

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 25 March 2020

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

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

Bills

COMMISSION OF INQUIRY (LAND ACCESS IN THE MINING AND PETROLEUM INDUSTRIES) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (10:31): I seek leave to move the notice of motion standing in my name in an amended form.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to provide for a commission of inquiry into land access regimes under the Mining Act 1971, the Opal Mining Act 1995 and the Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Act 2000, the operation of the Department for Energy and Mining in relation to such land access regimes, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (10:32): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The bill that I present to this house calls for an independent commission into land access and approvals for the mining sector and the petroleum sector to be able to obtain access to agricultural land and work collaboratively with all sectors that have been affected. Previous bills have been brought through the Parliament of South Australia, but no bill has been able to satisfy all parties; therefore, I feel it necessary to have this commission of inquiry.

There are people who may say that as legislators we get it right every time we bring any legislation into both houses of parliament, but we must be realistic and look at and review our consultation and how we do it, especially with the general public. I believe that we can and should always improve on what we do, and in particular we must improve how we communicate and consult.

This bill proposes that the inquiry be held away from politics and also that the commissioner be an independent person. My bill requests that the commissioner be a retired justice of the Supreme Court or Federal Court and that this person be appointed by the Attorney-General. This person should not be a retired political person but someone well and truly away from politics.

It appears that for far too long mining legislation may not have looked at all opportunities. For this reason, I have placed in this bill the opportunity to look into the practices of not only interstate but also overseas jurisdictions and how they may be able to achieve best practice and balance the rights of landowners and those who may seek access to land to explore for or extract mineral resources, including petroleum. I also envisage that the commissioner will inquire into administrative and legislative options that may be a model of best practice for not only South Australia but also other jurisdictions. The bill also requires that the operations of the Department for Energy and Mining be looked at for the best model for all to be able to operate within.

Since I introduced a similar bill in the last parliament, which at that time did not include the petroleum industries, I have had numerous calls—and I mean numerous—from across regional South Australia regarding the current situation, supporting the independent commission of inquiry. People have been ringing me and also stopping me, not only in my electorate but also across the whole of South Australia.

I have received support from Yorke Peninsula, across the South-East, the West Coast and also from other areas across South Australia suggesting that this inquiry should go further than the original bill submitted in the last parliament and should include other acts such as the petroleum industry. There may be other acts that the commission may elect to investigate along with other legislation that may be identified.

As in general life, we are advised and guided by others whether they are family, or advisers, as in our case. In our journeys, we come into contact with people who may have different views or ideas, and sometimes we need to stand back and re-evaluate what we do and how we do things. What we do in this place is no different than what we do in our own lives. It has been mentioned many times that the department is seen as both the regulator and the promoter of any projects that may eventuate.

Currently, it is my belief that a resource company obtains a licence first and then proceeds to undertake the required environmental processes. Perhaps there is another way for there to be best practices that are agreeable to all parties. It is very rare for numerous stakeholders, including the South Australian Chamber of Mines and Energy (SACOME), Grain Producers SA, the National Farmers Federation, Primary Producers SA and Livestock SA, to come together at a round table to contribute to the best opportunities for all their members. It was a resolution of all parties that an independent review be commissioned for the best opportunities for the best practices for all concerned.

The independent inquiry should also be able to identify alternative models and jurisdictions with a view to suggest best practice ways to address the question of land access, aquifer protection, environmental legislation and any other opportunities that may arise. This inquiry will also bring greater transparency and better balance for all landowners and resource companies. It should be stated today that there are many projects that go through the processes that are in place currently and all may be in agreement. However, there are other occasions where the process may not have been so smooth and has cost many people thousands of dollars and lots of frustration.

There have been times when the agriculture sector has been stressed due to the length of approval and the development processes that have taken place. The education for all parties should be clearer and easier for all parties to understand the process. We are a great state and we need to be able to extract the best we can from all sectors to put in place the best practices and methods to enable everyone to achieve the best outcomes for all involved and for all our other industries.

This bill will allay concerns from everyone in the mining and petroleum industries. All this bill asks is that an independent inquiry into land access be established for the mining and petroleum industries and that the final report of the commission be laid before each house of parliament within 60 days of receiving it. As mentioned earlier, I have received numerous calls from across the whole state regarding this and what progress there will be from here.

When the minister introduced his bill in the last parliament, he was successful in getting his bill through. One of his undertakings was to make a personal commitment to consult. This bill could form part of his commitment to further consult. I present the bill today. The second reading will be deferred, as normal, for the opportunity for everyone in this house to have a look at it. As I have now presented the bill for all members of parliament to pursue and consider, I hope that the government will have the bill on the *Notice Paper* as soon as it can for debating and hopefully at the next sitting of parliament.

I look forward to getting bipartisan support for this bill to ensure best practice is put in place so as to benefit all sectors involved in regard to modernising our mining and other processes, including the petroleum industry. I know that we have discussed lots of things previously but I think what we need to do is try to get our message out with clear consultation and communication to all sectors. I feel that this bill should be supported by all sides of politics. It should be supported by everybody. Like I said earlier, we have to review what we do every day. Today I review what I did yesterday and hope I can do better tomorrow. This bill is along the same lines. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (CONTRIBUTORY ITEMS IN DEVELOPMENT PLANS) AMENDMENT BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (10:40): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (10:41): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill serves one clear purpose: to strengthen the protection of our state's built history and streetscape character. In short, it is designed to protect our streets and neighbourhoods from mass demolition and the destruction of the fabric of our communities.

Since the State Planning Commission released a series of discussion papers and accompanying documents in May last year, concerns have grown amongst the South Australian community that our state's built history and streetscape character will be threatened under policy changes earmarked under the Planning and Design Code. Importantly, strong and widespread opposition has built against the government's policy to not transfer contributory items from council development plans to the new Planning and Design Code.

Contributory items are commonly understood as buildings or structures that demonstrate historic, economic or social themes and characteristics as expressed predominantly in a historic conservation zone or, under the Planning and Design Code, a Historic Area Overlay. Therefore, the value of contributory items is the individual contribution they make to a historic conservation zone overall.

In many councils, contributory items have been painstakingly identified through the survey work of heritage experts. They have been individually identified so that, in many council areas, they enjoy enhanced protections against demolition in order to ensure that the history and character of the historic conservation zone is not diluted by their removal.

The South Australian community has been advised throughout the policy development phase of the Planning and Design Code that the code in its initial form would largely transfer the policy content contained in council development plans. There are many examples in the draft Planning and Design Code for phase 2 and phase 3 council areas where this has not occurred, but one of the most glaring examples is the refusal of the government to transfer contributory items to the Planning and Design Code.

In June last year, I wrote about these concerns to the chair of the State Planning Commission. I emphasised the individual contribution that contributory items make to the built history and streetscape character of our communities and how their removal would dilute the value, dwelling by dwelling, of a historic conservation zone or, under the Planning and Design Code, a Historic Area Overlay.

I also emphasised that heritage and planning experts could point to instances where the individual listing of contributory items in council development plans has protected buildings from demolition in the Environment, Resources and Development Court proceedings, in contradiction to the advice and rhetoric of both the State Planning Commission and the Minister for Planning.

In fact, it is worth emphasising that several councils, the Local Government Association, many planners, heritage experts and the Protect our Heritage Alliance have expressed severe apprehension about the inclusion of one of the criteria that will be used to assess whether buildings and structures can be demolished in the Planning and Design Code's Historic Area Overlay, namely, whether the structural integrity or condition of the building is beyond economic repair. This will apply weaker protections to contributory items than are currently applied in many council development plans.

The local government sector have not sat on their hands and have been very proactive in developing ways for the state government to progress this matter without destroying our built

heritage. Councils have consulted widely and invested heavily in obtaining appropriate heritage and legal advice, but to no avail. Many councils, including the Norwood Payneham and St Peters council and my own Town of Gawler, have made considerable efforts to find workable solutions to this devastating policy, but have at all times been rebuffed by the Marshall Liberal government.

In my letter to the State Planning Commission, I suggested that, to prevent the dilution of our state's built history and streetscape character from occurring one dwelling at a time, the government should transfer all contributory items currently identified in council development plans into the Planning and Design Code. This would ensure that all contributory items would enjoy the same demolition protections under the Planning and Design Code that they currently enjoy under the council development plans in which they are identified.

In simple terms, this is what the bill would deliver: it will transfer all contributory items currently identified under council development plans to the Planning and Design Code, and these items will enjoy the same demolition protections as they currently enjoy under the existing council development plans. In the letter I sent last June to the State Planning Commission chair, I also suggested that a process should be developed under the Planning and Design Code for the establishment of a consistent statewide process for the identification of contributory items and the application of rigorous demolition protections.

I make it very clear: we are not opposed to ensuring that we have a consistent scheme across the state. What we are opposed to is the removal of all these contributory items without protections. This bill and our suggestions made to the government will enable those to be transferred and, through a consistent process, enable those things to be identified across the state to ensure we have a scheme in place that is consistent so that residents know what protections they have, and also, importantly, that the development sector know what they are dealing with. This bill would deliver that.

The bill should be supported. I have introduced it into the house to provide the government with the opportunity to rethink their commitment to our state's built history and streetscape character, which is so important to our communities. For those reasons, I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION (DISALLOWANCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (10:47): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Subordinate Legislation Act 1978. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (10:48): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce the Subordinate Legislation (Disallowance) Amendment Bill 2020. My contribution will be brief as I have spoken about the need for this bill in my Address in Reply contribution as well. Over the course of my time in this place, a constant concern of mine has been the value of the vote and the importance of the democratic practice. As I have often said, democracy does not happen every four years when we vote: it happens every single day. Sadly, trust in politics is at an all-time low in our nation.

Rebuilding trust in politics is far from easy when politicians take shortcuts. One of the more outrageous of these, in recent times, has been the political games played by the government with the GM crop legislation. Firstly, the government tried to lift the moratorium on GM crops by regulation before a parliamentary committee had even reported. Then, having lost a disallowance motion in the other place, the government proceeded to suspend standing orders and ram the bill through the house, hoping to split non-government members in the other place. The hope was particularly to pick off enough votes on process grounds, given that many members in the other place indicated their support for the disallowance motion on process. But the bill failed again—and again on the process grounds.

After having lost two votes, the government remade the regulations while parliament was in recess and prorogued the parliament, enabling a further bill to be reintroduced. The regulations were promptly disallowed by the other place when parliament resumed, but were remade again the very next day. To describe this process as a farce would be generous. All these political games serve to achieve is to erode public faith in our democratic system and cause damage to the conduct of good government in our state.

Had the minister and the government taken the time to progress this matter in the proper way, had the traditions and conventions of this parliament been adhered to and had there been proper respect for the democratic system parliament embodies, it is quite possible there may have been a new policy win by now. Instead, a fight has been picked with members of the crossbench and the opposition and, therefore, the people we represent. That is why I am bringing this bill before the house. When regulations are disallowed, no minister should have the power to remake them with the disregard that we have seen in this particular case.

The Subordinate Legislation Act dates back to 1978 and has been amended 15 times since. All the amendments have been minor in nature and primarily related to other legislation being progressed through parliament. The potential for a Mexican stand-off between the minister and parliament has always been an inherent tension baked into the scheme of the act. Of course, it has been used by governments of all colours.

Since the Subordinate Legislation Act was enacted, according to information provided by the parliamentary library, motions of disallowance have been carried on 99 occasions in either of the two houses. This has included disallowance of regulations and by-laws. While it is difficult to extract full details from the parliamentary record, the number of occasions when ministers have remade regulations that either house of parliament has disallowed is a widely known loophole in the legislation exploited by both sides.

Among the more notorious examples, members may recall, was the stand-off in the early 2000s between the Legislative Council and the then attorney-general in relation to victims of crime regulations, which were disallowed five times. Similar stand-offs arose in the 1990s in relation to recreational net fishing, Housing Trust water rates, shopping hours and unfair dismissals. All of these occasions gave rise to private members' bills for the reform of the Subordinate Legislation Act to prevent such abuses.

It is notable that on most occasions these bills were moved by the then opposition, without the support of the then government. For the keener observers amongst us, you will note the irony of these dates. The first of these bills, the Subordinate Legislation (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 1998 was moved by the Hon. Ron Roberts, a former member and later presiding officer of the other place. The second of these bills, the Subordinate Legislation (Disallowance and Variation) Amendment Bill 2005 was moved by another former member of the other place, the Hon. Robert Lawson, who was also attorney-general in the last Liberal government.

This bill has a very simple purpose: to ensure that once parliament has disallowed regulations they may not be remade by the government until six months has passed. This is the same standard applied by the commonwealth, Tasmania, New South Wales, the ACT and the Northern Territory, as well as reflecting a reasonable limitation for bills.

As in other jurisdictions, the bill incorporates a safety measure allowing the parliament in effect to withdraw a disallowance if circumstances change. We really should not be playing around and wasting time on procedurally dubious political pointscoring, and this bill will help address that. I note the remarks of the Hon. Robert Lawson who, in moving his bill over a decade ago, stated:

The practice of remaking regulations immediately after they have been disallowed makes a mockery of parliament's power to disallow subordinate legislation.

In these times, when trust in politics is at its lowest ebb for a generation—and dare I say more important than ever in these particular times—responsible politicians do not act the way we have recently seen. I know the government is passionate about its policy agenda, but I urge the minister to stop the political games and start focusing on proper process that honours this parliament's traditions and the spirit of democratic practice. A first good step would be to pass the bill. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES (DRUG OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:54): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Controlled Substances Act 1984. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:54): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I will be brief. As I am sure you are aware, this is a replica of some legislation I brought into this place in the last sitting of parliament, which was rejected over and over again by the government, as were several other measures intended to enhance police powers in relation to the detection and eventual prosecution of ice-related offences—drug offences, but directed mainly at ice nonetheless. This measure was a recommendation of the Ice Taskforce, as were some other measures I brought into this place that were similarly rejected by the government. I will try again to bring some sense into this parliament in relation to the ice scourge.

This is a very simple bill. It amends the Controlled Substances Act to essentially give police the authority to search people and vehicles observed entering and leaving a known drug house, that is, a house from which police reasonably suspect drugs are being dealt and/or trafficked. At present, of course, it is very difficult for police to prove this link. This amendment provides that simply being seen leaving or entering such premises can be a cause to suspect and therefore reason to search. Under the current law, police have no particular power to search these people and vehicles for drugs, even if they reasonably suspect that drugs are being sold from the house from which these people are seen coming and going. The clause is simple: it is one clause inserted into the Controlled Substances Act. It reads:

- (9a) Without limiting the circumstances in which an authorised officer who is a police officer may form a reasonable suspicion for the purposes of subsection (6) or (9), if the officer sees a person or vehicle entering or leaving premises that the officer reasonably suspects are used for the manufacture, distribution or storage of a substance, and possession of the substance by a person would contravene this Act, it is reasonable for the officer to suspect that the person has the substance in the person's possession or that the substance is in the vehicle or a vehicle in which the person is present after leaving the premises.

This, of course, is eminently sensible and simple, and it is something which the police certainly in the last government asked for. It was a recommendation of the Ice Taskforce and, as I said, it was introduced into the parliament last year alongside another measure which proposed to give police powers to search for drugs at positive roadside drug tests. Both of these measures were, to date, inexplicably rejected by the government.

We have heard some talk from the Minister for Police about the introduction of certain changes to the Road Traffic Act that may go some way to amending this particular situation. These are simple measures that could be taken by this parliament right now. They should have been taken, indeed, as early as 18 months ago. I urge all members to support this legislation.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (THROWING OBJECTS AT VEHICLES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:58): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:58): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Again, I will be brief. This bill is again a replica of a bill I brought into this place some 18 months ago—in fact, June 2018, more than 18 months ago—in response to what was then a significant increase in the amount of illegal throwing of rocks and other debris off bridges along the Southern Expressway. It is still fairly unclear what caused this spike in activity but at the time the government were very slow to act.

The police, of course, took it seriously. They instituted certain operations—Operation Watercolour—and they involved the use of mounted police, dog units and increased patrols along the Southern Expressway. However, at the time the government itself did very little in the way of action. In contrast, the Leader of the Opposition was very quick to release a plan to make people safer as they drove along the Southern Expressway.

I will go through the measures which were outlined by the Leader of the Opposition in June 2018. One was to declare the Southern Expressway a protective security area so that protective security officers can be deployed at the commissioner's discretion, to install temporary cyclone fencing in vulnerable areas, to install high-powered lighting in low-lit areas, to remove built-up vegetation, to increase rewards to \$50,000 for the arrest and conviction of offenders, and the final measure was the bill we see before us, reintroduced today. It is an extremely simple bill. It increases the penalty for throwing rocks and debris at vehicles or potentially at vehicles on roadways, and that is an important distinction. It is simple but, I still think, necessary legislation.

I think the member for Heysen, in a contribution when the bill was last introduced, pointed out that there were already significant laws in place: attempted murder, for instance, or acts to harm in certain ways, and they reach varying levels of seriousness up to very, very serious, of course. The point of this bill, as I think I pointed out in the last parliament, was that it is pre-emptive. It makes it illegal to throw the rock whether there are vehicles present or not. It makes the simple throwing of the rock the offence.

The second point I would make—and I do not know if I made it in the last parliament but it has since come to my attention, and this is arguable—is that there is some evidence that increasing penalties in small ways does very little to alter people's criminal behaviour. I am not a criminologist but I am told that small penalty increases often do little to change behaviour. Significant penalty increases, however, are noticed by people and have been shown to significantly alter behaviour. This is a doubling of the penalty from five to 10 years. It makes the offence far more serious in the eyes of the courts, one would hope, and I think it is a sensible measure.

At the end of last year—on New Year's Eve, in fact, I was on the radio talking to Tony Pilkington about this—there was another significant spike in similar activity along the Southern Expressway. Thankfully, that did not amount to very much but it does highlight the need that these things will crop up from time to time, whether it is seasonal, whether there are more people about at certain times of the year. It is still unclear why there was a spike last time or, indeed, around New Year's Eve last year.

Nevertheless, I think this is a good measure. It is a simple measure. It could have been supported in June 2018. It has to be said that, while the government was slow in reacting, it did take certain measures along the Southern Expressway. More significant was the increased police presence, Operation Watercolour, and the associated police activity around Operation Watercolour, which very quickly stomped on this activity then. However, we do need a significant deterrent and I believe that this legislation provides that deterrent.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (TRANSPARENCY) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (11:03): I move:

That the bill be restored to the *Notice Paper* as a lapsed bill pursuant to section 57 of the Constitution Act 1934.

Motion carried.

FUEL WATCH BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 March 2020.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:05): I rise to speak to the Fuel Watch Bill as put by the member for Florey. I certainly get the intent of the member for Florey with this bill, but I do not believe that it is the best approach with regard to getting accurate fuel pricing. I know there are various models in place around the country, as far as real-time pricing, and I guess there is no time like the present to think about real time. However, it appears that there are better models that can be utilised.

When we look at the fuel issue, not just in this state but in this country, and how things have changed over many years as far as the processes in regard to whether we are even refining fuel as we used to at Port Stanvac—which is long gone—now we are essentially related to a shipping lane, which is basically our pipeline coming from overseas places like Singapore, for example. It is quite serious, obviously, especially in relation to people such as myself when I was actively farming. It affects farmers especially and people in heavy industries because they buy fuel in bulk. Gone are the days of buying in bulk, where you might only order as little as 900 litres to fill up your unleaded tank or, in the old days, the super tank—that is going back a while.

A lot of orders were made, as far as bulk fuel was managed, in 2,000 or 3,000 litres and perhaps up to 5,000 litres. With the natural course of things—and it is a bit sad in a way—farming has come to a situation where essentially you have to get big or get out. It has always been that way since my father started back in 1933-34 working for his father at Angle Vale. They were not using a lot of fuel then, I must say. When people on the land order fuel now, much of it is ordered in 10,000-litre batches and it is not uncommon for orders to come in semitrailer loads, which may be 25,000 or 28,000 litres or possibly more. You can get reasonable discounts by ordering that amount. Certainly talking about industrial levels, and I guess at the farming level, depending on what size the orders are, people can get reasonable discounts.

However, part of the object of this bill is to ensure that consumers are provided with up-to-date and accurate information regarding the price and availability of fuel. That is the issue: the availability and the sea pipeline that comes to our shores. I have noticed at times, and as we are now moving into the seeding phase on farms within the next month—and some might be going earlier than that on the Far West Coast and in some of the Mallee areas, starting their programs—there will be a lot of diesel coming through.

Despite the current challenges that we are facing at the moment, that fuel needs to arrive—and I understand it will be arriving—because of our food producers. When you look across the country it is absolutely vital that that fuel gets here, because being a country of 25 million people we do produce enough food for at least 75 million people. I just want to reflect on that briefly in this conversation. There have been some—and I am not going to use another word—what I call unusual buying practices in supermarkets in regard to food. It is unusual, and it is not really necessary as far as I am concerned because we have so much food we are producing, and it is great to see some of those great food icons, like the Crottis and the Thomases, getting out there promoting what we can produce in this state, let alone what we produce in this country.

Just as an aside—and this does affect obviously the use of fuel and industry—in regard to the run on toilet paper, I find that bizarre to say the least. I understand that before Kimberly-Clark down at Millicent went to three shifts, at two shifts they were getting out 35 B-doubles of toilet paper a day from Millicent, from our home state here. So I am sure there is probably something around 50 B-doubles a day of toilet paper being sent around the state and the nation. I guess what I am saying is we are not going to run out any time soon, and people have already found, to their individual dismay, that they cannot take it back to the shops. I think the shops should keep that policy in place just so we can get some sensibilities in place in regard to these purchases.

Fuel is absolutely vital for day-to-day running in the community. I absolutely get that. It has come down in recent times because of a price war overseas. I can remember what happened in the seventies. We were going to run out of fuel, evidently. Well, here we are, a long time since then and

there is still plenty of fuel around, and there will be for a long time. Despite all the advances in green energy and that kind of thing, I understand that oil growth, as far as using oil goes, is going up exponentially even as we speak. I salute renewable energy as we transition—and I stress the word 'transition'—into it, but it is a fact that oil use has gone up in recent times compared to what it was previously.

I just want to keep reflecting on the vital need for producing that food, because in these times where people do get uncertain about things that are happening in the world, there is this absolute certainty that we can produce great food and fibre in this state. In regard to the run on toilet paper, they are working flat out down at Millicent to produce it. Last time I looked, when I was in the South-East, there were many hundreds and thousands of acres of forest that can be felled, so you are not going to run out any time soon.

I do salute all of our food producers, and I salute them in this time when there is uncertainty around a range of things. I know most of them, especially those that are really super organised, have organised their chemicals to be on site, their fertiliser to be on site, because it is absolutely vital that they get all those supplies, including fuel, to function.

In regard to this Fuel Watch Bill, during the process leading into the last election, the Labor Party and SA-Best, of blessed memory, supported the introduction of mandatory fuel price reporting by fuel retailers. The idea was to put downward pressure on fuel prices and to give consumers greater information about the market to make more informed purchasing decisions.

One thing has always intrigued me with fuel pricing and fuel sales with the proliferation of diesel vehicles now, including many of us in this place driving diesel vehicles. Certainly, in the farming sector it is best to have a diesel vehicle, especially when driving over stubble. There are other stories I could talk about, but I will not be doing that today. Diesel, which is essentially light crude oil, is usually reasonably dearer than more refined fuels like the 91, 95, 98 octane unleaded fuels. I was always intrigued by that. When I was working in the oil field at East Mereenie, we used to get our fuel out of a light crude well. They took the water out of it, separated it out, and we ran all the vehicles on that.

There has been research done in regard to the Productivity Commission for their consideration. We note this bill from the member for Florey, but we will not be supporting it. However, we will be looking at the release of the Productivity Commission's report and the associated government response before moving forward.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (11:16): I am pleased to rise to make what might be effectively some preliminary remarks in response to the bill that has been brought forward by the member for Florey, the Fuel Watch Bill 2020 that is before the house on the *Notice Paper* today. I have listened carefully to the contribution by the member for Florey in relation to the objectives that she would see furthered by the operation of the bill. I will come in a moment to the structure of the bill and the way in which that is endeavouring to do that work. Suffice to say at the outset, the bill would impose a combination of reporting requirements and price freezing measures with penalties attached and would render the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs responsible for the implementation and oversight of those measures.

One might reflect on the balancing act that is to be achieved philosophically in imposing a regulatory regime that has characteristics of price control and price fixing. What we know is that the member for Florey, like others in this place, is responding to what has been significant and sustained community awareness and concern about what has happened over a period of time. This is not only a South Australian issue but a national one. It may be a matter of concern in other countries around the world as well.

The issue is about what might be described as 'dramatic fluctuations' in fuel pricing from day to day. My community has observed from time to time what might be seen as fluctuations occurring in an apparently consistent manner in any given area such that a consumer might be arriving to refuel on a given day and find that the price was at one level, perhaps a relatively attractive level, and the next minute it has dramatically changed.

Those concerns have arisen, and there has therefore been concerted consideration around the country about how consumers can receive maximum transparency in a market and how the market can be most predictably accessible to consumers, with a view to fairness. That is where we all start from. It would be perhaps fair to observe there is a degree of commonality about that starting point. Nobody wants to see people stuck with suddenly and unpredictably having to pay a whole lot more than they might have anticipated for an essential commodity. Fuel is certainly an essential commodity for people getting around day to day in their work and daily lives.

As the member for Hammond observed just now, it is perhaps apposite to observe that we might see a different scope of fluctuation going on with respect to different fuel types. I think 20 years ago it might have been fair to say that the bulk of people getting around on our metropolitan roads in their daily drives would have been driving petrol-driven cars. I might extend that a step further to say typically four and six-cylinder petrol cars. That was very much the norm.

That whole picture has been changing, just as the technological landscape has been changing over the last generation. We now have a significant proportion of people in the metro area, let alone in our country areas, whose daily drive is diesel powered, or a combination of diesel or petrol with electric power. Indeed, we have seen—and this is still new news—over the course of the last two to three years in particular, an increasing number of people whose daily drive is entirely electric powered. We have seen a dynamic shift in the sources of power that drive our vehicles, particularly in the metropolitan area.

I note the member for Hammond's observation that diesel power has been at the core of what drives our regional and country areas for a very long time indeed. For the purposes of this debate I make the observation that, for reasons associated with perhaps the distribution of diesel as distinct from petrol, price variation of diesel at our retail service stations does not appear to be occurring to anything like the extent that we see on the petrol side.

So we are certainly now used to an environment in which there is a high level of price fluctuation that is certainly apparent. Price can change quite dramatically from one day to the next but, also, that is not consistently applied across different fuel types. Also, the diversity of fuel types that are driving South Australians and those around the country as well—daily drives—has really been changing rapidly with the times.

I make those observations because the drivers for those changes are partly a response to technology and they are partly a response to the importance of dealing with the climate effects of using fossil fuels, but they are also partly a response to market forces. Where people do not like the high cost of fuel, they will drive increasingly efficient vehicles, so as to have to buy less fuel, and where other technologies become available that obviate the need to buy those types of fuel or indeed to change the whole driven platform altogether, then they will do that. We have seen this occurring really quite rapidly.

Those who observe the motoring industry globally will have seen news in recent weeks. I think it might have been around late January this year when we saw that Tesla has gone from a market capitalisation somewhere among the relative minnows to, all of a sudden, having a market capitalisation that rivals the behemoths in the motor industry. Tesla, of course, is famously the producer of entirely electric-driven vehicles. So the landscape and the diversity of fuel sourcing and so on is changing, and changing rapidly.

In the context of this debate and in the context of the desirability to legislate in the interests of consumers for improved outcomes about price transparency, price predictability and so on, that is a very important part of the context. A lot of work has been done on this topic. As I said earlier, it is not entirely a South Australian or indeed an especially South Australian issue. It is an issue that has been given consideration in a pretty thorough way in Queensland, we are told, and it is also a matter that has been experienced in subtly different ways in each state, I would hasten to add, and in Western Australia as well.

The government, in being alive to this issue and diligent in terms of its work in stepping through the evidence that might underpin any legislative measures in this area, has looked very closely at a trial that has been underway in Queensland and is monitoring that trial very closely. Action in this state, I would expect, therefore, would be valuably guided by pricing information that

comes to us from Queensland following that trial. We are told that data from the trial that Queensland is undertaking is not yet publicly available. No doubt, we will have information about its benefits and any downside aspects of it when and if that information is made available. That is going to be relevant information from both consumers and motoring bodies, as well as those who are administering the trial. I have indicated it is a national issue, and there have been proposals that have emerged. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING AND SESSIONAL ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (11:30): I move:

That standing and sessional orders be so far suspended as to enable Government Business to take precedence forthwith, for one hour, over Private Members Business, Other Motions.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the house and, as an absolute majority is not present, ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

Motion carried.

Bills

PUBLIC TRUSTEE (PUBLIC TRUSTEE AND GUARDIAN) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (11:33): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Public Trustee Act 1995 and make related amendments to various other acts and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (11:33): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce the Public Trustee (Public Trustee and Guardian) Amendment Bill 2020. The bill amends the Public Trustee Act 1995 and various other acts to effect a merger of the offices of the Public Trustee and the Public Advocate. For those who are following this debate, I particularly refer to the provisions of the Guardianship and Administration Act 1993, which accommodates the provision of the establishment, terms of engagement, powers and the like of the Public Advocate.

There are approximately 700 joint clients who receive support from both the Public Trustee and the Public Advocate. Amalgamating the two services will provide a greater opportunity to provide a coordinated service for this client group. This significant reform will result in one entity delivering for all clients a consistent, cohesive and simpler service that takes a more holistic approach to meeting their needs. With the merged entity, clients and their families can expect to go to one place for all their needs relating to administration and guardianship. They can expect greater coordination in relation to the management of their affairs, improved responsiveness for complex matters that have urgent or pressing needs and better information sharing.

The Public Trustee has broad-ranging functions under the Public Trustee Act 1995, as well as other legislation. Its services include the preparation of wills and enduring powers of attorney, acting as executor for deceased estates, personal financial management, funds management and taxation assistance. Under the Guardianship and Administration Act 1993, the Public Trustee can be appointed by the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (SACAT) as administrator in respect of the estates of persons unable to look after their own health, safety or welfare or unable to manage their own affairs due to mental health issues or other specified conditions.

The Public Advocate, as I have indicated, is established under the Guardianship and Administration Act. Under that act, the Public Advocate may be appointed by SACAT as the guardian

of last resort for persons unable to look after their own health, safety or welfare or unable to manage their own affairs due to mental health issues or other specified conditions. Broadly speaking, a guardian is responsible for decisions about the accommodation, health access and lifestyle of protected persons.

The Public Advocate also has other important functions relating to the needs of mentally incapacitated persons, including systemic and individual advocacy, dispute resolution, education and investigation. I pause to say that both the Public Trustee and the Public Advocate, and their extensive teams, currently do provide very valuable services to South Australians. As many members would appreciate, circumstances where there is a dispute in a family as to who should take responsibility for decision-making can be a very vexed issue and be very difficult for the families and friends of that person. Therefore, the roles of both the Public Trustee and their officers and the Public Advocate and their officers provide a very valuable service to South Australians and their families in these circumstances.

Under the reform reflected in the bill, all the statutory functions of the Public Trustee and the Public Advocate are to be maintained. The Public Trustee will be named the 'public trustee and guardian', and all statutory functions currently held by the Public Trustee and the Public Advocate will become functions of the public trustee and guardian. The office of the public trustee and guardian will replace the offices of the Public Trustee and Public Advocate. The bringing together of the functions of guardianship and administration within the one statutory office of public trustee and guardian substantially mirrors reform undertaken in the Australian Capital Territory in 2016.

After all of the matters that have been presented to me, our government supports this and I consider it to be worthy of replicating here. The reform is not a budget savings measure. I will repeat that: this reform is not a budget savings measure. There will be no reduction in services, and upon the merger taking place, the budget of the Office of the Public Advocate, together with all its staff, will be added to the budget and staff of the Public Trustee.

The focus of the reform is to achieve a better delivery of service to some of the state's most vulnerable people. Clause 8 of the bill amends section 4 of the principal act and makes provision for the appointment of the public trustee and guardian. Clause 62 of schedule 1 to the bill deletes part 2 of the Guardianship and Administration Act, pursuant to which the Public Advocate is currently established and its functions are set out.

Clause 9(2) of the bill amends section 5(2) of the principal act to set out the functions and powers of the public trustee and guardian. It adds to the functions currently exercised by the Public Trustee which are set out in section 5(2)(a), those currently exercised by the Public Advocate. Clause 10 amends section 6 of the principal act, which deals with the ministerial control. The current ministerial power of control and direction on matters of policy only in respect of the functions of the Public Trustee has been retained; however, pursuant to proposed section 6(1a), that power will not apply in respect of functions being transferred to the public trustee and guardian which are presently undertaken by the Public Advocate.

Currently, under the Guardianship and Administration Act, the functions of the Public Advocate are expressly not subject to ministerial direction or control, and that independence is retained in respect of the public trustee and guardian's future exercise of those functions.

Other clauses of the bill insert into the principal act powers or obligations to be held or owned by the public trustee and guardian that replace equivalents currently held or owned by the Public Advocate under the Guardianship and Administration Act. For example, clause 9(3) inserts subsection 5(5) which grants a power regarding the establishment of committees for the purpose of providing advice to the public trustee and guardian in relation to the performance of its functions.

Clause 11 inserts section 6A relating to the public trustee and guardian raising matters with the minister and Attorney-General. Clause 57(3) inserts section 51(2)(ab), which requires the public trustee and guardian to include in its annual report prescribed particulars of all applications made by the public trustee and guardian for the issue of a warrant under the Guardianship and Administration Act 1993 during the year.

This bill aims to improve and better coordinate the services provided to our vulnerable citizens. South Australians expect and deserve high quality services that are tailored to their needs,

and this is particularly true for those who are vulnerable and require support due to limitations in their decision-making capacity. This reform supports this main objective, and ensures our justice policies and legislative reforms reflect contemporary needs—one of the priorities outlined in our government's justice agenda.

I commend the bill to members and I seek leave to insert a detailed explanation of clauses in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Public Trustee Act 1995*

4—Amendment of long title

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

5—Amendment of section 1—Short title

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

6—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause makes consequential amendments.

7—Amendment of heading to Part 2

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

8—Amendment of section 4—Public Trustee and Guardian

This clause amends section 4 of the principal Act to provide that there is to be a Public Trustee and Guardian who will be appointed by the Governor on terms and conditions determined by the Governor for a term not exceeding 7 years.

This clause removes the requirement that the office holder be an employee in the Public Service.

The clause also sets out the circumstances in which the office of Public Trustee and Guardian becomes vacant and the circumstances in which the Governor may remove the Public Trustee and Guardian from office.

The clause also notes that the Public Trustee and Guardian is the same body corporate as the Public Trustee under the *Public Trustee Act 1995*.

9—Amendment of section 5—Functions and powers

This clause amends section 5 of the principal Act to set out the functions of the Public Trustee and Guardian.

This clause further provides that the Public Trustee and Guardian may establish committees to provide advice in relation to the performance of the Public Trustee and Guardian's functions and that such committees will be taken to be advisory bodies for the purposes of the *Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act 1995*.

10—Amendment of section 6—Ministerial control

This clause amends section 6 of the principal Act to set out the circumstances in which the Public Trustee and Guardian is, and is not, subject to control and direction by the Minister.

11—Insertion of section 6A

This clause inserts section 6A into the principal Act to allow the Public Trustee and Guardian to raise concerns with the Minister and Attorney-General and request that a report of a matter raised be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

This clause further provides that the annual report of the Public Trustee and Guardian must include a summary of the matters raised by the Public Trustee and Guardian.

12—Amendment of section 7—Execution of documents

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

13—Amendment of section 8—Delegations

This clause amends section 8 of the principal Act to provide that the Public Trustee and Guardian may delegate a function or power (other than a prescribed function or power) and to allow for further delegation of a function or power.

14—Amendment of section 9—Administration of deceased estate

This clause makes consequential amendments.

15—Amendment of section 10—Public Trustee and Guardian need not give security

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

16—Amendment of section 11—No action to be instituted after Public Trustee and Guardian has obtained administration

This clause makes consequential amendments.

17—Amendment of section 12—Appointment as administrator until certain actions determined

This clause makes consequential amendments.

18—Amendment of section 13—Administration of trust estate

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

19—Amendment of section 14—Appointment as executor or trustee

This clause makes consequential amendments.

20—Amendment of section 15—Appointment of Public Trustee and Guardian by executors, administrators or trustees

This clause makes consequential amendments.

21—Amendment of section 16—Appointment by court as trustee of amount of judgment etc

This clause makes consequential amendments.

22—Amendment of section 17—Custodian trustee

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

23—Amendment of section 18—Power of attorney continues despite subsequent legal incapacity

This clause makes consequential amendments.

24—Amendment of section 19—Payments to or from executors etc elsewhere in Australia or in New Zealand

This clause makes consequential amendments.

25—Amendment of section 20—Public Trustee and Guardian must require delivery or transfer of property to which Public Trustee and Guardian is entitled

This clause makes consequential amendments and replaces the divisional penalty with a maximum penalty of \$25,000 or imprisonment for 1 year.

26—Amendment of section 21—Court may summons administrator etc on application of Public Trustee and Guardian

This clause makes consequential amendments.

27—Amendment of section 22—Result of disobedience to summons

This clause makes consequential amendments.

28—Amendment of section 23—Public Trustee and Guardian to give notice to beneficiary entitled to property

This clause makes consequential amendments.

29—Amendment of section 24—Administration of Public Trustee and Guardian may be referred to Court

This clause makes consequential amendments.

30—Amendment of section 25—Public Trustee and Guardian may make advances for purposes of administration

This clause makes consequential amendments.

31—Amendment of section 26—Public Trustee and Guardian to keep accounts in respect of estates etc

This clause makes consequential amendments.

32—Amendment of section 27—Investment of estate funds

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

33—Amendment of section 28—Money from several estates may be invested as one fund

This clause makes consequential amendments.

34—Amendment of section 29—Common funds

This clause makes consequential amendments.

35—Amendment of section 30—Accounts, audits and reports in respect of common funds

This clause makes consequential amendments.

36—Amendment of section 31—Information for investors or prospective investors in common funds

This clause makes consequential amendments.

37—Amendment of section 32—Public Trustee and Guardian's duties with respect to unclaimed money or land

This clause makes consequential amendments.

38—Amendment of section 33—Provision for parties subsequently claiming to apply to Court etc

This clause makes consequential amendments.

39—Amendment of section 34—Appointment as manager of unclaimed property

This clause makes consequential amendments.

40—Amendment of section 35—Powers of Public Trustee and Guardian as manager

This clause makes consequential amendments.

41—Amendment of section 36—Public Trustee and Guardian to have discretion as to exercise of powers as manager

This clause makes consequential amendments.

42—Amendment of section 37—Public Trustee and Guardian may apply to Court for directions

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

43—Amendment of section 38—Money to be invested in common fund

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

44—Amendment of section 39—Remuneration and expenses of Public Trustee and Guardian

This clause makes consequential amendments.

45—Amendment of section 40—Property managed by Public Trustee and Guardian to be held for owner

This clause makes consequential amendments.

46—Amendment of section 41—Termination of management

This clause makes consequential amendments.

47—Amendment of section 42—Transfer of unclaimed property to Crown

This clause makes consequential amendments.

48—Amendment of section 43—Expenditure of money on land

This clause makes consequential amendments.

49—Amendment of section 44—Fee for administering perpetual trust

This clause makes consequential amendments.

50—Amendment of section 45—General provision relating to Public Trustee and Guardian's charges

This clause makes consequential amendments.

51—Amendment of section 45A—Recovery of GST

This clause makes consequential amendments.

52—Amendment of section 46—ADI accounts, investment and overdraft

This clause makes consequential amendments.

53—Amendment of section 47—Tax and other liabilities of Public Trustee and Guardian

This clause makes consequential amendments.

54—Amendment of section 48—Dividends

This clause makes consequential amendments.

55—Amendment of section 49—Responsibility of Government for acts of Public Trustee and Guardian

This clause makes consequential amendments.

56—Amendment of section 50—Accounts and external audit

This clause makes consequential amendments.

57—Amendment of section 51—Annual reports

This clause makes consequential amendments and provides that an annual report of the Public Trustee and Guardian must include prescribed particulars of applications by the Public Trustee and Guardian for the issue of a warrant under the *Guardianship and Administration Act 1993*.

58—Amendment of section 52—Certain documents may be deposited with Public Trustee and Guardian for safe keeping

This clause makes consequential amendments.

59—Amendment of section 53—Certificate by Public Trustee and Guardian of appointment to act

This clause makes consequential amendments.

60—Amendment of section 54—Indemnity to persons having dealings with Public Trustee and Guardian

This clause makes consequential amendments.

61—Substitution of section 55

This clause replaces the current regulation making provision with a new provision that provides for the making of regulations and fee notices.

Schedule 1—Related amendments and transitional provisions etc

This Schedule:

- makes related amendments to various Acts, principally to replace references to the Public Advocate and Public Trustee with references to the Public Trustee and Guardian
- deletes Part 2 of the *Guardianship and Administration Act 1993* which establishes the office of the Public Advocate
- includes transitional provisions.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

RADIATION PROTECTION AND CONTROL BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (11:44): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to control activities involving radiation sources and to provide for the protection of people and the environment from the effects of radiation, to make related amendments to the Environment Protection Act 1993, to repeal the Radiation Protection and Control Act 1982, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (11:45): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Radioactive substances are widely used and handled across a number of industries, including industrial processing, mining and petroleum operations, medical and health care, and research and educational facilities. South Australia is one of only two jurisdictions in Australia where uranium mining takes place and uranium is an essential contributor to the state economy. It is, therefore, essential that modern and effective legislation covers mining and all other aspects of radiation use.

In South Australia, the Radiation Protection and Control Act 1982 regulates activities involving radiation sources and provides for the protection of people and the environment from the harmful effects of radiation. This includes providing for the licensing of certain activities and registration of certain items and premises which involve radiation sources. Parties that are regulated under the legislation include hospitals, dentists, veterinarians, soil analysis companies, mining companies, radiographers, radiologists and ports.

Despite the importance of this legislation, it has not undergone substantial revision since its commencement in 1982. As a result, many of the standard administrative and enforcement provisions are outdated. The new act proposed in this bill will modernise radiation protection regulation in South Australia and will implement a progressive risk-based approach that builds on and improves the current system. It will reduce administrative burdens on small business through the streamlining of licensing from the existing seven separate licence categories down to two licence categories: a radiation use licence and a radiation management licence.

In addition, registrations of equipment will be able to be included on radiation management licences providing a single document for businesses to manage their regulatory obligations, whereas the current system requires individual registration of equipment separate from licensing. The act currently contains no expiable offences and no head power to prescribe expiation fees for enforcement in the regulations.

As a result, enforcement of the act and regulations cannot take place without prosecution through the courts. This is an inefficient method for less serious offences under the act as it is time-consuming and expensive. Further, it does not provide an effective deterrent for recalcitrant licence holders who act in the knowledge that no expiation fee can be applied to them. Under the current provisions, such an offender must instead be notified when a breach may result in court proceedings and provided with an opportunity to correct their behaviour. If the prosecution does not proceed to court, the offender incurs no penalty and none of the costs incurred by the Environment Protection Authority in undertaking enforcement actions are recovered. The bill includes expiations for a number of offences and also for further expiable offences to be established via regulation.

The bill also provides for order making powers that can be utilised to obtain compliance without the need for costly court proceedings. Court proceedings are appropriate for significant offences and for applying a punishment as a deterrent to others, but achieving compliance on minor issues is much more straightforward with the use of orders. The review of administrative decisions in the current act is upon application to the Supreme Court. Thankfully, we have come a long way since 1982 and now have a less burdensome and much more appropriate avenue for review of administrative decisions through the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal. The bill allocates jurisdiction for administrative appeals to the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal.

The act currently contains a series of specific offences set largely within the licensing and registration requirements and relating to unauthorised use or handling. These offences are necessary; however, they are more administrative in nature and are not linked to the harm or risk of harm that a breach of the act might present.

Inclusion of harm in regulatory schemes where there is a risk of harm to human health or the environment is necessary to provide a suitable deterrent. The application of harm provisions to the environment is reflected in the national directory's objective of radiation protection legislation that 'legislation must include the objective of protecting the health and safety of people and the environment'. Of the Australian states and territories, only South Australia and Western Australia do not currently have harm elements within radiation protection legislation.

The penalty framework proposed in the bill draws on the approach taken in the Work Health and Safety Act 2013 and the Environment Protection Act 1993. Part 5 of the bill provides new offences relating to causing radiation harm, with clause 50 relating to causing serious radiation harm and clause 51 relating to causing radiation harm. Radiation harm offences will provide a significant penalty in circumstances where an individual, a group of persons or the environment is harmed or likely to be harmed by exposure to quantities of radiation beyond those lawfully permitted by the remainder of the bill. These provisions do not apply to matters where the harm is considered trivial.

The maximum penalty for recklessly or intentionally causing serious radiation harm of \$5 million for a body corporate and \$1 million or 15 years' imprisonment for a natural person is the highest penalty that can be imposed by a sentencing court and must reflect the worst possible offence that could occur. In practise, it is extremely rare that the court imposes the maximum penalty and higher penalties are reserved for the most serious, repeated and aggravated contraventions.

The maximum penalties for the radiation harm offences have been set with consideration to the nature of the legislation, the particular offences they relate to and the precedent set by other comparable legislation. Of particular relevance, sections 8 and 9 of the Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) Act 2000 have a similar maximum penalty to the offence of recklessly or intentionally causing serious radiation harm, being \$5 million for a body corporate for the offences of construction or operation of a nuclear waste storage facility and importation or transportation of nuclear waste for delivery to a nuclear waste storage facility where the potential consequences, in the worst case scenario, are comparable.

In addition, national commitments have been made through the Australian Health Ministers' Conference and the Council of Australian Governments to implement a uniform national framework for radiation protection. To this end, the South Australian government is committed to amending the Act to implement the National Directory for Radiation Protection that Australian health ministers agreed to implement in 2004.

The national directory aims to provide nationally agreed and uniform requirements for the protection of people and the environment that meet international best practice and ensure the safety of radiation use. These relate to radiation protection principles, management requirements for radiation sources and provisions for the future adoption of documents forming part of the national directory.

In 2006, the Council of Australian Governments also agreed to a national chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear security strategy to provide a framework to strengthen and enhance Australia's existing arrangements. This included the establishment of a national regulatory scheme for the storage, possession, use and transportation of certain radiological materials to minimise the risk of such materials being misused.

A significant component of carrying out the Council of Australian Governments' decision is the implementation of the Code of Practice for the Security of Radioactive Sources. The security code, as it is known, sets out the various security measures that must be undertaken to maintain the security of sealed radiation sources. These security requirements have been developed based on the likelihood of unauthorised access and the consequences of malicious use. The bill is vital to ensuring the ongoing security of our radioactive sources and modernising the regulatory framework in order to minimise the risk to the health and safety of our community. I commend the bill to members.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING AND SESSIONAL ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (11:55): I move:

That standing and sessional orders be so far suspended as to enable government business to take precedence forthwith until 1pm over private members business and other motions without notice.

The SPEAKER: As an absolute majority is not present, please ring the bells.

A quorum having been formed:

The SPEAKER: An absolute majority is present, therefore I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

An honourable member: Yes, sir.

Motion carried.

*Bills***SUPPLY BILL 2020***Standing Orders Suspension*

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (11:56): I move:

That standing orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable the introduction of a bill without notice forthwith and passage through all stages without delay.

The SPEAKER: There is an absolute majority; I accept the motion.

Motion carried.

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (11:57): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act for the appropriation of money from the Consolidated Account for the financial year ending 30 June 2021. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (11:58): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

A supply bill is necessary to be enacted as soon as possible to provide appropriation authority from the beginning of the financial year until the Governor's assent is given to the Appropriation Bill 2020. The Appropriation Act 2019 expires on 30 June 2020. The Supply Bill 2020 provides interim appropriation authority for 1 July 2020 until the Appropriation Bill 2020 is passed.

The bill is required in order to respond to the delay in the 2020-21 state and commonwealth budgets, as agreed by national cabinet, to mitigate risks associated with any possible delays or issues arising from COVID-19 and to enable the operations of government to be paid for the period from 1 July 2020 until the Appropriation Bill is approved.

This bill provides additional time and flexibility for the passing of the 2020 Appropriation Bill. In the absence of special arrangements in the form of a supply act, there would be no parliamentary authority for expenditure between the commencement of the new financial year and the date on which assent is given to the main Appropriation Bill. The amount being sought under this bill is \$15,336,000,000. This amount is based on the budgeted appropriations that were required for the 2019-20 financial year. Clause 1 is formal, clause 2 provides relevant definitions and clause 3 provides for the appropriation of up to \$15.336 billion.

What we are seeking to do here today—and I want to thank the opposition for their forbearance and their quick response in helping to enable this house debate the bill through all stages at a time of national emergency—is have a parliament that works together for the good of all South Australians. I think it is essential for the expedient function of its government and it shows the great strength of this institution.

We are in unprecedented times. Making sure that we can respond to the health emergency and also making sure that we can respond to help stimulate our economy is extremely important. This appropriation bill, which is different from previous appropriation bills in the size and quantum of the money being sought, will allow the government to do that. I thank all members in this house for their help in bringing this bill on. I commend the bill to members.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (12:00): I rise firstly to indicate the opposition's support for the Supply Bill, and the member for Schubert is correct, we do live in extraordinary times and emergency measures are required. It is an unusual Supply Bill, not just because of the circumstances in which it is being introduced and the purposes for which it is being introduced, but also because the amount that this bill seeks is a much larger amount compared with what this parliament is used to for supply bills.

Usually, the parliament is called on to provide an amount of money that would suffice for a period of say four or five months to give a margin to the government of the day to make sure that it gets all of its budget bills passed and assented to, for example, between July—the beginning of a financial year—and say, November of that same year.

Here, we are seeking to provide a much greater sum of money: \$15.3 billion, as the member for Schubert has pointed out. That is the sum the government required last financial year for the entire year, not for four or five months. That is a very different proposition from any that has been put to this place before. It is important to think that this will give the government sufficient flexibility in responding to the unfolding crisis that the coronavirus presents to the South Australian community.

It is very clear that we will need a continuation of additional resources provided to, for example, our healthcare systems and other areas within the government's response. We will also need very significant resources brought to bear by the government for the support of the community, whether that is support for people, whether that is support for households or whether that is support for businesses and the economy. We have seen the federal government act. As I told this place yesterday, it is my view that in this respect the federal government has acted decisively to provide additional support to individuals and businesses to try to maintain a level of economic and financial activity in these very difficult and uncertain times.

Yes, of course, there are some issues with it. There are those who feel that perhaps the federal government could have found ways to make sure that people could access some of the payments that they are making available more quickly in order to provide them with a bit more comfort in the coming days and weeks. There are also other views, for example, about whether it is inadvertently—not deliberately—setting people up for some level of longer-term hardship by giving them access to superannuation in these times. However, it is important that the federal government has acted and acted so quickly.

Here in South Australia we heard the state government make much of the so-called stimulus package, which they announced more than two weeks ago now: \$350 million of almost exclusively already planned expenditure merely to be brought forward. Of course, not much, if any of that, has actually made its way into the community yet and we have seen over the course of the last two weeks the beginning of the impacts of the coronavirus on our state's economy and on small businesses and households. That has led the Labor opposition to call for, repeatedly, some urgent and far greater measures to be brought to bear by this government here in South Australia to better support individuals, households, businesses and our state's economy.

I am hoping that this \$15.3 billion will provide sufficient capacity for the government not only to continue meeting the challenge of health care and other service delivery in response to the coronavirus crisis but also this need to support individuals, households, businesses and the economy. We are used to using the term 'stimulus packages' since the global financial crisis when we had a federal and state government response to do what its name suggests and that is stimulate economic activity, but I think what we are facing now is, as the Victorian Premier, Dan Andrews, has described it, a survival package necessary for many individuals, households, businesses and their economy.

I made some brief remarks in the grievance debate yesterday that I had been contacted particularly over the course of last week and early this week by many constituents, including small business owners who were genuinely panicked and worried about both their personal circumstances as business owners and operators and also the circumstances of their employees. They were desperate for advice and desperate for support from somewhere, and I think to some extent what the federal government has announced in their responses to date has provided some of that certainty.

I will also say, as someone who has used my position as a member of parliament as a platform to raise serious, legitimate and repeated concerns about the behaviour of the banking sector in Australia, including in South Australia, I have actually been somewhat pleased to date that at least the big four banks have chosen to respond in a more helpful way than that to which Australians have become accustomed. I do note, of course, that after the Reserve Bank made the decision to decrease interest rates by 25 basis points, all of the big four banks took the opportunity to delay passing on that rate cut to home loans by between two and three weeks.

That, of course, is little surprise to Australians. We all know that the big four deliberately schedule their board meetings as far away from RBA meeting dates as possible to make sure they can maximise the amount of time in which they can continue to charge higher home loan rates from Australians. Notwithstanding that, at least this time in response to the Reserve Bank of Australia's significant injection of funds into the banking system—the availability of additional funds from the RBA to the big four banks—the big four are taking measures now to massively reduce lending rates particularly for businesses, but also for some home loan products, to suspend the requirement for people to make mortgage repayments either on their homes or on their businesses if they are impacted by the coronavirus, and I think these are welcome developments.

I think we should have the same expectation that the federal government has created where the federal government have said that they will move again, if and when necessary, and I think all of the language and the intimation from the Prime Minister is that we can expect further movements from the federal government in terms of providing more support to Australians. I hope we also see that from the Australian banking sector as well, that they are able to provide further support when it is needed by Australian individuals and Australian businesses.

But I reiterate: the passage of this bill to provide this financial capacity to this government—\$15.3 billion—also means that this government needs to act quickly and it needs to act strongly and decisively with much, much greater levels of support for South Australians and South Australian businesses and the economy. The efforts to date have not been anywhere near enough.

The Labor opposition has put forward several suggestions about how the government could be doing that. We could be seeing an increase in state-based concession payments to those 250,000-odd recipients of benefits, such as the energy concessions that would provide an immediate boost to household finances for those people. We have suggested that there could be greater support for those industries that can virtually immediately respond to the state of declining economic activity that we find here in South Australia and ramp up output and activity in that sector. The housing sector is a great example of that.

The government has a lot of levers that it can pull here in South Australia in that respect. It owns a lot of houses, particularly houses that need refurbishment or even demolition and rebuilding. It owns a lot of land available for such housing developments and, of course, it charges taxation on those people who are looking at buying or building houses. So there are a lot of measures that the state government could put in place which would benefit the state's economy by effectively turbocharging the housing sector.

We have spoken at length in this place about the most unfortunate increase in state taxes, fees and charges from last year's state budget—\$500 million over four years. The government should use this as an opportunity to roll back those tax increases and, indeed, go one step further by relieving South Australians of state taxes to make sure that they have more money in their pocket so that they can continue to support themselves and their families, and they can continue to keep their businesses afloat. We are talking about things like payroll taxes.

The increase in land taxes will hit thousands of South Australians from the introduction of aggregation measures from October of this year. As I was driving home last night, I got a phone call from a constituent saying, 'Stephan, could you please raise this issue of land tax aggregation? There are thousands of us here in South Australia who are going to get a bill thousands of dollars higher. This is the last thing we need as property owners with tenants right now. We need to be doing everything we can to support tenants.'

I raise that issue of supporting tenants because that is where the state government could also assist. Pleasingly, I think it is good that the national cabinet—which has been established in recent weeks—has talked about what state governments could be doing to support tenants of landlords in these difficult times. Remarkably, I had a phone call yesterday afternoon from a constituent, a residential tenant, who had been contacted by the landlord's agent to evict them with the requisite 60 days' notice under the Residential Tenancies Act.

On the face of it, those circumstances might seem entirely legitimate under the Residential Tenancies Act but, in the circumstances in which we find ourselves in the community, must that actually happen? It would be gratefully welcomed by the community if there was more of a role that

could be played by the Attorney-General, using the efforts of her Consumer and Business Services agency, in mediating some of these unfortunate circumstances that are beginning to play themselves out across the community during this time. That is something that we would look forward to.

Of course, we also think that there are sectors of the economy that have been particularly hard hit by the coronavirus and people's changing behaviours in the community as a result. It is no secret to any of us that all of us MPs have large numbers of small businesses in the hospitality, tourism, food and beverage industries. These are important drivers of economic activity but, more to the point—not to speak of it so dryly—they support so many local jobs in our communities. It is absolutely essential that the state government gets behind this industry and provides some support.

On Sunday, the Labor opposition suggested that there is a role here for the state government to play in establishing an industry support fund. We nominated an amount of \$200 million, which could be used by the government, in conjunction with industry, to support those businesses just to try to stay afloat; not necessarily to keep their doors open and trading given the restrictions that have been placed on community activities at the moment to try to control the spread of the virus, but at least to make sure that owners of businesses have some chance of operating into the future once we deal with this, and that they at least have some chance of supporting their workforce, in conjunction with those support packages that the federal government has announced.

Again, we suggested payroll tax rebates and refunds for what had already been paid for the current financial year for this sector. We also suggested that the next round of liquor licensing fees, which are due to hit later this year—in fact, substantially increased liquor licensing fees because of the changes brought in by this government—should be waived. Not only should we be helping the relationship between landlords and their tenants in this particular industry, but we should also be looking at waiving the land tax for these landlords if that puts them in a better position to assist their tenants at this difficult time.

We would also like to see a level of moratorium on all other state government fees and charges apply not just to this industry—of course it should not only be this industry—but other industries going forward suffering the worst effects of the downturn in community activity. Perhaps somewhat controversially, those businesses relying on cash flow may also need to defer some of their taxation obligations, like gaming tax, to help them make sure that through these difficult months they can maintain their businesses, and a renewed commitment for the government to rapidly accelerate the payment of its invoices to South Australian businesses in particular. Other states and jurisdictions around the country have nominated a period of five business days. That, of course, historically speaking, is an absolute gold standard but we think it should be 'the standard' that is applied to how government can interact.

We have seen premiers and leaders of interstate jurisdictions post videos and talk to their communities about what their governments are doing. I was particularly taken by one comment made by Chief Minister Gunner of the Northern Territory when he talked about the support that the Territory government is providing to the construction industry. He said that his government was providing more money to the construction industry for what he called 'screwdriver ready projects' so that there can be work immediately for tradies and like businesses in the Territory. He encouraged them not only to win that work from government but also, once they got paid by government, to go out and spend that money in the Territory community and support other Territorians during this time.

I think that is a great demonstration of the power of government spending during this time. It is not just about giving money to one person or to one business, it is the power of what those funds can do more broadly, with a multiplier effect, throughout the South Australian economy and community. It is absolutely essential that we see these efforts continue. We all realise now that we are in for the most difficult time, certainly that my generation has ever contemplated. I talk as someone who has only been around a little longer than the 27 or 28 years of consecutive economic growth that we have had in South Australia, and certainly I think these times are going to test older generations in South Australia and across the nation about whether they have ever been through more difficult times.

What we now know, of course, is that the new orthodox way of responding to these economic crises is for government to get as much money out to the community as possible, rather than wait

and wait, as was the experience after the Great Depression. So we urge, with the passage of this bill, that this government do the same.

I will conclude my comments about that now, but I do want to say one other thing. With the benefit of this parliament rushing this piece of legislation through for the potential expenditure of \$15.3 billion comes an obligation of scrutiny on this government. We are sitting here today, of course, with different arrangements, different circumstances, with a much reduced number of members of parliament and a much reduced effort throughout the chamber so that we can maintain that important effort of not only parliamentary representation of our communities but also the operation of responsible government, holding the government of the day to account.

Now, if this government is going to ask for a much greater amount of supply from the parliament, then it stands to reason that the government should also be willing to subject itself to the appropriate level of scrutiny in the coming months for the decisions that it makes and the expenditure decision it makes on the benefit of using these moneys. I hope we do not see what we saw in Canberra earlier this week—that is, a day of sitting followed by the government in Canberra using its numbers to shut the parliament down for months and months. That has not gone down well, certainly in my community. It has been seen as a lack of leading by example. It is also seen, particularly by those people who show a keener interest in current affairs and politics in particular, as perhaps the government looking to avoid scrutiny during these important times.

So I would say to those opposite, I would say to the government here in South Australia: if you want the parliament to support this—and I have already indicated that the opposition will—then you also have to support that basic tenet of responsible government in providing the opportunity for this place, the Parliament of South Australia, to hold the government of the day to account. All 47 of us in this place—and I guess to some extent the other 22 in the other place—are the ones who are receiving the phone calls; who are getting the emails; who are even, hopefully under different circumstances, at a greater distance, getting the visits to the electorate offices from people who are desperate for answers, desperate for help, and who want to know whether the government is doing absolutely everything it can to support them and to support their communities.

If this place is not sitting then we cannot be making the necessary suggestions, we cannot be putting the necessary pressure on and we cannot be holding the government to account for how it is going to conduct itself in the coming months. So I will conclude my remarks by issuing that plea to the government. Please do not use this as an opportunity to shut the parliament down. Please do not use this as an opportunity to avoid scrutiny of the decisions that will need to be made in the coming weeks and months. Please do not use this as an opportunity to avoid scrutiny as to how these moneys may be spent in the coming weeks and months.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (12:23): I want to thank this chamber for its forbearance and certainly the opposition for its support. The evolving economic situation in South Australia is one that this government has taken proactive steps on every single step of the way.

Even before coronavirus had reached our shores, the work this government has done to help stimulate and grow our economy stands us in good stead now. Whether that be cuts to land tax; capping of NRM levies; cutting payroll tax for small business—for any business with a payroll under \$1½ million; the massive cut of \$90 million to the emergency services levy; as well as some modest reductions in electricity prices that we are starting to see the flow through our economy; and, quite clearly, what work is going to be done on helping to reduce water prices in South Australia, we as a government have helped to deliver a lower cost of living across a whole host of areas that government has control over so that we can help put more money back into the pockets of South Australians.

However, perhaps the biggest part of our plan to help grow the economy is that in a situation of neutral fiscal policy, which has been the mantra of the government over the past two years in relation to having balanced budgets, the way that we can provide stimulus into the economy is by debt-funded infrastructure development. It is making sure that we balance the books on the operating side but being very keen to spend money, given how cheap the cost of money is. Building infrastructure projects now is extremely important to help grow the economy. It helps the productive

capacity of the economy and also does so at a time when the cost escalation on delivering these projects is actually higher than the interest rates at the time.

I am speaking about our \$12.9 billion infrastructure program, a program that is really kicking into gear over the course of this year in advance of coronavirus. Whether that be some 100 education projects that are currently underway, whether it is the almost \$1 billion we are spending in health infrastructure upgrades, whether it is the almost \$4 billion we are spending on upgrading our roads or the almost \$1 billion we are spending on upgrading public transport, we as a government are using responsible debt at low interest rates—interest rates lower than we have ever seen before—to help grow our economy.

That is the situation our economy found itself in before we were hit with this coronavirus. In South Australia we were actually the first jurisdiction to put a stimulus package on the table—\$350 million worth of projects to help kickstart our economy through this time. Those projects were very much around how we utilise existing programs to get small capital projects into the community. Whether that is the bringing forward of maintenance on hospitals, whether that be the \$50 million Planning and Development Fund, which is going to partner with local governments to be able to deliver stimulus quickly into our economy, or whether that be a whole host of other measures that will be rolled out over the coming weeks, that package is all about helping to stimulate our economy during this difficult time.

We do have to be nimble about how we deal with the impacts of coronavirus. There will be further stimulus by this government in the coming weeks and months. The reason we need to be nimble is twofold. First, we need to be cognisant that the stimulus we put into the community has one eye to the restrictions that are in place in our society in relation to mass gatherings and a whole host of other restrictions that are progressively coming into place.

The stimulus measures that we put on the ground need to be able to work whilst we go through the limited social interaction that can occur under the regimes that we find ourselves in as a response to COVID-19. We need to make sure that stimulus packages and future stimulus packages take that into account. There is no point, for instance, trying to stimulate the tourism economy when there are no flights. It does not make sense, for instance, to try to stimulate the hospitality sector when at the moment that sector is not able to operate. Making sure that our further stimulus in the economy is flexible is an extremely important component in helping to deal with this.

The second thing that we wanted to take heed of here in South Australia was to actually understand where the federal government was going to head. They have announced two stimulus packages to a total of 10 per cent of GDP into our economy, helping small business, helping the unemployed and the newly unemployed by a Newstart Allowance and also enabling people to access their super. I think what the federal government has done has been remarkable. They have acted early, they have acted swiftly and they have acted with a magnitude that will help to have money flow through our economy.

I also want to thank the banks, which very clearly play such an important role in helping to keep our economy going through this time. Certainly the work that they have done, for instance, on deferring home loan repayments, on deferring small business loan repayments, on extending overdrafts in some instances is all work that is going to help increase liquidity into the market. We know that that is important during this time because free cash flow is going to become the thing that helps get business through.

There will have to be quite an understanding of the business-to-business economy, because businesses are going to have to understand that there are going to be some customers who simply cannot pay their debts until we come out the other side of this. Businesses essentially have two options: they either crystallise that bad debt now and take a hit to their books or work together with the small business sector to keep those businesses alive so that when we come out the other side of this we have an economy that is functioning and a structure that allows us to roar back into life.

Perhaps the biggest message that the community needs to hear is that we are going to go through some difficult times over the next few months. We have seen over the course of just the last couple of weeks the increase in restrictions on how people can socially interact, from the banning of mass gatherings over 500 people outdoors and 100 indoors, to the four square metre rule, to the

restrictions that were put in place over the weekend around hospitality venues, to the restrictions that were put in place just last night around a whole series of other venues and other opportunities that people have to socially interact.

These next few months are going to be difficult, as we head further and deeper into this coronavirus disease and its spread through our community, but we will come out the other side. As a government, we are very keen to make sure that when we do come out the other side of this we have an economy that is ready to move forward, we have a system in place that helps stimulate the economy back into life as quickly as possible and that we have much of our business infrastructure in place so that those businesses that have gone dormant can rehire people and can have people getting out there much further and much more quickly into the economy.

We need to make sure that as we come out the other side of this we are in the best position possible to take advantage of the opportunities that there will be. As a government, we have reacted swiftly at every step of the way, including even just now in the last few days with the Attorney-General putting on the table relaxed restrictions in relation to the sale of alcohol and takeaway alcohol, so that businesses can try to find new ways to adapt in this restricted operating environment.

This government has done everything it can to stay at the forefront of the curve, to deal with the health emergency but make sure that our society can continue to function in the short term. We are up to the task and what we are doing here with this Supply Bill is giving ourselves the necessary funds and the necessary flexibility to be able to respond, to be able to put further stimulus in place into the future and to be able to make sure that the South Australian economy and the South Australian society as we know it roars back into life once this awful health emergency has been dealt with.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (12:32): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Sitting suspended from 12:33 to 14:00.

Message from Governor

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

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government (Hon. S.K. Knoll)—

Adelaide Metropolitan Passenger Transport Service Contracts—Report from the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government pursuant to section 39 of the Passenger Transport Act 1994, 2020

Question Time

CORONAVIRUS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:03): My question is to the Premier. Can children spread COVID-19?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:03): I think anybody can spread COVID-19. The question is about the risks associated with those individuals and the circumstances they are in. That's the advice that we have from the Chief Medical Officer, Dr Brendan Murphy. He has been providing advice to the national cabinet.

One of the most important things that he talks about is risks: the degree of risk between different cohorts in terms of being able to contract it, the risks in terms of what their likely journey will be living with the disease, the risks that they will need to be hospitalised, and the risks that they can pass it on to others. That's the basis of the advice that he has been providing to the national cabinet.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04): My question is to the Premier. If children can spread COVID-19, why are schools still open?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:04): Children can contract and spread COVID-19 whether they are in schools or whether they are in the community. It's the considered opinion of the AHPPC that schools need to remain open at this point in the progress of this disease. That position hasn't changed; it was only confirmed last night. As I said in the parliament yesterday, and in many public statements, that advice can change into the future.

When I look at the way that we have progressed in South Australia, we have based all our decisions upon public health advice, expert advice and expert input, and I think that when we look at the results here in South Australia we are in front of the curve. We want to stay in front of the curve. We want to reduce the peak of the disease in South Australia, and we want to push it out into the future as much as possible. We know that by doing that we will protect our population.

There are some who don't want to accept what the experts are saying, and this can be a dangerous departure for us in South Australia. I know that many people have an opinion on this, but I think, at a time like this, the only reasonable thing that a government can do is listen to what the experts are suggesting. They are the ones who have access to the modelling, and they present compelling evidence that changes to the arrangements and the settings with regard to this virus can bring catastrophic consequences. These are matters of life and death, and so we think, in this instance, that we should be listening to the experts, and that's precisely what we are doing.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:06): Has the Premier read the advice of other experts on the closure of schools, particularly the advice provided by 22 eminent specialists from the Group of Eight universities?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:06): As I said in my previous answer, there is a variety of advice, and we have made the decision that we will listen to the advice of the AHPPC (Australian Health Protection Principal Committee). It is chaired by Dr Brendan Murphy; he is the Chief Medical Officer for Australia. He is the chair of that, and Dr Nicola Spurrier, our Chief Public Health Officer, is on that committee. All the chiefs from around the country have input to that. They meet on a daily basis. That is one of the reasons why, in South Australia, going back to the beginning of last week, we appointed three new deputy chief public health officers in South Australia: Evan Everest, Chris Lease and also Mike Cusack. So three eminent clinicians in South Australia now hold the position of deputy chief public health officer because Dr Nicola Spurrier is really involved as much as possible on the AHPPC.

As I have said in the parliament before, and I will repeat it for people again today, there is a further expert panel that has been assembled, which is called the Communicable Diseases Network Australia. This is, if you like, the specialist expert advice that the AHPPC is drawing on. Those two groups work together; they present their advice to the national cabinet, and that's what we are relying on.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08): My question is to the Premier. Why has the Premier not read the advice of the Group of Eight research universities,

considering that it is the AHPPC that has procured their advice in regard to school closures, amongst other issues?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:08): I refer the leader to my previous answer.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:08): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house on the measures that the government is taking to flatten the curve and minimise the impact of COVID-19 in South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:09): I thank the member for Hammond for his excellent question. He is interested—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is on the board.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —in what we can do in South Australia to flatten the curve in South Australia to reduce the peak and push it out as far into the future as possible—as I am sure all members in this parliament would be. One of the principal elements of making sure that we can tackle the coronavirus is that we have expert testing and data available to control this disease. For that work, I very much thank SA Pathology, led by their chief clinician, Dr Tom Dodd, who has done an outstanding job in setting up an enviable world-class testing regime in South Australia.

To date, I think we have now sailed past 18,000 tests in South Australia, which puts us second-highest in the world—significantly higher than any other jurisdiction in Australia, significantly higher than South Korea which is often held up by people in the media as having the best testing regime. We are significantly better per head of population than them. We are doing two types of testing. One for the COVID-19 target market but also one to look at community transmissions, and that's what gives us confidence that our data is accurate.

We have set up testing stations right across the state, rapid testing assessment clinics, and I think this provides us with an excellent opportunity to give access to those people who need it, including the great innovation of a drive-through clinic at the Repat, which has now been replicated at the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre. Of course, we are all aware that there are more restrictions coming into play now and that's all designed to make sure that we are social distancing and that we are doing everything we can do to make sure that we can control the spread. We fully appreciate that some of these measures are extraordinarily inconvenient for people but we know that if we apply these we are going to save lives.

This morning I had to communicate with Cheryl Cates, who is the president of the RSL in South Australia and the Northern Territory, and it was with much regret that I had to say that as of midnight tonight RSLs in South Australia will have to close their doors. This is particularly difficult in the lead-up to ANZAC Day, but Cheryl understood. The RSL understands that our most important task at the moment is to protect the lives of our vulnerable citizens, and our veterans fall into some of those cohorts, and they will certainly be abiding by that.

Some people have queried why we are reducing the number of people who can attend weddings and funerals. It seems extraordinarily harsh when somebody cannot have the number of people they want to have at a family funeral. The reality is that if we look at the super outbreaks, the super spread events, in Australia since COVID-19 came, the number one was a wedding and the number two was a funeral. It seems extraordinarily tough, extraordinarily harsh, but we are only doing these things to do what we can to slow the spread of this disease.

Last night, the national cabinet met. The Prime Minister updated the people of Australia immediately after that with a range of new restrictions. Again, I know that this is having a devastating effect on our economy in Australia. There have been two major stimulus packages at the federal level. South Australia was the first to move on a local stimulus package designed to get work out into the market as quickly as possible.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Ramsay!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The cabinet is now working very diligently to provide a second stimulus package. We are going to be doing everything we can to protect as many lives as we can. Cabinet met on Sunday. It met again on Monday, yesterday, today and will be meeting tomorrow. I can't imagine another time when the cabinet has met five times in five days. Everybody is working as diligently as they possibly can to make sure that we can provide that stimulus and support that South Australians need at this time.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier discussed the Group of Eight universities advice, particularly around school closures, with his Chief Public Health Officer?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:13): I have discussed a range of issues with the Chief Public Health Officer. I don't go through every item which is on the AHPPC agenda but I am absolutely confident that our Chief Public Health Officer is doing an excellent job. In fact, she has been acknowledged nationally and I am quite sure that once this is over she will be acknowledged internationally for the work that she has done. She has sprung into action from day one when this disease was first identified in the northern hemisphere. She could see what the potential was in Australia, and ultimately in South Australia, and put all the necessary precautions and procurements in place that will stand us in very good stead for when the peak hits.

I am not there to provide input to her consideration for the policy settings that she puts in place. I think that that would be completely inappropriate. What we are trying to do is depoliticise this entire process. I think the people of South Australia are very grateful that we have depoliticised this process. I think they are very grateful that we aren't making it up in South Australia and that we are following the expert advice and will continue to do so throughout the entire journey that we are on.

It is going to take some time, but I am 100 per cent confident that if we abide by these restrictions and we follow diligently the advice that has been put forward by the experts, then we will come through this to the best of our ability. My goal is that Australia comes through this coronavirus best in the world and that South Australia comes through it the best in Australia.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): Why is the advice from 22 other experts associated with the Group of Eight research universities wrong?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:15): I have provided an answer to the house on this already.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Is there one more question on the left? The leader and then the member for Colton.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): My question is to the Premier. Have any further cases been identified at South Australian schools beyond the two already accounted for at Unley High School?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:15): I don't have that specific information, but I am sure we can come back to you. The total number as per the update yesterday was that we had 170 people who had become infected in South Australia. They have been identified.

For the reasons that I outlined earlier, I believe that we have a very accurate picture of the number of infections in South Australia compared to just about any other jurisdiction in the world. Everybody reports the number of infections, but probably very few places in the world can have the

confidence in their data like we have in South Australia for the reasons that I outlined before. I think we are in a good position.

To date, we have no deaths in South Australia and, in fact, today was the first day in which we had patients admitted to an ICU. What the statistics show you is about eight out of every 10 people that contract this virus will have very minor symptoms and will probably get over this disease in a very rapid time, about 20 per cent of people will require higher-level medical support or hospitalisation and about 7 per cent of the total population will require intensive care.

That is one of the reasons we want to obviously push down the peak but also delay it as much as possible: so that we can increase our capacity—our ICU capacity, our critical care capacity, our ventilator capacity, our nursing capacity, our ECMO capacity and all the things that the health professionals have informed us for months now that we will need to have in place at the time of the peak.

One of the other reasons we want to delay that peak is so we can learn from the other jurisdictions. If we can get further behind at the front internationally and further behind the front in Australia, we can learn from how those jurisdictions handle the peak of this disease. What we are also finding now is there is more and more research being done and we are getting closer to a vaccine, but we are also already getting a lot of information about better treatments for people who are living with COVID-19 so that they are not spending as much time in ICU, they are getting through and there is a better recovery rate.

When we look at the death rate in Italy, up over 7 per cent, we've got to do everything we can to make sure that we are absolutely at the bottom end of the scale in terms of unnecessary deaths in Australia. That is all a matter of getting demand for this high-level health care and supply in balance and that is what our whole process is about.

SMALL BUSINESS

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:18): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney update the house on how the Marshall government is helping small businesses through temporary licensing measures?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:18): I thank the member for Colton for this question. As I indicated to the house yesterday, the events of Sunday, when a declaration of a major emergency was made, meant our police commissioner has been appointed under the act as the coordinator. He issued a direction on Monday, which had a direct impact on our hospitality industries, if I can broadly describe them as that.

Cafes, restaurants, small bars and local clubs are all part of that. One of the things that became very apparent as a result of that direction was that if each of the hospitality industries were able to continue to provide takeaway food and beverages for patrons, the inconsistency between perhaps hotels and restaurants and cafes became obvious; namely, the licensing arrangements for our cafes, restaurants, small bars and local clubs was different to hotels and they wouldn't be able to provide takeaway food with alcohol in these extraordinary times.

That was a matter which was exercised by commissioners of licensing around the country. They discussed the matter. Yesterday, I received a recommendation from the commissioner, Mr Dini Soulio. I agreed to it. It was executed, and this is the situation: purchases will be able to be undertaken by liquor licensing holders under a temporary licensing arrangement for two bottles of wine, or one bottle of wine and a six pack of beer, cider or premixed drinks. They will require the same stringent responsible service requirements already imposed on takeaway alcohol.

Those operating, obviously, in our very important small bar/cafe/restaurant industries are able to apply, as I say, for a free, short-term and temporary licence enabling them to sell that small amount of alcohol with takeaway meals if ordered. In addition, our community clubs will be able to sell liquor for takeaway to club members, and also will be able to sell alcohol to any member of the public purchasing a takeaway meal, but this will be limited to two bottles of wine, or a bottle of wine and the six pack as previously described.

The temporary measures will be in place for the same period that the Emergency Management Act—or, perhaps, it may return to the public health acts. However, as long as they are in place during this pandemic then that will be the time period for which the temporary measures will apply.

Obviously things are changing. But it was important that, although, for example, the hotel industry was not ever happy in the past with these other aspects of service delivery and having the capacity to be able to provide alcohol in these circumstances, I did speak to Mr Ian Horne, who is the chief executive of the Hotels Association. So, whilst they had taken that position historically, I think he understood perfectly the importance of having some equity in this small part of the market, which is now important to be able to provide a service to the community, and I thank him for his time in that regard. I also yesterday advised Clubs SA and the chief executive of Restaurant and Catering, and this morning notices went out to all of the parties that are able to apply for this benefit.

It is important that, as a government, we not only, as the Premier rightly points out, take the advice and identify the principal and primary responsibility of us to look after the health of the community but also, where we can, ensure that there is an equitable distribution of either the pain or benefit of the support that we can give to industry to ensure that we maximise employment and provide, as best we can, economic support to South Australians.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): My question is to the Premier. What actions or systems does the Premier have in place to ensure the expert advice he is relying upon is right and other expert advice is wrong?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:23): Well, I have no reason to believe that the people who have been selected to be on the AHPPC and to be on the Communicable Diseases Network Australia aren't giving us accurate information. As I said, we have been relying on the advice of our Chief Public Health Officer, Associate Professor Dr Nicola Spurrier, since the start of this, and we have been very happy, very satisfied, with the level of advice that she has provided, and that is the advice that has really put us in the position that we are in today where we have an excellent testing regime. We've got high level confidence that we don't have significant community transmission.

I note that yesterday was the first time that Dr Spurrier had updated the daily briefing to suggest that she is now suspecting that one case in South Australia is of community transmission. What we mean by that is that, at this point, she is not in a position to be able to track back and work out where the infection actually came from. This is a significant development, but it is not unexpected. This is what is happening in every other jurisdiction in the world.

So, we have done very well, if you like, to keep that event at bay, and we will continue to take every possible opportunity we can, as I said, to reduce that peak and push it out as far as we can.

BORDER CHECKPOINTS

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:24): My question is to the Minister for Police. Now that the Limestone Coast has four cases of COVID-19, can the minister explain why there is no manned station on the Princes Highway or Nelson Road at the Victorian and South Australian border?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:24): My understanding is that the police commissioner was putting in stations at 12 locations. I am not familiar with that location, but I can chase that up with him. These were put in at rapid pace. We first discussed this when a general emergency was declared on Sunday morning and those stations were put in place by 4 o'clock yesterday afternoon. Let me take that question that the member has asked and I will follow that up immediately and come back to him with an answer as quickly as I can.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr PICTON (Kaurana) (14:25): My question is to the Premier. Why did the Premier say on radio and again to this house that in terms of our curve we are in front when actually we are on the same path as other states in terms of the acceleration of cases?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Point of order: the member is seeking to introduce fact and argument as part of the question.

The SPEAKER: For inserting facts. Would the member like to seek leave?

Mr PICTON: I would like to seek leave.

Leave granted.

The SPEAKER: Member for Kaurua, can we have the question again with the insertion of facts?

Mr PICTON: My question is to the Premier. Why has the Premier said to this house that in terms of our curve we are in front? With your leave and that of the house, I will explain. The Premier said on the radio and again to this house, 'In terms of our curve, we're in front.'

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:26): There's plenty of information out there that looks at various trajectories and we are certainly very satisfied with the trajectory that we're on. Our goal is to slow that further. We have had no deaths, we have had very few—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Leel!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I refer the member to my previous answers.

BORDER CHECKPOINTS

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:26): My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister inform the house about what steps the South Australian police are taking to restrict the movements of people entering South Australia?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:27): I thank the member for Newland for his question.

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

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

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I know that a number of people in this place are very concerned about this. Indeed, the community has made contact with me, my office and various other members in this place to discuss the restrictions on movements of people entering South Australia. I think we all acknowledge that we are in unprecedented times. We are all united in this place in the one message: the health and safety of all South Australians is at the forefront of our minds as we put in place measures to restrict the spread of COVID-19.

At 10.37am yesterday, the Commissioner of Police issued a direction under the Emergency Management Act restricting movement of people entering South Australia. The direction came into effect at 11am yesterday, Tuesday 24 March 2020. As a result, any person crossing the border into South Australia is required to commit to a 14-day self-quarantine period, whether they are South Australian residents or not.

From 4pm yesterday, police and other government agencies have been actively staffing border checkpoints in line with restrictions. But, I must be clear, there are some exemptions to the commissioner's direction. Essential travellers, such as people involved in transport and logistical services, emergency and essential health workers and national security workers will be exempt. Those persons will not be subject to the direction of quarantine for 14 days.

Police are now positioned at various checkpoints and mobile on our highways to stop and speak with travellers entering the state. Our police have the power to ask people questions, including name, phone number, contact details and purpose of travel. As I mentioned earlier, the direction provides exemptions to those classified as essential travellers.

Anyone entering the state is required to individually determine if they meet the requirements of an essential traveller. If a member of the public believes they are classified as an essential

traveller, a police officer will ask them to justify why when they are stopped at a checkpoint or any other place. The officer will be responsible for advising whether the traveller is exempt or not from the direction and, where appropriate, allow the traveller to transit into the state uninterrupted.

I reiterate, the direction generally includes the following people as essential travellers: national and state security and governance, health services, essential medical treatment, transport and freight services, skills critical to maintaining key industries or businesses, emergency services workers, cross-border community members (and people passing through will need to make their own inquiries about entry into their final state destination) and also compassionate grounds.

The commissioner's direction, first and foremost, seeks the community's cooperation. The direction is aimed at reducing the speed at which the virus is spreading. There are significant fines for those people who do not adhere to the directions but I again stress this is a community issue that requires compliance.

If you are interstate and intending to holiday in South Australia in the next few days or weeks, you need to reassess your travel. If it is absolutely not essential that you travel then don't. It is vital that we all work together to ensure we maintain social distancing guidelines and comply with the directions to quarantine. If we work together we can protect those vulnerable within our community by reducing the number of cases experienced by health services, and together we can help flatten the curve.

BORDER CHECKPOINTS

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:30): My supplementary is to the minister. Does the minister believe that a border checkpoint should occur at the border?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:31): I thank the member for the question. I think I outlined quite clearly in my answer that the border checkpoints have been put in place. There are also mobile checkpoints. This is an operational matter for the police commissioner. I would suggest that the checkpoints would have been put in place that are the most safe and secure to make sure that this can be carried out.

I do also stress in the point there that compliance is a very big part of that, and we ask everyone to comply with these directions. They are very clear, they have been outlined quite succinctly, I think, and we ask people to engage and do the right thing.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:31): My question is to the Premier. Who has advised the Premier that in terms of our curve we are in front?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:31): I could point the member to the Grattan Institute, which has published only earlier this week, that showed that we had a doubling of infection rates every four days. This put us at a very—

Mr Picton: Really?

The SPEAKER: Member for Kurna, be quiet!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —good position compared to other jurisdictions. It was previously every five days, and this is one of the reasons why we have effectively closed the borders in South Australia because we could see in recent days an increasing spike with regard to the number of infections that were coming from people who had returned from interstate travel, so this is the reason why we have taken that step.

I would point out to the house, though—again, it is acknowledged by every independent person looking at this—that our data is accurate, that we don't have the delays in the system and, because we are testing more, we are finding more infections. This is not a bad thing. What we need to do is maximise our testing so that we do have a clear and accurate picture on which to base all of our decision-making.

Whilst we can have great confidence in the figures that we are publishing, I don't think that's the case in other jurisdictions around the world. I will leave them to worry about the accuracy of their

data. But I am very confident about the accuracy of my data, and I point the member to the Grattan Institute publication, which was only made available earlier this week.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader! Member for Kurna, I apologise, I am trying to give you another question but the leader is interjecting. Member for Kurna.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:33): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Why does the Premier say that he is satisfied with the rate of the curve in South Australia when we have the second-highest per capita rate of cases?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Point of order. That question offends standing order 97, sir.

The SPEAKER: For that characterisation it's a minor breach at best. I am going to allow it in the spirit of questions. Premier, would you like to have a crack at that?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:33): When we look at the way that this data has been presented in the early stages of this, small movements can make large discrepancies in terms of the overall analysis of the data. As the member would be aware, there was one group that really has skewed that data quite significantly.

We have seen in the last few days the number not continuing to escalate. Having said that, there is no doubt that this number will escalate in the future. Please be aware—and this is important for all members to understand—we are not going to stop the disease coming to South Australia. So for those opposite, with their incredulous looks on their face, they should actually understand we are not going to stamp out the coronavirus in South Australia. No public health official would say that that is the objective.

As I have tried to point out to this house on numerous occasions—and I think that we, as elected members and leaders in the community, really do need to get a good understanding of this disease and we should be familiar with the basics of this disease—(1) it is a global pandemic; (2) we are not going to avoid it coming to South Australia, it is actually already here; (3) the fundamental problem that exists in other jurisdictions around the world is that they have got a massive imbalance in the demand for high-level health care with the ability to supply it.

We are doing everything we can to slow the rate of progress; we can't eliminate it. So we can't throw our hands in the air and scream, 'Oh my goodness, we've got another infection!' That is going to occur. That is the way these epidemics and these pandemics actually work. But what we are doing is following expert advice to slow the rate to a level so that the peak is something that our health system can cope with and simultaneously massively increasing the capacity of the health sector in South Australia to cope with it.

I am very satisfied that we have a strong plan to address this. In fact, I am very pleased that we have the experts that we do have in communicable diseases and public health administration in South Australia, and they swung into action as soon as this insidious disease came to the notice of the rest of the world. We are very fortunate that we have a strong plan to tackle this. If we continue to implement and roll out the elements of this plan and we continue to listen to the expert advice then we will put ourselves in the best position possible to deal with the inevitable consequences of an increase in infection in South Australia.

People will become infected with the COVID-19 virus. Eighty per cent of people will have very mild symptoms and they will get over it in a very short period of time. Our interest in South Australia is making sure that we have got the necessary resources in place for when that peak hits, and we know that six or seven per cent of the people who get that infection require high-level hospital care. That is our focus; it has been our focus now for weeks and weeks and weeks, and we continue to make progress.

Whether it be increased testing; whether it be putting new hospital beds in place or new resources in place in terms of ventilators, ECMO and of course the nursing staff that is required; whether it will be shifting likely cases that will come in to use those finite resources right at the time

of the peak, there are a large number of elements to our plan and we continue to roll them out in the best interests of all South Australians.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:37): My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier concerned that the Minister for Health and Wellbeing has told the other place that he is not aware of the Group of Eight expert advice?

The SPEAKER: Insertion of fact. Would the member like to seek leave again to insert fact?

Mr PICTON: I would.

Leave granted.

The SPEAKER: Do you need the question again, Premier? Can we have the question again.

Mr PICTON: My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier concerned that the Minister for Health was unaware of the Group of Eight expert advice? With your leave and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PICTON: The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has just told the other place that he was not aware of the Group of Eight expert advice to the AHPPC and the national cabinet.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:38): We all have roles to play in making sure that we can tackle the COVID-19 virus, and the Minister for Health and Wellbeing in South Australia probably has the busiest workload of any person in the South Australian parliament. I want to publicly thank him for the excellent job that he is doing. He has got enormous pressure on him. He is available I think probably 20 out of every 24 hours. He works and makes decisions based upon the information that he is provided.

He is not utilising his finite time at the moment to become a public health expert. He is setting up the systems to follow the very best public health advice. I do not think that this would be a useful pursuit for him to become a super expert in all of the advice that exists on this topic in the world. In fact, on a daily basis I think we're probably all being bombarded with dozens and dozens of helpful (and sometimes less helpful) advice on how we should be dealing with this.

As I have said to this parliament on many occasions, we have developed a methodology to seek that advice. It is common across all jurisdictions. If those opposite would like to put forward an alternative view of scrapping the AHPPC advice—

Mr Brown: Glass jaw again.

The SPEAKER: Member for Playford! There is no glass in here.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —I would point out that they would be at odds with the Labor leaders in five other jurisdictions in South Australia. So, it would be an extraordinary departure—

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

The SPEAKER: Premier, there is a point of order. The point of order is for debate?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Assigning any form of motive to the opposition is debate, sir.

The SPEAKER: Yes; I have given the Premier a fair bit of latitude. I would respectfully ask him to come back to the substance of the question, please.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, sir, and if I have in any way suggested that there were improper motives, I'm very happy to withdraw that. I was certainly not suggesting there are improper motives, but if it is the considered position of the opposition that they don't want to stay with the AHPPC advice I think that in the interest of all South Australians, they should make that clear.

We have made our position very clear on this. We have made our position extraordinarily clear on this. It seems now, on a daily basis, the opposition has other advice that they have sought from other people. They are suggesting perhaps that we depart from the AHPPC advice—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Badcoe!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and I'm just pointing out to this house that although they are entitled to their opinion, as it turns out, at the moment we're in government and we're making decisions. We're actually backed, with the decision-making mechanism that we're using, by five other Labor jurisdictions around Australia. We are not acting at the national level in a partisan way; in fact, I think there has probably never been a time, sir, when leaders from around the country have come together in such a unified stance.

We used to routinely hear about the fights that would go on every time there was a COAG or when premiers and the prime minister got together. Can I say, because I have been on this national cabinet on Sunday night, last night, tonight and again on Friday morning, that everybody is actually working in the best interests of the nation. We have decided that we won't be providing our own technical health input; we'll be listening to the experts. That is the considered opinion of the national cabinet, but as I said previously, others are entitled to their opinion.

COURTS ADMINISTRATION AUTHORITY

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:42): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General update the house on how public health is being promoted by the state's courts?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:42): Thank you, member for Heysen, I certainly can. As members would be aware, the Courts Administration Authority is almost a unique model in Australia, but we have a system where our state courts are headed under the Courts Administration Authority by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. His executive administrative head, Ms Julie-Ann Burgess, and her team are obviously very involved in how they are exercising the best possible protections, not only for their own staff operating in the courts but also the general public, and indeed the litigants, witnesses, professional representatives, etc.

The Courts Administration Authority has made a number of announcements concerning what arrangements they have put in place to protect the public during the C-19 pandemic and managing that risk. Several arrangements have been put in place. I will say, in appreciation with the Chief Justice and Ms Burgess, that they are seeking advice and have the ongoing advice of the chief executive of the Department for Health, and can of course continue to work with the coordinator, the Commissioner of Police, now that we have a major emergency declared. The situation at the moment is—again, this is consistent with the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (SACAT), which is outside of the Courts Administration Authority, who are doing what they can to ensure that we limit face-to-face interactions.

Much use of audiovisual links and telephone conferencing is underway. When non-attendance at the court is not possible, then strict distancing protocols are being observed. The access to the courts is reported in requests for unnecessary attendance at the court. Some members might be aware that the magistrates' measures include enabling administrative adjournments in direction hearings in appropriate cases, excusing defendants in criminal matters from attending court unless the matter is to finalise and varying bail applications in chambers.

In our District Court, which is also a very busy court in South Australia, there will be no new jury trials commencing prior to 1 May 2020. The matter will then be reviewed. Listing arrangements are being adopted to minimise the risk of people in court at any one time. First directions hearings for March and April have been cancelled. Again, the use of audiovisual links for defendants in custody is being utilised where that's available and appropriate.

The Supreme Court is dealing with directions hearing adjournments and possession matters by email, where they can be. Settlement conferences are held between parties by telephone, mediations are being postponed unless all the parties agree, and other similar measures are being

implemented in the Youth Court, which of course provides for the care, protection orders and juvenile crime matters in that court.

The Federal Court, the Family Court and the Federal Circuit Court also operate in South Australia, and they are also largely in the Victoria Square precinct. They, too, have issued on their websites a number of measures to identify. It's fair to say that the Federal Court is very advanced in relation to audiovisual technology; like SACAT, they have had quite a bit of experience in being able to suspend the requirement for physical attendances and have the capacity to be able to implement that. The Law Society of South Australia and the Bar Association have also been very active in providing advice to the profession and to the public on these matters.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:47): My question is to the Premier. Exactly how many ventilators does our state have right now?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:47): I don't have that information with me at the moment, but I know that this is something that we are working on very carefully. I know that Dr Evan Everest, who is one of the three deputy chief public health officers in South Australia, is charged with the responsibility of determining how many we have and how many will be available for this and to significantly increase our capacity, not just for beds, which are a part of it, but also for both the ventilators and the ECMO (extracorporeal membrane oxygenation) capability that we need in South Australia. We are working very diligently on all of the things that we need to have in place. I am very happy to provide an update as soon as it comes through.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:48): My question is to the Premier. How many additional ventilators are on order, and when will those ventilators arrive?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:48): That's a very important question. My understanding is that we will be doubling our ICU and ventilator capacity in South Australia. Although I don't want to give incorrect information to this house, without referring to it I can say that, when I looked on the list of ventilator capacity in South Australia versus other jurisdictions around Australia, I think South Australia should feel very happy, confident and assured that the public health administration in South Australia is working very hard to increase the ventilator and ECMO capacity in South Australia to what surely is at the top—or, if not, near the top—in Australia.

In fact, the list that I looked at last night suggested that we certainly had over 10 per cent, probably getting closer to 15 per cent, of the nation's ventilator capacity. That's not to say that other jurisdictions might not catch up and put some more into the system, but I feel very capable, as a state that represents approximately 7 per cent of the nation's population, that we will have our capacity in place as the peak hits.

INTENSIVE CARE UNIT BEDS

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:49): My question is to the Premier. Exactly how many ICU beds do we currently have in the state and how many are you creating?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:49): Again, I don't have that number with me but, as I indicated in my previous answer, we have done modelling that would suggest that we need to double that. That doesn't mean that we are not also taking other decisions to try to look at the types and the cohorts of people who need to have ICU in South Australia under normal circumstances and seeing what we can do to eliminate that during the peak.

So this is one of the reasons why we have tried to bring forward much of our elective surgery. We spent \$45 million to halve our elective surgery waiting list because what we know is that there is a cohort of patients, even post elective surgery, who will need to go into ICU. We just won't be in a position, with finite resources, to have those patients in ICU unnecessarily.

So we are trying to do whatever we can to suppress the need for ICU in the general population by making some of those planning decisions, as well as increasing the capacity of beds, ventilators, ECMO, nursing capability and doctor availability. This is one area that I think we have done extremely well in, as in so many other areas. We have to be very grateful for the people who

are working so diligently on this. They have put South Australia in an enviable position to be able to tackle this when the peak hits.

SHOULDER SEALING

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister advise the house if the Blyth Plains Road shoulder sealing project, which was mentioned in the last sitting of parliament, will be started in April? Has this been tendered? When was it tendered out? How was it tendered? Who is the successful tenderer?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:51): I am more than happy to take the substance of that question on notice, given that it's one that I don't have to hand at the moment, except to say that this work was procured as part of our extended shoulder sealing program. There is normally a budget of around \$11 million a year. We increased that last year to add an extra \$26 million to that program.

We know that shoulder sealing is something that saves lives and reduces by up to 40 per cent the number of deaths and serious injuries on roads that have been shoulder sealed. We have something like 10,000 kilometres of road that would need to be shoulder sealed across our network and, to have every road that needs it shoulder sealed, we are working down that list in priority order as quickly as we can.

Blyth Plains was a project that we were happily able to bring forward this year because of the increased amount of money that we have. There are myriad contracting models out there at the moment and, quite clearly, at the moment, a lot of what we are trying to do is to make sure we can bring forward work as much as possible and utilise existing contracting mechanisms to be able to do that. I am more than happy to look into this case to see what information I have.

ESSENTIAL SERVICES

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:53): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is supporting the delivery of the essential service of electricity in South Australia in response to COVID-19?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:53): Thank you to the member for Hammond for that important question. Yesterday in question time the Premier made it very clear that our first and foremost priority is to maximise the health outcomes of South Australia during this period and also that another important priority is to support our economy. The delivery of essential services, including electricity, is vital for both of those priorities. It's incredibly important.

We met last Friday with the COAG Energy Council in a virtual meeting with telecommunications. We met with the resources ministers yesterday afternoon because, of course, the provision of electricity is both an energy and a resource, primarily through gas supply. We are mirroring the approach that has been taken between the Prime Minister and the premiers to make sure that, in this incredibly important area of work, we have all states—Liberal and Labor—and the commonwealth government working collaboratively to make sure that we get the right results.

We had very constructive discussions on both occasions and we have all in our various states—obviously my interest is South Australia—been in close contact with the various industry players that help with the delivery of electricity, from generators and retailers to distribution companies and transmission companies. As well as security of supply, which is incredibly important, we are also focused on customers' needs.

We know that this is going to be a very difficult time for all South Australians. Many people have already lost their jobs and, tragically, many more people will lose their jobs. Two-income homes will become one-income homes or perhaps no-income homes. We know that supporting South Australians with regard to energy payment hardship programs is now, and presumably for the next six to 12 months at the very least, one of our highest priorities.

I have to say I am very pleased with everything that industry is doing in this space. They are working very closely together. It is probably quite fortunate that the electricity industry is used to collaborating, with competitors collaborating in an appropriate way at times of pressing need and

urgency. For example, when we have heatwaves and when we have a generator go down unexpectedly or when we have transmission lines knocked out for one reason or another, this industry, including gas suppliers, has a good track record of coming together to get through, in a practical sense, what they need to for those periods of time.

They have the lines of communication already open. They are working through their short, medium and long-term plans to do everything that they possibly can to support communities. Electricity provision, which was the substance of the member for Hammond's question, is an essential service, without any doubt. It is an essential service because we need our hospitals to have electricity, we need people at home to have electricity, we need all of the industries that are able to continue to operate to have electricity, and we need all of the medium and the small business that are able to continue to operate to have electricity.

We also need it to be affordable and reliable. The work that we have been doing for two years now to make electricity in South Australia as affordable, as reliable and as clean as possible continues through this time, but, of course, we have a much broader and much more combined and concerted effort between state governments to support each other and between companies that normally would be competitors to support each other in an appropriate way.

I say again that through this time, we will do everything that we possibly can to make sure that all South Australians, from the smallest household to the largest employer, are served as well as possible through this difficult virus pandemic.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (14:57): My question is to the Premier. Why has the government not released a COVID-19 plan to either the public or our clinicians, unlike other jurisdictions such as Victoria, WA and the commonwealth?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:57): Well, we have one national plan and we have our plan here in South Australia. As I have said previously, there are three critical components to that. One is slowing the spread of the disease, lowering the peak and pushing it out as far as possible. The second one is a resources-based one that we have also spoken about in this parliament in depth, which is looking at all of the resources that we need, whether they be physical resources, human resources or testing resources, and making sure that we have a plan to deliver all of those in time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We have the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sorry, sir, it is just that they were asking about what the plan was. I am sort of outlining—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Yes, we have the question. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The third element is making sure that we can continue to provide high-level public information on this disease. It is really important that people understand as much about this disease as they possibly can. There is a lot of misinformation about this disease and the response to that disease and I think it is really important that we provide—

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Light is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —all that information, as much as possible, to inspire public confidence. We know that in other jurisdictions around the world the lack of information going out has caused major problems. This is one of the reasons why we have now had the information with regard to this virus translated into 30 different languages and made that available. I think that is going out this afternoon or tomorrow. There was some preliminary information made available, but that is continuing to go out and then we will ramp up. A public information campaign is already underway at both the state level and the federal level.

I was very pleased earlier this week to go on a teleconference with the Minister for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, who is also the Minister for Local Government in South Australia, and speak to pretty much every mayor across the state about their opportunities to participate in this public education campaign.

The fourth area that we have here in South Australia, which isn't part of the health plan in terms of response but which is certainly part of our overall state response, is with regard to the effects that it is going to have on the economy. As we all know, there are very serious and significant effects that are emerging now in terms of business failure and in terms of a high level of unemployment very rapidly coming here in South Australia. That is why we were the first state in Australia to move with our first stimulus package, which we have—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison: No-one knows about it.

The SPEAKER: The member for Ramsay is warned!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have been very clear with the people of South Australia that we are fast tracking \$350 million worth of projects around South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: One of these projects, which has been extraordinarily well received, of course, especially in country SA, is \$15 million going to rapid maintenance projects and important—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —maintenance projects here in South Australia. We believe that our response to date has been immediate, but we also recognise that there is much greater need even over and above the two separate stimulus packages which have been announced by the federal government. That is one of the reasons why we are working overtime at the moment to bring forward a second stimulus package—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —the second one in two days.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I took the opportunity—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to go back and have a look at the last global financial crisis and the response of the former government. In that response, they laid off 1,600 public servants in South Australia, they stopped a whole pile of public projects and they cancelled the prisons project,

costing the taxpayers of South Australia tens of millions of dollars. So I am very happy for my stimulus—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and economic response to be put up alongside the previous Labor government's any time, sir.

The SPEAKER: The Premier's time has expired. The member for Kaurna and then the member for Colton.

Mr Malinauskas: If the GFC is the comparison, no problem.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is warned, because I am trying to give the member for Kaurna a question. The member for Kaurna.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education, be quiet, and the leader, be quiet!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education and the leader will be doing this outside at a 1.5-metre distance if this continues. The member for Kaurna.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:02): My question is to the Premier. Is there a shortage of hand sanitiser at the Women's and Children's Hospital or at any of our public hospitals?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:02): Well, I'm not aware of any, but one of the things that we are doing is looking at all of the critical components that we need to have in place, whether that be hand sanitiser, whether it be PPE, whether it be masks (of course, part of that PPE), whether it be testing reagent. There is essentially, at the moment, a global shortage of all these things, so I don't think that anybody who is watching this issue would not be aware of the massive spike in demand for some of these fundamental components of our response to this global pandemic.

However, I am assured by the people within SA Health—who I think are doing an excellent job—that we do not have any critical shortages at the moment. That does not mean to say that we are not monitoring very carefully the availability of all of these supplies. I think we were very open and up front earlier in the week when we made it clear that there was a shortage within some of our schools of hand sanitiser, and this was unacceptable. We made that very clear.

We have 900 schools, preschools and educational facilities across South Australia, and around 13 of those were without the necessary requirement. We made sure that we rectified that as quickly as possible, and I would like to thank all of the people who are working in the education department at the moment for the outstanding work that they are doing.

I have got to say that this is a time when we recognise the great contribution of the Public Service that we have in South Australia. All public servants in all departments are playing their role in helping us combat the COVID-19 virus, and I thank them very, very sincerely.

Grievance Debate

PARLIAMENTARY SITTING PROGRAM

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:04): I had the parliamentary library do some research for me on the parliament's sitting schedule during some of the biggest crises facing the state and the nation in the past. No doubt, there have been some very disastrous events that have occurred that have impacted South Australian families. The three big standouts so far were: World War I, World War II and the Spanish flu. It would be interesting for members to know that throughout all three of those traumatic events in South Australia's history the parliament has sat. Indeed, the nation's parliament sat. Why?

I say to the house that the reason these people in those times of crisis insisted that the parliament sit is that, when you are sending your sons into harm's way to fight a war in your name, to die on the Western Front, to die on the beaches of Gallipoli or to go to a faraway country to fight for another country, at the very least the leaders of the countries and the jurisdictions who are sending them to the wars are here to be held accountable, to make sure that they are being equipped with the tools they need to fight that war or to make sure that the war is justified and to ask the difficult questions.

Indeed, when the Korean War and the Vietnam War were underway, this parliament sat. When the Spanish flu was ravaging this nation, when 50 million people died around the world, this parliament sat. In a time of crisis, when people are looking for leadership, when decisions are being made, like acts being enacted giving democratic powers to appointed officials that are normally only the purview of elected leaders, now more than ever this parliament must meet. It must meet not just so we can sit around and debate bills—although that may be important in a time of urgency to pass something quickly. I do point out that today, without reflecting on a vote of the house or the mismanagement of that vote of the house—not a reflection on the Chair—this opposition, through our shadow treasurer, authorised the government to procure \$15 billion in less than an hour. That is cooperative opposition.

We have done so without a budget. We have done so without the government telling us how they are going to spend the money. That is leadership from the Leader of the Opposition. That is understanding from the crossbench. That is what you do in a time of crisis. What you do not do in a time of crisis is shut down our democratic institutions. Because, if the Premier is acting too slowly or getting the wrong advice, it is here that that is fleshed out; it is here that the people hold the government to account.

We are asking people to make massive sacrifices. We are sending them on to Centrelink queues, unable or unaware of how they are going to pay the next bill. We are asking people to turn up and put themselves in very difficult situations, so we should be here. We should be here so that the Premier can answer the questions, even if it is just the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier and the Speaker, just so people know that the people making the decisions, who are authorising the decisions, have scrutiny. Not just media scrutiny, but democratic scrutiny from a loyal opposition—not here for the violent overthrow of the government but here to hold the executive to account. That is our role, first and foremost.

The idea that this parliament might somehow self-isolate for six months while we are asking other people to attend work I think lets down those past parliaments that turned up when their sons were at war and when the state was facing the Spanish flu. When we have had other pandemics and epidemics ravage this state, we have turned up. What will be said of our generation, of our parliament, if we do not turn up for work, if we do not turn up and hold the government to account?

Today, as we speak—and I point out that I have complete faith in our police commissioner—the police commissioner (unelected) is the most powerful person in South Australia. He answers to one person, the police minister. He should be here every day to answer questions from us about the exercise of that authority, as should the Premier, as should his ministers and especially the health minister, the person in charge of making sure that South Australians live rather than die.

COORONG DISTRICT COUNCIL

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:09): I rise to talk on the Auditor-General's Report, Report 4 of 2020, entitled 'Examination of credit card use and management: The Coorong District Council'. At the outset, I declare I am a ratepayer within the Coorong District Council area, and I also represent a large portion of the council area as it falls within my electorate of Hammond. This report examined the use and management of credit cards by the council for the period 1 July 2016 to 30 April 2018. I would like to stress that this period does not fall within the time of the current elected council who were not elected until November 2018.

The common theme throughout the report is the lack of policy and guidance to staff around the use of credit cards by the executive. It was found that council's delegation process and documents were unclear and that the council did not maintain a formal instrument of the chief executive officer's sub-delegations. The effect of this is that the scope and effect of the delegations

were unclear, they may not have reflected the council's intention and they may have referred to specific people, not their positions. The Auditor-General also found that the then mayor's financial delegations were not in line with the Local Government Act and were invalid.

The Local Government Act does not allow a chief executive officer to delegate their power to a mayor to spend council money. The mayor at the time, Neville Jaensch, was issued with a credit card with a limit of \$5,000 by their then CEO, Vincent Cammell, without any authority under the Local Government Act. The Auditor-General found the mayor reviewed the CEO's transactions and the CEO reviewed the executive members' and the mayor's transactions. This is hardly an independent review, as is normal practice.

The Auditor-General found these reviews to be inadequate because they failed to ensure credit card transactions were supported by adequate or current records to justify their business purpose. He also found that the reviews were not performed by someone who could exercise independent judgement because they had benefitted or could be perceived to have benefitted from the expenditure.

The Auditor-General believes that the then mayor, Neville Jaensch, should not have been involved with the daily operations and affairs of the council as this is the role of the executive staff. The Auditor-General found examples of the business purpose of credit card use not clearly justified at the time the expenditure was incurred. The report found transactions that were not business expenses and not a proper use of public money.

The report found examples of transactions that were not business expenses, including the purchase of alcohol, lunches for offsite meetings between council staff, refreshments for celebratory events, gifts to staff and external parties, and some travel expenditure. The following transactions were some singled out for close inspection as non-business expenses:

- \$2,213.76 on flights to Canberra for a conference, including the then mayor Neville Jaensch's spouse;
- \$884.39 on alcohol for three art exhibition openings;
- \$500 in jewellery store accounts for departing staff;
- \$389 on an aquarium; and
- \$317.80 at a hotel.

I find these revelations appalling. The lack of leadership at the Coorong council was becoming apparent to me over a few years. The improper use and misuse of credit cards seems to be only one of the outcomes of poor leadership and management at the council. Numerous constituents coming to me regarding the appalling state of the road network within the council area is but one example. Examples of pierced fuel tanks and damaged cars and trucks were common.

I myself saw the condition of local roads deteriorate around my farm and district. The Coorong council is a rural council with an extensive road network, and farmers and their families rely on these roads for daily transport and, more importantly, to transport their goods to market. I really do believe that councils should concentrate on the three Rs—rates, roads and rubbish.

I am pleased to see in the Auditor-General's Report that the council adopted a new credit card policy in May 2019, for which I commend the current council. I wish the current Coorong council well and commend, in particular, current Mayor Paul Simmons in working through the aftermath of the failings outlined in the Auditor-General's Report.

TOURISM AND HOSPITALITY

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (15:14): I rise today as the shadow minister for trade, tourism and investment. Over the last two weeks, I have been talking to restaurant and cafe owners, hotel managers and tourism operators. They have been some very difficult conversations for people who have already been experiencing a tough time.

Thirty-nine thousand South Australians work in hospitality and tourism, and their concern is what is happening. There is a lack of clarity. We hear from the Prime Minister what is happening

today without him foreshadowing what is likely to occur next. But we have examples in New Zealand, for example, where they have been very clear about the different stages and the elements of those stages. We can all read and we all hear what is happening internationally. Do not insult us. We know things are going to get difficult. What is our plan?

I listened to the Prime Minister last night and I heard the politics of division. He said that all workers are essential. What does this mean to tourism and hospitality workers who have just lost their jobs? This is very divisive. People are hurt by these words. We are all in this together. When I speak to people I hear their worries and I hear their concerns: how are they going to afford their food and their rent? How are they going to pay for utilities to keep things going? What I heard very clearly was the lack of time that they had to prepare. There was a lack of time to know what the different stages would bring, and now they are lining up in front of Centrelink.

What are the impacts to our hospitality and tourism industries? First and foremost, I heard from people how heartbreaking it has been for them to let staff go. These are staff who have dedicated themselves to their business, who are part and parcel of the team, and they had to say with very little notice, 'I can't employ you anymore because we have shut our doors.' They are very concerned about how they are going to pay for their leases and their rents. Most importantly, they say to me, 'I don't know if my business will survive.'

Labor has called for constructive immediate action, a rescue package, cancelling our fees, charges and taxes, and we want to work with industry, with a task force. What we need is decisive action. My words to the Premier, a Premier who has taken on the role as Minister for Tourism, are that we have no time to lose. Please release the details of your economic stimulus. Today you are talking about a second package and people do not know what was in your first package. We may have moved first, but there is a severe lack of detail.

We looked to Tasmania recently for some influence. There, the Premier is also the tourism minister. What did Tasmania do? On 17 March, more than a week ago, Tasmania released a detailed package for businesses, with a great focus on supporting tourism and hospitality businesses. This week, the Adelaide city council moved to have a three-month moratorium on rents for shops that they own and the Central Market. Premier, I call on you to support this industry and to support them now.

When I had these difficult conversations people said to me, 'My business might stand still for six months, but what I want to know is that I can flourish quickly when this is over. I need confidence and support from this government.'

GET HOME SAFE FOUNDATION

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (15:19): In parliament today, I take the opportunity to speak about the Get Home Safe round that I attended in February. It is run by the Get Home Safe Foundation and was hosted by the Glenelg District Cricket Club. In fact, it is the second season that the club has hosted it.

The Get Home Safe round is aimed at highlighting the need for better attitudes on our roads and also the consequences of poor decisions made while driving. Eli Murn is the ambassador for the Get Home Safe round, and at the after match presentations held at the Glenelg District Cricket Club, Eli told his story to all the teams that were present, ranging from the under 12s right through to the senior teams. Eli grew up as an active kid. He was very coordinated and competitive, and he played a variety of sports ranging from ball through to cricket, where he was an opening fast bowler.

He also happened to grow quite quickly as a young lad and ended up playing basketball and volleyball, where he certainly excelled. He was a member of the Volleyball Australia Centre of Excellence, playing with the South Australian under-17 team, and also the under-21 South Australian Sports Institute squad.

Eli's under-17 state team won the national championships and because of this and his performance there, he was invited to attend training camps with the men's volleyball team, the Australian men's under-21 volleyball squad. Eli required a positive and success-focused attitude to excel in this sport. Unfortunately, as Eli admitted to all the players, he made really poor choices on

the roads. In fact, he chose to take risks on the road for what he thought was fun, and what he mistakenly thought would impress people.

Unfortunately, he did not impress people when he crashed his car into two pine trees on a very wet night in the Hills. Eli nearly died that night; thankfully, his girlfriend at the time walked away unhurt. Eli said that she kept on walking and he never heard from her again. Eli was rushed to Flinders hospital by ambulance and was only given a 50 per cent chance of survival. He spent eight weeks in hospital. Eli was left with a permanent brain injury and has had to spend the past two years in rehabilitation learning how to do the basics: how to walk, how to talk, how to feed himself and how to use the toilet.

Every aspect of Eli's life has changed significantly, and any chance of playing competitive sport was completely lost. Eli really does wish that he had taken as much pride in his driving as he did in his sporting endeavours. You can imagine all the cricketers listening to this. The whole room was silent as Eli told his story.

The message he wanted to impart upon them was to try to transfer successful on-field behaviours over to those needed whilst on the roads, and to cut out poor choices on the road that can lead to, as Eli said, life-changing injuries. I congratulate the President of the Get Home Safe Foundation Darren Davis, all the Glenelg District Cricket Club players, and their president Jarret Moysie on promoting the Get Home Safe round.

Here we are in March, in unprecedented times, when sport across the country has been stopped in the fight to stop the spread of the coronavirus. I think the message we heard that night is still relevant: being the best you can be on the sporting field and taking those behaviours onto the road. This can equally be applied to how we as individuals can take those behaviours and act to slow the spread of the virus—behaviours such as discipline, teamwork and care for your teammates. I am certain these young athletes can use those skills they have developed to be leaders in the community.

We all have personal responsibility to slow the spread of this virus by washing our hands frequently, coughing into our elbows and undertaking social distancing, and also limiting non-essential gatherings and keeping away from each other to reduce those numbers. All these measures are new to so many Australians and will need to be in place for many months. It will take discipline, teamwork—one in, all in—and it will take care for your teammates, who in this case are your fellow Australians. Together, we can do this. I know that those cricketers at Glenelg District Cricket Club, like so many other sportspeople in our community, can lead by example and help to slow the spread of the coronavirus.

CORONAVIRUS

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:24): This afternoon, I would like to use the five minutes available to me to air some concerns I have about the impact this current health crisis is having on particular groups in our community and also to highlight what we do next once the crisis is over to ensure that we still have a fair and just Australia. The first issue I would like to talk about briefly concerns the most vulnerable people in our community who, for example, are in some sort of care facility, whether they are the aged members of our community or people living with a disability.

For a whole range of reasons, these people live in some sort of care facility. Many of those care facilities are now shut down to visitors. I appreciate that that measure has been designed to reduce the risk to the people who live and work in these facilities. I understand why because obviously they have older people who are at higher risk and also may have a whole range of other illnesses and comorbidities that may contribute to some poor health already. We need to keep the virus out of these facilities, but in doing so we also need to balance the protections we have for people who are living in our care facilities.

This is not to say that wrongdoing is occurring, but only in recent times we have had huge reports before this parliament, in the media and before a number of inquiries and royal commissions where there have been examples of very poor treatment of people living in our care facilities of some description. My concern is that, without any visitors allowed, family will be less able to visit. There will be fewer opportunities for people to visibly check how a family member is, how they are going and what their condition may be.

I think it is very important that all spheres of government—local, to the extent that they are involved, and state and federal governments—up their compliance activities. It is very important that, if we do not have family members and friends walking in to speak with people in these care facilities, that we have people who are going there to ensure that people are being well fed and well cared for and that their medical conditions are being addressed.

It is no secret that our aged-care sector and our disabilities sector are poorly resourced. It is not a secret when I say that. Unfortunately, this crisis is bringing additional burdens on those people providing services to this group of people, so it is important that we do that. That is one aspect of my concerns, that we ensure that all spheres of government are very proactive to make sure that people living in care facilities are being protected.

The other issue is about social isolation. People in care facilities are often socially isolated, more so than the general community. Now that the facilities have been shut down—again, I understand why—we need to make sure we work out ways for the people not to become socially isolated to the extent that it has a negative effect on their mental and psychological wellbeing. That is a very real risk to this group of people.

Another issue I would like to raise today is the impact that the virus is having on the volunteer sector. I do not think we have fully understood the effect that the virus is having on the volunteer sector. First of all, the number of volunteers available is reduced because often volunteers are in the high risk group in terms of their age, and so they are not able to participate in a whole range of community events. There are also the people who rely on the services provided by the volunteers at risk, organisations like Meals on Wheels. They are often the only contact that some people have in their homes.

This virus is not only causing social isolation; it is compounding social isolation for some people in our community. Many activities have now been shut down. A lot of sporting and recreational activities are being shut down. It is very important that we have policies in place to make sure that, when this virus is over, they can gear up. What I am suggesting is to make sure that local, state and federal governments get behind our sporting and recreational organisations in our communities to make sure that we reduce their costs and other things so that they can re-engage with the community at the appropriate time.

COMMUNITY RESILIENCE

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (15:29): I take this opportunity to reflect on the importance of the strength of community, particularly the strength of our regional communities, and the importance of doing all we can in the context of a crisis like this to help our regional communities to be as strong as they can possibly be. In doing so, we invest in supporting health and wellbeing in our regions.

We heard the Premier just now refer to the unhappy news that he had to convey to the RSL, regarding the closure of the RSLs, coming at this particularly unfortunate time close to ANZAC Day. I reflected immediately on the proactive steps that have been taken at Macclesfield by President Dennis Oldenhove. Knowing that the ANZAC Day service, which is such a special part of commemorations held in the evening on the main street at Macclesfield, would have to cancel, he immediately was on the front foot saying, 'Right. How can we get behind our veterans in other ways? How can we make sure that we support our community in other ways?' He has provided such great leadership in adapting so as to continue to build the strength of his local community and to ensure that its wellbeing is bolstered.

I bring to the forefront the need to focus on health and wellbeing investment, particularly so at a time like this. We know that the South Australian government has been first off the mark with this extraordinarily enormous stimulus spend of \$350 million. We know that \$15 million of that will be directed to the bringing forward of a rapid maintenance program for regional hospitals. It is hugely important, but it is not all about the money. It is about what it drives in terms of community confidence and the ability of the community to say, 'We are responsible for the strength of the fabric in our local area.'

We know that the government planned to spend, prior to and in the first budget of the new Marshall Liberal government, a generationally significant amount on renewing and expanding aged-

care facilities at Strathalbyn, and it is relevant now more than ever. I want to highlight in that respect that, yes, it is a significant spend of money. Yes, it is a necessary investment in our regional health infrastructure. But all the more importantly so, it is backing and supporting the community's initiatives to establish a means by which those in need, those elderly people in the Strathalbyn community, can continue to interact with each other and continue to have a maxim of wellbeing.

In that respect, I highlight the very important work of the op shop at Strath, led by Neil Hissey and his team of dedicated volunteers at the op shop. I have made it clear to them at all times that they and the community they serve are very much at the centre of all that we do with our money investments in delivering improvements. Strength of community is so important at this time. We know that the health investments in the regions are significant and they are widespread.

As part of strengthening the health workforce, we know that they have committed \$20 million to doing that, there have been investments in the rural ambulance workforce, the digital telehealth network and the SA Ambulance Service, to name a few. We have \$200 million coming to country hospitals. I applaud it and look forward to being part of that implementation.

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2020

Standing Orders Suspension

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:35): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion forthwith for the rescission of the vote to pass the third reading of the Supply Bill.

The SPEAKER: An absolute majority is not being present, please ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

The SPEAKER: There being an absolute majority present, I accept the motion.

Motion carried.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:37): I move:

That the vote taken on the third reading of the Supply Bill be rescinded.

Motion carried.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Parliamentary Committees

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE WYATT BENEVOLENT INSTITUTION INCORPORATED (OBJECTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (15:39): I bring up the final report of the select committee on the bill, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

Bills

THE WYATT BENEVOLENT INSTITUTION INCORPORATED (OBJECTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:39): I thank the member for Heysen for his report, and note that it is without dissent. I thank both he as Chair, and I think the member for Badcoe who was also a member of the committee.

As a hybrid bill we appreciate their consideration of the matter, and, without any indication of dissent from that report, I move now, by leave of the house:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 15:41 the house adjourned until Tuesday 7 April 2020 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***COUNTER TERRORISM ACTION PLAN**

21 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (20 February 2020). Has the government completed its anti-terrorism communications plan, promised as part of the government's Counter Terrorism Action Plan?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): A communications plan has been submitted to cabinet for consideration.