

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 8 April 2020

The **SPEAKER (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)** took the chair at 10:31 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*

#### **PLANT HEALTH (PEST AFFECTED PLANTS) AMENDMENT BILL**

##### *Introduction and First Reading*

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (10:32):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Plant Health Act 2009. Read a first time.

##### *Second Reading*

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (10:32):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

It is my honour to introduce the Plant Health (Pest Affected Plants) Amendment Bill 2020 to the house today. This bill amends the Plant Health Act 2009 by introducing a defence for a person who declares and hands over a pest, or a plant or a plant-related product affected by pest, to an inspector or destroys or disposes of the item at a quarantine station.

I have been forced to have this bill drafted because of the approach adopted under the minister's so-called zero tolerance policy on behalf of several of my constituents who, in endeavouring to do the right thing in handing over plant matter at the quarantine station, have been fined along with many hundreds of others in this state also intending to do the right thing. Under this policy, the legal standing of which is questioned, the minister has instructed inspectors in his department to issue significant fines to travellers presenting at the Yamba quarantine station and at other temporary quarantine points, even if those travellers freely declare and surrender fruit prohibited in the Riverland fruit fly protection area.

Like many in the community, I have been shocked by a heavy-handed enforcement approach which now very clearly has resulted and is continuing to result in grossly unfair outcomes. Protecting our fruit fly free status is, of course, vitally important and not underestimated by anyone involved in this process at all, but it does not need to come with costly fines handed out to pensioners, self-funded retirees and others on low or fixed incomes trying to do the right thing.

Travellers should be encouraged to continue to do the right thing and declare their fruit at the Yamba quarantine station, just as they are at Adelaide Airport, rather than be penalised with a whopping \$375 fine in the mail a few days later after being grilled in interrogation rooms in a way that can only be described as deliberately intended to intimidate and then be told that it was a warning. The surprise at receiving a fine after such an event or series of events has added to the perplexity and anxiety and caused the bill to be brought to the house today.

The minister says this policy is in accordance with legal advice, but he has not released the legal advice. I for one would like to know how it is a policy direction from the minister to inspectors to adopt zero tolerance in all cases is a lawful direction from the minister. I would also like to know how a policy direction for zero tolerance to expiation review officers in the minister's department is a lawful direction. These officers, exercising power granted to them under legislation, should be exercising their own judgement first and foremost, not simply abiding by directions from the minister that appear to have no formal standing in the statute book.

Public concern about the minister's zero tolerance approach has been mounting in recent months, with regular media reports about travellers who justifiably feel they have been unfairly treated as part of what they see as really a revenue-raising operation. Reportedly, waste bins have

been overflowing on multiple occasions. On some approaches, it appears waste bins have not been installed at all.

Signage ahead of the Yamba station, which is several kilometres in from the border and the only location on departmental maps illustrating places to dispose of fruit that lies within the Riverland protection area, is very wordy and difficult to read when travelling at 100 km/h. I note also the upgrade of the Yamba station and the amount the government has estimated in increased revenue for this financial year are strangely in alignment.

I myself have been approached by constituents seeking assistance with fines, but to no avail. Neither the minister nor the department has been willing to consider their very reasonable circumstances. Both of the constituents I have attempted to assist in having expiations reconsidered and withdrawn are retirees with limited means for whom the \$370 fine is significant and who do not have the financial means to risk taking the matter to court.

One constituent, fined for having an apple in her possession at the Yamba quarantine station, is a diabetic who, quite reasonably, needs to keep sugary foods on her person in case of an imbalance in her blood sugars. Fining people who are trying to do the right thing by declaring and surrendering fruit at the quarantine station seems entirely counterproductive and sends the wrong message. What does it really do to protect Riverland growers from the fruit fly risk?

An answer from the minister to recent questions I asked reveals the Yamba station collected 13,057 kilograms of host material in the calendar year 2019, since zero tolerance was implemented, compared with 27,009 kilograms in the calendar year 2018. I am sure the minister will tout this as evidence his zero tolerance approach is working, but it could just as easily be suggested this means more people are simply avoiding declaring fruit to avoid the inevitable fine.

The real question is: what benefit is this delivering to the Riverland growers? Ultimately, fruit is being seized as a proxy for protecting the fruit fly status of the Riverland. A legitimate question to ask is whether the policy is more about being for show than changing outcomes. If the minister or the department had been reasonable in waiving fines, where there were reasonable grounds to do so and where we have evidence this has been done, there would be no need for this bill at all.

Given the extra \$5 million in revenue the Treasurer has already banked in his Mid-Year Budget Review, the public has a right to know if tough fines are just a way of paying for the increased expenditure of the minister's zero tolerance policy, including the upgrade to the Yamba quarantine station, which is, unfortunately, in the minister's own electorate. The bill will put an end to the unfair fruit fly fines being foisted on South Australians under this current regime. It will do so in a way that allows the fight to maintain our fruit fly free status be continued unimpeded because it is very important work, which we all recognise. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

## **CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (COVID-19) (ASSAULTS ON CERTAIN WORKERS) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Introduction and First Reading*

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:41):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Read a first time.

### *Standing Orders Suspension*

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:42):** I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended so as to enable the bill to pass through all remaining stages without delay.

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

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

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Elizabeth, do you wish to speak to the motion?

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Yes, briefly, sir. We have all been shocked time and again by images on our TV screens over the years of criminal spitting and coughing on front-line workers, particularly

police officers. This type of behaviour has always been considered an assault—a particularly disgusting and abhorrent form of assault—but generally a common assault nonetheless. Last year, we had lengthy debates in this place about assaults of this type as well as assaults on front-line workers generally.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Elizabeth, whilst I believe you are speaking to the merits of the bill, I believe that the debate in the first instance should be on the reason why the suspension is needed. I know that you will get to that very shortly. Thank you.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Indeed. Simply put, our front-line workers need protection now, and it is important that we change some definitions in the act as part of that, as part of creating a new offence to protect front-line workers in cases involving COVID-19-type assaults by including retail workers within the definition of 'front-line workers' for these types of offences. This is a new type of assault; it is a new circumstance. The debates we had last year about assaulting police officers and other workers and human biological material was a step in the right direction. It was appropriate for the circumstances then, but we need to change some definitions.

We need to introduce tougher penalties in the current context of COVID-19 for assaults perpetrated on a front-line worker, including retail workers, if the perpetrator knows they have COVID-19 or suggests to their victim by words, actions or in the context of their behaviour that they have COVID-19. We need to impose penalties of up to 10 years gaol. These workers need protection now. We need to include retail workers and other pharmacy workers and the like in the definition of 'front-line worker' for the purposes of this legislation. We need to do it today so these workers can go out to work tomorrow and feel protected by the law.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (10:45):** I rise to oppose the suspension on behalf of the government for a range of reasons. As a government, we have taken a consistent and measured approach to how we deal with this coronavirus situation. What we have done and will continue to do is be led by the experts in relation to what powers they need and what behaviours they need to see modelled in our behaviour and in our society. We are in constant contact with the police commissioner, the State Coordinator, in relation to what powers or law changes he believes are necessary to ensure that we—

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Point of order, a point of clarification: you pulled me up on addressing the bill directly—

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I did.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** —rather than the suspension.

**The SPEAKER:** I am going to give the minister the same latitude and expect the same of him. Minister.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** I was not actually debating the merits of anything, Mr Speaker, just merely trying to understand the process—

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —by which we as a government have gone about law change and the principles by which we achieve that. Speaking constantly with the State Coordinator, the police commissioner, in relation to what powers he needs is something that this government has done. In fact, not wishing to speak about a bill before the house, this is actually a matter for consideration by the upper house in relation to what powers were deemed necessary for the State Coordinator to be able to undertake his function.

We do listen to and respond to the needs of our health professionals and health experts. Again, Dr Nicola Spurrier, as our phenomenally competent and impressive Chief Public Health Officer, has done an outstanding job. Again, as a government, we have done what has been asked to ensure that the health experts and the State Coordinator have what they need to be able to deal with this crisis.

There have been a range of measures that have been put forward by the opposition in recent days around how they feel that they can use the parliament to improve the situation in relation to dealing with COVID-19. There is this bill, there is a bill to be introduced about locking up Kangaroo Island, about ankle bracelets for those who are not doing the right thing in terms of self-isolation, and some changes to workers compensation. We have seen—

**Mr BROWN:** Point of order, Mr Speaker: now he is not even talking about this particular bill.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I will listen carefully. I do remind the minister of my earlier ruling. Minister.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** The reason I bring this up, Mr Speaker, is that what is being asked for today is a suspension to deal with all stages of bills, when there are a number of these bills that have not been presented to the government at this stage.

**Mr Brown:** A bill.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I am listening carefully. I will be calling members to order if this continues. Minister.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** We need to make sure that when we deal with matters of the law we take the time to be able to consider them in a timely manner.

**The Hon. A. Piccolo:** We dealt with your bill yesterday.

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Mr Speaker, I do appreciate and thank—

**Mr Malinauskas:** Which one don't you have copyright?

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —members of this parliament, this chamber as well as the other chamber, for their help and support in dealing with urgent legislation that has been put through this parliament over the course of the past few weeks. Again, those bits of legislation have come from advice from various parts within the government sector and, again, we will continue to listen to that advice and facilitate to make sure that the government's response to the coronavirus is as fulsome as it needs to be. However, we do not feel at this stage that a suspension of standing orders is warranted based on the points I have just made.

**The SPEAKER:** The question before the house is that the motion for suspension be agreed to. It has been moved and seconded. Would the member for Elizabeth like a right of reply? He is entitled to one. No? Very clearly, the question before the house is that the motion for suspension be agreed to.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes .....	13
Noes .....	13
Majority.....	0

AYES

Bedford, F.E.  
Brown, M.E. (teller)  
Koutsantonis, A.  
Odenwalder, L.K.  
Stinson, J.M.

Bignell, L.W.K.  
Close, S.E.  
Malinauskas, P.  
Piccolo, A.

Brock, G.G.  
Hildyard, K.A.  
Mullighan, S.C.  
Picton, C.J.

## NOES

Chapman, V.A.  
Knoll, S.K.  
Pisoni, D.G.  
Treloar, P.A.  
Wingard, C.L.

Cowdrey, M.J. (teller)  
Marshall, S.S.  
Sanderson, R.  
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Cregan, D.  
Pederick, A.S.  
Speirs, D.J.  
Whetstone, T.J.

## PAIRS

Bell, T.S.  
Luethen, P.  
Cook, N.F.  
Teague, J.B.  
Hughes, E.J.  
Ellis, F.J.  
Wortley, D.

Power, C.  
Boyer, B.I.  
Harvey, R.M.  
Gee, J.P.  
Gardner, J.A.W.  
Szakacs, J.K.  
Murray, S.

Bettison, Z.L.  
Patterson, S.J.R.  
Duluk, S.  
McBride, N.  
Michaels, A.  
Basham, D.K.B.

**The SPEAKER:** There being 13 ayes and 13 noes, we have a tie. I cast my vote with the noes and so the noes have it.

Motion thus negatived.

*Second Reading*

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:55):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

As I was on the cusp of saying, the legislation we passed last year in terms of assaulting police and the human biological material matters we discussed were a step in the right direction. They were pertinent to the circumstances then, but circumstances have of course changed and our front-line workers need protection now. It has been suggested to me that if the government has not had time to consider these matters then perhaps we could not only stick to the agreed sitting schedule but even bring some sitting days forward in order to deal with some of these urgent matters. That is, of course, a matter for the government; I am sure they will not do such a thing.

I will just quickly talk about what this legislation does. It specifies that a person who assaults a prescribed worker—which, importantly, includes retail workers for the purposes of this legislation—in the course of their official duties, who either at the time of the assault has COVID-19 and knows they have COVID-19 or at or immediately before or immediately after the assault makes a statement or does any other act that creates a belief, suspicion or fear that they have COVID-19, irrespective of whether or not they do have COVID-19, is guilty of an offence.

As I said, it would cover all those prescribed workers we discussed last year in terms of the assault police and emergency worker legislation and would also, importantly, include retail workers. I will not go on. I have canvassed most of these issues already. These assaults are going on already. We have had a number of occasions on which this has happened already. It has been prosecuted so far under the common assault legislation that already exists. We think that there should be much tougher penalties, we think that the definitions of prescribed workers who are victims of these types of assaults should be expanded and we think that that should happen urgently. I urge all members to vote for this bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

**EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT (COVID-19) (ELECTRONIC MONITORING) AMENDMENT BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:58):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Emergency Management Act 2004. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

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

That this bill be now read a second time.

I will not trouble the house long with this, as I think I know what the result of the vote will be. This measure has been canvassed publicly since Sunday, and certainly the Attorney has had a copy of the bill since Monday. We consider this matter urgent as well.

Basically, the provision of this bill insists that if a person does not comply with a legal order from the State Coordinator to self-isolate or quarantine themselves for whatever period that the State Coordinator sees necessary, if they breach that order, then the State Coordinator or an authorised officer has the option of attaching an electronic monitoring device either on the person or in the person's home in order that they comply with that order. The bill also has a provision that attaches a penalty of up to a year for tampering or removing such a device.

It goes without saying that it is extremely important at this time that people comply with the self-isolation orders that the State Coordinator can legally impose upon people, whether they have been travelling overseas or whether they have been put in some other way at risk of COVID-19 and therefore put the rest of the community at risk. It is important that this happens.

If we believe what the police commissioner says, and I see no reason not to, we have seen a very high rate of compliance so far. Very few fines have been issued as a result of the checks conducted, with some 2,900 checks as of yesterday morning and about 20 cautions and fines issued, I am advised. There is a very high level of compliance, but this emergency is far from over. We will see many more people ordered into self-isolation as the weeks and months go on, and it is important that these people stay in self isolation. It is important for the rest of us, for the rest of the community, and particularly for our more vulnerable citizens that these people comply.

Yesterday, we hastily debated another bill. I will try not to be disorderly, but I assumed that I would in fact be withdrawing my bill today because it would be somehow covered by the extraordinary new powers we are giving the State Coordinator. I was advised in the committee stage of that bill yesterday—again, I am trying not to be disorderly when I refer to this—that the possibility of an electronic monitoring device being placed on someone who has breached a legal order of the State Coordinator is not possible under the emergency legislation we passed yesterday, despite the fact that it gives the police commissioner other extraordinary powers to use whatever force necessary to do almost anything. It remains the case—

**The Hon. V.A. Chapman:** You could have moved amendments.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I could have moved amendments; you are exactly right. I assume that would have failed, too. I assumed that the extraordinary powers we were conferring on the police commissioner covered a situation such as this. I was informed by the Attorney that it does not; therefore, I bring the bill to the house today. We on this side of the house believe that the State Coordinator, whether he has expressed a view on this or not, will need in the future every tool at his disposal in order to deal with COVID-19 and in order to stop the spread of COVID-19. We believe that this is an important step in the right direction.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

**RETURN TO WORK (COVID-19 INJURY) AMENDMENT BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (11:02):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Return to Work Act 2014. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (11:03):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

While there are sadly too many South Australians who do not have a job to go to at the moment, we are asking many other workers to turn up every day in the face of uncertainty and risk. It is only fair

that we stand with them and ensure that they are protected and supported if something goes wrong that most likely occurred through their work. The bill seeks to achieve that outcome.

In summary, the bill sets out a limited list of prescribed occupations and workplaces. These occupations and workplaces must meet two criteria: workers must undertake duties because they are critical to the ongoing operation of economic, health and emergency functions, and workers may be exposed to dozens or hundreds of other people every day. There is no easy way to draw a line about who should or should not be supported, but the bill includes hospital and surgeries, public transport and passenger aviation, child care and aged care, schools and kindergartens, supermarkets and service stations, and police and emergency services.

Importantly, the bill allows the minister to make regulations that can add additional workers as necessary. In these occupations or workplaces, if a worker contracts COVID-19 it will be presumed that the illness was contracted through work, in the absence of evidence to the contrary. This reverses the onus of proof, just as the act already does for more than two dozen conditions in certain circumstances. In doing so, it will provide greater access to workers compensation for a limited number of workers in specific circumstances.

We cannot afford for these workers not to be at work, and this bill will give them peace of mind and the protection they need. At a broader level, the COVID-19 crisis has presented many challenges and it requires that they are addressed in record time. The government has been working to address many of these issues, and the opposition has supported every piece of COVID-19 legislation they have brought to the house.

The opposition has also been working with people from across the state to listen to their voices and address their concerns. This work led to the development of this bill, primarily by the shadow attorney-general, the Hon. Kyam Maher. Work is a huge concern for everybody. Many South Australians have lost their jobs and income through no fault of their own. Fortunate members of the community are able to work from home with little or no public contact, but others, from specialist doctors to the person who helps us at the supermarket, are in greater demand than ever before. These people have no choice but to be at work and to come into contact with dozens or hundreds of people every day.

For them, there is an increased risk of infection, even if their employer or workplace has taken steps to protect their staff and customers. That is why this legislation is so important—to make sure that those workers are protected, those workers who have no choice but to turn up for work, those workers who have no choice but to be exposed to hundreds of people every day. They need our backing and they need our support through this legislation.

For casual workers on low pay or with no access to leave, this bill provides critical income protection if they contract COVID-19 in a prescribed workplace or occupation. For permanent workers, it adds an additional layer of protection and builds on the Return to Work Act schedules that already list presumptive conditions for which the standard onus of proof is reversed. This includes conditions directly linked to occupations, such as mining or meatworks. It also includes work that exposes employees to hazards, ranging from noise to radiation. Those are already legislated; we want to expand that to cover this pandemic.

We introduce a new schedule 3A that makes COVID-19 a presumed condition for people in a prescribed occupation or workplace. The opposition shared this bill with the government last week in the hours following its drafting. Despite an offer to discuss the bill, no response was ever received. Instead, there were media responses from the government and media releases began to appear from some interstate groups warning of supposed dire consequences, including completely erroneous claims of charges of manslaughter resulting from this. Despite those erroneous claims, we have in fact now included a statement in this legislation to make it very clear. I quote:

- (2) To avoid doubt, nothing in this Schedule (or in another Schedule of this Act) is to be construed as giving rise to liability beyond that which is already provided for in this or any other Act.

So these sorts of consequences are not actually going to flow from this legislation. This is a bill to protect workers. This is a bill to protect those we are relying upon to provide services critical to the public, from nurses in our hospitals to check-out and pharmacy operators, to people we all rely on

for however long this pandemic lasts. The Labor Party will always back these workers and hence we endorse this bill to the parliament.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (SPIT HOODS) BILL**

#### *Introduction*

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (11:09):** 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.

### **EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT (COVID-19) (KANGAROO ISLAND ARRIVALS) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (11:10):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Emergency Management Act 2004. Read a first time.

#### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (11:10):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Australia is in a reasonably fortunate position as we look at the global outbreak and spread of the coronavirus. Because we are an island and we have lagged the rest of the world, we have been able to close down our borders, and we have seen other islands around Australia—firstly, Tasmania, Norfolk Island, Stradbroke Island and other Australian islands—close down to try to prevent the spread of COVID-19 to these island communities, which are very rarely able to deal with medical emergencies.

Kangaroo Island is one of those islands that needs to be closed down, and it is something that the population of 4,500 on Kangaroo Island has been calling for for several weeks. In fact, Kangaroo Island Council passed a motion last week 7-1 for the island to be cut off from the mainland except for essential travel in times of medical emergencies, or medical treatment, or for goods and services that cannot be provided from people on the island, which may be needed for the bushfire recovery we are undertaking on Kangaroo Island, and for other reasons agreed to.

These rules that I seek to introduce today would be along the lines of the rules that we have as a state with our border enforcement to make sure that people are not coming into South Australia unless they have a valid reason to do so. If they are coming to the island, then they will need to self-quarantine for a period of 14 days, as people coming into South Australia do. If people from the island need to leave and go to the mainland they, too, would have to go into self-quarantine for a period of 14 days upon their return to Kangaroo Island.

Kangaroo Island has had a pretty tough time of it since the bushfires, which started over there on 20 December and which burnt for several weeks. We lost 89 homes and we lost two lives, and a lot of people are still not in their own homes. Those who are out on their properties are often in a fairly remote part of the island. Let's remember, it is not a small island: it is 4,500 square kilometres. The people particularly down at the west end of the island are feeling quite isolated as they are out on their farms trying to rebuild their lives, putting up fences, restoring sheds that were lost and living in makeshift homes or staying with friends or relatives.

One of the things that people on the island were really looking forward to was the return of some normality—the return of things like the football and the netball seasons, where people leave their farms to come out and play, train and spectate, have a drink, have conversations and mix with their fellow islanders. Three or four weeks ago, it was being proposed that if Kangaroo Island could be shut down it may indeed help to get some of those activities back up and running that are not possible in a community with wider access.



The island is fortunate in many ways in that the only way people can get to or get off the island is via a ferry or via aircraft, so it is easy to control. An order from the government to the airlines and to the ferry providers can make it easy for those companies to refuse people getting on their ferries and on their planes. It is something that I know the vast majority of Kangaroo Islanders really want and I think it would make it easier for ferry operators as well. I know that Kangaroo Island Connect has closed down their operations because they do not think it is the right thing to do to have people coming to the island at this time.

SeaLink not only provides for passengers and vehicles to get over but is also the crucial freight link between the mainland and the island. I know there are tensions there with the fact that they have to run a commercial operation and it is not really their job to decide who can come to the island and who cannot. They are seeking direction as well. I know that the staff at SeaLink, the crews who have to interface with the public, would really like the government to come down and say, 'You can only come to the island if you have a valid reason to do so, if you are an essential traveller.' Of course, the freight lines to the island would need to be kept in place.

I really urge everyone in this chamber today to get behind this bill, to get behind the people of Kangaroo Island. I know that the Premier and the cabinet keep saying that they listen to the advice of the experts, but we live in a democracy where we represent the people of South Australia. In my case, I represent the people of Kangaroo Island. In the cabinet's case, every member of cabinet represents the people of Kangaroo Island as well. I would like to implore members of the cabinet to consider the expert advice of the people who live, work, go to school and run their businesses on Kangaroo Island because I think they have a pretty good insight into the way their part of the world runs.

The police commissioner, who is the State Coordinator, has done a terrific job. I do not want to take anything away from the role that he has played, that the Premier has played or that anyone has played. If we look at this at a state, federal and local government level, I think everyone has done things in an exemplary way, but there are tiny little things like this that we need to draw out and bring to the attention of the parliament to see if we can follow the wishes and desires of the people of a part of our state that can be cut off quite easily to see if that can indeed happen.

The police commissioner has said that Kangaroo Island will not be treated any differently from any other part of South Australia. Well, Kangaroo Island has always been treated differently from other parts of South Australia. It has had to be out of necessity because that piece of water that separates it from the mainland means that people on the island have to pay more to get out and about. People on the island have to pay more for their freight and all their goods because of the freight costs that are added on.

People on the island have always had to pay more for their fuel because of the freight costs that are added. People on the island have also been fortunate in that many diseases and pest species, both animals and weeds, have not made it to Kangaroo Island. At the moment, it is illegal to take a potato, bees, honey, foxes or rabbits to Kangaroo Island, but we have no law that keeps people off Kangaroo Island who may be carrying the coronavirus.

As we head to Easter this weekend, I know there are people lining up to go over to the island. People have told me, 'I've got a holiday house over there, so it's my right to go over there.' I say, 'But you might have the coronavirus,' and they say, 'I haven't got the coronavirus.' Well, 65 per cent of the people who have passed on the coronavirus did not know they had the coronavirus. If anyone tells me that they do not have it, unless they have been locked up at home since December I cannot believe them because nobody knows with any absolute truth whether or not they have the coronavirus.

I cannot see any reason why we would adjourn today a move that the people of Kangaroo Island desperately want done, because the time for this action to be taken was two weeks ago. It definitely needs to be taken today before we hit Easter this weekend and before more people come to Kangaroo Island.

I ask everyone in this place to please listen to the people of Kangaroo Island and to give them a hand in their time of need. I know that everyone in the world, everyone in Australia and everyone in South Australia is suffering, but for the people of Kangaroo Island this is another layer

of suffering on a community that has suffered possibly more than most communities in Australia have ever suffered. There is hurt, there is homelessness and there is grieving still going on from the bushfires that burned from 20 December for more than a month.

The rebuild is happening. We need to get people back out as a community on Kangaroo Island because the mental health problems that people are experiencing now will become worse through the isolation as people have to remain in their homes and are unable to get out and mix with fellow islanders to share their burden, to share their grief and to share the emotions they are forced to suffer alone at home.

People out on their farms down the west end tell me that when they could go to footy or to netball that was something that would force them off the farm. It was something that told them what day of the week it was. But at the moment, because they cannot leave, they just stay out there, fixing the fences, doing what they can around the burnt-out wreckage of their farm with no punctuation marks, nothing to tell them that it is not Monday or Tuesday or Wednesday or Thursday or Friday. Every day is the same because there is no coming together and there is no gathering point.

Had the wishes of the people of Kangaroo Island been brought in four weeks ago and this style of travel ban introduced, these people may have been a little bit closer to having life be a little bit more normal than it has been for them. I hope that we can get support for the bill to amend the Emergency Management Act 2004 so that we can curtail non-essential travel to Kangaroo Island while we, as a state and as a nation, deal with the coronavirus that has hit South Australia.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

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

### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 March 2020.)

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (11:24):** I have spoken about this in my second reading contribution. It is very important. The issue is that when the mining bill went through the parliament last year, the minister at the time took a lot of consultation out there but, as I understand it, he never got back into the regions. One of our concerns at that particular point was that when he closed his debate he said that after the bill went through both houses of this parliament (and it did) four Liberal or government backbenchers went across and voted with the Independents on the original bill.

This does not investigate the bill itself. This is a bill to understand whether we have the best process in place for access onto agricultural land by both the resources and petroleum industries. We in this house make the legislation, and we do a lot of that on the advice of advisers. That does not mean to say we get everything right the first time. My argument is that we have the opportunity to look at all avenues and to reassess the processes. As a state and as a government, we then have the opportunity to look at processes by way of discussions to support access onto agricultural land by resource companies and mining opportunities.

We as legislators think we get everything right the first time, but we do not always get it right the first time. We always need to go back. I look at opportunities in my own life. What I do today I analyse tomorrow and the next day and try to do something different. Every day we do something in our lives. We look at what we did yesterday and then ask ourselves: did we do it the right way or can we improve ourselves? We analyse that today.

I am asking the government to look at what we as a state and what other jurisdictions do in relation to accessibility for stakeholders and farmers who are really involved in this. Some of these agricultural properties have been in the family for many generations. Quite often, when the big companies come in—and let me say that a lot of the companies are doing everything right—there are always opportunities for smaller companies to do something that is frustrating and not right for those communities. I ask that we look at other avenues. Look at how they do it interstate and internationally, in particular.

I had the opportunity to travel overseas a couple of years ago under the previous government. I looked at how the petroleum industry liaises with the fishing industry off the Scottish coastline. They looked at all their opportunities and they had a great facility to get the best results, not only for the petroleum industry but also for the fishing industry. In fact, at that particular time they were both working together.

In our system here, quite often the Department for Energy and Mining appears to be the promoter and also the regulator. Is this the best way to go about it? Can we do it better? Can we have a bit more transparency? I know that the government is always promoting transparency and always promoting opportunities out there, and to make certain we listen to everybody. As a parliament, as a government, as a state, we have been given the due diligence and the opportunity for small people out there—the farmers—to have a true process going through.

SACOME and Primary Producers SA are both looking for an independent review. This review is asking for somebody away from politics to do the review and for that opportunity to be kept well and truly away from the political avenues. All I am asking for is to have an independent inquiry into access by the mining and petroleum industries onto agricultural land. It is simple. It is not political. It is looking at the best opportunities. If this independent inquiry comes back after we look at all those opportunities and avenues, and we do it in the correct way, then everybody is—

**Mr BROWN:** Point of order, Mr Speaker: I draw your attention to the time and ask if it is appropriate that the member for Frome seeks leave to continue his remarks, given that it is now 11.30 by my reading of the clock.

**The SPEAKER:** It is 11.30. There is a little bit of time there. Would the member for Frome like to seek leave to continue his remarks?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** I seek leave to continue my remarks, please, Mr Speaker.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

### *Motions*

#### **VETERANS SUICIDE SUPPORT SERVICES**

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (11:31):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) honours the service and sacrifice of current and former members of the Australian Defence Force;
- (b) recognises the strong and respectful advocacy of Ms Julie-Ann Finney in addition to other grieving families and members of the veteran community who have successfully advocated for a commonwealth government inquiry into veteran suicides; and
- (c) urges the commonwealth government to implement, as soon as practical, the key recommendations regarding the implementation of veteran-specific suicide prevention, monitoring and data collection programs, the implementation of measures designed to improve the welfare of veterans and their families, and proposals to improve the transition of ex-service personnel into civilian employment, as detailed in *The Constant Battle: Suicide by Veterans* (an August 2017 report of the Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade References Committee), *Veterans' Advocacy and Support Services Scoping Study* (a December 2018 report of the Australian government), and *A Better Way to Support Veterans* (a June 2019 report of the Productivity Commission).

I would like to draw members' attention to various parts of this motion. The first part deals with honouring the service and sacrifice of current and former members of the Australian Defence Force. I think it is an appropriate occasion to do so today, given that it will be the last opportunity we have to debate this matter prior to ANZAC Day.

Regrettably, this year ANZAC Day will not be celebrated in the normal way, with a whole range of ceremonies around the country, because of the coronavirus. However, there are other ways that we can in our own way honour our current and former defence personnel while still complying with the health guidelines for this period. I think it is very important that we do that.

Even though we are in a health crisis at the moment, we need to make sure that we do not forget those who served this nation in a variety of ways, with many making the ultimate sacrifice with their life. We should not forget them at this time. Some suggestions made by the RSL and other

veteran organisations about the way we can remember the courage and service of our defence personnel include, for example, standing in your driveway at 5.55am, observing a minute's silence while the ode is played.

You can also put a red item on your letterbox, symbolising family members waiting for a letter to arrive from overseas either from the family member or, worse, from the government saying that their loved one has been killed in war. You can fly the flag. You can follow some services on TV; there will be some limited services on television. You can perhaps sit down and speak with your children or grandchildren and explain to them why this day is very important. There is a whole range of ways on this day that we can honour those who have given their life.

On ANZAC Day, we remember those who have given their life on the battlefield. This motion is about honouring not only those lives but also the lives of those people who have given their life, unfortunately, off the battlefield—those ex-service personnel who have taken their own life. I understand that, since 2001, 400 serving and ex-defence personnel have taken their lives. This is particularly sad because these are people who have taken their life while trying to re-enter the community and rebuild their normal life.

Sometimes words fail to describe the enormity of a tragedy, and I think this is one of those areas: trying to come to terms with the enormity of this tragedy for those people directly involved in taking their lives and also for their family members who are left behind. They are often left seeking answers and trying to understand why their loved one has taken their life when they have been serving their nation. The second part of this motion addresses that in part.

It seeks to recognise the strong and respectful advocacy by Ms Julie-Ann Finney, in addition to that of other grieving families and members of the veteran community who have successfully advocated for a commonwealth government inquiry into veteran suicides. I have been very fortunate to have had the opportunity to meet with Julie-Ann Finney on a number of occasions, and I was moved not only by her words but by her demeanour and grace. This is a woman who lost a son to suicide, a son who served this nation, yet all she was seeking—and not from a place of anger—was not retribution but to understand what her son went through.

More importantly, she made it very clear on the occasions I spoke with her that she did not want any other mother or parent or brother or sister to go through the grief she has gone through and to suffer the pain she has gone through. Her call is a call to understand what her son did, but, more importantly, it is a call to understand what has happened and to make sure that it does not happen again because she has experienced it firsthand.

I do not know that experience. I have been very fortunate in life. I do not know the experience of losing a close one to war or losing a close one to suicide, but you can tell when she speaks with you that the pain is quite deep. We need to work with her and other mothers and fathers and brothers and sisters to make sure their loved ones do not do the same, so there was some light on the horizon when the Prime Minister announced an inquiry.

I say there was some light on the horizon with this inquiry because I am not quite clear about what actually has been promised by the government in terms of an inquiry. A whole range of terms is being used, but I do not understand yet and I am not clear that the terms of reference have been drawn up yet for this national inquiry. What I can say though is that I have met very few people who actually agree with what is proposed, or what they understand has been proposed.

Certainly, Julie-Ann Finney has made it very clear that after her initial positive reaction to what was said she is very disappointed, and I will come to that in a few moments. She is really disappointed in the way this matter has been handled. I am reading from a media release from the Hon. Darren Chester MP, Minister for Veterans' Affairs and Minister for Defence Personnel. His media statement says the government supports:

...the establishment of a permanent and independent National Commissioner for Defence and Veteran Suicide Prevention to inquire into all suspected veterans and ADF suicides...

He calls that 'a significant step forward in tackling this serious and complex national issue'. He goes on to say:

The National Commissioner will have the enduring powers and resources, formalised by terms of reference, to investigate suicides and related issues as they arise in the future, and also to review past cases, supported by the ability to conduct public hearings, receive submissions, and include families in the process should they wish. Importantly, these are ongoing powers not restricted to a one-off inquiry as would be the case with a royal commission.

It is interesting that a royal commission is an inferior inquiry, yet when it was announced the Prime Minister said that this was actually better than a royal commission. I would now like to put forward some views expressed by others of what has been proposed and explain why I believe what the Prime Minister has announced (and I say what I believe to be the case because I am not sure what has been announced at this point in time) I do not think is good enough for our veterans and their families.

The Senate recently passed a motion, supported by the Labor Party and all the minor parties in the Senate, that I think is very important. It reads as follows:

That the Senate—

(a) is not of the view that the Morrison Government's announcement of the National Commissioner for Defence and Veterans Suicide [Prevention] is 'better than a Royal Commission';

This is the view of the Senate. It continues:

(b) calls on the Morrison government to establish a Royal Commission into Veterans Suicide, with a clear start and end date; and

(c) invites the Royal Commissioner to recommend that a standing, permanent capability be established to oversee reform should the Commissioner see fit to do so.

The Senate is basically saying that you have a royal commission and you get to a position where you actually understand what is involved. Part of those recommendations hopefully will be to set up a permanent inquiry. That would actually cover what I believe these mothers and families are asking for. From what I understand, it is not what the Prime Minister has offered to this point. I will also quote Senator Steele-John, one of the Greens in the Senate, where he talks about discussing this issue with families who have a lost a child or another family member to suicide:

Anybody who has spoken with a family that has been touched by veteran suicide will know the pain they feel and the urgency that is demanded by so many for an independent and rigorous investigation that is able to look under every rock and stone and get an answer to the question why so many veterans are being driven to take these actions.

It is important this process breaks through the very bureaucratic barriers that have stopped other inquiries from making meaningful recommendations or delivering on meaningful recommendations, and there are a number of those. The reaction to the Prime Minister's proposal is interesting. I am quoting a piece by the ABC's *7.30 Report*:

A Victorian coroner has recommended that the Department of Veterans Affairs...be subject to independent audits of its handling of the veterans' compensation claims following an inquest into the suicide of army veteran Jesse Bird.

The clear inference to make from that is that the way our bureaucracies are handling a whole range of issues is actually contributing to the loss of life of these people who have served their nation overseas. It continues:

Coroner Jacqui Hawkins called for the role of National Commissioner for Defence and Veterans Suicide Prevention to be dramatically expanded to allow for broader reviews of DVA processes, and investigations into complaints about the Department made by veterans.

This Coroner has actually looked at the Prime Minister's proposal and says that it is wanting. The Coroner has made a finding that what is being proposed by the commonwealth government is not enough: it is insufficient. The Coroner found, 'There appeared to be a lack of care, attention and proactive support,' given to veterans who come back from their service.

Tim White, the President of Law Society of South Australia, recently wrote a piece in the paper in which he talked about the number of suicides that have taken place. He also makes a very important point because people often say, 'Suicide is a matter of life. It happens to non-serving personnel as well.' That is certainly true: people in the general community, regrettably and sadly, also commit suicide. He goes on to say, 'The suicide rate for ex-servicemen is 18 per cent higher

than the broader population.' So there is something wrong in our defence system that is not helping our defence personnel to re-enter the community in a safe way, and we need to address that.

In the case of ex-servicewomen, the stats are even worse. White says they are 'twice as likely to take their own lives as other women' in the community. Mr White is a person who has actually worked with veterans, and he says, 'I have seen many financially and emotionally ruined by the Department of Veterans Affairs' claims process,' when they talk about claims, etc. I would just like to quote *The Advertiser*, talking about Julie-Ann Finney:

The grieving Adelaide mother who has spent the past 12 months fighting for a national solution to veteran suicide is maintaining her calls for a full-blown royal commission.

Ms Finney, from Blair Athol, said the PM's proposal to appoint an independent commissioner to investigate veteran suicide did not address the issues she believed were causing the crisis at the centre of the Australian Defence Force (ADF) and the Department of Veterans' Affairs (DVA).

You have here the mother, who has agitated with courage and with grace to get a royal commission to look to help a whole range of other families in this nation who believe that this matter is not being properly addressed by our Prime Minister. I think it is very important. I understand that we are in a crisis at the moment and that this is probably not the number one issue we need to deal with, but make no mistake: this issue has to be addressed once our health emergency is over, and I can assure you the families of those veterans will not let it go or be hidden somewhere else.

I will also add that it is very important that while we do have a royal commission—and I think a royal commission will come, if not from this government then a future government—it is important that those recommendations made by a successive range of parliamentary inquiries be implemented immediately. There are a number of things that the government could be doing to reduce the risk of suicide amongst our veterans today. They need to give attention to these matters urgently because these people who have signed up to protect our nation deserve better.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (11:46):** I move to amend the motion as follows:

Delete paragraph (c) and insert:

- (c) acknowledges the commonwealth government's initiative to establish the National Commissioner for Defence and Veteran Suicide Prevention, who will be empowered to make findings and recommendations to the government.

I thank the shadow minister for bringing his motion to the house. I think it is a very important motion and the government will be supporting paragraphs (a) and (b) in particular:

That this house—

- (a) honours the service and sacrifice of current and former members of the Australian Defence Force;
- (b) recognises the strong and respectful advocacy of Ms Julie-Ann Finney, in addition to other grieving families and members of the veteran community who have successfully advocated for a commonwealth government inquiry into veteran suicides;

This is a very important time for the veteran community in Australia; in fact, it is a very important time for the entire population of Australia as we lead up to a very different ANZAC Day from those we have experienced in the past. This is, if you like, our most solemn day, when we commemorate the service and sacrifice of so many men and women who have served in the ADF, and in many other roles as well, to protect of our freedoms in Australia.

I for one have been very pleased to see the growing numbers of people who have been attending ANZAC Day dawn services in recent years. In fact, if we go back 10 or 15 years, there were very few who turned up. Each year, as we were heading towards the centenary of ANZAC, we saw those numbers grow and grow. It is with a great deal of sadness that this year, because of the COVID-19 situation, we will not be able to have those large commemorations, sub-branch by sub-branch and electorate by electorate, right across this country.

Here in South Australia, we will be continuing with the dawn service at the National War Memorial on North Terrace. There will be a modified service, which will be telecast, and we look to telecast in conjunction with the service that will be held at the National War Memorial in Canberra. This, of course, will be attended by His Excellency the Governor of South Australia, the Hon. Hieu

Van Le, here on North Terrace with a very much reduced number of other dignitaries and a special message to be conveyed to those people who are watching from home.

The shadow minister has outlined other measures that have been suggested on the national stage and supported here in South Australia by the RSL. I must say that it was with great regret that I had to inform Cheryl Cates, the President of the RSL SA and NT, about the federal government's decision, but we have agreed to work together for the dawn service and this very solemn and important commemoration to continue. So we are very, very pleased to support paragraph (a).

We are also very pleased to support paragraph (b). We do genuinely thank Ms Julie-Ann Finney for her courage in bringing the issue of veteran suicide to an issue that has been very high on the agenda nationally. We thank her for that, because it is a courageous move. Her son lost his life to suicide back in February 2019. He served our country with distinction in the Royal Australian Navy for two decades. He did suffer from post-traumatic stress, and this continued when he had left the Royal Australian Navy.

Since this time, Julie-Ann Finney has raised this concern to members here in South Australia and more broadly around the country. Her petition was signed by more than 300,000 people. To me, this really indicates that the people of Australia are very, very concerned about the extraordinarily high levels of veteran suicide, the unacceptably high level of veteran suicide. We all need to do all we can to address this issue.

In South Australia, after the election I established the Premier's Council on Suicide Prevention. One of the areas of representation that we made sure of was that we had a veteran on this important body. It has now completed two years of work and its work has now been extended for a further year. I thank the Hon. John Dawkins for his chairmanship of this particular group.

Ms Finney had been advocating for the establishment of a royal commission to look into veterans' suicide. This was an issue that she spoke to me about on 20 November when we met in my office at the State Administration Centre. I committed at that meeting to raise her concerns personally with the Prime Minister. Although I do not recall the exact date that I spoke to the Prime Minister, it would have been in late December when I had an opportunity to speak to the Prime Minister about Ms Finney's concerns and her advocacy for the establishment of a royal commission.

I could tell from my conversation with the Prime Minister that he was very moved by the representations that were made. He was very concerned about coming up with a model that would work. However, as the shadow minister would appreciate, whilst there were many people who signed the petition, there were many organisations of high standing that did not want to have this royal commission be put in place. I think that the resolution that the Prime Minister came up with was a very good resolution to this issue.

As the shadow minister would know, we now have a new permanent National Commissioner for Defence and Veteran Suicide Prevention in Australia, so it is not a once-off inquiry. It is an inquiry that has no end. It is a permanent commission. This new independent body will investigate all suspected veteran and ADF suicides and investigate measures to help save lives. The commissioner will be an independent and permanent public accountability body with the same powers of a royal commission to compel the production of evidence, to summon witnesses and make findings and recommendations to government. The commissioner will also provide an ongoing investigative function of individual cases of suicide, working with each state and territory coronial office making recommendations to government.

This was announced by the Prime Minister on 5 February. On 10 February, we had a veterans ministers roundtable meeting with all states and territories represented. This provided the federal minister, Darren Chester, with an opportunity to go through the details of the Prime Minister's decision regarding the establishment of this new permanent National Commissioner for Defence and Veteran Suicide Prevention.

I do not recall any of the state or territory ministers opposing the establishment of this new body at the meeting. In fact, we thought that it was a good way to provide a necessary oversight of an issue that we all must work together to improve in Australia.

The shadow minister raises questions that were posed by the Victorian Coroner and which relate to investigations to do with DVA issues more broadly. These were not envisaged in the original royal commission into veteran suicide that was put forward by the petitioners, and the questions that are raised by the Victorian Coroner are probably very important issues more broadly to do with DVA.

However, we believe that the federal government's position on this is very sound. It is respectful of the magnitude of the problem that we face here in South Australia, and although it will not satisfy every person we believe it is an adequately resourced permanent commission to look at this very important issue for our country.

With those words, as I said, we will certainly be supporting paragraphs (a) and (b), and we seek to amend the motion with the insertion of a new paragraph (c).

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:56):** I rise to support the amended motion in regard to veteran suicide. I note the initial two paragraphs of the motion, which read:

That this house—

- (a) honours the service and sacrifice of current and former members of the Australian Defence Force;
- (b) recognises the strong and respectful advocacy of Ms Julie-Ann Finney, in addition to other grieving families and members of the veteran community who have successfully advocated for a commonwealth government inquiry into veteran suicides; and

Amended paragraph (c) reads:

- (c) acknowledges the commonwealth government's initiative to establish the National Commissioner for Defence and Veteran Suicide Prevention who will be empowered to make findings and recommendations to the government.

Looking after our veterans as much as possible is the least we can do. As I have mentioned in this place before, many members of my family for well over 100 years have served in the defence forces. Some of my family members served in the militia back in the late 1800s and early 1900s, and in World War I my great-uncle Joe Pederick served at the Somme and got what I guess you could call a million dollar injury. He was walking between two blokes and was shot by a sniper through the nose from the side. He was repatriated to England for treatment, obviously, and by the time he was right to go the war was over.

Certainly, I had several uncles who served in World War II. My uncle Les Dutton served in the Navy on a ship, the *Shropshire*. He actually served with my neighbour, Maurie Williams, from Coomandook, who has since passed away. Another uncle, Uncle Os, served on Sunderland flying boats bombing submarines in the English Channel, and Keith Leske served in the Army in the various fields of service—I applaud their service.

I also want to acknowledge my father's service. He was basically ordered to stay home and provide feed for the nation and the state. I recently came across his service record. He served with the 10 Battalion Volunteer Defence Corps and his service number was S80200. Even though he did not go overseas to serve, as he was helping to provide food for the nation, he served in a role here to defend the nation in case of attack.

I also want to acknowledge my brother Chris Pederick. He served in the Australian Defence Force for 23 years. He had a small gap in between, as there was a time line arrangement where he pulled out for a while then came back in and could still accumulate his service. He went in as an infantryman and then went in with the mechanics and the RAEME. He did great service. One of the interesting times was when he went to Rwanda in 1995 as part of United Nations Peacekeeping when horrendous massacres were happening between the Hutus and the Tutsis.

The rules of engagement under UN battlelines are not too flash. They are not really battlelines. It was basically: 'Hold your fire until you're almost overrun.' Those are the rules of engagement under the United Nations scheme. I know he went to pick up the ambulance from where the massacre was. He went in there 10 days later and reckoned he had about 50 AK-47s pointed at him. He said, 'Well, the bulletproof vests we had at the range wouldn't have been any good.' I applaud his service in Rwanda.



Interestingly enough, he did get the Australian Service Medal for service overseas as a peacekeeper. Thirteen years later, it was put up to active service, but he also got an Australian Active Service Medal for serving in Iraq in a six-month tour at the end of 2005 and early 2006. Serving there was also a very dangerous mission, especially doing the runs between the airport and Baghdad. He can, if he likes, get the bar for his Australian Active Service Medal. A couple of months ago in Canberra, for the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of that Rwanda service the unit was awarded a Meritorious Unit Citation by the federal government.

That is a brief outline of the people I know who have served over the years. I talked earlier about Uncle Les, who served in the Navy in World War II and in the Army in Korea with another uncle, Royce Baohm, so there has been lots of service over time and it is very interesting to see the things that go on. Back in the time when my brother Chris was in Iraq, the support to the next of kin from the government was meritorious. It was just fantastic. I could not send enough FruChocs to him in Baghdad.

Talking about suicide is a very serious thing, and I note Julie-Ann Finney's advocacy. American defence members do 12-month tours. I do not think too many of our services here do 12-month tours. It is a long, long time—it is Vietnam War era stuff—to be away serving your country in a battle zone. Our defence personnel do six-month tours. I have reflected on my brother's friend Ian, who was hardened by military life serving not only in peacetime operations but also in Iraq, where I think he did three tours in the end. I think he got past the psychs, and that affected him. Sadly, he was taken a few years ago with throat cancer, but he was one of the coolest cats.

Things happen to people, I have seen it happen to people and I have mentioned him in here before. The strongest people who you think would never have any issues can crack because they see things we do not see. They witness things we do not see. They can come back and be as large as life and full of courage but I think it is those hidden scars. It was noted from the times of World War I with shell shock—PTSD back then—and, obviously, World War II had similar things, as in any war whether it was Korea, Vietnam or the more recent wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I want to commend the many hundreds of thousands of people who have served this state and this nation, and not just in their overseas service. It is just as vital a service for people to serve their country here because, without our defence forces, we would not be the country we are. I want to very quickly acknowledge, in the short time I have left, the work of the defence force in the recent issues with the bushfires around the state and the nation. It is just fantastic what they have done, coming in to play to support communities, whether they be reservists or full-time serving people.

I want to acknowledge in the closing few seconds the commonwealth government's initiative to establish the National Commissioner for Defence and Suicide Prevention who will be empowered to make findings and recommendations to the government. I certainly support all our service men and women in everything they do, no matter where they serve.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (12:06):** I thank the other speakers—the member for Hammond and the member for Dunstan—for speaking partially in support of my motion. I indicate that we will not be accepting the amendment; we will be opposing it when it comes to a vote. I will explain why. I think I have a duty to explain why.

Firstly, by his own admission, the member for Dunstan—the Premier, who is the Minister for Veterans' Affairs in this state—indicated in his contribution that when he put the Victorian Coroner's findings aside, he was already limiting what the scope of this commission would be. He said that it is a DVA matter over here, somewhere else. With all due respect, they are not somewhere else. The behaviour and actions of the DVA, the behaviour and actions of the defence forces, the behaviour and actions of a whole range of organisations and individuals all need to be considered by a royal commission. They all make a contribution, not necessarily deliberately, to either the wellbeing or the fact that some of our ex-defence personnel take their lives.

To narrow that debate, to narrow that inquiry already, as the Premier has done in his contribution, explains quite rightly why we need a broader royal commission. That is why the Victorian Coroner has basically said that the current model is not sufficient. What is proposed is insufficient. It will not uncover the truth that the families are seeking. We would be betraying both the service

personnel and their families if we do not set up a royal commission which uncovers that truth and sets up guidelines for the future.

More importantly, we must fully appreciate that, as the member for Hammond has indicated, our service personnel do tours overseas, quite dangerous tours, and some lose their lives. But for some, it is that last tour, the tour at home, which is the most dangerous because that is where they lose their lives. We need to find out why that is happening. Again, I say respectfully that what is proposed by the federal government is insufficient to do that. The Premier quite correctly pointed out that some service organisations put their signatures to a statement opposing a royal commission, and that is certainly true.

I have spoken to many of the organisations to try to understand why, and they have explained to me the reason is that they do not want a royal commission established which means we do nothing for the next two, three or four years while the inquiry is undertaken and nothing happens to support our veterans today. That is why paragraph (c) was inserted into the motion deliberately in response to general concerns raised by the veteran organisations to make sure that what we already know through a number of inquiries, both inside and outside the parliament, is that that work should be undertaken today.

I do not think it is deliberate, but by removing paragraph (c) the Premier has effectively gutted the motion and acted contrary to the wishes of those service organisations. It was their wish to say, 'Let's implement already what we know to protect our ex-servicemen to make sure they do not suicide.' By removing that, he has gutted the motion and effectively put everything on hold until this national inquiry makes some recommendations. I do not support that.

The families of those service personnel who have suicided do not support that. The service organisations do not support that. They want action today. That is why this motion was deliberately crafted in this way to make sure that we take action today and strengthen that action with a royal commission for tomorrow.

I have met a number of defence personnel who have indicated to me that they have either attempted or contemplated suicide, and I can assure you that their relationship with the Department of Veterans' Affairs, their relationship with the defence department, is important and we need to understand that. We need to understand that relationship if we are going to prevent further suicide. What the Premier has done—to exclude that from this commission inquiry—does a disservice to the service personnel and their families. With those few comments, I would encourage members to oppose the amendment and support my original motion.

The house divided on the amendment:

Ayes ..... 13  
 Noes ..... 13  
 Majority ..... 0

#### AYES

Chapman, V.A.  
 Knoll, S.K.  
 Pisoni, D.G.  
 Treloar, P.A.  
 Wingard, C.L.

Cowdrey, M.J. (teller)  
 Marshall, S.S.  
 Sanderson, R.  
 van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Cregan, D.  
 Pederick, A.S.  
 Speirs, D.J.  
 Whetstone, T.J.

#### NOES

Bedford, F.E.  
 Brown, M.E.  
 Koutsantonis, A.  
 Odenwalder, L.K.  
 Stinson, J.M.

Bignell, L.W.K.  
 Close, S.E.  
 Malinauskas, P.  
 Piccolo, A. (teller)

Brock, G.G.  
 Hildyard, K.A.  
 Mullighan, S.C.  
 Picton, C.J.

## PAIRS

Basham, D.K.B.  
 Bell, T.S.  
 Harvey, R.M.  
 Hughes, E.J.  
 Murray, S.  
 Gee, J.P.  
 Teague, J.B.

Szakacs, J.K.  
 Gardner, J.A.W.  
 Duluk, S.  
 McBride, N.  
 Bettison, Z.L.  
 Power, C.  
 Boyer, B.I.

Ellis, F.J.  
 Michaels, A.  
 Luethen, P.  
 Cook, N.F.  
 Patterson, S.J.R.  
 Wortley, D.

**The SPEAKER:** There being 13 ayes and 13 noes, we have a tie. Accordingly, I cast for the ayes.

Amendment thus carried; motion as amended carried.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** Status quo again, sir?

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens talks about 'status quo'. I imagine he is speaking about a band from the seventies.

## WORLD SOCIAL WORK DAY

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (12:17):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises World Social Work Day is celebrated on 17 March 2020;
- (b) acknowledges those workers who work within state government, in particular the Department for Child Protection, other government departments, non-government and charitable organisations, who are skilled, knowledgeable and specialise in issues related to social and emotional wellbeing; and
- (c) expresses appreciation for the work of social workers who are passionate advocates for the individuals, families and communities with whom they work.

I take the chance also to note that I have been fortunate to have had the opportunity to participate, together with Minister for Child Protection, who is here in the chamber with me, and members of this house and members of another place, on the joint committee inquiry in relation to social workers and the registration of social workers. I will have just a little more to say about that in a moment.

World Social Work Day was celebrated on 17 March this year, just a matter of weeks ago. It is a day that is an initiative of the International Federation of Social Workers. That is the global body for the profession of social workers and it is a body that, in the course of the joint committee's inquiry work, I have become somewhat more familiar with than I was previously. It is a body that reflects social workers in jurisdictions around the world and indeed documents the important work that social workers do in a wide variety of different countries.

This is a key day in the year, and social workers worldwide, I understand, unite in recognising the day and the opportunity that the day presents to advance a common global message for social workers internationally. In my view, this year's theme for World Social Work Day could not be more appropriate in the circumstances of the public health emergency that we are presently living through day to day.

The theme this year highlights promoting the importance of human relationships, and by doing so that is really bringing to the fore the very important theme in responding to this challenge that we focus on day to day here and in our communities, and that is the promotion and galvanising of community wellbeing. Focusing on a theme that promotes the importance of human relationships is always important and always at the core of what social workers are looking to do in their everyday work and in the course of their profession, but I might add that it is a theme we might all adopt and reflect on all the more so at this time.

As the motion reflects, the vital work of social workers is clearly on display in the work that goes on throughout our state government departments. The public provision of social work supports

is very much at the core of the state government's service provision here and throughout the country and internationally. In South Australia, that is particularly so in the important work that the Department for Child Protection undertakes within the responsibility of the Minister for Child Protection. I take this chance to recognise and thank the minister for her capable, innovative and steadfast leadership of her department and the tremendous work she has been doing with those particular, and at times, if I may say, particularly existentially challenging, aspects of work within the department.

It of course is working with vulnerable families, as we see with social workers across the board. We see important social work being done through non-government organisations as well, by foster carers and the community more broadly, who are importantly, while not exclusively, involved in the care and protection of vulnerable children.

Again, if there might be some more particular reflection at this time, it is that we all, as families and throughout our communities, are finding ourselves in challenged social circumstances, and as we look, as family units, to self-isolate and to constructively engage meanwhile with the usual institutions such as school, in particular, so far as children are concerned, there is an important role at this time for social workers to help steer a course through these challenging times. Of course, it extends beyond the acute circumstances that we see now to the chronic and sustained matters that are the subject of the work of the Department for Child Protection: the addressing of abuse and neglect and endeavouring to keep children, in particular, safe from further harm.

We take the opportunity to express appreciation for the work of social workers. They are often the most effective and certainly passionate advocates for the individuals and the families and the communities for whom they work, and we recognise them as such. The Australian Association of Social Workers is a key professional body that represents a large majority of social workers in this country—as I understand, more than 11,000 social workers—and is taking a lead role in the marking of the day and then in promoting the theme for this year. I recognise the important work of the association.

There is also more that we can do to recognise the importance of the day. In order to support the important work of the association and of social workers generally, it is important that we call out and advocate against discriminatory and abusive behaviours, and also structures that would otherwise permit those to continue, and that we do all that we can to prevent the oppression of vulnerable groups in our society.

It is in this context and the context of the promotion of wellbeing and support for the vulnerable, as I had the opportunity to mention yesterday, that I again raise and commend to the community the new support line that is available for members of the community in particular to raise concerns that they may have or needs for support: the SA COVID-19 Mental Health Support Line, which was established by the state government.

The support line is a practical component of service and support provided by the government. I hope it demonstrates in part the government's commitment to the promotion of wellbeing alongside the practical day-to-day work of our social workers. I note again that the support line is available and staffed from 8am to 8pm and the telephone number is 1800 632 753. More information is available at SA Health's website, [www.sahealth.sa.gov.au/covid-19](http://www.sahealth.sa.gov.au/covid-19). With those remarks, I commend the motion to the house.

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (12:30):** I would firstly like to thank the member for Heysen for moving this motion. It is very important that we recognise the work of social workers, probably even more so at this time that we find ourselves in. I thank him for his excellent motion and those of us on this side support it.

The world would indeed be a very dark place without social workers. They are at the very core of delivering for our social justice system. They are the people on the front line who are building relationships and trying to rebuild relationships within our community, and they are really the ones doing the grunt work and the difficult things in our community. It is an incredibly difficult job. Anyone who is a social worker, who knows a social worker, or even who has just had conversations with social workers about the work they do, will know that this is a complex profession, an ever-changing profession and, of course, an absolutely vital profession for the social cohesion of our state and for all of us living in this state.

Obviously, we have a large number of social workers who are working in the Department for Child Protection, which I take a particular interest in, and also in the Department of Human Services, and we thank them for the amazing and detailed work they do every single day. There are also social workers working throughout pretty much every other social justice type of department across the government and, indeed, the non-government and private sectors as well.

Areas such as health and education also have people with social work backgrounds or in social work roles who are delivering for vulnerable people or people we want to make sure do not become vulnerable, supporting them, supporting the relationships they have in the community and making sure they are getting access to the services they need. Of course, social workers are also the ones who are devising many of the programs and policies advising government about the types of services we need to be rolling out that are then delivered on the ground by many social workers and others.

There are a large number of social workers in the government departments, but I would also like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to those who are working for our non-government organisations. Some of them are very well known to people in our community—organisations such as Anglicare and UnitingSA—but also there are smaller NGOs that are employing social workers and doing some great stuff. There are also a small number of for-profit organisations that are employing social workers and people with social work backgrounds, and they are delivering some pretty amazing results in the community as well.

When we look at this issue, I reflect on the area of child protection and think of all the families and all the children whose lives have been absolutely changed by the work of social workers. We hear about a lot of difficulties that happen in the human services and child protection portfolios, but when you speak to people many have had excellent outcomes and really had their lives turned around by the relationship they have had with a social worker who has taken a special interest in the circumstances that a child or a family has found themselves in and really committed themselves to understanding the difficulties that person faces, using their professional skills and professional judgement to work out what those families and children need in order to have the same opportunities that we hope all South Australians have.

That relationship and the dedication of those social workers to their craft and to the people they work with cannot be underestimated. Of course, we all reflect on our teachers from when we were at school and the impact that a teacher can have on our lives: on our love of learning, our engagement with others and our sense of security and having a strong future. Really, social workers are doing a very similar job to that. They are looking at the issues that young people and families in the area of child protection are facing. They are thinking quite critically and using their professional skills and judgement to come up with the best support that they possibly can.

Of course, there are no simple solutions to a lot of the problems they are dealing with. There is not a pill you can take and there is not a sudden quick fix that can be applied. This really is a matter where so much comes down to the relationship and the dedication that a social worker has with the people they are working with and for. We recognise that and we greatly appreciate the life-changing differences they are making every day in our state.

At this time, when we are dealing with the coronavirus across South Australia, across Australia and across the world, the work of front-line workers, including social workers, comes into sharp focus for us. Many of those workers have had to change the way that they are working amid COVID-19 and they are having to adapt to new ways of being able to deliver care for people in our community—but they are still there, they are still available to our community and they are doing some absolutely excellent work at this time.

Obviously, at this time many people are dealing with issues such as social isolation, loneliness, anxiety and, of course, the impact of being separated from families, friends and people who are our support networks. I think that is true of almost everyone in the community. For others, existing difficulties that they have been experiencing in their lives are exacerbated—things like domestic violence, difficult family relationships, mental health concerns and also issues of access and custody when it comes to being able to speak with and meet with children who people may have a very strong relationship with, either as parents or relatives or carers.

All these things have now really been heightened. For people who are experiencing these issues every day anyway, the coronavirus has increased the difficulty for many of them. Social workers are the ones who are charged with and delivering on those issues, as much as possible in these difficult times, so that they can be addressed and worked through, that new solutions can be found, that people are supported in their communities and that people can continue to have those vital relationships in their lives, or even work on those relationships that are strained, to try to make sure that we can continue with that good work in this very difficult time.

Social workers are actively tackling the existing issues as well as the emerging issues that are coming to the fore due to the COVID-19 crisis. I really think that the role of social workers will not only be on display during this crisis period, and indeed will increase during this pandemic, but also will be absolutely vital in the recovery. When we come out of this, whenever that might be, there is going to be a need for people to be supported, to re-establish their own support systems and the support systems that are put in place through governments, through NGOs and through others. Social workers, the work they do and the dedication they have will be critical in that recovery phase for not only South Australia but indeed all jurisdictions.

On this side, on the other side and on the crossbench, we all deeply appreciate the dedication of social workers. In this time, I think we can all certainly be unified about offering our thanks to people who are really going above and beyond every day, but especially at the moment.

I would also like to thank the Australian Association of Social Workers. It has been wonderful for me in my role as the shadow minister for child protection to get to know the leadership there and to speak with the many, many members of that organisation. They do some fantastic work not only in terms of highlighting the role of social workers and the achievements of those people as well—especially through their awards program—but also putting on the table the difficulties that social workers face and how policy makers can make life easier for social workers, and to reflect the things that social workers are seeing that need to be considered and incorporated when we are delivering social policy.

I was sad to see that their event was recently cancelled, and I hope that that might be reinstated. Thank you to all the social workers, and I would encourage everyone in our community to recognise the front-line social workers and their immense contribution to South Australia. We wish them well at this very testing time.

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (12:40):** I, too, thank the member for Heysen for bringing this important motion to the house. World Social Work Day was celebrated on 17 March this year. The day gives us all an opportunity to recognise the hard work and dedication of social workers. An initiative of the International Federation of Social Workers, this year's message promoting the importance of human relationships could not be any more apt in what has transpired across the globe this year and what continues to impact each of our daily activities.

Social workers are one of the largest professional working groups in Australia. In South Australia over 2,000 social workers are employed by government agencies. Social workers are employed within my department (the Department of Child Protection), the healthcare system, schools and justice, just to name a few. As part of their role, social workers respond to crisis situations, advocate for clients and work toward improved outcomes.

Last year my department was privileged to host Emeritus Professor Eileen Munro in South Australia. Professor Munro, a professor in social policy with a social work background, was engaged by prime minister David Cameron to lead the 2011 review of the United Kingdom child protection system. While here, staff from my department, as well as from the general public, through her booked out public lectures were able to learn from her knowledge and insights.

One of Professor Munro's key points is a need for social workers to feel trusted and supported—to make decisions in the context of great complexity and uncertainty. Professor Munro rightly suggests that, in circumstances which most social workers are engaged, mistakes can sometimes be made, but when they are it is the role of their employer to create a learning culture not a culture of blame. My department is working hard to turn these learnings into practice.

The Practise Approach, developed specifically for the South Australian context, aims to ensure that social workers feel trusted to make decisions, to practise intuitively and to know they will be supported when a defensible decision is made.

Today, our world looks different from the way it did last year. The COVID-19 pandemic has significantly altered life for each and every one of us. The spread of COVID-19 and the efforts to flatten the curve have meant that each of us is presented with new challenges. Living in this beautiful state our way of normal life was represented by the freedom we enjoyed and the safety of our environment. These basic pleasures, which we all took for granted, helped us to thrive in our community and for our interpersonal relationships to flourish.

For the time being, we are all impacted as we follow the guidance of the government and expert advice to keep ourselves and others safe, and while the majority of the population adhere to the messages and are staying at home there is a workforce of social workers who have a very important role to play as they ensure they maintain some semblance of contact with those who are most vulnerable in the community and potentially more so in these uncertain times.

Now more than ever before, the important input of our social workers is being called upon. In the last two years since forming government there has been a reduction in job vacancies in my department of approximately 8.6 per cent. During that time, more than 211 social workers have been recruited, meaning that, as a result of the Liberal government's focus to drive efforts to staff my department, we find ourselves with the best workforce capacity we have had in a long time to face the challenges of both our normal business and the daily challenges that COVID-19 presents.

Within child protection, our social workers are still engaged on the front line, delivering certainty and services to children and young people in care. During these times, our social workers are still attending their places of work and reaching out to their clients. In these uncertain times, they are creating stability and maintaining relationships and remain committed to delivery of service and keeping our children and young people safe.

It is important to recognise that now more than ever our social workers are finding themselves in a unique position to promote disease prevention efforts by the dissemination of clear government messaging from trusted sources and to assist with anxiety and other concerns that are arising as a result of this public health crisis. They are also assessing notifications, conducting investigations and intervening when necessary to keep children safe. This work cannot and will not pause during COVID-19, and I am very proud of my department's response and thorough planning to ensure that our business of keeping children and young people safe continues.

While the opportunity for me to meet many social workers and share breakfast with them on 17 March in recognition of their very important day was sadly unable to go ahead, I am grateful for this opportunity to express in this place my appreciation and gratitude for all our social workers for the work they do and the impact they have on the lives of the people they work with. I commend this motion to the house.

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (12:46):** I thank those who have spoken up in favour of the motion. I thank the Minister for Child Protection for her remarks in support of the motion and for outlining some of the further initiatives that are being taken by her department. I recognise and thank the member for Badcoe for her contribution on behalf of the opposition and for the opposition's support of the motion. I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

## MOTOR NEURONE DISEASE

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (12:47):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) notes that motor neurone disease (MND) is a complex, high-needs disease that generally has rapid onset causing significant disability;
- (b) notes that the average life expectancy from diagnosis to death with MND is only 27 months;
- (c) recognises that MND SA is the only NGO in SA providing equipment and support to more than 200 South Australians living with MND and their family carers;

- (d) acknowledges that NDIS and My Aged Care packages often do not adequately cover the needs of people living with MND due to the rapid onset of the disease;
- (e) recognises that people with MND often die while waiting for a support package or plan to be put in place or increased; and
- (f) recognises the work MND SA do to support the South Australian MND community on a tight budget, relying on fundraising, donations and bequests.

This is the second year I have raised this motion about motor neurone disease in parliament because of its importance to people living in my electorate and in the broader South Australian community. Due to a lack of time, I think there will be fewer people talking about this today on both sides, and I want to acknowledge that as well.

Only last week, I had a conversation with a local man, Graham Johnson, who was diagnosed with terminal motor neurone disease only six months ago in 2019. MND is a neurological disease that causes the death of voluntary muscle neurones. People with MND eventually lose the ability to walk, speak and breathe. Mr Johnson has one of the most aggressive forms of MND, ALS, and has been given between 12 and 24 months to live. He has said he has severe muscle atrophy and has lost 14 kilograms over just the past few months.

Graham told *The Bunyip* paper: 'It just eats your muscles away and you get very tired. You get a lot of cramps throughout your body.' Graham told me that, prior to being diagnosed with MND, he was an avid runner. He took up running after his 60<sup>th</sup> birthday. For 951 days straight he ran more than 13 kilometres a day, and he ran five marathons. He agreed with my observation that many people diagnosed with MND seem to have been very fit and very engaged in sport and fitness in the past. Graham told me, 'There's nothing I can do. I've just got to enjoy the time I have left and be positive.'

In 2019, Graham was able to raise over \$14,300 for Fight MND, a Victorian not-for-profit organisation. He has now set his fundraising sights on the Motor Neurone Disease Association of South Australia (MND SA). Mr Johnson said that MND SA is 'absolutely marvellous' and 'they help your family out immensely.' They rely on fundraising to deliver their services. Sadly, fundraising has just got a bit tougher right now during the current COVID-19 pandemic. Graham, like most people with MND, is now confined to his house. Because people living with MND are sick and vulnerable, they will rely on family and friends to shop for them. Imagine knowing you only have months to live and now you can only wave at people through the window. Imagine living your last months in isolation.

Today, this motion notes that motor neurone disease is a complex, high-needs disease that generally has rapid onset, causing significant disability. Last year, a group of people living with MND came into the parliament for morning tea. We had hoped to do it again this year but, with COVID-19, this has been prevented. In parliament, in my electorate and at the awesome MND gala ball last year, I have seen people at various stages of MND. It is quite scary and confronting.

These people living with MND are also incredibly inspiring. Each of these people are fighting for better services to help people with MND and I commend each one of them. The average life expectancy from diagnosis to death with MND is only 27 months. This motion recognises that MND SA is the only NGO in SA providing equipment and supports to more than 200 South Australians living with MND and their family carers. I am very grateful to the Premier who provided funding for equipment to MND SA last year.

This motion acknowledges that NDIS and My Aged Care packages often do not adequately cover the needs of people living with MND due to the rapid onset of the disease. After our motion last year, and my advocacy to the Premier and the Minister for Health, I have been informed that the Premier has lobbied the Hon. Stuart Robert MP, Minister for the National Disability Insurance Scheme, for more support. The minister has provided the Premier with an update following the Premier's advocacy for people with MND needing better and speedier support.

A letter from the federal minister says that, where there is evidence of rapid deterioration in functional capacity or an immediate risk to a person or others in the community, an access request is considered a priority and the access decision is now completed in three days. This prioritisation is compared to the legislative requirement of 21 days. The minister says that he has asked for the NDIA



to focus on the timeliness of the planning process for people with MND. Further work is being done. The minister says he has also met with the peak MND body to discuss better access and planning. This is because we care so deeply about this issue and delivering better services, so I thank the Premier for taking this fight for better services up alongside MND SA.

This motion recognises that people with MND often die while waiting for a support package or a plan to be put in place or increased. This motion recognises the work that MND SA does to support the South Australian MND community on a tight budget, relying on fundraising, donations and bequests. Karen and the team are living angels. Every person with MND and their family tell me how much they value MND SA's work and support. I thank them all.

Their two major annual fundraisers have been impacted by COVID-19 and I encourage all members of the South Australian community, members in this house, and people who can afford it in my electorate to donate to MND SA if you can. It will make a tremendous difference to a South Australian's life. Karen Percival, the CEO of MND SA, asked me to emphasise these points today. People who are diagnosed with MND over the age of 65 are not eligible for the NDIS and they receive no NDIS funding because of their age. Their disability and needs are no less because they are over 65, but they are left to fall under the My Aged Care funding and they often die whilst waiting for their packages.

MND clients are amongst the high-risk category for COVID-19, for which there is no cure. Karen said, 'Look at how frightened we all are. Imagine the fear that clients with MND live with every day. There is also no known cure for MND.' She said that people with MND need support. They need our community support. They need equipment, which cost lots of money, to deal with the increase in this disability and the onset. MND SA is the only specialist organisation providing support for people affected by MND, yet they have limited resources. Karen has asked that we continue to support those affected by MND, regardless of age or postcode.

The cause of MND is not known, although around one in 10 cases are familial. You cannot catch MND from someone. MND usually starts slowly, sometimes starting on one side of the body and then spreading. Usually, the first things people notice are a weakness in their hands or grip, slurred speech, weakness in their legs, weakness in their shoulders making lifting difficult, and cramps and muscle twitching. Later on, people with MND have little or no movement, and they have trouble talking, breathing and swallowing.

Today, there is no cure. Doctors and others help people by easing symptoms and keeping them as mobile as possible, which is hard these days. Most people with MND die within two to three years of developing the condition. Today, I am so glad I got to speak because this is a call-out to my colleagues and the community to give to MND SA. A donation to MND Australia is a gift for over 200 South Australians currently living with MND, as well as their loved ones. Your donation will allow MND SA to provide care, support, knowledge and equipment, to influence policy, to provide trusted information and to raise awareness about MND.

You can also help by donating to the MND Research Institute of Australia (RIA). When you donate to MND RIA, you are assured that every dollar of your gift will be invested in research with the best chance of understanding the causes, developing effective treatments and finding a cure for MND. It is terrible enough to have MND; it is sad to know that many people living with MND and their carers, families and friends are now impacted by this pandemic. My heart goes out to each and every person living with MND, their families and each of the staff members at MND SA. I thank everyone for helping and I thank the South Australian community in anticipation of your important donations to MND SA.

I will continue to advocate for better services, along with my colleagues, and ask for my colleagues on both sides to support me and, hence, support these vulnerable members of our South Australian community. I commend this motion to the house.

**Mr PICTON (Kurna) (12:58):** There is not a significant amount of time left for me to speak, but I would like to make a few brief comments now and continue them when we next discuss this matter. The opposition obviously supports this motion, supports people with MND and supports MND South Australia and its great work. The member for Wright has been doing a lot of work with MND South Australia, and I believe that when he is able to speak on this motion he may in fact have some

amendments to strengthen it, particularly where we can further support MND South Australia and the work they do. I believe that they have been seeking support from the government for the past couple of years to make sure that they are properly funded and can provide that support.

In my short time now, our thoughts are with all people with MND in South Australia and their families, their loved ones and their carers. This is obviously a difficult time in terms of our response to the pandemic, which affects a whole range of other carers, clinicians and support workers in a range of other clinical areas as well, with MND being no exception. So we need to do everything we possibly can to support people to make sure that they are getting all the support they need. There have been difficulties with the NDIS that we have been trying to resolve. This is an area we need to work on to make sure that it improves.

Looking at the NDIS system, the bureaucratic logjams that were put in place for somebody suffering MND were significant. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.*

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **PAPERS**

The following paper was laid on the table:

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Genetically Modified Crops Management—Designation of Area No. 3

#### *Parliamentary Committees*

### **LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:02):** On behalf of the member for Heysen, I bring up the third report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

#### *Question Time*

### **CORONAVIRUS, KANGAROO ISLAND**

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:02):** My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier follow the lead of the Queensland government, which has banned travel to three of its significant tourist islands, and now lock down Kangaroo Island?

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I was not going to uphold your point of order, if there was one.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:02):** I'm happy to answer this question and provide some explanation of the situation that we have in South Australia. I don't really want to reflect on decisions that are made in other jurisdictions. I note that there are some decisions in Queensland, and also one in Western Australia with regard to Rottnest Island, where I think they are doing some of their quarantining work and so they have put a ban on people travelling there.

Each jurisdiction really needs to make their own decisions based upon the advice that they receive, and the advice in South Australia is very clear. We have sought that advice because there have been issues and concerns raised right across regional South Australia—very legitimate concerns, quite frankly, because people are very concerned about the coronavirus and the effects that large numbers of people visiting those regions could have on the finite health resources that they have in those areas.

We consulted with experts in South Australia, and their position was very clear to us that they would not be advocating for a ban on travel to Kangaroo Island. They wouldn't be advocating a ban for travel to Eyre Peninsula, to Yorke Peninsula, to Robe and to other areas. You would note

that some time ago, when there was a cluster that broke out in the Barossa Valley, the Chief Public Health Officer moved very quickly to, if you like, significantly reduce travel in and out of the Barossa. This is something that received some national attention. This was perfectly legitimate in that situation.

I know that there have been some concerns, and I am very grateful to many people on the island who have made contact with me. We have been able to talk through the issues associated with bans on travel to and from the island. In particular, I have spoken to I think three of the GPs, the head of the local tourism agency or group on Kangaroo Island, people who run tourist venues and facilities and properties on the island, as well, as elected members of the local council of course.

There is a genuine concern there, but there is also an understanding that there are implications for a travel ban to Kangaroo Island. The ban was put in place; it is not a ban that is put in place for two or three weeks. Of course, it would be rendered completely ineffective unless members from the island who were travelling to Victor Harbor, for example, to get a prescription filled on their glasses were prepared to have a 14-day self-isolation on the other side.

I know that there are plenty of people who said, 'Yes, actually, we would do that. We would definitely do that,' but it's not enough to say that we've got a group of people that would be prepared to do it: you need to have a blanket ban on all people on the island. This would actually include people who were going over for the fire recovery because, of course, anybody coming to or from Adelaide could potentially bring coronavirus to the island.

The member would be aware that we now have a case of somebody who has contracted the virus—I think two cases, potentially—on Kangaroo Island. This was contracted from interstate travel and then brought back to South Australia. My understanding is they followed all of the protocols and practices that have been put in place. We have closed off South Australia to overseas travel and so people returning; that's one big cohort taken out. We have closed off travel for people coming from interstate.

We have a very, very low level of community transmission in South Australia and I am sure this was uppermost in the minds of those people ultimately making the decision that they would not proceed with a ban on any designated area in South Australia except for when a cluster does appear.

#### **CORONAVIRUS, KANGAROO ISLAND**

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:07):** My question is again to the Premier. Why hasn't the Premier acted on the call by Kangaroo Island Council to lock down the island because of the COVID-19 pandemic?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:07):** I thank the member for his question, and it's a good question. Their call was not to me, and it would have been inappropriate for it to be made to me because I am not the State Coordinator. We have a major emergency declaration in place at the moment and so these decisions and directions are put in place by the State Coordinator, who is, of course, Grant Stevens, the commissioner. I think that they have directed their request respectfully to the State Coordinator and his decision stands.

It doesn't mean to say that we don't look at the evidence that is presented and from time to time revise those directions. Members would be aware that there have been a significant number of directions here in South Australia since the major emergency declaration was put in place. But, taking all the information and the advice from the Chief Public Health Officer here in South Australia, the State Coordinator has not been moved to change the directions with regard to travel to Kangaroo Island.

However, I would say that he has made it very clear that he doesn't want to see an increase in travel to Kangaroo Island or, in fact, to any other part of regional South Australia over these school holidays or, in fact, Easter. He has made that crystal clear, the Chief Public Health Officer in South Australia has made that crystal clear, I have made that crystal clear. We have spent a large sum of money in South Australia running I think a very well-received public campaign advising people of the necessity to stay at home this Easter, to stay at home these the school holidays.

I have been sending through some of the detailed materials that have been produced to those on Kangaroo Island and I have received almost instantaneous messages back thanking the

government for what they are doing. It is not a foolproof plan, and I fully accept that it is not a foolproof plan, but we are making best endeavours to send a very strong message that we don't want to see people travelling this Easter.

I think this Easter is going to be very different from any other Easter that any of us have ever experienced. The churches are closed, holidays are off and people are spending time with their family. It is going to be a very different Easter for many families and individuals in South Australia, but what we know is that by working together we are going to save lives in South Australia.

All anybody needs to do to be motivated in this cause is to take a look at some of the scenarios overseas where they haven't been listening to their public health advice, they have been making it up on the run and they now find themselves, in many jurisdictions and many countries around the world, in a very precarious situation. It is heartbreaking to watch the television news services from around the world, and it is heartbreaking to be in South Australia, where we have recorded two deaths in two days.

We now have two deaths recorded in South Australia related to the coronavirus out of 50 that have been recorded nationally, so we can't take this for granted. We do have a very, very low level of community transmission in South Australia. I haven't looked at the figure updated as of this morning, but as of 9 o'clock yesterday morning there were 540 cases around Australia, of which just three were in South Australia. I think that increased to four yesterday at the 4 o'clock update, but I don't know what the national figure was at that point. We are taking this very seriously but, most importantly, what we are doing in South Australia is following that very clear expert advice.

#### **CORONAVIRUS, KANGAROO ISLAND**

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:11):** My question is again to the Premier. I appreciate that he just said that he, the police commissioner and the health officials are sending that strong message to people to stay home this Easter, but is there anything stopping anyone from getting on a plane or a ferry and travelling to Kangaroo Island this Easter?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:11):** I think I have provided that advice. I must say that the vast majority of South Australians are doing the right thing. We are not going to get down to no regional travel, but I trust the people of South Australia. I would just point out to the member that other states that have put more restrictive directions, if you like, into place haven't actually had the adherence that we have had in South Australia. I don't know about you, but I trust the people of South Australia to do the right thing.

I also know that one of the most important things we've got to do is get the balance right in this situation. We don't want to have a situation where people are chasing people with an umbrella down the street because they think they might come from a different part of the state or from interstate. That is not who we are in South Australia. I have to say that if the police commissioner in South Australia thought that he was putting us in a precarious situation, he would change that direction overnight.

But I make this point: we have really heeded the strong advice from the police commissioner and from the Chief Public Health Officer in South Australia. I think people are getting the message. It will not be down to zero, but it is a very, very strong response that we have had. Don't forget: we have stopped the major source of the new infections, which is people who are returning from overseas travel, and we have stopped the second largest source, which was people coming from interstate. We have turned those taps off and we have a very, very low community transmission level in South Australia.

We cannot wipe out this disease; it is already here in South Australia. That is actually not what we are trying to do. We are trying to follow the plan that we have put in place in consultation with the experts to reduce the peak and to push it out into the future as much as possible. You would have seen from the Prime Minister's comments yesterday, and also from the comments that have been put forward by the Chief Medical Officer of Australia, Professor Brendan Murphy, that Australia by and large has done that first part really well—controlled the spread, reduced the peak, pushed it into the future.

The second part is really making sure that we can build up the capacity within our health system in Australia and here in South Australia to make sure that we have the requisite critical care needs when the peak hits. That's our focus at the moment. We can't actually put the entire nation into cottonwool until a vaccine is found. But what we do have to do is avoid the chaos that exists in so many other countries around the world where the demand for that critical care capacity massively outstrips the capacity to supply.

As of this morning—and I haven't had an update this afternoon—there were around 100 people in ICU beds around the country and about 40 on ventilators. That is for the entire country. South Australia could supply, I think, probably tenfold that national requirement at the moment here in our state, and we are continuing to build up that capacity every single day. That is a critical part of the plan that we have put into place.

We have got to have balance with the way that we approach this. Of course we've got the health need, but we've also got to have a calm in our society because we are stuck with these restrictions not for one or two weeks and not for one or two months. So whatever we put in place in terms of the restrictions has got to be sustainable, and I think we've got the balance right in this state at this point.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order: in response to the member for Mawson's initial question in question time, the Premier referenced expert medical advice that he was following. Could he please table that to the house?

**The SPEAKER:** I don't believe that the Premier was reading from the expert medical advice and therefore is not required to table it, but I will revisit the footage, as I do every day, and if there is a need—

**The Hon. S.K. Knoll:** I am not sure that that has ever worked, Tom.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Transport is called to order. If there is a need for the Premier to table anything I will advise the house.

#### STATE ECONOMY

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:16):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house on how the government is supporting the South Australian economy during the COVID-19 crisis?

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** Is Sam not here for Dorothys?

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Lee!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:16):** It is a very important question because, as the member for Hammond knows and I think as every member of this parliament appreciates, we have a dual crisis occurring in Australia at the moment. Of course we have the health crisis and, as I have outlined on many occasions to this parliament, I think if you had to be somewhere in the world at the moment you would want to be in Australia, quite frankly.

When you look at some of those images around the world, they are very, very confronting, even in countries where you would expect that their public health administration would be of such a calibre that the scenes that we are now experiencing could not possibly have occurred. So I feel very fortunate to be living in Australia. But, as I said, we also have this dual crisis of an economic crisis. We all saw those soul-destroying line-ups out the front of Centrelinks only two or three weeks ago when a huge number of Australians—hundreds of thousands of Australians and tens of thousands of South Australians—lost their jobs as a consequence of the coronavirus. Through no fault of their own they lost their jobs, and this is something that we have to be very mindful of.

We are again very fortunate in Australia that, because of the fiscal discipline that we have had in this country for decades and decades and decades—and I acknowledge under federal governments and state governments of both major political party persuasion—we have the capability to actually implement an economic stimulus and support package while the emergency is still emerging. There are very few countries around the world that can do this. In fact, many countries are on the back foot trying to supply the immediate health needs.

While the emergency is unfolding, we are putting a platform in underneath our economy, and I want to commend the work that the national cabinet, led by our Prime Minister, the Hon. Scott Morrison, is doing in making sure that we don't forget about this side of the crisis, which is enveloping the world at the moment. As we speak, the federal parliament is meeting and they are doing work on a massive \$130 billion support package. I know that this has enjoyed the support of the trade union movement in Australia. It seems that every person in the country is wanting us to support as many people as we possibly can, and we are playing our role here in South Australia as well.

Sir, as you would be aware, on 11 March we announced the first wave of our stimulus program. This was directly in line with the advice that had been received, originally at COAG and then ultimately reinforced at the national cabinet, by Dr Philip Lowe about the types of things that state and territory governments should be doing, fitting in with the national stimulus and support mechanism. We announced a \$350 million stimulus package in South Australia, and that has been rolling out ever since.

We were the first state in the country to talk about stimulus, and I am very proud that cabinet moved very quickly to recognise our role in trying to preserve as many jobs as possible through this crisis. As you would be aware, sir, on 26 March we announced a further \$650 million jobs rescue package in South Australia. This was a range of initiatives including significant payroll tax and land tax relief, further cost-of-living concessions in South Australia, the waiving of liquor licensing fees in South Australia and two huge funds totalling \$550 million. There is still much work to be done. We are applying ourselves to this task every single day.

#### **CORONAVIRUS, EMPLOYMENT**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20):** My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier aware that government enterprises such as Adelaide Venue Management—with the Convention Centre and the Entertainment Centre—and the Adelaide Festival Centre are standing down workers?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:20):** Yes. My understanding is that there have been a number of people in casual roles who have lost their jobs. This is pretty similar to what is occurring right across industry in South Australia. The sectors that have been hardest hit include the meetings industry as well as hospitality, the arts, the music sector and, of course, restaurants and pubs. A lot of these businesses are absolutely on the front line with many other sectors as well.

The federal government has put forward different packages already. They have moved very quickly, first of all with the JobSeeker package, which would be available to those workers here in South Australia, and secondly the JobKeeper package, which would not be available to those state government casual workers. That work is going through the federal parliament at the moment. I don't know, as I haven't received an update, whether there were any amendments to the draft bills that we were, if you like, briefed on in national cabinet yesterday.

But again I go back to the fact that we are in a fortunate position in Australia to be able to support people and organisations, companies, through this particularly difficult period. We are not going to be in a position to, if you like, compensate every single person in the country, but what we are going to do is try to build this bridge to the other side of this disaster, preserving as many businesses as possible. I think the JobKeeper package is particularly clever, and that has been acknowledged by the trade union movement, because what it does is keep the individual employee linked to the employer.

You might ask: why do you want to do this? Some people cynically have said that we don't want to see line-ups out the front of Centrelink offices. What it is all about is being able to start up on the other side. It is keeping that, if you like, relationship going between the employee and the employer, and it is making sure that, on the other side, we are going to be able to stand up and recover faster than other countries around the world. I think it is a very good package. Obviously, we will wait to see what happens in the federal parliament later today. It is possible that that will pass today. If it does pass today, I think it will be an extraordinary moment for our nation.

**JOBKEEPER PAYMENT**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:23):** My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier concerned that up to 1,000 South Australians have been stood down by government enterprises and cannot access the JobKeeper payment?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:23):** I have, I thought, provided a pretty detailed explanation in my previous answer. There are a large number of people who are affected. Some will be eligible for the JobKeeper package; some will be eligible for the JobSeeker package.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Ms Cook interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** We are trying to preserve as many jobs as we possibly can, but let's be very clear.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I hear somebody saying, 'Well, stand them down.' I am not sure what the advantage of standing them down would actually be.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Ms Stinson:** You're standing them down and they can't get any relief.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Badcoe, I am not standing anyone down. Please do not interject. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Sir, I think you would be more than aware, and those of us who have been reading the media would be more than aware, that we are doing everything we can to keep as many people engaged as possible. In fact—

*Mr Brown interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Playford is called to order.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —we were the first state in the country to actually push ahead with a job stimulus \$350 million package not only to keep people employed but also, of course—

**Mr Brown:** What about your own employees?

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Playford is warned.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** They are clearly not interested, sir.

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** Your own employees in your own portfolios.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee is also warned.

*The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Premier, please do not respond to interjections.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Police is called to order. He has been doing it all day. The leader would like another question, and then one on my right.

**JOBKEEPER PAYMENT**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25):** My question is to the Premier again. Will the state government step in and provide any direct support to those workers

who have been stood down by his government who are not eligible for the JobKeeper allowance as the Premier responded in his previous answer?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:26):** Thank you very much, and I hope that the opposition can remain civil during my answer to this question, because we are in the middle—

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** You dilettante!

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee is warned.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —of a global pandemic, and I think there is a higher level of civility that is required when the government is providing answers to important questions.

As the leader points out, we do not have enough work in every single aspect of every single agency within the government. I think one of the examples that he has given is with regard to Adelaide Venue Management. I would like to commend the board and the chief executive there for working on programs to keep as many people employed in that organisation as possible. You would have seen, sir, in some of the media, which I think has been widely distributed, that Adelaide Venue Management skills are being applied to producing meals for many of the organisations in South Australia that have lost their volunteer workforce.

I think this is an excellent program, and I commend Adelaide Venue Management for doing that. They are looking at all sorts of ways that we can better utilise the skills that we have. I would point out that some of our staff who work in those government agencies will actually be capable of taking out the JobKeeper wage subsidy, and I will tell you the way that this works, although I am not aware that it has actually passed the federal parliament.

If somebody has been working in a casual environment for more than 12 months in a non-government role they will be eligible for this. They will be eligible for it once, and so many people who are working who are in roles and who may not have been there for 12 months, or who may be working for a government organisation, will also have a second casual role. This is quite commonplace.

In fact, when I have spoken to some restaurant owners who have been very concerned that they haven't been operating for 12 months, they have gone back and checked with their staff, and their staff have 12 months' casual employment in another entity, so they will qualify for it. I make the point that they qualify for it only once; so it is not as if somebody has four different casual jobs and they can get the \$1,500 per fortnight in each of those jobs.

Many people who have part-time casual employment will have another part-time casual employment which qualifies for this. The information that we have received from the commonwealth is that there are approximately six million people who could potentially qualify for this JobKeeper payment. We know that does not necessarily mean that every person will qualify for it. We need to wait to see what the final deal through the federal parliament actually is, but it is an excellent program. It is not fair to say that every person who has been on a casual employment basis in South Australia and who doesn't meet the strict requirements of it with one employer will not meet it with another employer.

### INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:28):** My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister update the house on how the government is assisting local businesses by fast-tracking infrastructure projects within the government's \$1 billion economic stimulus plan in response to coronavirus?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:29):** I would like to thank the member for Kavel for that question and note that his electorate has been a beneficiary of this program, of this government's commitment to help improve infrastructure around our state.

When the Premier made the call that we as a government were going to put together a stimulus package very early on in this piece—in fact, before any other jurisdiction in the country—we were keen to look for projects that enabled us to get work out the door very quickly, within a matter



of weeks, within a matter of months, so we set about designing a package of works that truncated a lot of things that can sometimes take capital construction projects time to be able to deliver.

We had to make sure that these were projects that didn't have long design time frames, long procurement time frames, land acquisition, community consultation, as well as other big bureaucratic time frames. Essentially, we designed a package of works that can get out of the ground fairly well straightaway. As part of that \$350 million package, there was \$120 million of road maintenance projects that this government is undertaking. Some 165 jobs are going to be created as a result of this package. It means that we can do more of the work that this government has been doing, and that is helping to fix roads across South Australia, especially in regional South Australia.

In the member for Kavel's electorate, in addition to the \$10-odd million worth of resurfacing work that is currently going on on the South Eastern Freeway towards Callington, there is actually now a further \$35 million to rehabilitate and resurface the South Eastern Freeway between the tollgate and Crafers. We are also undertaking a midlife replacement of the Heysen Tunnels, some \$15 million worth of work, the tender for which has actually already been released.

We've also got \$52 million for targeted regional road network repair and improvement along the Stuart Highway, the Yorke Highway, the Dukes and the Riddoch. Without reflecting upon members, I know that those members who are not with us today because of the restrictions on numbers in this place will be very keenly listening to this answer and wanting to know precisely when that work is going to happen in their electorates.

As part of our GlobeLink report there were identified a number of improvements that could be made for the north-south corridor, essentially a freight route that connects Truro with the upper section of the South Eastern Freeway. We are undertaking \$12 million worth of work, shoulder sealing and some bridge upgrades, to help improve that road to provide those bypass opportunities for heavy vehicles to go around Adelaide.

What we have also done is put out a \$6 million package of work to seal a 28-kilometre section, or thereabouts, of Adventure Way and Innamincka Airport with a capping solution that is something that has been trialled on an ongoing basis over a number of years in outback South Australia. In the member for Stuart's electorate, this is something that is extremely important. This capping solution is one that provides us the opportunity to be able to seal a road but do so with a cost structure that helps to provide most of the benefits of a fully formed sealed road at something like a quarter of the cost.

The great news about that is that we can help to reduce road maintenance requirements on that road and roads that we cap in that same solution across a regional road network. It means, for those days when it does rain—and I think we would like a few more of those days rather than less—when we do see flooding in the outback those rates that are capped can get opened and back underway more quickly. The tender for that project has also already been released.

We are getting on with the job of stimulating our economy, undertaking capital projects that are going to provide productivity improvements into the future and help to provide jobs now. That's precisely what we as a government have been doing and we will continue to do as part of our \$1 billion stimulus package.

#### **JOBSEEKER PAYMENT**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:33):** My question is to the Premier. For those state government enterprise employees who lose their job as a result of the current circumstances, who are not eligible for JobKeeper allowance, will the Premier advocate to the national cabinet that those people should be able to get access to the JobKeeper payment? With your leave and that of the house, I am happy to explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** I understand that the federal Treasurer has just explained to the commonwealth parliament that there is a provision within the proposed legislation around the JobKeeper payment that allows for changes to be made to accommodate circumstances that were not initially foreseen.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:34):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. I think he is right. I think in the draft bill there was some discretion provided to the Treasurer in the order of \$40 billion, which seemed to me to be an extraordinarily large sum of money, so he does have some discretion. That's certainly something I would be very happy to take up at the national cabinet.

As the leader would be aware, people in South Australia who do not qualify for the JobKeeper but have lost their job as a consequence of the coronavirus after 1 March this year do qualify for the JobSeeker payment. The JobSeeker is around double the previously named Newstart package, which I think also has had a change of name recently.

This is double the previously named Newstart package. It also had two other provisions which were announced by the federal government. The first of those was that there was, if you like, no asset threshold so that people of all different personal asset backgrounds could apply for that. Secondly, there was no 13-week delay in that money becoming available. There were two specific things as well as the doubling; that's the JobSeeker package. But back to the original question, yes, I am happy to work with my colleagues on the national cabinet to advocate for all and everything that we can get into South Australia to support our state through this particularly difficult period.

#### CORONAVIRUS, EMPLOYMENT

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:35):** This will be my last question on this subject to the Premier. Since those government enterprise employees are currently not eligible for the JobSeeker payment, notwithstanding the Premier's commitment to look—

**The Hon. S.S. Marshall:** JobKeeper.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Sorry, the JobKeeper payment—notwithstanding your commitment to look into that, will the Premier instruct those government-owned enterprises to not stand down workers in the interim so as to preserve their current incomes?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:36):** Well, no.

#### CORONAVIRUS, SCHOOLS

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:36):** My question is to the Premier. What financial support is the government providing to relief teachers who are unable to work due to the COVID-19 emergency?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:36):** I don't have that information but I am happy to get that information and come back to the house.

#### CORONAVIRUS

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:36):** My question is again to the Premier. What financial support is the state government providing to casual early childhood workers who were stood down from public childcare centres due to the downturn in numbers as a result of COVID-19?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:37):** Again, this is a detailed question. I am very happy to get the detail and come back. I don't want to in any way mislead the parliament, so I think it's fair that I just get a detailed briefing and come back to you directly. It wouldn't need to go back through the parliament. I will do that as soon as I can.

#### CORONAVIRUS

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:37):** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Is the minister's position of promoting national parks over the Easter long weekend in conflict with the state government's position of staying at home this Easter, staying at home these school holidays? With your leave and that of the house, sir, I can explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr BELL:** I have received email correspondence from a Dirk Verschure, who lives near Ewens Ponds near Mount Gambier. He is concerned that these ponds are open over this weekend

and he believes that snorkellers from Warrnambool and Clare are planning to come down to snorkel over the Easter break.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:37):** I thank the member for Mount Gambier for a very relevant question and a topic that is very worthwhile to explore in the house today and provide some information. The state government, with the particular advice from Associate Professor Nicola Spurrier, has made a very clear decision to leave national parks, conservation parks, recreation parks and the various components of our reserve system open for people to be able to access during this particularly challenging time. That is because we believe that people getting out into the great outdoors, being able to connect with nature and immerse themselves in fresh air, is particularly important for people's wellbeing at this difficult time.

So, where possible, people can undertake this activity in a sensible way by practising social distancing and undertaking the outdoor activities within the guidelines and advice being put forward by the experts in this state, which have been clearly communicated into the public domain by the Chief Public Health Officer, by the state government and the various networks. We feel confident that South Australians will do the right thing, that they will connect with nature in a responsible way, that they will practise social distancing and that, by enabling our parks to remain open, we will be able to enhance the overall wellbeing of South Australians rather than diminish it.

The Premier mentioned in his answer earlier that he has great confidence in South Australians doing the right thing, whether that be following advice not to travel too far from home and enter the country or go in larger numbers to national parks. One of the things we have made very clear when we have been communicating that our national parks remain open is to please go to a national park that is close to home.

The member for Mount Gambier mentioned that he had some concerning information that a constituent believes people are going to travel further afield to visit the Piccaninnie Ponds. That is against state government advice, not just around national parks but beyond that—around non-essential travelling extensively across the state. Our message about national park visitation is very clear: visit a local park.

What does 'local' mean? We have been saying publicly that 'local' is a comfortable walk from home, around a 10-minute drive or a comfortable half-hour bike ride. We are blessed with so many parks in South Australia, 21 per cent of our state is within our reserve system and our city is bounded by areas of open space, so the vast majority of South Australians we believe will be able to access that open space in a responsible way in a relatively short drive or a comfortable walk.

In my own electorate, that would be Hallett Cove Conservation Park, Marino Conservation Park, O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park. I had a chat with the member for Schubert earlier. He is planning on the weekend to take his daughters for a walk in Kaiserstuhl Conservation Park, which is just a short drive from his home. There are lots and lots of opportunities for people to do this. We have, however, taken precautions.

There will be signage in place reminding people of social distancing, particularly in our high visitation parks. I understand that four echidnas apart is the recommended distance, and of course we have also closed campgrounds in conservation and national parks to prevent congregation.

#### **CORONAVIRUS, NURSE EMPLOYMENT**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurana) (14:42):** My question is to the Premier. What support is the state government providing public hospital casual nurses who have had no shifts and pay and who are not entitled to receive the federal government's JobKeeper allowance?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:42):** Can you repeat the very first part of that.

**Mr PICTON:** Yes, the question, again, is to the Premier. What support is the state government providing public hospital casual nurses who have been given no shifts and no pay and are not entitled to receive the federal government's JobKeeper allowance?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I am very happy to get a detailed answer and come back. I know that many of our LHNs and the Women's and Children's Health Network are looking at the

moment at how we upskill our nursing capability in particular at the moment, so you are taking nurses with a certain level of expertise and making sure that we can use this period of time to create a different level of capacity for ICU and critical care beds.

*Mr Picton interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** We announced earlier this week I think 80 or 90 just at the Women's and Children's Hospital alone. I am obviously aware that we need to keep all our nursing capability in place during this period. It's one of the reasons why we entered into a new national partnership agreement with the federal government—to try to keep as much capacity in the private sector available for the peak of the coronavirus here in Australia.

It is fair to say, and we realise this, that there are some very harsh consequences of putting a ban on non-urgent elective surgery in Australia. This has particularly hit casual nurses in the public and private sector, as well as the entire private sector in South Australia. Many of them were facing almost immediate ruin, with essentially the vast majority of their work banned almost overnight.

This decision was not, of course, a decision that was taken lightly because we understood the consequences. We understood the consequences were going to be particularly harsh on a sector that we need to be working with us at the moment, but it was a necessary decision to be made because we need to preserve that PPE. If we go back to what we are trying to do at this part as we prepare for the peak, we are trying to put in as much capacity as we possibly can but also preserve as much of the PPE as we possibly can so that we can be ready to respond when that peak hits.

There is more and more PPE that is coming in. I think I heard the Prime Minister saying that in the last week there were 30,000 items of PPE, in particular the two types of masks that we are using that have come into Australia—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Million. Sorry, did I say 'thousand'? I apologise.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Hurtle Vale!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** The member for Hurtle Vale seems to know more than the Prime Minister.

### SKILLS TRAINING

**Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:45):** My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is supporting South Australia's skills training sector in response to COVID-19?

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (14:45):** I thank the member for Colton for his question. His electorate has been affected enormously by COVID-19. The hospitality industry that was booming at Henley Square and other centres around the seat of Colton have been affected with closures as part of the protective processes that have been put in place for the people of South Australia against the virus. Of course, that has had an impact on the training sector because many of those businesses were training apprentices. They were training trainees in the hospitality sector: cookery, front of house and other areas in that sector.

This was very concerning for the government. We have learnt a lot about what industry needs since we have come to office because we have established eight industry skills councils, so we have a direct line of communication with industry, almost right down to the factory floor, right down to the kitchen bench, about what is going on in industry and what it is that they need and what are the barriers for their businesses to grow.

Of course, skills are a major barrier and we have been very successful with the changes that we have made, introducing Skilling South Australia into South Australia with a \$200 million commitment with the federal and state governments to deliver more skills funding and more skills in South Australia. The last NCVET figures that were released demonstrated a 20.6 per cent growth in

the number of commencements for the September quarter last year compared with 12 months earlier. That is after we have had a continual decline in commencements for apprenticeships under the previous government.

We are very pleased with the actions that we have taken so far to grow the skills opportunities for South Australians. The COVID-19 pandemic has set up new challenges, so we announced a \$16 million package for non-government registered training organisations so they can continue to offer training for those apprentices who may not be engaged in the sector currently and also to make sure they don't lose their skill base, their lecturers, their trainers, for when the recovery starts to happen towards the end of the year.

We have worked with the non-government sector for the last two years to increase their delivery of skills training by 20 per cent. We don't want that to disappear. We are supporting the sector. The government's initiative will support the delivery of skills to continue to almost 48,000 students across the state, as well as new students. These are opportunities for students who want to move into some of those areas that are still in demand: aged care, disability care, what we describe as the care sector.

Over the next five years, we have nearly 5,000 vacancies in that space and there are vacancies right there, right now in that area. Food production is another area of opportunity for people to move into. There are job vacancies right through regional South Australia, in particular. I have been advised that for every job vacancy that is advertised in regional South Australia, 50 per cent of them remain unfilled, so there are skills needs there that we need to deliver on. This package will help us to keep those trainers in work and ready for that uptake.

#### **CORONAVIRUS, NURSE EMPLOYMENT**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:50):** My question is to the Premier. How many public hospital casual nurses are currently left without work and pay due to the cancellation of elective surgery? With your leave and that of the house, sir, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr PICTON:** Yesterday, I asked the Premier exactly the same question and he was unable to answer and said he will be checking the figures. Every day, we are being informed of more nurses who are left in this position, unable to pay their bills.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:50):** I haven't had an answer back on this and I just ask for the member's patience on this issue. As you would be aware, we are in the midst of a global pandemic at the moment and so obviously our focus at the moment is very much on implementing our plan. I apologise that there hasn't been an answer in the last 24 hours, but we will seek to get that. It doesn't need to go through the normal parliamentary process and we will provide it to the member directly as soon as it's available.

#### **TAXI INDUSTRY**

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (14:51):** My question is to the Premier. What support will the government provide to the access taxi industry, which is on the brink of collapse because of the COVID-19 pandemic?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:51):** I thank the member for Hurtle Vale for her question and do note that the taxi industry more generally has experienced huge difficulty at this time. We are seeing reports now of some 60 to 70 per cent reduction in the number of trips that are being undertaken by our point-to-point transport industry. Off the top of my head, I think about 102 out of the 1,137 registered taxis in South Australia are access cabs. They have a very specific role to do. Given that access cab work is centred around the elderly, people with severe disabilities and people who are potentially part of a more at-risk cohort from serious ramifications from contracting the coronavirus, we have seen a reduction in the number of people choosing to use that service.

We are and have been working with various players within the taxi industry, the Taxi Council as well as the central booking services and Suburban Taxis, the ones that have the CBS contract at the moment for access cabs. We have been working with them to look at what package would be

appropriate. Again, as the Premier has outlined in numerous answers to the house, what we are seeking to do is work with and complement the measures that the federal government has put in place, as opposed to compete with them.

The taxi industry, for everybody listening at home, is quite a complicated industry in the sense that there are central booking services, there are operators, there are plate owners and there are drivers, and all those people are not actually the same person. So we have been looking at what measures we can put in place to help the sector more generally. What I would say is that, again, given the distinction between the operators and the drivers themselves, there will be different answers for different people within that industry. Drivers themselves who are out of work will be able to get access to those various JobKeeper and JobSeeker payments from the federal government provided they meet the criteria, but we in the state government are looking at what we can do from an operator level.

The other thing I would say, though, is that we are very keen to make sure that in this period of hibernation we actually see market forces work as they should. At the moment, we have 1,100 taxis. At last count, I saw that we had around 300-odd of those taxis deregister. Essentially, what that means is, for the remaining taxis, there is more work to go around. That needs to happen and it needs to happen naturally. I don't think it is something that the government can dictate, who can and can't operate a taxi. Again, given that there is this very strong safety net that after today will be in place from the federal government, there will be an opportunity to make sure that those arrangements are in place for those people.

I would sound a word of caution, though, in relation to access cabs in that we know that we are dealing with a global pandemic. It has hit people hard, but the reports that I have had from yesterday and today are that there were as few as 17 access cabs out there—and as I understand from this morning, potentially as few as two—actually providing services to the community, and that may actually be as a result of some quasi-industrial action being undertaken by the various parts of the access cab industry itself.

I know that this time is difficult. The government is very close to finalising a package to help people, but I would caution anybody who tries to use this global pandemic as a way to undertake industrial action because it will put at risk vulnerable members of our community and those people who need access cabs to be able to get to and from medical appointments to make sure that they can look after their own circumstances.

#### TAXI INDUSTRY

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (14:55):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier explain how people living with disability will be able to get to and from urgent appointments and buy necessities if the access cab industry no longer operates?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:55):** Apart from the fact that that question is extremely hypothetical in its construction, I won't raise a point of order—

**The SPEAKER:** You are seeking to answer it.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** I will seek to answer it. Can I say that there is work there for access cab drivers and the arrangements in relation to them being operated have not changed. The subsidies in relation to the South Australian Taxi Subsidy Scheme are there and still in place, providing that 50 per cent to 75 per cent subsidy. Again, there are also the NDIS support packages that are also in place for those up to 5,000-odd people who have transitioned across to the NDIS.

Those arrangements and that cost structure have not changed. I would accept that there is a lowering in the level of demand and so we don't necessarily need all hundred-odd access cabs on the road at any one time. What is expected—when we went out to tender and Suburban Taxis took on the gig—and is in fact actually part of the responsibility of that contract is that there are access cabs available so that people can undertake, as the member points out, those very much-needed trips, whether that be to the supermarket to get their groceries or whether it be to get to their medical appointment. That service should still be available and the circumstances of providing that service have not changed.

Access cabs will have to operate and continue into the future. The government is looking at this package to help make sure that we do our bit in helping this entire industry be able to partially hibernate through this period. Again, the government has very strong processes in place to ensure that access cabs continue to operate, and those arrangements have not changed. I would say again that I think it would be extremely disappointing if this was used as an opportunity to try to air pre-existing industrial grievances using this global pandemic as an excuse to bring it to the fore.

### CORONAVIRUS

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (14:57):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier advise regarding a person who has been working in a particular industry for over 2½ years and continues to be there and the only change is a change of ownership of that same industry. With your leave, Mr Speaker, and that of the house, I will further explain.

Leave granted

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** People working in a facility at Crystal Brook have been working in excess of two to three years. During this time, the only change is that a new owner has taken over that industry in the last eight months. These people who are working in that industry, the previous owner and the current owner have been advised they don't qualify for any JobSeeker—

**Mr Bell:** JobKeeper.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** Sorry, JobKeeper.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:58):** The member is right: they would qualify for the JobSeeker but potentially not the JobKeeper. I am happy to take up that specific issue, but they would also have to satisfy the requirement, as everybody needs to, that they have to be able to demonstrate that the business was affected by more than 30 per cent since the coronavirus came into play.

As I have stated on many occasions, this is not going to satisfy every business or every scenario. I don't think there is a person in Australia who isn't affected by this, really, and the vast majority affected adversely. This JobKeeper, to the best of my knowledge, is only available for businesses that turn over less than \$1 billion if there has been a 30 per cent reduction. If they are over \$1 billion, it has to be a 50 per cent reduction. My office can take those details and I will be happy to follow that up for the member.

### RESOURCES SECTOR

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:59):** My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister update the house on what the Marshall Liberal government is doing to assist the resources sector during the COVID-19 crisis?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:59):** This is a very important question from the member for Flinders, who I know has a very objective view with regard to the resources industry, which I respect enormously. The resources industry is incredibly important to our state. We have about 22,000 South Australians employed in the resources sector. It accounts for 50 per cent of our exports and \$6.9 billion of value in our economy, so it is an incredibly important sector.

It also contributes royalties—about \$300 million of royalties—and those royalties to the South Australian government are then used to contribute funding to schools, roads, nurses, police officers, disability services, and a wide range of other things. So there are a lot of reasons why we want the resources industry to stay profitable, stay operating and stay as much untouched by this virus as it possibly can be.

We are supporting the resources industry in many ways, particularly with regard to fly-in fly-out and drive-in drive-out workers crossing borders. We have had tremendous cooperation between the government, industry bodies, regulatory bodies, other states and the companies themselves with regard to reducing the number of employees they need to travel across states. They have been incredibly responsible about that. We see the resources industry as an essential one. We

see the workers within that industry, which the individual companies identify as essential, as being very important.

We are doing everything we can to work with them in that way, including, for example, looking at the Moomba Cooper Basin area and saying that, practically, there is no need to look in that part of the world at a hard South Australian Queensland-type border, which workers cross over every day quite often in the course of their work. If we look at that region, the Queensland government has been very good in that regard.

In terms of more specific support, of course many companies will gain the benefit of the payroll tax exemption which we have put in place for companies with a payroll of below \$4 million per year and which covers many companies. We are not thinking about the BHPs, the OZs, the Santos and the Beaches, but we are thinking about the lower end of the industry and particularly the METS sector, as the mining equipment, technology and services sector is very important. There are lots of small companies there.

We have also offered deferral for exploration companies on their fees to the government—six months deferral—and also a deferral on some of the work and expenditure obligations they have to the state government. We have also done similarly in the petroleum industry with regard to deferral of fees and providing an enormous amount of flexibility for those companies so that they have committed work and expenditure programs in place to say, 'Look, we understand that, quite likely, you will not be able to deliver all of this, so we will help you.'

The reason we are doing this is that we want these companies to stay afloat. We want these companies to be there when we come out the other end of this virus. This is very important because these are the companies—small, medium and large—in the resources sector that will be able to give our economy and our South Australians in work an enormous boost coming out the other end. The more we can do to support these companies through this difficult time, the more they will contribute back to the South Australian economy.

The resources industry has been critical for 150 years in South Australia, and it is also one of the industries that can give us the greatest growth in our gross state product in years to come, particularly soon after the coronavirus pandemic passes us.

#### *Grievance Debate*

#### **CORONAVIRUS**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:04):** I thank the chamber for the opportunity to make some remarks in light of the COVID-19 crisis that our state, our country and indeed our planet are experiencing. I would like to start by putting my thanks on the record on behalf of the South Australian Parliamentary Labor Party, and then I will seek to make an important point.

I would like to start by thanking the people of our great state. We have seen an extraordinary response from people in South Australia to these events. The level of compliance that we have seen South Australians undertake with all the substantial restrictions that have necessarily been placed upon our society has been extraordinary. Around the world, we have seen signs of a lack of civility. We have seen desperation lend itself to acts of selfishness on the part of some people, but here at home those examples are in the absolute minority.

I think the majority of South Australians have shown a willingness to comply in the pursuit of doing the right thing and simultaneously shown extraordinary acts of generosity to their community more broadly. It is very tough. We are asking humans in South Australia to give up all the things that make them human. Social interaction is part of what makes us different. For many people, the ability to work very much defines their own character, and so many South Australians have necessarily been deprived of that at the moment. This is tough.

We are all finding some of the sacrifices that we have to make rather difficult. I miss seeing mum and dad. I miss seeing mates. I miss footy like you would not believe. My daughter has her fifth birthday tomorrow, and it is going to be really different. She is going to miss out on the party that she was really looking forward to. This has been experienced right throughout the land, and people are making those sacrifices willingly, gladly, in the knowledge that they are literally saving other people's



lives. It is quite humbling to witness, and I want to put on the record my thanks to South Australians for making their contribution to this effort.

Secondly, I want to thank all the people in South Australia who remain at work trying to deliver for their communities during this time of need. I am talking about everybody who is doing that, starting from the Premier and everyone throughout the government, who are in significant positions of responsibility during extraordinary times. I thank them for their hard work. I thank all those front-line public servants who are doing the day-to-day work of servicing our community, whether they be nurses, whether they be doctors, whether they be hospital cleaners, whether they be people in public transport or whether they be teachers still going along to school. We put on the record our thanks to them.

I thank those people in the private sector as well, retail workers working at the front line in the service of others along with a whole range of other industries. These people deserve our thanks and our commendation. I think it demonstrates an important point about the work that we all do in this place. For as long as we expect our nurses, our doctors, our teachers and our retail workers to be at work, I think it is reasonable that they expect us to be at work too. The way that work represents itself most importantly is right here in the parliament of this state.

Each of us, all 47 people in this chamber, have been elected to be the leaders of our own communities, whether it be in Croydon, Kangaroo Island, Mount Gambier, the Riverland or the eastern suburbs. We have all been elected as leaders of our communities. Now is our opportunity to show leadership to the community generally by giving them a voice by the decisions that are made right here in this place. That is why the Westminster system has always sat in times of peril—World War I, World War II. This global pandemic, in our view, should be no exception.

We have been elected to lead. Allow us to do exactly that by the parliament performing its critical and important functions. The Westminster system is one of the greatest inventions in human history. It can perform its role now like never before, whether it be through the act of question time, whether it be through the act of dealing with legislation or whether it be through the act of asking questions and representing our community as only we can. Allow this parliament's function to continue throughout this crisis so we can represent the very best of what democracy can be.

#### CHAFFEY ELECTORATE

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:09):** I, too, rise to make a plea to the public of South Australia and those visitors who would normally travel to the great River Murray, one of the great destinations. I am sure that many people in this chamber alone have at some point in time holidayed or travelled up to the River Murray in one way, shape or form for a great experience, whether that is to the river, to Lake Bonney, to some of the beautiful pristine environment, or to visit some of the fantastic wetlands. These are some of the greatest experiences in our lifetime, particularly of our childhood.

However, I would like to express my concern as the member for Chaffey to those people who are intending to make their way to the Riverland over the Easter break and over the school holidays: please stay home. Reconsider your plans. Change your plans and make sure that, if you are intending to take a break, please take it at home with your family. It is a time we have never seen before. It is a precedent that very few of us have ever seen in our lifetime.

We talk about the world wars and how very different the world wars were from what we are experiencing today. Back then, people went offshore, they went away from their homes and they went to other countries to represent their country and fight for peace. They fought for various different reasons, but here we have the COVID-19 virus at our front door. We have the COVID-19 experience in every way, shape or form in terms of our social activities and our way of life, and that is why the plea to every visitor who is considering going out into the regions of South Australia is: please delay your travel plans, delay your holiday.

Those beautiful regions will be there for another day. They will be there for your family to experience and to enjoy to make those life-lasting memories of going to some of our beautiful landscapes and our beautiful watercourses, and the Riverland is no exception. I have seen a number of people already show contempt for the direction. They have come up a week early, two weeks

early. They have set up camps. They have set up their caravans. They have set up their facilities like they are going to stay there for a month.

What really worries me is that the direction from the senior public health officers, from our State Coordinator, from our Premier, from all the state's leaders, and this chamber is no exception, is there for the public safety of South Australia, and that public safety call is for every person to stay at home. Enjoy an experience with your family at home to reduce the risk of contamination, to reduce the risk of that virus impacting on someone else's life—someone close to you, someone far away.

We have seen what contamination can mean for those people who are independent of a public space, whether it has been walking into a common place—a cellar door, a shop, a workplace—or into a place to which people have been who have travelled from overseas or interstate, and the impact it is having on those lives, those numbers of people who have tested positive to COVID-19, those people who have become very sick and who are now relying very heavily on our public health system.

To those people who have been impacted and who have lost their lives, my condolences to those families, but it is a reflection of why there is an ask for people to stay at home over this holiday period. I would say that those people who have planned to come up to the river corridor, those people who have set up in some of the most pristine beautiful places on earth: please reconsider and stay at home.

To the many, many people who have contacted me, the constituents of Chaffey, I have listened and I am acting. I have put significant effort into public messaging, as I am doing right now in the South Australian parliament, and the message is very, very loud and clear. The Premier, the State Coordinator and the senior health officers have given these directions, these recommendations, for a very clear purpose—that is, to save lives and to save South Australia from being further contaminated by COVID-19.

### **NURSES AND MIDWIVES**

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (15:14):** As we know, during this crisis all work is essential. We on this side of the house are here every day for all workers in all roles in this state, but today I am here for my nursing and midwifery family, particularly for the casual nurses and midwives who, day to day, hold up the hospital system. In one hospital alone, we are losing 250 casual nurses from the workforce on any given day. They are not getting any shifts. Some of them have not been given shifts for three or four weeks.

Nurses are not wealthy people. Nurses are hardworking. Midwives are multiskilled and multitalented. For many of the people in the casual pool across our hospital system—and we are talking Flinders Medical Centre, the Women's and Children's, The Queen Elizabeth, the Royal Adelaide, the Lyell McEwin, Modbury, all the country hospitals—these nurses and midwives do not have just one certificate: they have many. They can work in intensive care, high dependency, in the nursery looking after babies. These are nurses who have held our hands, looked after us and been there for us when we have needed them. They have been at the beck and call of the public and the private system for decades, and now they need us.

I have been a nurse myself for nearly 35 years. I have gone from working in the most respected profession to being a politician. I often joke about that, but it puts me in an absolutely amazing position where I can speak up for my nursing colleagues I have worked with over decades. I have been absolutely swamped by letters, emails, messages, phone calls and cries for help from some of the hardest working and most dedicated staff in our hospital system over the past few weeks. I have to tell you, I am absolutely gutted. I have no answers for them.

We have tried to get answers in here from the Premier. I raised this in a speech yesterday. I talked about nurses—nurses who were not able to feed their children, nurses in the private sector, nurses in the public sector. Some of them are single parents, some of them have children with special needs, and they cannot work full time; they need to work casual hours. These nurses and midwives go on the casual roster and therefore do not have to work over rotating shifts seven days a week. They can set their roster. They are at the beck and call of others. They will pick up extra shifts. They will cut their shifts short if need be. They are very, very flexible.

I worked as a hospital coordinator for nearly 20 years. I know how these people work. They are the most incredible staff, and we cannot lose them. When I talked about them yesterday, I talked about public nurses. Later on in the day, the Attorney-General actually verbally me in the committee stage of the bill and said that it was private hospital nurses that I was talking about. It was not: it was public sector nurses. I have checked *Hansard*. These are the nurses who are going without work, and their children will go without food if they do not get work, so they need to be utilised.

These people have the skills to support our community. They have the skills to get out there and educate and look after the people in the community who are confused about COVID-19 and frightened. We can invest in our talented nurses and our workforce in order to educate the community and put out the best ever grassroots public health campaign using telephones. We know how effective telephone calls are. I had a letter sent to me today, and I would just like to read to you a few bits out of it because it sums up probably dozens and dozens of messages that I have received. This is from an RN in the casual pool. She states:

I am trying to highlight the current plight of casual nurses in the employ of SA Health! We seek someone who can highlight this publicly on our behalf...

I would like to point out to both the public and government the financial plight that myself and many of my friends and colleagues are facing. We are Nurses who are employed by SA Health on casual contracts, which have until now filled a large gap in the hospital system. Most of us are highly educated, and knowledgeable nurses who can cope in any situation (we work across all areas of the hospital), but we are currently experiencing unprecedented numbers of casual shifts. [We have not worked for weeks.]

She goes on to explain that she understands why elective surgery has been cancelled. These people are educated. These are the ones who are informing the people who are informing the people who are informing us. They need to work. These people find it distressing and insulting that they now hear that you are recruiting.

This government, this minister and the Premier are talking about recruiting and upskilling nurses. There are hundreds of them. They are already there. They have been recruited. They are upskilled, they are amazing and they are wonderful. They hold our hands, they cry with us, now they need us. The government has to listen, and we have to retain them. They cannot get the JobKeeper allowance. They are public sector nurses. We have to fight for them.

## CORONAVIRUS

**Dr HARVEY (Newland) (15:19):** As we speak, there is an army of researchers around the globe, including right here in Australia and South Australia, working hard to find new ways to treat and prevent COVID-19. The virus responsible for COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, is almost certainly zoonotic, with most evidence thus far pointing to its origin in a species of bat that then found its way to humans via a kind of anteater, the pangolin.

The COVID-19 pandemic is the third outbreak of a coronavirus in the last 20 years. In the early 2000s, there was the SARS outbreak and, in 2012, MERS came about. In fact, both of these had significantly higher mortality rates than COVID-19 but were much more easily contained and less efficient at transmission, thus avoiding pandemics. What makes COVID-19 of such great concern is that, as the virus has not been seen before by the human immune system, there is no immunity in the community and thus the virus spreads with ease.

While 80 per cent of people only have mild symptoms, the ease with which this virus can spread throughout the community is of significant concern for those likely to experience severe disease. Moreover, given that this virus is novel, there are no known antiviral treatments or vaccines. In fact, at present, the only known protection against COVID-19 is social distancing and the control measures that support it, which is why what we are all doing right now is so important because for now this is all that there is.

Just as an aside, given that we are dealing with an infectious disease for which there is no vaccine, for all the anti-vaxers out there, this is what your world would look like all the time. Just as an example, as a point of comparison, it is estimated that on average the number of people an individual with COVID-19 will transmit the virus to—and these are best guess numbers at the moment—is between two and 3.5 people. Compare this to the vaccine-preventable measles where

an infected individual will on average transmit the virus to another 12 to 18 people. In light of what we are facing now, imagine that world.

But while we are all doing our best to slow the spread of COVID-19, to push the peak of cases in South Australia as far into the future as possible, the army of researchers I alluded to earlier is working hard to find new measures to combat the virus on a number of fronts. I would like to highlight a few examples happening in South Australia.

Just yesterday we heard about a local coordinated research effort, funded by the Hospital Research Foundation and the Women's and Children's Hospital Foundation, which is bringing together virologists, immunologists, clinicians and health workers from the University of Adelaide and our hospitals. This effort, led by Dr Branka Grubor-Bauk, Professor Simon Barry, Associate Professor Michael Beard, Professor Guy Maddern and Jessica Reid, is working hard to understand why some people suffer more severe disease than others. This work will be important for understanding the immune response to the virus that will inform the global effort to develop novel drug treatments and a vaccine.

The South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, led by Professor Steve Wesselingh, hosts a wide range of COVID-19 projects, including:

- work on understanding the early stages of infection and how this might impact transmission and the epidemiology of the virus;
- work that seeks to help further inform our hospitals' preparedness for elderly COVID-19 patients;
- a compound that may help block the intracellular replication of the virus in human cells;
- work to help inform the broader public health response; and
- evidence-based mental health training during these challenging times.

I would like to thank Professor Caroline Miller, Associate Professor Maria Inacio, Professor Chris Proud, Dr Kirk Jensen, Dr Johan Verjans, Joep Van Agteren and their teams for their work.

The search for a vaccine is currently underway at Flinders University as part of a project, led by Professor Nikolai Petrovsky, who has developed a model using artificial intelligence to predict what a successful vaccine candidate might look like—a technique used successfully in the past to design a vaccine against swine flu. This work, based on the previous experience with SARS, is looking to interfere with the interaction between the virus's spike protein and the human ACE receptor.

This is only a glimpse of what is happening here in South Australia, let alone the world, but what I want to do is acknowledge and thank the tireless efforts of all researchers around the world. These men and women offer hope during these difficult times that we will get through this crisis, save lives and consign COVID-19 to the annals of history.

### **SPRINGBANK SECONDARY COLLEGE**

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (15:24):** I rise to raise the concerns of my community regarding the future of Springbank Secondary College. Only a few weeks ago, the government told us they want to examine the closure of the school, and I think it is pretty obvious that they do not want to just examine the closure: they want to actually close the school. This news came as a huge shock. It was very sudden information for the school community, and certainly the impacts of it are still sinking in.

This government said that there would be an independent review that would take three months. We will see in time how independent that review is. My community—including students, parents at the school, teachers, community leaders, including the entire Mitcham council—is concerned now that this three-month review cannot and should not happen in the current climate that we face, dealing with the coronavirus. These groups and individuals are calling for this process to be entirely cancelled because of course they would like to see the school remain open. Failing that, they would like this government to suspend the process until the coronavirus pandemic is consigned to history.

Clearly, the priorities of families have changed, and so they should in the midst of what we are dealing with right now. A lot of people in our community are dealing with employment issues having lost their jobs. They are dealing with how they are going to get an income and look after their families. They are dealing with homeschooling. For the first time, many are having to learn how to be teachers and teach their own children at home and the difficulty that comes with that.

For many parents who have children at Springbank Secondary College, their children often are from the disability unit or are experiencing autism and that really adds to the difficulty of homeschooling, which is making life very difficult for many families. Families are also concerned and prioritising their health and are removed and isolated from family members who might ordinarily provide support.

The ability for our community to be informed about this consultation process and actively engage in it is also remarkably diminished through the crisis with the coronavirus. Unley High School closed several weeks ago after the two outbreaks. Families are not at school at either Springbank Secondary College or Unley High and have more limited means of finding out what is going on with a review. They certainly cannot converse with each other or gather together to share experiences and even to plan how they are going to express themselves through this process.

The community has also raised with me the very real question about whether the planned expansion of Unley High School to accommodate some 170 new students from Springbank is going to be achieved and whether that work is going to be completed in time to accommodate those additional students. Many parents have also raised with me questions about what schooling will even look like post COVID-19.

Those people who are part of the Friends of Springbank Secondary College, the Save Springbank campaign, the Mitcham council and indeed those on our side, are actively advocating for the Springbank Secondary College to remain open, for a shared school zone to be introduced giving parents choice about where they send their students and, also, for the \$10 million—which was invested under the previous Labor government—to be delivered at that school.

Ultimately, those groups would want to see the government abandon this three-month review altogether and keep the school open and operating. However, if the government do not want to do that then they should at least have the good sense to delay the review program. We have seen expressions of support from the member for Elder and from the Minister for Education for this school over the last two years, particularly praising the significant change in progress of this school two years into a five-year transformation plan. But, of course, those words ring pretty hollow right now when the plan is to shut the school entirely.

Even if the government is determined to close the school, as I am certain it is, surely a genuine consultation process is needed. There is a great deal of scepticism that this government does not want a genuine and rigorous process. The community will perceive the outcomes as predetermined and feel their views were not genuinely considered and hiding under a pandemic is a low act, a blatant attempt to avoid scrutiny, and I would urge the government to reassess what it is doing in relation to Springbank Secondary College and have an open and genuine consultation process.

### **BALAKLAVA HOSPITAL**

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:29):** Today, I would like to talk about the Balaklava hospital operating theatre uncertainty. Some months ago, the operating theatre of Balaklava hospital was suspended pending a review on the condition and operating future of this facility. This facility has been used for many years and is operated by highly qualified nurses, anaesthetists and doctors.

This move has caused several cancellations of procedures by visiting specialists and caused many procedures that could have been performed at Balaklava hospital to be transferred to Clare Hospital and, in some cases, to Gawler and other metropolitan hospitals. Regional hospitals, and in particular operating theatres, are a very important part of the community and also the smaller communities surrounding Balaklava. We have small communities like Owen, Hamley Bridge and smaller areas where there is no doctor but there are many aged-care facilities.

I have had a meeting with the chair of the newly established local health board to place my concerns directly to the chair of the board. It is very frustrating because as the local member I am not entitled to or allowed to attend any of these newly established regional local health board meetings. I have written a letter to the minister asking why this is not able to be facilitated.

At this stage, the review of this operating theatre has not been completed, nor has the review been published. As we can all appreciate, the local community has been very concerned about the future direction that SA Health has taken and is prepared to take with this facility. To the Balaklava community's credit, they organised a petition to be circulated, and it was circulated between 5 March and 20 March this year. The COVID-19 issue has curtailed the time available.

However, to the credit of the community, and also Geoff and Lyn, the organisers, they obtained over 935 signatures requesting that the Minister for Health and Wellbeing cease this review and have an urgent review of the facility undertaken. Unfortunately, this petition, which I picked up at the weekend, was not formatted in the correct wording and could not be presented directly to the Parliament of South Australia. In their haste, there was no communication between my office and the community to be able to get the correct wording.

As a result, I have written to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing and received the communication advice that he is very aware of the community's feelings. The petition has now been delivered to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, and to ensure that the petition gets the attention of the minister I have also had direct discussions with the minister's department to explain why we need to go through this procedure, not being able to present it directly to the Parliament of South Australia.

I would sincerely hope that the minister hears the concerns of the community of Balaklava and ensures that the operating theatre at Balaklava hospital is retained and continues to facilitate procedures that can be performed at the hospital. Wakefield Regional Council, the local doctors and the general community are combined in their efforts to get specialists to visit and perform procedures at Balaklava and for the locals not to have to travel long distances to have these issues attended to. As I mentioned to the chair of the local health board, there are many community people who do not have a motor vehicle or cannot drive to other locations to have their procedures attended to.

The comment was made that we have volunteers out there in regard to ambulance and other organisations. However, due to the strict and extra requirements for volunteers of SA Ambulance, the number of volunteers in the Balaklava area has dwindled from 22 to eight, creating a lot of issues and uncertainty. There is also a very large strain on existing volunteers to transport these people, as I said earlier, and we need to look at ways to encourage people to volunteer their time at times suitable to them and not be dictated by an eight-hour shift.

I ask that before the minister moves forward with any review of the Balaklava theatre he makes certain he has public consultation and open discussion about retaining the facility in its current form.

#### *Personal Explanation*

#### **CORONAVIRUS**

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:34):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Today, during the grievance debate the member for Hurtle Vale claimed that during the course of debate yesterday I had verballled her and that, furthermore, I should check *Hansard* in respect of her contribution to that debate in which she referred to nurses and, if I can paraphrase, their worth and of course the loss of employment they were facing during COVID-19.

Firstly, I bring to the attention of the house that during the course of the debate—and it is recorded at page 704 of *Hansard*—I responded to the member for Hurtle Vale, and I will try as quickly as possible to read this:

...there were a couple of matters raised which I think I could easily respond to. One was made by the member for Hurtle Vale in relation to employment opportunities for casual nurses, some of whom were her friends, who are employed in the private hospital sector...

Then it notes Mr Picton interjecting as usual. I go on to say:

Well, no. This is in relation to her contribution, thank you member for Kaurna. In her contribution, she was talking about those who were in the private sector who were immediately vulnerable income-wise because they had lost shifts, and that is fine. I just remind her that the Premier has indicated...

I go on to outline initiatives that enable them to seek reapplication for employment, some job hub opportunities at the national level and the like. Members can read that for themselves, rather than me reading it back completely.

It is correct to say that, in the reference to nurses in the context of the private sector only, the member for Hurtle Vale had in fact identified those nurses undertaking elective surgery without identifying whether they were in the private or public sector, but I categorically reject any assertion that I had verbalised her in a response. If she takes offence at it in any way, I want to reassure her that my objective was to make sure that she be informed as much as she could as to the information I had available as to what might be available that could assist her friends and those who were in that sector.

### *Bills*

## **FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:37):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Freedom of Information Act 1991. Read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:38):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce the Freedom of Information (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2020. This bill makes a raft of amendments to the Freedom of Information Act 1991 to update it in line with legislative developments interstate and changes in technology.

Representative democratic government is supported and enhanced by ensuring that proper public scrutiny of government activity occurs. Documents and information held by government agencies are a public resource. Consistent with these principles, members of the public should have a presumptive right to access such information, subject only to such restrictions that are consistent with the public interest and the preservation of personal privacy.

Further to this, our government, the Marshall government, took a strong set of policies to the 2018 state election, prioritising open and accountable government and transparency. This is also reflected in my justice agenda. The Freedom of Information Act has been in operation since 1992. Since then, there have been sporadic amendments to the act and ad hoc and fragmented policy developments in response to concerns raised within the public sector by the media and members of parliament (frequently by me in opposition, I might add) and growing demands within the community for increased government openness and accountability. The last significant amendments to this act occurred in 2004. Since that time, developments in technology and information management have increased the demand on government to be more efficient, flexible and transparent in its practices.

In May 2014, nearly six years ago, the former ombudsman, Mr Richard Bingham, released his report, an audit of state government departments' implementation of the Freedom of Information Act. That 2014 report was a snapshot of how 12 government departments were managing their responsibilities under the act. It is a very good read. That 2014 report contained a number of recommendations for amendments to the Freedom of Information Act, which are fully endorsed by our current Ombudsman, Mr Wayne Lines.

To date, these legislative changes have not been made, although several of those proposals have been implemented by way of administrative policies, including proactive disclosure by online publication of regularly requested information, including information about spending and travel by ministers and agency executives; publication of disclosure logs setting out the details of applications and information previously released under FOI that are likely to be of interest to other members of the public; provision of a schedule of documents with a notice of determination of an application; and the introduction of an online FOI application system.

I do note, however, legislation introduced into the other place by the Hon. Mark Parnell MLC, another strong advocate for transparency in this area, in his attempt to deal with recommendations of the 2014 report. I take this opportunity to thank the honourable member for his continued interest in freedom of information reform and reflect on our shared history of years of applications to governments as members of the opposition and crossbench in this parliament.

After I took office, I asked the current Ombudsman for his views on implementing legislative changes recommended in the 2014 Ombudsman's audit report. He submitted to me, as Attorney-General, that given the time that has elapsed since the 2014 report a comprehensive review of the FOI Act was required that takes all past and current issues into account. The Marshall Liberal government is committed to keeping the law and our policies current and relevant, which is a key priority to our government's justice agenda.

This bill follows a comprehensive review of the Freedom of Information Act, as referred to earlier, which has not, as I said, seen any significant update in over 15 years. The bill now proposes more than 40 amendments to the Freedom of Information Act. Some of the more significant changes include:

- legislating for proactive disclosure of government information and publication of disclosure logs so that these requirements can be extended beyond state government agencies to FOI Act agencies, such as councils and the South Australian universities, where this is beneficial. By legislating for proactive disclosure and disclosure logs, all agencies and their officers who publish information under these provisions will receive the protections under liability contained in the FOI Act, including protections against actions for defamation or breach of confidence;
- reinforcing the presumption in favour of disclosure by amending the 'objectives' provisions of the act and providing guidance about how public interest factors are to be taken into account in determining applications for access to information;
- legislating the 10-year rule for release of cabinet submissions;
- providing that refusal of access on the basis that 'documents cannot be found or do not exist' is a reviewable determination. This reverses the decision in *EI Shafei v Central Adelaide Local Health Network* [2017] SACAT 5. This change is further supported by amendments giving the Ombudsman specific powers to require an agency to explain what searches were undertaken and allowing the Ombudsman on external review to remit deemed or inadequate determinations back to the agency for reconsideration;
- increasing the Ombudsman's powers on external reviews to obtain documents from agencies;
- creating an offence of improperly directing or influencing a decision or determination made under the act. That, incidentally, is a recommendation made back in 2014;
- precluding agencies from charging processing fees if they exceed the statutory time limit for giving access to information;
- updating the act to reflect electronic communications and electronic information management and storage methods. This includes setting limits around what an agency is expected to do in searching for and producing documents from an 'electronic back-up system'. In addition, the act is updated to recognise the specific challenges posed by dealing with access to CCTV and similar footage by clarifying that agencies may charge



- a fee for retrieval, viewing and redacting of 'documents' (including de-identification of CCTV and similar footage where it is practicable);
- extending the time agencies have to deal with an application from 30 calendar days to 45 days, and internal reviews from 14 to 20 days, to reduce the significant number of 'deemed refusals';
  - providing a section 19(2a) equivalent for internal reviews to facilitate provision of access to documents after the internal review time limit has expired, to ensure agencies are covered by the liability protections of the FOI Act and to reduce external reviews. Similar changes are made to section 39 to facilitate provision of access to documents during an external review;
  - allowing for applicants and agencies to negotiate extensions of time for dealing with access applications and for the agency's principal officer to extend the time limit where an unusually high number of applications have been received, including multiple related applications from an applicant or applicants acting in concert;
  - setting clearer limits around what is considered an unreasonable request for access;
  - allowing the Ombudsman to declare an applicant vexatious on the Ombudsman's own initiative or on the application of an agency such that the Ombudsman or an agency may refuse to deal with an application by the person. Such a declaration will be reviewable by SACAT;
  - providing greater flexibility on who may deal with FOI applications by removing the seniority requirements for officers dealing with part 4 Amendment of Records applications, due to the straightforward nature of such applications. Although, as members might be aware, this is a section of the FOI Act that has hardly ever been touched in its operation;
  - in relation to reviews by SACAT under the act, this review process has been streamlined so that external review applications must first be made to the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman has the investigative capability and is best placed to deal with the reviews at first instance. Further review will then be available by SACAT, other than on the question of sufficiency of search, which is now reviewable under the act by the Ombudsman but which SACAT is not equipped to investigate. Agencies will no longer be limited to reviews on errors of law and will also be able to apply to SACAT for a review of a determination that a document is not an exempt document, noting that there is no change to the position that agencies must pay the other party's costs where an agency initiates the SACAT review; and
  - changes are made to the document and agency exemptions in schedules 1 and 2 of the act, including:
    - deleting the subcategories of document exemptions in schedule 1 of the documents containing unproved criminal allegations, since these should be covered by the existing exemption for unreasonable disclosure of personal affairs information, and documents relating to an agency's commercial activities, on the basis that this overlaps with the clause 7 business affairs exemption;
    - merging the existing cabinet and executive council documents exemptions;
    - exempting information and correspondence prepared by agencies for the purpose of an audit by the Auditor-General while the documents are in the possession of the agency, to maintain the integrity of the audit and reporting functions of the Auditor-General and ensure the Auditor-General's existing status as an exempt agency is not undermined;
    - exempting documents containing matters the disclosure of which could reasonably be expected to identify the location of threatened or endangered

fauna or flora, or other rare items of cultural or scientific importance, and thereby endanger the safety of these species or items; and

- including a limited agency exemption for the Office of Parliamentary Counsel in respect of the documents it holds that are subject to legal professional privilege, similar to the existing schedule 2 exemptions of agencies, such as the Solicitor-General, Crown Solicitor and the Director of Public Prosecutions.

To sum up, this bill includes a range of measures designed to strengthen government transparency and accountability, to strengthen the public's 'right to know', as well as to further encourage and facilitate proactive release of government information by agencies. The bill also includes measures designed to enhance efficiency and sustainability in administering the Freedom of Information Act in recognition that increasing efficiency in the administration of the legislation will also ultimately operate to enhance transparency and public access to information under the act.

Finally, I commend all public sector employees across all offices and departments who undertake the tireless work of compiling and deciphering freedom of information assessments. I particularly do this because, I think for 16 years, I gave most of them a lot of grief. This is a body of work that requires often tremendous amounts of time and resources while modernisation of programs and processes has occurred. Further work will be done as implemented in this bill.

Before I conclude, I wish to place on the record the work of the former ombudsman, Mr Richard Bingham, and our current Ombudsman, Mr Wayne Lines, who have both provided an extraordinary amount of advice and review to bring the bill to its fruition in it being presented to the parliament here today. I will refer later to those who worked hard in that regard. I commend the bill to members and seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it because, Mr Deputy Speaker, as you will appreciate, there are 40 significant changes, and we would be here a very long time if I read them all out.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary 1—Short title 2—Commencement 3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Freedom of Information Act 1991*

4—Substitution of sections 3 and 3A

This clause replaces the current provisions setting out objects and principles of administration with a new statement of principles and objects.

5—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause amends various definitions for the purposes of the measure.

6—Insertion of sections 4A, 4B and 4C

This clause inserts new provisions as follows:

4A—Exempt agencies

This section links to the definition of *exempt agency* in section 4.

4B—Accredited FOI officers

This section provides for accredited FOI officers and includes similar requirements to those currently specified in the definition of accredited FOI officer in section 4 of the Act but allows for small agencies to use the accredited FOI officer of another agency (where it is not practicable for the agency to have its own officer) and also allows a person to be designated as an accredited FOI officer for the purpose of dealing with applications for the amendment of records under Part 4 of the Act despite the fact that the person does not meet certain requirements relating to seniority.

4C—When document is held by an agency

This section sets out when an agency will be taken to hold a document for the purposes of the Act and in particular deals with documents contained in electronic backup systems.

7—Amendment of section 8—Defunct and restructured agencies

Section 8 is amended to provide that where an agency takes over some, but not all, of the functions of another agency, the responsibilities under the Act in respect of documents at any given time will lie with the agency that holds the documents at that time.

#### 8—Insertion of Part 1A

This clause inserts a new Part setting out proactive disclosure principles and requiring the Premier to issue a *proactive disclosure policy* (consistently with the proactive disclosure principles) directing specified agencies to publish information relating to the agency or held by the agency (other than personal information of a person).

#### 9—Amendment of section 9—Publication of information concerning agencies

This clause amends section 9 to reflect a change in terminology from records concerning 'personal affairs' to records concerning 'personal information' and to remove requirements to specify the 'designation' of a person to whom inquiries should be made and to specify the 'address' at which applications should be lodged and to replace those with more generic requirements to specify the 'manner' in which inquiries should be made and the 'manner' in which applications should be lodged.

#### 10—Substitution of section 13

This clause substitutes a new section as follows:

##### 13—Applications for access to agencies' documents

This section updates the provision on applications to allow for electronic forms of communication and also—

- makes it clear that applications that only identify the documents sought by date range will be taken to provide insufficient identifying information;
- sets out special identification requirements for applications for access to documents concerning personal information of the applicant.

#### 11—Amendment of section 14—Dealing with applications

Section 14 is amended to ensure that all determinations made in relation to an application are made by the accredited FOI officer, to clarify that an application is not taken to be received by an agency unless it complies with the requirements of section 13(1), to require certain information be given to applicants and to extend the time within which an application must be dealt with from the current 30 days to 45 days.

#### 12—Amendment of section 14A—Extension of time limit

Section 14A is amended to allow (in addition to the existing grounds for an extension of time) an extension of time to be granted if the applicant consents to it or where the agency is dealing with an unusually high number of applications or where the agency is dealing with a number of related applications.

#### 13—Insertion of section 14B

This clause inserts a new section dealing with an agency's obligation to undertake reasonable searches for documents that are the subject of an application.

#### 14—Amendment of section 17—Agencies may require advance deposits

This clause requires additional information to be provided in a notice accompanying a request for an advance deposit and specifies that a request for an advance deposit is a determination for the purposes of the Act.

#### 15—Amendment of section 18—Agencies may refuse to deal with certain applications

This clause provides a number of amendments aimed at clarifying the provision allowing an agency to refuse to deal with an application.

#### 16—Insertion of section 18A

This clause inserts a new section empowering the Ombudsman, on the Ombudsman's own initiative or on the application of 1 or more agencies, to declare that a person is a vexatious applicant where—

- the person has repeatedly made applications for access or external review (or both); and
- the repeatedly made applications are an abuse of the right of access or made for a purpose other than to obtain access to information.

A determination under the provision will be reviewable by SACAT.

#### 17—Amendment of section 19—Determination of applications

This amendment is consequential to the amendment to section 14 extending the time within which an application must be dealt with from the current 30 days to 45 days.

## 18—Insertion of section 19A

Various provisions of Schedule 1 provide that a document is exempt from disclosure if certain preconditions are satisfied and disclosure of the document would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest. Proposed new section 19A provides that for the purposes of that Schedule, disclosure of a document would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest if (and only if) there are public interest considerations against disclosure and, on balance, those considerations outweigh the public interest considerations in favour of disclosure.

## 19—Amendment of section 20—Refusal of access

This clause amends the grounds for refusing access to a document to clarify that access may be refused if access to the document has previously been given to the applicant or if the document cannot be found or does not exist and to remove the current reference to documents created before 1 January 1987. In addition, proposed subsection (2) provides that an agency must refuse access to an exempt document referred to in Schedule 1 Part 1 (the restricted documents) and may refuse access to any other exempt document.

## 20—Amendment of section 22—Forms of access

Section 22 is amended to allow an agency delete out of scope information from a copy of a document provided to an applicant.

## 21—Amendment of section 23—Notices of determination

This clause makes minor changes to the information to be provided in a notice of determination. The name of the officer that made the determination will not have to be provided but the notice will have to state a designation for the officer who made (or directed) the determination and provide contact details for the agency. Also the notice must specify (in accordance with the regulations) the documents to which the application relates that are held by the agency.

## 22—Amendment of section 25—Documents affecting inter-governmental or local governmental relations

This clause applies section 25 to a document that contains matter concerning the affairs of any council (including one constituted under a law of another State) or any government (whether of Australia or elsewhere).

## 23—Amendment of section 26—Documents containing personal information

This clause amends section 26 to:

- change references to information concerning the 'personal affairs' of a person to references to 'personal information' of a person;
- only require consultation with the person where the nature of the personal information is such that it might be an exempt document by virtue of Schedule 1 clause 6;
- disapply the notice requirement where you are unable to locate the person;
- allow an agency to require that the applicant nominate a medical practitioner who will be given access to the information where the agency has a reasonable expectation that disclosure of the information to the applicant would have an adverse effect on the physical or mental health, or the emotional state, of the applicant;
- provide for the situation where the personal information relates to a child.

## 24—Insertion of Part 3 Division 2A

This clause inserts a new Division on disclosure logs as follows:

## Division 2A—Disclosure logs

## 28A—Requirement for disclosure log

Agencies will be required to keep a disclosure log (in accordance with requirements specified in the section) of information about applications made to the agency where access to documents is provided if the agency considers that such information may be of interest to other members of the public.

## 28B—Required information about applications

This section sets out information that is to be recorded in a disclosure log.

## 28C—Objections

This section provides for the making of objections to the inclusion of information concerning an application in an agency's disclosure log.

## 25—Amendment of section 29—Internal review

This clause:

- clarifies when an application for review of a deemed determination can be lodged;
- requires written confirmation of the receipt of an application for review;
- specifies that a review cannot be conducted by the person who made the determination that is the subject of the review;
- changes the period for a deemed confirmation on review from 14 days to 20 days, with the possibility of an extension of that period in specified circumstances;
- makes it clear that nothing prevents the agency making a determination to give access to a document the subject of an application for a review after the period within which the agency was required to deal with the application for review (and any such determination is to be taken to have been made under the Act).

26—Amendment of section 30—Right to apply for amendment of agencies' records

This clause amends section 30 to reflect the change in terminology from information concerning 'personal affairs' to 'personal information'.

27—Substitution of section 31

This clause substitutes section 31 as follows:

31—Applications for amendment of agencies' records

This section updates the provision on applications to allow for electronic forms of communication and also sets out identification requirements.

28—Amendment of section 32—Dealing with applications

Section 32 is amended to ensure that all determinations made in relation to an application are made by the accredited FOI officer, to require certain information be given to applicants and to extend the time within which an application must be dealt with from the current 30 days to 45 days.

29—Amendment of section 34—Determination of applications

This amendment is consequential to the amendment to section 32 extending the time within which an application must be dealt with from the current 30 days to 45 days.

30—Amendment of section 35—Refusal to amend records

This clause amends section 35 to make the existing grounds for refusing a request to amend records more objective, to add as grounds for refusal, that the application is frivolous or vexatious or is not made in good faith or that the agency has already decided a previous application made by the applicant that was substantially the same.

31—Amendment of section 36—Notices of determination

This clause makes minor changes to the information to be provided in a notice of determination. The name of the officer that made the determination will not have to be provided but the notice will have to state a designation for the officer who made (or directed) the determination and provide contact details for the agency. Also the notice must specify (in accordance with the regulations) the documents to which the application relates that are held by the agency.

32—Amendment of section 37—Notations to be added to records

A minor amendment is made to section 37 to allow for electronic lodgement of a notice.

33—Amendment of section 38—Internal review

This clause:

- allows for electronic lodgement of an application for internal review;
- clarifies when an application for review of a deemed determination can be lodged;
- requires written confirmation of the receipt of an application for review;
- specifies that a review cannot be conducted by the person who made the determination that is the subject of the review;
- changes the period for a deemed confirmation on review from 14 days to 20 days.

34—Amendment of section 39—External review by Ombudsman

This clause makes changes to reflect the fact that the Ombudsman is now the only applicable review authority under the provision and gives the Ombudsman an additional power to require an agency to provide information relating to the manner in which it searched for, sorted or compiled documents or undertook consultations.

## 35—Amendment of section 40—Reviews by SACAT

These amendments:

- allow an agency to seek a SACAT review of a determination by the Ombudsman that a document was not an exempt document (in addition to the existing right of review on a question of law);
- allow persons other than an agency to seek a SACAT review of a determination by the Ombudsman on a review or under new section 18A;
- require the Ombudsman to be notified of review proceedings (even though the Ombudsman is not a party to the proceedings) and to make written submissions to SACAT on application or at the request of SACAT;
- clarify that nothing prevents an agency from making a determination to give access to a document the subject of review proceedings.

## 36—Substitution of section 47

A new service provision allows for service of any notices and documents under the Act (eg a copy of a determination by the Ombudsman under proposed new section 18A) and allows for service by email if an email address for service is provided.

## 37—Insertion of section 49A

This clause creates a new offence of directing an accredited FOI officer to make a decision or determination that the person knows, or ought reasonably to know, is not one that the officer should make or improperly influencing the making of a decision or determination by an accredited FOI officer. The maximum fine is \$5,000.

## 38—Substitution of sections 50 and 51

This clause substitutes a new provision granting protecting from liability in respect of various new functions to be carried out under the measure. The existing provisions of the Act are limited to granting access to documents but the new provision will extend to things such as publishing in accordance with new section 18A and disclosure of information in a disclosure log.

## 39—Amendment of section 53—Fees and charges

This clause makes some clarifications to the fees and charges provision.

## 40—Amendment of section 55—Regulations

This clause brings the general regulation making power into line with more recent drafting practice.

## 41—Amendment of Schedule 1—Exempt documents

This clause amends Schedule 1 (exempt documents) to:

- replace the existing exemptions relating to Cabinet and Executive Council documents;
- provide an exemption for documents that would put at risk any endangered, vulnerable or rare species or any threatened species or threatened ecological community or rare items of cultural or scientific importance;
- delete unnecessary exemptions;
- provide an exemption for documents prepared for the purposes of an audit, examination or other statutory function required to be undertaken by the Auditor-General;
- make other minor miscellaneous amendments.

## 42—Amendment of Schedule 2—Exempt agencies

Schedule 2 is sought to be amended:

- to make the Office of Parliamentary Counsel an exempt agency in relation to information that would be privileged from production in legal proceedings on the ground of legal professional privilege. Such information is exempt under Schedule 1 in any case but, if the information is only subject to a Schedule 1 exemption and a request for access is made, OPC is still required to undertake searches for the documents and compile the documents for the Departmental accredited FOI officer to enable them to determine the application. This arrangement is inappropriate where the documents include privileged documents of non-government members of Parliament;
- to update some references.

## Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

## 1—Application of amendments

The Schedule sets out transitional provisions.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. S.K. Knoll.

## **RAIL SAFETY NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (RAIL SAFETY WORK) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:51):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) Act 2012. Read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:52):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) (Rail Safety Work) Amendment Bill 2020 makes changes to the definition of rail safety work so that it is more aligned to the purpose and objects of the law. The Rail Safety National Law is Australia's rail safety legislation, which establishes a coregulatory system involving a process by which rail safety operators assess the risks associated with their railway operations and then establish a safety management system to manage those risks.

The amendments to the RSNL ensure the definition of rail safety work aligns with the objects of the RSNL, captures only work that could pose a risk to railway operations, current or future, and clearly distinguishes between risk from the work and risk to the person performing the work. The amendments also remove risks to workers that are not specific to railway operations and therefore are adequately addressed under WHS laws. It is intended that changes to the RSNL will reduce the rail safety work assessment burden for industry by removing risks to workers that are not specific to railway operations and therefore are adequately addressed by WHS laws.

On 27 June 2019, officers at the National Transport Commission provided instructions for drafting by the Australasian Parliamentary Counsel's Committee. The responsible ministers of the Transport and Infrastructure Council unanimously recommended the making of the proposed legislation at its meeting on 22 November 2019. As South Australia is the lead legislator for the RSNL, parliamentary counsel has drafted the amendment bill. The RSNL amendments are broadly supported by industry, jurisdictions, the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator and the Australasian Railway Association. I seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted 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 Rail Safety National Law

4—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This amendment inserts the word 'safely' into the definition of *rail infrastructure* to emphasise that rail infrastructure relates to facilities that are necessary to enable a railway to operate safely.

5—Amendment of section 8—Meaning of rail safety work

This clause amends section 8, which sets out the classes of work that are *rail safety work* for the purposes of the Act. The amendments in clauses 5(1) and (2) of the Bill to section 8(1)(d) are consequential on the amendments to paragraph (f) in clause 5(3) of the Bill. These amendments ensure that construction of rolling stock and rail infrastructure are included within the ambit of paragraph (d) (currently referred to in paragraph (f)). The amendments

also ensure that work that involves checking that rail infrastructure is working properly before being used is covered by paragraph (d) (also currently referred to in paragraph (f)).

The amendment in clause 5(3) of the Bill substitutes a new paragraph (f). Proposed paragraph (f) limits work on or about rail infrastructure or associated works or equipment to work that places the worker at risk of exposure to moving rolling stock and thus focuses on work involving risks that are peculiar to railway operations.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

## **SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PUBLIC HEALTH (EARLY CHILDHOOD SERVICES AND IMMUNISATION) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

Sitting suspended from 15:54 to 23:07.

## **COVID-19 EMERGENCY RESPONSE BILL**

### *Final Stages*

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

No. 1. New clause, page 13, after line 2—Insert:

10A—Provisions applying in relation to certain water and sewerage charges for sporting clubs

(1) The operation of the *Water Industry Act 2012*, the *Local Government Act 1999* and any other Act or law prescribed by the regulations (being an Act or law relating to the supply of water, sewerage services or storm water management) is modified as follows:

- (a) the Minister under the relevant Act may, by notice in the Gazette—
  - (i) waive an amount of prescribed costs payable by a specified sporting club, or a sporting club of a specified class (whether incurred before or after the commencement of this section); or
  - (ii) exempt (conditionally or unconditionally) a specified sporting club, or a sporting club of a specified class, from a specified provision of those Acts;
- (b) the regulations under this Act may modify or suspend the operation of any Act or law relating to the supply of water to, the use of sewerage services by, or the management of storm water by, a specified sporting club or sporting clubs of a specified class;
- (c) a term of any contract, agreement or other instrument that is inconsistent with the modifications made by this section will, to the extent of that inconsistency, be of no effect.

(2) In this section—

*prescribed costs* means—

- (a) an amount payable for the supply of water (whether potable or otherwise); or
- (b) an amount payable for the use of sewerage services; or
- (c) an amount payable in relation to storm water management; or
- (d) any other amount of a kind prescribed by the regulations.

*sewerage services* has the same meaning as in the *Water Industry Act 2012*.

No. 2. Clause 11, page 13, line 35 [clause 11(5)]—Delete 'may, if the Auditor-General thinks fit to do so,' and substitute 'must'

No. 3. Clause 11, page 14, line 10 [clause 11(8)]—Delete 'may,' and substitute 'must, as soon as is reasonably practicable'

No. 4. New clause, page 15, after line 12—Insert:

13A—Modification of requirements relating to laying of reports before Parliament



- (1) Despite a provision of this or any other Act, a requirement under an Act that a report or other document (however described) be laid before either or both Houses of Parliament within a specified period will, by force of this section, be modified so that the report or other document is required to be laid before either or both Houses of Parliament (as the case requires) within 7 calendar days after the occurrence of the event that requires the report to be so laid before Parliament.
- (2) A requirement under subsection (1) will, if the Parliament, or the relevant House of Parliament, is not sitting during the 7 day period, be taken to be satisfied by the report or other document being delivered to the President of the Legislative Council or the Speaker of the House of Assembly.
- (3) If the President of the Legislative Council or the Speaker of the House of Assembly is absent at the time a report or other document is to be delivered under subsection (2), the Clerk of the relevant House will receive the report on behalf of the President or the Speaker (as the case may be) and the report will then be taken to have been delivered to the President or the Speaker.
- (4) The Clerk of the relevant House or Houses must, as soon as is reasonably practicable after a report or other document is received under subsection (3), cause the report or other document—
  - (a) to be published on a website determined by the Clerk; and
  - (b) to be distributed (whether electronically or by some other means determined by the Clerk) to each member of the relevant House or to each member of Parliament (as the case requires).
- (5) The President of the Legislative Council and the Speaker of the House of Assembly must, not later than the first sitting day after a report or other document has been delivered (or is taken to have been delivered) to the President or the Speaker under this section, lay them before their respective Houses.

No. 5. New clause, page 18, after line 31—Insert:

18A—Disallowance of regulations made under Act

- (1) Despite section 10(3) of the *Subordinate Legislation Act 1978*, all regulations made under this Act must be laid before each House of Parliament on the next sitting day of that House after the regulations are made.
- (2) Except as is provided under subsection (1), nothing in this section limits the operation of the *Subordinate Legislation Act 1978*.
- (3) Where regulations made under this Act are disallowed, the Governor must not, except in accordance with a resolution of the House that disallowed the regulations, remake those regulations, or make regulations that are of the same effect, within 6 months after the day on which the regulations are disallowed.

No. 6. Clause 19, page 18, lines 22 to 26 [clause 19(2)]—Delete subclause (2)

No. 7. Schedule 2, page 29, line 25 [Schedule 2, clause 3, inserted section 16AA(1)(b)(iii)]—Delete 'section 17(7)' and substitute "subsection (4)'

No. 8. Schedule 2, page 30, line 12 [Schedule 2, Part 3, clause 3, inserted subsection (5), definition of *prescribed public work*—Delete 'or desirable'

Consideration in committee.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

May I indicate that I am happy to deal with the amendments together and indicate to the house that the government agrees to the amendments presented to us from the other place. We thank them for their consideration of the bill diligently during the day to enable us to conclude by this further session.

To briefly summarise the terms of the matter for those who have not been able to follow in detail the debate in the other place during the day, amendment No. 1 makes provision for the capacity of the minister to accommodate the waiving of prescribed fees in relation to water costs, in particular for the benefit of sporting clubs, which was similar to a matter that was raised in this house.

Whilst it has been presented as a matter that 'may' be considered rather than mandatory, and although the Treasurer has indicated in the other place that he did not see this as adequately dealing with the matters, it is clear—and I confirm the commitment I gave on behalf of the government—that matters relating to the ongoing expenses of sporting clubs during this period, which may, as I have pointed out to the member for Frome but I am happy to share with the house, include things like not just water costs but also insurance, electricity costs and security costs during a period when many sporting clubs, for all the reasons we know, for COVID-19, are currently experiencing a very significant decrease if not an obliteration of their revenue base.

These are matters the government will consider. We have announced as a government and the Premier has proudly espoused the opportunity through the Community and Jobs Support Fund of \$250 million to enable applications, and they are being progressed.

The second area, amendments Nos 2 and 3, relate to obligations in respect of the Auditor-General reporting to us as a parliament. Previously, it was that the Auditor-General 'may' make those provisions; now it is the mandatory 'must'. Amendment No. 4 allows for a modification of requirements in relation to the laying of reports before the parliament. Amendment No. 5 deals with the disallowance of regulations made under these emergency provisions, if I can generalise them in that way, requiring that they be tabled in parliament within a day, and also disallowance having the effect of a six-month embargo on their being returned to parliament. That is to apply only to regulations made during the operation of this legislation.

Amendment No. 6 deletes a clause which had been proposed to assist in the protection and probably would have mostly affected police officers as to providing them with some protection, if there were allegations of misconduct or any breach of professional standards. That was not to be supported in the other place, so that has been discharged and removed as available to them. The other matters related to the prescribed public work to require that to be directly necessary for the purpose of COVID-19 matters, i.e. upgrades of hospitals and other work supporting stimulus relating to or coming out of the COVID-19 declaration period. The words 'or desirable' were removed.

We thank the other place for their consideration of the matter. There was just one other issue which was raised which did not really have a lot of attention in our house. It related to schedule 1, which was a new model of protections, largely for people who were responsible for the care of people with a mental condition under the Guardianship and Administration Act. It related to people who have to deal with the management of persons in this category and what special powers they would have for up to 24 hours, then to be endorsed by an order that had to reinforce it via SACAT as to how that was going to operate.

The Public Advocate, Anne Gale, has provided advice to the government in relation to this. As I said, it did not receive a lot of attention, but there was one issue relating to this that resulted in some questions being asked for which the Treasurer was not able to fully provide answers. I have received that information from the Public Advocate, Anne Gale, and I propose to place it on the record. Regarding examples of why schedule 1 is required, I am advised that there are some individuals who do not understand social distancing who need assistance, sometimes by education, but if not possible they may need to be kept safe from COVID-19 and orders may be necessary to be in place to keep them safe.

As to what is envisaged in respect of any public reporting, questions were asked about that. I indicate that I am advised the Public Advocate proposes to provide reporting to the Attorney-General on the number of orders issued and anticipated on a monthly basis, so I thank her for her indication of that reporting. The shadow attorney-general sought clarification as to whether the authorising officer is subject to direction of the minister, that minister being the Attorney-General. I indicate that I am advised the authorising officer would be subject to the direction of the minister and is accountable in this way. As I have indicated, the minister referenced would be the Attorney-General.

The authorising officer is accountable to the Attorney-General to ensure independence in decision-making regarding a person's detention. This is a serious matter and such decisions must be reported and accounted to high authority. If I were to try to give an example of where members might be more familiar, the minister for corrections has responsibility and powers under our corrections law as a similar way to deal with his chief executive, who has quite significant powers, understandably, to deal with the management and incarceration of prisoners.

One of the areas that often gets attention is whether there is a prisoner kept in solitary confinement. There are all sorts of human rights rules sitting around solitary confinement, so there is a very clear set of guidelines on how this is to operate. It is not to be used as a punishment, for example. The minister for corrections has all sorts of powers to require the chief executive to account to him, report to him and obviously be subject to direction by him to ensure there is compliance. The shadow attorney-general further asked:

Is it the case then that the minister in effect could order the detention of someone via their ability to direct the authorised officer?

Can I indicate to the house that I am advised that it is anticipated that the authorising officer would provide short-term authority to an accommodation service provider to detain a person who is at risk of contracting COVID-19. The minister would provide oversight and direction in terms of the operations of the scheme. A further question was asked:

I wonder if the Treasurer is able to answer: is there any other place in legislation in South Australia where a minister can, in effect, order the detention of someone, whether directly or via the direction of the officer?

The answer, I am advised, is that it is difficult to answer this at this time. Generally, this probably does not occur, but there are circumstances under other laws that time does not permit to be precise. That is the information from the Public Advocate, but I hope members are comforted by the example I have given in relation to prisons.

The detention proposed in the bill relates to adults with incapacity and it would be the authorising officer or appointed guardian approving detention to keep someone safe from the spread of COVID-19. The issue to be addressed here is keeping safe people who do not understand social distancing with other public health guidelines. The minister does not issue the orders. An independent authorising officer or appointed guardian would. The order is only for 28 days and then the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal would review the application. The Hon. Connie Bonaros also asked: 'I am wondering which other class of persons the government envisages as being covered by that provision?'

I am advised that this provision enables the minister to enlist additional resources if needed from people who can assist and work with people who may not understand the social distancing guidelines. It may not be necessary to do so, but if police resources were unavailable the minister could consider other suitably qualified persons, such as paramedics or other suitable persons. That is the full extent of the information I have been able to obtain from the Public Advocate. The shadow attorney-general in the other place, the Hon. Kyam Maher, may have further questions arising out of that, and I indicate that I am happy to make Ms Gale available to answer any further questions.

I think it is important that we understand that somebody who has a mental incapacity, for example, needs to be protected, particularly if they do not understand the significance of going up and repeatedly hugging someone who had proved to be positive to COVID-19 and does not understand the risk to them of being able to contract it. It may mean they need to be physically separated to ensure that that does not persist and that the risk does not cause that alarm. Obviously, it is important that we protect them, but we are mindful of the fact, as is the Public Advocate, who has a very clear responsibility for those who are vulnerable in this area, that we need to ensure that they are protected. I hope that covers those matters.

I thank those in the other place for their diligent work during the day to try to ensure that we are able to have clarification of the responsibility of the State Coordinator—that is, our police commissioner and his authorised officers—to get us through this difficult period and, most importantly, to have the envelope of protection for those who might be vulnerable to eviction, whether it is from their shop or their commercial premises or their home during this period. I thank all members for their contribution.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I rise to make a few brief comments on the amendments that have come back to us from the other place amending the COVID-19 Emergency Response Bill. It was only very recently, of course, that we were dealing with this bill in this place before sending it to the other place. No-one needs to relitigate either the breadth of the issues canvassed in the bill or the gravity of those issues and the extraordinary changes that we are permitting as a parliament for the government to use as it combats the impacts of this pandemic.

I am very grateful for all the efforts that people have put into not only putting this bill together but also seeking to refine this bill and get it into a shape where it is acceptable to the parliament, because it does seek extraordinary powers, albeit at an extraordinary time. I think it is clear to everyone that the parliament, and in particular the opposition, has been a willing participant with the government in seeking to ensure that the government has the powers it needs and that the government is able to have these new powers as quickly as possible. This is, I think, now the fourth piece of legislation that has been attended to by the parliament and, together, attended to in record time for the benefit of the government and its capacity to respond to the coronavirus pandemic.

There are some important changes that have been put in both places, here and in the Legislative Council, and I am pleased that the majority of those have been accepted by the government. I think they are important changes and the fact that the Attorney is willing to deal with these en bloc and accept all the changes that have come back from the council is an indication of goodwill from the government to those suggestions that have been put both by members of the crossbench in both places and by members of the opposition.

I think it is terrific that the government has seen the merit in the member for Frome's proposal about providing relief from certain water and sewerage charges for sporting clubs. As we discussed here last night, they are the thousands of community organisations that have been forced to cease their operations. It is not just for their own benefit; these sporting organisations are often the glue that holds local communities together.

They are the outlet for people to enjoy participation in team sports or even just catch up with fellow members of their local community and engage in socialising and recreation. The fact that they are not able to conduct their regular operations denies them income at a time when they have ongoing expenses, so this is a good way in which the government can provide some further relief. We look forward to the government providing some relief in this regard, because it comes at a time when sporting clubs are finding it very difficult to retain ongoing income streams.

At the same time, I understand from representations made by Sport SA, the industry representative, if we can put it like that, that the government's annual grants programs have for some inexplicable reason been placed on hold. That is a real concern and frustration for those thousands of organisations around the state. Perhaps that might be something we can examine tomorrow during question time with the Minister for Recreation and Sport, should we of course be provided the opportunity from a government that has the courage to face a question time again this week.

I am also glad that the government and the Treasurer, resident in the other place, have given some ground on the requirements of the Auditor-General in these new provisions in the bill—that he will in fact be required to furnish a report to the parliament about the certification of those instructions from the Treasurer that suspend or modify financial reporting obligations of agencies and also suspend or modify requirements for the Auditor-General in conducting his regular annual report.

I am pleased that there will also be an enhanced reporting process by which, for the first time, there will be an immediate publication of a report from an Auditor-General once it is provided to the parliament itself. This, of course, is something that has actually been asked of the current Auditor-General, something that was taken on notice by the current Auditor-General in October 2018 and still has not been actioned by the current Auditor-General for whatever reason. But it is pleasing that we have all been able to find time to gather together to finally address something that he has not had the capacity to—and that is to provide adequate and timely reporting to the members of parliament that he reports to.

It is also pleasing that the government has been willing to support amendments from the Greens when it comes to reports being tabled in parliament more generally and also the tabling or the dealing with regulations and the disallowance of regulations made under the act. Of course, this is and this should be a source of concern for all members of parliament—that this bill enables the government to make regulations pursuant to the bill, and of course we have no idea what those regulations will be. So it is important that there is a mechanism for the parliament to make speedy disallowance, if necessary, of those regulations. I think that that is a very good thing.

I am also pleased that the government has agreed to the opposition's proposal to do away with the proposed suspension of professional standards at this point of time. I think that struck a lot

of people on this side and also on the crossbench in both places as an unusual proposition. It is usually in responding to a crisis that you would hope that your skilled and qualified people performed to the highest of standards, not be relieved of the requirement of exercising professional standards. That was a sensible modification and one we are very pleased has been agreed to by the government.

There is a minor amendment about reporting to the Public Works Committee, and of course another amendment has been removed with regard to a prescribed public work as merely being 'desirable' rather than being 'necessary' to respond to the crisis. As we have heard before from many contributors in this place and in the other place, these are extraordinary times, and the government is being asked to respond in extraordinary ways. The government itself is proposing to respond to the coronavirus in extraordinary ways, and it is asking for extraordinary powers from this parliament. The need for parliamentary scrutiny of the government has never been higher than it is right now in this term of parliament. It has never been higher.

It has been my recollection, as someone who has followed the proceedings of parliament for nearly 20 years, that although we have not quite confronted something of the magnitude of this coronavirus pandemic there have certainly been situations and emergencies the state has had to contend with, whether it has been devastating impacts of bushfires, for example, or other occasions. It is usually at those times when the leaders of government and government ministers make themselves more available to the community and more available to the parliament to make sure they can provide timely, accurate, honest and courageous information about how these instances are being dealt with. They certainly have not tried to take the opportunity to use their numbers in dominating the operations of parliament, to shut a parliament down to avoid scrutiny because it seems some sort of mere inconvenience to their day.

I reiterate my comments that when we pass a bill, particularly a bill with these amendments, it is absolutely important that the parliament continues to sit according to its published schedule. Of course, we would be willing to speak with the government about making allowances for the changes with a later budget and not having the estimates schedule proceed in July as it is currently scheduled, but aside from that we should still be sitting.

We should still be sitting tomorrow so that we can talk about the coronavirus pandemic. We should still be sitting tomorrow so that we can talk about the more than 1,000 government workers who have found themselves unexpectedly out of work and out of pocket. We should be sitting tomorrow so that we can consider all the other matters of public importance, which members of the community would turn to their local parliamentarian to ask them about.

We should even sit tomorrow because some might find it of interest how the member for Waite found himself given the call during question time to ask a Dorothy Dixier of the government, only for it to be revealed 24 hours later that he was being charged by police—and who knew what when over the course of the last 24 or 36 hours during that occurrence? That might be in itself a reason why a Premier or senior ministers might not want to face a question time tomorrow, Thursday 9 April. That is a matter for the Premier to reflect on and justify both to this parliament and to the community why he thinks he should be beyond the reach of responsible government at this most important time.

I would ask the Premier if he could find it in himself to behave in the way that every other Premier has found it in themselves to behave in this state—

**The CHAIR:** Member for Lee, I am going to interrupt here. We are actually debating right at this moment the amendments made by the Legislative Council.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Indeed.

**The CHAIR:** We are—so I ask you to come back to that.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Thank you. I would ask the Premier, when these amendments in this bill come into force, to find it in himself to be available to the parliament to answer important questions about the operation of the provisions of this bill, as amended, as well as all the other important issues concerning the affairs of this state.

If the Premier thinks he is above answering questions about the provisions of this bill, if he thinks he is above answering questions or appearing in parliament so that he can give us up-to-date and accurate information as and when the public of South Australia demands it, and as and when parliamentarians representing the public of South Australia demand it, then perhaps he can furnish us with an expectation about why he is above, beyond and separate from every other Premier of this state who has maintained access, maintained a presence in this parliament and been courageous enough to front up to this parliament and answer questions when they have been put to Premiers previously.

**The CHAIR:** Member for Lee, I would ask you to come back to the amendments. I suspect there will be a time when we can continue this debate—maybe even later this evening, I suspect—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes.

**The CHAIR:** —so I will bring you back again now to the amendments.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Thank you. So I am pleased—

**The CHAIR:** No, thank you.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Thank you, Chair.

**The CHAIR:** Yes, thank you.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** We thank each other.

**The CHAIR:** Yes, we are.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Thank you. Yes—it is a circle of thanks.

**The CHAIR:** Because you are going to do what I am asking you to: to come back to the amendments.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, I thank you for your guidance and you thank me for my obedience. Thank you.

**The CHAIR:** We are thanking each other, so let's do it.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** We are all very thankful. Let me extend the thanks to the Deputy Premier because I think she has shown some leadership in her carriage of this bill and her willingness to respond—usually at length—to questions from the opposition about our concerns with this bill.

**The CHAIR:** She is not alone there, member for Lee.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** No, it is contagious. She has responded at length to our questions of this bill, and that has been greatly appreciated. That has allowed us to reach the point where, here we are, barely 24 hours after this bill seeking such extraordinary powers was introduced into this place. Not only has it passed through here with some amendments but it has gone to the other place and been considered and passed through there with some further amendments and come back here and had those amendments accepted so that this can finally become law.

I think that is an extraordinary reflection on both houses of parliament. If I am honest, it is more of a reflection on the other place than here. We are used to hard yakka down here. It is also a reflection on the Deputy Premier's stewardship of this bill. I thank her because when the chips are down and you are looking for leadership over that side she is the one who usually provides it. I think that is a good thing, and I really thank her for her support. There is much that the person sitting to her left could take from that, but that is a matter for them.

**Mr PICTON:** I have a few comments to make. Firstly, I support the amendments that have been passed through the other place. These are sensible amendments. The other place has worked through this legislation in a speedy and effective manner in making sure that appropriate scrutiny can be applied, just as we did through the process yesterday. I think the houses of parliament have worked together well, and I think the people of Australia can be proud that that has happened over the past 48 hours to ensure that has happened.

As I said in my second reading speech, our approach as the opposition to this matter has been to support measures that can protect our state. If the government put up measures that will better protect us, that will better prepare us, then they have our support. That is what has happened with this legislation and has happened with the other various bills that the government have put up. Of course, our job in a democracy is to apply scrutiny, to ask questions, to look into the detail and to make sure that that is applied. We have done that through this process, and I think that there is a better bill because of the amendments that have been moved—both the amendments yesterday in this house and now the amendments in the other place.

Of course, we will continue to make recommendations to improve our response. Where there are areas that we can identify, where there are things that need to be improved, then we will do that. We have put forward a number of pieces of legislation to do that. They have not been supported, but we hope that that spirit can be returned and we can pick up any good idea that can further prepare us.

This is a very broad piece of legislation. There are some very broad and extraordinary powers that are being given to various elements of the government, particularly to the State Coordinator, but a lot of it is the executive government in itself through this legislation. These are extraordinary times, so that is not a criticism, but it is important that this is now time limited. It is important that there is a clear date at which this will end and requires additional parliamentary scrutiny if it was to continue. We welcome that happening.

It is important because of the broad nature of this that there is going to be appropriate scrutiny of the government response and that the other place has set up a select committee to provide that scrutiny. That is absolutely appropriate. We have seen other governments around the world undertaking such measures, and we are very glad that that has now taken place so that there can be appropriate democratic scrutiny of that.

We also believe very strongly that parliament needs to play its role in providing scrutiny, and also, as it has done in the past 48 hours, in providing legislation that is needed to help our response. That is why the sitting schedule that is in place must continue as it is in place. There should not be any alteration to that sitting schedule. As long as check-out operators are continuing to work, as long as pharmacy attendants are continuing to work, as long as garbage people are continuing to work, then we must continue to work.

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

That the question now be put.

**The CHAIR:** I accept the motion; is the motion seconded?

An honourable member: Yes, sir.

Motion carried.

**The CHAIR:** The question now before the Chair is that the amendments made by the Legislative Council be agreed to.

Motion carried.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **SITTINGS AND BUSINESS**

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (23:45):**

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 12 May 2020 at 11am.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I move:

That the time allotted for debate be five minutes.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I think we are jumping ahead there, Attorney. Could you please repeat the time allotted, Attorney.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Tuesday 12 May 2020 at 11am.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** There are two separate motions, but we have to deal with the one allocating the time in the first instance.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Can I speak to that, sir, please?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I do not know that we are debating that yet, member for West Torrens. We are looking to pass the time allotted now.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes, that is a motion.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** My advice is that that is not to be debated. We will get to a debate in a moment, I am sure, member for West Torrens. The motion for the time allotted has been moved by the Attorney; is that seconded?

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 13  
Noes ..... 13  
Majority ..... 0

#### AYES

Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J. (teller)	Cregan, D.
Knoll, S.K.	Marshall, S.S.	Pederick, A.S.
Pisoni, D.G.	Sanderson, R.	Speirs, D.J.
Treloar, P.A.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.
Wingard, C.L.		

#### NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bell, T.S.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Brown, M.E.	Close, S.E.	Hildyard, K.A.
Koutsantonis, A. (teller)	Malinauskas, P.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Stinson, J.M.		

#### PAIRS

Basham, D.K.B.	Michaels, A.	Ellis, F.J.
Wortley, D.	Gardner, J.A.W.	Szakacs, J.K.
Harvey, R.M.	Duluk, S.	Luethen, P.
Cook, N.F.	McBride, N.	Bettison, Z.L.
Murray, S.	Boyer, B.I.	Patterson, S.J.R.
Gee, J.P.	Power, C.	Hughes, E.J.
Teague, J.B.	Brock, G.G.	

**The SPEAKER:** There being 13 ayes and 13 noes, we have a tied vote. I cast my vote with the ayes, so the ayes have it.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** There are three reasons why it is important that we adjourn the parliament: firstly, we are in the middle of a global pandemic in relation to the coronavirus known as COVID-19; secondly, it has happened before; and, thirdly, we are probably the highest performing state in relation to the commitment we have made to the people of South Australia that, as long as possible, we will continue to have our parliament meet on a regular basis. On the first matter, it is obvious and I need to say no more. On the second matter, I remind members that during the 1919 Spanish flu the parliament prorogued on four occasions: on 23 January, on 20 March, on 8 March and on 12 June.



*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** They continued to operate consistent at that time with what we are proposing will be available to South Australia. As for the rest of the country—apart from Queensland, which is proposing to return on 28 April to deal with its emergency legislation similar to what we have done and what has actually occurred in most other jurisdictions—the commonwealth have adjourned to 11 August; the New South Wales parliament to 18 September; Tasmania to 18 August; the Victorian parliament, under a Labor government, have determined that they will not even fix a date; and the Northern Territory, similarly under a Labor administration, have determined in their parliament not even to fix a date.

So I say to the parliament that we remain committed on this side of the house to do everything we need to do to get South Australians through this pandemic, to continue to regularly sit in this parliament and, thirdly, to make sure that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —we continue to have the scrutiny that we agree needs to be there.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (23:53):** This time has brought out the best, I think, in parliament. I have been here a long time; not as long as the Hon. Rob Lucas in another place, but I have been here, along with the member for Florey, since 1997. Parliaments can be very partisan. It is their nature—look at the way the parliament is laid out: it is an adversarial system. It is designed to have this system of adversarial politics, but this pandemic has brought the best out of us.

I think it has brought out some very good aspects of the government, and I think it has brought out the very good aspects of the opposition and some of the very best aspects of South Australia. But what I fear I have just witnessed in the way the government has used its majority—and, to be fair, you do not have a majority now. You are a majority by agreement—by agreement.

**The Hon. S.K. Knoll:** Go on, break it.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I am not going to. I am not like members opposite.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Minister for Transport, be quiet.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I will just point out to the house that on 17 September 1940 the Luftwaffe were bombing in and around Westminster. The parliament sat. The parliament sat during the Blitz. During World War I and World War II, this parliament sat. During the Spanish flu, this parliament sat.

**The Hon. S.K. Knoll:** It was prorogued four times.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** And you prorogued the parliament twice in two years. So what? Our job is here. We are asking retail workers to put themselves in harm's way and we are asking nurses and paramedics and doctors and police officers and firefighters. We belong here, not to try to score points, not to play politics, but to assist the government where we can. As I said earlier, we passed a \$15 billion allocation for the government without a budget in an hour. That is bipartisanship. We have allowed the government to win this vote without actually having the numbers here. That is bipartisanship.

That is us honouring the spirit of the parliament. Do you know what does not honour the spirit of the parliament? Moving a motion about when parliament should sit and limiting debate to five minutes. Why not suspend standing orders and have the debate after midnight? Why have an

agreement with the government to suspend standing orders? Did they even ask? No. But again the boy king could not help himself. Parliament should not be like this now. The government has brought us to this unnecessarily. We could have had this debate with 20 minutes for each speaker and got it done and the government still would have won.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 13  
Noes ..... 13  
Majority ..... 0

#### AYES

Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J. (teller)	Cregan, D.
Knoll, S.K.	Marshall, S.S.	Pederick, A.S.
Pisoni, D.G.	Sanderson, R.	Speirs, D.J.
Treloar, P.A.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.
Wingard, C.L.		

#### NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bell, T.S.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Brown, M.E.	Close, S.E.	Hildyard, K.A.
Koutsantonis, A. (teller)	Malinauskas, P.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Stinson, J.M.		

#### PAIRS

Basham, D.K.B.	Szakacs, J.K.	Ellis, F.J.
Boyer, B.I.	Gardner, J.A.W.	Michaels, A.
Harvey, R.M.	Hughes, E.J.	Luethen, P.
Cook, N.F.	McBride, N.	Bettison, Z.L.
Murray, S.	Gee, J.P.	Patterson, S.J.R.
Wortley, D.	Power, C.	Brock, G.G.
Teague, J.B.	Duluk, S.	

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The bells continued to ring past midnight. The house is adjourned; standing orders so say.

**The SPEAKER:** In my opinion, the time had expired before it was 12 o'clock. The question is put and the division has been put in place and it has been concluded. I am going to accept the division. I understand the criticism. I am going to accept the division, as I have said.

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

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens will be seated. I have made my point clear.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Can you reference the standing order, sir, please?

**The SPEAKER:** I am going to accept the division. There being 13 ayes and 13 noes, I have a cast. I accordingly cast with the ayes. The ayes have it and the house stands adjourned until Tuesday 12 May at 11am.

Motion thus carried; house adjourned.

At 00:04 the house adjourned until Tuesday 12 May 2020 at 11:00.