SPEAKER: Okay.

Mr DULUK: At the time of the debate, the member in the other house, the Hon. Clare Scriven, falsely misrepresented that the Labor Party had support for its amendments from a range of disability organisations. Some of these organisations have advised the Liberal Party that, while Labor had emailed them for consultation, they were only given two hours' notice to comment—not even enough time to acknowledge the email. It was a blatant example of disrespect to these organisations during the debate in the other house.

Secondly, on 18 June last year, the member for Hurtle Vale and the Leader of the Opposition convened a round table to discuss funding certainty for community groups. The meeting was ostensibly a fishing expedition to identify programs that might not be funded beyond 30 June 2018.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The member now is imputing improper motives to a member of the parliament.

Mr DULUK: I am not.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You are.

The SPEAKER: I will listen to this.

Mr DULUK: These were programs that might not be funded beyond 30 June 2018—a reflection of the previous Labor government's short-term and often ad hoc approach to funding priorities. We have been advised, and the minister has been advised, that some of the participants attending the round table were informed that footage taken from the event would not be used in any way. That footage was then used in a clear breach of trust, and that footage was published on social media.

Thirdly, in 2012, the former Labor government decided to close the Strathmont Centre—the former residential campus for people with intellectual disabilities. In 2014, the former minister, minister Vlahos, issued—

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order.

Mr HUGHES: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr DULUK: Lucky for the people of Whyalla. Thirdly, in 2012, the former Labor government decided to close the Strathmont Centre, the former residential campus for people with intellectual disabilities. In 2014, former minister Vlahos issued six-month leases with the existing users of the Strathmont pool in recognition of the pool's eventual closure. Knowing that the pool was closing, Labor did not invest any money to bring it up to contemporary standards. As a result, the pool suffered the equivalent of a long-term, drawn-out multisystem organ failure.

In the week following its closure, yet another significant maintenance failure occurred. The Department of Human Services worked with all user groups over seven months to find alternative arrangements. Sadly, the government's efforts were actively undermined by the action of Labor members who insisted that the pool remain open in spite of the potential risk that this would present to user safety. It was deceptive and cruel and gave false hope to families and users.

If Labor members had any concerns regarding access to the pool prior to the 2018 election, why did they not push for a swimming pool to be included in the Lightsview recreational precinct? Any claims by the local member for Torrens or any other member that Labor had plans for a new pool in the area are misleading. The Department of Human Services has checked several times, and there is no evidence that Labor had planned for an alternative once the Strathmont pool closed.

To say in one breath that Labor never made any decision to close the Strathmont pool and then, in another, to admit that this was in fact Labor's plan, as the member for Hurtle Vale recently did, again shows the depth Labor went to to hide its own inadequacies whilst in government. It is no surprise that the party that was deceptive in government, as we know it was in regard to Strathmont and especially in regard to the Repat in my community, is again being deceptive in opposition.

Finally, we have seen over the past few weeks Labor members naming various community organisations under parliamentary privilege to score political points. The member for Hurtle Vale often refers to her work in the community sector, much of which is so valid, but I really wish that she would stop bending the truth and misleading the house in terms of the work of community organisations.

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Yes. I ask the member for Waite to withdraw the statement that she is misleading the house.

Mr DULUK: Sir, I withdraw that statement.

Ms Cook: And apologise, sir.

The SPEAKER: I have asked him to withdraw. He has withdrawn it.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:42): By leave, I move:

That Mr Szakacs be appointed to the committee in place of Dr Close (resigned).

Motion carried.

*Ministerial Statement***MINERAL EXPLORATION**

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:42): I table a ministerial statement made by the Hon. Rob Lucas MLC in the other place.

*Motions***CHRISTCHURCH MOSQUES ATTACK**

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. S.S. Marshall (resumed on motion).

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:43): This parliament is at its best when it comes together, as it does now to mourn and reflect on what has happened in Christchurch. It touches us in the way that similar incidents in other countries do—not to the same degree, though it should. It touches us because of the strong connections that we have with New Zealand going back many years. It is not just the strong connections: it is also the fact that, as two nations, we share much in common.

On that Friday, I was with the member for Morialta in Whyalla, opening the STEM facilities at two primary schools. We were there with the children in all their primary school innocence, wanting to make an effort in the new STEM facilities. Also on that day, a lot of secondary school students were striking for a better world. But it was all dwarfed by what happened in New Zealand. As the story unfolded it became clear just how terrible it was, the slaughter of innocence in a place of worship by someone who was just consumed by hate. Some people have reflected upon how that man ended up being the way he was. That will come out in the fullness of time.

There is absolutely no doubt that over recent years there has been the demonisation of part of our broader community. People of the Islamic faith have been demonised in all sorts of ways: in our media and at times with the dog whistling that has gone on in politics, especially at a national level. I am sure that all people in this chamber condemn wherever that dog whistling is coming from because it does have consequences.

It is often said that the people of Islamic faith do not have the capacity to integrate into Australian society. When I say it is often said, it is often said on what has become, in some respects, the sewer of social media. Parts of social media have almost become Goebbelsian in the way that they have promoted hate and division on the part of extreme groups that once upon a time did not get air, did not get oxygen, in our society. Unfortunately, they now have a medium within which to spread their vile views.

Today, the leader reflected upon the long history of people of the Islamic faith in South Australia, as did the member for Stuart when he mentioned that the first mosque was established way back in 1861 in Marree, and something that we should be proud of is that the first mosque in a capital city in Australia was established here in Adelaide in 1888.

My own community of Whyalla has been a vibrant and multicultural community, with people from all over the world. At one stage, 64 different nationalities were represented. Going back to 1975, a centre for prayer and meeting for the people of Islamic faith was established in Whyalla. Those people who came from various countries many years ago and those who have come to Australia recently have been part of our community, part of the workforce that makes up our community and part of the social fabric of our community. They have got along with everybody in our community, as have most people in our community got along with people of the Islamic faith. In fact, it is something not even worth mentioning. It is just what it is and how we operate as a community.

It was brought home to me the danger, explicitly and implicitly, in a lot of the nonsense that is now spread on social media and sometimes the commentary that gets into the media, even in the regional media. The *Whyalla News* printed a couple of anti-Islamic letters in the paper. A few weeks later in January 2013, at that prayer centre that had been in Whyalla since 1975, somebody put an incendiary device at the front of the building and at the back of the building in order to attempt to burn down the building.

I was on the council at the time. Full credit to our mayor at the time, Jim Pollock. Jim, other councillors and I went to the centre in solidarity with the Islamic community in Whyalla to say that

this is not our community. Not only is it not our community in Whyalla but it is not our community anywhere in South Australia and it is not our community anywhere in Australia. The vast majority of the Australian populace, irrespective of where they come from, do not support the values of that small minority that are deeply prejudiced.

Over recent years, we have seen parts of the mainstream media, especially the Murdoch press and especially in the Eastern States, peddle all the nonsense and all the myths we have heard about people of the Islamic faith. They have attempted to demonise people. Indeed, for years now there has been demonisation of refugees—people who have been leaving often desperate circumstances to come to our country. This is not an argument about secure borders. I have no issue with secure borders, but it is an argument about having compassion and empathy and not allowing the uglier aspects of our society to manifest themselves and to grow.

What New Zealand is going through at the moment is horrendous, but the way that they are attempting to deal with this incredibly traumatic set of circumstances is a credit to the New Zealand population, its politicians and especially its Prime Minister. There has been mention in New Zealand about the need to tighten gun control and I would be one of those who agreed.

I think most people in this chamber would reflect very positively on the role of John Howard and Tim Fischer in facing down incredibly strong opposition in regional communities when they called upon the states to introduce much tighter gun control. It resulted in saving many lives in Australia, so I wish the New Zealand government well when it comes to introducing tighter control. It is the easy thing to do because weapons are the means. It is the motivation that we have to reflect upon and the lessons that we have to take from that.

Social media is all profit and no responsibility. What Facebook and other social media have got away with, with their total level of irresponsibility, is absolutely shocking. We need to come together not just in this country but in other countries to address this and to put in place some reasonable constraints—constraints that are in keeping with the open democratic society that we have here and elsewhere.

When ISIS was in full swing, it was actively using social media to spread its incredibly odious message, but there was a strong international collaborative arrangement to deny them that platform. It was largely successful, so it can be done and it needs to be done with what is the essentially white supremacist and Neo-Nazi outpouring that happens on social media.

I have been on social media for many years. A long time before coming here, I had a personal page and I retained it when I joined the parliament. There were people who advised getting rid of it, but I find it an incredibly interesting barometer because there are a lot of people on it with incredibly diverse views. I sometimes admonish myself when I see racist anti-Islamic views expressed by people I know but I have not taken the opportunity to respond, partly because I think it is a waste of time and I am not going to change their minds, but I think I was wrong: we all need to make that stand. I did not delete those people from the account. In a way, I find it useful to know what they are thinking and what they are doing. However, it does reflect upon elements of our society in an incredibly poor way.

What scares me is that these are, in most respects, mainstream people who are picking up these memes and all this other nonsense propagated by social media, and then they are reflecting themselves, often out of ignorance. They believe the nonsense they are reading. The great danger of social media is that it is totally unfiltered. That is bad enough, and I think it is time that we have to in some way, given technological difficulties, call a halt to it. We have to do something to constrain this outpouring of hate.

Mainstream media should know better. At times, mainstream media—not so much in this state but certainly in the Eastern States, certainly on *Fox News*—are propagating a lot of this nonsense. They give free rein to One Nation and they give free rein to people like Fraser Anning. They use it as click bait; they use it to generate viewing audiences. I know that everybody in this chamber is better than that. I think that we as a party should reflect upon what we also did in one campaign in this state.

As the Liberal Party, as the Labor Party, as the Greens, as the crossbenchers in the other house, we are all better than that. We are at our best when we come together to condemn what has

happened in New Zealand. However, we also have to address what is happening in Australia, in South Australia and in our communities and say that this is not good enough, that we all have to take a stand in our electorates and call out this behaviour for what it is. It is often racist, it is Islamophobic and it is just not on because the consequences can be dire.

We often look back on one of the worst examples, when six million Jews were exterminated in Germany. That did not come out of the blue. That came out of almost centuries of myth, lies and incredibly ugly things said about and done to the Jewish people in Europe, including the pogroms and that whole history. That historical context created a platform and a foundation for what the Nazis were able to get away with.

I am not saying that we are facing a commensurate situation here. We are not, but what we are facing is people who are virtually the ideological descendants of those people who did those things way back then. A lot of those memes come from those alt-right groups, from Neo-Fascist groups that have found an audience on Facebook and elsewhere. Let us all join together in calling this out and saying that it is unacceptable.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (15:58): The suburb of Park Holme is in the south-eastern corner of Morphett. As you walk through the streets, it is mostly lined with gum trees, many of them very large. Walking in the morning, you will often be met with the relaxing sound of lorikeets chirping in the treetops. It is certainly a peaceful part of the world. On Friday afternoons, if you happen to be walking along Condada Avenue or Cungen Avenue, the streets will start to fill up with parked cars, as worshippers make their way to the Marion mosque for Friday prayers.

Just last November, I joined some of my parliamentary colleagues, including the member for Elder, for the opening of the Al Salam Community Centre at the complex. This was the realisation of the Islamic Society of South Australia's vision for a hub in the inner south-west for diverse communities to gather and enjoy. The mosque itself is easily accessible from the street for worshippers attending prayers on Friday afternoon. These Friday prayers are replicated throughout Australia and other parts of the world, including Adelaide's sister city Christchurch, both cities having been so alike in 1972 when the relationship was established.

Additionally, similar scenes occur on Sundays in both these cities, as Christian congregations worship peacefully in churches that are, again, easily accessible and welcoming. In 2019, both cities are still similar in their culture and to some extent aligned enough to have a shared kinship, with both being far away from any conflict zones, so people are confident of coming home safely.

So it was expected to be last Friday 15 March in Park Holme, as people looked forward to the weekend, just as worshippers did at both the Al Noor and Linwood mosques in Christchurch, except last Friday an extremist terrorist motivated by hate walked into these Christchurch mosques and massacred innocent men, women and children while at the same time leaving many others injured and ripping apart families and friends. The warped gunman himself described the killings as terrorist acts and racist acts. It was an act of pure evil.

So, here in the parliament today, I along with all the other speakers and those who sit here take the opportunity to express our deepest sorrow for and abhorrence of this senseless killing. At these times, many emotions spring to mind, and they are no doubt different for each of us. Some of the raw emotions are fear, anger and sorrow—fear because the similarities between Christchurch and Adelaide make the event so relatable and so easy to visualise here. It was only last December, just before Christmas, when a worshipper at the Marion mosque was approached by someone off the street and punched. This generates fear of copycat attacks and reprisals.

We have also seen around the world Christians, Jews, Muslims, people just like us who have families, who love coming together to enjoy sport, going to school, holidaying or praying, all destroyed by terrorism. We need to overcome this fear and continue our way of life but, at the same time, as a community we must be vigilant and alert to people's strange behaviours. Anger is another emotion, and this is also where the community must be careful not to turn against each other, for in so doing we will do exactly what extremists hope for by dividing communities and inciting violence against each other.

One of the real strengths of our nation has been that we are a young country where everyone, except the Indigenous people, are immigrants. Luckily, our enemies have been the arid harsh environment and the tyranny of distance, and these factors have meant that we have had to work together to survive and that mateship is a highly valued national trait. We are not burdened by history and centuries-old intractable animosity and hatred. We offer new migrants a break from this. There is no better example than Australian Rules football matches where you see over 100,000 spectators come along, barracking for their opposing teams yet sitting alongside each other. There are not too many other places in the world where this is possible.

It is hard to divide Australians, so now more than ever we need to fight anger with respect and friendship. Friendship that comes in the form of human contact is so important. There has been plenty of commentary in this chamber but also more widely around the community about social media and connecting with people and the pros and cons of this. In fact this evil act perpetrated in Christchurch used social media to live stream the atrocity on Facebook, which was then virally mirrored on this and other platforms so rapidly. The internet has also become a tool of radicalisation to create extremists in the first place.

It is this parliament's responsibility to condemn this extremism and the terrorism that results. This community condemnation certainly has a role to play in not accepting this behaviour and trying to rule it out, but in addition Dora Abbas, the Chairperson of the Muslim Women's Association, urged that, now more than ever, parents spend more time with their children and that grandparents spend more time with their grandchildren—to seek out family involvement so that people do not feel isolated at a time when social media and the internet are used by extremists to amplify their voices and infiltrate the minds of the isolated and disenfranchised.

They prey on people who are looking for a sense of identity and self-worth, and the extremists give them a warped version of this. Therefore, the family unit is so important in providing a guard against this. We have seen pictures of the evil killer cradled in his father's arms as a young child, like so many other family pictures you see, and you wonder how evil could have got into that young child to create the atrocious acts we witnessed and heard about just last Friday.

In these times and tragic circumstances, the importance of family is always brought to mind and generates feelings of sorrow. We mourn the tragic loss of life and extend our deepest sympathy to the families and friends of all those affected by this appalling event. The government, this parliament and in fact all people of South Australia stand in solidarity with the people of Christchurch and the South Australian Muslim community.

No more so was this demonstrated than on Sunday, when the Islamic Society of South Australia, led by the society's president, Mr Ahmed Zreika, held vigil at the Marion mosque in Park Holme. It was attended by the Governor, His Excellency Hieu Van Le, the Premier and many members of this parliament, federal parliamentarians, the Muslim community and the wider South Australian community, all from multiple faiths and ethnicities.

The Premier's clear message to those present and the wider Muslim community in South Australia was that the government, the parliament and the people of South Australia condemn extremism and terrorism and stand together with the Muslim community. Professor Mohamad Abdalla spoke of the need for society to fight against dehumanising people based on race and religion. There was no talk of revenge but, rather, uplifting messages of tolerance and respect. Today, this motion reaffirms our commitment to be an inclusive and harmonious, multicultural society where people are valued.

At the mosque at Marion on Sunday, the flowers and messages of support to both New Zealanders and Muslims present at the mosque showed more generally that South Australia is an inclusive, multicultural society. Amongst the many messages of support from South Australians was a poem. It read, 'Evil will not divide us, love will unite us, compassion be our comfort.' On arrival and after the vigil, many in the Muslim community came up to me to offer their appreciation for the support that was shown by parliamentarians and the community leaders. It was highly valued by all. In addition, thanks go out to the police officers who were there for their support. They were also thanked by members of the Muslim community.

As we left the vigil, the sun was setting and the sea breeze cooled us all down after what had been a reasonably hot day. Again, in the distance you could hear the lorikeets, so uniquely Australian, reminding us of what a beautiful and peaceful place Park Holme and, more generally, South Australia is. Long may that be the case, and let peace return to Christchurch.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (16:08): I rise to add my support for the motion before us today. My sincere condolences go to the families in Christchurch, New Zealand, who lost loved ones, and to those who were injured in such tragic and devastating circumstances. I strongly believe equality, acceptance, inclusion and respect are values that, together as Australians, we need to continue to grow in our community, our schools, our sports clubs, our workplaces and our families. We must stand up against hatred, prejudice and discrimination and work even harder in our communities toward achieving greater tolerance, acceptance and understanding.

On Sunday evening, I joined with more than 2,000 people in the vigil at the mosque in Park Holme, where representatives from all walks of life, right across our Australian community, including churches, sports clubs, state and federal parliaments, councils, hospitals, schools, universities—both students and lecturers—families and individuals, gathered to show their support.

The tragedy that unfolded last Friday in a place of worship has highlighted the need for this. As leaders in the community—whether members of parliament, local councillors, coaches, referees in sporting organisations, journalists and media organisations, employers and bosses in workplaces, people in positions of authority in our community organisations, schools, churches and also our families—we all have an important role to play. There is no greater gift that we can deliver for our children and future generations than a world of peace and love. I commend the motion to the house.

Mrs POWER (Elder) (16:10): I rise to support the Premier's motion. In doing so, first and foremost I would like to pay my respects to the families and friends of those who tragically lost their lives or were cruelly injured and to the wider New Zealand community, in particular Adelaide's sister city of Christchurch, who have been impacted by this violent massacre.

When one group of people practising their faith peacefully is targeted, attacked and brutally murdered, then it is an attack on all of us who attend a church or a mosque to practise our faith, whatever our faith might be. It is also an attack on all of us who cherish our diversity, our freedom, including our religious freedom, and our tolerant and peaceful way of life.

In supporting this motion, I also acknowledge and thank the Islamic Society of South Australia, headed up by its president, Ahmed Zreika, who provided the opportunity for us in Adelaide to come together on Sunday night at the mosque on Marion Road in Park Holme. It was a chance for us to unite as a community to stand in solidarity with New Zealand and with the Muslim community, both in New Zealand and here in our state and country. Unite and stand together, we must, not only during this time of grief, shock and horror but at all times on all days. With a heavy heart, I commend this motion to the house.

Ms MICHAELS (Enfield) (16:11): I rise to speak in support of this motion but I do not feel that my words will do this justice, so I am going to read parts of a letter I received from a gentleman by the name of Ikram on Saturday night. He wrote:

I am new in Australia with a family of six: my wife, three sons and a daughter. We landed in Australia in 2018 on 8 May. Before coming to Australia, the situation was a blur, we were not sure what would be the nature of the people here, would they even accept us or we will have to go through a lot of racism and hatred.

Like any other parents, we wanted to provide a quality lifestyle and education to our children. We came here with not much preparation. After coming to Australia, our first two nights were spent in a caravan park. On our first morning, when I woke up, someone knocked on our door. When I opened the door, there was this Aussie lady with a bright smile on her face. She asked me if we were new to Australia. I said, 'Yes, but how do you know?' She said, 'My partner and I saw you with the suitcases coming in last night. We wanted to meet you and say welcome to Australia but you look so tired, so I thought I would meet you in the morning.' I was a bit confused and surprised as it was not what I was expecting. She then left and I started getting ready to prepare breakfast for my family.

There was a knock on the cabin door again. I was not sure who it was going to be this time. I opened the door and it was her again. She had a cake, some chocolate and some toys. She said, 'If you don't mind, can I give these to your kids? I am sure you guys have not had anything to eat and my husband and I brought these for you.'

We then moved to North Adelaide, found a unit for ourselves, and here the property lady (Aussie again), her name is Heather, met us, she helped us through our tough days...showed us the bus routes, brought us groceries,

eggs, milk and other kids' stuff. She said, 'You are new here. This is a small welcome from us Aussies.' My wife and I were confused for a moment. Did we really come to Australia or Heaven because whoever we met was so friendly, no racism, no hatred, no discrimination. I started to believe that our decision of picking Australia for the bright future of our kids was the best decision we ever made.

I am currently working as a manager at the IGA Blair Athol, I have a lot of Aussie customers who are my best friends...It was just this last Friday...when I came from the mosque and read the newspapers and saw online about the most brutal attack on Muslims that were offering Friday prayers in a mosque in New Zealand. Many people had...different thoughts, the attacker was recognised as Australian and all of a sudden I came across very bad and negative comments from people with [a different school of thought]. But, I will not agree with them at all, for me, Australia is a very beautiful country that is full of people that are angels. Their lovely hearts, smiley faces and willingness to help us...shall not be ignored, just because some ill-tempered and sick person did something bad.

Terrorism has no religion, we will always have this threat no matter what religious beliefs we have, but we must not forget that religion comes later, it is the humanity that comes first. We need to be better humans first...Please don't drag Australia in this bad incident. It was done by an individual, who had some problems...I have met many Australians, in the last...nine months [who are] honest...caring, and they are beautiful with a heart that believes in sharing all the good times. Being a Muslim, I have no fear from any Australian and I feel safe with my family, I am proud that all the Australians are standing by our side and I assure the same to them that we will stand by all the Aussies for this is what they deserve. It is Australia that showed its trust in us and I believe it is our turn to show Australians that their decision of sharing their land with us was right. We love you Australia and we will never let you down.

Islam is a religion of peace. We are peaceful, and that is the way it should be. The terror attack was a mistake made by someone who was recognised as Australian...I am not an Australian as I don't have citizenship yet, but I already feel that I am an Aussie, I want to share the good side and share all the good gestures with my Aussie friends. Australia is in pain in this crucial time, we will need to support it. We will never forget about what happened to those innocent people, but at the same time we should not lose our grip and focus on making Australia an even better country. This is our moral, ethical, religious and humanitarian duty.

Let us help the nation to come out of this grave time as soon as possible, bring smiles, happiness and joy back and let the people shout with love and proudness again, let them say Aussie, Aussie, Aussie! Oi! Oi! Oi!

I went to the mosque on Sunday night with many other members from here, and yesterday I went across to the IGA at Blair Athol, right across the road from my electorate office, and met Ikram, who was surprised that I had walked across the road to meet him. I can say that he is a truly optimistic person, that he is truly compassionate and what I believe Australia is about, and I hope we will all remember that as time goes by. I give my deepest condolences to the people of New Zealand and I also commend this motion to the house.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (16:17): I rise also to commend the Premier's motion to the house. First, can I share with other honourable members in conveying my heartfelt condolences to all those who were hurt or indeed killed in these horrible events that we have heard reported in Christchurch and are now dominating our news. I hope and pray for the speedy recovery of those who were injured, and our hearts go out to their families and friends and the extended community of those who have been affected directly by these horrible events.

I cannot put it any better than did the Prime Minister of New Zealand in the immediate aftermath of her first coming to have detailed knowledge of what was panning out in Christchurch last week, and I will just share one of several articulate and heartfelt precise reflections of the Prime Minister of New Zealand. She said on 15 March:

Our thoughts and our prayers are with those who have been impacted today. Christchurch was the home...For many this may not have been the place [where] they were born. In fact, for many New Zealand was their choice, the place they actively came to and committed to...the place they were raising their families, where they were part of communities that they loved and who loved them [in return]. It was a place that many came to for its safety, a place where they were free to practise their culture and their religion.

The Prime Minister continued:

...we, New Zealand, we were not a target because we are a safe harbour for those who hate. We were not chosen for this act of violence because we condone racism, because we are an enclave for extremism. We were chosen for the very fact that we are none of these things, because we represent diversity, kindness, compassion, a home for those that share our values, a refuge for those who need it, and those values...will not and cannot be shaken by this attack.

We are a proud nation of more than 200 ethnicities, 160 languages, and amongst that diversity we share common values, and the one that we place currency on right now is our compassion and the support for the community of those directly affected by this tragedy, and, secondly, the strongest possible condemnation of the ideology of the people that did this.

You may have chosen us, but we utterly reject and condemn you.

I repeat those remarks because I know that we all in South Australia wholeheartedly identify with them and would describe our state in precisely the same terms. We could not have a more close relationship with our brothers and sisters in New Zealand, and we share very much all that is conveyed by the Prime Minister in those comments.

I also share those remarks at some length because I have reflected upon the very hard practical work that is ahead of those who would legislate in New Zealand, those who would lead the community, and in every respect now must pick up and carry on and do the hard work in the wake of these terrible events. That will be hard work day in, day out, and we have seen the Prime Minister continue that work over the weekend and in the commencement of this week.

It will include things like the urgent consideration of changes to gun laws, investigations as to how this has come about, care for those affected and any number of hard and practical matters that will need attention. I would urge all of us in this house to bear that in mind and to provide whatever practical support we can. I for one have been particularly impressed with the tremendous leadership that has already been on display by the Prime Minister in particular.

I also wish to reflect more locally on the experience of one of our local leaders, the Dean of St Peter's Cathedral. Frank Nelson and his wife, Christine, are New Zealanders. They came from New Zealand some years ago when Frank took up the role of the dean of the cathedral. Frank has a brother and a sister in Christchurch, and 14 members of his extended family are living there. Indeed, his first position in the clergy was in Christchurch and very close, he tells me, to the mosque at which these terrible events transpired.

Frank observed to me, as others have done in the course of this debate, that all those in Christchurch have in fact been retraumatised by these terrible events. It is only a few short years ago that the city went through the horrendous natural trauma of earthquakes. We are all aware of that. Frank is very conscious of the fact that many people suffered post-traumatic stress disorder in the wake of those earthquakes and that there will be a widespread experience of retraumatisation.

I want to note that the dean, together with the archbishop and Lynn Arnold, joined many others at services in mosques across the metropolitan area, including at Marryatville on Sunday, which the archbishop and Lynn Arnold attended. There was also a gathering at the city mosque on Saturday evening, which the dean attended. I note that there will be special prayers at Evensong at the cathedral tomorrow evening at 5.30, and I understand that there is to be a multifaith service at St Francis Xavier Cathedral at 4 o'clock this Sunday among, no doubt, many other outpourings of thoughts and prayers for all those affected in Christchurch. May we do all we possibly can to ensure that this never happens again.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (16:26): I, too, rise to support the motion, to send my condolences and love to the people of Christchurch and to wish them, all New Zealanders everywhere and all Muslims everywhere God's strength as they come to terms with what was an absolutely horrific act. Back in July 2016, I was on a holiday in Christchurch with my son. We were walking through this city, which, as people have mentioned, is a sister city to Adelaide and has a lot of the design characteristics of Adelaide. We were walking through those streets five years after the devastating earthquakes that killed 185 people, flattened so many buildings in that city and displaced thousands and thousands of people.

It felt sad to be walking there, knowing that buildings once stood where now there were just empty spaces and that buildings once stood where now there were shipping containers that had been turned into souvenir stalls and other shops. But then we started talking to the people. They had an amazing resilience and an amazingly optimistic outlook despite the physical characteristics of their city being so devastated and the make-up of their city being so torn apart because so many people had left Christchurch.

One of the things that really stood out was a neon sign that was about 25 to 30 metres long and went along the entirety of a building. We walked past it at about 7.30 at night in the middle of winter, and each of its letters was in a different colour. It said: 'Everything is going to be alright,' and I think that sums up the attitude of the people of Christchurch. We wish them well over the coming weeks, months and years because this is going to be a lot to deal with.

It has been interesting to see the political reaction to this as well. I do not think that anyone could fault New Zealand Prime Minister, Jacinda Ardern. She has done an amazing job. She has proved herself to be an outstanding leader. The reaction here in Australia has also been good. Over the weekend, we saw our Prime Minister, Scott Morrison, stand side by side with members and leaders of the Muslim community in New South Wales. At the same time, the opposition leader, Bill Shorten, was in his home state of Victoria doing the same thing in Melbourne.

I hope that this coming together can continue because the person who committed this atrocity is an Australian. I think we have changed over the past 2½ decades to the Australia that we were perhaps in the 1970s when we had Malcolm Fraser as our prime minister and here in South Australia we had Don Dunstan as our premier. I think we were then a much more tolerant, loving and caring society as a nation and indeed as a state.

I remember at school having the best lesson on compassion, love and understanding, not from the priests and brothers of the de La Salle community at St Michael's, but by a kid called Tony Engelhardt, who was a refugee from Vietnam, whose body was covered in blisters and scars from a napalm attack. Tony Engelhardt taught me all about being welcoming and that it did not matter what you looked like, where you came from or what your religion was, we are all human beings. We have a Governor now who was a refugee from Vietnam. We were so welcoming.

In 1994, 1995 and until early 1996, I lived in Switzerland. The war that was taking place in former Yugoslavia was seeing widespread atrocities, deaths and a lot of refugees fleeing from there. I was talking to Swiss people who did not want to welcome any of these people as refugees. I proudly told them how Australia was a wonderful multicultural country and that we had a prime minister, Paul Keating, who was espousing the virtues of embracing Asia and making sure that the people of our country were not xenophobic in their attitude to those who may come from a different part of the world or practise a different religion from that of some other Australians.

So, for two years, living in Europe, I told this story about what a wonderful multicultural country we were and how we welcomed people from around the world and that we had wave after wave of migration. Our state and indeed our nation was built on all these waves of migration. In early 1996, I returned home to live in Adelaide. There was a federal election campaign on. I turned on the television and there was a guy with a big hat called Bob Katter, whom I had never seen before. He was talking about 'slanty-eyed ideologues'.

Then this other woman turned up, who owned a fish and chip shop in Queensland, and she was saying that we were being invaded by Asians and that she spoke for 90 per cent of Australians. I could not believe that I was actually hearing people who wanted to put their hand up to be in federal parliament speaking that way. It seemed so far removed from the Australia that I had left two years earlier.

Then what we saw was this inflaming of racial hatred by some of these far right politicians. What followed was perhaps a dropping of the guard by both major parties. What followed after September 11 also played a role perhaps in our not being as fair and as compassionate to people from overseas. We saw the Baxter detention centre and the Woomera detention centre open where people like Saeid Safavi—a refugee from Iran, who now has a great little cafe in Port Pirie—were locked up for about two years.

I think we may have made some mistakes and we may have lost our way, but what we saw on the weekend, with the Prime Minister, Scott Morrison, and the opposition leader, Bill Shorten, was an actual coming together and joining with those of Muslim faith in Melbourne and Sydney to send a message to all Australians that we must return to that place of understanding and compassion because that is the only way we are going to defeat these far right fundamentalists. They do live amongst us. They are on social media and they are propagating some fairly awful hatred towards people from different countries and different religious beliefs.

Senator Fraser Anning has been widely criticised and so he should be. I know the federal Labor Party has come out today and said that it is going to put Fraser Anning last and also encourage people to put One Nation last at the upcoming federal election. I am sure that the Liberal Party is also giving that consideration. I think that is something that we need to do. If any good is to come out of the horrific situation in New Zealand last Friday, may it be that Australians change the way they

view these right-wing extremists who live amongst us. I think it is incumbent on all politicians, regardless of which party they are in or whether they are in state or federal parliament, to call it out as well.

Last year, after Pauline Hanson turned up in a burqa, we heard a terrific speech by George Brandis and I think that is what we need to do. We need to congratulate those who are brave enough and strong enough to speak up and absolutely condemn those who add fuel to the fire of hatred and right-wing extremist views.

Another thing that we saw over the past four or five days—and we saw it immediately because not only did this killer do this awful thing but he streamed it live through Facebook—is social media being used in a way that I do not think we have ever seen before. It is a change in MO and something that both traditional media and social media have to really get on top of. They need to change the way things are done. If that requires federal and state changes to legislation, we all need to work on that as well.

Bill Shorten and Scott Morrison's press conferences were streamed live over the weekend. I watched them on Facebook through the television network's coverage. People were allowed to comment and the sorts of comments that were being made were full of hate. There must be a way for media organisations to cut that out and, perhaps in the extreme cases, for the police and other agencies to chase those people up who are saying some of those things on social media.

I return now to the people of Christchurch and to that sign that was erected after the earthquakes: 'Everything is going to be alright.' Let's hope that it is not just in Christchurch but in our part of the world as well. I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (16:38): I would like to thank all members for their contribution to this important motion. I am very pleased that it is a motion we could deal with as soon as parliament resumed. I think it is very important for us to be able to place on the record our condemnation of the activity that occurred in Christchurch, New Zealand, on Friday last week.

It seems to me that the themes covered by the various speakers all centre around our horror, shock and dismay at what occurred in Christchurch but also our appreciation for the way that the Muslim community in South Australia has dealt with this extraordinarily difficult event for them and for their community. Many speakers have reflected that this could have gone one of two ways. The Muslim community has every right to be angry and feel very threatened by what has occurred. What we have seen is an outpouring of tolerance within the Muslim community in South Australia and respect for diversity.

The coming together at the mosque on Sunday afternoon was really a moment when everybody across the political divide stopped and came together, led by His Excellency the Hon. Hieu Van Le, Governor of South Australia, with speakers from right across the political spectrum all saying with one voice that we must do everything we can to maintain the harmonious multicultural relations that we have in South Australia. It is something that we should all be very rightly proud of in this state. It is something that we should never, ever take for granted. In fact, it is something that we must all—all—do everything we can to protect and nurture going forward.

When we look on the television at what has occurred not just in Christchurch but also in other places around the world, sometimes other places around the country, we can see what happens when we are not tolerant, when we are not respectful, when we do not embrace diversity. We have been extraordinarily fortunate with the tolerance that we have here. We must never take it for granted.

I for one will use this horrible, shocking event to double my effort and my focus, and the government's effort and government's focus, in making sure that we do everything to continue to promote diversity, tolerance and respect in South Australia. I commend the motion to the house.

The SPEAKER: Members, we express our deepest sympathy to the families and friends of all those who are affected by this appalling event. I ask members to please rise so that the motion can be carried in the customary manner.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

*Parliamentary Committees***SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES (MISCELLANEOUS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (16:42): By leave, I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the committee be extended to Thursday 4 April 2019.

Motion carried.

*Bills***CRIMINAL LAW (HIGH RISK OFFENDERS) (PSYCHOLOGISTS) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 28 February 2019.)

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (16:43): I rise to speak on the Criminal Law (High Risk Offenders) (Psychologists) Amendment Bill 2019 and indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition. Labor will be supporting this bill; however, I should note at this early stage that we do share some of the concerns that have been raised by a number of key groups and stakeholders, particularly the Law Society and others.

This bill makes amendments to the Criminal Law (High Risk Offenders) Act 2015 to expand the range of medical practitioners who are able to provide the reports required under the act. The Attorney-General argues that this proposal will help free up resources and reduce delays being experienced in the provision of reports for high-risk offenders under the Sentencing Act 2017.

I understand that there are only a small number of forensic psychiatrists who are able to provide these reports currently. During the briefing with the shadow Attorney-General, the Attorney-General's Department indicated that there are approximately 30 such reports carried out each year, and the proposed bill will likely impact upon approximately 15 per cent of those reports, or roughly four or five every year. This is a very small number; however, we accept that that was only an estimate from the officer. In her second reading response, the Attorney-General might like to provide some additional details in regard to that.

I understand that in line with the existing regulations the South Australian Forensic Mental Health Service clinical director, Dr Narain Nambiar, will remain as the prescribed authority to allocate medical professionals to provide reports. It is worth noting that this bill does not directly amend the Sentencing Act 2017 to enable psychologists to provide reports regarding sexual offenders and whether they are unwilling or unable to control their sexual instincts. The bill does not directly address the underlying issues causing the shortage of medical practitioners prepared to undertake assessments and reports.

The Law Society have provided commentary querying whether lesser qualified persons are qualified to prepare these reports. I am advised that forensic psychologist Dr Loraine Lim has also provided similar comment. However, the Attorney-General's second reading explanation indicates that this bill is part of a range of measures designed to help reduce the backlog, including the establishment of a diversion service in the Magistrates Court as well as a more competitive remuneration rate for forensic psychiatrists. The AGD has also indicated that there are additional FTEs being allocated to the Forensic Mental Health Service, and we would appreciate more information on that.

As I mentioned earlier, the shadow attorney-general received a briefing from the AGD. At the time of the briefing, AGD were unable to answer what the size of the current pool of experts is, how many additional FTEs are being allocated, how the new pay rates differ from the old rates and whether the clinical director is able to delegate his power to authorise medical professionals to undertake reports. We still do not have answers to those questions. I think it is important that the Attorney-General, in her response, outline some of those answers to those important questions. I think it is unfortunate that we are debating this bill without that full information, which I think would be appropriate and respectful for the parliament to have before it.

I conclude by reiterating that the Labor opposition will not seek to delay the bill from passing in this place. As I said, this is an important area. We do not want to see any delay in those important hearings. We do not want to see any of these offenders released because the government has been unable to seek to get a report provided to the court. However, it does seem that, rather than recruiting those extra psychiatrists and making sure that they are available, this is the wrong way round of doing this. However, we do not want to stand in the way of any measure that would potentially lead to somebody being released who otherwise should not be due to the lack of actions on the government's behalf.

So we will not delay the passing in this place, but we do have significant concerns about the regime. When we come to the committee stage, I will be raising a number of questions, and certainly we will be raising a number of questions when it goes to the other place as well.

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (16:48): As the Attorney-General earlier outlined, the purpose of this bill is to enable registered psychologists to be used to prepare reports for the Supreme Court under section 7 of the Criminal Law (High Risk Offenders) Act 2015 when an extended supervision order is sought in respect of an individual. The bill is intended to assist in alleviating delays experienced in providing forensic psychiatrist reports under the act and, indirectly, under the Sentencing Act.

I turn to extended supervision orders for high-risk offenders under the Criminal Law (High Risk Offenders) Act. Section 7 of the act, below the heading '7—Proceedings' provides:

- (1) The Attorney-General may make an application to the Supreme Court for an extended supervision order to be made in respect of a person who is a high risk offender (the respondent).
- (2) An application for an extended supervision order may only be made within 12 months of the relevant expiry date for the respondent.
- (3) The Supreme Court must, before determining whether to make an extended supervision order, direct that 1 or more legally qualified medical practitioners (to be nominated by a prescribed authority for the purpose) examine the respondent and report to the Court on the results of the examination, including—
 - (a) if the respondent is a serious sexual offender—an assessment of the likelihood of the respondent committing a further serious sexual offence; or
 - (b) if the respondent is a serious violent offender—an assessment of the likelihood of the respondent committing a further serious offence of violence; or
 - (c) if the respondent is a terror suspect—an assessment of the likelihood of the respondent committing a terrorist offence, or otherwise being involved in a terrorist act, or committing a serious offence of violence.

Similarly, under section 57(6) of the Sentencing Act 2017, the Supreme Court must be provided with reports from at least two legally qualified medical practitioners before imposing indefinite detention on an offender unable or unwilling to control their sexual instincts. Section 57(6) provides:

The Supreme Court must, before determining whether to make an order that a person to whom this section applies be detained in custody until further order, direct that at least 2 legally qualified medical practitioners (to be nominated by a prescribed authority for the purpose)—

the same language as the section in the other act—

inquire into the mental condition of a person to whom this section applies and report to the Court on whether the person is incapable of controlling, or unwilling to control, the person's sexual instincts.

Members will know that there are a small number of psychiatrists qualified to undertake the assessments of the type that I have outlined to the house. Those psychiatrists work to discharge their full-time clinical duties, and I understand that those duties are significant. They also undertake assessments for the Forensic Mental Health Service within SA Health. The demands placed on them are considerable. These demands can lead to delays in assessments being prepared for the court. As I have mentioned, the bill is intended to alleviate those delays.

The former government, we understand, was made aware of the delays experienced by courts in obtaining forensic assessments, from as early as March 2017, and the now Leader of the Opposition was made aware in April 2017. The then government did not take the necessary steps to resolve the issue. That was a failure of leadership. There appears to be a collective amnesia on the

part of the opposition in relation to matters of this type. The Leader of the Opposition recently remarked on radio that if, and the leader referred to a particular offender—

...is released and it's because the government hasn't got the reports that are required, then I think the public have every right to be incredibly angry, and as a father I certainly will be.

The opposition collectively, and the leader specifically, had every opportunity to resolve this issue in government. They did not, he did not and we are.

If passed, this bill will amend the Criminal Law (High Risk Offenders) Act to enlarge the pool of professionals able to provide reports to assist the administration of justice by permitting registered psychologists to provide reports under that act. The use of registered psychologists will reduce reliance on psychiatrists and allow psychiatrists to focus on preparing reports under the Sentencing Act in respect of a person alleged to be unable or unwilling to control their sexual instincts, as the Attorney has accurately and usefully outlined for the house. Forensic psychologists will be performing work under the governance of the clinical director of forensic mental health, and other appropriate oversight and governance arrangements will, of course, naturally continue to be in place.

The Attorney earlier addressed a range of other measures designed to streamline the psychiatric court assessment process and to ensure that the community can be confident in the quality of reports prepared following the amendments we now propose. I refer to, but do not repeat, the Attorney's useful and helpful remarks made earlier to the house. I also note that Labor are supporting these amendments, but I take members to earlier comments I have made in relation to Labor's opportunity to make amendments whilst they were in government.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (16:54): Briefly, I also rise to commend the bill to the house. I welcome the fact that the opposition indicates its support and, therefore, I expect that the bill will have quick passage through the house, as it should.

I note that, pursuant to the Criminal Law (High Risk Offenders) Act 2015, in section 7, the Attorney-General may make an application to the Supreme Court for an extended supervision order and it is such an order to which the bill relates. I make the further observation that section 7(5) provides that the paramount consideration of the Supreme Court in determining whether to make an extended supervision order must be the safety of the community.

I think that it bears some reflection on what is relatively recent history in terms of the capacity for technology to be applied to permit us to consider these sorts of arrangements that are often in the form of some sort of amelioration of what would otherwise be the only alternative of continued incarceration of certain prisoners. This is because an extended supervision order involves, usually as one element, the application of an electronic monitoring device of some sort.

Members may be interested to bear in mind that, as a benchmark, it was around the turn of the century in the early 2000s that we saw the advent more broadly of the use of the electronic monitoring devices. There was some authority at the time, in South Australia at least, about the effect of the use of an electronic monitoring device, as it were, in terms of considering the extent to which it impacted on the freedom of someone who might be considered for bail in certain circumstances.

Justice Gray made some observations in *R v Blayney* in 2002 about the fact that an electronic monitoring device, and the use of it, in fact had a significant impact in reducing the level of freedom of the person who is then released. That was back in 2002. It was in the period between about 2001 and 2004 that we saw the development of the use of such constraints in a range of circumstances, including in the context of bail, pre-sentence for prisoners who are on parole and, in these particular circumstances, for those who have completed a term of imprisonment but who are in a category of sufficient high risk that where these measures can be put in place then to refer back to section 7(5). Again, with the interests of the safety of the community in mind, the measures can be applied to some benefit.

The history of the technology does not go back a whole lot further than that. I have had the benefit of one of the publications of the Australian Institute of Criminology, a paper produced by Messrs Black and Smith, entitled 'Electronic monitoring in the criminal justice system'. It informs us that the technologies of electronic monitoring had their origins or their roots in research conducted at Harvard University in the late 1960s.

At that stage, those who developed the device had developed a one-kilogram unit described as a radio telemetry device that could be worn by a person. We have come a significant way since then in terms of the nature of the device that can be worn, but it bears reflecting that this is relatively modern technology and that it is still relatively evolving in terms of the scope of its application.

The authors went on to observe that it was not until the 1980s in the United States, very much in circumstances where there was pressure on prison populations and strong incentives to look for ways in which the prison population could be limited, that electronic monitoring devices were first used as part of community-based sanctions over there. As I have referred to, we have seen the use of these devices evolve together very much in the same vein as the development of the technology itself.

It perhaps speaks to the relative success of the use of these devices in the modern community over the last 20 years that, after a flurry of reforms initiating the use of these devices in the early 2000s, the use of them has become a matter that is not so much controversial but a challenge for practical and reliable deployment and so forth. So we see their application evolving from what were originally quite limited circumstances to ones in which they are now accepted as a valuable and important tool as part of the sanctions mechanisms available to the justice system.

The subject of the bill goes to the further practical aspects of enabling extended supervision orders to be made, including the deploying of these devices in circumstances where it seems to be a matter of wholehearted agreement across the community and stakeholders that those qualified to make the necessary assessments were to be drawn from a far too narrow pool. It just happens that we are dealing with a very small number of practitioners who formerly fell within the relevant class.

As has been observed just now, the prescribed authority—the clinical director of the forensic pathology health service in South Australia—had to choose from a too small group of health professionals when obtaining the necessary report. It is an entirely practical and considered measure, therefore, to look to expanding the classes of practitioner to include psychologists and other medical practitioners who may be nominated by the prescribed authority for the purpose. Again, I make the observation that it speaks to the relative utility and lack of controversy that are associated with these measures that it is regarded as appropriate that we ensure that the process around them can be completed as expeditiously as possible, including by expanding the class of professionals who can be associated with those orders.

We know, too, that there has been wideranging consultation, and those many agencies within the justice system that will be responsible for administering these orders have been consulted. I note the observations from the member for Kaurua that it may well be that there is an opportunity for those concerns to be further addressed.

In terms of the principle, though, we are dealing with the making of orders that are desirable primarily in the interests of the safety of the community. They are steps that the Attorney-General ought appropriately be able to take pursuant to the act, and when taking them it is appropriate that the class of those from whom the necessary report might be obtained be practicably one that ensures that the administration of the act, including the obtaining of the orders, can be progressed expeditiously. With those remarks, I commend the bill and encourage its speedy passage through the house.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (17:06): I thank the speakers who have made a contribution: firstly, the member for Kaurua who, on behalf of the opposition, has indicated their support of this bill, although he has identified some reservations; and the members for Kavel and Heysen, who elegantly added to the standard of the debate and gave valuable extra historical information, which I hope adds to the reassurance of the house of the significance of not only the principal legislation and the development of it but also why we are here today to amend it.

May I just briefly say that a number of matters were raised at the briefing on 12 March (which I assume to have been last week) by the shadow attorney-general of another place, and I have to hand a script of a number of matters that I believe covers the matters that were raised. I am happy to place those on the record, I hope, to encourage the opposition to the understanding of the significance of the effect of these amendments.

Can I just briefly say this: the Criminal Law (High Risk Offenders) Act 2015 in criminal law terms is quite novel law because it addresses the question of what is to be done with people who are deemed to be high-risk offenders by certain definitions, who have concluded their sentence or who are about to, and it is considered for various reasons that they are unsafe to be placed back in the community, that is, unsafe for the purposes of the community.

In a way that flies in the face of the concept that you commit an offence against public order, you are convicted, you are sentenced, you do the time and you are released, because this new law does two things, one of which is particularly novel; that is, in the face of the 'do your time, you will be released', it gives a process that actually keeps you locked up. It can be up to five years, or such lesser period as the Supreme Court determines.

That is quite a new and different concept, but one that was at that time under discussion around the country as to how we deal with these very difficult cases. In a way, it is a bit easy to deal with someone who has a mental incapacity because they are not convicted. They are treated in a different way. They may be held in a detention facility or in custody as such, but they are not held in a prison, and they are treated as a health patient. They are in a forensic environment; nevertheless, they are a health patient.

But this is an entirely new category. I remind members that, in undertaking such a significant reform affecting someone's actual freedom in a continuing detention order, it had to be a fairly high threshold. The law that we passed really covered only four areas: a person had to be in the category of a serious sexual offender, and there is quite a bit of definition about that; alternatively, they had to be in the category of a serious violent offender; they had to be a terror suspect who was serving a sentence of imprisonment or a person who was subject to an extended supervision order.

Within those four categories, they had to get to that threshold. There would not be a week that goes by when an application is not put in front of me with someone's history indicating whether there should be an application for a continued detention order or whether I, as Attorney-General, should apply for an extended supervision order and/or an interim supervision order with that, all of which are provided for under the act.

There are two things that have to happen. There has to be sufficient evidence that, firstly, they do qualify as a high-risk offender and, secondly, there is a risk to the community and the safety of the community is at peril. There is a whole list of other direct matters mainly centred around the likelihood of reoffending, which are all set out in the act. I will not repeat those, but I remind members that this is a discrete, relatively small group of people who the parliament has determined need to have a second set of protection around them for the purposes of ensuring that the public are safe. That is why we have it.

I think it is fair to say that the previous government, when they presented this legislation for the parliament's consideration, were of the view—and, indeed, we support it—that, if we are going to exercise this role of locking people up for longer, even when they had undertaken and completed their sentence, or ordering them to either abstain from certain conduct or do certain things under an extended supervision order, then we need to be very clear about what the terms and conditions are going to be and we need to have someone very senior make those decisions. The Supreme Court was selected, and they have undertaken this role.

I think it is fair to say that, in the last year or so that we have been in government, it has been pretty clear that more applications have been made than were probably expected. I have had continuing discussions with the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court on the number of applications that have been made because it is his court that has responsibility for dealing with this. Regarding the actual numbers, I am advised that 40 reports were prepared by the Forensic Mental Health Service in the period from October 2017 to November 2018, a period of one year.

Mr Picton: Sorry, how many?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Forty. Based on the statistics for 2017-18, it is expected that there will be around 35 to 36 reports per annum, which is slightly more, on checking, than the information that I understand the member for Kaurna was provided. You can see that we have nearly one of these matters a week that requires a psychiatrist's assessment.

Of course, the other thing is that, not long after coming into office—in the envelope of the Colin Humphrys case, which is now well known to the public—the question of the threshold was considered as to what is to apply in relation to these matters, and the obligation for the two medical practitioners' support plus the change of onus and the obligation on behalf of the applicant for release was considered. A tight set of prescriptive rules apply to this very narrow aspect of the population who are in these dangerous categories, which attract this extra protection for the community. We endorse all that. I appreciate the now opposition's support in tightening that up.

Another matter that became evident to us as a new government by late last year was that the number of people available to do these reports—which was a process via the South Australian Forensic Mental Health Service under the directorship of Dr Nambiar, who has been referred to—was clearly getting to an acute stage, and we convened some round tables and had some discussion with various representatives at that time. We did not know at that stage that the previous government had in fact been alerted to this problem in 2017. Much has been said about that, but let's move on. They did not do anything about it, but we are, and we need to do something about it.

The heads of the courts, their representatives, a particular magistrate Dixon (who is familiar with these matters and who has some history in looking at these issues), the Courts Administration Authority, the Office of the DPP, the South Australia Police, the Forensic Mental Health Service—in particular the clinical director, Dr Nambiar—the Department for Correctional Services and the Legal Services Commission all have a direct interest in either providing a service or supporting the applications or management in these matters.

We sat down and talked about what we could do to try to redress this situation. We clearly had a certain cohort of work to be done and it was a level of work that was not all that attractive to a lot of people. Let's be fair: not everybody wants to go down to high security prisons and interview people in this category. That is a fact of life, so we had to address it. A number of things have occurred.

Firstly, extra funding was allocated for SA Health, which was the referring body and an operational body for the provision of the reports, under Dr Nambiar. Additional funding of \$803,000 per annum went towards the new forensic court diversion and assessment service. In addition to that, the remuneration rate for court-ordered reports was reviewed and the rate for those reports prior to March 2019, under section 269 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935, was \$772.00 per report and reports under the Criminal Law (High Risk Offenders) Act and sections 57 and 59 of the Sentencing Act were at \$989.00 per report. Both are GST exclusive.

The remuneration post 1 March 2019 will be all reports prepared on a fee-for-service basis based on the WorkCover scale. Accordingly, there is no fixed rate for reports based on each act. The total cost will be based on the time taken to assess the defendant and the work involved in preparing the report. These are two important initiatives that we sorted out as quickly as we could. However, in the meantime we did need to gather the advice of a number of other parties as to how we might spread the load in respect of health professionals.

The question of psychologists was presented as an option in a similar way to what we had done when the previous government came to us and said, 'We don't have enough dentists in South Australia. We will get dental therapists to come in and take on a certain role in relation to dental treatment, particularly in respect of children and decay and all of these sorts of things.' There was a question of the professional standards that needed to be applied, and I recall some conditions were put to ensure that dental therapists were only going to be doing the work in relation to children's teeth because, as probably most people would appreciate, children's teeth are the baby teeth and can be extracted fairly easily.

Usually, children do not have diseased gums or things that tend to be more applicable in adults, so we could get dental therapists. As a parliament, we could approve dental therapists undertaking some of this work for the dental hygiene and health of children particularly and that would relieve the responsibility or workload for the other dentists. These are the sorts of adjustments that can be made, so we worked through that.

The recommended reforms that were presented on the table in respect of psychologists were then consulted on by the Forensic Mental Health Service—again, Dr Nambiar, the clinical director,

was valuable in his advice—psychiatrists for the forensic court diversion and assessment service; Dr Craig Raeside; staff of the existing court liaison service; the South Australian Health chief executive, Dr Chris McGowan; the Chief Psychiatrist, Dr John Brayley; the Courts Administration Authority, which is headed by the State Courts Administrator, Ms Julie-Anne Burgess; the Legal Services Commission; the Australian Psychological Society; and the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists.

It is a big list, but it is an important one because clearly we need to know that the clinicians who are going to undertake this work will be competent to do so and able to assist the Supreme Court in making these hard decisions. Once we got through that stage—and there was certainly an indication of an appetite for this reform—we then had to amend the act. The bill does this by providing that, in addition to a medical practitioner, which is not currently defined to include a psychologist, a prescribed health professional is now to mean a psychologist or a medical practitioner nominated by the prescribed authority. That is the addition we are adding to cover this initiative.

Those legislative amendments, via this bill, were then consulted on by the Forensic Mental Health Service, the Law Society, which has been mentioned, and the South Australian Bar Association. Obviously, the bill itself is not very long. It is to add in this extra prescription for the purposes of a qualification extension for a prescribed health professional. The same rules still apply; that is, the prescribing authority that nominates these is the Forensic Mental Health Service, as I have referred to. Dr Nambiar is the head. There is no power of delegation. I understand that there was a query at the briefing on this.

Our understanding is that there is no power of delegation and, accordingly, I inform the house of that. I expect that if Dr Nambiar were not available—on leave, for example—there would be an acting director and, of course, they would have those powers, but there is no capacity for him to delegate them. He does have power to identify people within the team. I still do not know exactly how many are in the unit, but it is quite a significant unit in the health department.

There was a question, for example, as to who the second report was prepared for in the Humphrys case. My understanding is that Dr Furst, a South Australian forensic psychiatrist, undertook that work, but there are occasions when, for obvious reasons, it is necessary to get someone from the private sector or, indeed, interstate. I am advised that there are usually very limited occasions when that might be required, as you would expect—where there might be a conflict of interest—but it is the exception rather than the rule.

Let's just consider the cohort of work to be done by this unit or allocated by psychiatrists in this unit under the direction of Dr Nambiar. There has been some work on having a look at the report. It is anticipated that forensic psychologists will prepare approximately 89 per cent of the reports ordered under the act, with forensic psychiatrists preparing 11 per cent. I recall the member for Kurna suggesting that it would be only four of the 30. I am not sure whether that was misunderstood at the briefing or the other way around; perhaps there was some misunderstanding.

However, psychologists would pick up the bulk of the work, and the 11 per cent is expected to be done by the forensic psychiatrists. I think it is important for the parliament to be aware that at all times health professionals undertaking these reports are under the supervision of the director. That is an important addition and some security in the standard that is to be available and maintained for the purposes of undertaking these tasks.

The final matter raised by, I think, the opposition—but I will give you credit for it if you had not—is about how the reports are allocated and what priorities and considerations are given. The allocation of reports, I am advised, is typically prioritised in order of the date of the court request. There may be times when there is a short time frame between the date of the court request and the day of the next hearing. In those instances, the clinical director may prioritise those requests or, if this time frame is too short, the relevant stakeholders will be advised that further time is required. Allocation of reports may also depend on the type of matter; if there is a particular type of matter that would benefit from a forensic psychiatrist with unique expertise, the request may be assigned to the psychiatrist.

For the benefit of members, I should add that these applications, once they are before the Supreme Court, are under the management of a Supreme Court judge or the Full Court, if it is under

appeal. They may indicate, which they have—certainly the Chief Justice has made comment on these matters—where there is a circumstance where some urgency is expected to be acknowledged in a particular case and, where possible, that is accommodated as quickly as possible to ensure that the request of the Supreme Court is followed through as best as can be done.

However, I want to reassure the house that when our new government became aware of this problem, as quickly as we could we gathered around the table people who had expertise, experience and capacity to contribute to the resolutions of this situation. Certainly, I heeded the concerns raised by the Chief Justice about any delay in the process of court applications, and we acted as expeditiously as possible to bring into account these new initiatives. We did not wait for the whole lot to be resolved. We have progressed others already, allocated extra funding and set new fees. We are here to do what we think will be an effective further tranche of reform by expanding the definition of health professionals to undertake this work.

I want to thank all members of the Attorney-General's office in particular and the opposition for their indication of support. They have undertaken the work to deal with this matter as expeditiously as possible. I am happy to move into committee if there are any further questions from the opposition or, indeed, any members.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr PICTON: I would like to ask the Attorney-General a question in relation to the Tipping case—Attorney-General (SA) v Tipping [2019]—from the Supreme Court. This was a decision where, according to the Chief Justice, and I quote:

During the first hearing in August 2018 two medical reports were ordered. The matter was adjourned until November 2018 based on an estimation provided by the applicant. At the time of the application heard on 16 January 2019, only one of the two medical reports has been received. The court was advised that the report writer of the second medical report was yet to be assigned by Forensic Mental Health, the effect of which is that the court only has the benefit of one of the two medical reports prior to the release date.

Further in his orders he said:

The delay on the part of the Attorney-General, a delay on the part of the prescribed authority in assigning the writing of reports to medical practitioners, is a relevant consideration in exercising the discretion pursuant to s 57(5) of the Sentencing Act.

My question to the Attorney-General is: when was she first advised that there was an issue in terms of allocating that report to somebody to be done, and what steps were taken once she was informed of the matter?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In terms of the Tipping case, those comments were published on I think about 20 January.

Mr Picton: The 16th.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes, 16 January, thank you. I think I have already made it clear in the contribution that by late 2018 we were already aware of a case, because the Chief Justice had raised it with us, and we started working straightaway. Issues in relation to extra funding and the redetermination of fees for reports, etc. were commenced straightaway, back in 2018.

By January, when a report had been prepared in the Tipping case, we were aware of it. Indeed the Law Society, which the member for Kaurua raises as being concerned about some of this bill, raised it with me in a meeting three or four weeks later. I was pleased to be able to advise the new president that not only had I read the judgement and taken note of what the Chief Justice had said but I had acted to ensure that there was attention given not just to that case but overall, hence the advancement of this legislation.

So, yes, the Chief Justice, without referring to that judgement, had already made it clear. As I say, once everybody came together, it then became clear that the previous government had known

about this for some time. He had been raising this issue; the Law Society had been raising it with the previous government. These were all matters that became apparent to our new government, and we acted with priority on this matter.

The Chief Justice is quite rightly not only able to bring but is appropriately bringing to our attention as a new government that this can potentially be a prejudice to those applicants who are coming before him or her in the Supreme Court. So it is entirely appropriate that it was raised. This time, though, when we were alerted to it, we acted on it.

Mr PICTON: From what I understand from what the Attorney-General is saying, she was informed by the Chief Justice back in 2018 about the Tipping case or about the issue just—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

Mr PICTON: Just generally. So you were not aware specifically of this issue in terms of the Tipping case until January, when it came up. Have you asked your department why you were not informed, or should it have been that the mental health agency should have informed the health minister that there was an issue here in terms of the Tipping case?

I would have thought that if you had been made aware that 'We've got this case coming up. It's going to be heard before the Supreme Court in January. We haven't been able to get a second report,' you might have been on the phone to the health minister, saying 'Let's see if we can fly in somebody from another state to make sure that this is going to happen so we don't look a bit foolish before the Supreme Court with only having one of these reports.' Should your department have known about it, or should the health minister have known about it?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: That is possible. I think what is more appropriate, though, is that having been informed on coming into office, there was a delay in these reports as a result of there being more reports than expected—that is, more cases than expected—once the legislation was in full flight. Secondly, although this had been a pre-existing problem, it was starting to translate into people's applications not being as expeditiously heard as they might have expected and the Supreme Court wanted to offer as that service.

Should I, as Attorney-General, be informed of every case? Probably not, because I think in these circumstances one appreciates it was 16 January. There was clearly a Christmas period, there may or may not have been people available, and it may be that the psychiatrist previously had been appointed and simply had not been able to conclude the report in that time.

I do not know the particulars of that, but I do know that it was brought to my attention and that just made me more eager to ensure that something be done about this situation. That is exactly what we have done. Should I be informed of every case? No. The Chief Justice raised this in his commentary, it was brought to my attention, and I advised the Law Society in early February, I think, that as soon as parliament resumed, this would be an action that we would take to help resolve that problem.

Mr PICTON: Who does the Attorney-General think should be monitoring this process? I understand that she believes she is bringing these changes in to make sure this sort of issue does not happen again, but whose job is it to make sure that for all these applications being made, understanding that that number is generally increasing and orders being made by the court for these reports or other reports that might need to be made are being checked, are actually happening as they are meant to? Is it her department's job? Is it the Forensic Mental Health Service's job? Is it the health ministry's job? Is it the police commissioner's job? What is the process by which that is being monitored?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: First of all, I do not think that there are increasing numbers; I think that there are more than were expected there would be annually. I am just reminded that formerly, in relation to the Tipping case, as Attorney-General I made the application for an extended supervision order on 8 August 2018. That is the application, just in case you need to have that for the completion of the Tipping case. In relation to it not being concluded as a result of the second report, the notice of that came from the commentary of the judge at the time.

Let me just go back a stage, though. Who should be responsible for this? I suppose you could ring up the Hon. John Rau SC and ask him, because he was the one who brought this in. The

reason I say that is that the model established under the act was that the Supreme Court would be the arbitrator of the application, there would be a prescribed authority and that authority was established to be the Forensic Mental Health Service in the health department.

That is a unit of the health department and that is the model that was established. I assume that is because the Attorney-General's Department at the time—and still now, I can assure you—does not have its own unit or suite of psychiatrists to do work for these sorts of matters, nor does the Courts Administration Authority, to the best of my knowledge. It is a highly specialised area in the health department.

I just want to say that is no different from the fact that the courts rely on expert evidence for lots of things: work injuries, motor vehicle injuries, compensation cases, property acquisitions, valuers, medical practitioners, and people who identify for the purposes of assessing values of businesses, for example. There are lots of structures in our law where the body that determines who is going to be appointed, mainly to avoid expert shopping, is an independent group.

Sometimes it is the Real Estate Institute, sometimes it is the Australian Medical Association's SA branch, sometimes it is a college of psychiatrists, but the Forensic Mental Health Service was the one that was chosen for this purpose. I suspect at the time it was because, firstly, they have the expertise. These people work for the health department. They have a right of private practice, I understand, but they also do these reports. They are pretty limited in number out there. This is not a real-world practice that a lot of people follow.

In essence, that is the structure that was established. I think it was a reasonable structure. I do not think it is appropriate for the courts to have to do that, especially as out in the private sector there are not many others who are available. This is a way of having an independent nomination process so that there is not what we call 'expert shopping' to try to secure the services of a particular specialist who may or may not be considered to be more lenient.

Mr PICTON: That is not my question. Who is going to be checking? The Forensic Mental Health Service?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The Forensic Mental Health Service is under the Minister for Health. It is a unit of the health department. I know that the member for Kaurua was a former minister and I do not know in the member's role historically as a minister whether he had much to do with the Forensic Mental Health Service. But if you did, within that area of work, you would appreciate it has a number of roles within the health department. As I understand it, a number of them have the right of private practice but, in addition to that, they undertake certain other duties for the government operations and one of those is the courts.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

Mr PICTON: The Attorney-General outlined a number of the stakeholders she consulted with as part of the bill. I am wondering if she can provide any of the submissions that were made by the stakeholders and advise what each of the stakeholders' views were regarding the bill.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The Forensic Mental Health Service is a government agency, so we do not as a matter of practice provide their response in relation to those. But I can tell you, as I think I outlined, Dr Nambiar's contribution of support in relation to this legislative amendment is there. The Law Society: you know that, because you have a copy of it and it is available online. The SA Bar Association did not even answer.

Mr PICTON: That is it? I thought there would be a lot more. The College of Psychiatrists?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: That is it. I will be clear about that. They were all consulted in respect of the implementation of all of the reforms that were being considered. There were round tables and so on as to a number of initiatives. In relation to this last one, they were not sent a copy of the bill because, as you said, it is two or three paragraphs.

Mr PICTON: Is the Attorney-General investigating the reintroduction of the master of forensic psychology program?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am not, but perhaps that is a matter you could direct to the Minister for Health.

Mr PICTON: The Attorney said in her comments earlier that she outlined the previous rates of pay and said that the new rates of pay will be commensurate, depending upon the complexity of the work, which is not a lot of detail in terms of how much people are likely to get paid. Can the Attorney-General expand upon that so that the parliament can get a bit of an understanding of what a report under this new payment regime is likely to be for a standard length and complexity report compared with the old scheme?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: On the information I was advised, and I will repeat it, the new rate for reports on a fee-for-service basis is based on the WorkCover scale, so there is a prescription list of fees for that. It is higher than the two figures I gave you, but it varies obviously because it is a prescribed scale, and then there is a capacity within that to accommodate for extra work, given the complexity. I am sorry if you missed that before.

Mr PICTON: I wonder if the Attorney-General can advise what is the pool of forensic psychiatrists and psychologists we are talking about who would be able to provide reports under the current legislation and what is the pool of forensic psychologists who would be able to do that under the new legislation?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I did mention earlier that I still do not know exactly how many are available but bear in mind that, apart from the forensic psychiatrists in the unit, there is a capacity, obviously, to outsource. In extreme circumstances, there is usually a conflict of interest for interstate. There is a very long list of psychologists in South Australia.

However, as I say, we would expect that not everyone would be rushing to do this type of work. Some like to specialise in clinical psychology to support children who are getting behind at school, and the prospect of going down to Yatala to interview people is not really something that they are keen to do. We have to respect that. On the advice of Dr Nambiar, we are expecting that that is something that will very significantly change the capacity and will address the issue.

Clause passed.

Clause 3.

Mr PICTON: I wonder whether the Attorney can outline what qualifications must a medical practitioner have to write a report? The term in the act is 'legally qualified medical professionals', but that definition is now being deleted. What does she envisage will be the qualifications after this legislation change?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The new definition will be:

...a person registered under the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law to practise in the medical profession (other than as a student);

As the member for Kaurua might remember from his days when he was providing excellent advice, I am sure, to the then minister for health, the Hon. John Hill, when he supervised the nationalisation of the registration of health professionals in this state, that became the new definition. That includes people who are legally qualified. That's the only basis upon which you can register under the national scheme, and I am sure that the member for Kaurua remembers fondly the advance of that reform.

Mr PICTON: I do. Does that mean that any doctor—because of course all doctors are registered under the national regulation scheme—would be okay under this legislation and that they do not have to have a particular proficiency in psychiatry or any other forensic qualifications, that is, as a GP, pathologist, etc.?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am advised that, yes, that is technically right. At the moment, the medical practitioner is the person who is under the definition in the current act. That was never prescriptive to just be psychiatrists. The previous law under the John Rau iteration that was passed in 2015 was for two medical practitioners. On the face of it, it could have been a number of different specialties, but psychiatry within that is a legal medical qualification. Psychologists are not, a bit like social workers are not, so to change the law to allow for psychologists, which is deemed by the people involved, we need to add in psychologists because they are not medical practitioners for the

purposes of what had previously been the case. That level of expanded health professionals, as such, was already there.

Mr PICTON: What will be the mechanism for this split between the kinds of reports that could be done by the medical practitioner and the kinds of reports that could be done by psychologists, noting that you said earlier in this debate that you thought it would be about 89 per cent that would now be done by psychologists, which is quite a lot and different from what we had understood? How is that decision made in terms of what the doctor and what the psychologist will do?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: That will be a matter of determination by the director.

The CHAIR: Last question on this clause.

Mr PICTON: You must have had some criteria applied to be able to come up with such a specific figure of 89 per cent to be done by psychologists versus medical practitioners. What are the criteria for which you would say, 'This one is too complex; it has to be done by a doctor'?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Let's be clear: I have not done this calculation and, to the best of my knowledge, my office has not done this calculation. This is the estimate from the forensic mental health unit of what would be the likely allocation of work. That matter is not prescribed by the parliament, by me as minister under regulation or by the health minister. That matter is left to the discretion of the director, just as when the Supreme Court orders that somebody in the Public Trustee, for example, is to deal with a deceased estate and they are appointed for the purposes of undertaking the provisions in the estate or when a valuer is appointed by the president of the institute of valuers. These are the types of orders that are made.

Mr Picton: What criteria does he use?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The expectation is that the people in those positions will make the identification as to the suitability. For example, in the case that was asked about, the second report for the Colin Humphrys case, the allocation of Dr Furst as a forensic psychiatrist was made by the director of the mental health unit as, in his opinion, a person suitable to undertake that task. I would see it as quite improper for the Attorney-General or executive government to be prescriptive on that or to interfere with it. My predecessor, the Hon. John Rau, probably for that very reason did not prescribe this.

Certainly, I have received no indication from the Supreme Court, which has the management of these cases, in particular the Chief Justice, that there is any concern that the standard of personnel who have been appointed as experts by the forensic mental health unit has been in any way deficient in that regard. If they had, then obviously that is a matter we would have to review, but no-one sitting around the table, including the Chief Justice, made any comment on that.

Clause passed.

Clause 4.

Mr PICTON: I believe that the Attorney mentioned earlier that an additional \$803,000 per annum was being allocated to forensic mental health for this work. Can she outline how many FTEs are being added to the pool of medical professionals who can prepare these reports?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No, I cannot, but I would encourage the member perhaps to have the shadow minister in the other place ask the Minister for Health. That might be the quickest way to deal with it, but I will make some inquiry in the meantime and, if it is available, I will make sure that it is forwarded to the Hon. Kyam Maher in the other place.

Mr PICTON: Chair, you will be glad to know that this is the last question. Can only medical professionals who are part of SA Health and the Forensic Mental Health Service provide these reports, and is that different for the Sentencing Act?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Private practitioners have been and can be used, even from interstate in exceptional circumstances. So, yes, they can, and that is obviously to supplement who is available to do the work. Again, it is entirely at the discretion of Dr Nambiar.

Clause passed.

Remaining clause (5) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (17:54): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

At 17:54 the house adjourned until Wednesday 20 March 2019 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***POLICE NUMBERS**

622 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (26 February 2019). What was the total number (FTE) of sworn police officers in South Australia as at 31 December 2018?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): As at 31 December 2018, the total number (FTE) of sworn police officers in South Australia was 4,612.80.

POLICE NUMBERS

623 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (26 February 2019). What was the total number (FTE) of sworn police officers in South Australia as at 31 January 2019?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): As at 31 January 2019, the total number (FTE) of sworn police officers in South Australia was 4,628.96.

POLICE CADETS

624 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (26 February 2019). What was the total number (FTE) of police cadets in South Australia as at 31 December 2018?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): As at 31 December 2018 the total number (FTE) of police cadets in South Australia was 152.

POLICE CADETS

625 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (26 February 2019). What was the total number (FTE) of police cadets in South Australia as at 31 January 2019?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): As at 31 January 2019 the total number (FTE) of police cadets in South Australia was 132.

INDUSTRY AND SKILLS DEPARTMENT

626 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (27 February 2019). How much has the Department of Industry and Skills spent on advertising since October 2018?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills): I have been advised:
\$113,948.00

TREASURY AND FINANCE DEPARTMENT

638 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (27 February 2019). As at 31 December 2018 how many public sector FTE positions were funded in Simpler Regulation Unit branch of the Department of Treasury and Finance?

1. What is the number of funded FTE positions by classification level?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

1. The Simpler Regulation Unit transferred under machinery of government from the Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF) to the Office of the South Australian Productivity Commission (OSAPC) effective 29 October 2018. 6.0 FTE transferred from DTF to OSAPC through this transfer.

2. The number of funded FTE positions by classification level (per the chief executive agreement for the machinery of government transfer of the Simpler Regulation Unit from DTF to OSAPC) is as follows:

FTE	Classification
AS03	1.0
AS06	1.0
AS08	2.0
MAS3	1.0
SAES1	1.0
Total FTE	6.0

3. As at 31 December 2018, the number of funded FTE positions by classification level for the OSAPC is as follows:

FTE	Classification
AS03	1.0
AS06	1.0

FTE	Classification
AS08	2.0
MAS3	1.0
SAES1	1.0
EXEC0F	0.5
CONAGD	0.7
Total FTE	7.2

PROGRAM AND INITIATIVE FUNDING

652 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (27 February 2019). Can the Treasurer provide a list of all programs and initiatives that have had their funding reduced or cut since 30 June 2018?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

The full list of the savings strategies of the government, including cuts to programs and initiatives, are set out in detail in the 2018-19 Budget Measures Statement.

The only adjustment to the savings strategies set out in the budget papers has been a reduction of \$23 million in the 2018-19 savings target of the Health portfolio. This was set out in the 2018-19 Mid-Year Budget Review.

TARGETED VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PACKAGES

660 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (27 February 2019). How much of the \$150 million TVSP scheme announced in the 2018-19 budget been spent in total?

1. How many FTEs have accepted in total?
2. How many FTEs accepted per department?
3. What was the classification level of FTE recipients, by department?
4. What is the average cost per FTE accepted?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

1. & 2. To the end of January 2019, agencies had sought reimbursement from the Department of Treasury and Finance for costs of \$18 million (169.9 FTE separations) against the central TVSP provision. Reductions in FTE numbers in the public sector are not solely reliant on TVSPs.

3. A breakdown of FTEs by department is shown in the following table (table 1):

Agency	FTEs
Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	41.1
Primary Industries and Regions	26.3
Industry and Skills	24.1
Attorney-General's Department	23.6
Environment and Water	19.1
Treasury and Finance	14.8
Human Services	6.1
Arts SA	5.0
Premier and Cabinet	4.0
Courts Administration Authority	1.8
Energy and Mining	1.8
Tourism	1.0
Environmental Protection Authority	0.6
TAFE SA	0.6
Total	169.9

4. The classification level of FTEs by department is shown in table 2 (appendix).

Agency	Classification (no. of FTEs)									
	AP & MST-2	ASO1	ASO2	ASO3	ASO4	ASO5	ASO6	ASO7	ASO8	ASX2
Arts SA	—	—	—	1.0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Attorney-General's Department	—	—	1.0	—	1.0	—	1.0	2.6	—	—
Human Services	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.8	—	—	—
Correctional Services	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Courts Administration Authority	—	—	—	1.0	0.8	—	—	—	—	—
Education	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Environment and Water	—	—	1.0	1.5	5.9	1.1	2.6	2.6	1.0	—
Environmental Protection Authority	—	—	—	0.6	—	—	—	—	—	—
Industry and Skills	—	—	1.0	3.4	1.0	5.0	4.8	3.4	3.5	—

Health Regions	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Trade, Tourism and Investment	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Metropolitan Fire Service	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Energy and Mining	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	1.0	1.0	2.0	—	1.0	—	1.6	2.0	1.0	—
Premier and Cabinet	—	—	1.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Primary Industries and Regions	—	—	1.0	—	—	—	1.0	—	—	—
SA Fire and Emergency Services Commission	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
South Australia Police	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
South Australian Ambulance Service	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
South Australian State Emergency Service	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
TAFE SA	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tourism	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Treasury and Finance	—	—	2.0	—	—	—	—	—	1.0	1.0
Total (by Classification)	1.0	1.0	7.6	1.0	2.0	1.6	4.4	2.0	7.0	4.0

Agency	Classification (no. of FTEs)							Total (by Agency)
	TGO2	TGO3	TGO4	TGO5	Suburban Train Driver Mainline	WHA2		
Arts SA	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5.0
Attorney-General's Department	1.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	23.6
Human Services	—	—	—	—	—	0.4	—	6.1
Correctional Services	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Courts Administration Authority	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.8
Education	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Environment and Water	—	1.0	—	—	—	—	—	19.1
Environmental Protection Authority	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.6
Industry and Skills	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	24.1
Health and Wellbeing	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Health Regions	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Trade, Tourism and Investment	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Metropolitan Fire Service	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Energy and Mining	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.8
Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	—	—	1.0	1.0	1.0	—	—	41.1
Premier and Cabinet	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4.0
Primary Industries and Regions	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	26.3
SA Fire and Emergency Services Commission	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
South Australia Police	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
South Australian Ambulance Service	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
South Australian State Emergency Service	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
TAFE SA	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.6
Tourism	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.0
Treasury and Finance	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	14.8
Total (by Classification)	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.4	—	169.9

5. The average cost of a TVSP is \$78,050 plus \$15,000 for a lump sum payment.

HOMESTART FINANCE

665 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (27 February 2019). What is the guarantee fee charged to Homestart Finance by the SAFA for the 2018-19 financial year?

1. What is the fee in percentage terms?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised that:

As at 18 February 2019, \$18.0 million in guarantee fees have been paid by Homestart Finance to SAFA for the 2018-19 financial year.

The guarantee fee rate for the 2018-19 financial year in percentage terms is 1.36 per cent per annum.

SA WATER

666 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (27 February 2019). What is the guarantee fee charged to SA Water by the SAFA for the 2018-19 financial year?

1. What is the fee in percentage terms?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised that:

As at 18 February 2019, \$57.9 million in guarantee fees have been paid by SA Water to SAFA for the 2018-19 financial year. The guarantee fee rate for the 2018-19 financial year in percentage terms is 1.36 per cent per annum.

RENEWAL SA

667 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (27 February 2019). What is the guarantee fee charged to Renewal SA by the SAFA for the 2018-19 financial year?

1. What is the fee in percentage terms?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised that:

As at 18 February 2019, \$8.2 million in guarantee fees have been paid by Renewal SA to SAFA for the 2018-19 financial year. The guarantee fee rate for the 2018-19 financial year in percentage terms is 1.36 per cent per annum.

HOUSING TRUST

668 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (27 February 2019). What is the guarantee fee charged to the South Australian Housing Trust by the SAFA for the 2018-19 financial year?

1. What is the fee in percentage terms?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised that:

The South Australian Housing Trust does not have any borrowings from SAFA. Accordingly, no guarantee fees have been charged to the South Australian Housing Trust for the 2018-19 financial year.

PREMIER AND CABINET DEPARTMENT

670 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (27 February 2019). As at 30 March 2018 how many total public sector FTE positions were funded in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet?

1. What is the number of funded FTE positions by classification level?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

The member asked this exact same question on 25th July 2018. An answer was tabled in the parliament on 4th September 2018 which I refer the member to.

PREMIER AND CABINET DEPARTMENT

671 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (27 February 2019). As at 30 March 2018 how many total public sector FTEs were employed in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet?

1. What is the number of employed FTE positions by classification level?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):

1. As at 30 March 2018, the total public sector FTE positions employed in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet was 1,709.2.

2. The number of FTE positions employed by classification level per the associated enterprise agreement is as follows:

FTE	Classification
AHP504	1.0
AS01	25.8
AS02	395.7
AS03	237.7
AS04	146.1
AS05	186.5
AS06	186.4
AS07	116.2
AS08	102.4
CONAGD	0.6
CFR001	2.2
CFR002	3.9

FTE	Classification
CFR003	25.1
EXEC0E	1.0
EXEC0F	0.8
LE4	1.0
LE5	1.0
LEC5	0.8
MAS2	1.0
MAS3	42.6
MINCOS	1.0
MIN000	1.2
MINAPP	7.0
OPS1	3.0
OPS2	2.0
OPS3	1.0
OPS4	4.0
OPS5	13.0
OPS6	9.7
PO1	5.0
PO2	17.0
PO3	27.5
PO4	27.6
PO5	25.0
PO6	1.0
SAES1	58.3
SAES2	14.5
TG01	1.0
TG03	2.0
TRA123	1.0
TRA124	5.0
WP601	2.6
WP602	1.0
WP802	1.0
Total FTE	1 709.2

ADELAIDE REMAND CENTRE

682 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (19 March 2019). Provide the names of any and all companies (including that company's parent company if applicable, and/or membership of any consortia) who have submitted an expression of interest in the operation of the Adelaide Remand Centre (DCS228 EOI refers) as at 14 February 2019?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): The State Procurement Board's Procurement Policy Framework sets out the overarching policy for the operation of procurement in the government of South Australia. A key principle articulated in this document is probity, accountability and transparency, which highlights the need for public authorities to ensure the confidentiality of information.

The evaluation of the Adelaide Remand Centre procurement is ongoing and negotiations with preferred tenderers are classified as Sensitive: Commercial.

Accordingly, I am not in a position to share information relating to the names of companies who may have submitted an expression of interest.

PRISONER NUMBERS

684 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (19 March 2019). Provide the total number of people incarcerated, or held on remand, in each South Australian correctional facility as at 31 January 2019?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): The table below provides a breakdown by prison of the number of people incarcerated or held on remand as at 31 January 2019.

Adelaide Pre-release Centre	81
Adelaide Remand Centre	222
Adelaide Women's Prison	146
Cadell Training Centre	183
Mobilong Prison	443
Mount Gambier Prison	554
Port Augusta Prison	519
Port Lincoln Prison	160

Adelaide Pre-release Centre	81
Yatala Labour Prison	546
James Nash House	11

CENTRAL ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK

In reply to **Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (5 December 2018).

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised that:

All concerns will be treated confidentially and anonymously if the staff member would prefer, and will be handled by trained staff who will provide the information to a disclosure officer within the Central Adelaide Local Health Network. The whistleblower hotline is operated by an Australian company with experience in providing such confidential services for the reporting of unethical or disrespectful behaviour.

KORDAMENTHA

In reply to **Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (5 December 2018).

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

As public servants at the executive level the officers will have the authority to direct public servants in accordance with public service legislation and policy, and under the direction of the chief executive officer, Lesley Dwyer.

CENTRAL ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK

In reply to **Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (5 December 2018).

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

Yes.

WATER RECOVERY SOCIO-ECONOMIC CRITERIA

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (12 February 2019).

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water): Submissions made to the Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission and Productivity Commission in 2018 are publicly available. These positions proposed are entirely consistent with the government policy position at the time.