

Madam Speaker Purick took the Chair at 10 am.

VISITORS

Madam SPEAKER: Good morning honourable members and visitors to Parliament House, including our two friends from Florida who have come to Darwin on one of those cruise ships.

Members: Hear, hear!

LEAVE OF ABSENCE Member for Arafura

Ms FYLES (Leader of Government Business): Madam Speaker, I move a leave of absence be granted to the Member for Arafura today due to personal reasons.

Leave granted.

Member for Daly

Mrs FINOCCHIARO (Spillett): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 224, I move that a leave of absence be granted to the Member for Daly for personal reasons.

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT National Day of Action

Madam SPEAKER: Honourable members, tomorrow is the National Day of Action for schools and the community to support that bullying is not acceptable. The theme for the National Day of Action is 'Take Action Every Day'. The National Day of Action gives schools the chance to take action and empower young people to be part of the solution when addressing bullying in their school community and provides an opportunity to focus on bullying and the big changes we can make to create safer communities for everyone. Join the thousands of Australian schools already part of the nationwide movement tomorrow.

Ribbons have been placed on every member's desks.

CONDOLENCE MOTION Hon Frederick 'Fred' Finch AM

Madam SPEAKER: Honourable members, it is with deep regret that I advise of the death of Hon Fred Finch AM on 12 November 2018, a former member of this place representing the seats formerly known as Wagaman until 1987, then Leanyer until 1997.

I advise honourable members of the presence in the gallery of family and friends of Hon Fred Finch. On behalf of honourable members, I extend a warm welcome to our visitors.

Members: Hear, hear!

Madam SPEAKER: I remind honourable members that on completion of debate I will ask members to stand in silence for one minute as a mark of respect.

Mr GUNNER (Chief Minister): Madam Speaker, I move that this Assembly:

- (a) express its sadness at the death of Mr Fred Finch AM, a former appointed member of the Legislative Council and a former appointed member of the Legislative Assembly and place on record its appreciation of his long and distinguished service to the people of the Northern Territory
- (b) tender its sincere condolences to his family and friends.

It is a privilege to speak today and share some of the words of people who knew and loved Fred. Often the best way into the story of a great Territorian is the circumstances of their arrival.

The great Territorian we honour today was an engineer by trade, he was a man who could build things. In 1974 the Territory needed building. He and his young family were to leave the east coast and begin new lives in what was then still firmly viewed by fellow Australians—especially by one's extended family—as a distant frontier.

His wife of many years, Lyn, tells the story of how their own parents worried about the move particularly, and understandably, about missing out on time with the grandkids. Reflecting on Christmas time 1974, Lyn remembers her mother rushing out of the house to spread the news of Cyclone Tracy saying, 'You cannot go now, Darwin has just been blown away', she said. They went to see it for themselves on the TV. Unfortunately for mum, what Fred saw did not put him off or turn him away. It did not make him worry or give him cause to rethink his decision; it confirmed his decision. The Territory and Territorians needed his skills more than ever, and rather than turn the Finch family around—it drew them faster.

Fred was building this place ever since, first in bricks and mortar then in the family that put down roots and still has deep connections here today. He built the Territory in the form of community organisations and clubs. From 1984, and for an incredible 14 years, he built the Territory in the form of policy from the floor of parliament and a decade's-worth of Cabinet meetings.

He is known as the father of surf lifesaving in the Territory. He was deeply involved in sport and its administration, a career-long passion that would see him awarded an Order of Australia Medal in 2007 and an Australian Sports Medal in 2000.

The bereavement notices in the *NT News* last year gave a small insight into his community reach: the Tracy Village Razorbacks; NT Rugby; Engineers Australia; and Bees Creek School, just to name a few.

One such notice came from former CLP leader, Jodeen Carney. She remembers Fred as someone not just willing, but eager to listen to new people bringing new ideas. He was funny, smart, and a little bit mischievous. 'He was the man who got things built,' Jodeen says. 'He knew how to build them, and he made sure they happened. What a legacy.'

He was a mentor and offered invaluable support. He was middle of the road in his politics. Something which Jodie remembers occasionally attracted ribbing from colleagues: after a tough 2005 election Jodeen remembers that friends in politics were hard to find. 'Not Fred,' she says, and I quote:

When others walked away, he stepped up. He worked hard. He knew the consequences and rode back up. I just love him; he was an amazing man.

Others, who had the fortune to know him better than I, describe him as genuine people's person who was easy going, and whose charms, humour and can-do attitude earned him the natural affections of this city and its people, not to mention, I am told, his penchant for a good red wine and beer.

His former boss, former Chief Minister Shane Stone, offered the simple words any public servant could hope to have ascribed to them. I quote:

... an honourable and decent man who always put his community first.

In his time in politics, Fred was responsible for just about everything at some time or another, memorably quipping in 1994 that a heart attack and subsequent lay-up in hospital were merely experience for his role as acting Health minister. But Lyn says his favourite job was Education minister. As an engineer, he was particularly passionate about mathematics and took every opportunity when on school visits to explain to students how important it was, not only for making things, but in understanding the world around them.

Lyn tells a story about one such visit to a remote school in which Fred, a Darwin Buff's supporter, used footy scores to make his point, 'If Saint Mary's kicks two goals and six behinds, and the Buffs kick six goals and 10 behinds, who wins the game?' he asked. Without missing a beat, a young fellow replied, 'You're wrong, minister. The Buffaloes could never beat Saints.' Fred was tickled and explained to the class that if they did not know how to do math he could not get away with telling them fibs like Buffs beating Saints.

Fred was proud of building the Territory. But more than anything, he was proud of his wonderful family. He leaves behind wife Lyn, daughters Georgie, Suzi and Kate. Sons-in-law Alan, Andrew and Darran and grandchildren Laura, Connor, Spencer and Tenzin.

I offer my condolences and best wishes to his family. It is for them, in honour of his legacy, that we move this motion today. And while our words could never adequately meet the measure of the man and his achievements, it is my hope that, spoken in this place he served with such dedication, they provide comfort to those he loved that his was a life that counted.

Members: Hear, hear!

Mrs FINOCCHIARO (Spillett): Madam Speaker, I rise to speak on behalf of the opposition to honor the life of a highly respected former long-term resident of Darwin and a former distinguished minister and member of this Assembly.

The Honorable Frederick Arthur Finch AM was born in Port Kembla, New South Wales on 16 June 1945. On 12 November last year he passed away peacefully at his home. Fred was the loving husband of Lyn; father to Georgie, Suzi and Kate; father-in-law to Alan, Andrew and Darran; and much loved Pa to Laura, Connor, Spencer and Tenzin; many of whom are in the gallery today.

I take this opportunity today to speak about the variety of interests, achievements and public service of this man, whose contribution to our community was immense and who left behind a huge legacy for Territorians.

Fred was the driving force and founding member of Surf Life Saving in the Territory and a true Territory icon. Fred's passing will be felt across the greater Surf Life Saving family where he is recognised as a great Australia by the community he was so passionate about.

Fred served as an active participant, president and coach of Surf Life Saving for over 15 years. It was at the Port Kembla Surf Life Saving Club that he began his surf career. As a competitor, Fred's strength lay in the chariot race, where he received both state and Australian medals.

He also won branch flags for the flag sprint and the relay. Fred spearheaded several building projects through the club, including the boat shed. Fred's father, who was also a member of Port Kembla, was a strong boat rower and a Councillor for the Wollongong City Council.

After Fred's graduation at the University of Wollongong in 1969, where he obtained a Bachelor of Science and Civil Engineering, Fred worked for the Sydney Water Board.

After nine years, Fred left the Water Board to work with a private engineering firm centralised around areas of land development, civil construction and consulting engineering.

He accepted a new position managing a small consulting office on Queensland's Sunshine Coast in 1972 before a transfer offer to Darwin was extended to the then 27-year-old. He became a partner with Brian Colless and the company Colless and Finch Pty Limited was born in 1977. Fred remained a partner in this company until 1983.

First joining Engineers Australia as a member in 1969 as a student, Fred earned his Chartered status in 1973 before his election as President of the Institute of Engineers Australia in 1982. Fred eventually obtained his fellowship status in 1988.

Following the devastation of Cyclone Tracy in December 1974, Fred's public service duties to the Northern Territory began by overseeing the structural requirements for private sector reconstruction. With the destruction of more than 70% of Darwin's buildings, including 80% of Darwin's housing, this was no small task. Like many dedicated and passionate professionals at the time, Fred's contribution to the rebuild should not be underestimated.

During his career Fred was a lecturer in engineering at Darwin Community College and later in his life, as Education minister, was a great supporter of the then NTU and later Charles Darwin University.

Mark Monaghan, Engineers Australia Northern Territory Division General Manager, in paying tribute to Fred, said:

It is with a heavy heart that we farewell one of the Territory's most influential engineers. His contribution to all aspects of the Northern Territory was immense, his dedication to the engineering sector unwavering and the legacy his work will leave is certainly something to behold

In 1983, Fred, encouraged by the then Chief Minister, Paul Everingham, stood for the CLP and won the seat of Wagaman. He represented that electorate until 1987. Following a redistribution, Fred then represented the electorate of Leanyer until his retirement from political life in 1997.

Fred had a remarkable career in politics spanning 14 years and served as a minister in the Hatton, Perron and Stone governments, also serving as:

- Minister for Transport and Works (1987–1992)
- Minister for Racing and Gaming (1989–1990) and (1996–1997)
- Minister for Education and Training in (1992–1995) and (1996–1997)
- Minister for Public Employment (1992–1994) and (1995–1997)
- Attorney-General (1994–1995)
- Minister for Health Services (1995–1996)
- Minister for the Liquor Commission (1995–1996).

During his public career, Fred was also Chairman of the NT Training Bureau from 1997–2000 and Chairman of the NT Planning Authority from 1998–2002.

We hear much said in this place about youth, an increase in youth crime and what should or should not be done to address this massive social issue in our community. Let me read from the maiden speech of Frederick Arthur Finch MLA, Member for Wagaman, and reflect for a moment on the words of wisdom he spoke in the Legislative Assembly on Wednesday 29 February 1984:

I support the need to provide further youth facilities and recreational activities for people in this area. Our youth policy focuses attention on these needs and is to be commended by all.

On completion of facilities such as the magnificent Marrara sporting complex and the extensions which are currently under construction at Casuarina High School, it can be seen that we are well on the way to satisfactorily providing suitable venues for youth activities.

These activities will provide not only for young peoples' needs, but will cater also for the public at large.

They will become a tremendous asset to the northern suburbs. However, work will still be needed to ensure that our future generations are given the best opportunities for full and productive development.

From previous experience with school groups, swimming clubs and various other sporting bodies; girl guides and other youth groups, I am also concerned that we should be attempting to encourage greater family involvement, particularly in the development of those vital areas of education, social attitude, self-discipline and development of character.

Whilst governments and educators can do and play a significant role through the provision of supportive services and facilities, there is no substitute for caring, paternal involvement. How we tackle this problem, however, I am not certain. But, it is certain that we must try.

Wise words indeed. All of us in this house would do well to remember them.

It was Fred's nature to always put the Territory first. This was no clearer in 1994 when he suffered his third heart attack. He had suffered two previous heart attacks in two months in 1987, the first within weeks of his appointment to the ministry. When asked if he would change anything, his response was:

Not being involved in my work would be more stressful than me being involved.

He went on to say that he had always been a workaholic and that he enjoyed his job. Fred quipped that instead of going to work at 6 am, he might go to work at 7 am and spend half an hour exercising every second day. The Territory and his ministerial responsibilities always came first and his health came second.

Fred had a passion for the Territory. His brushing aside of his third heart attack, declaring things to be, 'Business as usual', was very typical of the man who said at the time:

I had a fitness test for my pilot's licence. I was 50% fitter than the average man half my age.

Speaking in the hallowed Chamber of what we call Parliament House causes me to reflect on what State Square may have looked like if it were not for Fred Finch, who was the then Minister for Transport and Works. According to former Deputy Chief Minister, Barry Coulter, who is in the gallery today, Fred was essentially the project manager for the State Square project.

His engineering expertise stood the government in good stead. He oversaw and reviewed every single aspect of that great project, ensuring that Territorians got value for money and an outstanding and unique Parliament House and Supreme Court.

As Minister for Transport and Works, Fred was relentless in his pursuit of the Commonwealth Government to build a new Darwin Airport. According to Barry, Fred did everything he could to embarrass them, time and time again, until the decision was finally taken to build it under the auspices of the then Airports Corporation. His engineering expertise came to the fore time and time again. The community halls at Freds Pass, Berry Springs and Humpty Doo are classic examples of the legacy he left for these thriving communities.

Fred was one of the best known Education ministers this Territory has ever had. Fred visited schools across the Territory and all the children knew and loved him. I happen to have been one of those children at the time. It was a special treat for the children if Fred the minister visited your school on his birthday and you got to sing Happy Birthday to him and have a great big cake for morning tea.

Barry Coulter recalls that one of the least known things about Fred, the engineer, was his participation as a member of the cultural club. Fred, with back bench CLP colleagues, the now deceased Don Dale and the then Member for Karama, Mick Palmer, visited museums and art galleries, interviewed famous members of the Australian arts community, including, I am told, Sir Robert Helpmann, to get an insight into how the government of the day could bring arts and culture to prominence in the Territory. A most unlikely pursuit for an engineer, but a responsibility that Barry Coulter said Fred took on with great gusto.

Apart from the many roads, bridges and buildings that were completed under Fred's stewardship, and remain as his legacy to this day, Fred will be remembered as a hands-on minister with the most incredible network across the Territory. He was a man who could get to the bottom of an issue with a few phone calls, fixing whatever the problem in no time. Barry said, 'We could do well with a few more people like Fred Finch today, that is for sure'.

Former Chief Minister Marshall Perron asked that I share some of his memories of his friend and colleague in this condolence motion:

Husband, father, engineer, local member and minister of the Crown—I knew him well as the last three and observed him as the first two. Fred was a thoroughly decent man at every level. We worked together in government for twelve years, sharing a passion and vision for building a Territory we could all be proud of.

Unlike some of our colleagues in politics, Fred was not on an ego trip. He took the job seriously, he did his homework, he understood the electorate and had a real empathy for the unfortunate in our community. He was a solid member of the CLP team and could be relied upon completely to represent the Territory at any forum here or abroad with the dignity and honour that the occasion required. Above all, Fred had that most important attribute any man can have—integrity.

I regard Fred Finch as a friend as well as a valued colleague. The Territory is a better place today because of Fred Finch and this country would be a better place if there were more people like him in parliament.

Daryl Manzie also reflected on his friendship with Fred and asked if we recount some stories. Daryl recounted how Fred loved his golf and was a member of the Darwin Golf Club. Daryl, Paul Everingham and Fred would meet at the golf club at 6 am and during their round would solve all the political issues of the day, particularly

those that related to the northern suburbs. They laughed and joked, and Fred was a very happy person with a great sense of humour.

Fred was involved in an infamous drive of a prime mover backwards from Katherine to Darwin. As Minister for Transport and Works, Fred was concerned about the significant increases in fees for truck drivers in proposed national uniform legislation. He thought the fees would make the transport industry go backwards and so he and others drove the truck backwards as a symbol of his opposition.

Another time Fred brought attention to the federal government's action—or lack thereof—with his campaign to get the new Darwin airport terminal built—a matter that caused him great concern about the Labor government's lack of action. He organised a working bee of Greek and other local construction companies, and with the developer said, 'We will build it ourselves'.

Fred would also go to the wharfies' Grey Collar Club—a tin/fibro shed—and have a few beers with the workers. Daryl and Fred would have lunch at the club and the members of the club would say, 'You are better than those Labor members. Brian Ede and his Labor mates have never come here for a drink or a meal.' Those memories are attributed to Daryl Manzie.

One of Fred's great strengths was his 'stirrer' or 'spoiler' role in the parliament and his ability to operate at a grassroots level and be an important barometer for Darwin's northern suburbs. He did this consistently and did not hold back in his final days in the Assembly when directing his comments towards the then Member for Wanguri for letterboxing in his electorate. He suggested to him that he should stop doorknocking because he was 'scaring the dogs and the kids'. Fred loved his electorate and his constituents and they truly loved and respected him. That is why, time and time again, he achieved a clear majority at the polls.

Fred's final speech captured the essence of the man when he said:

In reflecting on my 14 years in parliament, 10 of them in Cabinet, I can walk out of this Chamber when the time comes knowing that I have contributed positively to the wellbeing of my electorate and its development and to the wellbeing of Territorians through the various portfolios that I have held.

He walked away with his head held high in the knowledge that he had given it his all.

In January 2007, Fred was a recipient of the Member of the Order of Australia for his service to the community of the Northern Territory through the Legislative Assembly particularly in the portfolio responsibilities of education, health, public works, the surf lifesaving movement, and NT Rugby Union.

Fred was a person who gave so freely to the Northern Territory community. His community work included Director of the National Council, Surf Life Saving Australia (SLSA), 1987 to 2003; being awarded a life member of Surf Life Saving Australia in 2003; public officer, Surf Lifesaving NT; inaugural Chair and President, 1989 to 2003; life member, Surf Lifesaving NT 1999; interim Chair for negotiations with Surf Life Saving Australia and Northern Territory leading to surf lifesaving autonomy for the Northern Territory in 1987 to 1989; Deputy President, Darwin Surf Life Saving Club, 1984 to 1987; Chairman of the Building Committee; providing coaching and team management support from 1984 to 2003; Lions Club of Darwin Casuarina member for 20 years and served as president, zone chairman and district governor; President of Port Kembla Surf Life Saving Club from 1970 to 1973; and committee member, 1968 to 1973.

Fred was also awarded the Australian Sports Medal in 2000.

Fred also showed great interest in the game of rugby union in the Northern Territory, holding a number of executive roles in the Territory while maintaining a presence on the field. He was: a life member of NT Rugby Union, 2006; vice-patron from 2004 to 2005; treasurer from 2001 to 2002; patron of the NT Junior Rugby Union and also served as a committee member; and patron of the Dragons Rugby Union Club for the period 1988 to 2001.

He served as patron of a range of sporting organisations including NT Rugby Referees' Association, NT Softball Association and NT Touch Association.

Fred was appointed a Director of Lasseters Corporation Limited in 1999 and was appointed as Fellow, Institution of Engineers Australia in 1988.

Frederick Arthur Finch, known to everyone simply as Fred, at five feet tall or thereabouts, was a giant of a man, both in and outside of the Legislative Assembly. At all times he had the best interests of Territorians at

heart. His extensive work in the community, whether in or outside of the parliament, is a testament to a man whose discipline, logic and analytical ability helped him get on with the job and get the job done. He impacted positively on the lives of countless Territorians.

Above all else, Fred was a family man. To him, his family was everything.

I extend my condolences to Fred's family on behalf of Gary Higgins and me. Thank you for sharing Fred with us. The Northern Territory is a better place because of him.

Mr WOOD (Nelson): Madam Speaker, what a wonderful response from the opposition. I am not here to repeat all that. I listened to and learned a lot of things I did not know about Fred.

My words are more about how Fred affected me. I used to be a silly person. I used to sit up there in the gallery when I had a bit of time off, and I listened to the debates in this parliament. People may remember that Question Time used to have unlimited answer time. If there is one thing that always stayed in my mind, it is that Fred knew how to use up that time. I must admit, I had to walk out, because those answers were not precise or concise.

He was a very clever politician. He knew how to debate issues and use his time as a member of parliament, politically, as he was working for the government, but he also contributed to many serious debates in this parliament which, as you would see from his opening speech, showed what a person he really was.

Some of what he said about youth in his opening speech should be the same attitude today in this parliament. He was the Member for Leanyer, which included Knuckey Lagoon. I met Fred because I was the local councillor for Knuckey Lagoon, and I was President of the council. There were times we disagreed a bit. People may remember he was the Chair of the Planning Authority. People might also remember I have long had an interest in planning.

When Fred made up his mind that I was wrong, he would tell me. Fair enough. I never took that in a way that was insulting or offensive. Fred had a view, as being in charge of the Planning Authority, and I gave my opinion. It taught me that he had a great belief in the Northern Territory. He believed the decisions he made were good for the Northern Territory and, in my case, the rural area.

I took a lot from that. He was a man with an opinion, but that is good. Sometimes we shy away from giving our opinion because we are concerned about upsetting people. But there are people like Fred who told us what he thought. If you listen to all the things he was involved in, you realise what a great man he was and what an example he set for the rest of us.

He moved to the rural area. He lived in Virginia—sand-fly country, but a great part of the rural area. I met him the times he visited Bees Creek Primary School. How much he loved that school. I think his grandchildren went there. It is a great school. His time as Minister for Education was a great time for education in the Northern Territory.

The Deputy Opposition Leader recited all the portfolios he had. I am totally amazed. From my point of view, when you listen to all the things he has done, you would have to say Fred was a fair dinkum Territorian. He is part of our industry and we should remember the contribution people like Fred have made to the Territory—forget the politics.

Perhaps he is someone—I hope this does not sound too corny and the Chief Minister does not clap when I say this—who fits in to the terminology that we are using today to promote the Northern Territory. Fred was 'boundless possible'.

Ms MANISON: Madam Speaker, it is a privilege to speak on this important condolence motion and pay my respects to the honourable Fred Finch AM. I would like to pay my respects and also pay respect on behalf of my electorate.

Many of my constituents were also constituents of Fred, when he was the member for Leanyer. I have very early and fond memories of Fred. The first time I came across Fred was seeing my next door neighbour, one Territory election many years ago, putting up a Fred Finch sign on their front lawn. There would not be many people of my age who went through the Darwin school system who would not know who Fred Finch is.

Fred was an active and passionate local member and he will be long remembered as a wonderful Education minister who thoroughly loved his job. If I am to go through my memory books of life growing up in Darwin

and going to those many schools—the member for Nightcliff and I have spoken about this before—you will find many memories of letters and certificates from Fred congratulating you for something you managed to achieved in your life and through your schooling.

Many Territory kids would have received something from Fred, some encouragement from Fred for them to pursue their education, that activity of their passion being in a sporting time and so forth. That is why so many of us have such fond memories of him. He genuinely cared about the kids going through the schools in the Northern Territory, particularly those through Darwin. We all will have great memories of Fred.

As a local member, it is fair to say he was active—I have often discussed this with the Member for Nightcliff. We call it the Fred Finch way of campaigning, the Fred Finch way, when you are working your electorate, of being constantly across the issues, making sure you are in contact with your constituents and that you are active from a grassroots level. That is something I admired and I try my best to continue these days.

Another fond memory I have of Fred—one of my first jobs through school was working on the checkouts at Hibiscus. When Fred came through he was always a delightful man. I remember thinking, ‘hey he is my local member, that fantastic Education minister who is always making sure he acknowledges the great work happening there and what a nice down-to-earth gentleman he is when he comes through’.

In my first year as a member of parliament, I remember having a chat to Fred one day. He was at Hibiscus indulging in one of his favourite Chinese restaurants for lunch. He popped in to the office and we had a great chat. There are many former members of this wonderful parliament here today and I think you would have appreciated some of the topics we discussed.

We were having a yarn about the differences between today’s parliament and some of the duties in the Chamber, but also out of the Chamber of a member of this Legislative Assembly. There have been some differences in how things use to work and how they work today. We had a good laugh. One thing we know has not changed today, and from the time Fred served this parliament, is that serving this community as a local member, the job you do remains much the same.

When hearing of Fred’s passing, the community was sad. I know for some of the government members that we exchanged messages on the night to say how sad we were. He was someone for whom we had immense respect.

Fred achieved so much when he moved to the Territory and dedicated a great deal of his professional and personal life to this place as a sportsman to a sports administrator, community member, engineer and a member of this Assembly. He loved it here and was passionate about the Northern Territory.

Fred was the past President of the Institute of Engineers Australia and worked as a civil engineer in Darwin in the wake of Cyclone Tracy, which would have been challenging but also interesting work and incredibly rewarding.

Fred then embarked on a 14-year political career in the Northern Territory, and anyone who has served in this House would understand the effort, commitment and frankly sometimes the toll that 14 years in the Northern Territory Parliament would take. Serving for that amount of time is certainly a significant achievement because it says a lot about how much their constituents respected him and it why they kept returning him to this Assembly, but it also would have come with great sacrifice for the family. But I am sure you have always been incredibly proud of all of his hard work.

During his time in politics, Fred served in many ministerial portfolios as the minister for Transport and Works, Racing and Gaming, Education, Public Employment, Attorney-General, Health and the Liquor Commission. He was heavily involved in the community, including serving at the Lions Club of Darwin, Casuarina, for around 20 years in various capacities, including president, zone chairman and deputy district governor. Friends remember him for his strong moral principles.

In the *NT News* article following his passing, the former Chief Minister, Shane Stone, said Fred was an honourable and decent man who always put the community first. Mark Monaghan of Engineers Australia Northern Territory described Fred as one of the Territory’s most influential engineers, saying his contribution to all aspects of the Northern Territory was immense and his dedication to the engineering sector unwavering, and the legacy of his work is certainly something to behold. Anyone would be happy to be remembered as someone who put the community first and who left a lasting legacy.

Apart from his family and career, Fred's other great love was surf lifesaving and he was heavily involved nationally and locally. He played a major role at the Darwin Surf Life Saving Club, receiving a parcel land for the Casuarina club house and was also involved in the design, building and project management.

Founding club members, including Fred, successfully applied for a grant and along with significant fund raising the club house was built and opened in 1987. We are all very grateful for that work because that still remains a very special part of the northern suburbs.

Fred was involved in surf lifesaving most of his life starting as a nipper at Port Kembla Surf Life Saving Club in New South Wales. As we have heard, his community service also continued as he was on the national board of Surf Life Saving Australia for 14 years and was the driving force to allow the Northern Territory to have a full vote on the board alongside the larger southern states, which is a wonderful achievement.

His involvement was so significant that Fred was often referred to as the father of surf lifesaving in the Northern Territory. He was a recipient of the Australian Sports Medal in September 2000 for outstanding voluntary commitment in competition at all levels, especially as administrator. Fred was also made a Member of the Order of Australia. He was awarded an OAM on Australia Day in 2007 for his service to the community through the Legislative Assembly, particularly for the portfolio responsibilities of Education, Health, Public Works and for his service to lifesaving and rugby union.

Fred will be sadly missed and well remembered by many Territorians. On behalf of Fred's former constituents from the electorate of Leanyer, we send our deepest and sincere condolences to Lyn, your family—you're your friends.

We have lost a great Territorian who leaves an amazing legacy. Rest in peace, Fred.

Mr MILLS (Blain): Madam Speaker, I too rise to make a contribution in part as some personal reflections. To Lyn, daughters and family and friends, my sincere condolences on behalf of Territorians who have respected deeply a man who had a strong imprint on this great Northern Territory.

I came to an awareness of the presence of Mr Fred Finch when I was the principal of a local school. He struck me as a man—as I saw him from afar giving a speech—who was solid on his feet. He was not particularly tall, but he was the sort of bloke that when he was speaking you knew he was speaking with conviction and authority. He certainly had that posture.

At the time the Northern Territory was leading the way nationally in its strong engagement with Indonesia. There was a sporting festival on, and I remember him taking the rostrum and speaking. He spoke about the unique connection between the Northern Territory and Indonesia. By the way he spoke, it made a difference; it cut through. He was a man born for his time, delivering a message that really had an impact.

Even when he cited a number of schools that were involved in language programs—let us say the number was 27—'There were 27 schools that were learning Bahasa'. Everyone said, 'What is Bahasa?' It was Bahasa, but even the way that he said it you knew what he meant and that it was fair dinkum.

At another time, I decided to join the Country Liberal Party. I was in awe of this man who would speak from time to time. When he spoke you knew he was worth listening to because the position he had taken was one he had thought through carefully. I thought about and realised that he was the epitome of a local member. We yearn for that epitome and standard in the Territory.

He drew his authority from, first of all, his sense of love for his family. He loved his community. It was not just a whimsical love; it was a practical love. He was properly connected and engaged, authentically listening, understanding and analysing the deeper concerns of his community. When he spoke you had to listen. He was taking an engineering approach—it was structural. The firm foundation was a proper connection to the community.

Before entering parliament I recognised that this was a man to watch on how he engaged with a practical love of his community. I heard people quip that he had a branch in the northern suburbs that was called the Fred Finch branch of the Country Liberal Party, because it was so connected and personal.

I remember in my early days going to a barbecue where someone was talking about this bloke, a politician by the name of Fred Finch and how they were amazed about him. They did not know I had political connection; it was just a chat over a barbecue. They said that they were at some event—it may have been a

sporting event—and the beers and wines were flowing, Fred Finch was a part of this gathering and everyone was having a good old yarn. But then he dismissed himself and left.

He occupied his space—it was a full on event—but he dismissed himself and he left. The guy who reported to me said, ‘He went to a school council meeting’. It was very impressive that he disengaged himself from a social gathering and went to invest himself fully in the school council meeting. That was his normal practice.

What was even more impressive that I hear from those on the other side—from those involved in school councils—was how authentically and deeply engaged he was at the school council meeting. On the other side of that was his full engagement at the social gathering at the sporting function. He was fully engaged with the people and their concerns.

Whenever he came to my electorate office when I became a newly elected member—he was growing grapefruit in the rural area. If Fred came to visit me it would be like the need for me to sit up straight. Though he may not have come with sweet platitudes, he would speak directly and plainly to me. I would never be left in any confusion as to the purpose of his visit. I can remember exactly what he had to say. So much so, there would be times when I had to catch myself out—‘Do I want to ask Fred’s advice?’ A part of me would say, ‘I prefer not’, but another part would say, ‘It is a wise thing to do’. It was not always pleasant, but it was clear and worth considering.

I genuinely admired the man because of the things I recited at the beginning. His love for his family was clear. His loyalty to his family and his community was admirable. It is an example for anyone who serves in this place.

I have also learned some things listening to these contributions today. One that has caught my attention is the culture committee. If Mick Palmer, Don Dale and Fred Finch were appointed to this culture committee, it must have been an official appointment of some kind. I assume there were minutes taken. We have a research officer in the library and I will make some inquiries. I would love to know what great contributions were made for the cultural development of the Northern Territory through that culture committee.

He was a man who left his mark, without a doubt, and he is a standard for every member aspiring to become a representative of the people of their community. Fred set the standard. He should be honoured as such. Each of us are encouraged to step up a little further and engage more directly and authentically with our communities and families. May he rest in peace.

Madam SPEAKER: On behalf of my family, I express condolences to Lyn, and her family and friends of the late Fred Finch. When I got the news from Lyn that Fred had passed away, I rang my mother and said, ‘Fred Finch has died’. She said, ‘Oh, I liked him!’ Coming from my mother that is high praise, because she really does not like anyone except for her family.

The Member for Nelson referenced that Fred was on the DCA, the Planning Authority and that is quite true. My mother and I had an experience when we had to appear before the planning committee because we were setting up a pet cemetery on the farm, which is still there. Unusually, we did it properly through the authority and put in an application for approval. Fred was the Chair. We presented our case and explained things. Of course, he had a few pertinent questions about how we would ensure that the wild dogs and dingoes did not come and dig up the dead dogs and cats. Before I could say anything, my mother said, ‘Listen, Fred, if any dogs or dingoes come on to my property and try to dig them up, I will either shoot them or run them over.’ After that, Fred said, ‘We should approve this application, members. What do you think?’

My mother liked Fred. They obviously had their time in parliament together. It was probably because of his practical nature and how he went about his business. My mother was married to an engineer and Fred was an engineer. They have a way of thinking—many in my family are now engineers, as in Lyn’s family.

I first had an experience with Fred when I was with St John Ambulance. This probably goes back to the Deputy Chief Minister’s comments about his community. Those who have been around long enough will recall originally there was an older fellow called Jacko who painted the bus shelters. We got to know him and we wanted to paint a bus shelter with St John Ambulance and things about nature. It was the bus shelter outside the Hibiscus Shopping Centre. We had gone through the Transport and Works people. Then I got this phone call from someone who said, ‘You cannot do it until the local member has had a look at what you want to do’. I thought then, ‘It is only a bus shelter’. But no, we had to go to Fred Finch’s office and show what picture we would put on the bus shelter. Once he gave a stamp of approval, we could go ahead and paint the bus shelter with an ambulance with sirens and people. He cared about his community, no matter what you were doing. He wanted to know what you were doing.

The other funny story I have was when I was with the Minerals Council. The Director of Education for Australia, Diane Stewart, was in town and we were doing educational things and had meetings with ministers. He was the Education minister at the time. It was up on the balcony. He may have been to lunch—I am not 100% sure. He met this nice lady from down south—she is a nice lady. He got down on his knee, grabbed her hand and kissed it. She just could not believe it, a minister of the Crown being so courteous to a visitor from down south. She still tells that story. She was in awe of this man—I think a little surprised and taken aback as well. He was perfectly charming. That was about 20 years ago.

He has left an indelible mark across the board, not only in the Territory but interstate as well. As everyone has said, he will be deeply missed. He was a huge character, terrific fellow and a real family man. My deepest sympathy to you all.

Motion agreed to.

Members stood for one minute of silence as a sign of respect.

Madam SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable members for their contribution to the motion and invite honourable members and family to join for light refreshments in the Main Hall.

HEALTH SERVICES AMENDMENT BILL (Serial 71)

Continued from 28 November 2018.

Ms FYLES (Health): Mr Deputy Speaker, I move that the bill be now read a second time.

Mrs FINOCCHIARO (Spillett): Mr Deputy Speaker, this legislation gives effect to the changed governance arrangements to the Northern Territory health system. When Labor came to power it got rid of the health boards in favour of the clinical senate model.

This bill essentially formalises what the government had in place since coming to power. We have already expressed our concerns and put on the record our view about those changes and the appearance of decentralising responsibility for health services.

However, the government has been implementing this model for some time now. We will continue to watch how it delivers health outcomes for Territorians. We all agree that consistent and high-quality healthcare services are a critical part of a brighter future for Territorians. This legislation provides a consistent approach and crystallises what the government has been doing for some time. On that basis, we have no objection to the legislation.

Ms AH KIT (Karama): Mr Deputy Speaker, I support the Health Services Amendment Bill and thank the Minister for Health for bringing it before the parliament. I reiterate what the Deputy Opposition Leader stated, that this bill looks to formalise the changes that have already been made to the operation of health services in the Northern Territory.

As Chair of the Social Policy Scrutiny Committee, which oversaw the inquiry into this bill, I thank the clinical senate for having its input. The question they asked about the Chief Operating Officer having corporate responsibility was followed up and clarified by the Department of Health, and is included in the original provisions of this amendment.

Mrs LAMBLEY (Araluen): Mr Deputy Speaker, this is a move away from the original structure that was put in place by the CLP government in 2014. I, as Health minister, had carriage of that bill. It was a total restructure of the Health department at the time. It was an idea of the former Health minister, David Tollner, who had some good ideas which we then had to put into legislative changes.

One of the great parts of the original piece of legislation was the establishment of the health boards that were made up of community representatives. That was probably the aspect of the 2014 legislation and changes that I liked the most and thought would strengthen the Health system of the Northern Territory. When the Gunner government came in it moved to disband the health boards and put in place other mechanisms.

The amendments are not offensive in any particular way. In 2014 we brought in a complete restructure of the Department of Health in the Northern Territory. What the Gunner government has done over the last two and a half years is to bring in some relatively minor changes. I wonder where this is all going.

If you are not happy with the structure of the health services that were brought in by the former CLP government, why would you not establish your own structure? Tweaking around the edges to change, in this case, the function of the COOs only serves to corrupt the original structure and system that was put in place in 2014.

I want to know where the government intends to take Health in the Northern Territory. We have not seen it put its stamp on the Health system. The former CLP government did that. There were radical changes to decentralise Health and set up local boards with community representation. It worked well for the three to four years that it operated.

The people who were on the boards really enjoyed their jobs. They made significant contributions at a local level, for the most part, as to how the Top End and Central Australian Health services were run. There was concerns on the cost of operating the boards—they were expensive. That could have been changed without dismantling the community health board system that was in place.

I do not know if what you in government are changing here really adds value or improves the structure of the Northern Territory Department of Health and the health services that we have. It feels like the government is teetering around the edges, tweaking here and there. It dumped the boards and put in place other mechanisms like the Northern Territory Clinical Senate, which probably doing an effective job in advising the health services and the Department of Health on how to operate. There are other mechanisms which you have put in place.

I cannot see what your vision is. Given that the Department of Health is the largest Northern Territory department and that it has the biggest budget, you need to work harder to convey to Territorians and the enormous number of people who work in Health as to where you are going and taking us. I want to see clarity and vision. People in Health are a, by and large, highly educated and intelligent group of people who will look at these things very carefully. They want to understand what the vision is and what the government thinks about its structure and how they will go about their business. These things are immensely important.

The CLP took a risk in 2013 and 2014 by restructuring, trying to give the regions more say over how health services were provided throughout the Northern Territory. I had personal reservations on that structure. But, over the two or three years that it was able to establish itself, it proved to be a good system. The Central Australian Health Services board was proud of their hard-work. I was particularly close to them, being an Alice Springs member. They came in within budget, they were proud of that in the final year they operated.

Health is such an enormous area of government expenditure. There are always increased costs in health. When I was Health minister, we knew that every year there would be up to 10% natural increase in the cost of delivering health. On top of that, there are budget blow-outs and cost pressures. It as an incredibly complex department to run.

This amendment the government is putting forward today, does not reflect or give any confidence to Territorians. Where do you see health going in the next five-to-ten years? The fact that for three years in a row I have put a vision on the table for Alice Springs, the Central Australia Health Services. That we look at planning a hospital for Alice Springs in 2030–35—whatever the time frame. In the long-term we have a vision that we aspire to look and operate differently, perhaps, with a different structure. If you do not like the structure that the CLP introduced in 2014, why not introduce your own structure rather than tweaking the role of the COO, the chief operating officer and dumping the board and replacing it with something else.

My sense is that this government does not know where it is taking health into the future, it does not have a vision. You have opened the Palmerston Hospital and you have taken all credibility for that—good for you, you have come in at an opportune time. As we heard from the Member for Blain in the Chamber yesterday, it was not a vision of the Labor party or the former Labor Government, that Palmerston Hospital be built. You fortuitously landed back in government at a time when you can say it is your hard-work and vision. But it was not.

We are at a time in history where you could embrace the opportunity to provide a positive and wonderful vision for health in the Northern Territory, including the planning and building of a new hospital for Alice Springs and Katherine—the Katherine Hospital is sitting on a floodplain, they have been calling for a vision

for a long time. The Tennant Creek Hospital has issues, the fact that it is an old building. It is not just about the building, it is how you deliver services in the most efficient way. That is the challenge.

The structure that was put forward in 2014 was not perfect. One good thing was the idea of decentralising it. Being a local member of parliament from a regional area, the regions too often miss out. We can see that already with the enormous amount of expenditure going into running the Palmerston Hospital. We have two big hospitals in Darwin and emphasis and resources has to go into sustaining them.

I do not have any objection to the amendments within this bill you are putting forward, but it says to me that this government does not have any great aspiration or vision for where you are taking health into the future. Tweaking around the edges, changing a few bits here and there, is significant to the actual administration but it does not beholden any great confidence in what you are doing.

Health is such a vital part of what you do as a government. It is the biggest department, employer and the largest allocation of funding goes into the Health Department. Surely, you can come up with a better vision than this.

Ms FYLES (Health): Mr Deputy Speaker, I thank the members for their contributions to this debate today. I find a little bewildering the comments we just heard from the Member for Araluen and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition claimed that we got rid of the health boards and put in place the clinical senate, which is factually incorrect. They are two very different things.

This bill we are debating today is the Health Services Amendment Bill. It is important for the governance and efficient administration of the Territory's public health system—our wonderful public health system. I acknowledge all those hard-working staff across the Northern Territory in the 50 government clinics—with approximately 30 run by Aboriginal medical services community control—and our six public hospitals.

We just heard some bewildering comments about RDH and Palmerston, two big hospitals—and I am not sure where the Member for Araluen was going with that.

Anyway, I know that we have fantastic people, from the people who are volunteering, meeting and greeting you as you walk into our hospitals to the staff in operating theatres, the clinical staff and the support staff who support them.

This bill today ensures that Territorians have access to high-quality health service. It amends the *Health Services Act* to give effect to the new streamlined governance structure of Northern Territory Health Services.

What is even more bewildering about the comments from the Member for Araluen—and I almost forgive her, but she was a Health minister at one point. She talked about 2014 when they suddenly came up with this structure. But it is so factually incorrect, I have to call it out. In 2011, the Northern Territory government signed the National Health Reform Agreement which committed all states and territories and the Australian government to a new range of financial and governance arrangements for Australian public hospital services.

The arrangements were aimed at delivering a nationally-unified, locally-controlled health system including improving local accountability and responsiveness to the needs of communities through the establishment of local hospital networks and confirming states' and territories' lead role as system managers to our public hospital services.

That agreement was signed in 2011, not in 2014, some three years later when the Member for Araluen claims that she and the former Minister for Health, the Member for Fong Lim, suddenly created it. I thought it was important to remind the House that it was in 2011 that the agreement was signed.

It was acknowledged at that time that the Northern Territory has a very unique operating environment, unlike those interstate. Sydney has, I think, four health services across the metropolitan area, for example, and in the Territory we had the Top End Health Service and the Central Australian Health Service and a health board established to govern both of those, with the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Health as the system manager. In 2011 it was acknowledged that the Northern Territory had a very unique context.

When she said it was something we disbanded, I wanted to remind her that things were well under way prior to 2014.

This bill amends the *Health Services Act* to provide for the removal of all references to the health services boards and service administrators. The bill continues the original objectives of the legislation to establish a

public health system that provide high-quality healthcare that Territorians expect, consistent with the Australian health system principles.

This bill makes I clear that the Chief Operating Officers of the Central Australian and Top End Health Services report directly to the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Health. It retains the existing health system and the governance arrangements between the Chief Executive Officer, the System Manager and the health services.

It also provides for offence provisions within the act to be updated in order to be consistent with Part IIAA of the *Criminal Code Act* due to current drafting practices.

When the Member for Araluen talked about community being involved—communities are still involved. They have their health services. In 2011 when that partnership agreement was signed, it was acknowledge that the Northern Territory had a unique context due to our small population. That brings me back to the point I was making, giving the example of Sydney where they have multiple health services within an area clearly smaller than the size of the Territory.

As a government, we needed to implement governance structures that accommodate our unique circumstances and utilise our finite resources in the more efficient and effective way. We need support staff and administrative staff in Health. They provide a vital role. We need to spend taxpayer dollars allocated to health on health services, but we need support.

We need to put as much money as possible into frontline health services. On 30 June 2017 the Top End and Central Australian Health Service boards were dissolved and a service administrator was appointed to each health service to undertake the role of the board as interim measures while these amendments were progressed to the *Health Services Act*.

This has been stepped out—in 2011 we acknowledged the Northern Territory's unique context and established the boards. The health services were established and we ensured that during their establishment they had strong leadership. I contacted the former Chairs of the boards, Annette Burke and Damien Ryan, and the members to make sure they were well aware of what was happening during this process.

I met with and wrote to the federal Health minister to inform him of the intended changes. It was always acknowledged that the Northern Territory has a unique context. It is pleasing to inform the Assembly that these amendments have the support of the federal Health minister and are consistent with the Northern Territory's obligations under the National Health Reform Agreement.

We want local communities to be involved in our health services. That is why we have health advisory committees for each health service. Without pointing at any specific person, it is important to note that the Central Australian Health Service was unable to recruit enough members for its board from Central Australia. It relied on expertise from outside.

We established the health advisory committees, which provide a two-way exchange on information between the local community and the Chief Operating Officer about health service delivery and the community's needs. These committees were established in November 2017. They advocate and advise on issues affecting the health, wellbeing and cultural values of the local community and region for each health service.

Health advisory committees are made up of between eight and 11 members of the local community, and committee members have a broad range of background skills and expertise, including as health consumers, carers, clinicians, administrators and other relevant stakeholders in the health system.

In addition to the health advisory committees, the NT Clinical Senate was put in place to establish, for the first time in the Territory's history, a Territory-wide clinician engagement process allowing our hard-working clinicians to come together with the chief executive officer and directly provide feedback. In November 2017 the clinical senate was formed with 45 multidisciplinary clinicians, professional leads, and consumer and research members from across the Northern Territory.

It is fantastic that the Territory has the clinical senate, because we need to ensure that when tackling the chronic health issues in the Northern Territory we have a multidisciplinary approach. We have such wonderful clinicians and staff who work with them, but we need to work across those disciplines to tackle the issues with health in the Northern Territory.

This provides a clinical governance strategy and implementation, clinical quality and patient safety programs, evidence-based strategies in relation to system integration, and management of consumers with chronic and complex conditions. Often people are being treated by one clinical team but will have other conditions and be treated by other clinicians. These functions help improve patient safety and the clinical quality of health services across the Northern Territory.

The health advisory committees and the clinical senate systems and processes reflect a very modern delivery of health services in the Territory. I acknowledge Catherine Stoddart, the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Health, particularly for the clinical senate. She is passionate about that and has driven it. The feedback I have received is that clinicians enjoy that opportunity to come together. They are all members of their own peak bodies, but this provides a space where they can come together and talk about complex issues, plan and provide care for Territorians.

The Member for Araluen was calling on me to put my stamp on Health in the Territory, to know what I am doing and that Territorians need confidence—where is Health going in the next five to ten years. I found that interesting coming from her—talking about Territorians having no confidence in Health. Territorians certainly did not have confidence under the five CLP ministers as it was an absolute debacle for Health in the Territory.

She wondered, 'Where is it going?', and that I need to establish my own structure. I will update the Member for Araluen and the other members of this House on how the Department of Health, the two health services, health NGOs and Aboriginal health services across the Territory are working hard to deliver high-quality health care that Territorians deserve as close to home as possible.

Mr Deputy Speaker, when you are out and about in your community and your own electorate, you must come across people who have to travel to Alice Springs for health care. We want to provide services as close to home as possible. This is difficult to do so given the large geographical area, but there have been some achievements since August 2016.

The Member for Araluen talked about how, 'It was the right timing. We came along and there was a hospital ready to open.' I will remind the Member for Araluen that there was a whole that was dug and then filled back in. That was about it from the CLP. We have got on with the job and delivered the Palmerston Regional Hospital. It is a fantastic facility with a specialist rehabilitation and geriatric focus and the hydrotherapy pool is nearing completion.

We delivered the PET scanner, which was an \$18m project. Before those opposite jump in to say that it is federal government funded, we got on with the job to secure funding and to work with the federal government not only to deliver the PET scanner, but the Cyclotron facility which is nearing completion.

Recently I was at the Royal Darwin Hospital at the Alan Walker Cancer Care Centre, which has had a \$5m expansion for an additional twelve chemotherapy chairs. As we often get criticised that we show up and building things—but to back that up there is \$35 over five years for improved cancer diagnosis and treatment services.

It was wonderful to be able to stand with clinicians and announce to the Northern Territory that Territorians will be able to take part in clinical trials for rare cancers through the Garvan Institute here in the Top End. They will not have to move interstate to access clinical trials as they will receive them here.

What else have we achieved in Health? We have delivered a new yellow book. The Member for Wanguri would be familiar with the yellow book now. We updated and launched it in January last year. It provides new parents with a guide on accessing health services and a place for them to record their infant's growth and health information so that it is all in one safe spot.

We launched the Child and Adolescent Health and Wellbeing Plan in December last year. There is the expanded sustained nurse home visiting program, which is so important particularly for remote areas. Training has commenced for Katherine West, Sunrise, Miwatj and Anyinginyi.

There is the expansion of Hearing Health into four Families as First Teachers sites, our new partnership with Menzies and the Balnaves Foundation for community-based hearing workers. Sadly hearing health impacts on young Territorians and leaves them with life-long impacts—not only is their hearing impacted but also their education. There is the Health under-fives, partnering with families, the roll-out of updated child screening programs in Katherine, Tennant Creek, Nhulunbuy and remote Central Australia.

We are not just delivering key health infrastructure in the Top End and Central Australia, but we are also expanding programs across the Northern Territory.

We fast-tracked the multi-storey car park project—450 free spaces. Let us face that no one particularly enjoys going to hospital and for families trying to visit patients the car parking was a complete debacle. It was a \$12m project that delivered jobs and delivered for Territorians.

The Alice Springs Hospice was a \$6.3m project jointly funded with the federal and Northern Territory governments. Those opposite will say that it commenced under the CLP. Yes it did, but it was not going to be a palliative care facility. It was going to be a multi-purpose facility. But I listened to my colleagues, the Members for Namatjira, Braitling and Araluen, on the need for that to be stand-alone hospice. We delivered it and it was fantastic to be at the opening in March 2018.

It goes beyond infrastructure. We have just seen the federal Labor government announce significant health changes, if they get elected, for women in Australia, but the Northern Territory leads the nation with a contemporary legislation and policies to allow women to have choice and safe services equivalent to the rest of Australia—in fact, it leads. That was something in terms of health.

The Member for Araluen asked us to talk about where is health going, what are we doing in the Territory? Renal services were completely forgotten under the CLP government. They failed to plan and they failed to deliver. We launched the Northern Territory Renal Services Strategy and it was fantastic to do that from the Tiwi Islands. Pirlangimpi is on track to have a renal ready room.

As well as expansion, a total redevelopment, a new build at the Nightcliff Renal Unit—\$10.5m for a purpose built facility. Those staff were delivering two clients, two patients—their care was amazing but the facilities did not back that. It was a pokey mismatched old facility that was adapted for renal care. They will be operating out of a purpose-built facility.

The delivery of renal care is so vital to hundreds of Territorians sadly. We welcome the Australian Government introducing an MBS item for remote nurse assisted dialysis. Not only introducing that item but a funding level that will allow it to be delivered. I acknowledge Purple House and Alan Cass from Menzies and the work they did. That was something we got behind, lobbied the federal government for the delivery of that.

Purple House commencing services in Docker River, Papunya, Mount Liebig developing services right across Central Australia. This is important in the delivery of renal care, which was forgotten by the CLP government.

Strategic infrastructure planning—we have developed the NT clinical services plan which will then inform a strategic infrastructure plan and masterplans for our hospitals. I note the Member for Araluen was talking about the Alice Springs and Katherine hospitals. What planning took place when she was the Health minister? Absolutely nothing. What we are doing is the clinical planning and then backing it up with the infrastructure planning so that we do not have ad hoc delivery of health services.

The Core Clinical Systems Renewal Program—a huge project—\$259m allocated in our first budget for the development of a patient information system to replace outdated hospital and community health systems. A huge project and so important in the Northern Territory where a patient can begin to receive their care in a remote clinic then be transferred in to one of our hospitals. Right now—multiple systems, paper files—this system is so important. We got behind it and delivered it.

Alcohol policies and legislation review—sadly we know that so much of our hospital admissions are based on alcohol.

We are working on the NT FASD strategy, which we launched late last year which aligns with the national strategy and took on board the work—I think you were on that committee, Madam Speaker—the NT Legislative Assembly Select Committee to prevent FASD.

It extends beyond the delivery of actual health services to the HASI program which is the Housing Accommodation Support Initiative—\$3m over four years to support people living with mental illness and mental health to sustain a tenancy. If they can sustain a tenancy and they have a roof over their head they are far less likely to interact with our mental health system. This is a collaborative project with Anglicare and the Department of Health—and I acknowledge the Department of Housing, Local Government and Community Development—a really important part of that program.

Headspace in Katherine will open later this year, supported by the Northern Territory Government. Suicide prevention—I acknowledge the assistant minister, the Member for Karama. We have been working with stakeholders, listening to community—absolute tragedy across Australia and the world—the work around mental health and suicide prevention.

There is so much we are doing—remote infrastructure and new clinics in the Territory and lobbying the federal government to support us for more. Late last year I was at the opening of the Gove District Hospital Emergency Department of the project, jointly funded by the federal government.

We put stimulus money into our remote clinics and the National Disability Insurance Scheme, progressing to that full scheme by 1 July this year across the Territory. We took the time to meet with the families and those services as we transition to that scheme—a huge change.

I am not sure what else the Member for Araluen would like us to do, but we are getting on with the job, ensuring that for Territorians there are strong structures in place. We have done that planning into the future in delivering healthcare in the Territory.

I spoke about the Member for Araluen believing it was coming on board in 2014. The work began in 2011 on establishing these health services. It was noted in that national partnership agreement that the Northern Territory had a unique context because of our small population spread over a vast geographical area.

This bill today does not have any impact on the day-to-day operations of health services. They maintain their status as independent statutory bodies. The Chief Operating Officer of each health service remains responsible for the daily operations of the service, including implementing the service delivery agreement, monitoring the financial and administrative performance of the service, the management of employees and participating in the governance of the public health system. The Chief Operating Officers, when this legislation is passed as I expect it will today, will be directly accountable to the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Health for the performance of their respective health services in providing those services to their local communities and the financial management of each health service.

I spoke about the processes now in place through those local advisory committees for members of the community to be involved in their health services, but also for clinicians through the NT Clinical Senate.

The Chief Operating Officers are also responsible for the functions of the service as set out in the Health Services Act which includes monitoring and improving the quality of health services provided, developing local clinical and other governance arrangements for the service and other best practice guidelines and standards and cooperating with the Chief Executive Officer, the other health services and the providers of health services in the Territory in both providing and planning for health services. That is particularly important in health in the Northern Territory. People transfer between the two health services to receive care. People come up from Central Australia to receive care at the Royal Darwin Hospital being the main tertiary hospital. Also, there is interaction with that important part of health delivery—the Aboriginal Medical Services and our community-controlled organisations, something we are committed to expanding. They are also responsible for meeting the performance standards and targets in the service delivery agreement.

The System Manager remains the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Health. The System Manager is still responsible for the overall development, management and performance of the public health system which includes the two health services. Governance has been strengthened internally for the Department of Health.

In mid-2017, the Northern Territory Health Oversight Committee was established. This comprises of the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Health, the two Chief Operating Officers of the health services, as well as the Deputy Chief Executive Officer, the Chief Health Officer, the Chief Financial Officer and the Director of People and Organisational Capabilities.

The Health Oversight Committee is supported by a number of key standing committees which provide specific focus on areas of the organisation and clinical governance. Examples of this are the NT Work Health and Safety Committee, the Financial Accountability Committee, the Strategic Information Management and Steering Committee. Additionally, the Risk and Audit Committee is an independent advisory committee with the primary purpose of providing assurance and assistance to the Chief Executive Officer in relation to the effectiveness of the systems, processes and internal controls in the management of governance risk and compliance in NT Health.

These changes, I believe, are the best thing for Territory Health. We have established the health services. I thank the work the boards did in establishing those processes which are well and truly established. We have those health advisory committees which provide that local input. We have the NT Clinical Senate, which allows our clinicians input. Not only do these changes deliver for health, they also provide a recurrent saving of about \$800 000 to \$1m per year. Of course, we know we want to spend taxpayer dollars on the things that Territorians want, which is high-quality healthcare, not on unnecessary administrative burden.

As I explained, this bill does not give total control of the NT health system to the Department of Health's Chief Executive Officer. These amendments continue to give effect to that National Health Reform Agreement from 2011—just to remind the Member for Araluen in case she missed it. One of the key principles of the agreement is that there is local governance for service delivery known as the purchaser-provider model.

While the CEO of the Department of Health is the system manager and will prescribe what services are to be provided and funding allocated for those services through the service delivery agreements, the delivery of services remain within the control of the chief operating officers for each health service. They are able to have direct contact into their community through those health advisory committees, working in their health services and decide what is delivered for Territorians in their specific area.

The chief operating officer has access to the Health Advisory Committee on how the services best suit the needs of their community, they can listen to feedback. We have different health services in Central Australia and the Top End.

The CEO has access to the NT clinical (centre) for advice on evidence-based best practice in quality and the safe delivery of health services. That advice helps shape the service delivery agreements and emerging national requirements.

The negotiation of the service delivery agreements becomes an operational matter between the health service chief operating officer and the Chief Executive Officer. The service delivery agreements are publicly available and are published on the Department of Health website.

This bill provides sensible streamlined governance for our Northern Territory public health systems. It embraces our consumers, community and clinicians into the system governance and utilises our resources most effectively.

I noted the comments from those opposite about the health budget. We acknowledge the largest component of the Northern Territory health budget. Territorians want to see us spending that budget on the delivery of services and that is what this bill achieves.

I would like to acknowledge the work of the current service administrators, Ms Pat Miller, Central Australia Health Service and Graham Symons, Top End Health Service—Graham replaced Mr Paul Tyrell. They will complete their terms of appointment on 30 June 2019 in readiness for this bill to commence on 1 July. We have put in place these measures, a systematic approach and stepped it out. I would like to thank Pat, Graham and Paul for their dedicated service and expert guidance, particularly during this transition phase.

In 2011, this was acknowledged—the unique delivery and setting up of health services in the Northern Territory. This has the support of the Federal health minister. I am proud of the work that has been done in not only setting this up, but in health across the Territory.

Reflecting on some achievements, we are focused on the delivery of health services, our responsibility in managing our budget and continue to work through with the Chief Executive Officer and the chief operating officer in ensuring we do that, whilst delivering services that Territorians expect.

In closing, I would like to thank the officers in the Department of Health and Office of Parliamentary Counsel for their work in the development, consultation and progress of this legislation. I acknowledge the Scrutiny Committee for their work at looking at this legislation.

We can all agree, that quality healthcare is important to Territorians. We are continuing to deliver that, not only through health infrastructure but through policy work and the delivery of projects across the Territory.

I commend the bill to the Assembly.

Ms FYLES (Attorney-General and Justice)(by leave): Madam Speaker, I move that the bill be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to; bill read a third time.

LIQUOR AMENDMENT BILL (Serial 74)

Continued from 28 November 2018.

Ms FYLES (Attorney-General and Justice): Madam Speaker, I move that the bill be now read a second time.

Mrs FINOCCHIARO (Spillett): Madam Speaker, the CLP opposition fully supports providing our hard-working, dedicated police with additional powers to enforce liquor laws in the Territory. As always, the major concern is that police are provided with the resource they need to undertake the duties they are required to perform. It is unacceptable to simply continue to require the front line to do more with less, and this government seems happy to increase the roles, responsibilities and obligations of police. We hope commensurate resources follow on from those additional responsibilities.

The opposition supports the Liquor Amendment Bill; however, we question whether providing additional powers to police without a plan to ensure those powers are backed up with appropriate resourcing or suitable guidance to police in the exercise of these powers will make any discernible difference to our correlated harm or the general crime crisis we are experiencing in the Territory.

We also question the chain of events that has led to the necessity for these powers in the first place. The Banned Drinker Register has not worked as intended. Instead it has caused a cascade of unintended consequences that have culminated in increased alcohol-related crime and increased police resources to combat the increase in crime.

The Opposition Leader has spent a significant amount of time in Alice Springs recently, and he has been told by business owners, residents and police officers that things have never been worse. People are terrified of going out at night for fear they will be robbed or assaulted. Part and parcel of this ...

Ms Fyles: Fearmongering!

Mrs FINOCCHIARO: I am just telling you, Attorney-General, what the Opposition Leader has been told by people in Alice Springs. It is a direct recount of events that took place.

House break-ins have increased by 83% in Alice Springs, and commercial break-ins are up 14%. That phenomenon is not limited to Alice Springs. In Katherine commercial break-ins have increased by a shocking and shameful 229%. In Tennant Creek house break-ins have increased by 70%. Across the Territory commercial break-ins have increased by 15% and house break-ins have increased by 18%.

In Darwin reported break-ins have targeted commercial businesses, with beloved venues such as Hanuman, Deck Bar and Bar Tapa Vino being broken into multiple times in the space of a few weeks. Hanuman was broken into eight times in the space of one month, which is completely unacceptable.

The motivation for these break-ins is obvious, but the government cannot seem to come to terms with it. Offenders, by and large, are looking for alcohol or cash to buy alcohol with.

The Banned Drinker Register and the floor price have caused secondary supply to explode across the Territory. Instead of having targeted interventions to deal with the root cause of alcohol-related crime, such as measures like alcohol mandatory treatment ...

Ms Fyles: Failure!

Mrs FINOCCHIARO: ... we have policies that target all Territorians.

Time and again we have heard from this Labor government how AMT was expensive, and the minister was just yelling across the Chamber that it was a failure. We acknowledge that it cost \$18m a year and that it was not perfect, but it was getting results. A modified model could be even more effective.

We know that 20% of participants had no further protective custody incidents. This is a success and could have been built on rather than abandoned entirely.

Over the past few weeks, the Labor government has been keen to point out that some categories of the crime statistics are down, but largely we think that is a result of the fact the numbers have been so high for so long that the year-on-year comparison looks as if there is a slight improvement. However, for the most part, all the figures are significantly higher than when Labor came to power in 2016.

More importantly, it is not reflective of the experience Territorians are having in the community, in their businesses or in their homes. Crime continues to be something they are hugely concerned about. Businesses are struggling to grapple with it. They are struggling under the pressure of having to replace glass, clean up the mess, make repairs and insurance claims, and all the headaches and heartache that comes along with being a victim of crime.

Equally, Territorians who are experiencing crime in their homes or on the streets are just as reluctant to accept the government's message that things are improving.

Whilst the bill seeks to address the problem of secondary supply, the government has failed to recognise that it has caused this problem in the first place through its other alcohol measures. This why from the start of this conversation about alcohol reform—something the opposition has been deeply committed to from day one. The first motion put into parliament was about a bipartisan approach to alcohol policy.

Those opposite can come up with whatever political garbage they want to while wrapping up this bill, but the record shows that we have a commitment to alcohol reform and that we recognise the extent of alcohol harm in and the cost to our community.

It always been important to us, particularly following the Riley review, that we measure the success or failure of measures. The Opposition Leader and I are on record time and time again saying, 'How is this measure going to be assessed? What are the KPIs? What is it that you want to see happening as a result of the BDR, the floor price or any other measure in place?' You in government have implemented a bunch of measures all in one go and have no interest in recording whether or not they work.

This is not dissimilar to how you approach other areas of policy. An example that comes to mind is the Boundless Possible campaign. You are happy to spend millions of dollars on that, yet the record shows—it was tabled in parliament—that there was no KPI for that campaign. It is not therefore surprising that there is not one for the BDR, floor price or any other measures. The government has policies out there, but it is not reflecting on what it is doing or whether they are working.

Secondary supply has spiked under this government. As a result you in government have had to create all these other measures and put all these Band-Aids around that problem. This is because you refuse to deal with the problem of the BDR to address what it is causing.

Whilst we support the bill, fundamentally we should not be in here talking about it. We should be dealing with the problem at the start. But, the government is continuing to kick the can along. When this is not enough we will be back in the chamber debating more reforms and legislation—'Hey, what the heck. Let us give police even more jobs than we already are to try to manage the problem we caused in the first place'.

It is important that we stop and reflect. No one will blame you for going back to properly revise measures. There may be elements of the BDR that are working superbly—who knows? But there may be others that are letting it down. You have to have to courage and appetite to reflect on what it is you are doing to make it better going forward.

It is important to say that whilst we support the bill, we do not support the approach. We should not have to do this because it has been caused by another failed policy of the government, which it is incapable of bringing itself back to addressing. Do you know why? The BDR was a flagship election commitment that was raved about for four years in opposition, it has been brought back and the government members are clinging to it with dear hope that one day it will sit them free. All that it is doing is causing more grief and pain in our community.

Among the powers of police augmented by the Liquor Amendment Bill 2018 is the ability to conduct undercover operations to combat secondary supply. The authority to seize items as part of those undercover operations and expanded POSI powers to stop and question any person or vehicle within a 20-metre radius of a licensed premises, including when the person is not the driver of a vehicle.

The bill expands the power of the Liquor Commission to hold public hearings where it is deemed that a public hearing is appropriate. It specifically allows the commission to hold a hearing where regards the variation of a liquor license, as opposed to when the application for a new licence or transfer of licence is being considered.

During the deliberations of the Economic Policy Scrutiny Committee, of which the Opposition Leader is a part, submissions were made to the committee by the AHA and NAAJA. The AHA was generally supportive of the provisions of the bill relating to the expansion of opportunities for the Liquor Commission to hold public hearings, pointing out the lack of public hearings on the variation of liquor licenses in the past was a concern.

However, the AHA was highly critical of the exercise of emergency shutdown powers under current section 48B and the addition of the bill's provision for undercover operations. While the general exercise of section 48B emergency powers are outside the ambit of this bill. The AHA has a point that the oversight is in there to ensure that undercover operations are conducted in a fair and transparent manner. The AHA also questioned the evidence supporting the necessity for undercover operations and the way in which the success of these operations will be measured.

The opposition has consistently maintained that any new policies concerning alcohol needs to be closely measured and evaluated—a concept that is incomprehensible to the government—to ensure that they are having—wait for it!—the desired effect. This bill is no exception. We know that clause 8 of the bill requires an annual report from the commissioner to the minister which chronicles the number of applications for undercover operations lodged by police, the number granted and the number of charges laid. This report must be tabled in the Assembly within seven days of presentation to the minister.

What is missing from this data is the number of persons taken into protective custody as a result of undercover operations where a charge for an offence is not laid. Also missing is the number of persons issued with an offence that are currently on the BDR and how many repeat offenders. Indeed, statistics on every offence, whether the result of an undercover operation or not, should be compiled to determine how much crime is being driven by the BDR, floor price and other restrictions on alcohol.

In its committee submission, NAJA separately supported the additional transparency regarding Liquor Commission hearings, but raised concerns about the impact of the other provisions in the bill on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Territorians. In particular, NAJA noted that the conduct of undercover operations and expanded POSI powers could contribute to the over-policing of Aboriginal people.

With regard to the POSI provision of the bill in particular, NAJA noted that section 101KZ adds the power to search vehicles at random, without regard to whether a police officer has reasonable suspicion that an offence has or is about to take place. This power already exists in circumstances where the Liquor Commission has declared a general restricted area under section 74 of the *Liquor Act* or the minister has declared a special restricted area under section 101AD. The new section 101KZ expands this power to the 20 metre area surrounding a liquor outlet.

The concern from NAJA's perspective is that this could lead to a situation where customers are questioned numerous times—for example, on their way in and out of an outlet—or confronted metres away from a bottle shop when they might have no intention of entering that location at all. Further NAJA requested that POSIs include safeguards to protect against racial profiling.

The matters raised by NAJA are valid. However, many of them are operational in nature rather than legislative. The opposition has the utmost confidence in our police that they will always enforce our law equally without fear or favour.

Overall, the changes introduced by the Liquor Amendment Bill 2018 are positive and will allow both the Liquor Commission and police to deal with serious issues involving liquor supply and secondary supply in a more efficient and effective way, so long as they are fully backed by this government to ensure the effectiveness of this measure going forward. A classic example of that was the implementation of electronic monitoring bracelets, a hugely important part of any government's dealing with justice issues. Yet, this government, because it was hell-bent on governing by media release, came up with an idea, did not back it up or support police on it and, as a result, a year after that law had come into place, we have seen eight bracelets being used. Without the proper support, the policy will fail.

Madam Speaker, I thank the Liquor Commission, the Northern Territory Police, NAJA and AHA for their contributions to this bill during the committee phase. Hopefully, the concerns they have raised will be taken

seriously by the government and operational policies will be developed to assist police in carrying out their duties with appropriate resourcing and support.

Ms MANISON (Treasurer): Madam Speaker, today I speak on the Liquor Amendment Bill 2018. Territorians have, no doubt, had a gutful of alcohol-fuelled crime or antisocial behaviour on our streets. There is no doubt that there all Territorians are impacted by alcohol each and every day. We see it across the Territory in all of our communities. We see the consequences of alcohol abuse through our hospitals, seeing too many children who do not get the best start, our schools in the rate of completion and attendance and our criminal justice system. We see that alcohol creates far too much harm in our community. This bill goes directly towards cutting the supply of alcohol and has my full support.

We know that when you cut the supply of alcohol, you will cut crime—it is that simple. Alcohol is the number one cause for violence in the Northern Territory. It is the cause of violence we often see in public and violence we do not see that happens in far too many homes. It is the reason many children do not get the best start to life and suffer neglect. It is the root cause of family dysfunction and breakdown. It is one of the main causes of our road toll. We know that for about 40% of people involved in road trauma alcohol is a contributing factor. Alcohol is one of the root causes why our police and ambulance officers have so much work in the Northern Territory.

As I said, people have had enough. I do not think Territorians of today accept that alcohol consumption and supply of alcohol should remain the way it has been in the past, because the consequences are devastating. Research conducted by the Menzies School of Health Research showed that the social and economic cost of alcohol-related harm in the Northern Territory has increased from \$642m in 2009 to \$1.38bn per year now. When you put that \$1.38bn each year in the context of some of the budget challenges we have—and one of those main challenges is driven through demand for government services—you can see that if you reduce alcohol consumption it will reduce the harm we see across the community, but it will also reduce the need for services as well.

Our issues is alcohol in the Territory creates so much misery and harm for so many and we need to change that. Everybody has had enough.

When I took on the Police portfolio mid-last year, the first thing I did was hit the road and visit as many stations as I could. I did this because I wanted to gain an insight into the issues that surrounded our police across the Northern Territory. I wanted to know firsthand, as minister, what I could do to help and ensure that our police have the supported they need on the front line.

Without a doubt, the number one topic that came up repeatedly was alcohol. Whether it was in Darwin, Katherine, Tennant Creek, Alice Springs or our remote communities, the number one thing police kept telling me repeatedly was that the biggest issue that confronts them, day in and day out on the job, is alcohol. They feel incredibly frustrated by what they see. They have to see far too much violence as a result of alcohol abuse. They felt very frustrated by it because they can see that if fewer people abused alcohol there would be so many fewer problems. Some of the things they have to see and deal with on the job are simply unacceptable.

That is why this government is taking on the challenge of tackling alcohol head-on. Some of our policies have led to a lot of debate in the community because this is a big and bold package of reforms because the problem is so big in the Northern Territory. There is no one single way that will fix the problem. We have to tackle this from all angles.

We held the comprehensive Riley review. It gave us a range of recommendations to implement to tackle the issue of alcohol abuse and harm that it creates in our community. There are many reforms. Some can be challenging for people, but if we do not tackle the issue of alcohol, particularly around the supply of alcohol then we will continue to see the misery that it causes across the Territory.

People deserve better, not just now but in to the future because we have seen far too many kids who do not get that best start to life because of alcohol abuse.

In March 2018, we announced some significant plans to do more to tackle alcohol fuelled violence across the Territory. One item that was backed by almost \$12m of investment annually consisted of police auxiliary liquor inspectors that are to go out across the Northern Territory in Katherine, Tennant Creek and Alice Springs. We are putting 75 in place.

We are also moving 12 police officers to form a new alcohol policing unit to tackle the issue of secondary supply and those who are not doing the right thing in the community when it comes to the supply of alcohol. We also included three prosecutors that are there to solely focus on ensuring that those who do the wrong thing are brought to justice.

We also applied an additional 10 CCTV cameras—these are mobile units to assist police in their operations across the Territory, particularly when it comes to the issues that are created by alcohol.

We have our college which has been working flat out training our new police auxiliary liquor inspectors—and they are doing a wonderful job.

I heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition raise concerns about police resourcing with all the additional work we are doing to tackle alcohol related harm in our community and I can assure her that we fully support our police, we back our police, we make sure that they are well supported with the resources that they need but there is no doubt that they have an incredibly busy job.

Members: Hear, hear!

Madam SPEAKER: How much longer do you have minister?

Ms MANISON: A fair while.

Madam SPEAKER: You have only just started, minister. Okay, we will suspend for lunch.

Debate suspended.

The Assembly suspended.

VISITORS

Madam SPEAKER: Honourable members, I welcome in Jumana and Hasan Ayoub and baby Alma who have recently immigrated from Jordan two weeks ago. He is brand new to Australia and the Northern Territory. Welcome to Parliament House.

Members: Hear, hear!

Madam SPEAKER: Honourable members, we were also having some students from Nungalinga College, but they are not coming—not today anyway. Nungalinga was booked, which would have been nice.

QUESTION TIME

Don Dale Facility

Mrs FINOCCHIARO to MINISTER for TERRITORY FAMILIES

You are two-and-a-half years into your government and you have mastered your second backflip on the site for a new Don Dale. Sensationally, on radio this morning, you said, 'We need to take our time. There are not many sites available' and you would be focusing on your breaking the cycle of crime policy instead. You failed to close the old Don Dale, build a new facility and curb youth crime. What do you have to say to Territorians who have lost confidence in you as a result of this farce?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the Deputy Opposition Leader for the question. It was an interesting summary of my extensive interview this morning. We are very clear that we have listened to the community. We are also very clear that if we will solve the issues of youth crime we need to bring the community with us because government, police and Territory Families cannot do this alone. This is a large problem.

I note this morning in your condolence speech, which I thought was very respectful of a great Territorian, these issues were being discussed in 1984 in the Northern Territory. These are long-term issues that need a long-term solution.

One of the things we are very clearly focusing on is ensuring we have a sustainable plan that is able to be moved into the future. We will be building a new Don Dale, a facility that is fit for purpose. We have spent extensive time and effort into ensuring the current facility which, when we inherited it—let us face it—was a debacle. We are now much more comfortable in using it in the medium term in ensuring the safety of both staff and young people.

We are doing a range of measures in working across government—not just Territory Families but police, health and education—in ensuring we have a comprehensive plan that deals with youth crime. We have, for the first time ever, used outreach officers, ensuring people are accountable when they are on bail. We are also ensuring we are investing in new services, which the CLP does not believe in and cut dreadfully while they were in government. We are ensuring that young people have a pathway to an important future life through education, with vocational training options on the table. This is a range of work—we gave more to do. We have never backed away from the size of this issue.

We are very clear that this will be about generational change. We need to do what we are doing now in investing in our police—120 front line police—ensuring they have the resources. I am very proud of the plan we have in Alice Springs where we have youth workers working beside police, recognising that police need support to do this hard frontline work. It needs Territory Families and police working together to ensure you have the right skill sets doing the right jobs.

We also need to be working with families. This is the reality. What you said this morning is very true. We need to be working with families and ensuring they have support. We have a range of things in place. We continue to focus on this and to ensure we are focused on community safety.

Palmerston – Family Capital

Mr SIEVERS to CHIEF MINISTER

My question is about my favourite topic. How are the government's investments helping to make Palmerston the Northern Territory's family capital?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the question from the Member for Brennan whose advocacy for Palmerston is tireless and admirable, as is the Member for Drysdale's.

When we came into government this term, we made it very clear that we see Palmerston as the family capital and that it be serviced in its own right. Too many services into Palmerston came from Darwin. Palmerston is its own place, its own entity and needs to be treated as such. That is how we have defined it and how we are resourcing the area.

It started with the Health minister getting the Palmerston Hospital built, which was fantastic. Getting the job done that the previous government could not do. The state-of-the-art police station is nearly complete, our election promise. We brought forward stage two and made sure it was built, which maximises the time that police spend in Palmerston, not going back and forth from Darwin. This is a fantastic result.

We are fast-tracking a new fire station for Palmerston. This is important—having been out to the old station at Emery Avenue, when it was built. We had to respond quickly to issues that have now become built-in: there are turns at either end of Emery Avenue; it has not been built to accommodate female fire fighters—we have seen a significant change in the make-up and growth of the fire fighter service.

We have based the Territory Families Youth Outreach and Engagement Officers in Palmerston as part of our community-based youth justice services. We have dedicated services for youth services, for example the night youth patrol and the skill centre youth drop-in centre are all being worked on as well as the child and family centre and the FaFT centres at Palmerston.

Five years ago these facilities were not on the agenda. Our government have set a very clear direction that Palmerston has to be serviced in its own right, front and centre as the family capital of the Northern Territory. The advocacy and work of the Members for Brennan and Drysdale—they have been tireless in making sure we think about and service Palmerston in the right way and look after the families of Palmerston.

Today we announced stage one of the Zuccoli Primary School—it was not even on the forward works list of the previous government. We brought it forward, made sure it happened, and that we are serving the people.

The families and kids growing up have choice of schools Palmerston, that were done and delivered by a Labor government, because we recognise and support the people of Palmerston.

Not only did they not have a dollar next to it, it did not exist on their forward works plan, was not even written. Had no plans for Zuccoli Primary School, it was a tragedy and a lie to the people of Palmerston that the CLP had ever had any thoughts along that line. Delivered by a Labor government.

Don Dale – Selection of new site

Mrs FINOCCHIARO to MINISTER for TERRITORY FAMILIES

This morning on the radio, you stated that in the medium term, Don Dale would stay where it was because it had been made safer for staff and children. In August last year, you announced a site in Pinelands without any consultation. Since then, you have conveniently hidden behind 'proper planning processes' to mask your lack of consultation.

If these are the 'proper planning processes' where you do not consult, you pick a site and then you go to the Planning Commission, will you repeat your same so-called proper process when you pick a third site for the Don Dale facility?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for the question. I am gobsmacked around the use of italics around proper planning processes through an independent process. We know how your government treated that independent planning processes. There are plenty of examples where you were not respectful of that and I am sure we can list them all here today. But I will not.

What we are saying is that we have followed the process and it has worked. We have gone to a proper process, and I will stick to that word, things have gone to the DCA for consideration, the public have had an opportunity to say what they think about the project and they have then been listened to. An independent report which has been considered carefully by the Planning minister and a decision has been made. That is the normal process of government.

I like the conspiracy theories over here. You did not consult on TIO or the Port being sold. The federal government did not even know about that! For you to be sitting over here pointing fingers, continue to point your fingers and the use of italics about what a process is...

Ms FYLES: A point of order, Madam Speaker! Standing Order 20: they do not like it when you remind them of the truth, they are trying to rewrite history.

Madam SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. Minister, you have the call.

Ms WAKEFIELD: We will continue to make sure we follow a transparent process that is set out through the independent DCA. We will not apologise for that. We will continue to use that process because it has worked.

Territory Budget Challenges

Ms NELSON to TREASURER

How is the government tackling the Territory's budget challenges? Can you share with us updates on alternative approaches other than the CLPs standard slash and cut approach?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, there are some real challenges ahead of us at the moment with the budget. It is important to remember when we came to government what we inherited as a government. First and foremost we inherited a significant deficit position of \$867m that was in the pre-election fiscal outlook, almost a billion dollars of deficit position there.

We also came to government knowing that the former CLP government had sold TIO, they had leased the port, they had put power prices up by 30% and we had seen their approach to government. We knew coming in to government that there would be a significant transition in the economy moving off the back of the INPEX project. What we had to hit the ground running with was rebuilding day-to-day business of government and

getting on with the job after they had four years of a chaotic CLP government and 18 Cabinet reshuffles. Nobody would ever forget that chaos.

We also had the \$500m GST reductions which have created a huge blow to our budget. These are unprecedented and have had a deep impact on our budget, and these are the facts.

This week we announced a public sector cap. We will cap the number of people in the public service on the average of the 2018 numbers—and every public servant equates to about \$100 000. This is not an easy decision it is a tough decision, and there are going to be more tough decisions that will be delivered because we are in a really challenging budget situation because of the GST changes.

We have our root and branch process going across all government agencies looking at expenditure. We have the next stage of the fiscal strategy being chaired by independent John Langoulant to look at how we reform government expenditure across the board moving forward. We will be announcing those decisions and they will be tough decisions.

We are not going to take the CLP approach. We have seen their approach and we have seen they go about these tough situations—slash and burn. What we have also heard from the Leader of the Opposition is that he says he backs a plan of looking at slashing public sector leave entitlements from six weeks to four weeks.

Our hard working public servants, from slashing their leave from six weeks to four weeks, and we have that ruled out. Our public service works incredibly hard and it is important that we attract the very best and the brightest to the Territory to work in our public sector.

Crime in Palmerston – Breaking the Cycle

Mrs FINOCCHIARO to MINISTER for TERRITORY FAMILIES

I feel like I have deja vu when I say this. Minister, on 6 December you announced without any consultation you are breaking the cycle of crime in Palmerston initiative. Since that time from what I can tell, you have done absolutely nothing to implement that policy. Your own numbers shows that in just a few short weeks you spent \$43 000 on advertisements including Facebook and email posting spruiking all about your initiative.

What have you actually done in the past three months besides plaster the media with your propaganda at tax payer's expense?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, we are supporting the people of Palmerston for a safer community. We are hearing that people want extra support. We need to put in extra services, and as was very clearly laid out the by the Chief Minister, this was not happening prior to this government coming in place.

I was shocked coming from Alice Springs when I went to Palmerston for the first time as minister. When we had all those youth services—none of them were based in Palmerston, they were all based in Darwin.

We have been clear that Palmerston is a family city that deserves its own services. We need to be working with locals such as Serena Dalton and others who are trying to deliver services to our most vulnerable Territorians. We will continue to do this work.

There are now YORETs based in the Palmerston office. I talked to them when I was in Palmerston just before Christmas—to meet with community members on how things were going. They said that the work between the Youth outreach officers and community services—particularly YMCA, which has a strong base in Palmerston—was working very well.

The school holiday program there has been transformed since we have been in government. There are now activities—the basketball centre is humming throughout the year. We will continue to do that work, but there is more to do. We have to invest in youth training there. I thank the Department of Education for taking on that role. This is a whole-of-government response, not just Territory Families. We have worked, and will continue to work, closely with Police and a range of other services.

The Palmerston re-engagement centre, run through Education, has been an important step in making sure we get kids back on a pathway to employment and a job. We need to give kids a place and a role in our community with something meaningful to do. If we do that the whole community will be much stronger.

We will continue to invest in Palmerston because we believe in Palmerston as the family centre of the Territory. It is a place that families can go to bring up their children. We have invested in primary and other schools. We will invest in further recreation facilities, such as a pool—which I know the Member for Spillett is not a big fan of. We will be investing in facilities to make sure there are recreational options in Palmerston.

We have a good story to tell in Palmerston. We will continue to tell that story as there is more to do. We will not back away from delivering services that are about Palmerston and based on the voices of the people of Palmerston, and what is needed there ...

Madam SPEAKER: Minister, your time has expired.

Mr SIEVERS to MINISTER FOR HEALTH

Minister, how are the alcohol polices of this government delivering generational change and building safer communities?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, perhaps those opposite might care to listen about what you can achieve when you deliver an evidence-based alcohol harm minimisation action plan.

Members interjecting.

Ms FYLES: There they go. They do not want to listen. They backflipped out of their commitments quicker than an Olympic gymnast and then they do not even acknowledge it.

Members interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER: Order!

Ms FYLES: Perhaps I can offer them a spot in the Arafura Games for backflipping. I recently released the 12-month progress update on the government's response to the Riley review, which was the most comprehensive plan to tackle the alcohol abuse that fuels so much crime and anti-social behaviour, and fills our emergency departments.

Early signs show that we are seeing reductions in some figures. There is a lot more work to do, which is why we are committed to implementing these plans. I look forward to the exposure draft of the Liquor Act being released soon.

We have seen a 44% reduction in alcohol-related assaults in Alice Springs in September to December 2018 compared to 2017. Territory wide we have seen a 24.5% decrease in alcohol-related emergency department presentations in Northern Territory hospitals between September to December 2018 compared to 2017.

Those on the other side might want to look away, but what that reduction means that our emergency departments, doctors, nurses and clinical staff are not as busy dealing with alcohol-related presentations and can focus on mums and dads with sick children, elderly people and the chronically ill.

More than 3000 litres of alcohol marked for illegal secondary supply has been seized by police since the creation of the alcohol policing unit. I know that those opposite are critical, but we continue the work of cracking down on licensees who are doing the wrong thing.

The report shows that 75 of the 219 recommendations have been implemented and a further 70 will be encompassed in the complete rewrite of the *Liquor Act*. There will be exposure draft of that bill which will go to the committee stage.

The Menzies School of Health Research has shown that the social and economic cost to the Northern Territory is \$1.38bn per year in alcohol-related harm. The early report of 2009 stated the cost at \$642m.

At lunchtime today the government was acknowledged with a national award for the most action taken on alcohol in 2018 from members of the National Alliance for Action on Alcohol. They acknowledged that the Northern Territory Government is taking action to introduce a range of alcohol policies that will save lives and

keep people healthy and well. Their comprehensive reform agenda is leaving no stone unturned and they have committed to evaluating these measures to contribute to a further evidence-based policy development.

Perhaps those opposite will listen now—on the national stage the Northern Territory has been acknowledged.

Budget Repair – Have Your Say Submissions

Mrs FINOCCHIARO to TREASURER

The government says it wants Territorians to have their say on the plan for budget repair. You even spent \$44 000 running an ad campaign asking Territorians for their thoughts. Now we learn that the government will not make public what the public has had to say about how to address the debt crisis. Will you make public the 96 submissions on the Have Your Say website, and if not, why not?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, a lot of work is happening at the moment to ensure we have the budget on a sustainable footing for the future. That is why we have embarked on the fiscal strategy. It is an important piece of work. We had the independent Chair of that, John Langoulant, doing that work. We want to make sure we put sensible measures in place to deal with the challenges we have, with the changes to the GST and revenue coming in to the Northern Territory, and still move the Territory forward to help meet that important service demand while growing our economy.

We have asked Territorians to have their say as part of that. John Langoulant has spoken to a number of people, industry groups, unions and important organisations across the Territory to get a good cross-section of views incorporated into what they think needs to be done going forward. We are better placed to make good decisions for the future of the Northern Territory if we have the views of Territorians there, as part of the process.

When it comes to the submissions made to that inquiry, we are happy to release those where people have given permission to do so. That is an important point. If people have said they are comfortable with submissions being released then I have no problem with that. You need the views of people who have put in submissions. We are happy to do that. We will get a good, constructive piece of work for the Territory.

This is about making sure that when we have incredible demand on services in the Territory—not the same revenue, at least not enough through the GST to deal with it. How do we make sure we manage and live within our means? It is what it is. The challenge is to live within our means and make sure we deliver services more efficiently and effectively, and do not compromise important frontline services.

Wherever you live in the Territory, you deserve access to good services. That is an important part of being part of this country. There is no doubt there are bigger challenges in the Northern Territory when doing that than anywhere else. We have some fiscal challenges and huge proportions of disadvantage in the Northern Territory.

Mineral Exploration Statistics

Mr SIEVERS to MINSITER for PRIMARY INDUSTRY and RESOURCES

Recently the Australian Bureau of Statistics released updated mineral exploration statistics. What does the latest data and information tell us about confidence in the Territory and our resources sector?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, this is a very pertinent point. We have a great resources sector. There has been a wonderful set of figures that has just been released. I understand that this sector does not get the limelight or celebration that they sometimes deserve, so it is good to recount the great work the resources sector does through the Northern Territory.

The number one priority for our government is jobs. This sector creates a lot of jobs throughout the Northern Territory. Under the Territory Labor government there is increasing confidence in our resources sector. The recent data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics drives this home. Mineral exploration expenditure in 2018 was at \$123.2m, which is up 35% on 2017.

As at December 2018, quarterly exploration expenditure, nearly \$40m, was easily the strongest quarter of exploration in the Territory since the boom days of 2012. It is important to acknowledge the great work that sector is doing. That is a very strong result and speaks of the confidence in the Northern Territory in the resources sector we have.

There was another strong indicator of confidence today. We have seen reports of a \$40m bid for Verdant Minerals, owners of the Ammaroo phosphate project. That has significant potential and is from an international investor. It is a demonstration of real confidence in the Northern Territory and one of our major projects.

We have spoken recently about the amount of registrations for the AGES conference in Alice Springs next week. We congratulate those people and look forward to them getting together—over 200 participants—next week to share their ideas and their passion for the industry and growing the sector through the Northern Territory.

Our government will keep supporting the resource sector with the \$26m investment our government has made through Resourcing the Territory. We recently met with the Minerals Council. There were people there who were speaking glowingly of that investment and their ability to tap into that investment to ensure they can get projects off the ground.

We have also included delivering almost \$1m in 2019-20 to collaborate and co-invest with Geoscience Australia on new work focused on geological potential in the Barkly region, something the Member for Barkly is very passionate about.

Madam Speaker, there is confidence in the Territory's resource sector under this government. Our government will keep supporting this sector.

Tropical Light

Mr WOOD to MINISTER for TOURISM, SPORT and CULTURE

The government estimates Tropical Light will bring more than 50 000 visitors to Darwin for a return of \$67m to the economy. Considering that people come to Darwin to look at many things, how did your department come to the conclusion that Tropical Light display will bring an extra 50 000 people to Darwin? It is a long way to come and just look at lights. What is the science behind the calculation of a return of \$67m to the economy? When the light display has finished will you be able to show that more than 50 000 new visitors came to Darwin because they wanted to see Tropical Light? Explain how you work that out.

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the Member for Nelson for the question. I was really excited to make the announcement about Tropical Light. We are investing in our tourism industry in the Territory. It is a major economic sector. That has come through really clearly through a number of forums over the last few weeks as well, where the broader business community is recognising the importance of the tourism industry to our broader economy.

Tropical Light will be a multi-installation light show across Darwin CBD. The lead artist is Bruce Monroe. Of course, we know Bruce Monroe from his work—probably many of us would be familiar with the Field of Light at Yulara, which attracted 250 000 visitors. We know it attracted 250 000 visitors through ticketed events that can be attributed to that. We also know that Bruce Monroe's Avenue of Honour in Albany has been under way. Of course, that is a regional area. He has just done the Avenue of Honour there for the Anzac Day memorial. They were expecting huge numbers. They were aiming for about 100 000 over the course of that installation. They had 8500 out-of-region visitors in their first week.

There are plenty of examples for us to build that from. We are aiming for 50 000 out-of-region visitors to that installation over the six months. Things like visitor expenditure are then calculated off what we know different kinds of visitors spend on average across the Northern Territory. There are a whole range of measures being undertaken by Tourism NT in that regard, with consistent measures being used across all the Turbocharging Tourism initiatives.

In terms of the final part of the question as to how we will know they visited—I understand that question and have been asked it before. As it is not a ticketed event, but there are a range of other evaluation techniques

that will be used. These are already used in a whole range of events from surveying visitors to telephone data to a whole range of measures that Tourism NT already use across its initiatives.

I am committed to making sure that everything we spend from Turbocharging Tourism is measured. We have around 43 800 additional holiday visitors attributable to the tourism initiatives so far. Our aim is 53 000 by the middle of the year. I am confident that we will smash that—we are well on track to. I welcome the opportunity to give anybody further briefings on the measurements.

Aboriginal Communities – Local Decision-Making

Ms AH KIT to MINISTER for ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Minister, we know that local decisions are the best decisions. In saying that could you please explain how the government is working with Aboriginal communities to support good local decisions that lead to good local outcomes in our communities?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, the question from the Member for Karama is an important one for the third of our population across the Territory that is Aboriginal.

As the Member for Karama said in her question, the best decisions are local decisions. I am proud to stand in the Chamber as a part of a Northern Territory Labor government that is pushing an agenda that Aboriginal people in the Territory truly deserve. It has been a long time coming. I thank the Chief Minister particularly for driving it in his role as the former Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and the current Minister for Treaty.

Decisions that are made locally are the best decisions. The Chief Minister spoke in Jabiru in my electorate in 2017 to discuss the significance of decisions which, when they are made locally, empower people, particularly Aboriginal people in our remote and very remote communities. It is important that we keep an eye on what is happening outside of town centres.

For Aboriginal people who are living in remote areas this is about deciding their own future and aspirations for themselves, while acknowledging the opportunities they have and barriers and challenges they have to overcome. But giving the empowerment to do that for themselves while government works along beside Aboriginal people in Aboriginal communities.

We are doing business differently now through our whole-of-government local decision-making agenda. This goes across Education, Health, Justice, Housing and all of our other entities. The decision-making power is being handed back to local people in the Territory.

In particular, of the local decision-making agreements that we have seen signed since last year, I am proud that three are in my electorate of Arnhem. The Yugul Mangi Aboriginal Corporation in Ngukurr signed the first local decision-making agreement in May last year. There has been some great cross-agency work happening, led by the Department of Chief Minister, throughout the Big Rivers region with Health, Housing, Education, Infrastructure, Justice, Tourism and Culture, and Territory Families.

All of our agencies are talking with Aboriginal people about what they want to see for their communities. Yugul Mangi, Gurindji Aboriginal Corporation—there was the big Anindilyakwa Land Council agreement that we made. We are committed to local decision-making for Aboriginal people in the Territory.

Climate Change – Fracking in the NT

Mr McCONNELL to MINISTER for ENVIRONMENT and NATURAL RESOURCES

Minister, this government is committed to implementing recommendation 7.8 of the NT fracking inquiry report which states that where there will be or should be no net increase in emissions from the shale gas fracking industry in the Northern Territory, with offset emissions being proposed as a potential solution. Some estimates have placed the cost of offsetting the emissions from the full production scenario at \$4.3bn per year by 2030.

What is the government's estimate cost of offsetting these emissions and what progress has been made to negotiating a framework to offset these emissions with the Commonwealth and the cost of that program?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, it is a pity you are not on this side because we are the government that is actually a government that accepts that climate change is real. On the other side of politics people do not believe that climate change is real so we have a group of climate change deniers in this House.

Members interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER: Order! Minister you have the call. Keep going.

Ms LAWLER: We are a government that have put out a discussion paper around climate change. That climate change discussion paper was out and there were a large number of people who took the opportunity to have a say around that climate change discussion paper. That consultation report is being finalised and we will have a climate change strategy that will be out later this year.

In relation to your question on the issue around hydraulic fracturing and the onshore oil and gas industry that was one of the recommendations in the report—was to work with the federal government. In the Northern Territory we have a very small population. The way that we would deal with offsets and climate change—we do not have the population. We do not necessarily have the finances to be able to do that.

In that report it talked about writing—working with the federal government around that and that is exactly what has already happened—it actually happened when Turnbull was the Prime Minister. Our government wrote to the then Prime Minister, probably a better person to write to because he actually truly believed in climate change, not like the current Prime Minister.

We wrote to the Prime Minister to say the gas industry is one that will benefit the whole of Australia. We need to make sure that the whole of Australia and all Australians can work around what we do to address the issue of climate change.

Our government has a target of 50% renewables by 2030. We were one of the first places that worked around offsets. One of the things we have done very well is provide grants to rangers to look at hot burns, to get those early burns happening and to address those issues that we have currently around greenhouse gases in the Northern Territory

We will have to work with the federal government to address those issues of climate change. It is not one where you have only 200 000 people, when you have a small population that you can address in the Territory, but we will work to do that.

Alice Springs Youth Crime – Breaking the Cycle

Mr PAECH to MINISTER for TERRITORY FAMILIES

Could you please advise the House how the Northern Territory Government is breaking the cycle plan for Alice Springs to tackle youth crime and antisocial behaviour?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, it is great to talk about our plans in Alice Springs. The Member for Namatjira and I have both spent a lot of time talking to people who have been impacted by crime in our community and we take this issue very seriously. We want to have a system in place that is about preventing crime before it happens but also ensuring that we have the victim's voice in our response.

It was great to talk about further investment in to services in Alice Springs. For a long time, one thing that has been called for is an after-hours response in Alice Springs. We had one but unfortunately it was cut by the Member for Araluen. We have been reviewing that and ensuring that we have in place the support that police need after hours in dealing with young people. In particular, young people who may not be committing a crime but are at risk of doing so.

That will be an after-hours service that will operate, usually to 3.00 am. We do not want to plan for it to be a 24 hour service at this stage, but if it is needed and we know there have been issues during the 5.00–5.30 am period, there is flexibility within that plan. We want a nimble plan that can respond in many ways.

We are proud of being clear that unless families or communities are involved, we are not going to make the changes we need to make with young people. We need families to stand up and be part of the solutions. The Chief Minister and myself organised and announced a case-management model which is making sure families are taking responsibility. Unless families do that we are not going to get those kids back on the right track.

Further, we are working closely with the Tangentyere Council and will be providing funding and support for the Strong Women's Group and the Men's Four Corners Group. Those groups know the kids on the street much better than anyone else. When we trialed some programs over summer—when I was standing on Anzac Oval at 2.00 am engaging with young people—I saw clearly that we need the police and the Tangentyere Council working together. They have the solutions.

This is about local decision-making involving Aboriginal people. Making sure our town is working together to come up with solutions to the problems that we face together. Making sure that Aboriginal people are leading the conversation as well as supporting our police and hard-working front line services.

Intergenerational Change

Mr PAECH to MINISTER for LOCAL GOVERNMENT, HOUSING and COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Could you advise the House how the CLP's continuing neglect of remote Aboriginal housing is having an effect on our government's plan for intergenerational change?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, great jump Member for Namatjira. That shows the enthusiasm of this local member, because it is an important point.

The Labor policy of generational change—I am proud to be a member of the Labor Government's put a stake in the ground and set a course, a policy platform for generational change. Every member of this House will agree that housing underpins that change. Housing to deliver better living conditions, to support kids going to school and getting an education, to support the family getting jobs and engaged in training to employment, to support those justice outcomes, housing.

It is clear in the Northern Territory today, there is a government that is improving, building, renovating, replacing and customising housing. That is Michael Gunner's Labor government. There is only one government doing this and the frustration is that the Federal government is playing politics.

Let me put some context on the Labor government's initiatives. To date, 1320 families have benefited from work this government has done to make their home better. 171 family homes have been built, brand new to the community. We have replaced 180 homes that were sitting vacant, too old to put back into stock or upgrade, 843 homes have received upgrades so that the family has a better home under this government.

126 families have received work under the Room to Breathe program. These are families who would never have seen that improvement under the CLP. If we compare 1320 to 488 during the last two years of the previous CLP's rein, there is a major comparison.

I would like to call on members to reflect on some respectful and passionate eulogies that were delivered. The message was a great Territorian, a liberal who left a massive legacy in the Northern Territory. I put out a heart-felt plea to Senator Nigel Scullion 'do not let your legacy be the only Territorian to hold the Indigenous Affairs portfolio to never deliver a dollar for remote Indigenous housing. Do not play politics with this Senator Scullion, be a Territorian that can leave your position with respect and dignity, with a legacy of committing the money. At the moment, you owe us \$35.5m. It is a bad debt in a very tight fiscal circumstance. You have committed and promised \$550m over five years. It is not enough but we want it and need it now.

We want additional funds to get on with the job. Allow the Prime Minister to release the funds, Minister Scullion.

Timber Creek Native Title Compensation Case

Mr MILLS to CHIEF MINISTER

A recent High Court decision that involves claimants from Timber Creek, which has been described as significant as the Wik and Mabo decision, will expose the Northern Territory to major compensation claims. While there is an indication that the Commonwealth may cover part of this cost, it is up to the states and territories to calculate the potential exposure for government and businesses in the Territory. How are we exposed and what calculations have you conducted?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, this is a very important question. The decision was handed down at 8.40 am. We are taking our time to consider it, because this is a High Court decision, a considerable and weighty decision. It must be read and considered thoroughly.

The Timber Creek native title compensation case was run as an important test case between the Northern Territory and Commonwealth, and the Northern Land Council, which represented the native title groups. The Commonwealth was part of the case.

This decision will impact across the entirety of Australia; it is not just a decision that will have ramifications in the Northern Territory. It was also the first sitting of the High Court in the Northern Territory. There is no doubt the High Court took this—as it takes everything—very seriously.

We are not yet in a position to provide a formal response on the judgment. This is a complex area of law and time must be taken to meticulously analyse the decision and its implications. I will not rush to early comment. We must make sure we take time to fully understand the decision because of the implications it will have.

We welcome the certainty of the High Court decision now. We are discussing with the Aboriginal Affairs minister, as native title minister, and the Attorney-General. We will be making a response to that decision in time, as I imagine the Commonwealth will. We are talking with the Commonwealth and other jurisdictions because of the impact beyond Territory borders.

It is an important decision of the full bench of the High Court. We will take our time to make sure we fully and properly respect, weigh up and respond to that decision.

John Stokes Square Redevelopment

Mrs WORDEN to MINISTER for INFRASTRUCTURE, PLANNING and LOGISTICS

Can you please provide an update on the progress made by the Northern Territory Government on delivering another important election commitment, that is, the major redevelopment of John Stokes Square?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, if the Member for Nightcliff could she would ask this question. She is passionate about this project and is watching it very closely.

For those who do not know, the John Stokes facility is opposite the Nightcliff village. It is nearing the end of its economic life. It has been there ever since I can remember, and I have been in the Territory for 57 years. It has been there a hell of a long time. It is in a run-down state, but it is also an area where there are antisocial issues.

The Member for Nightcliff lobbied hard during the election period to make sure there was a commitment to upgrading the Nightcliff police station as well as John Stokes Square. We will see a \$45m project to redevelop John Stokes Square and include a much-needed 24-hour police station; public housing that will prioritise seniors, people living with disability and their carers; and facilities for associated specialists and wraparound services, such as a multi-hub facility offering services for family violence victims, people with disability and mental health support.

From my perspective it is about creating jobs. We have heard loudly and clearly from the construction industry—the Education Minister and the Member for Brennan were out at Zuccoli stage two this morning. We have heard from the developer and construction workers there about how much they value the work that we are doing as a government to stimulate the economy and roll out big projects.

Forty-five million dollars will see about 240 jobs there. It is a huge and great project. The redevelopment has taken a significant step forward with the release of a tender for contractors to start on clearing the site. There

is a lot of work to do. The Minister for Housing has been involved in—the word is decanting—taking people from there to other Housing developments, which provides us with the opportunity to demolish that.

Member for Spillett there will be community consultation. You will be excited to hear that. There will be information stalls at Woolworths and at the Nightcliff Markets for the community to be able to ask questions. Jackman Gooden have been commissioned to prepare a concept ready for construction later this year.

The CLP members were the ones who shut down the Nightcliff police station. We are putting in and making sure there will be a brand new 24-hour police station. There will be a walkway, providing pedestrian access between Nightcliff Village and the Nightcliff Shopping Centre. A link between them will make Nightcliff fantastic.

Alice Springs Youth Detention Centre

Mrs LAMBLEY to MINISTER for TERRITORY FAMILIES

Minister, a few weeks ago at a public meeting in Alice Springs you apparently said that you will not be building a new youth detention centre in Alice Springs. Is this true? How was this decision made? With two thirds of kids in detention in the Northern Territory from Central Australia, why would you not build a youth detention centre in Alice Springs rather than Darwin?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, it was a shame the Member for Araluen was not able to attend that public conversation that was organised by the council. I thank them for setting up that community consultation. It was a great meeting. We had nearly two hours of conversation on what are the solutions for youth crime in Alice Springs.

I did not say that we would not be building a new detention centre in Alice Springs. I said that we would be working through replacing the Don Dale facility first and then looking at what the options were.

We acknowledge that the numbers of changed while we have been in government. There are more children from Central Australia going into the detention system. We need to look at why that is occurring. We also need to look at options such as YDAP, which is working successfully in Central Australia. We may work through these with our Back on Track process.

There are a range of things that we need to do. We have done extensive work on the Alice Springs facility, acknowledging that it has not been ideal in the past. When I first became minister there were girls and boys held in an old adult prison in unsafe conditions. It was not a safe situation for young women in custody. This was something we acted on immediately.

The facilities are much improved. Much like you visited the Don Dale facility this week, we have booked you in for a visit to the Alice Springs Detention Centre in April. I am interested to hear your feedback from that visit. We have improved the situation there significantly. There is now grass in the recreational area so that young people have the ability to exercise while they are in detention. The classroom that was there when I became minister was just appalling—you could barely fit five kids in it, let alone the 25–30 that were regularly in the facility.

We have set a cap to make sure that staff safety is assured. We have done extensive work on security. We need to step through the process carefully. We need to make sure that whatever we build now is for the long-term future of a youth detention and justice system that works. This is what the community expects. We need to bring the community along with that conversation.

We cannot do this alone. The community needs to support the youth justice system that we set up, which includes having a say in where detention centres are. We will continue to work through both issues in Darwin and in Alice Springs. But, our focus is strongly on making sure that we have community safety at the centre of everything we do.

Bilingual Education – Specialised Positions

Mr GUYULA to MINISTER for EDUCATION

I am confused, or you are confused, or we are confused—in 2017–18 there was an ST4 position that was wholly dedicated to bilingual education. It was the principle consultant for bilingual education. I understand

that in your restructure this position no longer exists, rather two positions have merged and become one position.

This is now the manager for student diversity, who has implemented several programs. The bilingual school is concerned about these changes. They need more support, not less. Can you advise if there are ST4 positions still wholly devoted to bilingual education?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, the advice provided at the end of Question Time yesterday related to the question you are asking today. The department has let me know, through my office, that the ST4 position is still there and that the team has grown to five people, which will implement the Northern Territory Indigenous Languages and Cultures Curriculum.

I am a big believer in bilingual education and a supporter of it. In regard to our student cohort in the Northern Territory, particularly in remote areas, 44% of our students are Aboriginal in remote areas. Having bilingual education, revitalisation programs and language maintenance programs in the Northern Territory education system is critical to making sure we allow all students access to a quality education regardless of whether English is their first, second, third or fourth language.

As in many of our remote schools, English is not the first language of many of our students.

I know you are passionate about this, Member for Nhulunbuy. I encourage you to seek a briefing in regard to the bilingual team in the department, and the Indigenous Languages and Cultures Curriculum implementation team through the department. I welcome your interest and input into what is being delivered in your electorate of Nhulunbuy—to hear your opinions and advice on what is running in other parts of the Northern Territory in regard to bilingual education.

Nine schools are officially bilingual schools, and other schools are looking to implement bilingual education. The Member for Namatjira has written to my office on behalf of his constituents in regard to his schools and outstation education provisions to be delivering bilingual education.

I am proud to say we welcome that input from our communities and schools, regardless of where they are. We look at our Indigenous languages as being a critical part of our education system. I will make sure we provide that briefing to you, Member for Nhulunbuy, and we will get the details from the bilingual team, which now includes two linguists. There are more schools interested in creating, developing and further implementing bilingual education in the Northern Territory.

Ms FYLES (Leader of Government Business): Madam Speaker, I ask that further questions be placed on the Written Question Paper.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION
Ochre Card Backlog – Police Assistance**

Madam Speaker, in response to the Deputy Opposition Leader yesterday—no frontline police were taken off duty to assist with SAFE NT processing. That is the advice I received from Police.

**LIQUOR AMENDMENT BILL
(Serial 74)**

Continued from earlier today.

Ms MANISON (Treasurer): Madam Speaker, as we were saying before the lunch break, I will again go to why this is important legislation and what we have invested in our police force to give them the extra capacity to tackle the issue of alcohol supply, ensuring that we have more of those frontline resources targeting those who are doing the wrong thing.

As I spoke about, we have instigated 75 Police Auxiliary Liquor Inspectors. This has been complemented by the 12-member Alcohol Policing Unit and the three prosecutors we have working on this very important job. Before we put this into place, the policy of the previous CLP government was to have sworn police officers at the front of these bottle shops, acting in the front line doing these duties. Frankly, we felt we did not need a fully-sworn constable police officer out the front of these bottle shops doing these duties. We felt that this

was a role that could be undertaken more like an auxiliary-type position. That is why we embarked on the recruitment of the 75 Police Auxiliary Liquor Inspectors for Katherine, Tennant Creek and Alice Springs.

The feedback we have had from police was that many of them did not sign up for the job to be doing duties in front of the bottle shops. Having a fully-sworn officer is far more expensive and was unsustainable. My priority, as Police minister—and the Chief Minister when he was in Police minister role—was to ensure we have as many of our sworn officers on the front line. That is exactly why we introduced the Police Auxiliary Liquor Inspectors.

This is an initiative that, so far, is going very well. Many have been recruited. They are on duty in Katherine, Alice Springs and Tennant Creek and they are backed by the *Liquor Amendment (Point of Sale Intervention) Act 2018*. Their 13-week training program comprises of law and legislation studies, policing in the Territory, cultural awareness and communication, defensive techniques and driver training.

I have met many of these Police Auxiliary Liquor Inspectors as they have been going through their training. These are outstanding people who come from such diverse backgrounds. It has been wonderful to meet people who are so eager to go through the training and get on the job. I was really taken aback by how they would express how they really felt they would be making a difference to people's lives in the roles they would be fulfilling. Many of them also saw that by underdoing the Police Auxiliary Liquor Inspector pathway it would also get them ready to look at a career in the police force, eventually moving to become a fully-sworn officer, which I thought was fantastic. We have people who are taking this first step to join the police and looking at a long-term career in the police force, which I thought was wonderful.

We currently have 39 of the PALIs on duty—27 in Alice Springs, 10 in Katherine and two in Tennant Creek. We have our third squad, comprising of 23 PALIs currently in training at the Peter McAulay Centre and another squad due to start in May this year, which will bring us to the full complement of 75.

We are investing in Police Auxiliary Liquor Inspectors because we are seeing that they work. Since the Police Auxiliary Liquor Inspectors have been in place in Alice Springs, we have seen significant reductions in alcohol-related crime. In December 2018 alcohol-related assaults were down 44% since they have been on board, alcohol-related emergency presentations decreased by 46.5% and domestic violence decreased by 36% in that very short timeframe.

Crime stats that are about to come out will show that these measures to tackle alcohol are starting to hit the ground in a positive way. The Territory, overall, shows alcohol-related assaults are down by 9%, Darwin alcohol-related assaults are down by 4%, Palmerston alcohol-related assaults are down by 10%, Alice Springs alcohol-related assaults are down by 19% and Tennant Creek alcohol-related assaults are down by 25%.

Police auxiliary liquor inspectors are starting to hit the ground in a positive way. There is a lot more work that needs to be done. But, we have seen encouraging results to start with. This is terrific. Ultimately we want to see less harm caused by alcohol in our community.

The Liquor Amendment Bill 2018 will see the clarification of point-of-sale intervention powers to now include anyone in possession of alcohol in the vicinity of the licensed venue. It will also allow a PALI to detain a customer's vehicle. These changes have been recommended to assist the PALIs in their duties.

It became apparent that customers were attempting to dodge or sneak their way around PALIs by waiting until officers were busy or caught up with other customers. They would then quickly enter the store and purchase their alcohol. Amending the legislation would mean that the PALI would be able to stop and question a customer leaving the premises even after a purchase. It will also mean a PALI can stop a vehicle attempting to leave a premises after making a purchase.

As I said at the start, we want to do what we can to stop alcohol from getting into the wrong hands.

The second amendment I will speak to today will give police the power to conduct undercover operations targeting breaches of the *Liquor Act 1978*. This will allow officers to submit evidence in court that has been collected covertly. While this will benefit all Territory police officers, in particular it will greatly assist the operations undertaken by the alcohol policing unit, the APU.

The alcohol policing unit consists of eight officers in Darwin and four in Alice Springs. Since their recruitment in October last year they have achieved some fantastic results, including more than 3000 litres of alcohol marked for illegal secondary supply and have seized 10 vehicles used in the trafficking of secondary supply

and grog running. They have made 39 arrests and issued 29 summonses for various secondary supply offenses or liquor breaches.

The changes will give police a greater ability to target those who do the wrong thing. It will allow officers to plan more strategic operations to detect and deter the secondary supply of alcohol. This will cut down the illegal trafficking of grog on our CBD streets and in our communities, particularly in remote locations where it is sold for inflated prices to vulnerable people. Let this be a warning, if you are doing the wrong thing, you should be worried because the police have more powers now to deal with it.

I have met with the alcohol policing unit. It is a fantastic group of officers. They were so keen about the work they are doing. They looked forward to the strategic planning of who they were going to target, what they were doing and the trends they were seeing. They are finally able to have thorough and targeted operations on the stories we often hear about things you see happen around smaller suburban shops. There were people who were targeting individuals or acting on intelligence they were receiving about grog running.

They were all for it. They love their jobs and getting out there because they know they are making a positive difference. It would be fair to say that when you see people peddling grog to people who are vulnerable at horrendous prices—it is good to see that there is more action being taken against them to stop that activity and ensure they are held to account for their irresponsible behaviour and criminal activity. We know how much misery that can cause.

That is why this is important legislation. The changes will strengthen our liquor reforms and increase public confidence. I extend my thanks to the scrutiny committee for the work it has done on the bill.

I extend my praise to the hardworking men and women of the Northern Territory Police Force. They do an amazing job and their work does not go unnoticed. Whether it be our officers or the new police auxiliary liquor inspectors, they are doing a fantastic job.

We believe these changes, which will be legislated through this body of work, will help them in their daily duties, so they are even more effective in tackling alcohol abuse in communities and making sure that those who do the wrong thing, when it comes to alcohol, are held to account.

Mr WOOD: Madam Speaker, I listened to the Deputy Chief Minister talk about police auxiliaries. If you want to start me up on something about police auxiliaries in the Riley review this is it. This bill once again goes against the Riley review by increasing the powers of police auxiliaries, who are now given two names: police auxiliary liquor inspectors, PALIs. That was not what Justice Riley envisaged. He said:

The re-introduction of the BDR is a significant point of sale intervention expected to have a positive impact on reducing alcohol harms, and we are of the view that the POSIs will complement the BDR. It is unlikely that the BDR alone will effectively replace the POSIs. Although POSIs have been extremely effective in reducing alcohol related harms, we do acknowledge the significant police resources that are required to continue the strategy. To that end, we believe that POSIs should continue in the regional centres. The question that then arises is how this successful strategy is to continue given its drain on police resources.

We recommend that the rewriting of the Liquor Act should include giving uniformed Licensing Inspectors the power to undertake this role. An assessment of how that may best be effected should be undertaken by Police and Licensing.

At a minimum it would be vital that these officers be, and are perceived to be, in a position of authority in order to carry out the functions formerly performed by the Police. Appropriate training must be provided to Licensing Inspectors. Ongoing evaluation and potential expansion should be a matter for the licensing authority.

We recognise this will require a significant increase in the number of Licensing Inspectors but will be offset by the savings effected through the reduced demand on Police resources.

In light of the success of POSIs and the importance of this role the Police need to continue to provide this service until the Licensing Inspectors are employed and trained.

Which means, once licensing inspectors were fully trained and employed, the police got out of that role. That is not what this government has said. There was always an intention that police auxiliaries and licensing inspectors would take over this role. That is not the truth, as shown by the Riley review

We are now adding more legislation to the *Liquor Act*, which the PALIs will have to look after. Those changes add new powers by adding to under the point of sale intervention of the act, where a police officer or inspector can act where the customer appears to be purchasing or intending to purchase liquor for consumption away from the premises or is in the possession of liquor.

An officer inspector may, if the customer is the driver or a passenger in a vehicle require the driver of the vehicle to stop the vehicle and require the driver or passenger to follow any reasonable direction to allow the officer or inspector to exercise a power under this section.

That comes under the section of the act Part VIII C Point of sale intervention. An inspector or police auxiliary can then ask for the customer's name and state the address where the liquor will be consumed. Some are normal things that are done by POSIs, but the changes that were made last year and this year are changes that should have been addressed last year and some changes are being introduced today.

I will quote NAAJA as we need to look at the bigger picture:

NAAJA supports the inclusion of statements of compatibility. You will see that in the explanatory statement the government issues with the act. It is called the Statement of Compatibility with Human Rights. NAAJA supports the inclusion of that statement, alongside new bills being introduced into the Legislative Assembly. It is seen as a positive step for the Territory to ensure that legislation meets a certain standard as set out by Australia's international human rights commitments.

NAAJA stresses, however, that in order for these statements to be effective, they must be seen as genuine attempts to anticipate the human rights implications of new legislation. In the absence of other human rights protections, the strength of these statements lies in their ability to change institutional thinking so that lawmakers can consider human rights compatibility before a bill becomes law. If these statements are to have an effect on legislative drafting, they must consider in detail the human rights implications of individual aspects of bills.

NAAJA is concerned that the full human rights implications of the Liquor Act Amendment Bill 2018 have not been considered in the context of how it will impact the human rights of Aboriginal people. Aboriginal perspectives of human rights are relevant, particularly as the Northern Territory has a significant Aboriginal population. It is clear that community feedback in relation to POSI operation serves to racially profile Aboriginal people and NAAJA has received extensive feedback from across regions as to the perceptions of harm and mistrust of authority that this situation creates. The community has not received an explanation as to why racial profiling should serve a role in relation to POSI operations.

NAAJA went on to talk about equality before the law. It said:

There are currently no discussion on how the expanded POSI powers can be expected to engage a person's right to equality before the law. Considering the significant expansion to POSI powers through the new definition of 'customer' and the power to stop vehicles, it appears that it is worth considering how the amendments proposed by clause 9 of the Liquor Amendment Bill will engage people's rights to equality under the law as set out in Articles 14(1) and (26) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).

Aboriginal people are more likely to receive attention under POSI powers as they currently stand. In its present form clause 9 has no safeguards in place to prevent POSIs being conducted on individuals under the expanded definition of 'customer', nor are there any protections against the power to stop vehicles being used as a ground for unrelated questioning, vehicle checks or searches. In effect, these reforms multiply the number of times an individual may be targeted under the Territory supply side liquor control laws. This will be particularly problematic in areas where there are already perceptions of police heavy-handedness. Increased negative contact with police increases the potential for individuals will perceive systemic discrimination impacting upon their perceptions of equality before the law with all the associated negative social, criminal and health outcomes that this has.

What I find interesting is that when I looked through the scrutiny report, I did not see any response to what NAAJA was saying. It is important that we should be looking at those issues. That is not to say what the government is trying to do is not important. We know the intention is to try to reduce the harm from alcohol. Of course, we must balance that with the rights of people, both black and white.

You will also note, as I mentioned before, in the explanatory statement there is also a statement on human right implications. It says, referring to this bill naturally:

The bill engages rights referred to in the freedom of movement and choice of residence for lawful residents, (Article 12, ICCPR). Article 12(1) of the ICCPR provides that everyone lawfully within the territory of a state shall, within that territory, have the right to liberty of movement.

Elements of the bill may interfere with the free movement of persons, as police officers and inspectors are empowered to stop vehicles where a customer appears to be purchasing, intending to purchase or has purchased liquor for consumption away from the premises is driving in or is a passenger in the vehicle.

It goes on to say:

Notably, however, Article 12(3) of the ICCPR provides that freedom of movement may be curtailed where it is necessary for the purposes of maintaining public order or public health and are consistent with other rights.

At the end of the statement it says:

This bill is compatible with human rights as it promotes a reduction in alcohol-related harm, and to the extent that it limits human rights those limitations are reasonable, necessary and proportionate.

Whilst I understand what both statements are saying, I thought there might be more discussion when this bill was introduced on what is 'reasonable, necessary and proportionate'. The issue of possible discrimination— simply because if this new legislation is not applied to all people it would be fair to say it is only being applied to one group of people.

We now have powers around POSIs that were first brought in last year which were extended to people that covered people if they were intending to buy liquor and you were within 20 metres of even the car park of a licensed premises, or an entrance to a building that contained the premises. How that works in reality I do not know, but now police will also be able to check a vehicle that has left the premises but is still in the immediate vicinity of the premises. I use the words 'immediate vicinity' because that is what is in the explanatory notes. Maybe that should say '20 metres'. I am not sure. What does 'immediate vicinity' mean?

Has there been a major problem previously, if there was, why could the sale of liquor not be simply restricted to those who have a vehicle. In other words, you cannot walk in off the street and purchase alcohol from a drive-through. I know there are some restrictions on drive-throughs in Darwin where you must have a vehicle.

If there was an issue in regard to people sneaking in while the POSI is checking a car, and buying their alcohol and getting out, is there another solution whereby you can only buy alcohol if you have a car? I ask that because there are places in Darwin where you cannot purchase your alcohol unless you are in a vehicle.

In the scrutiny committee report the legal adviser, Sally Gearin, said this:

The proposed amendment to section 101ZK(1)(b) expands the definition of 'customer', thereby increasing the POSI powers by permitting these powers to be exercised on any person in possession of liquor who is within a licensed premises or the prescribed boundary area, irrespective of whether they have or appear to be intending to enter the licensed premises to purchase takeaway liquor. This amendment will also allow POSI powers to be exercised after a purchase has been completed.

The advice provided by Ms Gearin stated the proposed amendment expands police powers by adding a power for a police officer to require a person who is in possession of liquor to do the things set out in section 101ZK(2). It permits the police officer to stop a citizen, obtain personal information, require them to produce identification, and be subjected to interrogation for no reason other than being in possession of alcohol and walking within 20 metres of a licensed premises.

This amendment goes beyond the powers intended by section 101K to be confined to customers purchasing or intending to purchase liquor for consumption away from licensed premises. It is an open-ended power permitting a police officer to stop anyone walking within 20 metres of licensed premises to see if they are in possession of liquor.

This applies when a person is not a customer, but any person who might be walking past licensed premises carrying their own alcohol on their way to a BYO function or carrying a bottle of wine as a gift. The citizen might have already gone through the point of sale requirements when they purchased the alcohol. No reasonable suspicion that an offence may be or has been committed is necessary for these powers to be exercised.

I feel uncomfortable about this legislation because I wonder if Aboriginal people feel there are more and more laws being made which might be done for the purpose of maintaining public order or public health and are consistent with other rights. It all points to them, as if they are the only ones with a problem.

I note that the committee asked what evidence there is to suggest that conducting a POSI on a person who has not entered and is not intending to enter a licensed premises will reduce alcohol-related harms. The committee also asked how the infringement on the rights and liberties of individuals is justified in circumstances where they are not attempting or intending to purchase alcohol from the premises.

I note the Attorney-General's response. The Attorney-General advises that the policy intention of the amendment is aimed at customers who have perhaps deliberately evaded the point of sale interventions, completed a purchase, are in the process of exiting premises. It is not to enable the police officers to ask questions of someone who is simply passing within 20 metres of a licensed premises, unless there is some known fact or circumstance about them which might indicate that an alcohol related offence was about to occur.

That did not really answer the question, as the questions asked was about a reduction in alcohol-related harm. It highlights that these changes that were introduced last year should have gone through a scrutiny committee when the questions would have been asked—but it was not sent to a scrutiny committee.

It highlights the mistake the government made in not sending this original legislation to a scrutiny committee. That is where I said I travelled down the highway and met just about every licensee that had a take-away licence. They knew nothing about this law. Now when you hear that a committee is asking questions about the issues of this 20 metre area around a licensed premises—it is already part of our legislation. It was in there. It was passed by this Parliament. I questioned it. It did not go to a scrutiny committee. Now it has come back and people are asking, is this fair?

This is something that disappoints me. The AHA has complained bitterly about the commissioner's power to suspend a licence. The Commissioner of Police may suspend a licence for not more than 48 hours. That was also part of the previous amendments to the *Liquor Act*. Were they discussed with the scrutiny committee? They were not.

That is an area that really needed discussing because the AHA says we should at least have some right of appeal or it should actually be the Liquor commissioner having that power rather than the Police Commissioner. Those things were not discussed because it did not go to a scrutiny committee. Now to come back to this particular sittings when they have already been approved. It is disappointing that that did not happen in the first place.

I raise these issues because there needs to be a lot more discussion in relation to where we are going here. We have BDRs, we have POSIs and police are out there making sure there are no secondary supplies. We need more education. Are we risking that Aboriginal people will feel they are being picked on. They have the right to get drunk. I am not saying they should get drunk. White people get drunk. Why should they not? I am not encouraging people to get drunk, but do they feel at times that they are the ones that have this burden?

Domestic violence is a major problem but domestic violence is not only an Aboriginal problem. It is a non-Aboriginal problem. The problem is you see one group of people is visible and one group of people are not. Sometimes we need to stop and perhaps have a look where we are going. Do we have enough legislation now to say okay, we have some controls—but allow people some freedom? Freedom even to do wrong.

I am not encouraging people to do wrong but we all have some freedoms that ...

Ms Nelson: Civil liberties.

Mr WOOD: Yes, you put it the right way. We have some freedoms. People can get drunk. I do not support people get drunk, by the way, but people have that right in the Northern Territory to get drunk. It is not an offence unless that state of affairs then causes a criminal activity like domestic violence or driving a motor car et cetera.

I raise that whole perspective of where this bill is going and I am concerned about the practicality of that 20 metre area. I raised it before when this legislation first came because it is so broad in many ways.

A customer is a person that appears to be purchasing or intending to purchase. How would one judge that if it went to court? If I looked up to check how much a carton of XXXX was on the outside a pub and then continued on—I could appear to be intending to buy a carton of XXXX. I could also say that I was just checking out the price.

It is a broad-brush approach which is not necessary, but it is in the legislation. It is not a sensible piece of legislation. I understand that there may be issues in relation to people sneaking out of bottle shops. But there are other ways to look at that without going down the path of where the changes to the legislation go.

I will make a point in relation to a section of the bill to do with undercover police. In relation to the powers for police to conduct undercover work for the purposes of detecting offences against the liquor act, I wonder if the committee looked at the comments of the AHA and the Riley report? This is what the Riley report says in relation to compliance:

Another area requiring significantly improved compliance and enforcement activity relates to the responsible service of alcohol (RSA).

We have noted that Queensland has a specific 'mystery shopper program' as part of its compliance activity. In 2014/15 the Queensland regulator introduced mystery shopper trials covering a range of licensed venue types and environments, including entertainment precincts and suburbs. The success of the trial led to the program being extended into 2016 targeting the high-risk venues that had been identified as more likely to experience RSA issues in the 2014/15 trials. Overall, some RSA issues were identified in 54 per cent of these venues in Queensland during the 2016 program.

The recommendation of the Riley report was that:

Licensing be sufficiently resourced to regularly undertake covert 'mystery shopper' programs, similar to those used in Queensland.

The government's response to the recommendations, under the heading, 'Compliance', was:

Supported in-principle

To be considered by Licensing NT and Police when developing their compliance and enforcement plan ... The NT Government, anticipates that mystery shoppers will be Police and Licensing Inspectors in plain clothes. However, any such compliance operations is for the consideration of Licensing NT and Police when developing their compliance and enforcement plan.

The government has said that it has completed this recommendation of the Riley report. It says that:

In November 2018, Government amended the Liquor Act to insert powers for police officers to conduct undercover operations to detect breaches of the Liquor Act, and to then use the gathered evidence in prosecution for that offence to strengthen the compliance and enforcement approach to alcohol reform and increase public confidence in policing. The legislation requires written approval of an undercover operation by a senior officer (above the rank of Commander) and there are annual obligations upon the Commissioner of Police to report the requests for use of the provision, adding to the transparency and accountability of the process.

This does not seem to be about mystery shoppers or licensing inspectors. I am not sure that this is what Justice Riley envisaged. Why does this section of the act come under the control of the Liquor Commission and not Police? Why can it not elect liquor inspectors to do the work?

I heard the Deputy Chief Minister talk about the work that police are doing. There is a special section of the police force that is looking at secondary supply. I do not have a problem with that. Why could that not operate and do that job—the recommendation from the Riley report on mystery shoppers is distinct from that work.

When I read the response I think that we have gone from mystery shoppers to covert undercover operations run by the police. That sounds a different scenario from what was being envisaged by Justice Riley.

I question what is really wrong with our existing legislation. If police know there is a car there—it does not have to be near the pub. But if they know there is a car with grog in it—when I say grog, cartons of beer and stuff—and they know where that car comes from, obviously they have power to start to question people.

I am a little confused as to why we need this legislation. Is it overkill? Is it starting to build into our society that we have a problem, we will fix it, we know what we are doing, we are targeting Aboriginal people. This is where I find the difficulty. I do not want Aboriginal families where mum and the kids are bashed up, but you need to also balance the rights of people to do things you might not always agree with. You only have to go past the takeaway out my way on a Sunday. People buy a lot of grog. They are probably very happy by the end of the day. You only have to go to some of the parties that occur.

It is not a one-sided discussion we should have in relation to the abuse of alcohol in our society. I believe this is legislation which needs a lot more thought. The area I spoke about before—and I will see if I can find it—which was: are these limitations reasonable, necessary and proportionate? When I look at this legislation, I do not think that is necessarily the case.

Mr Deputy Speaker, until I am convinced that is the case, then I will not be supporting that section of the legislation. I support other parts of the legislation, but I cannot support that section.

Mr GUYULA (Nhulunbuy): Mr Deputy Speaker, I am concerned about alcohol addiction in the Northern Territory. We see the impact that alcohol addiction has on our communities, the pain that is caused by alcohol, sniffing, marijuana and other drugs. I have several concerns about the proposed legislation that I believe will impact on the most marginalised members of our community.

My concerns were also reflected in the NAAJA submission to the Economic Policy Scrutiny Committee. Their submission states:

NAAJA re-emphasises the position that alcohol abuse is primarily a health issue and that any links with the criminal justice system must emphasise and place at the centre of the policy a key focus of rehabilitation and therapeutic approaches. The policy framework must also address the root causes of alcohol dependency.

We are concerned at the apparent escalation of alcohol policies and laws which appear to focus on criminal justice responses without adequately dealing with the health responses ...

We are concerned that the approach appears to be on greater prohibition of alcohol for Aboriginal people, an increase in policing and criminal justice responses, a lack of pathways for the development of a safe culture of consumption and inadequate attention to health responses ...

NAAJA is concerned that without adequate safeguards on the exercise of these expanded police powers, the day-to-day implementation of reforms proposed by the Liquor Amendment bill are at risk of further perpetuating perceptions of systemic racism amongst significant sections of the community.

What other Yolngu elders and I want to see is an alternative option for people who have drug addictions. We want to see a reason for people to return to country. If there were drug rehab centres on our homelands providing cultural healing and support, we may be able to pull people away from addiction and away from the long grass and back onto country where elders can assist with education and detoxification as well as reintegration into strong cultural identity and practice.

I am concerned that these options are not the main emphasis of liquor reform and instead of helping people to address their addictions, this government will instead increase incarceration rates of Aboriginal people through these kinds of reforms.

Mr McCARTHY (Local Government, Housing and Community Development): Mr Deputy Speaker, I commence my contribution to debate by being very clear. As legislators, this legislation is passing through the Legislative Assembly for all Territorians. If I put my take on it, this is another step in the way of implanting the Riley review, the most comprehensive and challenging review I have ever seen conducted into alcohol harm and misuse.

We need to be very clear that what we are targeting here is alcohol harm and misuse and that relates to alcohol addiction. This legislation is another step in the way. The Member for Nelson really surprised me in his contribution to debate. He does not know where we are heading with this.

As a resident of Tennant Creek and the Member for Barkly, I stand here today in this House as a person who has incurred the highest level of restriction on alcohol in the Northern Territory. When I stand in a public forum and face the constituency and look at the responsible drinkers, the people that consume alcohol responsibly, all I have for those constituents is a plea. That plea is, please bear with us, be part of the solution.

This is a government that has engaged in a pathway to reducing alcohol harm and misuse across the Northern Territory. We are under current restrictions that are severe. Bear with us, we will get there. When I talk about alcohol harm and misuse and we have the civil libertarian approach raised in this debate.

From my life experience, 40 years in the Northern Territory and beyond, that it is not about smashing a 30 pack of VB. It is not about drinking yourself to be unconscious. It is not about consuming alcohol to go on wild sprees of crime or assault or domestic violence. It is about having a drink and enjoying alcohol for the purposes of social activity or whatever you like.

It is about normalising the use of alcohol. This is all about trying to get this problem in the Northern Territory, a problem that we have incurred for decades and generations, under control. Our young people will continue to want access to alcohol. Of course, they should be strong in culture so therefore the two, in my opinion, come together.

You have to moderate your alcohol consumption. It is not about abusing alcohol, your culture and your family. This is the same for a white fella. This is not discriminatory, it is about Territorians. It is not appropriate that you should bring harm to your community, family and culture, no matter what culture on earth you represent. It is logical—the legislation passing through is another step in the right direction.

I support the Liquor Amendment Bill 2018. The bill has three main purposes.

The first point is to give the Liquor Commission the power to conduct a public hearing when making variations of a licence on its own initiative. The people of Tennant Creek are awaiting that opportunity. We have seen dramatic changes in our crime stats on domestic violence, assaults against a person, alcohol-related assaults and public drunkenness. We want to get back in front of an authority that licenses the use of alcohol to explain our position. This is a logical step in that direction.

It also represents our government's platform of local decision-making. There is a significant cohort of responsible drinkers in Tennant Creek that want to get back in front of this debate and to be able to show real outcomes and talk through how we can manage this based on local decision-making. It needs to be based on all stakeholders and all residents.

The second point is to clarify the point-of-sale intervention powers given to police officers. I welcome the recruitment and retention of community police officers in Tennant Creek. What this was set up to do was to train a specific, targeted officer in relation to dealing with a specific issue to free up general duty police. General duty police can then concentrate on other aspects of community policing.

We are essentially going to create two teams, but they are actually one team. They are all part of Northern Territory Police. When I say that I am welcoming the recruits to Tennant Creek, I do not just welcome a recruit. I welcome a new family to our community. Every shift that officer will leave their home in a uniform. This sends a clear message of respect—respect your community, yourself and the police. If you moderate alcohol use and use alcohol responsibly, you will not incur any trouble.

The officer will be a respected member of our community. We have a contingency plan for Tennant Creek. I was proud in my electorate office the other day when the boss of the public housing safety officers from Alice Springs brought in two public housing safety officers to meet with me as the local member. I was able to talk to two public housing safety officers about their job and role, our town and what they do.

The real pride came in when I was looking at a young man who I remembered as a student. He was a star football player—he came to Darwin and played in the top-grade AFL league here. He has returned home and is now in uniform as a public housing safety officer. He has his own family. He was able to articulate to me that he wants to make a difference in our town. Do you know the courage that that takes for someone from that cohort?

This is a young man who has put on a uniform and is now supporting public housing tenants and the community. In a peer group of his era—he is going to be up for a lot of challenges. We talked a bit about that. I wish him well.

When you talk about community police officers and public housing safety officers in a town like Tennant Creek where we can identify high-density public housing areas that have been created through poor planning from a previous era, but I will not go into that, you can talk about working together and sharing information and resources. Most importantly, in Tennant Creek you can talk about leaning over the fence and talking to families you know about the issue of alcohol misuse. No one has a problem with people accessing alcohol and no one has a problem with people returning to a public housing dwelling, but those people who chose to smash a 30 pack and get completely wasted, causing community and family harm, will be called out.

We are now putting together the resources that will address this in a logical, coherent way on the streets. I commend our new superintendent of police in Tennant Creek, and the new sergeant. I am looking forward to going on a police foot patrol with those officers. I have invited the Public Housing Safety Officers as well. The electorate officer has already experienced a foot patrol with one of the new sergeants—it is a breath of fresh air, another way of frontline community policing.

As the local member, I am looking forward to my chance to be on foot, walking the streets and visiting public housing tenants—most of whom I know—and talking to them about this changes, what they mean and how they impact on our lives in regard to reducing harm and misuse of alcohol.

Enjoy your lives, have a good time and teach your children well, but if you choose to play up and misuse alcohol, harming the community or your family, you will be dealt with. This is swift and sure. I am looking forward to Tennant Creek setting this model in motion. It applies to Alice Springs, which is a big local town, and to Katherine. These are regional communities. This level of community policing and partnership with Public Housing Safety Officers will be make a difference. I am looking forward to it.

I am doing that in this place, with a government that has had the courage to stand up and conduct an independent review to get the truth out there and tell the hard stories. We are now applying that in legislation to regulate alcohol-related harm and misuse in our community.

To give the police the tools needed to conduct undercover operations to detect breaches of the *Liquor Act*—that outlines to me the issue of secondary supply. I commend the Tennant Creek police. Over the last six months they have conducted successful, big busts of sly grog and drugs coming in to our town and region. These have been significant undercover police operations to unearth mercenary, selfish people who are preying on the vulnerability of others and profiting from the misery of the vulnerable.

These coppers have worked hard to gather the intelligence and plan the sting, and to make sure it is all legal. At the end of the day, that is one of the biggest problems our police face—making sure their work progresses through a court for a just outcome. These things were targeted and they worked. We are talking about significant amounts of grog being picked up.

It is logical when you look at Mount Isa as a city, on the other side of the Queensland border, with easy access by good roads back to Tennant Creek. That will be the temptation, and our police in Tennant Creek and the Barkly are determined to make sure people travel on that route safely and to enjoy their lives and traverse that country for whatever reason, but anybody who is carting grog for sale or to cause misery in vulnerable people's lives will be hit with the hardest hammer of the law. So they should be.

This legislation makes sure that in our legal jurisdiction it is proper, fit and will work. That is why I support this legislation.

It is clear that Territorians are sick of alcohol-fuelled crime and antisocial behaviour. We have seen it for many years and are sick of it. Alcohol is the fuel that sparks most violence and crime in the Northern Territory and that is not in dispute. Every time we get up in this House and talk about alcohol misuse and harm we talk about a bipartisan agreement. Now we just see that there is a bit of division in how we apply it.

Tackling the problems caused by alcohol is a central value of this government and that is clear and centre, and this legislation passing through the Assembly is another step in the implementation of the Riley review to address alcohol misuse and harm.

Without making tough choices on alcohol and what is acceptable in our community, we will continue to spend billions of dollars addressing alcohol harm and misuse through Health, Police and Corrections at the acute end and that will impact on budget repair. It is very clear and members of this House should be very cognisant of that fact.

Without tackling alcohol we will not be able to properly address crime and antisocial behaviour. Without actually tackling alcohol we will continue to see children being neglected and lives wasted. No one in this Parliament can claim that we do not need to address this. No one in this House can claim that any previous government has done enough in this space.

We have a plan and we are implementing it through a number of measures. This bill is but part of that plan. The public hearing amendment part of the bill is relevant to the electorate that I represent where the Liquor Commission last year made changes to licence conditions in Tennant Creek and across the Barkly. Through that period there was some uncertainty about processes for a public hearing and this amendment responds to that.

The changes to licence conditions have been controversial however, the results have not. In Tennant Creek we have seen huge reductions in violent crimes, domestic violence, assaults against the person and presentations to the accident and emergency ward.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition spoke in debate and as usual spoke well, but she challenged measurement. She wanted to see KPIs, she wanted to see numbers on a page, but I would ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition who has resources and flexibility and time that I no longer have, to come and visit our hospital in Tennant Creek. Come and talk to the hospital staff in the accident and emergency ward or the general wards of the hospital. Come and talk to our police and our sobering up shelter. Come and talk about what the changes have been that will represent numbers on a page, but at the moment we are working through some very tough alcohol restrictions that have shown very real results on the ground.

Many Territorians drink responsibly but we all know difficulties that the Territory has with problem drinkers. The cost of alcohol harm to the Northern Territory was reported at \$640m in 2009. I remember that number well because I was in a government that brought in the Enough is Enough alcohol policy.

When as a new parliamentarian and a new minister, when confronted with these numbers, and when I was a person representing the regions in the remote areas and thinking wow, what could I do with \$640m for the bush? Then it made sense that this is an area we have to address. The previous Labor government started to introduce measures to address alcohol harm and misuse and that represented Labor's policy 2008–2012 which was the Enough is Enough policy, where the BDR was but one component of that—and I have spoken at length in this House about that.

Politically it continues to be separated out. It is continuously talked about in the media, in the public and by the Opposition. It cannot be identified as the only tool. It has to be considered in terms of a suite of initiatives that are all working together to reduce alcohol harm and misuse, as it was when it was part of the Enough is Enough strategy, the Enough is Enough policy.

The real action that was taken by a government over those four years heavily criticised by a big heavy-hitting CLP opposition which really played populist politics in that space and used the good old chestnuts of the nanny state and whatever, and really fuelled up those urban and city areas with a sense of discrimination. It was taking away civil rights. It was just one part.

Where it really hit home—and the Member for Blain, of whose contributions I have taken great interest in the last couple of days—has to come back with a self-assessment because, as a Chief Minister, the first minister in this legislature holding the ultimate power, was the guy who basically put the BDR out of business in an email. I was on the end of that.

I was in the Barkly—I have told this story before—when the CLP gained government in 2012—they were as shocked as we were. One of the first actions they initiated by email was, 'Do not worry, the tap is back on, the river is flowing. You do not need any identification to buy grog.' I was at a community function and there was a senior lady I know well and she was clearly intoxicated. I was sad to see that, but I was even sadder when she came to me and thanked me for scrapping the BDR. That was on night one. Then the roadhouses and the wayside inns started to come in with the stories, 'It is all off. It is back on. The BDR is turned off.'

My point in this debate is that we are talking now six years of setback. That political decision set us back six years. I want you to consider in this debate, when we are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars in addressing alcohol harm and misuse, is what should the budget be like today if we had continued in a bipartisan fashion with a bipartisan approach to reducing alcohol harm and misuse? What would the Territory look like today? What would Tennant Creek look like today if we had continued through those years from 2008 to 2012 and 2012 to 2016 with these quite significant reductions in alcohol harm and misuse, domestic

violence, assault against the person, alcohol-related assaults, and presentations to accident and emergency wards across the Northern Territory? What would our Territory society look like today without that setback?

Member for Blain, in the debate, front and centre, you are right. These things politicians do have massive impact. Scrapping of the Enough is Enough legislation set us back decades in addressing this issue. It also has massive fiscal outcomes. Here we are today, still appropriating significant money and frontline services to address alcohol misuse, antisocial behaviour and crime.

That links to property crime. There is no doubt you will experience a period, spike or acceleration in property crime when you confront the addicts. There is no doubt about that. When you grew up in western Sydney and lived through the scourge of drug and alcohol abuse and those completely out-of-control decades of heroin abuse, you come to this parliament with a bit of life experience—some more than others. I tend to think I got more than others.

If you jam the addict, then you will see some serious reaction. Some survive, some do not. But if we had been on track with that policy with a bipartisan approach to alcohol harm and misuse and continued to jam those addicts, we would have a far different Territory now with a far less property crime issue we are trying to resolve. It plays on my mind when I have sat in this House now for 11 years and seen the 10 steps forward, nine steps back. We cannot get away from that issue of alcohol harm and misuse.

Recent research conducted by the Menzies School of Health puts a dollar figure on the social and economic cost of alcohol related harm in the Northern Territory, which has not increased to \$1.38bn per year. How much better would our budget situation be today if we had stayed on track; if we had continued with a bipartisan approach? What happened in reality was a scrapping of a policy was fuelled by populist politics that turned our back on the issue.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition talks about Alcohol Mandatory Treatment. Okay. Let us talk about Alcohol Mandatory Treatment. I will just give you one small example. There are many examples across the Northern Territory of this policy. 'Enough is enough' was scrapped. The Banned Drinker Register—just one in a suite of initiatives in that major policy—was scrapped and Alcohol Mandatory Treatment appeared.

In Tennant Creek—what that meant for our town which had the first night patrol in the world, the first town community that had to look at how they were going to address people who were abusing alcohol, hurting themselves, their families and their culture. The town that had struggled with alcohol abuse through the grog wars and the prohibition of Thirsty Thursday; the town that really had been at the forefront of trying to do something about alcohol harm and misuse and struggled through a number of failed initiatives, gets a new government that says we are taking over your sobering-up shelter.

But hang on a minute, it is brand new. We have just built a new one because we have been living with old infrastructure for decades. We are taking it over and we are going to spend a million-odd dollars securing the place because we are going to put addicts in there. Alright, we will go with it. Suddenly we wake up with no sobering-up shelter so our local police—who for decades had an alternative to people going into the watch house—had nowhere to take people.

We had to scramble. What did that mean? It bounced down the line. My transitional home for prisoners exiting the Barkly Work Camp was taken over. I lost a transitional house. When we lost it, there were six guys living in there, working in Tennant Creek that were exiting the Barkly Work Camp. They were correctional services people that were exiting prison. That house was taken back.

We have a limited sobering-up shelter, we have spent a million dollars on an Alcohol Mandatory Treatment centre and then we wait and see. Who is going in there? I think there were numbers around five or six over a period of 18 months to cut a long story short.

The appropriation in this House, tabled and talked about by the minister, started to round out at about \$4m. I think the government of the day realised enough was enough and so they shut it down. There was 18 months, around \$4m appropriation, the loss of a sobering-up shelter, the loss of my transitional house for correctional services prisoners exiting a prison who had jobs in the town.

We got back to oh well, what we will do is take all your people to Alice Springs. That was the end of that.

Anybody that wants to get up here and talk about the alternative policy—that was the alternative policy in Tennant Creek, one of the toughest towns in the Northern Territory. I challenge the Deputy Leader of the Opposition on Alcohol Mandatory Treatment but I also refer back to the fact that we have lost significant

ground and have incurred significant expense that we are still in the process of trying to get the bull by the horns when really we have to throw a bull by the tail.

Early signs show that this Territory Labor government's reforms are starting to work. We are seeing significant reductions in crime and hospital admissions. The one year review since the Riley review has shown, among other things:

- a 44% reduction in alcohol-related assaults in Alice Springs between September and December 2018 compared to the same period in 2017.
- a 24.5% decrease in alcohol-related emergency department presentations in NT hospitals in 2018 compared to December 2017.

The social and economic benefits are becoming clear. What would our budget situation be today if we had reduced assaults and emergency department presentations six years ago? How much more could our police and health workers done in that time to address other concerns in our community? That relates to the property crime issues we have spoken about.

My time in this debate has come to an end. I support the legislation. I ask every member of this House to support it too. This is not the end of the story as it will go on. The implementation of the Riley review will take significant legislative change.

I compliment the minister because when you sit in Cabinet and caucus to debate this stuff, when you go through hard yards and take the hard hits, and when you accept the fact that you have to be in the tent to really make a difference, that is what I am proud of. It is the message I send to my grandchildren. The minister, with a dedicated and focused Department of Attorney-General and Justice and the Office of Parliamentary Counsel, is on track to get the Northern Territory back on track in addressing one of the radical scourges in our community: the misuse of alcohol.

Mr McCONNELL (Stuart): Mr Deputy Speaker, I am a great believer in setting an example. I challenge this place to set an example. Alcohol is regularly served in this building. I believe alcohol is still served on the 5th floor at media drinks from time to time, is it not? Why do we set an example by not serving alcohol in this building as a regular occurrence? There might be an occasion when it might happen.

Alcohol is a problem in the Northern Territory community. I have had issues with my alcohol consumption during periods of my life. My brother passed away predominantly from his issues with alcohol consumption. Many of my constituents have issues with their alcohol consumption. Let us lead by example. It might help.

Recently there were some fairly serious leaks that resulted in some people being removed from the caucus—removed from the tent, so to speak. Apparently that was leaked by someone else. When the media was spoken to about that, the very person from the media who broke the story to the community said that the leak came from the 5th floor. Maybe if we helped people control those urges by reducing their consumption of alcohol at official events, that might really help.

Let us look at doing some of those things. People can smirk, snicker and carry on all they like about this. The issues are very real. You are talking about passing legislation here to allow police to covertly track people down and accuse them of purveying alcohol to cause harm. People have consumed alcohol to cause harm in this very place.

While I catch my breath, I refer to my wife of 17 years today, Kathy McConnell. Thank you Kathy for all your support, including writing the notes I am using today. Kathy is currently in the building enduring today's debate. I thank you for that on our 17th anniversary.

This is ongoing fiddling with alcohol policy to correct bad legislation. We are not dealing with the causes of alcohol abuse, we are dealing with the symptoms. The symptoms of lack of social inclusions, of lack of economic inclusion, and of not treating Aboriginal people as our equals on every measure, not just the measures this or other governments choose to measure them on.

The truth is, we have alcohol law in the Northern Territory that is based on race. There is a law in Alice Springs, and indeed in other parts of the Territory, that I believe is still on the statutes. It is referred to as the two kilometre law, where you cannot consume alcohol in public within two kilometres of where it is sold, except the Telegraph Station—where the white people drink. I was a ranger there for a number of years. Some of the behaviour I saw at events was deplorable. It was disgusting. It was bikie groups, people having

their end-of-year sporting events, car clubs doing burnouts on the lawn, all sorts of things. But it was all right, because they were white folk.

Meanwhile, Aboriginal people who were drinking—also to dangerous levels—had been pushing into the shrubbery in the backstreets. It is disgraceful.

The fact that law—that racially discriminatory law—is still on our statutes is a blight on us all. The two kilometre law was one of the first significant laws that reinforced covert drinking. People thought it worked because it hid the problem. However, it encouraged more and more dangerous drinking. There was literally nowhere in Alice Springs that people could legally consume alcohol responsibly. The pubs and clubs did not make them comfortable.

Do you know where people were? They were drinking on the side of Anzac Hill and the little valley where no one could see them. What happened when domestic violence took place there? Could the ambulance or police get there? In more recent times were you able to make a call from a mobile? No. This is not acceptable.

I think I have told this story before, about a senior police representative coming to Napperby, where I grew up, where Laramba community is, in the late 1970s. It was not very long after self-government, around 40 years ago.

This senior police officer talked to the community—we are talking about a very traditional community back then—about the issue that alcohol was here to stay. We were well after the equal wage decision and the 1967 referendum. The police officer explained to the community that alcohol was here to stay because people had citizenship rights, which included the ability to consume alcohol, but also the expectation to consume it responsibly.

The minister for Housing, the Member for Barkly, has rightly said there have been some great policies at times that have been interfered with over generations. I agree with the referral of previous Labor policy. I quite liked an earlier CLP policy that was around in the 1990s, but I cannot remember what it was called.

Mr McCarthy: Living with Alcohol.

Mr McCONNELL: That is right. We had the Living with Alcohol policy for a time in the Territory. There were aspects of it that did not work very well, but it was there. Others in this place may know more about this policy, so thank you, Member for Barkly.

Now we have a situation where many people in the Northern Territory believe the abuse of alcohol is distinctly Aboriginal people. This is widely held in Alice Springs, Katherine and Tennant Creek. We have police auxiliaries on bottle shops, but are the issues not similar in Palmerston and Darwin, where we do not have police auxiliaries on bottle shops? It is interesting.

Abuse of alcohol occurs when people are not included in society, where there is no economic inclusion, where levels of education are poor or where people feel completely disenfranchised or powerless. This legislation does not alleviate any of these causes of alcoholism or alcohol abuse.

The alcohol policy that prioritises the expenditure of \$15m in ongoing commitment to put police—albeit auxiliaries—at the front of bottle shops has definitely been prioritised over resourcing remote police stations. That cannot be denied and it can be presented in evidence with the operation of the police station at Alpurrurulam and facilities at Haasts Bluff and Willowra. I am interested that there is this priority. I understand the dangers of alcohol, but this is prioritising of police in urban places over police in remote bush areas.

Once again, we continue to try to move the problem out of sight instead of trying to address the causes of the problem. It must also be stated that this policy is based on race. I will be very careful in the words I choose, because I respect the need for alcohol policy and review of policy and the role of police officers in administering the laws they are given.

I understand police officers and auxiliaries are being asked to implement a policy they did not design. I believe they are doing that to the best of their ability. I believe they have tried to put a framework in place to best implement the policy. I am in no way suggesting that police are inherently racist, but I believe the police in front of bottle shops policy is. This policy began under a previous Labor government. The idea was to place police officers at the front of bottle shops, particularly during major events. This was a good policy of police at the front of bottle shops when there was a major event such as the Lighting carnival in Alice Springs which attracted community people from around Central Australia and the Barkly. That policy was good.

The policy of the BDR that was also implemented by the previous Labor government, I strongly believe is good policy. There are people in this Chamber who will not agree with me. The CLP removed this overnight and it was extremely foolish to do so. After the ensuing chaos, the CLP put police at the front of bottle shops permanently without a legislative framework to do so and without consideration of the budgetary implications. In fact, there are still budgetary implications on the Territory police force now as a result of the way the idea of putting police at the front of bottle shops permanently in those three remote towns was very poorly implemented.

Labor promised to reinstate the BDR and the Riley review—and I support the majority of its findings—was a priority of this government. The implementation of the recommendations of this Riley review continues to be a priority.

I will not refer to the clause in what the Riley review says because I do not have it in front of me, but the Riley review did not say, 'put police at the front of bottle shops'. It says 'uniformed licence inspectors'. When I was in the tent and I took this issue to task when I heard about police at the front of bottle shops—I think I heard about it at 8 o'clock in the morning and the media were already texting me to ask what it was about, this was a Saturday morning briefing of Caucus, when I was in the tent—that was the first I heard about police being at the front of bottle shops. That was about the first I heard about \$14.4m being spent to put police auxiliaries at the front of bottle shops.

The interesting thing about that is what point is the BDR in those communities where we have police at the front of bottle shops? You go in, you go through the process, especially if you are Aboriginal, of having the police officer look at your licence, enter data in to an iPad that the police officer has—normally they will not tell you why they are entering that data or for what purpose because they are just too busy entering the data—then you have gone through that process and then you go in and you still have to put your licence on the scanner. Make your mind up. You are committed to the BDR or you are not.

You are committed to an alcohol policy that is the same across the jurisdiction or you are not. You are committed to special measures where the population is predominantly Aboriginal and then almost no measures in the places where the population is not Aboriginal. That is fine if that is the way you do business. Get on with it and do business that way. Do not come and stand in this place and tell us about how socially progressive and committed you are to good outcomes for everyone. We do not believe you.

This policy of police at the front of bottle shops is a CLP policy. The ALP policy was to put police at bottle shops when there is a major event on to not put police at the front of bottle shops all the time as some sort of permanent policy to the cost of \$15m to implement it and then \$11m to continue to follow it up in the subsequent years.

It appears to my constituents that police at front of bottle shops is more important than police in their community. I have repeatedly spoken about this. It appears to my constituents and others' constituents in this place that Aboriginal people are being treated differently by police at the front of bottle shops. I again stand in defence of police, they are doing their best to implement what is an appalling policy. So they do their best.

I can absolutely tell you that you can talk to a wide percentage of people in Alice Springs, or the other two communities affected by this policy, and they will tell you that it is quite regular that Aboriginal people get stopped and non-Aboriginal people do not get stopped.

I have been not believed in this place before, and in the status that has been given to me by being elected to this place, so go out and talk to those people. Those people want to hear you talk to them, they want to hear you justify your position that these special measures like this are acceptable.

Are they acceptable when your whole views that you are from the progressive pride of politics, you are from the side of politics that treats people as equals and where they have individual rights and responsibilities, but then you are going to put special measures in place that racially profile them at the front of bottle shops.

I am not just making this allegation. This is happening every day. It is probably happening while we speak. I would say it is almost certainly happening while we speak.

I acknowledge that aspects of police at the front of bottle shops works. The strongest advocate for police at the front of bottle shops is the Member for Araluen. I have had a lot of discussions about the fact that we differ on this point—and dramatically differ on this point.

Do you know why we differ on this point? I sincerely believe that we should be treating people on the way that they behave as individuals and we should implement policies that penalise people that do not behave properly but also do not affect people that do.

I am not saying that the Member for Araluen contravenes those views, she holds a different set of views, but she is honest about those views. What bothers me is the dishonesty of the views coming from what is now the other side.

I said the Riley review does not say police at the front of bottle shops and I was told that I was wrong. Can I not read?

The Riley review does not say police out the front of bottle shops. Am I correct?

Mrs Lambley: Correct.

Mr McCONNELL: That is correct. That is the treatment I got when I was in the tent, 'No, you are wrong. Here it is on paper in front of you, but you are wrong.' I was not wrong.

Stand by your convictions. If you want to justify police at the front of bottle shops, do it. Do not tell fibs. Do not claim to be socially progressive and hold these values of equality, because you do not.

I know about the issues of alcohol in the Northern Territory. I can tell you so many personal accounts, like everyone in here can, about the terrible things alcohol and its misuse has inflicted on our citizens, our culture and our country—the Territory—which we love. I can tell you that we need to work on them and that we need temporary measures from time to time, like police at the front of bottle shops when there is a major event on, and that we need regulatory review and new legislation, which is in the Riley review.

Be truthful about how you are implementing it. Justify your position. Do not lie about your position—sorry, you are not allowed to call people liars. I withdraw 'lie'.

Do not claim one thing when it is clearly not the case. If you have a position to justify putting police at the front of bottle shops, do it in a clear and concise way. Say why you are implementing something that is not in the Riley review, why you need to take the extra measures and what it is. It is not to do with the implications of cost. It is to do with the fact you have been influenced by external parties because you got concerned about it politically. You were concerned about the political mileage that has been made on this policy of police in front of bottle shops.

The people you are reaching out to in order to overcome that political problem probably do not even vote for you. They probably vote for the conservative side of politics. The people who supported equity and equality in the way we treat people in bottle shops voted for the Members for Stuart, Namatjira and Barkly. These people you are reaching out to by implementing a CLP policy did not vote for you, and they probably will not vote for you.

What is the point of that? Why are you burning political capital to implement the other side's policy? I do not get it. I am supposed to be a political naive, but what is going on? It is extraordinary.

The number one thing I campaigned on, which those of you now on the other side are aware of, particularly the leadership team—the Attorney-General, Chief Minister and Deputy Chief Minister—was to bring back the Banned Drinker Register. It is fair to everyone across the Territory, whether you are in Darwin, Palmerston or Alice Springs. It is fair whether you are a white fella like me or an Aboriginal person. You put your licence on the machine and it gives you a red screen or a green screen.

You are not profiled at the front of the bottle shop or treated differently because you live in Katherine, where there is a high percentage of Aboriginal people, or because you live in Darwin, where the percentage of Aboriginal is lower.

That is not the policy that progressive governments implement. That is a policy of the CLP government. You have actually picked up and turned it into law, because the CLP government did not have the guts to create the laws and support the policy it rolled out. What we are talking about today is one of those laws to roll this policy out. What message does this send to that third of the Northern Territory that are Aboriginal people, particularly if they live in the remote area and feel like they are not getting equality of service or that they are not engaged in the future to such a level that they are not getting their children to school in the numbers we

need. What message do you think this is sending? 'We have special measures for you where the people of your type—where your population is high, we have special measures'.

Because there is a big mob of Aboriginal people in Alice Springs, Tennant Creek and Katherine, there are special measures for the people there. People that I know who live in Katherine, who are Aboriginal and who have worked all their lives, get stopped at the bottle shop. White fellas are cruising through. Katherine is the place where it has been probably implemented most fairly.

You will see in the media coverage that there are issues in Katherine because there have been line-ups where the police auxiliaries are checking everyone's license. They are doing it very evenly. This is causing frustration because the queues can be quite considerable as everyone tends to buy their alcohol at the same time of day. There might be a big queue out the door.

This is not happening in Alice Springs. What happens in Alice Springs is usually that white fellas can cruise on in. But if you appear to be Aboriginal you will almost certainly get stopped. I am not making this up or trying to be difficult. I am telling you what is going on in our Territory, that people will support my position and that we need to better.

If there are special things that we need to roll out from time to time, we need to explain them well—much better than you are doing. We need to explain why we have to do them. We need to demonstrate that there is an equity of service delivery.

We are still the beneficiary of funds from the Commonwealth to support policing resources in the Northern Territory. That amount of resources is being withdrawn over time and there will be an issue going forward. We had a policy of where those police resources were to be deployed that was modified by the previous CLP government just before it lost power to allow flexibility. They had to fill a hole that they generated through the overtime cost of putting police on the front of bottle shops, which they had not funded.

Have we returned those resources to the bush? Have we returned those resources to Alpururulam or Willowra? Not to my knowledge. I tried for months to get a clear idea of what the Police resourcing would be in the electorate of Stuart, as well as other electorates. I never got it and I still do not have it. I still have no idea what is going to happen to the former Operation Themis police stations, which were funded under the Intervention. There are a number of them in my electorate. I have no idea what is going to happen to them.

I made suggestions in writing. I reviewed my notes on those suggestions before making this speech, I could not get any feedback on it. The priority is, 'We have police on the front of bottle shops and we have trained this many police auxiliaries. They are not really police officers, they are focused on something different. They have this yellow thing on their sleeve that identifies them as police auxiliaries rather than police officers.'

Everyone recognises those people as police officers and rightly so. They are police officers. I hope that the Police Minister is correct in that a number of the people recruited progress on to other careers in the police force. I sincerely hope they do. I am trying to bring a level of honesty to this place.

Other than kicking the CLP a couple of times in the guts when they probably deserved it in my speech, I did not spend ages talking about how bad they were. But Labor has been in power now for two-and-a-half years. The CLP were in power for only four years and Labor was in power for 11 before that. There is no need to talk about that. No one is switching on their radio listening to parliamentary times because we are rubbishing the CLP. The Territory rubbished the CLP and they did a really good job of it in August 2016. Let us move on, guys. My constituents want us to move on.

My constituents want to know that they will not have issues at the bottle shop and end up having their relationships with police deteriorate where they are calling the police 'blue dogs' because they are sitting at the front of the police stations—sitting around like a blue dog. I do not want my constituents talking about police like that. I want my constituents to value the Northern Territory Police Force as we all do.

Yes, aspects of police at the front of bottle shops work, but it is at an extremely high cost. I note that racism in Alice Springs has been in the international and national media recently with regard to a hotel in Alice Springs and that guests at that hotel are racially profiled. That is disgraceful. But what is more disgraceful is when my constituents are racially profiles at the front of a bottle shop by a person bearing the authority of this government.

Mrs LAMBLEY (Araluen): Mr Deputy Speaker, this afternoon I talk on the Liquor Amendment Bill 2018. The most effective strategy I have seen in combatting the harm of alcohol has been the police outside bottle

shops. I have listened to the Member for Stuart very intently. I agree with him—the way it is implemented is racist and wrong. I have always maintained that.

The government needs to have a very close look at just what the police auxiliaries are now doing outside bottle shops. I have had a spate of complaints from constituents within my electorate of Araluen in Alice Springs complaining of people being asked before they even get into the supermarket which houses the bottle shop who they are, what they intend to buy, how much do they intend to buy and who will be drinking it. There are all sorts of issues occurring.

Yes, the Member for Stuart is right—nine times out of 10 it is Aboriginal people who currently are being asked to provide identification when they present at a bottle shop in which a police auxiliary is present. That is wrong. I have seen it, just like the Member for Stuart described. I feel embarrassed when I am not asked, yet the person in front of me who is Aboriginal and the person behind me who is Aboriginal are asked for identification. It is wrong and it should have been addressed a long time ago. I have been talking about this for years. I am surprised it has not changed. Perhaps that is a message the government could take away from today—to ensure that the way in which this policy is implemented is not racist and everyone is randomly asked to provide their identification and answer questions about their purchase of alcohol.

I do not particularly like the whole idea of being asked for that information when I buy alcohol. I have never liked the Banned Drinker Register—it is an imposition and an invasion. So is police outside of bottle shops or the PALI service, as they now call it. I do not like those types of policies and strategies. I do not like anyone's human rights being infringed upon in that way. But I believe that police outside bottle shops has been the most effective strategy we have seen in Alice Springs.

That has been proven very clearly by the fact that it was not implemented in its full capacity for over two years after the election of the Gunner government. If you want to prove if something is working or not, the best way to do it often is to stop doing it and measure the fallout of it not being in place. That is exactly what happened with the police outside bottle shops.

I have talked about this twice already in parliament this week; this is the third time that I am talking about this issue. It is extremely important to put on the public record that this government decided that it was not necessary to have police outside all of the bottle shops 100% of the time. Over the last two and a half years, we saw the impact of that which has been profound.

We saw the rivers of grog flowing freely in Alice Springs virtually within months of this Gunner government coming to power. The crime statistics reflect that antisocial behaviour and crime escalated over the last two and a half years as a direct result of the police not being outside all the bottle shops in Alice Springs 100% of the time.

That is evidence. We hear this government talk a lot about evidence-based policy and strategy and approaches. There is your evidence very clearly. We in Alice Springs, have paid the price of your lack of adherence and respect to a policy and an approach that has been highly effective.

The Member for Stuart labelled it as a CLP policy. It started off as a Labor policy but the former CLP government embraced it. For the four years that they were in power, they made sure in Alice Springs, that every bottle shop was covered 100% of the time. That is why it was so effective.

It is racist in the way it is implemented so I do not take exception to the Member for Stuart saying that. That is the truth. What also is racist about alcohol policy in the Northern Territory is that probably over 90% of the landmass is subjected to alcohol prohibition. That is racist and that causes a lot of problems for everyone.

I tend to sit on the fence on this issue because I can see why people living in remote communities, particularly women and children, do not want to have access to alcohol on their communities because of all the problems that go with it but equally you have a situation where all those people living in areas in which alcohol prohibition exists, they pour into places like Alice Springs and Tennant Creek and Katherine and they enjoy having free access to alcohol.

It is a perfectly normal thing to do. It is not illegal to drink alcohol. It is not illegal to enjoy a drink and they should not necessarily be denied access to alcohol while they are in town. The fact that they can only access it while they are in these regional centres becomes a problem because they have nowhere to drink it.

We also have alcohol-free areas in Alice Springs: houses, town camps and various places. We have the two kilometre law which the Member for Stuart mentioned before. People come into town from alcohol prohibition

areas, they want to enjoy a drink and they literally have nowhere to drink it and the problems unfold from there. That is a racist situation if you want to put it like that.

I do not know what you do about it but if you are going to talk about racism, let us be frank, it is more than just having police outside bottle shops and it not being implemented fairly. It is about a whole system that has been constructed over decades to basically protect Aboriginal people from the evil effects of alcohol. For good reasons these strategies and policies have been put in place but if you are going to be perfectly honest, they are racist.

The discussion regarding the Riley review always intrigues me because when it was first delivered a couple of years ago in 2017 immediately the government decided not to accept one of the recommendations, but that seems to have dropped off from the discussion. It seems to have slipped out of the narrative. Like the Member for Stuart said, having police outside bottle shops was also not a recommendation of the Riley review, yet we hear this sort of mantra that the government has commissioned this independent review into alcohol, it is all evidence-based and they are here to roll it out in its purest form, when that is not the case. You have two fairly clear examples of where the government has decided they know best.

I do not necessarily have a problem with that. I have a problem with the insincerity of the government using the Riley review as this sort of Bible of how we will solve the problems of alcohol-related harm in the Northern Territory. I do not have a problem with commissioning reviews and then deciding what will and will not work. This carte blanche acceptance of all recommendations of all reviews is not very smart. There are other recommendations in the Riley review that are not necessarily brilliant either. Reviews should be putting context in a timely basis. It is not just about blindly accepting everything because these people were commissioned to do a piece of work.

I maintain that although the people who undertook the Riley review were indeed distinguished professionals; I do not think they were experts in alcohol or harm reduction at all. I do not think any of them really had specific credentials or experience in this area. They were three esteemed people who took on a piece of work, and they came out with some interesting recommendations. For that I respect them. I read the report very closely. They have made a significant contribution to this debate, but not everything they recommended was brilliant. This is where this government is proving to have made some mistakes. We have seen this with the recommendations with the Royal Commission into the Protection and Detention of Children in the Northern Territory, the fact that they now seem to be withdrawing from the recommendation in the report that they build new youth detention centres.

To blindly accept that meant you were blindly accepting an investment of \$70m or more, which we clearly cannot afford. They have realised that is impractical, possibly, unless they want to send us further into debt. They are now reviewing their commitment to that particular recommendation. There will be many other recommendations of that Royal Commission that over time they will realise are extremely difficult to implement, from a financial perspective and many other perspectives, as things evolve in that space.

Going back to alcohol strategy and policy of the Northern Territory, I do not have any great objections to the amendments in this bill. I think it makes perfect sense for the Liquor Commission to be able to hold public hearings and the police or inspectors to stop vehicles and have an increase in their intervention powers, that their powers be better defined and that police can be involved in undercover operations regarding alcohol. Those things are probably being done already by the police to some extent, apart from the public hearings.

I was invited to a hearing of licensees last year by a group of licensees, who asked me to meet with the Liquor Commission. I remember that one of the commissioners was quite contrite about the fact that the Member for Araluen had turned up to the hearing. There were other people there at the meeting who were not licensees, but the commissioner made a rude comment to me about my attendance at the meeting.

The Chair went on to say that they would like to have the provision in place allowing them to have hearings as it sees fit, allowing all people to come along and be involved in discussions on changes to licensing. These things are in and of themselves fairly inoffensive to me.

But, like a lot of people this afternoon, there are broader issues that this type of legislation raises for me. There are all sorts of things that the government and the Liquor Commission are considering for my town of Alice Springs, as well as others more broadly across the Northern Territory, which I take exception to. I do not think they are good policies.

One of the more offensive things that is on the table, and was a part of the Riley review, is to introduce the 15% cap on alcohol sales for mixed businesses such as supermarkets. The government has conceded to

increasing that to 25%. But the evidence from the Lhere Artepe group of supermarkets, that had independent work done on this, demonstrated that this will make the three Aboriginal owned and controlled IGA supermarkets financially unviable. They will close as they will not be able to sustain that level of control on their alcohol sales.

Effectively a 25% cap on alcohol sales will mean that people in Alice Springs will be buying their alcohol from Woolworths and Coles. There is an anti-competition flavour to this. It seems morally and ethically wrong that people should be pushed to purchase alcohol from those places that will virtually not be affected by this. When you are turning over millions and millions of dollars in the sale of food, a 25% cap on alcohol will mean nothing to Coles and Woolworths.

That is an example of a bad policy that we are told is on the way. It will affect not just those business, but it will affect the people's livelihoods and the way they go about everyday business in a place like Alice Springs. The three Lhere Artepe IGAs are where people go to buy a carton of beer, a bottle of milk and whatever. The Attorney-General says that these places were designed to sell food and should not be selling alcohol. They have sold alcohol for many years.

The way we go about business in Alice Springs is that the people who live in the neighbourhoods where there small mixed businesses, not just the Lhere Artepe businesses—as there about eight similar mixed stores. They have become part of the lifestyle of the neighbourhoods in which they exist—the patterns of purchasing behaviour of buying food and alcohol in those parts of Alice Springs.

The other thing I spoke about yesterday that I find completely disturbing is the idea of bottle shops being required to identify suspicious transactions. As I outlined yesterday in parliament, those suspicious transactions are:

... sales to an individual in excess of two cartons of full-strength beer, six 750 millilitre bottles of wine, two 750 millilitre bottles of spirits, or 24 cans or bottles of ready-to-drink mixers.

Welcome to the nanny state of western world. If you go into an alcohol outlet or a takeaway liquor outlet in Alice Springs soon, you are likely to be identified as having a suspicious transaction if you buy those sorts of quantities or more of that alcohol.

An intrusion into the privacy of all individuals. This does not target anyone it is targeting the average person who might decide rather than go to the bottle shop once a week, they will go once a month. It is ridiculous. It is a broad brush approach that does not target drunks or grog runners. It targets a lot of people who are responsible drinkers.

I take great exception to this type of broad brush approach to alcohol strategies. The Banned Drinker Register has always been contentious, in contrast of having police outside of bottle shops, it has been ineffectual. When it first came in it did not have any great benefit in Alice Springs because of the secondary sale of alcohol. The habitual drunks in my part of the world were very quick to work out that they might be denied service at the counter but they could get someone else to buy it for them. That is exactly what they did.

It was ineffectual, particularly when you compare it to the effectiveness of having police outside of bottle shops. I listened to the Member for Barkly talk about having a bipartisan approach to alcohol. In an ideal world that makes perfect sense—it would be lovely if we all agreed on the same strategies. I am glad that we have come to a point in history where both sides of politics seem to agree that in Katherine, Tennant Creek and Alice Springs, having police outside bottle shops does work and is effective.

The fact that assaults are starting to go down in Alice Springs is a very good sign. The reduction in assaults correlates with the introduction of 100% police coverage outside of bottle shops at the end of last year. That is good news but we still have major problems with crime in Alice Springs. Nine times out of 10 you can safely attribute alcohol to crime either directly or indirectly in Alice Springs.

During the last calendar year compared to the previous calendar year we have had an 83% increase in house break-ins in Alice Springs. This is an astronomical increase in house break-ins. Motor vehicle thefts are up by 55% and commercial break-ins are up by 14%.

You have this slight reduction in assaults in Alice Springs but you have this massive increase in thefts and break-ins. That is about a community that was left with the rivers of grog flowing freely for those two years. Slowly we have seen increasing crime which correlated with the police not being outside of the bottle shops

and it is still spiking now. That two years in which the police were not outside the grog shops 100% of the time has been a social and economic disaster for Alice Springs.

Talking about bipartisan support, why did the government not come in and listen to the people of Alice Springs, Katherine and Tennant Creek in 2016? Why did they think that taking away that particular strategy—or just relaxing it, they did not take it away—would be a good thing for our town? I could never forgive this government for doing that because we were on a positive trajectory and doing well. Crime was seeming to be under control and there were positive signs up until the Chief Minister decided that it was an operational issue and was not up to him to tell the police force to provide 100% coverage outside of bottle shops.

He took no responsibility for that. Police decided that it was far too busy to provide that service. Alas, this is situation we are in.

Bipartisan support goes both ways. The CLP threw out the Banned Drinker Register in 2012 primarily because it was not showing results. It brought in the alcohol mandatory treatment. The Gunner government came in and threw out alcohol mandatory treatment and reintroduced the Banned Drinker Register and relaxed the police outside of bottle shops. But it has come around to working out what really works for places like Alice Springs. It is obviously the nature of politics. It is nonsensical and irrational why some of these decisions were made.

I take up the suggestion the Member for Stuart made earlier that our Northern Territory parliament becomes grog free. What a great and fabulous idea. It would put to bed any suggestion that this government is hypocritical when it comes to grog. Parliament is run by the Legislative Assembly, but I am sure if the government for making a big decision on making all of Parliament House alcohol free it would send a strong signal to the whole of the Northern Territory that we are imposing strict grog restrictions on you and on ourselves. That makes perfect sense to me.

I would support any attempt to bring in an alcohol-free zone to the Northern Territory parliament.

Ms UIBO (Education): Madam Speaker, I support the Liquor Amendment Bill 2018, serial 74, which contains important measures with the intent to create safer communities across the Northern Territory.

The bill further demonstrates the Gunner Labor government's commitment to reduce alcohol-related harm in the Northern Territory. Even though it may prove difficult and unpopular at times, we have committed to drive significant reform and change in order to create safer communities across the Northern Territory.

There is no quick fix in the policy area relating to alcohol. It is critical that we have suite of measures that remain contextual and relevant to curb problem drinking in order drive a decrease in antisocial behaviour in our Territory communities whether they be urban, rural or remote.

In the lead up to the last election we were clear that the Gunner Labor government would use evidence-based approaches to tackle alcohol-related harm and that we were prepared to make tough decisions where necessary. I thank the Attorney-General for leading this much needed reform and pushing through its implementation through our government. I thank her for her hard work.

We all know that the Territory faces high levels of harmful drinking and that alcohol consumed on average in Territory is amongst the highest in the world per capita. This is a shocking statistic considering that we have a population of 245 000 Territorians. Such levels of alcohol consumption have serious impacts on our economy and the wellbeing of our society as a whole. It creates a high level of burdens on our health resources and increases violence, particularly domestic, family and sexual violence in the Territory.

A large portion of Police time and resources are needed to be committed in the effort to keep our committee safe from the negative consequences and harmful levels of excessive alcohol consumption that we see in the Territory. In the home environment, heavy drinking can increase the burden on families and communities. Family budgets are impact and kids lose sleep and are less likely to be school-ready the next day. Health issues commonly follow from excessive alcohol use. These can have further consequences and impacts on the family as a unit.

Managing excessive and poorly controlled alcohol consumption is one of the major social challenges facing the entire Northern Territory. As a government we are leading in this space. We heard earlier today in Question Time from the Attorney-General, who is also the Minister for Health, the award the Northern Territory Government has received very recently in regards to the national context of alcohol reduction and

the stringent and holistic measures that have been taken by the Territory government. Thank you for sharing that information Attorney-General.

As the Member for Arnhem, the impact of alcohol on the communities and constituents I represent is sadly all too well known. One of the key things we see in alcohol-related issues is deaths on our roads. This is a very sombre and morbid topic but one that is very important.

People dying on our roads due to excessive alcohol consumption is something that is preventable and that for me is one of the saddest things that we experience. I am very passionate about it and it affects not only the immediate family but the extended family, friends and the entire community when we lose one of our Territorians due to drink driving.

Another thing that affects us in the Arnhem electorate is alcohol fuelled violence and crime. Thirdly, sly grog, secondary supply and the impact on communities that do not want to have alcohol as an issue. Sly grog is something that can be prevented.

As the Minister for Education, I am deeply invested in safer communities as they inevitably result in our children attending school more regularly, being able to learn and reach their potential. In my role as Minister for Workforce Training, there will be an impact on the quality of training outcomes and the potential to gain employment if we follow the clear recommendations presented in the Riley report and implement those as a government. We need to have those conversations in our communities about the benefits of safe drinking, reducing alcohol consumption for the individual and the family and the community around them.

Our Labor government's response to the Riley review, where we decided to re-establish an independent Liquor Commission, was a significant turning point in addressing alcohol management. We agreed to a community impact test for significant liquor licencing decisions and we extended and expanded the moratorium on all new takeaway licences.

We are clearly very different to the previous CLP government who thought that alcohol was not an issue and allowed licences to come and go as anyone pleases and did not mitigate and reduce the impact on our communities by looking at this obvious area for reform of liquor licencing. I thank the Attorney-General for her work in this space. It is not an easy thing when we are talking about businesses but we are talking about being responsible with the way that alcohol is accessed and served in the Northern Territory to reduce those harmful impacts on our communities.

This Labor government has made the tough decisions that need to be made and we are prepared to take things to the next level to deliver safer communities that Territorians want and deserve. The first element of this bill relates to given the Liquor Commission the power to conduct a public hearing when exercising its power to vary a licence under section 33 of the *Liquor Act*.

Having the power to conduct public hearings where necessary and ultimately varying a licence is an important step in listening to the community and seeing decisions which are reflective of the community's perspective. The public hearing process will allow the Liquor Commission to test public interest and ensure the perspective of the community is heard.

In order to achieve this the commission may choose to publish notices and invite individuals or organisations to make submissions to attend the hearing. This is in keeping with the government's strategic approach around local decision making and that the community will now have the capacity to contribute to the Liquor Commission's considerations as to whether it should vary a licence and ultimately the conditions whereby alcohol is available to members of that community and any visitors to our communities.

Alcohol management is a complex issue but it can be less so if we listen to our community members who are best placed to inform what is necessary to understand for that particular community context.

Aside from the bill, issues that are of concern in the Arnhem electorate about alcohol management plans is the strong opposition we have in our Northern Territory Senator and the federal Minister for Indigenous Affairs in allowing our Aboriginal communities to decide and speak up for themselves about what they want to do to tackle alcohol in our remote and very remote communities.

These alcohol management plans that some communities have waited for months and years to be looked at by Senator Scullion are still waiting to hear from his office and from him personally as a Northern Territory Senator. This is the frustration we have as hard working local members and members of the Legislative Assembly that we still have people in our communities who are disempowered by this process. It is up to the

individual who is the Northern Territory representative in our federal parliament who refuses to support Aboriginal communities deciding for themselves with these alcohol management plans.

This is something that I will continue to work on as the local Member for Arnhem and in my role as the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs to be able to support communities to look at what they want to do with their own individualised alcohol management plans. We have not seen any support from Senator Scullion in regards to alcohol management plans in our Aboriginal communities. Shame on him!

Getting back to this bill, the second element is clarifying police powers in relation to the point of sale interventions. There is no doubt that amendments to the *Liquor Act* which came to effect in June last year have complimented the Banner Drinker Register in providing strong point of sale interventions in the immediate vicinity of the licenced premises.

The Member for Araluen spoke about the Labor government coming into effect in August 2016, changing these rules and taking police away from bottle shops. In Katherine, my home town, and the Member for Katherine's home town, this has not been the case at all. There has not been a gap in between seeing police at bottle shops and being an immediate point of intervention for the point of sales.

The Member for Katherine was speaking while the Member for Araluen was saying this, that this was not the case in our home town of Katherine. We have seen the support and the operations of the police have been determined by the police and we have not seen a gap in that service. I cannot speak for Tennant Creek or Alice Springs—I do not have the knowledge or experience in those areas—but it is definitely not the case in Katherine township.

In regards to the second element of the bill, it has allowed police officer or liquor inspectors to ask questions of people appearing to purchase or intending to purchase alcohol as to where alcohol is to be consumed. Whether it be purchasing from another person or whether that person is on the Banned Drinker Register. The proposed amendments will allow police or liquor inspectors to exercise these powers after alcohol has been purchased and will extend to having the power to stop a car and ask the same questions of the driver and passengers in that car.

In tightening up this element of the *Liquor Act*, we are further restricting the flow of alcohol where it is deemed to be consumed by a banned drinker or likely to be taken to a community where the alcohol is not welcome and can potentially cause harm.

Territorians want productive safe and happy communities. At the same time, there is a higher than acceptable level of alcohol-fuelled violence and antisocial behaviour experienced across the Territory. As I said earlier, there is no single solution or quick fix regarding this that will prevent what is simply not acceptable in our community. The Territory Labor government is prepared to do whatever is necessary in order to create these necessary measures to limit the supply of alcohol where it results in the reduction of harm for Territorians and visitors.

This government has not shied away from any of these hard decisions, and will continue to make hard decisions and implement these in order to develop and refine the suite of measures that are necessary to improve the quality of life across the Northern Territory. We have had support from the opposition for many of the measures contained in the Liquor Amendment Bill 2018. I hope they continue to support these very important changes to the Territory in order to improve the quality of life of Territorians and Territory businesses, which rely so much on tourism and visitors boosting the Territory economy.

I support the Attorney-General when she urges all in the Chamber to work together to tackle the unacceptably high levels of alcohol consumption we see and hear about in the Territory, and can experience in our electorates and communities. I urge all members to get on board. I commend this bill to the House.

Ms AH KIT (Karama): Madam Speaker, I also contribute to the debate on the Liquor Amendment Bill and thank the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice for bringing this important bill to the House. The bill introduces another tranche of changes to continue our government's reform of alcohol policy to address the huge detrimental impact alcohol has on many Territorians.

The bill has four purposes. The first will allow the Liquor Commission to hold public hearings as part of the process to vary conditions of an existing licence. The second is to add two circumstances where a person possesses liquor and will be subject to the provisions of point of sale interventions. The third will provide a power for police or inspectors to stop a vehicle and give reasonable directions to the driver when they wish

to conduct an inspection. The fourth will allow police officers to undertake undercover operations where the police officer and the subject of the investigation are in the Northern Territory.

I am sure we all have numerous stories of how alcohol has negatively impacted us. There is no doubt constituents have shared their stories with us as well. We cannot escape it; alcohol is everywhere. Our government understands the huge impact alcohol has in our community, which is why we have implemented more than 70 recommendations from the Riley review. As the Attorney-General stated, we are committed to a full review of the *Liquor (Amendment) Act 1978*, where we will address remaining recommendations of the Riley review.

Proposed subsection (1A) of section 33 will enable the Liquor Commission to convene a public hearing, if it considers it to be appropriate, when considering whether to vary the conditions of an existing licence. The act already requires the Liquor Commission to hold public hearings in certain circumstances, but this amendment will allow for increased transparency of the decision-making process for these types of circumstances. Many community members will watch closely and probably appreciate the opportunity to attend and follow these public hearings.

The Gunner Labor Government passed legislation last year to place police auxiliary liquor inspectors at the front of bottle shops. We did this to free up our police officers, so that they could be available to respond to more serious crimes and for them have other opportunities to engage with community members. The Liquor Amendment (Point of Sale Intervention) Act 2018 established point of sale intervention powers, obligations and offences under the act and came into effect in June 2018. Following a 9 month period it has become clear that additional powers are required to help deliver the intent of the legislation.

When introducing the bill, the Attorney-General advised parliament that there have been instances where police officers or inspectors were busy checking a number of individual at a drive-through bottle shop. At the same time people entered the licensed premises, purchased their takeaway alcohol and then left. As a result these people evaded the point-of-sale intervention on that premises.

The proposed amendment to section 101ZK(1)(b) looks to expand the definition of customer to allow for inspectors to capture people who deliberately evaded the point-of-sale interventions and allow inspectors to engage with a customer after they have made a purchase.

The Economic Policy Scrutiny Committee has recommended that the wording of this amendment be changed to accurately reflect the intended power of the point-of-sale intervention inspectors. I agree with its suggested changes.

Regarding the stopping of a vehicle, the proposed new subsection 101ZK(7) allows for a police officer or inspector to stop a vehicle on a licensed premises to exercise point-of-sale intervention powers. The Attorney-General clarified that this change is required to allow point-of-sale interventions to occur at drive-through bottle shops in the same way as they apply to those walking into a licensed premises to purchase takeaway alcohol.

This change will allow police officers or inspectors to conduct a point-of-sale intervention of a vehicle that is in the process of leaving a premises after a purchase has been made. At present the legislation does not expressly give power to police officers or inspectors to do this.

The proposed new Part VIII BA will give police officers the power to conduct undercover operations to detect if breaches of the act are occurring. This is an important amendment to help address the failure of licensees to adhere to the act by allowing officers to acquire, supply or possess liquor at a place or in a manner that would otherwise be an offence under the act for the purposes for detecting the commission of an offence.

The secondary supply of alcohol is an issue, but police find it difficult to prove elements of the offence in order to achieve a conviction. The amendment will allow police to gather stronger evidence that hopefully leads to successful convictions.

I was horrified to hear stories of licensees scanning their own identification when a customer failed to produce their own so that the customer could purchase takeaway alcohol. This shows a blatant disregard for the law. Those who are implementing this practice or are not adhering to the act should suffer the full consequences of their actions.

Madam Speaker, as you would appreciate police officers may obtain more in-depth information relating to criminal activity when they are undertaking covert operations. The proposed section 101ZIB will enable a

police officer to seize a thing that they believe relates to an offence against the act without having to obtain a warrant. A thing is defined as something that is used in the commission of an offence or may be used as evidence when trying to prosecute an offence.

This provision will allow for police to seize a motor vehicle, boat, mobile phone or any property, including a house, that they believe to be related to an offence against the act. The proposed section 101ZID will allow for a person who owns or has an interest in a seized thing to apply to the Police Commissioner to have that thing released. However, the onus of proof will be on them to prove that the return is warranted.

Seizure powers already exist in the act. This amendment allows for seizure powers to be applied to a different regulatory function. The Economic Policy Scrutiny Committee recommended for provisions to be inserted into the bill to allow the Police Commissioner to release seized property where the applicant knew about the commission of an offence, but was not in a position to prevent it. This is a sensible recommendation and I thank the committee for proposing it. I support the committee's recommendation for the government to review the impact, reasonableness and proportionality of property that is lawfully seized and the offences that it relates to.

The bill introduces further mechanisms to help address the extraordinary detrimental impact that alcohol has on Territorians. The Minister for Health has already mentioned to today the report recently released by the Menzies School for Health Research on this matter. I take the opportunity put on record a few excerpts from its executive summary:

The total social cost of alcohol in the NT in 2004–5 was estimated to be \$642m. On a per capita basis this was more than four times the comparable national level. While alcohol consumption in the NT appears to have decreased slightly over the past decade, this report shows that the costs and harms associated with alcohol consumption have not. Indeed, the scale of the harm has continued to increase.

At a population level it is now estimated that the total social cost of alcohol in 2015–16 was \$1.3868bn, with tangible costs of \$701.3m and intangible costs of \$685.5m. This excludes the lost quality of life due to addiction amongst dependent drinkers and the family members of dependent drinkers; the magnitude of which are less certain but likely to be very substantial.

The following estimations have been made regarding the impact of alcohol on the Northern Territory in 2015–16. There were an estimated 142 net premature deaths caused by alcohol. Crime caused by alcohol accounted for \$75.9m of police time while the total costs of alcohol-attributable crime are just under \$142m.

Alcohol is estimated to be responsible for between 4.5% and 11% of cases of child abuse and neglect, creating costs of \$8m to \$20m in increased child protection spending by the NT Government, and imposing lifetime costs of \$62m and \$384m on the victims of child abuse and neglect.

Almost 50% of road crash deaths and 20% of serious injury crashes are attributable to alcohol. This is absolutely deplorable. I thank the Menzies School of Health Research and the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies who are based out of the University of South Australia for creating this important report.

Our government's alcohol reforms have taken a mammoth effort from public servants in both the Department of Attorney-General and Justice and Department of the Chief Minister, and I thank you all profusely for your efforts. It is safe to say that you have all earned your six weeks annual rec leave and I hope you take them all and use them wisely. Well done everybody.

Our reforms to date include bringing back the Banned Drinker Register, introducing Police Auxiliary Liquor Inspectors to replace police at the front of bottle shops, introducing a minimum floor price for alcohol, and introducing risk-based licensing.

Coupled with this we have also increased frontline police officer numbers, expanded the Larrakia Nation day patrol service from one vehicle to five vehicles, and once again I will urge Senator Nigel Scullion to come to the party and increase the number of night patrol vehicles from three to five to be on par with our investment.

We have also established an Alcohol Policing Unit who are doing great things to help address secondary supply right across the Territory. We know we still have much more work ahead of us to combat the scourge of alcohol throughout our communities but we will continue on this mission for the benefit of all Territorians.

I commend the bill to the House.

Mr SIEVERS (Brennan): Madam Speaker, I rise to support the Liquor Amendment Bill 2018 and thank the Attorney-General and staff for all their work on this bill.

We know the issues we have with alcohol and how it affects every fabric of our community from the individual to the family and our community right across the Territory and again I say this—and people need to know this—you don't need to be addicted to alcohol to have problems with alcohol. As we know in the NT, we have many issues with drink driving, domestic violence, and assaults.

It is clear from evidence around the world that not one single intervention alone will sort alcohol issues. Rather it is a range of good evidence-based strategies that make a difference, and some of these strategies are short-term and some are long-term.

The Gunner Labor government are committed to addressing these issues and we have implemented the recommendations from the most important and comprehensive alcohol review ever done in the Northern Territory; the Riley review. I am very pleased about this as working in this field for many years, I was always waiting for a government—any government—to follow the evidence. Not parts or bits that they think will win votes but evidence-based strategies that will finally work towards addressing the alcohol issues we have faced for many decades.

That is why I am so pleased that this Gunner Labor government is following the evidence base and supporting the Riley review recommendations. To any professional in this field from anywhere in Australia or the world, the Territory would be a place you would like to work, as we are following your best practice strategies and finally you have a Government that is listening and supporting our professional staff in the field.

The Attorney-General has spoken about the Riley Review today with 70-odd recommendations now completed, with the remaining recommendations being addressed in line with the full review of the *Liquor Act*.

I must commend the Attorney-General and the departments involved for implementing the Riley review recommendations to date, and also for today. The Minister for Health and Attorney-General and this Government and its departments were recognised today and awarded for their hard work in alcohol policies and their commitment to reducing the harms associated with alcohol misuse.

Further as we have heard today from the Minister for Health and the minister for Police alcohol-related incidents are coming down, the data is starting to show significant trends in reductions of alcohol-related incidents. This is fantastic news, so soon into the changes occurring and the best practice strategies being implemented.

Our government is focused on the Riley review and the evidence-based primary secondary and tertiary strategies that, as we are hearing here today, are now showing good signs in reducing alcohol-related incidents and harms across the NT.

There is no silver bullet in all this. We understand it is hard work, however I must stress that if these strategies are taking pressure of our Hospital emergency wards or police watch houses, assaults and domestic violence issues, then this is a great trend to follow, and this is happening now with only half of the Riley review recommendations fully implemented. I am looking forward to the future outcomes when all the Riley review recommendations are implemented, as currently these early signs are very good.

Ms Nelson: Hear, hear!

Mr SIEVERS: Thank you, Member for Katherine. Some of the changes in the Bill are to strengthen the point of sale interventions. I fully support these changes as it is important that police have appropriate powers to deal with the issues they face daily. Police need our support to address the many alcohol-related issues in our community that they are dealing with every day. Our police do an amazing job and they do not need any extra work. If you are doing the right thing then will not need to intervene, however if you are not doing the right thing then you should be asked and held accountable. This amendment is for all.

Another point of the bill is to enable police to conduct undercover operations to detect offences against the act. Again I fully support any interventions that address sly grogging or second hand supply of alcohol, as

the persons doing this often target and charge a lot of money from our most vulnerable people in society. I fully support the police and the law to deal with people who take advantage of others who are very vulnerable.

I have worked in the field of AOD for many years. Member for Stuart, I worked in the Living with Alcohol Program days as well. You are correct; they did have some good things, but not everything worked. I have worked with many people and communities that have had issues with alcohol and other drugs. I have seen firsthand the issues that happen when people become dependent on alcohol and other drugs. I have seen the impact it has on their families and children.

It is a really sad story, as the alcohol or drug becomes the first priority when you become addicted, your life style revolves around your next drink and everything else unfortunately becomes second. I have seen starving children and families in town, and in rural and remote areas because all the money is spent on alcohol.

I have seen starving children and families in town, rural and remote areas because all the money is spent on alcohol. I have seen children being neglected and have serious health and hygiene issues because of the neglect. I have seen parents unable to stop drinking because they become so sick and start fitting when they stop drinking alcohol.

I have seen this and more over my time in the field. Alcohol does not discriminate and affects everybody. That is why it is time for changes. We are dealing with long generational issues and are not trying to hide them. We are addressing them and it is tough but it has to be done. It has to address the alcohol misuse issues so that children of our future have a chance at life. To do any less as a government would be an offence.

I have heard people in the Chamber talk about the alcohol mandatory treatment centre—I was working in the field those days. Not many people went there and when they did, there were issues. We used to refer to it as the \$70m place that nobody went to. It did not work and we need to learn from that lesson and move on.

That is why I fully support the Riley review because it is evidence based. I liked the 'living with alcohol' days because some of that was evidence based and some of it was our best data and outcomes in a long time. In saying all that, I love a cold beer—as many others do in this Chamber—or a wine here or there at my local pub, home or at a social event with my family, friends or old rugby and footy mates.

I too must treat alcohol with the respect it deserves. Anyone nondependent or dependent can and will have issues with alcohol if we do not show it respect and recognise that alcohol can be a very dangerous drug if misused.

We can have fun without alcohol too—we must learn and teach this. A lifestyle without alcohol is what many Territorians choose as well. It is okay not to drink and we must show our children this—that it is okay to say no to alcohol. As the chair of the Economic Policy Scrutiny Committee, it was the committee's recommendation that the Assembly pass the bill. The committee proposed four amendments to clarify provisions and strengthen the bill.

The committee also recommended that as part of the complete review and rewrite of the act, the government review all of the act's seizure and forfeiture powers to assess their impact, reasonableness and proportionality to the offences they relate to.

I thank the Economic Policy Scrutiny Committee for their hard work on this important bill and all the people who made submissions. I thank the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice, the Department of the Attorney-General and Justice, and all the departments for their work and comprehensive answers to our economic scrutiny committee questions.

I commend the bill to the House.

Ms MOSS (Tourism, Sport and Culture): I rise in support of the Liquor Amendment Bill and would like to begin by congratulating the Minister for Health. It was positive to see that the Northern Territory was awarded the National Alliance for Action on Alcohol best performance in alcohol policy development and implementation.

It is important that this work is being recognised in this way and should be acknowledged against in this House. It is always good to go after the Member for Brennan who has worked in this area of policy, as have I in a very different role—around harm minimisation and involving young people in that conversation.

We love the Northern Territory, it is a fantastic place to live and work. We are lucky to have such a great lifestyle here and enjoy many of the things that you do not get to enjoy down south. As a community we also face some significant challenges, in particular antisocial behaviour, crime and violence. All too often this behaviour has a key contributing factor and that is alcohol.

It is certainly something I see around my electorate of Casuarina, as many members do. The harm that comes from alcohol is a really significant factor. As has been mentioned by many members of the Chamber throughout this debate, many Territorians enjoy having a social drink and it has long been considered part of our lifestyle. The vast majority of people drink responsibly, but we must continue to have an honest conversation regarding alcohol culture in the Northern Territory and the promotion of that through media and other mediums. We still grapple with this and have to come to terms with it.

Alcohol has become a serious problem in our community. It is a problem that faces us as a whole. The social and economic cost of alcohol abuse in the Territory really is startling, at \$1.38bn per year. That was quite a shock to me because I remember that the last report of that kind published was released by the Menzies School of Health Research in 2009. That had the figure at \$642m per annum. That was already an astounding figure, so that is an enormous jump. That is why the Gunner Labor government has taken such significant steps to reduce the harms alcohol causes across our communities.

People deserve to feel safe in their community and homes. Children deserve to grow up in families that are free from violence and neglect, which is so often magnified by problem drinking. I am careful in what I just said, because I want to be clear that it can be very easy to blame alcohol for behaviour when perpetrators of family violence, domestic violence, sexual violence and violence on streets need to own their behaviour. We need to address the other drivers of violence. This is not the only one.

On that note, I also want to commend the leadership of the Minister for Territory Families, particularly regarding things like the family, domestic and sexual violence prevention framework and the work in place regarding domestic violence and women's shelters and other proactive measures we have to protect people from domestic violence and reduce that behaviour. Tackling alcohol-related crime and antisocial behaviour right at its foundations will go a long way to making our community safer and healthier. We are doing this in a holistic way because previous attempts to tackle just one aspect of problem drinking has created or exacerbated alcohol-related problems elsewhere. That is well documented.

We need to tackle the root causes of problem drinking as well as the effects on our community. With that, it cannot be understated, the work that is going into education, health, the unprecedented commitment to housing across the Northern Territory, the local decision-making commitments and agreements, the creation of jobs across the Territory—all of those things are incredibly important for dealing with this issue.

We have maintained our focus on this since coming to government and we are seeing the benefits. Some of the other measures already in place to tackle problem drinking include employing additional frontline police officers and liquor inspectors, the reintroduction of the Banned Drinker Register, establishing an independent Liquor Commission, introducing a minimum floor price on alcohol and tough new police measures to suspend liquor licences and target secondary supply. We are well on track with the implementation of the 219 accepted recommendations to come out of the Riley review into the Territory's alcohol policies and legislation. So far 75 have been implemented, with work continuing on the others.

We are starting to see positive results from this roll-out. It is not being talked about enough. I am really grateful to my colleagues for putting this forward tonight because we should be talking about this. In a recent release from the Attorney-General, she released some information that quantified some of the benefits that are starting to flow out of these measures—things like a 44% reduction in alcohol-related assaults in Alice Springs between September and December 2018 compared with the same period in 2017. That is really significant.

There was a 25.5% decrease in alcohol-related emergency department presentations in NT hospitals in December 2018 compared with the year before. That is really significant:

- more than 3000 litres of alcohol marked for illegal secondary supply being seized by police since the creation of the Alcohol Policing Unit
- a crackdown on licensees doing the wrong thing with the Police Commissioner suspending five liquor licences since June 2018.

I was particularly interested in the efforts that have been undertaken so far to put a dent into secondary supply. It is a huge issue across the Territory and it is an issue that I am aware of across the northern suburbs. It is a hindrance to the vast majority of hospitality businesses and liquor outlets that do the right thing as members of this community and fully understand their role in reducing harm.

It is important I mention this as the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Culture and a lover of good food because there are so many incredible hospitality businesses across the Territory whose role is so important in maintaining a vibrant place to live and visit. They provide wonderful food and beverage experiences and their stakes are just as high in making sure we have safe, connected communities for locals and visitors.

Most importantly is to draw attention again to the progress that is being made in presentations to Emergency Departments across our Territory hospitals. I am sure we would all agree our hard-working doctors, nurses and hospital staff have enough work to do without our health systems being clogged up with more preventable presentations.

The legislation before the House is part of our suite of measures that will give police and liquor inspectors more powers to stop problem drinking at the source. It provides some clarity and strength around point of sale interventions which complement the Banned Drinker Register.

There were 628 refusals of alcohol sales due to a person being on the Banned Drinker Register in January with just over 8000 individuals on the register at the end of January this year. Without a doubt this is assisting in the fight against alcohol-related harm and it is important that we provide the tools to strengthen this measure.

The return of the BDR was supported by the community after its political scrapping by the CLP in 2012 and we have always said it is not the entire answer but it is part of the answer. It is one of a suite of measures to make our community safer. It is Territory-wide.

The amendments being debated today also provide more clarity to the independent Liquor Commission and its ability to hold public hearings at its discretion when considering changes to existing licences. The public hearings provide that confidence of public and stakeholder voices in the process and this further strengthens that and supports the commission in their role.

In closing, it is vital that we continue to work together in addressing the immense harm in the Northern Territory in which alcohol is a factor. The reality is that things cannot continue the way they have in the past. Dealing with this issue is everybody's business.

I join others in the Chamber in thanking those staff who have worked on this bill. I commend the bill to the House.

Ms NELSON (Katherine): Madam Speaker, I also rise to speak in support of the Liquor Amendment Bill 2018. I have said this before, every single time we talk about alcohol, I mention that I am sick and tired of talking about it. That rings true. Alcohol is still causing so much harm to our families, our communities and our economy. For that reason, I rise when alcohol reform legislation is before the Chamber.

Imagine how much better our bank balance would be if we were not constantly dealing with the crime, injury, disease, homelessness and poverty that alcohol brings. Imagine being able to invest in other things like prevention, early intervention and education rather than the end results of addiction. It is utopian of me but I still think it is possible.

Given that alcohol is a problem right across the Northern Territory—and I know that this will raise eyebrows but I am going to say it anyway—my constituents ask and I ask on their behalf again, why are there no PALIs in Darwin? Why are outlets in Darwin responsible for putting on their own security but the same is not required for the outlets in Katherine, Tennant Creek or Alice Springs? Why are the people in the northern suburbs of Darwin or in Palmerston not subject to the same alcohol control measures as the rest of the Territory?

I do not ask this to be controversial. I ask because this is what my constituents ask of me. I do not have a good answer for them. Until I have a good answer for them, I will continue to scrutinise legislation that will affect my constituents that affects my constituents, like the bill before us today.

This is one of the reasons I volunteered to join the Select Committee on a Northern Territory Harm Reduction Strategy for Addictive Behaviours. The committee has heard from many organisations and agencies, not only in Northern Territory, but throughout Australia and other countries who have collectively said that mandatory

treatment arrangements do not work. They had the most success in reducing the violence and crime associated with substance abuse issues by treating substance abuse as a health issue.

While there are one or two components of the reform of the Liquor Amendment Bill that I do not support 100%, I am supportive of the bill as a whole because I acknowledge and believe that the bill ultimately aims to create a foundation and framework that will pave the way for an all-of-government approach to supporting those affected by alcohol abuse and misuse.

While we are on this, I will correct a few things that were stated by the Member for Araluen. First, police have never been removed from the front of bottle shops in Katherine—they have remained. We should revisit the history of POSIs. Abolishing the BDR appeared to be the top priority for the Country Liberal Party. It featured in its pre-election platform as its activity for day one if they won the election.

On 29 August 2012 the newly elected Chief Minister Terry Mills signed an instrument that removed the conditions requiring the scanning of photo identification prior to the purchase of alcohol in the Northern Territory. The then Chief Minister also directed the Police Commissioner to make licensees immune to prosecution if they failed to scan identification. It was anticipated that BDR provisions would eventually be repealed from the *Liquor Act 1978*. At the time the BDR was abolished in 2012 there were around 2600 persons listed in the register.

We go over and over the same issues. As I did the research for my speeches and reviewing legislation or scrutinising it in the Social Policy Scrutiny Committee, the issue goes back 20 to 30 years ago. Recently I had dinner with the former Chief Minister, the Hon Paul Henderson.

I went through some of the scrap books he shared with us that night. We were reading through old newsletters from previous members of parliament, including his own. They talked about exactly the same issues we are talking about today: alcohol abuse, alcohol-related crime and domestic violence related to alcohol abuse. These were from 20 years ago. You can understand why I sound sick of talking about it.

In 2017 I issued a media statement regarding police in front of bottle shops in Katherine. The *Katherine Times* in that year had reported that the CLP Senator, Nigel Scullion, stated that the Northern Territory government was planning on ending the policy of basing police officers outside bottle shops. That is not what we had planned or what we did.

Our government did not plan on ending the policy and we did not scrap it. There has only ever been one policy change—the power to make decisions on how to best utilise police resources was handed back to Police to make decisions. The BDR was rolled out Territory wide on 1 September. During the transition period police remained at the bottle shops of Katherine. They remain there until such time that the Police Commander decides that they are no longer needed. That has never happened.

The truth is the BDR was not given enough time to demonstrate its effectiveness before it was dismantled in a move that reeked of political acrimony when you try to work out the rationale behind its abandonment in 2012.

After BDR was thrown on the scrapheap the previous CLP government waited almost two years to roll out an alternative solution to alcohol abuse and management. Two-and-a-half years after the POSIs were unveiled, we looked back over statistical data which proved that they had done little to lessen the impact of alcohol-fuelled violence in places like Katherine, Alice Springs and Tennant Creek.

In December 2014, the POSIs, which were known as TBLs, temporary beat locations, were implemented. In that time frame, 32 of the 45 assaults reported to police involved alcohol.

Fast-forward to 12 months later—December 2015, another 45 assaults were reported. Thirty-seven of them, over 82%, were found by police to have been triggered by or involved alcohol.

Fast-forward to 12 months later—December 2016 was one of the best months in the TBL's two-year history with alcohol being identified as a contributing factor in only 65 reported assaults.

The supporters of having police permanently in front of bottle shops can spin statistics however they want. They can use it whichever they want to misguide in an attempt to justify the scrapping of the BDR and the introduction of permanent police presence.

When you look back at all of that, the raw data does not lie. Twenty-nine months after the POSIs came into effect, more than 70% of all assaults reported in Katherine still involved some form of alcohol abuse.

I go back to the very first media statement I sent out after being elected. I stated, 'The BDR will prevent problem drinkers buying. That is what the BDR does.' This has been broadly supported by the police as the most effective method to combat alcohol-related crime. The BDR is not a silver bullet. It is not the catch-all, the number one thing to resolve this or be the magic answer.

I listen to the opposition and Independent members across the Chamber. I listen to their criticisms; I listen to everything they say. Sometimes I wish I did not. I find the Member for Araluen and her criticisms interesting. On 25 April 2013—this is reported by the ABC online:

Alcohol policy minister, Robyn Lambley, has conceded the government's decision to scrap the Banned Drinker Register, may have contributed to a doubling of alcohol-related admissions to the Alice Springs Hospital since it came to power. She says that changed police practices following a death in custody are also like to have contributed.

That was 2013. Thank you, Member for Araluen. There are quite a few others I have here that I have researched and picked up on. This is from 2012, posted in a blog by Ken Parish who says, 'We are living in a nanny state'. He talks about the changes that were made after the CLP was brought into government, 'Did nothing to improve the alcohol-abuse situation.

This is a great heading from the *NT News* on 8 January 2014:

CLP member breaks ranks; supports BDR. A Territory CLP politician has broken ranks with his party calling on his government to consider reintroducing the Banned Drinker Register that it scrapped, to tackle the scourge of alcohol-related crime in the Northern Territory. The CLP government dismantled the previous Labor government's BDR when it was elected to office in 2012.

The CLP member for Daly, Gary Higgins, the now Leader of the Opposition, said that the issue of alcohol-abuse was above politics and raised the idea of parliamentary inquiry with bipartisan support from the Labor opposition.

I am sure that is what we did, it is called the Riley review. He stated in the *NT News*:

As a government we have addressed rehabilitation, we have addressed the criminal side to things but we have not addressed the supply side and I think all of those areas need to be looked at.

That is what we are doing right now. 'I think the BDR has an affect,' he said. 'I think people were accepting of it to a certain degree.' When asked if he thought it made a difference and if he would support some form of individual prohibition coming back like that, he responded, 'Yes, I do. I think that is one of the measures we can use. But it has to be taken in conjunction with all other measures out there.'

I am sure that is included in the Riley review as well. He said:

Incorporating some of the CLP government's and the opposition's solutions to alcohol related violence and crime could be the way to go.

I am sure that is in the Riley review.

The *New Matilda*, 24 April 2015:

For months now a significant number of the Alice Springs police force including commanders and detectives have been stationed outside the town's bottle shops from 2 pm to 9 pm on weeknights and 10 am to 9 pm on weekends. More than 35 members of the police have been assigned a shift duty with back-up being supplied from other towns.

This article asks:

'Why are there police outside NT bottle shops?'

All the responsibility falls onto the police and none falls onto the people who are making the money. I do not know if it is the job of the NT police to stand outside bottle shops as de facto security guards.

What the NT government has effectively done is remove the Banned Drinker Register and not replace it with any effective tool.

The Banned Drinker Register was a policy the former Labor NT government that prevented problem drinkers from buying alcohol. Takeaway alcohol outlets were required to scan the ID of patrons to reveal whether they were on the BDR. Serving someone on that list could result in serious sanctions.

Yet we have members of this Chamber that are now arguing against those sanctions and saying they are terrible. Still, the same argument—you cannot have it both ways. You cannot ask for stricter control measures and management regimes and say we cannot sanction people.

We will go back to this article, it is an interesting article. You should google it.

During the 2012 election campaign, the NT Country Liberal Party argued that the register was not working and served only as an inconvenience for those who were not problem drinkers. It seemed a petty gripe given the depth of the drinking problem in the Territory, but dumping the BDR became an election promise, one that was delivered when the CLP finally took power from Labor in August that year.

Wow, the BDR is an inconvenience. Long wait lists at the hospitals, domestic violence rates going through the roof because of alcohol and all of these other social issues—not so much of an inconvenience but having to produce your licence and get it scanned in is an inconvenience.

Inside Story from another blog—I will table all of these—the ‘right to drink’ in Alice Springs:

Loud music blares from the Riverside Bar at the back of the Todd Tavern as a security guard passes a metal detection wand over each person seeking to enter. It is 1.45 pm on a weekday afternoon in Alice Springs and the bar has been open for nearly four hours.

Minutes later the guard ushers out a jumble of people, all Aboriginal, who then congregate around the edges of the pub’s driveway as if waiting for a public event. By five to two, about eight vehicles are lined up in the driveway of the bottle shop. First in the queue are two eight seater minibuses. There is a big sign that says ‘We accept BasicsCard’. Entry on foot is prohibited. At two o’clock, the roller doors rattle up and the sales commence. The door of the Riverside Bar is locked as the next shift selling cheap grog begins.

This is a great article and I am going to table it because it goes on to talk about the failures of alcohol management. The failures of the CLP government at the time scrapping everything and leaving nothing in place. Appealing to populous libertarian sentiment the CLP presented the BDR as an encroachment on the civil liberties of the average Territorian.

In reality, the ID scans accompanying the BDR were a minor inconvenience—again, the inconvenience—especially given that carrying a licence was already a prerequisite for driving through a bottle shop in the Territory. The CLP back then claimed however that the BDR unfairly affected the majority of responsible drinkers and not just the ‘problem drunks.’

The writer of this article goes onto say:

...and we all know that this is a euphemism for Aboriginal drinkers. The problem drinking, according to the National Drug Research Institute’s Dennis Gray, extends across the Centralian population. If Indigenous drinking is factored out per capita, consumption by the non-Indigenous people in Central Australia is still about 52% higher than the national average. Rates would still be up there if every Aboriginal person stopped drinking in the NT tomorrow.

How about we start dropping that from our language. Alcohol abuse and misuse is not an Indigenous-only issue. It affects every single person in our community. An article from 18 April 2013, the People’s Alcohol Action Coalition from their website. It states:

NT drowns in grog while Tollner ducks and weaves.

Licensing Minister Dave Tollner has joined the NT Government’s confused alcohol policy mantras with more contradictions and misinformation on the Territory’s alcohol problems.

In his media release 'Time to Address Addiction Not Supply' (17 April 2013) he echoes his colleagues' repetitive refrain of untruths, half-truths and resistance to evidence.

'Mr. Tollner says the Banned Drinkers' Register did nothing to help problem drinkers. Wrong,' said PAAC spokesperson Dr. John Boffa.

'The BDR was designed in the full knowledge that some people would still be able to get some grog. It was about people obtaining less alcohol and getting less drunk less often because they could not buy take-away grog anywhere, and secondary supply was banned. This is a very legitimate approach to dealing with alcohol-dependent people.

Dave Tollner knows that the Alcohol Mandatory Treatment plan, if it goes ahead, will only deal with very small numbers and the government has admitted it doesn't expect that many people will stop drinking. Getting a few problem drinkers off the streets won't solve the great majority of these problems, or reduce the crime rate by the promised 10% per annum.

I could go on. There is quite a bit I have printed out here and I am going to table it, but I am going to stop there because I would like to go on and read the statement I have prepared. It does pay for people to revisit the history of alcohol management policies and legislation and BDR and POSIs.

There are a number of changes put forward by this bill. Firstly, it will give the Liquor Commission the power to conduct a public hearing when determining whether to vary a liquor licence. I am a strong proponent of public hearings especially in this situation. Nobody should be excluded from expressing an opinion on a liquor licence where it can be heard by the decision-makers.

Too often hearings conducted on important issues, be they alcohol, planning or other important issues, are kept to small groups, held at inconvenient times or just not held at all. We need to do better to be open and transparent with our communities particularly on issues that affect us all, as alcohol does.

Do you want to know something? The onus falls on each member of this Chamber as local members. It is part of our job and it is our responsibility. For people to point the finger and claim that we as a government are not being transparent or open to the people, I ask what are you doing to take this information to the people in your electorate?

Under this provision the Liquor Commission has the power to set how it will hold public hearings and when it will do so. I hope they err on the side of giving more people the opportunity to share their thoughts and feelings on the impact of alcohol in their communities.

The bill also clarifies powers when a person is in possession of alcohol within the boundaries of a property giving auxiliary liquor inspectors the power to stop a vehicle and require the driver or passenger to follow their directions. This will allow police and PALs to exercise their powers when a person has already purchased alcohol from an outlet having not previously come to the attention of the officer or inspector.

In addition to the clarification of powers police will now be able to authorise undercover operations, including engaging in limited illegal activity to detect offenses against the *Liquor Act 1978*. While this may seem like a power exercised in an episode of *Law & Order*, these powers could be used to shine a light on a number of illegal acts that cause harm to our community. In particular, the powers have the potential to interrupt secondary supply networks. This is a massive problem in Katherine.

These networks and their activities are difficult to identify and even harder to prosecute. The use of these powers and their results will be reported by the Police Commissioner. This will allow for the evaluation of these powers to occur and determine if these powers are having an effect on illegal activity as intended.

In principle I support the changes to the *Liquor Act 1978*. As a government and as a community there is much more to do to reduce the harm associated with alcohol. Regulation, control and enforcement are just one part of that puzzle. It is important that we recognise the vital role of education, prevention, early intervention and appropriate treatment when dealing with alcohol and its many negative impacts.

I have said many times that I am highly supportive of the Riley review. Every time I contribute to debate on liquor amendments I say it. I am disappointed that we did not accept all its recommendations, but I am supportive of my government that is working hard to ensure that the recommendations we accepted are implemented timely and sensibly.

I hope that we do not get wrapped up with fiddling around the edges of the *Liquor Act 1978* and make some real reforms on how alcohol is managed in the Northern Territory with the full support of the opposition and Independent members. That is what we need to do to make this successful.

I am pleased to see that there have been some successes from measures already introduced by this government, including the drop in alcohol-related assaults since the reintroduction of the BDR. But there is much more to do. The bill tightens up sections of the *Liquor Act 1978* to assist with licensing, regulation and enforcement of alcohol control measures. While broad alcohol control measures are often controversial and unpopular, the reality is that we all need to make sacrifice to try to reduce the harm experienced by some of our most vulnerable Territorians.

The inconvenience that people talk about just boggles the mind. They only seem to think about the inconvenience to their lives—long waits at the hospital increases cost to the health system. However, I reiterate my earlier comments on how alcohol restrictions and controls have been introduced across the Territory. I am proud to say they have been collectively introduced across the Territory by this government. I commend the bill to the house.

I seek leave to table the articles.

Leave granted.

Mrs WORDEN (Sanderson): I support of the Liquor Amendment Bill 2018.

I said this yesterday, I recently joined the Economic Policy Scrutiny Committee. This bill came through—it was halfway through and caught up with some of the work. The briefings we got as members of that committee were super and it was good to get external input that we did on this bill from a range of places.

I join the chair, the Member for Brennan, in thanking those people that took the time to put those submissions in for such an important subject. I am on the record saying that this parliament has had never had a more important agenda than this one.

I thank the Member for Katherine for the history lesson because it is an important part of the story. Part of the reason we are in this situation is because if others before us—I am not saying just over the last four years—had done something earlier than now we would not be experiencing the collective impact of a number of changes over time.

It is important that those things were put there and that we are all held to account for our views. I welcome those opposite changing their view as long as it is positive and supporting the direction that this government is taking.

Alcohol reform is a large body of work and we have seen a number of pieces of legislation come here. They are often overlapping in the areas of reform to achieve the goal of reduced harm. It is the collective impact of this legislation and some operational changes that will have the effect that we want.

The people that I speak to, not just in Sanderson but as members of parliament we are heading out to different things where we meet people from the Northern Territory and beyond. We speak to a lot of Territorians on a weekly basis. They are reiterating the message that they are sick and tired of antisocial behaviour on our streets. They are embarrassed by the things that are happening in the place they call home.

That is a new awakening for Territorians. In the past they might have been prepared to look past some of the behaviours but now they are embarrassed, particularly when we have cruise ships come in. Congratulations to the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Culture for the work that she and her department are doing in that space to bring more cruise ships here to Darwin. This week we have seen a number of tourists out there.

In our parks, places like Tamarind Park and the park right outside of Parliament House, it is important that we do not just clear those spaces away when our visitors come. It is important that we are working with the different organisations that are supporting us in this space to make sure that people who need help, assistance and support get it through legislative change.

We are the first government to tackle this through a comprehensive package of measures. Once you start breaking it down and have that conversation one on one with people on the street, they get the full picture. That one on one conversation—not just the headline for a little bit of legislative change. Once the collective impact is explained, people truly get it.

It feels sad that we are having to take such measures but this is the reality of the Territory when we came to government. The previous government's strategy was handing out more licences. We had to put a stop to that immediately. The Riley review points out that there was up to one licence per 300 Territorians—that includes men, women and children. That is appalling as a figure and had to be fixed.

That was subject to those caps being taken off over time and it had to be fixed. The flow on effects, as the Member for Katherine eloquently put it, in health, education, corrections, police and the savings that we can make. I take up on her point about the interruption that that makes to everybody's lives in the emergency sectors. Our call outs for police. If there is something genuine going on in your area and you know that the police are consumed with incidents that relate to alcohol, whether it is a crash or a domestic violence incident—of course they have to prioritise. The more we can drive change in this area, the more we will free up resources and the funding that is required to keep them at an operational level.

It is consuming our resources on a large scale. We need to reduce the impact of alcohol to free them up for Territorians. However, the impact on families lasts a lot longer than that. We talk here all the time about generational change. We also often talk about families who are subjected to alcohol and sometimes drug abuse. Over the longer term, through generations—the lasting impact on them in the education and health space is something that has to be broken.

I find it is an easy conversation to have with people across the Territory. As I have said a number of times it is well over since I gave up alcohol on being elected. This was because I wanted to model good behaviour. This is not to say that abstinence the only way for change—of course it is not. I do not ever hear people talking about the fact that you can choose not to drink.

We have a long conversation—our kids get to 18 and you see it on places like social media all the time, they have party like an 18th. People are standing there with alcohol. It seems to be the norm for celebrating any major event. You even see it at one-year-old birthday parties.

My daughter said to me recently, and she will not mind me sharing, that she was going to parties for one-year-olds as she is in that age group. Those parties seem to be called just so the adults can get together and consume alcohol. First birthday parties are about milestones for your children. As the Member for Casuarina said, there is an alcohol culture. It is one that we need to break.

If having a conversation about—'Hey, you can choose not to drink at all', with a 16-, 17-, or 18-year-old is an option. It is not too bad. It is fine if people choose to have alcohol in moderation. It is not a bad conversation to have. I challenge people to have it. I will remind the chamber of it at every opportunity I get. Not drinking is a good choice. It is not a bad thing and it does not make you a bad person. I have not suddenly been wiped off the face of the earth because I decided to stop drinking alcohol.

I challenge people to look at their Facebook pages to see that a lot of things focus around alcohol. It is not just an Indigenous problem. I pick up on the comments of the Member for Stuart. He is absolutely on the money. It is a problem for those in low socio-economic circumstances and where people are feeling disengaged. It is also a cultural problem in the Northern Territory more than most other places.

Drink driving is another area. I am always disappointed—I will boycott reading them now on the number of Territorians who are still being picked up well and truly over the limit. There was a number last week. It is always that the attitude to alcohol is, 'It will be okay', and it is not.

I am interested of late that vendors of alcohol are expressing that they are sick of alcohol-fuelled crime. It perplexes me. If every vendor did the right thing and did not sell to vulnerable people or those they suspect who are passing on, we would not have these problems. I am not saying that everyone in the industry is doing the wrong thing because so many are doing the right thing.

I pleas with industry that it is entitled to sell alcohol. But we need to work together to fix this. It is about everybody in that space. Government is doing the heavy lifting in the legislative area and the departments in the operational area. If we did not have vendors selling to vulnerable people or to those people they suspect are passing it on to vulnerable people, then we would not have the magnitude of problems that we have.

We are doing what we can. We are giving the Police and the Liquor Commissioner the tools to further tackle these issues. I note that the Liquor Commission is getting the power to conduct public hearings when exercising its powers to vary a licence on its initiative.

This change literally gives certainty. The Minister has stated here that the current legislation is not clear. This gives clarity. It is important, as we all know in this place, to hold public hearings to make specific decisions particularly when the granting of another liquor licence or a substitute licence or a variation to a licence is involved. It is important that the community is a part of and can see when those decisions are made.

Where circumstances might require it, those could be held in private but on the whole a public hearing on a decision that affects the community is appropriate. It is important to get community input at that time. Quite frankly, the community are the ones affected by all of this. They know their area and the public impact of liquor on their community. It really makes it clear and it is a great change today.

The second area is clarifying the point-of-sale intervention powers given to police. I quote what the Minister stated earlier:

...so that a customer will include anyone in possession of alcohol. It will also allow a vehicle to be detained when the customer is in the vehicle.

These are vital changes. I will detail an incident that I have seen where one person in a local shop has stood there collecting money from others. It was very clear that people shopping and getting the alcohol out of the fridges were going to consume the alcohol. Simply, one person who could clearly pass the BDR, collecting money in front of other customers and then paying and only scanning that licence under the BDR is extremely poor practice.

Whilst I understand that it might have been okay legally, it is not okay. The vendor knew where that alcohol was going and in fact made a statement on exit of 'enjoy your party.' That is unacceptable behaviour and it has to stop. They are the problems that we need to fix.

The passengers of taxis, we know very well and some good work has already happened in this space and I believe there might have been some prosecutions for secondary supply. We need to clamp down on where people are going through and getting access to alcohol through the use of a taxi.

People are finding ways around and we need to cover this off and this legislation today really does fix it. It broadens the area around a licensed venue that police—once they are working and I take the minister's point. They might be in one area working with a person that has come into purchase alcohol and there might be some suspicions of some activity that is not above board or somebody trying to purchase that is on the BDR, they could be slow to intercept so this legislation is just in case so they can be caught as a follow up to that person they suspect at the point of sale.

It is all complementary work for the Banned Drinker Register and police must be able to ask those key questions about where that alcohol is going to be consumed, whether the alcohol is being purchased for themselves or for another person—that is a key question—and whether the other person is prohibited from consuming alcohol.

The third measure outlined by the minister gives police the tools needed to conduct undercover operations to detect breaches of the *Liquor Act*. This is the last part of the bill.

There were some concerns that this power could be abused but I assure the House that this sort of power is already used for searches with drugs and we do not see the abuse of that power spilling out into the public arena. It makes sense that police should be able to gather intelligence from covert operations. It is a core part of what they do.

We all know that such operations may require a police officer to undertake work that is not in line with their usual duties and may require them to break the law. They rightly need some protections in that to not face prosecution. As long as they are in line with the operations they are a part of, it makes good sense.

As the minister outlined the Police Commissioner will be required to report on these operations to ensure accountability. There are other parts to this bill, such as the power to seize and indeed release items that are taken that provide important operational parameters. I will not comment much on this today, but it is important that we get the operations of the Liquor Commission and new powers to the police right.

We are seeing reforms starting to bite. In my local shopping centres, where we have previously had some issues—those areas have now gone so quiet that some locals have started to comment to me on how wonderful it is to see those areas quieten down. Some of the problems we have there are only intermittent now. I am looking forward to them stopping altogether.

This bill will help to reduce the crime, which is a flow-on effect of alcohol abuse. It will contribute to lessening antisocial behaviour on our streets. That is what my constituents and local businesses want. If we can tackle alcohol and reduce abuse, we are turning this ship around. It takes heart and courage to do what we are doing. I say to retailers and those who are doing the wrong thing, get on board. Many retailers are doing the right thing, but while there are some that do not, this work is crucial

Let us all get on board, work with retailers and vulnerable people to change our landscape. I am pleased to support this bill.

Ms FYLES (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice): Madam Speaker, before I get to the substantive features of this bill, I thank members for their contributions. I thank the Member for Spillett for the opposition's support, however I note her criticisms regarding alcohol reform.

There is a long way to go, but early signs indicate that our reforms are working. There is not one measure that will tackle the Territory's alcohol problems, the crime and antisocial behaviour we see. That is why we are implementing a range of measures. I will speak to some of her more specific comments in a moment.

As the Member for Wanguri discussed, the Alcohol Policing Unit is already operational. We need to tackle the secondary supply that these problems cause when people access alcohol illegally. That police unit will help to tackle that problem. I thank the Member for Wanguri for her contribution and I note her comments about her visits to police stations across the Territory, where alcohol was raised as being the biggest problem. We can all agree that the alcohol abuse, antisocial behaviour, crime, filling of our emergency departments and the road trauma are the biggest social issue we face in the Territory.

This bill works towards reducing that problem and I am sure police will appreciate these powers. We have had a lot of commentary regarding this bill this afternoon. Some of it is correct, and some is a little incorrect. I thank the Member for Barkly for his comments. I think he made an important comment regarding how this legislation is for all Territorians and Territory communities. Comments were raised that this bill and some of the measures were somehow based on race. That is what is so important about not just the Banned Drinker Register, but all the measures. They go right across the Territory. With the Banned Drinker Register, it does not matter who you are or where you are from; you need to prove you are not on that BDR by providing your licence or another form of identification at the point of sale.

I will touch on the Member for Nelson's comments regarding the PALIs going against the recommendations of the Riley review. The Member for Nelson has said this previously and I will restate the government's position regarding recommendation 3.6.2. It was decided early on to achieve that recommendation regarding having liquor inspectors. We believe that the PALIs, as licensing inspectors in place, are meeting that recommendation. We are seeing early signs that it is working.

It is a real shame to see members of the House not support measures that reduce alcohol-related crime and harm when we are seeing the early positive signs. I will come to the Member for Katherine's comments in a minute. The Member for Nelson spoke about the effects of a person's human rights under this bill. The committee did consider NAAJA's submissions and a human rights compatibility statement was created in the development of this bill—a measure introduced under this Labor government that we have those statements in bills.

The member raised concerns around covert operations and mystery shoppers. A mystery shopper program would help to identify a breach of responsible service of alcohol. What is proposed with covert operations is to be targeted criminal enforcement of the *Liquor Act 1978* to prevent secondary supply issues which is a huge problem.

The Member for Nhulunbuy, Member for Stuart and Member for Araluen spoke similarly to the Member for Nelson. I note the Member for Barkly in his comments around this being a Territory wide measure, not just targeting one area. That is what are seeing with previous measures that are being put in place around alcohol policy. They have been put in place in one area and not in another, and I will come to the failed alcohol mandatory treatment in a moment.

The Member for Stuart spoke about the BDR. The BDR cuts off the supply of alcohol to problem drinkers and provides them with a path to rehabilitation. Referral to the BDR Registrar occurs by health practitioners, police, child protection workers, families, carers or guardians and includes a clinical assessment to determine suitability. It is an important measure that we have put in place.

The BDR Registrar contacts all self-referring applicants offering them brief intervention in alcohol and other drugs services information and referral to withdrawal services. Several self-referred applicants have provided feedback about the positive impact that their Banned Drinker Order has in assisting them address their alcohol misuse. The BDR Registrar is working with other agencies, services and clinicians to ensure assessments are undertaken and decisions are made as promptly as possible.

I assure the Member for Nhulunbuy that the health perspective of alcohol harms has been a huge consideration in our reforms. The Member for Araluen spoke about the grocery stores. These measure are not shutting down businesses, this is about changing the business model away from a model that uses alcohol to prop up that business. That is fuelling alcohol into our communities, causing crime, antisocial behaviour and all the things the Member for Araluen harps on about.

I point her to the Facebook post from last month on the ABC Alice Springs page talking about the Alice Springs supermarkets—the smaller independent supermarkets—and whether they could survive setting the alcohol component at 25%. The family that run the supermarket in Larapinta says that their business does not even need to sell alcohol to be viable.

It is disappointing when you have the Member for Araluen come in here, huff and puff, saying we are shutting businesses and do not like small businesses. This is about compliance with existing licence conditions that were always ancillary to selling groceries. We want to work with businesses—the Alcohol Review Implementation Team is out there working with businesses across the Territory to a pathway to compliance. We want businesses to succeed. It is about changing the business model and tackling alcohol related crime.

I have met with George Kovits from the Master Grocers Association and Paul Denton from Metcash. They talked positively about the transitional periods for their measures. They will work with businesses—these small independent retailers—and we will continue to work with them to a pathway to compliance.

We have so much negativity that these measures are bad for business when there is a business saying that they do not need to rely on alcohol sales for their business to be supported. The Member for Araluen spoke about the recent decision notice from the independent Liquor Commission. I note that this decision is made by an independent Liquor Commission that is independent of government—that was the way we set it up, through the parliament in that manner.

The independent Liquor Commission has formerly notified specific licences of its proposal to add conditions to their takeaway licences. The commission did note our government's policies aimed at reducing alcohol related crime Alice Springs have seen improvements, particularly with emergency department alcohol related admissions and alcohol related assaults.

The proposed changes by the independent Liquor Commission will require licensees to report suspicious transactions in order to assist police to detect, prosecute, deter and prevent illegal secondary supply of alcohol. One measure will not solve the Territory's alcohol problems. As we plug the whole with one measure, people will shift to another measure. This is why we need to have a range of measures in place.

We have point-of-sale interventions. We have given police more resources. There is an independent Liquor Commission. We are putting a new Liquor Act to strengthen licensing. We have therapeutic supports for people who have a problem with alcohol.

The independent Liquor Commission was looking at the ways they can support police to stop the secondary supply of alcohol. Further, the commission proposes to impose a special condition on the Cobra Hotel and the Desert Oaks Motel similar to the restrictions currently enforced on the Curtain Springs Roadhouse. I quote from that decision:

As suggested by licensees in the liquor industry groups that contributed to the inquiry, the commission proposes to add conditions to takeaway licences requiring the reporting of suspicious transactions in order to assist police to detect, prosecute, deter and prevent illegal secondary supply.

Licensees have a chance to respond to the proposed variations before the commission makes a final decision. The independent commission will make that assessment.

I turn to alcohol mandatory treatment. It is important to note that we did not get into government to just throw out alcohol mandatory treatment. We made it clear before the election that if we were privileged to be elected the Northern Territory Government, we would not continue alcohol mandatory treatment. It was a failed and costly model.

But, we left it in place until our measures were ready. That was something the CLP government did not do. We have heard from members this evening on the Banned Drinker Register. On the 29 August it was gone. When you talk to licensees and retailers, the computer was just left sitting there, turned off. There was nothing in place to protect our community. Suddenly, people who were previously unable to purchase alcohol had free access. We saw alcohol-fuelled crime, antisocial behaviour and alcohol getting back into the hands of those who caused harm.

It is important to call out the Member for Araluen that we did not simply throw out AMT—we left it in place. Not one of the recommendations from the Riley review recommended the restoration of mandatory treatment for people who misuse alcohol.

The Members for Araluen and Blain—it sounded today as though the CLP were trying to reinstate their failed alcohol mandatory treatment problem. Its independent evaluation demonstrated that the program was expensive, ineffective and without an evidence base. Their position was condemned by leading NT Health, justice and welfare stakeholders AFANT, NTCOS, ADANT, NAAJA and AMSANT.

AMT criminalised people with an alcohol dependence. It was punishment, not treatment. It locked up people who had done nothing wrong other than drinking in a public space. It was steamrolled into operation against the advice of health practitioners. Forcing people to participate in treatment is not productive.

Madam Speaker, we were both in the Assembly when we stayed to four o'clock in the morning when the CLP rammed that legislation through. It cost \$57 000 per person per treatment. We do not know how long people stayed in treatment for or what the success rate was. This is compared to \$17 000 for a voluntary treatment based in the community.

It provided no benefit in alcohol-related harm indicators such as ED presentations, interactions with police and homelessness compared to people who had no treatment. AMT excluded more people than it included. There were 810 in the evaluation between 2014–15 who met the trigger for AMT but only 301 people received a treatment order. Of those, only 190 had a mandatory residential treatment.

In the last six months around 700 people have voluntarily undertaken an alcohol assessment. Over a thousand people have commenced a treatment under our voluntary programs and pathways in place. A recent article in the *Australia New Zealand Journal of Public Health* argued that AMT was both a waste of money and an abuse of human rights under international law. The evidence says that it takes multiple treatments, occasions and a variety of treatment methods to support people through the path to recovery from problem drinking. As a government we have made a large range of options available for people to access to help them.

Income management orders are being implemented on people who continue to have difficulty managing their problem drinking in small numbers. There are 25 people who have been referred for income management by the BDR registrar. This week in parliament we have been talking—the Member for Brennan articulated it well last night. Those opposite are trying to rewrite history. We need to call out AMT for what it was. I point to that article. If you do not want to listen to me that is fine, but the Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health argued that AMT was both a waste of money and an abuse of human rights under international law.

In closing on the comments from members, I thank my colleagues, the Members for Brennan, Casuarina, Katherine, Sanderson, Karama and Arnhem for their comments. I apologise if I missed anyone else. The Member for Araluen made a lot of interesting comments. I will not comment on them. I was quite surprised by them this evening. People reading this debate will have perhaps already read them, or they can go back and read them. Some of those comments were quite surprising. Just before I move through to a little more content on the bill, one of the points was an evaluation. Regarding evaluation, we are looking at a number of measures. We have the BDR evaluation where we have monthly BDR reports and statistics are published. Then we had the six-month report of evaluation of the implementation of the BDR, released in July last year. We had the 12-month report evaluation on the impact, which was released in December. The next report is due in June this year.

We are also ensuring that recommendations are being reported on in the Alcohol Harm Minimisation Action Plan. Regarding sobering up shelters, Price Waterhouse Coopers Indigenous Consulting released a report on behalf of the government late last year. Implementation is well-progressed among our sobering up shelters. The social and economic costs of alcohol consumption in the Northern Territory—I will talk about

this static, but that was released in February. The Cardiff model of last drink surveys will be implemented into our emergency departments in the very near future.

We are working on other projects regarding evaluation. The preliminary evaluation of floor price is being developed with funding from the Hospital Research Foundation. A full evaluation will be commissioned, as recommended by the Riley review. A treatment demand study is being undertaken by Menzies and the University of New South Wales, which will also report this year. There are certainly many evaluations and much work being done in that space because it is important. People need to see not only key indicators, which we are providing on the website, which looks at decrease in the overall consumption rates, alcohol-related deaths and assaults. It is important that we have this information for people in our community to see.

The reason this work regarding alcohol is so important is that Territorians have had enough of alcohol-related crime, road trauma and the emergency departments and hospitals being full with alcohol-related admissions when they are trying to take family members there to receive care. We are starting see our measures working. We have seen that with a 44% reduction in alcohol-related assaults in Alice Springs between September and December 2018 compared to 2017.

Territory-wide we saw a 24.5% decrease in alcohol-related emergency department presentations in Northern Territory hospitals between September and December 2018 compared to 2017. Three thousand litres of alcohol marked for secondary supply has been seized by police since the creation of the Alcohol Policing Unit. We have seen police cracking down on licensees doing the wrong thing and ensuring that we have strong compliance.

The Member for Brennan is someone that is very passionate and worked in this space certainly knows what he is talking about. He talked about the numbers in the recommendations that have been implemented and our latest report shows that 75 of the 219 accepted recommendations have been implemented.

It is very interesting, while I am on that point, to hear from the Member for Araluen about how we can hold these reviews but we should not just accept everything they say. This was very well considered. We received the report in October, we accepted the recommendations in principle except for the recommendation relating to no trading on a Sunday. We felt the restrictions in place were reasonable.

We have been working through them in terms of the implementation but I am not sure what they would do over the other side, whether they would just have reviews and not accept anything or whether they would even bother in the first place.

As I said, 70 of the recommendations are tied up with the rewrite of the act which was expected to be released as an exposure draft very soon.

A number of members spoke about the cost to our community, \$1.38bn per year in alcohol-related harm. That is just huge. That figure has increased. The last figure that was \$642m in 2009. It is important to note that there has been a slight change in the reporting methods and that is not just us, the others will come running in on the other side and say we have changed the reporting to make it look worse.

That is actually research and it picks up things such as child protection which alcohol-related harm has a huge impact on. It has increased but it is important to note that there is a changed method to that research but \$642m in 2009 to \$1.38bn per year it costs the Northern Territory.

Reducing alcohol-related violence and crime means safer communities, more jobs and more resources for our schools, our hospitals and our police. When I was in Alice Springs recently, I was at the hospital. I was there with the Member for Namatjira. We were accepting some donations from the Drivers. A shout out and a thank you to the Drivers.

The doctors in the Emergency Department had a smile on their face. They had time to stop and talk to us. The last time we were there, they were very busy, rushed off their feet. I could feel that a minister visiting the hospital was a burden whereas this time they had time to talk to us. I think that points to these measures starting to take effect.

This bill makes technical amendments to the *Liquor Act (1978)* to further improve the operation of the Liquor Commission and the point of sale intervention, or POSI, scheme. The bill introduces new powers for police to conduct undercover operations to detect offences against the *Liquor Act* particularly aimed at curbing the ongoing secondary supply of liquor.

The bill continues to develop important tools to address unacceptable levels of alcohol-related harm in the Territory and implement the recommendations made by the Riley report. I call on this Chamber and those members opposite to work together to address the alcohol-fuelled violence and crime and to deliver the safe communities that Territorians deserve.

It was yesterday in debate that we heard about the alcohol-fuelled crime and how the government had to do something. They had the opportunity to come in here today to ask questions and to speak in support of this bill and instead we had comments such as 'this is morally and ethically wrong' and that we are attacking businesses. It was really disappointing when those opposite had that opportunity to engage in meaningful debate.

In terms of the key features, this amendment amends the *Liquor Act (1978)* to provide that the Liquor Commission may, if it considers necessary, hold a public hearing when proposing to vary a liquor licence on its own initiative under section 33 of the act.

This is to provide clarity to that Liquor Commission that if they do propose to vary liquor licences and I think the best example was in Tennant Creek when there were variations to liquor licences. It is clearly providing them with the ability to hold those public hearings.

It clarifies for the purpose of point of sale interventions at or near licensed premises, that a customer will include anyone in the possession of alcohol and that officers may stop and detain a vehicle when a customer is in the vehicle.

It empowers police officers to conduct undercover operations to detect breaches of the *Liquor Act* with robust approval and reporting requirements. The bill further clarifies aspects of the Riley review already implemented by the *Liquor Commission Act 2018* and the *Liquor Amendment (Point of Sale Intervention) Act 2018*. The need for further clarity is in response to operational experiences of our dedicated police officers and the Liquor Commission.

One of the questions was, 'Where is this coming from?' This is from listening to police on the beat about the tools they need to do their job.

The *Liquor Commission Act 2018* commenced in February 2018, delivering an important recommendation from the Riley review. The independent Liquor Commission conducts its public hearings when deciding on a range of matters that affect our community. We reflect on the horrific circumstances that the community of Tennant Creek faced last year.

Addressing these distressing incidents was one of the first issues the Liquor Commission was charged with and it was when the Liquor Commission travelled to the community to consider changing the conditions of an existing liquor licence, it was identified that they were lacking a clear power to conduct a public hearing. That is a critical element to ensure the strong operations of the independent Liquor Commissions, which is why we are making that change. The clarifications of police powers also stem from operational experience.

In 2012, the Northern Territory Police force developed an operational model that targeted alcohol supply at the point of sale, referred to as temporary beat locations, in an effort to manage unacceptable alcohol-related offending in Alice Springs. Over time the temporary beat locations evolved into a more sustainable process: point of sale intervention, or POSI operations.

Subsequent events saw an increased public demand for the operations to continue and the POSI framework was legislated in June 2018 as part of the *Liquor Amendment (Point of Sale) Intervention Act*.

The change to the point of sale powers proposed by this bill comes from operational challenges identified by police officers and the police auxiliary liquor inspectors known as PALIs in their work on our streets and in and around our bottle shops.

Police have asked for changes to be made to help them target secondary supply of alcohol, namely the definition of 'customer' and to be able to safely stop a vehicle proceeding through a drive-through bottle shop.

For Alice Springs, Tennant Creek and Katherine, POSIs have been an integral part of protecting the community from alcohol-related harm. In regional areas, such as East Arnhem Land, general restricted areas enable the use of liquor permits as a control mechanism.

In the Darwin and Palmerston area, restricted areas do not apply. The POSIs are not in effect. Police can provide temporary beat locations and can target outlets, but there is a far larger number. Targeting the secondary supply of alcohol is the principal control mechanism with other initiatives such as the Banned Drinker Register or stopping people who are trying to bypass the Banned Drinker Register.

The Riley review noted the practice of selling liquor without a licence or carrying alcohol into designated dry communities was a problem. Police officers have significant powers to conduct covert and controlled operations under the *Police (Special Investigative and Other Powers) Act 2015*. There are serious sentences for anyone conducting an offence.

In terms of secondary supply, the offences that will help include breach of a licence condition are the sale of liquor not authorised by the licensee and the purchase of liquor when the sale is not authorised by a licence. All of these have a maximum term of imprisonment of less than three years.

The police have asked for practical, specific powers to conduct under-cover operations to deal with these offences in the same way they have done since 1990 under the *Misuse of Drugs Act 1990*. These operations will assist police to identify and shut down those in our community who sell alcohol out the back of a vehicle without a licence at, sometimes, three to four times the retail price.

To ensure these powers are exercised responsibly in an accountable manner, there are limits on who may approve such operations. The Commission of Police will need to provide an annual report with the number of requests received and the outcome of those approvals.

There are processes in place for the return or disposal of things seized in the course of such operations and the provisions of the return of things seized mirrors two other parts of the *Liquor Act 1978*.

With the amendments to the *Liquor Act 1978*, there was extensive community consultation as part of the Riley review, followed by public discussion of its recommendations and implementation. There has been ongoing consultation by the alcohol review implementation team and industry over the ongoing processes to reform and rewrite the *Liquor Act 1978* in accordance with the Riley review.

There has been significant work done by the alcohol review implementation team. I acknowledge that team which sits in the Department of the Chief Minister for the hard work they have undertaken to work with licensees across the Territory on the pathway to compliance.

In terms of the bill's clarification of POSI powers, since April 2018 when the POSI framework came into force, police identified and raised operational concerns in relation to the use of the point-of-sale intervention powers under section 101ZK. Police officers and liquor inspectors have reported that if they are not able to exercise their powers before a person has purchased alcohol, they are prevented from doing so afterwards as the customer will not satisfy the technical requirement that the customer appears to be purchasing or intending to purchase liquor.

This can occur when bottle shops are busy and police are checking a number of customers. A customer may enter a bottle shop or drive-through and purchase alcohol before they come to the attention of those officers. Some customers have entered a bottle shop inadvertently when police are occupied with people and other customers will enter opportunistically to avoid being subject to a point-of-sale intervention.

It is the advice of NT Police that the change to the definition of customer to a person in possession will assist them with their work, extending their point-of-sale interventions to situations where a sale has taken place. I think that is fairly straight forward.

Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43, I move an extension of time for myself.

Motion agreed to.

Ms FYLES: Although I have a few remarks left, it is important to have them on the record as there have been questions asked in the House this evening on the definition of customer.

The power will also cover those who have alcohol in their possession in the vicinity of the premises but perhaps have not purchased the liquor. For example, it may have been stolen or given to them by another person to hold. To ensure that point-of-sale interventions can be appropriate to cover these circumstances, it is desirable to amend section 101ZK(1)(b) to add these circumstances to trigger a point-of-sale intervention.

The police officer or inspector may ask a person to provide their name and address, to show identification to identify themselves and ask questions to establish that the identification provided is accurate. The person may also be required by a police officer or inspector to answer questions about where the alcohol is intended to be consumed, whether the alcohol is being purchased for themselves or for another person, and whether that other person is prohibited from consuming alcohol.

The police officer or inspector may investigate whether the person, or the person to whom that person intends to supply liquor, is subject to a prohibition under the *Liquor Act 1978* or is subject to bail conditions relating to liquor. It will remain the policy of NT Police wherever possible to intervene in sales prior to customer making purchases or leaving the premises.

Police have asked for the safety of all concerned that they be given a clear power to stop vehicles proceeding through drive-through bottle shops. If a police officer tried to stop or divert a vehicle as it proceeded through such an area and the driver of the vehicle refused to stop, it is unclear that the existing powers would enable the officer or inspector to require the vehicle to do so.

It is important that police are able to exercise such a power and stop a vehicle in the same circumstance and manner as if the person were on foot. The power will continue to be limited to the customers physically located within 20 metres of the licensed premises, an entrance to the building containing the premises, or a driveway or carpark for the premises.

The police and inspectors will be able to give reasonable directions to the driver of a vehicle to ensure that the POSI power can be carried out. As always, police must be reasonable in the directions that they give and only do so for the purposes of point-of-sale interventions.

If the police officer or inspector reasonably suspects that an offence against the *Liquor Act 1978* or the *Alcohol Harm Reduction Act 2017* is likely to occur, the officer or inspector may seize the alcohol that has been purchased and destroy it. The police officer or inspector may also prevent the person from entering or remaining on the licensed premises and is empowered to direct the licensee of the premises to not sell alcohol of that person for the remainder of the day.

They may also provide the licensee with the name of the person and additional information necessary to enable the licensee to identify that person. Additionally, if the police or inspector reasonably believes that the identification provided by the person is false, the identification can be seized.

Another purpose of the bill is to provide police with the power to undertake undercover operations. The Riley review noted that the practice of selling alcohol without a liquor licence, fly grogging as it is referred to, was a problem in many parts of the Territory. Further, the review noted that while members of the public were often willing to give information to the police, they are reluctant to give evidence in court due to a perceived risk of payback or retaliation.

Police require a clear authority to work undercover and engage in limited illegal activity. Unlike the *Misuse of Drugs Act* which has always contained the specific provisions for undercover operations, the *Liquor Act* does not.

For those offences in the *Liquor Act* with penalties of over three years' imprisonment for acts engages with the provisions of the *Police (Special Investigative and Other Powers) Act* but not for the offences with terms of imprisonment three years' or less. Accordingly for police to engage in undercover investigations for offences against the *Liquor Act* with penalties of less than three years' imprisonment, specific provision needs to be made.

A majority of the offences under the *Liquor Act* police wish to target—the secondary supply of liquor—have terms of imprisonment of less than three years. Therefore special investigative powers are not available to them. A new part VIIIIBA is being inserted into the *Liquor Act* to empower police to conduct undercover operations to detect offences against the act, no matter what term of imprisonment might be imposed.

These provisions mirror similar provisions which have been in operation in the Territory for nearly 30 years in the *Misuse of Drugs Act*. The new provision will allow police to possess liquor, engage in conduct such as buying or attempting to buy liquor where all persons are in the Northern Territory. The purchase of liquor from someone who does not hold a licence is an offence under section 116 of the *Liquor Act*.

The new part VIIIIBA includes provisions to monitor the use of the power and for those that have an interest in an item seized as part of an operation, to seek to have it returned to them. There are the ancillary provisions that deal with the seizure where appropriate return of things related to such undercover operations.

New section 101ZID sets out the processes which a person has a thing or a part of a thing seized as part of an undercover operation may seek to have it released. The provision is drafted to be consistent with other release and seizure provisions in the *Liquor Act* so we can have uniformity.

I have spoken about police powers of activities and they must be authorised in writing by a police officer of or above the rank of Commander so by the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioners, Acting Commissioners or Commanders. The Commissioner for Police will also need to report on an annual basis.

The reporting requirement is in similar form to that which currently exists in 48C of the *Liquor Act* which was implemented when the Police Commissioner was given to the power to suspend a liquor licence for not more than 48 hours under section 48B.

There are also similar amendments to sections 19A and 19B of the *Liquor Act*. Section 19B was introduced into the *Liquor Act* in 2018 to assist in the detection of the sale of liquor in the Northern Territory by retailers located outside of the Territory. Part of its function is to enable inspectors to seek to purchase liquor, mostly in an online environment, to test whether the sale will comply with the minimum floor price requirements of the act. A police officer might use his or her power under section 19B to gain initial intelligence that a particular retailer is not complying with its obligations under the act.

The Economic Policy Scrutiny Committee, following introduction of this bill in November 2018, called for submissions. I thank the Chair of the committee, the Member for Brennan, and members of the committee. They tabled their report earlier this week with a number of recommendations. In the interests of time, I will not read those.

These recommendations have been accepted by the government. Recommendations 1-5 have been accepted; recommendations 2-4 will be addressed during the committee stage. In relation to recommendation five, this will take place during the consultation of the *Liquor Act* review. There will be an exposure draft bill and will come back into the parliament for scrutiny.

I thank the Parliamentary Counsel for drafting the amendments. These have been circulated. Members were notified yesterday that we intended to accept the committee's recommendations. Briefings were offered to all members.

The bill will commence on a day fixed by the Administrator by Gazette notice and is expected soon after assent. The Liquor Commission and the acting Director-General of Licensing NT will inform relevant stakeholders of the procedural changes as required and by notice when the Liquor Commission does resolve to hold a public hearing. Police will take the necessary steps to implement the changes necessary to their general orders and training to incorporate these changes in relation to the POSI and undercover operations.

This bill is an important step in our alcohol reform agenda and we have continued to work through this in a systematic manner. We have brought in many pieces of legislation and have a significant rewrite of the *Liquor Act*. We need to tackle alcohol related crime in our community and this bill provides our police with tools to do so. It ensure the public can be engaged through the Liquor Commission process.

I acknowledge the ARIT team as well as the team at the Department of the Attorney-General and Justice—the very hard working team there who have lead the development of this bill. I also acknowledge the Office of Parliamentary Counsel for their work in drafting this bill, in the committee's recommendations and making sure we have those amendments to pass this bill in a timely manner.

I commend the bill to the House and I look forward to the debate in the committee stage.

Motion agreed to; bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail.

Clauses 1 to 7 taken together and agreed to.

Clauses 7A and 7B:

Ms FYLES: Mr Deputy Speaker, I move amendment 1 that clauses 7A and 7B inserted into the bill. These new clauses amend sections 97(5)(b) and 101AP(5) of the *Liquor Act 1978* so that the wording in those sections is the same as that being used in the new section 101ZID(6) which is being inserted into the act by clause 8 of the bill.

All three of these sections deal with the same subject matter that being the circumstances in which the commissioner of police may release a 'thing' which has been seized by police back to a person who owns or has an interest in the 'thing'. While the three sections take effect under different circumstances, operationally there should be no difference in the factors which the commissioner may consider when deciding whether to release a seized 'thing'.

Each of the sections were incorporated into the *Liquor Act 1978* at different times and consequentially were drafted differently. However, it is desirable that the act be consistent in its drafting for sections which are intended to have the same operation. This also reduces the potential for inconsistency in the way that the act is applied. Consequently the opportunity has been taken to redraft the two older sections so that their wording matches that being now used in the new section 101ZID(6) which is being inserted by the bill.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 7A and 7B, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 8:

Ms FYLES: Mr Deputy Speaker, I move amendment 2 to clause 8 of the bill which among other things, inserts new sections 101ZIA(1) and 101ZIA(3) into *Liquor Act 1978*. The proposed section 101ZIA in clause 8 is further amended so that all references to the word 'acquire' are replaced with the word 'purchase' and that all references to the word 'supply' are replaced with the words 'sell or otherwise supply'.

This amendment is proposed to ensure that the language used in this new section is consistent with the language that is used elsewhere in *the Liquor Act 1978*.

Functionally it is not expected that this change will have any impact on the operation of the new section, however, to ensure clarity in the act and to avoid the potential for confusion it is desirable that language used is consistent throughout the act.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 8, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 9:

Ms FYLES: I move amendment 3 to clause 9 of the bill to insert a new clause 91A which amends section 101ZK(5)(a) to remove a reference to a container having been purchased by a customer. This amendment is a logical change to make following the change to the meaning of customer to a person who, within licensed premises has in his or her possession. The amendment will provide functional consistency in the operation of the new provision. The committees report has recommended these changes, I have accepted their report and these amendments will give effect to those recommendations.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 9, as amended, agreed to.

Remainder of the bill, by leave, taken as a whole and agreed to.

Ms FYLES (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice): I move the bill be now read a third time.

PAPER TABLED

Further Report on Consideration of Reform to Standing Order 23A Speaking of Languages other than English during proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of the Northern Territory

Ms FYLES (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice): On behalf of the Standing Orders Committee, I am pleased to table this further report to the Assembly on matters relating to speaking in languages other than English.

This report comes about as a result of the recommendations of the Committee adopted by the Assembly in August 2017 which were: the Assembly retain existing Standing Order 23A until further consideration. Members were invited to make direct submissions to the Standing Orders Committee during 2017, that time has now concluded the further consideration referred in August 2017 has also concluded.

As all members will be aware, this matter has an extensive and well publicized recent history dating from the 12th Assembly and continuing onto the 13th Assembly. The previous reports tabled in the Assembly in August 2017 and prior to that in April 2016 provide all the background. The Standing Orders Committee considered the matter as required by the previous resolutions and recommendations and for more than three years has been engaged in considerations about the best procedure to allow Members to speak during debate in a language other than English.

The Committee's Report tabled in April 2016 resulted in the Assembly adopting Standing Order 23A. Standing Order 23A provides that the business of the Assembly may be transacted in languages other than English where a Member provides, a translation of the words spoken prior to the language other than English being used and providing a written transcript in both English and the other language.

As reported previously, the Member for Nhulunbuy has sought changes to the Standing Order to reverse the onus so that he speaks in his first language first then provides a translation in English. The Member for Nhulunbuy has spoken in the Assembly in his first language on one occasion. The Member for Nhulunbuy's evidence to the Standing Orders Committee meeting was outlined in the August 2017 Committee Report to the Assembly. In accordance with the recommendations of that Committee Report the Member for Nhulunbuy has since made a further written submission to the Standing Orders Committee. I commend the Member for Nhulunbuy for his persistence in being involved in the procedural matters of the Assembly and thank him for his submissions. He has asked to be able to speak in his own language before speaking in English.

We did not receive any other submissions. The committee has received only the submissions from the Member for Nhulunbuy over the past two years. We took the view that they provide sufficient advice for the Assembly to conclude that he is the Member in this Assembly most impacted by the existence of Standing Order 23A.

The Committee therefore found no reason to continue with a practice which, while well intentioned and is not meant to be ill of any members at that time, has perhaps not realised the outcomes desired by its introduction.

The committee therefore proposes the following procedures be adopted by the Assembly:

1. The Assembly agrees to remove Standing Order 23A from Standing Orders.
2. The Assembly reverts to the previous practice of leave being sought by Members as required to contribute in languages other than English and the Assembly may either grant or deny leave at its discretion.
3. The Speaker makes arrangements if and when requested to assist the Member, where leave is granted for that Member, to participate in a language other than English.
4. Members seeking leave to speak in languages other than English must provide the Speaker with adequate notice for the Speaker to make any arrangements to provide assistance so that the Member may be understood and the Parliamentary Record may accurately report the contribution if the leave of the Assembly to speak in the other language is granted.
5. 'Arrangements' may include use of an interpreter, or relying upon the Member providing their own translation orally or in writing. Where a translation is provided only in writing, other Members will be permitted an opportunity to respond to any concerns they have about content in written translations.

This is an issue that the Standing Orders Committee took a great deal of time on. There were many discussions and I acknowledge my fellow committee members. We hope that this change assists the Member for Nhulunbuy, as I referred to in my comments, as he was the only member who provided submissions to the committee over the past two years. In this Assembly we can all understand his wish to speak in his first language. We hope this arrangement works. We are open to reviewing it at any time. We welcome that conversation to continue with the Member for Nhulunbuy.

I thank the committee and committee secretariat for their work. I commend the recommendations and move they be adopted.

Motion agreed to; recommendations adopted.

CONSIDERATION OF COMMITTEE REPORTS, AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORTS AND GOVERNMENT RESPONSES

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Honourable Members, pursuant to the routine of business the Assembly now consider committee and Auditor-General's reports and government responses. I invite members if they wish to proceed with any item.

Consideration deferred.

MOTION

Note Petition – Petition No 32 – Repeal of the Liquor Floor Price and Reintroduction of the Liquor Amendment (Repeal of Minimum Pricing) Bill 2018

Mrs FINOCCHIARO (Spillett): Mr Deputy Speaker, the purpose of this petition was to convey to the government how Territorians felt specifically about the floor price. Although there was a separate petition circulating at the time to voice displeasure with the government's liquor reforms, Leslie Hogan from Alawa felt so strongly that the floor price unfairly penalised responsible drinkers and would fail to deter irresponsible drinkers that she took it upon herself this separate petition. I will read from the petition:

We the undersigned respectfully showeth that we the residents of the Northern Territory call on the Northern Territory Government to cease penalising responsible drinkers for the actions of a few and instead focus its efforts on targeting its efforts to decrease antisocial behaviour and alcohol-related crime through targeted interventions.

It then prays that the government undertake a couple of things. Point 2 of the petition is to:

... reintroduce and pass the Liquor Amendment (Repeal of Minimum Pricing) 2018 as introduced into the Legislative Assembly by the Northern Territory opposition on 31 October 2018.

Ms Hogan is pleased that we are able to debate her petition in parliament tonight and extends the opportunity to the Chief Minister to give her a call to chat to her about it. She felt so strongly about this that between her friends, family and neighbours she was able to quickly gather 201 signatures on her petition. That is a fantastic effort by Leslie.

This is in addition to the 1406 signatures that signed the broader petition circulating at that time condemning the government's liquor policies in general and targeting family-run corner stores specifically. That makes for a lot of unhappy Territorians.

Territorians value their freedom, independence and their lifestyle. They do not want to have the way they live their lives dictated to them from on high or to be punished for the bad decisions or excesses of a small minority of people. They do not like being told that the government knows best and that they should change their lives to suit political whims. However, that is precisely what the floor price has done. It has unfairly punished the many for the behaviour of a few.

Instead of targeting all Territorians with the same big stick, the government should be focused on helping people who are addicted to alcohol. They are addicted to the point where they are making bad decisions in life. They are begging, stealing, and breaking into homes and businesses to access their drug of choice.

The government has gone out of its way to choose measures such as the floor price that target the entire community. Measures such as the BDR are a blunt instrument that affect everyone whether or not they do the right or the wrong thing.

With the floor price, suddenly every Territorian on their way home from work after a long week or those just popping out to the shop was confronted with increased prices for even mid-strength beer. It is entirely reasonable and understandable for them to ask themselves why this government is punishing them. It really does not make any sense.

Targeted treatment interventions work far better than a floor price and the BDR, which is not evidence-based despite the fact that the government likes to say that it is. The evidence suggests that the BDR is causing huge problems with secondary supply.

There are other options available to the government to help address alcohol-related harm. It is acknowledged that the cost of alcohol-related harm financially and socially is tremendous. Something needs to be done. However, this measure is an overstep by the government. We hope that it changes its position on the time frame for evaluation, evaluating it after the 12-month period to see if it is making any difference at all.

We continue to advocate for targeted policies such as alcohol mandatory treatment, which has been spoken about at length this evening during other debate. The time for this debate is short so I conclude by thanking the petitioners who spent the time and energy to put this petition to parliament.

I like the new process where we get to debate people's petitions. They too put time and energy into it. It is important to ventilate their concerns. Two hundred and one petitioners is an important showing from the community that there are concerns on the floor price legislation.

Evidence from places like Scotland shows that it does not work. It does not improve health outcomes nor does it make people with a drinking problem drink any less.

I thank the petitioners for bringing the petition to the Assembly. I look forward to the response from the minister.

Ms FYLES (Attorney-General): Mr Deputy Speaker, our alcohol reforms are about cutting crime and making safer communities. The Member for Spillett just spoke about freedom and independence. That is exactly what tackling alcohol abuse and its harm in our community achieves.

We are creating safer communities. The floor price is one measure. The floor price—we have been through it in this Chamber around how it calculated—is the number of standard drinks multiplied by \$1.30. I remind consumers that if their product is above that, they should contact Consumer Affairs.

To have this debate with the opposition—an opposition that back flipped out of their support for a floor price. At the time we talked about it, it was coincidental that it was something that the Leader of the Opposition had supported. He was on the select committee for FASD which recommended the *Liquor Act* be amended to implement a minimum floor price ensuring that a standard drink would cost at a minimum \$1.30.

The Leader of the Opposition went on to say that:

Any method that increases price will help significantly reduce both consumption and the harm related with misuse of alcohol and abuse.

The cost—the deputy Leader of the Opposition referred to it in her speech and we were talking about it early—from \$642m in 2009 to \$1.38bn. When we talk about freedom and independence, this is something that is not a political whim. It is something that is evidence based and has been in the Territory twice before and both times it was found to be very effective in tackling alcohol related crime and violence.

I find it extraordinary that those opposite want to talk about the crime and antisocial behaviour, want solutions and want us to do it, and when we put in place measures, they will not allow them to take time to work. We are seeing evidence that these measures are working, a 44% reduction in alcohol related results in Alice Springs between September and December 2018 compared to 2017.

Territory wide we have seen a 24.5% decrease in alcohol related emergency department presentations in NT hospitals. A 24.5% reduction in alcohol related presentations—that means our doctors and nurses are not as busy and run off their feet with alcohol related cases. They have more time to care for your family and loved ones when they are ill.

There is a strong link between alcohol price, consumption and alcohol related harm. The evidence is clear here in the Territory and across the world. A floor price reduces crime. Evidence was presented in the Riley review and shows that a floor price in the NT is very effective at tackling alcohol related crime and antisocial behaviour.

We saw it twice before in 1995, a minimum floor price was found to be effective in reducing alcohol related violence. The Member for Brennan talked about the Living with Alcohol Program. In 2006, the Alice Springs

Liquor Supply Plan trialled the voluntary floor price of \$1.10 and found a 12% drop in overall alcohol related crime. Canada has 10 provinces that have been using a floor price since the 1990s—they do not like it when we bring out the evidence.

The evidence clearly shows how a floor price can affect alcohol related crime and harm. Once of the provinces demonstrated a 10% increase in price lead to an 8.4% reduction in consumption, an 8% decrease in night alcohol related traffic offences and a 20% reduction in violent offences. British Columbia found a 10% increase in floor price lead to a 3.4% decrease in consumption, a 9% reduction in acute hospitalisations and a 31% reduction in wholly attributable alcohol related deaths. The Riley review references 15 national and international research papers that support floor prices as a measure to reduce consumption.

We understand that Territorians do not want to be impacted and the BDR is a point of sale intervention—you get out your licence, credit card or rewards card, whatever. They are a small inconvenience for the huge inconvenience that alcohol related crime and antisocial behaviour plays in our community.

We will continue to implement measures and will not back flip out of them when times get tough. We are focused on the long term generational change that the Territory needs.

Petition noted.

RESPONSE TO PETITION Petition No 30

The CLERK: Honourable members, pursuant to Standing Order 123, I inform members that a response from the Minister for Infrastructure, Planning and Logistics to Petition No 30 has been received and will be circulated to members.

The text of the response will be included in Parliamentary Record and placed on the Legislative Assembly website. A copy of the response will be provided to the Member for Goyder for distribution to the petitioners.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms FYLES (Leader of Government Business): Mr Deputy Speaker, I move that the Assembly do now adjourn.

Mrs FINOCCHIARO (Spillett): Mr Deputy Speaker, tonight I rise to pay tribute on behalf of Gary Higgins, the Leader of the Opposition and myself, to Grant Heaslip. I do so knowing that whatever I say will be totally inadequate as a tribute to this great man from Central Australia.

Born in Adelaide in 1939, Grant and his wife Jan moved to Alice Springs where they purchased Bond Springs Station in 1965. They arrived in the middle of an eight-year drought. Every dam was dry. The country was dry and according to Jan, there was no garden. There were only dust storms.

Once the drought broke in the late 60s, there was only a short reprieve. The grass grew but this was followed by bushfires and everything was wiped out. For Grant and Jan, life was tough until the decision to start breeding cattle and selling them to make money. Grant hung on and over time made a success of running Poll Hereford cattle on the 1500 square kilometre property, just 15 kilometres north of Alice Springs.

He was a shining example of a Territorian can-do approach with the energy and tenacity to match. He was a man who was small in height but a mighty man of great stature who was a passionate and active advocate for pastoralists, the cattle industry and a proud Territorian.

Grant was a man who cared deeply about the land, livestock, the environment and the land's sustainable uses. In 1977, Grant was appointed a member of the Livestock Producers Consultative Group to the Australian Meat and Livestock Corporation. He was subsequently appointed the Chairman of the NT Rural Land Advisory Group.

In 1977, Grant led a Northern Territory trade mission to the Middle East including the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Iran. The delegation's purpose was to convey to the countries visited some of the basic details relating to the Northern Territory and the immense potential displayed in this part of the country; to establish closer ties with countries to our north; seek out markets for our cattle and beef, particularly the possible reopening of markets for live slaughter cattle and if necessary, to examine ways our produce could be made more acceptable to their markets; to explore potential markets for NT

agriculture products to complement the beef industry's falling income; and to explore interest in possible joint venture arrangements.

In providing their report, Grant expressed the delegation's thanks for the opportunity given to them to officially represent the government overseas and to play their part both in the expansion of the Northern Territory export trade and the economy as a whole. He was a trailblazer in his endeavour to contribute to the future economic prosperity of the Northern Territory.

Inevitably, this esteemed pastoralist became the inaugural President of the NT Cattlemen's Association in 1984. In that capacity, Grant demonstrated exceptional leadership until he was stood down in 1987 to make way for John Dyer. According to an article in Queensland Country Life, Ken Wilcox wrote:

Grant was the logical choice to lead the newly formed association when it came into being in 1984. He possessed initiative and a pioneering spirit and earned high respect in the community for the pivotal roles he played in sporting, economic, political and educational organisations at Territory, national and international levels.

Those qualities were also expressed in his business interests and resulted in a diversified and vertically integrated pastoral operation involving feed lots, abattoirs and retail as well as property development and investment interests.

His stewardship in the formative years of NTCA is evident from the fact that within one year of its establishment, the association was representing 117 full members accounting for over one million cattle which equalled 77% of the NT herd at that time.

Grant remained a selfless industry champion throughout his life and that contribution was recognised with the award of NTCA Life Membership in 2005.

Then NTCA President, John Armstrong, paid tribute to Grant through a poem he work in the spirit of Kipling's Jameson. To quote:

*If it weren't the vision of our forebears bright
And the encouragement of dignitaries like De Vos
If they'd not had the courage to light the light
We'd be forever bushed as sad and sorry loss.*

*If there'd been none to stick his hand up to be the leader
For all those who could skite leadership or give lip
If we could see for the Herefords there was from the centre
His name, ladies and gentleman, was Grant Heaslip.*

During his stewardship of the Cattlemen's Association, his achievements are too many to mention in the time I have tonight, but please let me name a few—the funding of the Mudginberri Abattoirs to fight their claim against the unions, the incorporation of the association, the support by the Perron CLP government to purchase the Rowe Creek cattle yard complex, the purchase of associate own offices in Darwin, government codes of conduct on pastoral properties, declaration of brucellosis and tuberculosis-free properties, modified registration of station vehicles was agreed by the Northern Territory Government, instigation with the Northern Territory Government of an economic study to lay down a blueprint for the future investment and development of the industry, the instigation of a drought relief scheme with the Northern Territory Government on environmental and economic basis, establishment of the NT cattle and buffalo industry group, to name a few.

The success of the organisation that Grant helped create can be judged from NTCA's standing as the Territory's peak industry body now representing 90% of the pastoral industry. At the time of Grant's passing in January this year, current NTCA President Chris Nott said Mr Heaslip will be sadly and deeply missed by all. NTCA would celebrate and acknowledge Mr Heaslip's contribution to the industry at an appropriate time after a private family service at Bond Springs.

His passion for advocating for the pastoral industry and training continued throughout his life. In fact, just before he passed away station owners and cattle industry leaders gathered in Alice Springs in late 2018 to see the official opening of the Northern Territory Cattlemen's Association's specialised training facility. The facility was named after Grant, and in doing so, Chris Nott said of Grant:

He is an absolute stalwart of the industry and we are very pleased to have an opportunity to recognise his contribution to the NTCA and the Central Australian pastoral industry by naming this facility after him.

Unfortunately due to his failing health, Grant was unable to attend the opening, but he would have been pleased to know that the NTCA will use the facility to train the participants of the pastoral Real Jobs program, including Indonesian students. The Bohning Yards facility is equipped with an in-site workshop, cattle yards, horse area, cattle, horses and motorbikes for use in training, as well as a variety of common farm machinery.

The Leader of the Opposition reflected that he could just imagine that wry smile on Grant's face as he thought, 'Well there is another great outcome for our young people, who will be trained correctly and safely to look after and respect the animals, the land and themselves.' I am sure you will all agree that Grant was so much more than a pastoralist. He was a father, husband, friend, industry leader, political party leader and a supporter of young people.

Grant was President of the Country Liberal Party from 1987–1988, at a time of the formation of the National Party in the Northern Territory. The CLP is forever indebted to his contribution to the party. Grant's support for young people and the good of the wider Alice Springs community included the Heaslip Arid Zone Research Scholarships, the Heaslip Research Project through St Philip's College; Grant's patronage of the Alice Springs Cycling Club, Pioneers Football Club, community clubs and events over many decades.

He also held a vision to promote local product through the Territory and throughout the 1980s and 1990s worked cooperatively with colleagues to supply and promote local beef products in butchers' shops in each major town throughout the NT. Grant further supported his wife Jan's great passion for restoring and preserving Bond Springs station. Their four children all received their primary education in the little old school room which is also, along with all the historic buildings on Bond Springs, heritage listed.

Here a governess taught them lessons sent from the correspondence school in Adelaide and also broadcast from the School of the Air, which is situated in Alice Springs. Grant and Jan have run Bond Springs Station and Bond Beef, and with their children have created a private tourist operation at the station where tourists can see a fully operational cattle station and have home cooked meals.

In 2014 Jan opened the historic Bond Springs Station to the general public as part of Heritage Week. The Opposition Leader at the time was the minister for Arts, and he had the pleasure of visiting Grant and Jan to celebrate this historic occasion. I read with interest some thoughts from Grant's wife, Jan, from *The Times'* archives. It read:

Station women, although generally independent and hearty, are not trained for the job. "You have to have a feeling for this life," said Mrs. Heaslip, who grew up in a small town in the south. Before she married Grant Heaslip and they bought Bond Springs Station she had that affinity for pioneering life and had tested it. "I was a governess on a station," she said. "I knew what it was like."

Mrs. Heaslip believes that station men choose their wives carefully: "Marriages do fail, but not many. Men look for a woman who will share the load. A woman works hand in hand with her husband. Because its such a hard land, a man needs his wife with him."

Husband of Jan; father of Tania, Meliss, Brett and Ben; father-in-law of Steve, Chris, Fiona and Laura; Grant had eight grandchildren and two great-grandchildren.

The Territory is privileged to have had the benefit of Grant's wisdom and friendship. I know Gary Higgins, the Leader of the Opposition, is grateful for Grant's friendship and loved catching up with him when he was in Alice Springs.

The vast Northern Territory is a better place because of him. Rest in Peace.

Ms WAKEFIELD (Braitling): I too rise to speak of Grant Heaslip and his great contribution to Central Australia for more than half a century. Grant was a leader in many fields in his own community and nationally, yet he retained a humble grace and an ability to recognise and support what was good in the people around him.

People here may be surprised at me speaking of Grant in such a positive way as he was very active in the CLP, including a stint at the local branch. However, he had personal qualities that surpassed party politics.

I was privileged to spend some time when I became the Member for Braitling to spend some time around the Heaslips' huge kitchen table and chat with them and their family about what was wrong and right in the world and hear a bit of the history.

Grant Heaslip and his wife arrived and Bond Springs and as mentioned by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in the middle of an eight-year drought with extensive fires happening. Bond Springs is only 20 kilometres north of Alice Springs and although it is easily accessible now, when they arrived it was a very long and winding road back to Alice Springs. They lived quite an isolated lifestyle for a long time.

The Heaslips forged ahead in their earlier hard time and made the best of Bond Springs, running a modern and diversified and virtually integrated pastoral operation involving feedlots, abattoirs and retail as well as running a Bed and Breakfast: Bond Springs Outback Retreat.

In 1984 Grant became the inaugural president of the newly formed NT Cattlemen's Association and within a year it had 117 full members accounting for over one million cattle, which equalled 70% of the NT herd at the time.

He earned high respect for the leadership he provided in the cattle industry as well as in the town of Alice Springs. That contribution was recognised with the award of the NTCA life membership in 2005. The NTCA is now one of the foremost peak industry bodies in the Northern Territory.

Grant was also a foundation member and a long-time supporter of the National Road Transport Hall of Fame. He was a patrol of Alice Springs Cycling Club, financially supporting junior riders and sponsoring the annual King of the Hills race for over forty years.

Grant was a mentor to many and played pivotal roles in sporting, community, economic, political and educational organisations at the NT, national and international level.

He was husband of Jan; father of Tania, Melissa, Brett and Ben; father-in-law of Steve, Chris, Fiona and Laura; with eight grandchildren and two great-grandchildren.

Grant Heaslip passed away at his home on 17 January 2019 with his family by his side. He was a man who contributed much to our community. We may not have agreed on many things but he did contribute very much to our community and was a true gentleman of a type we rarely see these days.

Mr McCONNELL (Stuart): Mr Deputy Speaker, I also reach out to the Heaslip family. I went to school with a number of the Heaslip family in School of the Air and did a school trip with Brett Heaslip to Tasmania, which I still remember. I can assure you, the teachers who accompanied us can also still remember it.

Speaking of children, tomorrow is a fairly important day. It is the School Strike for Climate Change. I acknowledge the growing global movement of schoolchildren who are taking their campaign for sustainable energy and prevention of further climate change to the streets with a school strike for climate change tomorrow, Friday 15 March 2019.

It is great to see young people motivated to influence their communities and governments to change policy on energy, environment and climate. Young people that appreciate science, love the environment and are motivated by hope for the future and to preserve biodiversity and life make me optimistic about life in the future.

The School Strike for Climate Change will be held in over 50 locations around Australia tomorrow, including Darwin and Alice Springs. Globally young people and their allies in more than 90 countries are expected to take part. I hope that young people can get done what adults have not. Climate change is already affecting us and will continue to affect us all.

We have already seen how weather extremes such as extreme floods, drought and heat can affect personal livelihoods and industries like horticulture, pastoralism and transport. Large hot fires, such as one earlier this year in Tjoritja National Park, are likely to occur more regularly, affecting biodiversity and changing our landscapes for ever.

Vulnerable people, particularly those who are ill, homeless, frail or very young will suffer through extreme summers and prolonged heat. We can already see that people living in remote housing suffering through heat and lack of air conditioning on long summer days in the Northern Territory. There was a house in Kintore where the inside temperature did not go under 44 degrees for 7.5 hours over summer.

This government's decision to strongly contribute to climate change through emissions resulting from further development of fossil fuels is a poor one. We must consider that there is more than one opportunity for economic development in the Territory. We need to not lose sight of the full view of what drives our economy in the Northern Territory. We must measure up the positive and negative activities that the further development non-renewable sources of energy will have and the effects that they will have on the environment.

I supported the inquiry into hydraulic fracturing of unconventional gas reserves in the Northern Territory. I am glad that we promised this at the last election. I am glad that the promise was honoured in order to attempt to assure that a final decision would take account of the real concerns of Territorians about its environmental impacts, as well as any positive and negatives effects on well-established industries and livelihoods.

However, as you are all aware, I did not support lifting of the moratorium on hydraulic fracturing due to economic and environmental concerns. Now that the moratorium has been lifted my concerns about hydraulic fracturing have not waned. I am no way opposed to sustainable economic development, but this is neither sustainable nor economic.

We are on the back end of the wrong curve. I still believe that we should not be subsidising the development of further oil and gas industry in the Northern Territory while sacrificing our deep environmental values. The minimum impact of maintaining environmental integrity is important to our community and our economy.

I am concerned that our environmental protection agency is neither strong nor independent enough to protect us from potential air or water pollution from hydraulic fracturing. I am concerned that other jurisdictions are moving away from oil and gas developments because they have recognised the benefits of renewable energy development, while this government appears to have not to an adequate enough degree.

I am very concerned that this government cannot afford to invest in or subsidise the industry because the economic pay off will not be worth the cost of offsetting the emissions, while trying to repair the negative environmental impacts or ameliorating the potential public health impacts. Meanwhile, our jurisdiction will be even further behind in the development of renewable energy, both here and in wider Australia.

I am very concerned that there may have been undue influence by some of the Northern Territory to lift the fracking moratorium by the current Australian government through promises of funding, fulfilled or unfulfilled. I place these concerns on the record today and encourage all members to ensure that we do not invest in subsidising an industry that may have such negative effects on our climate, our future and our true territory values. The Northern Territory has always been nature territory and it should remain that way. I look forward to supporting the children tomorrow and I think we all should support the children they are our future.

Ms NELSON (Katherine): Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure tonight to rise and tell everyone about some of the wonderful works and achievements in and of the Katherine Community and I do want to acknowledge the Member for Stuarts comments and a reminder about the climate change student protest tomorrow. I will be there, I think that it is wonderful that the students are showing such great passion and interest in their environment and the climate.

The Katherine Community, the Katherine schools and in particular the young Katherine students who are developing their leadership qualities now and will become great leaders in the future are absolutely worthy of being acknowledged and having their information placed on record.

Great leadership is required not just in parliament, but in all facets of a functional society. Great leadership is required in business, in family homes, in community groups, sporting groups, schools, on the street and in the bush.

Leaders are a source of inspiration. Leaders are counsellors; they help others work through their challenges. A good leader is humble and knows when to seek help and acknowledges the help of those around them. A great leader lights the fire within, not underneath the people they are leading. Ladies and gentlemen, I wish for the Hansard Record to forever reflect the leadership being shown in Katherine, not just in the schools, but throughout our community.

We all can lead by example, we all have the opportunity to be the change that we want to see in the world. I know these young leaders in the Katherine schools are a new generation of Northern Territorians. They work hard, respect their environment, and have great respect for the people around them and that is shown every day.

As great leaders, they will continue to look out for those less fortunate than themselves, and will make sure, they, as leaders continue to ensure a fair go for everyone. They will keep on looking out for the little guys. If they see something that isn't fair, isn't right, they will Speak Up, Even if Their Voice Shakes.

Young leaders of today understand Equality. They know what justice is. And, working together, they make a wonderful vibrant community. I commend the following school students, their teachers, their parents and grandparents and carers for leading by example, and for raising the young leaders of our future.

From Katherine South Primary School, congratulations to the elected school captains Mia Harris and Ross Sutherland. School vice-captains Temperance Fletcher and Will Brown. House captains and vice-captains Charli McWhirter, Kayden Lee, Boyd Fletcher Olivia Gamble, Mikaylah Amarant, Ian Thomson, Pippa Murphy, Ethan Redpath, Jordyn Matthews, Oliver Wuttke.

Congratulations also to the following elected student representatives council leaders Joseph Wuttke, Brooklyn Gamble, Cody Bates, Nylah Amarant, Mackenzie Woodhill, Riley Prime, Jorja Gamble, Jobe Prime, Nicole Wilson, Tahla Hutchinson, Annabel Gibbs, Shaun Sodhi, Bonnie Stanley, Caitlyn Usher—the Usher family, their kids are doing really well—Sophia Bartlett, Tayne McArthur, Aleeah Bawi, Henry Russell, Henry Frogley and Jessiann Storey.

From Casuarina Street Primary School, congratulations to the school captains Ava Yeoman and Campbell Burns; Vice Captains Amelie Cox, Arch Howard; House Captains Eva Walters, Kane Albert, Lainey Blake, Max Stuart, Isabella von Minden, Riccardo Baldock, Jacob Small, Miyah McCoy—whose parents are fantastic, Laura and Dwayne McCoy, great family, very actively involved in the community—and the elected members of the Student Representative Council Finley Lovering—well done Finley, congratulations on being elected, Audrey Lehman, Stirling Macgregor Shaw—wonderful to see your name on the list Stirling—Lacey Hales, Abiya Merin-abi and Charlie Dalglish.

From Clyde Fenton School, congratulations to the school captains Simeon Tallon-Rosas and Ella Perduns; Vice Captains Joe Laurie and Miki Campbell; House Captains and Vice Captains Connor McDonald and La Shani McDonald, Daina Bostock and Tylar Raymond, Layleeshia Slater and Thomas Rachor, Harry Bader and Tio Hughes, George Rosas and Nedrika Shadforth, Ronald Kerr and Kalisha Huckstadt-Rankine, Jaxon Egan and Jazmerelda Mota, Tony Williams and Olivia Donzow.

From St Joseph's Catholic College, congratulations to the primary school leaders Cameron Da Forno, Louis Clementson, Rudy Walker-Sangster, Grace Morrow.

Congratulations to all of the students, I look forward to catching up with each of you when I return home after sittings.

I remain on my feet to pay tribute to the families in the Katherine community who are opening their hearts and homes to children who are not able to live with their own families.

Foster carers are very special people, and do a wonderful job, not only providing a safe, secure and loving environment for young people to grow up but providing a great example for their children and for the rest of the community.

For a child, entering the foster care system is often a frightening and stressful experience. Being taken away from the place they once felt safe and being surrounded by strangers in unfamiliar territory, is a terrifying thing to go through. Foster carers provide a safe, loving environment for these vulnerable children.

With their love and support, the children in their care quickly adapt and often thrive. Put simply, foster carers help to make a real difference to vulnerable children in society.

Our government is working to address the issues that has led to high rates of children in out-of-home care. We are addressing home dysfunction. Our programs addressing generational change are not cheap results in some ways. But if it helps just one child grow up in a safe, loving and functional household, it is priceless.

I am so proud of the members of the Katherine community that contribute every day in their own very small way to keeping the community together. They add to the vibrancy and success of the Katherine community.

I also want to take a quick moment to acknowledge my two electorate officers in the Katherine office: Ms Kate Ganley and Ms Jennifer Robinson. They do an amazing job of supporting me and providing service to

the Katherine constituents. Without their support and assistance, my job would be that much harder. I cannot begin to put into words how much I appreciate everything that they do on a professional level and a personal level.

Ms UIBO (Arnhem): Mr Deputy Speaker, really great to hear some of the Katherine electorate achievements, particularly for the students and young people. Thank you for sharing that Member for Katherine. I live around the corner from the Katherine High School so it is really great to hear what is going on in your electorate and my neighbourhood.

I acknowledge some more artists tonight from the Arnhem electorate, particularly some who are kicking some fantastic goals, the Mambali band, which is a mix of my family from Numbulwar, Ngukurr and Groote Eylandt are being recognised on the interstate and national stage. They have been working with and are now signed with Skinnyfish music label. Over the last couple of years they have performed at Barunga Festival. Last year they performed and they are a very professional and energetic act. The crowd was up and dancing on both stages, so it was really great to see Mambali at that big community festival.

Ms NELSON: They are a very great band.

Ms UIBO: Yes, a very great band. Thank you, Member for Katherine. On Tuesday there was an online article printed about Mambali band and I will enter that for the record to recognise they have been celebrated in other parts of Australia and not just the beautiful Top End of the Northern Territory. This was from The Music Network website. I will be tabling a few documents at the end of my adjournment. This one is for Mambali:

Emerging in force from the remote coastal community of Numbulwar in the Northern Territory, Mambali are a fresh and exciting band bringing sounds from the edge of the Gulf Of Carpentaria to a wider Australia. Mambali have been performing for the last few years at festivals around the Northern Territory and are now ready to release their debut single 'Fish Hawk' ahead of their debut album later this year. Their traditional songs are about country, culture and the Dhumbul Dance (Devil Dance) but are performed with contemporary arrangements, edge and energy. The six piece primarily perform in their first language, Nunggubuyu with the intention of engaging young people through positivity and empowerment. 'Fish Hawk' has stormed both the Regional and Metro charts this week, gaining plenty of attention from the likes of Radio Adelaide in SA, the Macleay Valley's Tank FM in NSA and 4ZZZ in Brisbane.

I think that is supposed to be New South Wales, but we will check that. That is from The Music Network

Mambali Band have just finished are returning to the Territory this week from playing at WOMADelaide, which is a festival in South Australia. This is a huge testament to the fantastic talent that they have. They are humble. I know that their families are proud and I am proud as their local member and as a family member.

They do a great job and they support our small festivals like the Numburindi Festival in Numbulwar. They are now on the national stage. WOMADelaide is a popular international event on the music and art scene, Congratulations Mambali Band for doing the Northern Territory Proud and presenting the amazing music that you produce, and for empowering young people.

Two other artists need celebrating. I am switching media to the film industry. The Northern Territory Travelling Film Festival, which the Member for Casuarina, the Minister for Tourism, Arts and Culture, is proud to promote, is hitting the Northern Territory in May and June. I have been looking it up online because there are two short films that will be played throughout the travelling festival which both come from my electorate.

I share descriptions of those short films and encourage those in the chamber and those listening, as well as all Territorians and visitors to the Territory who are in the Northern Territory in May and June, to get onto the website www.ntravellingfilmfestival.com to look up what is available. There are some iconic places that are being used as the backdrops for the airing of these films.

These include Nitmiluk National Park; Leliyn, which is Edith Falls; Kakadu National Park, they are being played in the Jabiru area at the croc hotel. There is plenty of opportunity here in Darwin to get out and about across the Territory to enjoy the short films from Territory film producers and story writers, as well those from across Australia. There may be some international ones—I did not get to look at the whole suite of films on offer. I looked at the Northern Territory ones in particular, so I will share a description of two of them from Ngukurr in my electorate.

I Am Numamurdirdi—I will first speak in Kriol and then give an English translation:

Olmen Walter Kolbong Rogers dalimbat stori bla im laif, weya imin densa en serremeni lida.

Which in English is:

Senior culture man and junggayi for this country Walter Kolbong Rogers tells the story of his life as a dancer and leader of ceremony.

The second film was also from Ngukurr. I have spoken before about Courtney Collins who received an Asia Link Artists Exchange Award. She will be travelling to India. Courtney helped with this project. I spoke about her on Tuesday night. *Lil Bois* is spelled in the Kriol way. I quote:

After swimming with his friends in a billabong, a nervous little boy returns to his camp and discovers everything has changed. His family is missing. With his friends, he heads out into the wilderness to find them.

Lil Bois was written and directed by Grant Thompson who is in Ngukurr. I spoke about him on Tuesday. It is the first short film in the traditional language of Ngandi. It also features the languages Wagilak and Kriol.

Congratulations to Grant and Courtney for their work on this festival. I will table these synopses, which have some great photos from the website. There is a wealth of talented people and artists in the electorate of Arnhem. I am happy to support, promote and celebrate the great work done by all of these artists in all their various media.

I know that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, spoke the other night about some of the great festivals that are happening in Central Australia, not just in your electorate but also in Alice Springs. It is great to celebrate that side of the Northern Territory and to know that we have such talented people. At the end of the day they all are members of our communities. They are happy to be celebrated in this way, but also to be humble and peaceful when they go home.

Congratulations to Mambali Band, Ngukurr Arts, Grant Thompson and Courtney Collins for their hard work which will be showcased with the short film festival. You will hopefully catch the Mambali Band throughout the Northern Territory at our various festivals. I believe they played at the Darwin Festival in 2017 and ...

Ms Nelson: The Katherine Junk Art Festival 2018.

Ms UIBO: And at the Katherine Junk Art Festival last year, which was great. We have talent that travels around but stays to celebrate in our communities as well.

Ms LAWLER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to talk about the lovely new student leaders in my electorate in Drysdale. The years seem to go very quickly. It is already coming towards the end of week seven for schools. Schools have organised all their student representative council members as well as their school council members too.

Palmerston College, Driver Primary and Gray Primary have all recently announced their school captains, vice-captains and sports captains. I had the privilege of presenting the new leaders with their badges at Moulden Park Primary School last Friday. I am proud of the wonderful schools that I have in my electorate of Drysdale.

I thank the parents and families who support their children in the great learning environments at our Palmerston schools.

Congratulations to the following students at Palmerston College: College Captains Jasinda Bourke and Melissa Prosser, College Vice Captains Emileah Sackley and Isla McCann, Year 10-12 Campus Captains Jack Hogarth and Tori Inglis. The Senior Leadership Council; Year 10—Paige Horrigan, Lilli Walsh and Sharmayne Rizaldo, Year 11—Hayden Dale, Max Garton, Nicholas Hatcher and Jessica Dent and Year 12—Hiranni Smith, Isabel Uybenes, and Yseblle Glori.

Congratulations to the following students at Driver Primary School: School Captains—Derel and Jasmyn, doing a great job already, Vice Captains—Sebastian and Lucy, Archer House Sports Captains Jacob and Cassidy, and Vice Captains Delfin and Breanna, Chaney House Sports Captains Clive and Ruby, and Vice Captains Kael and Miharna, Johnston House Sports Captains Geoffrey and Shakaila, and Vice Captains Ethan and Yvonne, Nelson House Sports Captains Angus and Hilda, and Vice Captains Cooper and Elektra.

Congratulations to the following students at Gray Primary School: School Captains Jack Bendsten and Chloe Martin, Vice Captains Keith Atkinson and Destiny Tarau. The sports captains; Guth Guth, which was my house when I was at Gray School. Guth Guth is red and it means possums so the Guth Guth Possums there sports captains Ricky and Cynarah, and Vice Captains Anthony and Taylor. Kulamingi House Sport Captains Dylan and Jenneffer, and Vice Captains Samuel and Ciana. Yuengi House Sport Captains Marshall and Sasha, and Vice Captains Max and Leah. Bilingida House Sport Captains Edward and Leah, and Vice Captains Conor and Leah.

Teaching is a fabulous and the teachers in my schools in my electorate as I said I would like to thank them for all the hard that they are doing at the beginning of the school year and setting up the school captains and sports captains, it is always a busy time.

Today I visited the site of the new Zuccoli Primary School with the Minister for Education and Member for Brennan, it is going to be an absolutely wonderful for the Palmerston community. Down that end of Palmerston, that new end, Zuccoli is just developing quickly. If you haven't had a chance to go down that way, there is a great little café down there, the Rainmaker Café and a terrific community out there and they have got the Mother Teresa Catholic School up and running but we will also have the Zuccoli government primary school there as well.

Stage one of the new school has commenced. This will be the preschool which will have space for 88 little ones and eight primary school classrooms. They will have room for about 200 students.

Today we talked about bringing forward stage two, which will provide an oval and a multipurpose area, as well as an administration area, for the primary school. These are great facilities that are going into Zuccoli and they are a great addition for our community in Palmerston. We have fast-tracked projects including Zuccoli school.

We fast-tracked the Palmerston fire station as well. We are pleased to see that we will be getting a brand new fire station in Palmerston. The Chief Minister has mentioned how old and run down the Palmerston fire station currently is. I remember when it was built in the early 1980s. My husband was a firefighter and he spent a lot of his 30-year firefighting career at the Palmerston fire station. We are well and truly in need of a new fire station. I am proud to be the Member for Drysdale who is looking forward to seeing the new fire station delivered.

The Palmerston police station is a \$30m project. There are about 340 jobs going into its construction. If you have not had a look at it, it is on Temple Terrace near the super clinic area. It is going ahead in leaps and bounds. It is looking fantastic. It will be an amazing facility. There will be a community hall for people to have public meetings there. If you want to have a function you will be able to have one as well. It is great to see a community hall going into the Palmerston police station.

We talked quite a bit about the Palmerston Regional Hospital, 410 local jobs with the build there. It is fabulous to have that hospital. If you are a Darwin person and have not had a chance to drive around Palmerston recently, I encourage you to do that.

It is about government investing in Palmerston's future. It is not just about infrastructure and schools. We had the Australia Day Awards and I did not get a chance last sittings to talk about those. The Palmerston recipients are wonderful, selfless and tireless people supporting our community and are fantastic examples for all of us to look up to.

Vanessa Lowe won Community Event of the Year with Come Walk with Me which is an event that raises awareness for suicide. I went to school with Vanessa and this has been something that is very close to her heart. The event is just getting bigger each year. It is a lovely community event. Congratulations and well done to Vanessa.

Citizen of the Year was awarded to Peta Preo. Peta works tirelessly with the bereaved parent support group in Palmerston. A great organisation and I thank her for all her work supporting families in the toughest times of their lives.

Denique Stuart was awarded Young Citizen of the Year. Denique organises celebrations and events for young people in Palmerston. She is a true role model for young people in Palmerston. Congratulations and well done to Denique.

The Member for Brennan and I sponsor pretty much all the sporting clubs in Palmerston: Palmerston cricket, tennis, football, AFL, Raiders. One of the ones we do support is the Palmerston Magpies. Both Tony and I also have loyalties towards the Buffaloes football club because of our backgrounds and our family backgrounds. We get in there and support the Palmerston Magpies because they do a great job with our young kids in Palmerston with sport.

Alwyn 'Froggy' Davey reached 150 NTFL games playing for the Palmerston Magpies just recently. The Magpies did not get into the grand final but I am sure they are heading that way in the next few years. They have some great young players.

Matthew Dennis, the Magpies' ruckman, was named the 2018-19 NT News player of the year and won the best and fairest for the Magpies this year. It is a great honour to be the NT News player of the year.

Janet Baird is from a great family in Palmerston. She is an ex Palmerston High School student and a Magpies player. She won the Gwynne Medallist which is the women's best player for the year—the women's AFL premier league, the number one league for women's best player for the year. Janet has a bright future in AFL.

I think the people who are our leaders in our community in Palmerston. It is an amazing community and we have great facilities. We are a government that are building those facilities to support them, but those facilities are not anything without the wonderful people of Palmerston.

Motion agreed to; the Assembly adjourned.

DRAFT