

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY****Wednesday, 29 April 2020**

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

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

*Motions***NOTICE OF MOTION WITHDRAWAL**

**Mr BROWN (Playford) (10:31):** On behalf of the member for Wright, I move:

That Private Members Business, Bills, Notices of Motion No. 1 be withdrawn.

Motion carried.

*Bills***STATUTES AMENDMENT (COLONEL LIGHT GARDENS CHARACTER PROTECTION) BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (10:33):** I seek leave to move the motion standing in my name in an amended form.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Development Act 1993 and the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016. Read a first time.

*Standing Orders Suspension*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (10:34):** I move:

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

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

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

**The SPEAKER:** An absolute majority present, I accept the motion.

**Mr PICTON:** Point of order: my understanding is that the member for Heysen left the chamber during the calling of the quorum, which I understand is a breach of standing orders.

**The SPEAKER:** I did not see the member for Heysen leave, but I will have a look at the footage. I will take it up and, if required, I will come back to the house. I accept the point of order. I will look into the matter. Thank you, member for Kurna.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Mr Speaker, is there opportunity for debate on the motion?

**The SPEAKER:** There is. We have multiple members standing up, so either sit down—

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Mr Speaker, do I get a right to speak?

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, you do, absolutely.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** The reason I asked for a suspension of standing orders is that this bill we have put before the house is an extremely important bill, which is a bill that has been raised not only on this side of the house but also by the other side. In fact, minister Speirs and the member for Elder have also raised this in the public domain as a critical issue that needs to be addressed. For those reasons, I would expect government members to support this bill because I think it is an issue—

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** That would be consistent.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** That is correct. It would be consistent. It is a very important issue in that community, so I look forward to the support of government members and crossbenchers to suspend standing orders.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (10:37):** Mr Speaker, when we on this side of the house have asked—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —for a suspension of standing orders, we provide other members of the chamber the courtesy of actually looking at the bill that is seeking to be debated forthwith before the suspension of standing orders is asked for.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** To ask this chamber to move to deal with all stages of a bill without showing the chamber the bill before the suspension is asked for just shows the fact that the member, having been here now since 2006—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —still does not understand how the process is supposed to work. The government will be opposing the suspension of standing orders. I do note that, in passing yesterday, the member for West Torrens told me they were going to move for a suspension of standing orders today. Did he say what it was about? No. Did he provide a copy of the bill beforehand? No.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** I understand that they are consulting on potential changes to heritage in Colonel Light Gardens right at the moment. It seems that that consultation is just a sham, and really they have the bill and what they propose to do ready for the chamber before they have even finished the consultation. To say that the government has to support this is ridiculous. If the member genuinely wanted a debate, rather than just have a farce in this chamber, he would have had the courtesy of providing the minister with a copy of the bill beforehand and been able to debate and discuss the bill so that we could deal with it, as opposed to what this is, which is just a stunt to waste the house's time.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 12  
Noes ..... 13  
Majority ..... 1

AYES

Bettison, Z.L.  
Close, S.E.  
Hughes, E.J.  
Odenwalder, L.K.

Brock, G.G.  
Cook, N.F.  
Malinauskas, P.  
Piccolo, A.

Brown, M.E. (teller)  
Hildyard, K.A.  
Mullighan, S.C.  
Picton, C.J.

NOES

Chapman, V.A.

Cowdrey, M.J. (teller)

Gardner, J.A.W.

## NOES

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

Marshall, S.S.  
Sanderson, R.  
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

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

## PAIRS

Bedford, F.E.  
Basham, D.K.B.  
Duluk, S.  
Harvey, R.M.  
Michaels, A.  
Murray, S.  
Wortley, D.

Teague, J.B.  
Boyer, B.I.  
Power, C.  
Koutsantonis, A.  
McBride, N.  
Szakacs, J.K.  
Cregan, D.

Bignell, L.W.K.  
Ellis, F.J.  
Gee, J.P.  
Luethen, P.  
Stinson, J.M.  
Patterson, S.J.R.

Motion thus negatived.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (10:44):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

It gives me great pleasure to introduce this bill to preserve the historic character of Colonel Light Gardens. In terms of the purpose of the bill, it proposes to amend the Development Act 1993 and the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 to require the drafting and adoption of a Burra Charter quality Colonel Light Gardens management plan. I will explain what all that means in a moment.

The amenity of Colonel Light Gardens is truly something special, and it is worthy of inspection. If it were allowed, I would show the chamber an international book that lists Colonel Light Gardens, but I will not do that because it would be disorderly.

**The SPEAKER:** It would.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** This book lists the model gardens around the world, and Colonel Light Gardens is one of them. It is internationally recognised as one of the model garden developments in the world, and we should be proud of that.

*The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** We should be proud of that. The street layout, public spaces, laneways, landscaping and architecture combine to make it one of the most livable places in the world. It is no accident that families both young and not so young love to live there. There is an opportunity to protect Colonel Light Gardens not just for existing households but for many generations to come.

I know the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Croydon, is very supportive of this bill, having grown up in the area, and he understands the importance of the bill in protecting the community where he was raised and where his family still lives. Other people have also been raised there and continue to live there. The bill will insert several criteria taken from the commonwealth's Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Regulations 2000, which detail the principles required for Burra Charter quality National Heritage management principle and management plans for National Heritage places.

Schedule 3 will require a Colonel Light Gardens Management Plan to be prepared by the minister. In preparation for the plan, the minister must undertake extensive stakeholder consultation, including any residents' associations based in that community. The plan will go into great detail, and the framework must consider comprehensive information about the location, features, condition,

historical context and the current use of the Colonel Light Gardens area to inform the heritage policy proposed.

This bill enshrines the heritage principles of Colonel Light Gardens in legislation, and that is very important. I will repeat that: this bill enshrines the heritage principles of Colonel Light Gardens in legislation. All future development would then have to adhere to these principles. In terms of the background to the bill, Colonel Light Gardens was the first entire suburb in South Australia to achieve state heritage status, and it maintains that status today, a status that could, however, be put at risk by prospective changes mooted for implementation in the coming months under the Marshall Liberal government's design code.

The suburb is commonly referred to by council and South Australian government literature as Australia's most complete example of an early 1900s 'garden suburb'. The suburb has an interesting history. It was established by the Vaughan Labor government's June 1915 purchase of the Grange Farm property (about 121 hectares) south of Adelaide, from the trustees of the estate of William Tennant Mortlock. The property was purchased with the intent to establish a model garden suburb, following the inspiration of a lecture tour to South Australia by Charles C. Reade in 1914. He was subsequently employed by the Vaughan government to become South Australia's first government town planner.

Reade's planning principles were guided by the international garden city movement of the time, which had an ambition to improve the lifestyle and residential environment of all classes of people. I stress that this suburb was not established for the rich and wealthy: it was actually established for working-class people. It was established to have a mixed community, in other words, working-class and other more affluent people. That is very important. It has changed today but the proposal for this garden was established with good egalitarian principles. The war interrupted the state government's intention for Grange Farm and the land was used as an army training camp until 1920.

I was pleased to discuss the heritage of Colonel Light Gardens with Keith Conlon on ABC radio last Friday. He talked about the rolling series of centenary celebrations to be celebrated, including the 100-year anniversary of the selection of the suburb's name, the planting of many of the large trees and the school opening in 1926. He agreed that a management plan was needed and the area needed to be better managed. In fact, Monday 27 April was Colonel Light's birthday. He was born in 1786.

While properties were available for purchase from August 1921, residential development was accelerated with the Gunn Labor government's 1924-26 Thousand Homes scheme, with 695 homes built in the suburb. This was one of the first iterations of what is now called the Housing Trust. The scheme complemented the garden suburb's ambition to improve the lifestyle and residential environment of all classes of people through the comingling of different socio-economic classes. It also expedited the development of shops, parks and other private developments in the suburb.

All properties designated for development were sold by 1927 and the suburb has remained substantially unchanged since then. We were so proud of the suburb that, in 1947, Colonel Light Gardens was featured in a film sponsored by the Australian government to attract British migrants to Australia. Such was the prominence of Colonel Light Gardens that it had its own act of parliament until the mid-1970s and remained the only suburb in South Australia under comprehensive town planning legislation until jurisdiction was transferred to the City of Mitcham in 1975, when the Garden Suburb Act 1919 was repealed.

In terms of the Planning and Design Code impacts or effects, the Marshall government's draft planning code may impose some unintended consequences that could put the heritage of Colonel Light Gardens at risk, as the draft code does not have the power to protect the character of the suburb. One of the biggest criticisms I have heard from local government and people involved in planning is that the new code's structure does not allow for local character to be protected. I stress that the draft code does not have the power to protect the character of suburbs, and particularly this suburb.

This could jeopardise the unique character of Colonel Light Gardens, including the public open space for parks and reserves, such as Mortlock Park and Reade Park; the absence of dwelling

congestion; ample yard space at the front and back of properties; careful residential, commercial and community land-use zoning; consistent vegetation of public space along roadways; natural clusters of river red gums near Reade Park and the south-east boundary of Colonel Light Gardens Primary School; the wide, tree-shaded footpaths of East Parkway and West Parkway, Salisbury Crescent and Sturt Avenue; the curved roads and rounded street corners at intersections for road safety purposes; and the functional hierarchy of streets and different street widths to facilitate traffic flow, such as Broadway, which is 99 feet wide, West Parkway, which is 80 feet wide, secondary traffic and shopping streets, which vary from 66 to 80 feet wide, residential streets, which vary from 42 to 52 feet wide, and the accordingly varied width of nature strips.

You do not get a true appreciation of the beauty, the intricacies or the importance of the original character of the suburb until you actually walk through it. I was fortunate enough to be taken on a tour of Colonel Light Gardens by the residents' association at the invitation of Mr Philip Knight. I was truly amazed at what I saw, and that opportunity allowed me to fully understand it. I understand that I was actually the first MP to do that; the local member had not yet found time to do that walk. The Minister for Water found time later on, but did not find the time today to support the suspension motion to debate the bill.

Homes have the distinctive characteristics of low-pitch, corrugated iron roofs; wide, overhanging eaves; street-facing gables; gable vents; and taper cut bargeboards, etc. You get the feel from the detail in that list of what a unique suburb this is. Under the draft Planning and Design Code for phase 3 council areas (regional city and metropolitan), the conservation zone only goes so far.

While it Labor's view that Colonel Light Gardens needs additional protection, more importantly, residents believe that more protection is needed. What we are doing here today is motivated by the actions of residents who have lobbied me, other members of parliament and, I am aware, members of the government for some time, saying that they want these protections in place.

Conservation zones become generic across the state under the draft code and a number of councils, including the City of Marion, have actually expressed serious concern that local character will be lost under the design code. Colonel Light Gardens is a special case. A clear management plan is needed to determine what can and cannot be done, as the draft code will effectively downgrade protection by watering it down. The draft code does not provide the protections the community is seeking. The residents have long held—

*The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Minister for Planning!

**Mr PICTON:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. Residents have long held the fear that the suburb's character might be damaged through incremental micro-level changes. The draft Planning and Design Code poses a major threat to the character of this suburb. Colonel Light Gardens should remain as Australia's most complete example of an early 1900s garden suburb.

As I indicated earlier, this is not only concern expressed by me and this side of politics but also, more importantly, concern expressed by stakeholders on the consultation. I would like to thank the Colonel Light Gardens Residents' Association and other committee members and groups who have raised their concerns with me and my Labor colleagues. Labor has undertaken extensive consultation. I was pleased to participate in a walking tour, as mentioned, of the suburb organised by Mr Philip Knight, who is the secretary of the Colonel Light Gardens Historical Society. He is very passionate about preserving the heritage of Colonel Light Gardens. Not only is he passionate but he is extremely knowledgeable about this, too, and his understanding and knowledge of this community is probably second to none. It would be wise for any MP to listen to that counsel from Mr Knight.

I thank everyone who has responded to Labor's 'Our plan to preserve historic Colonel Light Gardens' survey, which has helped inform the preparation of the bill to ensure that it reflects the views of the local community. The residents' association's view is that, if elements of the garden suburb's principles and values, which underpin Colonel Light Gardens' state heritage area listing, are subverted through ill-advised development approvals, the heritage value of the suburb is diluted and effectively undermined one development at a time.

Having assessed the draft Planning and Design Code, the residents association do not expect the code, which will replace the Mitcham (City) Development Plan, to resolve their concerns regarding inappropriate developments in Colonel Light Gardens. I stress that: having assessed the draft Planning and Design Code, the residents' association does not expect the code, which will replace the Mitcham (City) Development Plan, to resolve their concerns regarding inappropriate developments at Colonel Light Gardens.

The residents' association is of the firm belief that the garden suburb values and principles of Colonel Light Gardens can only be appropriately upheld through the establishment of a management plan drafted in accordance with the principles of the Burra Charter. Under this proposal, all development applications would have to be assessed against the Burra Charter quality.

Labor knows that this is a priority for residents because, when I and the Labor team meet with Colonel Light Gardens' locals, planning, development and heritage issues are consistently raised with us. We have listened to residents, and today Labor is introducing this legislation to preserve the character of this historic suburb. I am now calling on the Marshall Liberal government to support this bill so that together we can better protect and preserve the unique garden suburb character of Colonel Light Gardens.

As shadow minister for veterans affairs, I am also aware of the areas' links with the former Mitcham Army Camp and soldiers who served their country during the First World War. The war interrupted the state government's intention for Grange Farm, and the land was used as an Army training camp until 1920. It was used by the Light Horse and infantry battalions, such as the 32<sup>nd</sup> Battalion raised at Mitcham, and many who went on to fight at Gallipoli.

While properties were available for purchase in Colonel Light Gardens from 1921, residential development in the suburb was accelerated under the Labor government's 1924-26 Thousand Homes scheme—695 of which were built in that suburb. With those comments, I commend the bill to the house. Also, to put it in a historical context, this suburb is not just a wonderful place but played an important role in the protection of our nation.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

## **HEALTH CARE (PRIVATISATION OF HEALTH SERVICES) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Introduction and First Reading*

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (10:59):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Health Care Act 2008. Read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (11:00):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

It gives me great pleasure to move the Health Care (Privatisation of Health Services) Amendment Bill and note the support of my crossbench colleagues. This bill amends the Health Care Act by inserting a new section 94, which prohibits the privatisation of an asset or service of a public provider of a health service without the approval of parliament.

A public provider of a health service is defined broadly to include incorporated hospitals—which includes hospitals in each of the local health networks established across the state—the SA Ambulance Service, SA Pathology and any other public sector agency under the Public Sector Act that provides health services in South Australia. The bill also consequentially ensures that the dissolution of an incorporated hospital or the transfer of any assets of an incorporated hospital to a private party may not occur without parliamentary consent.

I first brought forward these amendments to the government's now lapsed Health Care (Governance) (No 2) Amendment Bill in the house last year and at the same time was talking about introducing universal emergency ambulance cover as a separate but related initiative, a vital component of an integrated public health system. I did so because of my concern that changes the government was pursuing would lead to the normalisation of privatisation in our health system.

We knew at that time that SA Pathology was already reeling from the effects of the first round of cuts and was under threat of privatisation. We could all clearly see the potential for more, similar privatisations as we cast our eyes across comparable threats on the agenda of the last Liberal government and now on this one's. No-one condones duplication or waste, but I put it to the house that there is very little fat to excise. Comparing SA Pathology with interstate services, we are not comparing like with like.

I am as delighted as anyone else that SA Pathology, which has shown outstanding commitment and dedication to the South Australian community in the course of this current pandemic, has been spared imminent privatisation by fiat of the Premier for now. If this pandemic has shown us anything, it is that the sickness of one of us is a concern for all of us. Testing has been our secret weapon, and SA Pathology has proved itself to be, as the Premier and health minister have publicly stated, 'an organisation of international standing'. The leadership and foresight of SA Pathology's senior staff made this possible and gave front-line and lab staff the opportunity to show their mettle.

As we have watched this virus overwhelm nations around the world, it is clear that a strong public health system is best placed and most capable of gearing up to meet a challenge of this scale. Protecting our community from future health crises requires our health system to be protected from future privatisation threats. The constant threat of privatisation to the provision and delivery of a universal health service and secure health workers' jobs has to stop. Over 30,000 health workers are employed in the state's public health system, including some 800 in SA Pathology, and all work hard to keep South Australians safe under normal circumstances and especially now in the face of the current pandemic.

It is heartening to see that the Premier recognises the importance of our publicly owned pathology service and indeed congratulates them on their outstanding work, but the threat of privatisation does remain. Staff throughout our health system deserve more than a pat on the back. They deserve to know that their work is valued and their jobs will remain after this crisis to deliver the essential care South Australians deserve and expect and be ready to step up again whenever necessary. Merely extending the deadline for SA Pathology to meet budget cuts is no comfort to workers on the front line and gives room for any future government to consider privatisation.

I am also concerned that, with the privatisation of SA Pathology off the agenda for now, attention will turn to privatisation of other parts of our health system. KordaMentha have merely paused their activities. I am not sure what they have actually paused, and no-one really is sure why their contract had to be extended. Have SA Health staff not yet been brought up to speed? So I introduce this bill today, a bill that has the support of representatives of SA Pathology staff and staff employed more widely within our health sector. I want to particularly acknowledge and thank the PSA and the ANMF for their public support of this bill today.

To turn briefly to the operation of the bill, it is important to know the definition of privatisation is drafted in fairly broad language, to include any disposal or transfer of ownership or control of public health system assets or services outside government. There are, however, exceptions built into this legislation for minor leases and minor contracts, such as the kiosk at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, being leases of five years or less, with contracts having the added safeguard of having a total worth of \$5 million or less. The other is disposal of an asset defined as minor, being an asset worth \$5 million or less, allowing for the disposal of things like equipment. All of these exceptions have room for regulatory change.

These are practical and reasonable measures which, given the government's decision not to proceed with the privatisation of SA Pathology, would give the South Australian community surety of process beyond the tenure of this government. As many would know, I have always opposed privatisation of our health system, starting with the ill-conceived privatisation of Modbury Hospital's administration decades ago. In the midst of this pandemic, a period when we all have to pull together, it is long past time we made our health system immune to privatisation threats. South Australians are proud of our health system and expect our government to keep it strong and able to keep us all safe and well. I seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

## Explanation of Clauses

## Part 1—Preliminary

## 1—Short title

This clause is formal.

## 2—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

## Part 2—Amendment of Health Care Act 2008

## 3—Amendment of section 29—Incorporation

This clause amends section 29 of the Health Care Act 2008 to provide that a proclamation of the Governor to dissolve an incorporated hospital, or to transfer the assets of an incorporated hospital to a person or body that is not an agency or instrumentality of the Crown, must not be made without the approval of Parliament given by resolution of the Houses.

## 4—Insertion of section 94

This clause inserts a new section providing that, from the date of commencement of the section, no asset or service owned, controlled or under the responsibility of a public provider of health services may be privatised without the approval of Parliament given by resolution of the Houses.

A public provider of a health service is defined to mean an incorporated hospital, the SA Ambulance Service, SA Pathology or any public sector agency within the meaning of the Public Sector Act 2009 that provides health services in South Australia.

To privatise an asset or service means to sell or transfer ownership or control of, or responsibility for, an asset or service to a health service provider that is not a public provider of a health service.

However, to privatise does not include the granting of a designated contract or a minor lease or the sale, transfer or disposal of a minor asset.

A designated contract means a contract for the provision of health services to a public provider with a value of \$5 million or less (or such greater amount as may be specified by regulation).

A minor lease means a lease of property owned or controlled by a public provider that is granted for a period of 5 years or less (or such greater period as may be specified by regulation) and has a value of \$5 million or less (or such greater amount as may be specified by regulation).

A minor asset means an asset owned or controlled by a public provider that has a value of \$5 million or less (or such greater amount as may be specified by regulation).

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

**COAST PROTECTION (SIGNIFICANT WORKS) AMENDMENT BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:07):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Coast Protection Act 1972. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:07):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am delighted to be able to bring this proposed legislation to parliament and will be sending it to the Minister for Environment and Water as soon as it has been introduced in order to hope that we can have a conversation and find a way to have this supported across the chamber.

We know that the management of our coastline, and in particular in this instance the management of our metropolitan coastline, is a vexed issue. There are three significant challenges that face Adelaide's coastline. One is, of course, the natural movement of sand that appears to have occurred for millennia, where sand naturally moves from the south to the north. The second is the encroachment of development along the coastline as Adelaide was settled, as housing and other property was built along the coastline and, of course, developments were approved over time that intruded into the coastline: marinas, basins and so on.



A third challenge, which sits over the top of almost everything we contemplate in this chamber, is the impact of climate change, the expectation not only that there will generally be higher sea levels around the planet but that increasing severity of storms will occur and there will be increasing frequency of those storms. Of course, what sits alongside climate change is the tragic loss of biodiversity that we are seeing.

All three of those come to bear when we have to consider what to do about the movement of sand. All three affect these beaches that have lost sand and the beaches that have gained sand and had it incorporated into complex dune systems.

Understandably, when talking about the movement of sand and the management of our Adelaide coastline, there are community concerns that are expressed at every point—community concerns for people who live in proximity to areas where sand is being collected and transported further south and community concerns where people live near beaches that have been severely denuded of sand. The people of West Beach, in particular, have been suffering for some time with the lack of sand on that beach. The people who live in the Semaphore South and Semaphore Park area have had a groyne put into the sea there, just offshore, to facilitate the collection of sand to assist further south. That has had a significant effect on the integrity of the dune system south of the Semaphore jetty.

There is also the challenge that has been experienced in other parts of Adelaide, but not yet in my neighbourhood, of the installation of sand pumps. Some people say that that has made a positive difference; others have seen, with some dismay, the extent of disruption caused by the installation of the sand pumps. There is some question about whether the pumping of the sand further south than West Beach has itself contributed to the diminution and lack of sand on West Beach, because it has created a closed loop. All these are issues that the community is aware of and that they have different and varying concerns about, some consistent and some at odds with each other.

There are also significant environmental concerns about the integrity of the coastline and the quality, nature and health of the seaweed and the sand grasses that used to be plentiful off our coastline, which were severely diminished by the way in which we chose to push untreated effluent and simply fresh water out into the gulf. These are sand grasses that are essential to the health of our marine ecosystem, including, as we head further north, the capacity to host fish nurseries for fish to be bred, which of course is an important part of our industry and our recreational and community life.

These concerns can occasionally find expression in frustration and anger with various points of government policy, and both sides of politics have experienced that over time. This bill seeks to make available to the minister additional power—not to require the minister to undertake but to be available to the minister—to recognise that an environmental impact statement might be an improvement in both the quality of the knowledge available to the minister and the Coast Protection Board, and therefore the community, and also the capacity for the community to engage, to be consulted and to make sure that their views are heard through the consideration of how to undertake the sand management processes.

I know that in recent times, last year, the community particularly invested in the quality of the dunes between the Semaphore and Largs Bay jetties. They would have appreciated an environmental impact statement on what was proposed to be done at that point. They would have appreciated it in order to have a better understanding of the likely impact on the environment and also because there would have been appropriate community consultation through an environmental impact process.

Last year, that was largely obviated through the government decision to not proceed with putting a road through the dunes to facilitate truck movements. However, it was not entirely obviated, because nonetheless there is sand collection occurring between those two jetties; it occurred just a few weeks ago. Now what is starting is a further process north of Largs jetty that will be taking sand in trucks along under Semaphore jetty and down to restore the dunes that have been damaged in Semaphore South.

I talk about my area because I know the way that the community feels most closely, but I also know about how the people who live around the Henley area—Henley South and West Beach—

feel about the desperate need for sand to be located down there. What I know very clearly, though, is that everybody wants to know the environmental impact of different decisions: the impact on the dune system and the impact on the sand management process itself.

This bill creates the opportunity for a minister to form the view that a proposed sand movement is of such significance that its decision-making processes ought to be strengthened by having an environmental impact statement. What this bill further does is require that, through that process of undertaking an environmental impact statement, there would be appropriate and deep consultation with the council and with the local community.

I have had significant concerns raised with me by people who are concerned about what is happening north of Largs jetty in the Largs Bay area. There is significant concern about what they perceive to be a lack of consultation over that matter, consultation that occurred very briefly, that occurred in the midst of people being very concerned about the pandemic. If we take ourselves back only five or six weeks, it was deeply troubling for South Australia and for Australia. They are concerned that that lack of deep and appropriate consultation has meant that their voices have not been able to be considered when the minister has made a decision about taking sand.

This bill is intended entirely to be useful. It is not intended to bind or force a minister. It is intended to give a minister the power and the opportunity to avail himself or herself of a further element of information gathering and consultation that would mean a sound decision can be made in full knowledge of the environmental impact and the community views both of taking sand—the manner and quantity of taking sand—and what occurs for the beach that is receiving the sand.

I have been on record and am very interested to see how fast the government is able to accelerate extraction and sand from an external source rather than the constant rotation from beaches further north, an external source to buttress what is a very serious circumstance in West Beach. I hope that that acceleration is occurring. I understand it is the policy position of the government, and I urge them to move that as fast as possible. Understanding the environmental impact of that process might also assist in understanding how long that solution might last.

I urge the government to consider this bill. I will, as I say, be sending it to the minister, and I hope that the minister might find a way to support what is intended to be a constructive and useful amendment bill to supplement the information he has available to him.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

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

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 April 2020.)

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining)**

**(11:18):** I rise to speak on behalf of my electorate on this bill from the member for Florey, who no doubt has put a lot of consideration into it and is representing her electorate as she sees fit, and we all respect that. However, I do not support this bill and neither does our government. I look forward to hearing the Minister for Primary Industries' contribution on this bill. He is somebody who knows an enormous amount about this topic not only through his role as minister but also through his role as the member for Chaffey.

The electorate of Chaffey is not the only one affected by incursions of fruit fly and other plant and animal risks. In fact, it would be fair to say that our entire state is affected, although many people do not actually realise this. But the electorate of Chaffey, through its incredibly highly productive citrus, grape, almond and other industries, is very affected. I look forward to hearing the member for Chaffey's contribution, which will be far more detailed than mine.

On behalf of the electorate of Stuart, let me say that it might seem to people in the city that this is not a particularly important issue, but it actually is. Everybody who wants to be able to consume clean, green, healthy, ideally locally grown produce should have an interest in this. It might also seem a little bit far-fetched to be claiming too great a connection from the electorate of Stuart, but one of our border crossing protection areas is actually in the electorate of Stuart, at Oodla Wirra, on the

Barrier Highway, dealing with people coming from New South Wales. This is a very real issue and there are people in the Peterborough area who are particularly concerned about this issue as well: olive growers in that district, among others.

I have great sympathy for the essence of what the member for Florey is putting forward, which is: if you make a genuine mistake, you are not quite aware, it is a small error, it was not a deliberate thing, you are not a bad person trying to do a bad thing, maybe there should be some more leniency. I do have sympathy for that, but the reality is that this is such an important issue that we just cannot take any chances. Our government has been very firm and our minister has been very firm on a zero tolerance approach.

I accept that a zero tolerance approach may well have some unintended consequences, but I think the responsibility to avoid those unintended consequences is not with this parliament and it is not with this government. The responsibility for avoiding those unintended consequences is with the people coming into South Australia and the people crossing between regions in South Australia, informing themselves of the need to do the right thing in this area.

At the moment, in the Adelaide metropolitan area we have five areas affected by outbreaks. Not long ago, the Minister for Primary Industries showed me a map as part of a totally different conversation that showed five areas in the metro area and then a massive exclusion area covering most of the metropolitan area—certainly most of the north and the west and a bit of the south and a bit of the east—surrounding those five areas, which are all adjacent to each other. This has a massive impact for people just with their backyard gardens, which is very important, but more importantly, our commercial producers. We must protect our commercial producers.

If we want to consume locally produced, high-quality produce and if we want to export locally produced high-quality produce interstate and overseas then we need to do everything that we possibly can to protect our growers and our reputation, because this is not something that you can just deal with and say, 'We had a few rough years with fruit fly or some other type of pest. Yes, it sort of decimated our crops, but we will bounce back.' It is nothing like that. This is not something that you bounce back from.

That is why when there is an outbreak, when there is an incursion, the government and PIRSA get onto it instantly, as fast as they possibly can. If we let this issue get out of hand, we will suffer the same fate as other states and other nations have around the world. We are relatively advantaged compared with those places that would like to produce in competition with us, but just cannot. We cannot let this go.

Having a person turn up at the border and say, 'I am sorry, I forgot,' or, 'I didn't know,' or, 'I threw out some fruit at the bin down the road, but I didn't see all of it in my fridge or esky or in a bag in the back seat' might seem like a small thing, but it is not a small thing. This is not one of those situations where you can say, 'Look, I just didn't know, so here it is.' It is a very thin sliver between, 'I didn't know, yes you found it, thank you and here it is,' to just passing right through with that fruit. It is something that is just not acceptable.

Rather than support this bill, responsibility needs to be taken by people travelling into South Australia from interstate and within South Australia between important producing regions. People must learn these rules, people must understand what they can and cannot do in this area. People need to take responsibility when they cross borders, whether they be intrastate borders or interstate borders, and come into the regions in South Australia that need these protections, and they need to know they cannot bring prohibited items with them into the state.

For those who have travelled across borders many times, as I have, in some places there is a bin, and in some places there is a checking station. There is a range of different ways it can be done, and you will find the same in other states. If you ever go on the ferry to Tasmania you will find one of the most thorough search processes you could imagine, because in that state they consider their primary production to be incredibly important and they want to protect it—just as we do in South Australia.

I am not just talking about this in theory or on behalf of my electorate in a very general way. On a personal level I can tell members that my wife and I, when travelling interstate, once sat on the

side of the road at the bin for nearly an hour. My wife had legally and appropriately purchased some potatoes interstate, and she knew that the law was that if she had bought them from a supermarket and had a receipt she could bring them interstate in the original packaging. I said, 'That's fantastic, you're 100 per cent right. The problem is you don't have the receipt. The potatoes are not coming into South Australia.' I still suffer from that conversation from time to time.

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** There is nothing I could say in this place that would get me into more strife than I am in already on this topic. I can say that I personally feel very strongly about this issue, so much so that I found myself in the situation I just described.

This is critical. People need to know the rules and people need to follow the rules. There are signs all over the highway, there are pamphlets and brochures and things all over the place. It is something that as a five year old in the back seat of the family car, driving around the place, you picked up on and started to realise, just by looking around and seeing what your parents were doing, that you were not allowed to take some fruit and vegetables and other things across state borders.

You get your driver's licence and become the person responsible for yourself and others moving around in this way, and it is your responsibility to know what the rules are. It is your responsibility to follow the rules—and it is the government's responsibility to enforce the rules. As I said, I have sympathy for the efforts of the member for Florey in this area, but I think the topic is so critically important to the livelihood of South Australian producers, to consumers who want to consume local, high-quality produce, and to our economy that we cannot support this bill.

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (11:29):** I am very aware of the time, but I rise to indicate our opposition to this bill as well. It is incredibly important that we have a zero tolerance approach when it comes to fruit fly, given the potentially devastating consequences when we do have a fruit fly infestation in our state. There is so much at stake when it comes to protecting our borders.

As a member, you get approached by constituents with some issues and some people feel as though they have been unfairly treated. It might well be that there are practical things that can be done on our borders to improve the situation so that people are not inadvertently doing the wrong thing: awareness campaigns, better signage, a range of other approaches. But, at the end of the day, we have to do everything we can to protect a \$1.2 billion industry. Some of the previous speakers referred to a fairly recent infestation on one property. It cost that business \$1 million. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION**

**Mr PICTON (Karna) (11:30):** I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move my motion in an amended form.

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

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

Motion carried.

#### *Motions*

### **CORONAVIRUS, PUBLIC HEALTH SYSTEM**

**Mr PICTON (Karna) (11:33):** I move my revised motion:

That this house—

- (a) expresses its appreciation to the talented doctors, nurses, paramedics and other health practitioners and staff for their work in response to the COVID-19 pandemic;
- (b) recognises that the public health and hospital system is a critical factor in the protection for South Australians and that system should always be well resourced and funded;

- (c) calls on the government to do everything possible to provide protections, such as personal protective equipment, to these hardworking health staff through the pandemic; and
- (d) calls on the government to provide all necessary resources to our public hospitals to look after all patients in a timely and effective manner during this pandemic and forever more.

Never before has the public health system been more important. Never before have our public hospitals been more important. We should be very proud that here in South Australia and in Australia we have public hospitals, we have a Medicare system, we have the ability for people to get care no matter what their income, and we have hardworking health professionals who work day in, day out within that system, dedicated to care for South Australians when they are ill.

We have seen the COVID-19 pandemic reach around the world. We have seen this pandemic, particularly in the Northern Hemisphere, causing untold numbers of deaths, damage and many illnesses, and sadly the worst is probably yet to come.

Thank goodness so far in South Australia, and in Australia broadly, we have avoided what is happening in the US and the UK at the moment, but it is absolutely important that we are prepared for that. The first line of that preparation is having in place a strong public hospital system, a strong public health system, and having those front-line doctors, nurses, paramedics, allied health professionals and all the other health staff who are absolutely essential, whether they be clerks, cleaners, catering staff or security. All those people who work in our hospital system are absolutely essential, so it is important today that we as a house pay tribute to them and say thanks to them for their hard work.

They have been busy over the past few months preparing themselves for what may hit our state and what still may hit our state in terms of a significant number of COVID-19 cases that they would have to deal with. They are seeing what is happening around the world. They are seeing the impact upon health professionals in the US, the UK, Italy and Spain—the number of health workers who have been infected and the number of doctors and nurses and other health workers who have died because of the infections that they have obtained while caring for COVID-19 cases—yet despite that, they show up to work. Despite that, they are busy preparing, and despite that, if this does hit our state, they will be working hard to prepare and care for South Australians who need care.

What they expect is for us to back them. They expect us in this parliament and us in the community and us in the government broadly to do our part to make sure that they have the resources that they need, that they have the protections that they need, that they have everything possible that they could need in place. One of the major elements of that that we are seeing around the world is the issue of personal protection equipment (PPE). This is a significant issue.

I think one of the great benefits of the fact that we are not seeing a significant number of cases—and particularly here in South Australia it has been a week since our last case—is that we have the ability now to put in place those measures. If this peak had happened a long time before, I think it is fair to say that we would not have had all those measures in place. We need to make sure that they are in place. We need to make sure that all of those health workers have the protections that they need, because it is not just the people who are looking after people who have been diagnosed with COVID-19 who need protection; it is everybody else who might be dealing with somebody who is potentially a carrier of COVID-19 who needs protection in our health system.

If we have people throughout the winter appearing in our emergency departments with respiratory issues, as they invariably do, there is no way of knowing when they come in the front door of the emergency department whether they are going to have COVID-19 or not. Everybody must be prepared. It means an entirely different way of operating than those health staff are used to. Health staff—doctors, nurses and other workers—are used to rushing in and getting to work straightaway.

The saying goes that there is no emergency in a pandemic. They need to look after themselves first. They need to make sure that their PPE is in place before they attend to the patient, otherwise they are putting themselves, their colleagues and their loved ones at risk through potential infection to them. That is the top line issue that we need to make sure that we have in place here in South Australia.

We also need to make sure that adequate training is happening. We need to make sure, particularly as we have seen a step-down in elective surgery over the past three or four weeks, and it is still only operating at about 25 per cent, that we are doing as much training as possible and we are upskilling our workforce as much as possible to prepare for what might be coming.

We are lucky in terms of a lot of the investments that have been made previously. If you look down the road here, we have probably the best hospital equipped to deal with COVID-19 in Australia—the Royal Adelaide Hospital. One reason for that is that it is an entirely single-roomed hospital. That issue has been the subject of significant debate over the past 10 or 15 years in this place as to whether it should have been built, as to whether it should have been built with single rooms, as to whether it was too expensive, but that is a massive insurance policy for our state right now.

That is why this state government—and credit to them for doing this despite their previous objections to the hospital—have said that the RAH has to be the COVID hospital because it is the best place to deal with these patients because of the single rooms. Because of all the measures around infection control that were put in place when it was built, that is clearly what needs to be our focal point in terms of the system.

Sadly, we have a number of staff who are sitting on the sidelines at the moment. The matter of these staff has been raised a number of times in this house, but I would like to do so again. Our system relies upon a casual nursing staff workforce to fill shifts, to fill absences and to deal with the very busy times and all those other variances that happen throughout the year.

Those staff upon whom we usually rely have been stuck at home for the past month. They have had no shifts or the odd occasional shift. They are applying for other jobs. They are applying to Centrelink. They are not able to access the JobKeeper arrangements. If they were working in any other business, they would be able to because many of them have worked over 12 months. Because they work for the government, because they work for public hospitals, they are unable to access the JobKeeper arrangements and so they are receiving no income whatsoever.

This is something that other states have fixed. This is something that this government has chosen not to fix. I call on them: if we are going to say what a great health staff we have, then we have to actually look after them as well. We cannot just leave them without income during this period and expect them to pick up the pieces and to go and fight this invisible enemy later on, which could potentially threaten their lives, when we have not been looking after them at this point in time.

We also have concerns in terms of the way our health staff are looked after in terms of WorkCover arrangements, which we have talked about as well. We need to make sure that, if there is a diagnosis of COVID-19 in health workers, then we say, 'We presume that is because of the work you are doing. We are not going to make you jump through many hoops to get to the point of getting protection.' That needs to be a given. The government has the ability to do that. They have not done that, and we call upon them to do that.

We also continue to have too many threats, too many security issues, too many attacks on front-line workers, and this is something where more action can be taken as well, and we call upon the government to do that. Just yesterday we had another report in the paper of the thousands of incidents that have happened to our front-line workers over the past few years, and it is not good enough. We need to make sure that they are protected, we need to make sure that all the proper security is in place, and we need to make sure that people who commit those crimes receive the full extent of the law.

As I said, we are very proud that we have a public health system in Australia and in South Australia. When you compare us to the US, where people are not only facing the risks of COVID-19 and deaths from COVID-19 but they are facing massive hospital bills due to that at the same time and complete inequities in terms of healthcare coverage that people have access to, luckily we do not have that in Australia. However, I think it is safe to say that we could still improve upon the inequalities in our system, but it is important that we keep those elements in the public system.

So we have been campaigning not just during this pandemic but for the past year and a half on keeping SA Pathology in public hands. We are glad that has been reversed now and it will stay

in public hands, according to the government, but we will continue to campaign to make sure that every element of our health system stays in public hands.

One of the interesting elements of this pandemic has been that people have generally been staying away from emergency departments. It has led to some concerns from some doctors that some people who probably should be attending emergency departments at the moment are not doing so out of fear and that might be leading to worse health outcomes for them, but we know that eventually that demand will return.

We know that we have seen incredible pressures over the past year on our emergency departments and on our health system. This was the original motion that we were going to discuss, in terms of the pressure that was on our health system, and we want to make sure that, as we look to the future, we make sure that our health system has the resources it needs to not return to where it was before.

This is an opportunity for us to consider what the future of health care in South Australia looks like, and I hope it is not one where the bottom line rules as it has been. I hope it is not one where we are bringing in corporate liquidators from interstate as we have been. One of the silver linings out of this process has been that their contract has been suspended.

We are not focusing on penny-pinching. We are not fighting the Ambulance Employees Association through the courts about the resources that paramedics need on the front line. We look to a future of a public-focused health system. We look to the future of a well-resourced public health system. We look to the future of a public health system where we value and protect and give the resources that we need to front-line doctors, nurses and other allied health staff, but also to those increasingly important people through this pandemic, the other essential workers—the cleaners, security staff, the orderlies, the other workers behind the scenes in the hospital.

One of the things we have campaigned on during this process is giving free hospital car parking to all those health workers, and we are very glad that the government has largely agreed. There are still some issues around some of the people missing out from that, but it is largely agreed. Where we were before was that they were facing massive increases. We do not want a return to that.

Let's look to assist them in the future, where we are looking after these people, the people who are risking their lives. They should have our protection. They should get the resources that they need. At the moment, they have the thanks of a very grateful state. Let's make sure that we are all united in helping them and giving them what they need not only now but also for many years to come in the future.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:47):** I was pleased to support the suspension of standing orders earlier that enabled the member for Kurna to effectively withdraw what was an utterly inappropriate—grubby almost—motion that he had put on the *Notice Paper* and instead offer this motion, which is entirely more suitable and—

**Mr PICTON:** Point of order: unparliamentary language directed at me.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Unparliamentary language?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** I do not want to hold up the house, so I withdraw the word 'grubby'. I congratulate the member for Kurna on introducing in the place of his original motion an entirely more appropriate motion, a motion that I think—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you, Minister for Education.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** —does some very important things. Given that we received his proposed amendment about half an hour ago, it was late notice, but I had a chance to look at his motion before he introduced it and I thank him for giving us that half an hour's notice that we would be debating a different motion.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Minister for Education, if I could interrupt for a minute, you have indicated that you will be amending the motion.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** I am about to indicate that, but I have not yet indicated that. I am still talking on the motion as introduced originally and therefore I want to congratulate the

member for Kaurna on adapting the motion and giving us that hour to have a look at the proposed change.

We agree with most of it, but I do think that, in the spirit this morning of our improving on the original motion, we have a particularly important further improvement to make because, while the motion as introduced does pay appropriate tribute to all the public health staff, all the staff in our hospitals and our healthcare system—doctors, nurses, paramedics and other health practitioners—I think that it would be remiss of this house not to particularly note at this time, given public health messaging, the way that the people of South Australia have done the right thing.

They have been led to do that right thing, particularly I think through their trust in the messaging they have received from the leadership in Health, from the government, and particularly from Professor Nicola Spurrier, our Chief Public Health Officer, and her deputy chief public health officers and their teams, and I congratulate them on that as well. It is a week since we had our last positive transmission of COVID-19 here in South Australia.

We also note that a number of the things that were called upon in the original draft of the motion from the member for Kaurna have taken place. Therefore, I seek leave to move an amendment by adding a new paragraph (b), as follows in the text below; by renumbering the existing paragraph (b) as paragraph (c) unamended, as indeed paragraph (a) is unamended; and by renumbering existing paragraphs (c) and (d), as (d) and (e) with minor amendments, as follows in the text. I hope this is a motion that every member in this house and every person in South Australia can get behind. I move to amend the motion as follows:

That this house—

- (a) expresses its appreciation to the talented doctors, nurses, paramedics and other health practitioners and staff for their work in response to the COVID-19 pandemic;
- (b) notes that it is now a week since South Australia has recorded a positive test for COVID-19 and thanks Professor Nicola Spurrier, her deputy chief public health officers and her team for their world-class public health leadership so far during this pandemic;
- (c) recognises that the public health and hospital system is a critical factor in the protection for South Australians and that the system should always be well resourced and funded;
- (d) notes the government has provided protections, such as personal protective equipment, to these hardworking health staff through the pandemic; and
- (e) notes the government has provided necessary resources to our public hospitals to look after all patients in a timely and effective manner during this pandemic and will continue to do so.

The fact is that the COVID-19 pandemic has presented challenges to health systems around the world, many of which have struggled with them to the point of breaking. In SA Health, we did not want to see any of the images that we saw overseas happen here. We did not want that for our community and we certainly did not want that for our front-line health workers, who have put their lives on the line around the world. We have joined with people around the world, through electronic means in recent weeks, to support those systems, particularly those that have been in dire need stretching to collapse.

The extraordinary footage we have seen from Italy, the United Kingdom, New York and other jurisdictions around the world has absolutely caused enormous anxiety to everyone here, and it was critical from the government's point of view that SA Health and our health workforce be given every support they needed to ensure that could not happen. That is why we have put in place significant measures to increase PPE, the use of which has gone up dramatically in recent months, and the production of which is now coming back to South Australia.

The announcement that Detmold is retooling to be able to produce millions upon millions of items of PPE is an example of the government in South Australia working with private industry in a way that does not just support our health workers here in South Australia but will support the health workforce more broadly around Australia through that capacity, and that will be a capacity that will continue. Nicola Spurrier, her team and the hospitals have been working hard with the health networks to ensure that the use of PPE is absolutely available and appropriate in the necessary way.



To deal with the potential need for increased capacity, the government has done a range of other things. We have secured the old Wakefield hospital site, which was an important measure that the government was able to take with SA Health, to ensure that should the peak hit in a way that required significant extra capacity we would be able to have that. It would mean that not every hospital in South Australia necessarily needed to have COVID patients, so you could have some COVID-free hospitals, and that was an important part of the mix.

We have been able to reinvest further funds in reactivating the Repat in a way that would enable some of those wards to become available should the COVID pandemic peak hit in a way that needed extra capacity. If we had been debating the original motion, I think that issue would have been touched upon several times. The fact that this government has saved the Repat and is now able to reactivate it in a way to help our fight against COVID-19 has been tremendously important.

There is a range of other hospitals that have bed capacity if there is a flex needed in COVID-19. Thankfully, we have a small number of people currently hospitalised with COVID-19. We only have two in ICU, and for those two it is a very difficult scenario. It is a tragedy that four people have passed away but, compared to what we have seen in other jurisdictions and around the world, it is relatively good news compared to what might have been the case.

How have we got there? There are a number of factors in our favour. There are things that the government has done, such as requiring a two-week quarantine for anyone coming into South Australia. There are things that all governments have done, through working with the national cabinet collaboratively with other states, that have been tremendously important—and we are seeing the benefit of those changes across Australia—but particularly the messaging that the people of South Australia have taken up.

This is a motion that indeed every South Australian can take credit for, with the introduction of the new paragraph (b) that talks about the public health messaging, led by Professor Nicola Spurrier, her team and her deputies. That is something where they have reached out to the public and the public have embraced it. They have embraced the capacity to do social distancing. They have embraced the capacity to practice strong hygiene habits. They have embraced the capacity to work from home where possible, particularly when there was a heightened level of risk of community transmission.

We celebrate the fact that in South Australia it is six days since we have had any positive diagnoses and it is well over a month now since there has been an example of untraced community transmission. That is a credit to the fact that our testing regime is the best in Australia, and Australia's is pretty much the best in the world. There have been more than 54,000 tests in South Australia. We are currently underway with a blitz and, since the beginning of that blitz, there has been not even so much as a handful of new cases identified.

The contact tracing team has been a spectacularly important part of the work as well, which is also led by Professor Spurrier and her team. They have been able to identify the networks of all but seven and found the epidemiological first cause of where that transmission has come from—usually from overseas, some from interstate and many from cruise ships, indeed. We have been able to get on top of clusters, such as the one in the Barossa. I am so pleased that schools in the Barossa and businesses in the Barossa are reopening today after the period where that cluster was expressed as a concern. They have got on top of it and they are doing well.

There is always going to be more that we are looking to do. Health is a complex and large area, and the government is working hard and has been working hard. It was pleasing to see improvements through our health system, improvements in terms of supports where they needed to be, even prior to the COVID crisis. It was pleasing to see a number of the issues left to us by the legacy of the failed Transforming Health experiment starting to subside even before COVID 19.

Our job is to keep South Australians safe. The government is doing it and our healthcare professionals, all of the workers identified in this motion, deserve every credit that we give them and we thank them for their work.

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (11:58):** I rise in support of the revised motion, as moved by the member for Kurna, the shadow spokesperson for health and wellbeing on this side of the house. It

is a really appropriate week to be talking with respect to the hard work and care that is shown by so many health workers in our state. That encompasses a whole range of skills, from administrative staff to cleaners, orderlies, ambulance workers, public health, public servants, nurses, doctors and a whole range of people who have come together to work so hard.

Yesterday was International Workers' Memorial Day, which is a day when we reflect on those people who have lost their lives in the duty of undertaking their work. Of course, we know that over the last few months across the globe hundreds of healthcare workers have lost their lives purely because they have turned up to work in order to save others. It is an appropriate moment in this house that we can choose to talk about some of the things that have been done well here in South Australia—in fact, across Australia—as compared to some of the things that have happened across the globe during the COVID pandemic.

In doing that, we also congratulate and thank many people who have stood up and advocated strongly for people working in the healthcare sector, and I will single out a few people or groups in respect of that. In particular, we have heard from the South Australian branch of the Australian Nurses and Midwifery Federation (ANMF), with Elizabeth Dabars taking a front role in that advocacy to ensure that the needs of our healthcare workers are expressed. I have heard from the United Workers Union and the Australian Services Union very loudly in terms of the failings in the provision of protective equipment for people, the PPE we talk about so frequently.

I note there has been an amendment to the amended motion that notes the government has, in fact, provided the PPE required. Well, the job is not done. It came quite late in the piece when we saw a large supply of PPE; in fact, that happened in the last sitting week of parliament. Some 31 million pieces or thereabouts were supplied to Australia during a period of time when it was being called for by healthcare workers, disability workers and all other people who were coming into contact with COVID patients or people at risk of carrying COVID. It was a time of great fear amongst healthcare workers and that has not gone away.

I have hundreds of friends who work in health care; that is my background. They are calling out constantly about the confusion around the PPE. It has been a bone of contention, of course. We heard publicly that there was some doubt around the integrity of masks that were being provided to healthcare staff within hospitals. I can tell you, from having worn PPE through some of the other pandemic situations such as bird flu and SARS, that having PPE on you is like armour. If you doubt the integrity of it while you are wearing it, your mind is elsewhere when you are trying to focus on your patient who is critically ill.

To have some doubt about the types of protective equipment that are being worn within our health system in this day and age is a terrible blight and a sad indictment of our capacity to look after healthcare workers. We have to make sure that that does not happen again. There needs to be no doubt and they need to be assured that they are provided with the best possible equipment. I think the rate at which the pandemic approached us and the spread of the disease in the early days was a real wake-up call and we should take that as a massive lesson that we cannot let that happen again.

I still see people talking on social media and in the public, saying things like, 'Oh, it's only a cold. This is just a flu. Many more people die of the flu across the world.' I need to say that that is absolute nonsense. I have listened to some of the more right-wing commentators around the world and their throwaway statements. I think the best example would be Prime Minister Boris Johnson, who made commentary about how he had been in the hospital and shook everyone's hands, saying, 'It's okay. Look at me, I'm fine.' A week later, he would have been trying to breathe sucking through cement in his lungs. Even with the constant attention of the best skilled medical and clinical staff in the country at that given moment, he still faced death.

This disease process is something you cannot imagine. It is not a cold. You cannot just blow your nose. You have cement in your lungs and oxygen does not pass through. This is a devastating illness. We are also seeing evidence across the globe that it turns into something sinister in young people. There are people who carry this without symptoms.

I congratulate the amazing public health team in South Australia. It has not just appeared; this public health team has been in South Australia and has been built up over decades. These things

do not happen overnight. Associate Professor Nicola Spurrier and her team have done an incredible job of pulling together the best possible evidence that we have, bringing that to a level that the public understand and putting that messaging out into our community so that we have been able to stop the spread.

We have flattened the curve, but the job is not done. To note that the PPE has been provided is lovely, but the job is not done. We cannot keep the borders closed forever. Australia will have to open up at some point, and what we will be relying on is that other countries have also stopped the spread and have also flattened their curve, and that we do not allow people into the country who are carrying this lethal virus unknowingly and then unwittingly spreading it to others. What we have done now by flattening the curve, by providing some additional skills to workers, has given us a bit of breathing space, a bit of a capacity to be able to handle another wave if that should come.

I know many people who are working in this space at the moment—not to be named, but thanking you all for the amazing work you are doing—and it would be remiss if I did not use this as an opportunity to talk about some words that were said in the upper house yesterday. There was a lack of understanding by the health minister of the numbers of casual nurses who have been left without work—highly skilled, highly agile, casual nurses on whom we will be relying as we ramp up our activity in hospitals again.

There was a waving away of the Hon. Emily Bourke, who asked a very reasonable question of the minister about these casual nurses. There was a suggestion that the Hon. Emily Bourke was implying that we should turn economics upside down, turn it on its head and provide guaranteed work for all casuals. Actually, the people who contacted me last night were horrified; they saw it as a version of misogyny. They thought she was being berated like a little girl, and to her credit Emily has not made an issue of this. The Hon. Emily Bourke has just copped that and thought, 'Well, this is just typical. We'll leave it where it is.'

But I can tell you that the nurses who contacted me are absolutely horrified and disgusted. These nurses' plight is to be left with no choice but to be on casual contracts. There are no full-time permanent jobs, no part-time permanent jobs. They are often young people who would love to work full time, but they cannot. They are parents, family members, skilled clinicians. I spoke about this a couple of weeks ago and I will use every opportunity to remind South Australia of what has happened with the attitude of this state government around dedicated, committed casual workers who are not able to apply for JobKeeper, and as such have been left without the ability to feed and support their families for up to six to eight weeks without a shift. I hope that changes.

Shame on you, Hon. Stephen Wade in the other place, for not understanding and not doing something about these workers whose help you will be calling out and screaming for over the next month. I commend the motion as amended by the member for Kaurana, and I thank him for his diligence and his open communication with not just me but with the public.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (12:08):** It gives me great pleasure to rise and make a contribution to this motion, a motion which principally congratulates those hardworking men and women who have put themselves in harm's way day after day, week after week, in our health system. I cannot imagine what it must have been like five weeks ago, when the number of cases in South Australia was doubling every two to three days, to have to front up to work and know that you were likely going to be dealing with people who were infected with the coronavirus.

I know there have been concerns from health workers about the availability and quality of the personal protective equipment, but, putting that to one side, even with the best, most impenetrable personal protective equipment it must have been an incredibly stressful experience to be working for many hours in that sort of environment. Of course you can also reflect on those people more broadly in the community who were not quite placed in such a situation in harm's way but nonetheless still had to front up to work and encounter, in the course of their work, many hundreds of people. I am thinking of, for example, retail workers who particularly have had to staff check-outs, dealing with dozens upon dozens of people coming through buying goods during this period.

Despite all that anxiety and the stress that those health workers must have been feeling, they have done the most unbelievable job for our community. It has been extraordinary. Along with the broader community—the rest of us, doing our best to abide by the directions to stay distant from one

another, to stay at home, to limit our adventures beyond our homes to only the most necessary of purposes—our health workers have kept a lid on the spread of this virus to the extent that it has been six days now since we had a recorded new case of coronavirus in South Australia. For each of those six days, the people who have coronavirus have continued to get better in most cases; of course, we are still troubled by the reports of people in intensive care.

As we have kept a lid on the spread of this virus and as we have kept a lid on the increase in the number of people who have caught it, more and more people have recovered from the virus, and that is a terrific thing. It now feels like, for our community, there is light at the end of the tunnel. That light is becoming brighter and more distinct, that we can once again set about doing those things that perhaps we only now realise we hold so dear: going and seeing our broader families, seeing our friends and our other loved ones, participating in organised sport and so on or taking two very energetic under five-year-old boys out of the house for a change, down to a playground. Those are the sorts of things that we are all looking forward to doing.

I am sure that the government will find an appropriate way in due course to recognise the efforts of Professor Spurrier and her team, who have led us through this period, and perhaps also find an appropriate way to recognise the efforts of the other clinical and medical staff who have played such a key role in doing this. I would encourage the government, I would encourage the Minister for Health and the Premier, to find an appropriate way to recognise those efforts in due course. Of course, we should recognise that the job is not yet done. We need to get through another period where the curve is flattened for a longer period, if I can put it so bluntly, before we can feel that we are clear of this as a community, but I would encourage the government to do that. I think that would be the least that our community can do to recognise these people.

I would like to spend a couple of minutes just reflecting on the genesis of the motion that we are making contributions to today and that I think all members of the chamber would be wholeheartedly supporting. This motion was originally moved in a far different form by the member for Kaurana; in fact, if my memory serves me correctly, it was moved as the parliament was reconstituted after it was prorogued. I think that was in very early February.

That was at a time when coronavirus was not a concern for us here in South Australia. Perhaps for those people who were engaged in international medical matters, it might have been something that was happening many thousands of kilometres away, but it was not a concern here for the rest of us. The motion took a form to raise concern again at how this government was managing the state's health system. The first two budgets of this government had significant cuts to SA Health and in particular the Central Adelaide Local Health Network.

Indeed, in the first budget alone, not long after the Liberal Party came to government here in South Australia, huge cuts to the Central Adelaide Local Health Network were made, including cutting 884 full-time equivalent health workers: doctors, nurses, clinicians, other medical staff, allied health professionals and so on. They were very significant cuts. This happened at the same time that ramping of ambulances outside our hospitals was reaching levels that had never been seen before in South Australia. In response, the government built a wall around the ramping so that it could not be seen by the public or, more to the point, by the media at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital.

*Mrs Power interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** The member for Elder yells out across the chamber. She is free to make a contribution, of course, to this debate. She shakes her head, though, so clearly she will not be game to.

On top of the ramping, the cuts to the health budget, the cuts to the CALHN budget and the cuts to staffing levels of nearly 1,000 full-time equivalents we had the introduction of corporate liquidators KordaMentha. Of course, it is this government's view that there is no professional in South Australia able to conduct forensic accounting services capable of going into SA Health, and so it was necessary to parachute in corporate liquidators from interstate to do this work. This is a theme we will be hearing a lot more about this year, how this government relies on interstate workers to carry out the labour that South Australians are more than capable of doing.

Nonetheless, these interstate corporate liquidators parachute in at remarkable salaries and start swinging the axe in our health network to remarkable effect. In fact, the only news that KordaMentha was able to report about whether they were doing any good in SA Health was the report that they had merely sent more invoices out to be paid to SA Health. How remarkable! There was no change, there was no improvement in systems, there was no rectifying what corporate liquidator Chris Martin called 'dysfunction' within SA Health, merely the issuance of more invoices. Apparently, that is worth paying \$20 million to a cooperative liquidator for.

Of course, it does not stop there at \$20 million. It is nearly \$50 million that their total contract was due for. It was not just the employment of corporate liquidators: it was also the announcement that if SA Pathology did not cough up \$105 million worth of budget savings over three years it would be privatised. SA Pathology is the very organisation that has been responsible for helping us get through this coronavirus crisis, through what we are told by the government is the most extensive testing regime in the world. This is what they wanted to privatise. They did not want it controlled by government, they did not want public sector employees involved: they wanted to hand it over to the private sector so that it could be subjected to swingeing cuts and, once again, the profit motive.

What have we seen in the midst of this coronavirus pandemic? We have seen this government, with its tail between its legs, have to retreat from having corporate liquidators operating in the Central Adelaide Local Health Network. We have seen the Premier forced into admitting in the middle of a radio interview that he will no longer privatise SA Pathology. When the Treasurer fronted that same radio network later that day and was asked about it, he said that that was the first he had heard of it. He was not even aware of it. He was not aware that the Premier had now committed not to sell SA Pathology to the private market.

Congratulations to the health system here in South Australia, to the doctors and the nurses and the hardworking medicos who have protected our community so well and have treated the ill during this time. You can understand the pressure they have been under, not just from the coronavirus but from this government.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Is the member for King looking to speak?

**Ms LUETHEN:** No.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** If not, the member for Kaurana will speak and close the debate.

**Mr PICTON (Kaurana) (12:18):** I would like to thank the speakers on this motion and note the amendment that has been moved by the Minister for Education, which I will get to in detail. I indicate that on the whole the opposition is supportive of the amendment and particularly supportive of the inclusion of paragraph (b), which I will talk about in some detail. We do have some issues with their amendments to paragraphs (d) and (e), however, and I will get to that as well.

I would particularly like to thank the member for Hurtle Vale and the member for Lee for their comments, and for their commitment and passion to the subject. The member for Hurtle Vale knows more about looking after people in ICU than anybody in this house, and probably anybody who has sat in this house for a very long period of time—if ever—which is vitally important to all of us, and provided good advice to me as well during this time.

The Minister for Education made a number of comments in terms of the amendment being provided to him late. I would like to clarify that, up until this morning, this motion was listed way down the agenda, at No. 13 or something like that. Since it has now come back to the top, we worked to come up with an amendment to the motion that I believed everyone would agree to without needing further amendments, so I was surprised that we had to have a further amendment to it.

I was working on it in the hope of a bipartisan outcome to this motion, given the times we are in. I think that is what the community are looking for: I think they are looking for what the plan is for the future, and they are looking for the government to continue looking after our health workers throughout the length of however long this pandemic lasts and, after that, also into the future. So it is surprising that the government is seeking to amend the motion to such an extent that, instead of calling on the government to do everything possible to provide personal protection equipment for our front-line staff, they are now noting that they have provided such equipment.

**Ms Cook:** The job's not done.

**Mr PICTON:** Yes. The government might be patting itself on the back, but this is a job not done yet. There is a long way to go in terms of providing PPE. We will see many TV pictures of boxes arriving at warehouses, and I can assure members that they are being used up by our healthcare staff who need them on the front line and that we are going to need more and more after that. I absolutely congratulate our local manufacturers for the work done in terms of surgical masks, but we do need work in terms of fitted masks, N95 masks, which are absolutely needed by our front-line workers, to make sure that they have the absolute protection that they need, let alone all the other measures, such as gloves, gowns and face shields, which we know are of critical importance as well. So this is a job not yet done.

We will not be opposing that amendment, but we do note that it is premature for the government to be patting themselves on the back and saying, 'Our job on PPE is done,' because there is a long way to go. In particular, I would like to pick up on something that the member for Lee raised, which I was remiss in not noting in my speech, in relation to voluntary separation payments to health staff. It was a campaign that was underway up until midway through this pandemic, and the government has now suspended that.

As we look to the future, as I outlined, we need to be thinking about what our health system is going to look like. We cannot have that program being part of the future. We cannot have the focus being on removing health staff—doctors, nurses and allied health professionals—from our front lines in the future. That program should not just be suspended, it should end. It should be scrapped entirely, and we should be focusing on how we can help those people, rather than how many we can remove from the system.

Last but definitely not least, I absolutely support the inclusion of paragraph (b), our public health staff. As I have noted in the parliament before when debating a number of bills, Professor Spurrier and staff all the way down to our contact tracing teams and other public health staff on the front line have done an incredible job. We are very thankful in this state for their professionalism and for the hard work that they have done on behalf of us all.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

### NEIGHBOUR DAY

**Mrs POWER (Elder) (12:24):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises Neighbour Day on 29 March 2020;
- (b) acknowledges the importance of connectedness in the social wellbeing of local communities; and
- (c) recognises the efforts of local clubs, groups and societies in building strong local communities.

When I laid my notice of motion before the house in February this year, I expected to be standing here today delivering a very different kind of speech. I had anticipated that I would be sharing with the house the wonderful way in which communities had come together to celebrate Neighbourhood Day, the importance of doing so and some of the gatherings and events within my electorate that residents were involved in.

Under the current circumstances, with the social distancing measures introduced in response to the spread of the coronavirus, the usual celebrations of Neighbour Day, the physical coming together of communities, were simply not possible. However, the importance of connectedness within one's community and with neighbours and simply looking out for each other at a time of physical separation remains more relevant than ever.

Each year, normally Neighbour Day is celebrated in Australia on the last Sunday in March, meaning this year it was set to be on 29 March. Neighbour Day was founded in Melbourne in March 2003 in response to the terrible finding of the remains of Mrs Brown, an elderly woman who had passed away two years prior and had remained undiscovered in her own home. Taking positive steps towards ensuring such a sad situation does not happen again, Neighbour Day was created as an annual celebration of community, encouraging people to connect with those who live in their neighbourhood.

The day itself has progressed from a reminder to connect with elderly neighbours to an annual celebration of strong communities and friendly streets. So, while we must be physically distant right now, human connection to ensure the wellbeing of others around us is absolutely crucial, especially while many in our community are forced into being socially isolated. This is reinforced by Relationships Australia, which oversees Neighbour Day. Relationships Australia is a provider of relationship and community support and family safety services and is promoting the power of the Australian community to support our most vulnerable, to tackle loneliness and to help ensure healthy and safe relationships throughout this pandemic and beyond.

Neighbour Day is a catalyst to encourage people across all communities to build and strengthen their social connections not just on one day but also throughout the year. This can still be practised at this time, and it is especially important for everyone to be creative and find other ways to connect and engage with their neighbours and communities. During our current COVID-19 pandemic there are many ways in which connection is being encouraged, such as online or virtual connections or small acts of kindness, such as leaving calling cards with a kind message and your phone number for those who are isolated. I know we have seen many examples of these caring acts, like people leaving care packages on their neighbours' doorsteps.

The risk this necessary physical isolation poses has been recognised by the Marshall Liberal government. The Red Cross Telecross REDi service was activated last month. It is a free daily potentially life-saving phone call checking on the welfare of vulnerable South Australians in response to COVID-19. It means that vulnerable people, their neighbours, friends or loved ones can register with the Telecross REDi COVID-19 service, and anyone already registered with the service will automatically receive COVID-19 service support.

Another component of the Marshall government's strong plan is the \$1.6 million funding boost specifically to help ensure vulnerable South Australians are supported locally during COVID-19. The \$1.6 million injection will be spent over the next three months and includes funding for the food relief sector, including funding for Foodbank, OzHarvest, SecondBite, Meals on Wheels in South Australia, charities and NGOs so that they can give emergency relief to vulnerable South Australians, including supermarket and pharmacy vouchers and to help with cost of living pressures; funding for the Salvation Army, who provide the Affordable SA Helpline and National Debt Helpline in South Australia; and further funding for existing providers within the statewide financial counselling program.

One of the largest SA venue management organisations, which operates the Adelaide Convention Centre, the Adelaide Entertainment and Cooper Stadium, is also producing up to 10,000 meals a day to support community catering organisations. It is enabling groups like Meals on Wheels to continue delivering food to the most vulnerable in our communities and has the benefit of keeping staff in jobs.

With the repurposing of their venues and their commercial kitchens, Adelaide Venue Management are helping with an unprecedented demand on the food relief sector and are producing up to 18,000 three-course meals each week. This is crucial support that is helping Meals on Wheels bridge the supply gap. Adelaide Venue Management is also urging other community organisations to contact them if they need meal preparation support. What a fantastic example of a South Australian organisation stepping up to help the community at this unprecedented time.

While not related to Neighbour Day specifically, this act of connecting, looking after and supporting each other is exactly what the day is all about. Just because Neighbour Day occurred in March this year does not mean that it cannot be celebrated at any other time throughout the year, perhaps down the track when our restrictions have been lifted and eased.

I take this opportunity to commend the City of Mitcham in my electorate of Elder that recently got behind Neighbour Day in an innovative way and created a competition for residents to submit and share what is great about their street. What a wonderful idea. They also offered the random winners of the competition barbecue vouchers so that they could then host a Neighbour Day celebration on their own street. While the events of Neighbour Day could not go ahead due to COVID-19, the streets of the City of Mitcham are set to sizzle with community barbecues in September 2020 instead, assuming that restrictions are lifted by that time.

Some of the submissions that the City of Mitcham received in their competition shared stories of incredible neighbours, such as a coordinated meal swap that sees four families in one street participating. Each family has a day on which they cook and deliver a meal to the other three families, meaning you are only organising dinner two nights of your working week. There are people acknowledging new families who have moved into the neighbourhood and wanting to progress their friendship from a wave and a smile to sharing a meal. There is also one family, Janette and her husband, who put on a community meal for the local residents in their street.

A couple who moved to the City of Mitcham in the last two years advised that they would have paid more for their property had they known the well-connected neighbours and family community that they were becoming a part of when moving in. It goes to show that having a connection with neighbours can be valuable in more ways than one.

This ANZAC Day just past also saw neighbours come together to recognise this very important day in a different way. Light Up The Dawn was a beautiful coming together of neighbours and community in their own remembrance ceremonies. Many lit a candle at dawn in their homes, on their driveways or on their balconies, as did my husband and I. Such respect and magnitude were still shared amongst neighbours and our community, even though we could not physically stand together at our local RSLs, as we normally would.

The spirit of community within our neighbourhoods currently also takes the form of the very cute display of teddy bears in windows. When walking around your neighbourhood, it is not unusual to see teddy bears in windows, on fences or sitting in cars. I know that there are so many streets and neighbourhoods in my electorate where there are teddy bears dotted all over the place. Why, you may ask, Mr Deputy Speaker? For teddy bear hunts.

While playgrounds have been closed and social distancing is in place, it has been harder to find activities for children who are at home. Our community has come together in support and recognition by displaying the bears so that children can spot them whilst out on walks. It is fun for kids and adults alike, but also a demonstration of unity and looking out for each other. This is exactly what Neighbour Day is all about.

In summary, it is more important than ever that connectedness and social wellbeing of local communities is recognised. Whether that be a friendly wave to a neighbour, a calling card offering assistance to another community member or a phone call to a friend, we can still be connected and supported even while socially distancing at this time. This is the purpose of Neighbour Day and one that can be practised all year round. I commend all the people in my electorate in particular who have gone out of their way during the COVID-19 pandemic to be incredible neighbours. I commend this motion to the house.

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (12:33):** I take great pleasure in rising as lead speaker for the opposition in regard to the celebration of Neighbour Day. Neighbour Day is a celebration that has been going on across Australia for about 17 years. As we know from history, Neighbour Day was founded on a neighbourhood tragedy. Sadly, it is a tragedy that we have seen much more of in recent decades, as our communities have changed in their fabric and many communities have distanced themselves from neighbourhood connections.

Sadly, I admit we had a neighbour only a couple of doors down who we did not know lived there for about 18 months. We bumped into them in the street and realised that we had known them for years, but we had not seen them. This was a few years ago, clearly, because we have made sure now that we are much more connected and know who lives in our backyard, etc. As history has shown us, social media, the use of mobile telephones and a whole range of other things have drawn us away from the deep connections that used to be very close neighbourhood celebrations over the years.

In terms of this Neighbour Day being celebrated again on the last Sunday of March, unusually we have found ourselves in a position where we could not knock on our neighbours' doors. In fact, one week before this, South Australia rightfully closed its borders and we were in midst of social distancing principles. These principles have kept us away from our neighbours and made it impossible to have physical contact with each other.



My husband, my son and I returned from Queensland on 22 March, the day the borders closed. We returned in the evening, so we returned after the declaration and did the right thing and put ourselves into isolation for two weeks. I felt very lucky to be in isolation with my family, with my son and my husband, so we had the capacity to look after each other and we had physical contact with each other. However, many people in isolation found themselves at home by themselves with nobody to have physical contact with or to share that experience, and for those people this has been incredibly tough.

Throughout that whole experience of self-isolation we had many people reaching out to us from the neighbourhood, many friends reaching out to us, saying, 'Are you okay? Is there anything we can do for you?' We had people tooting their horns as they went past in their cars. We had people dropping things off at the doorstep for us. When people asked us whether we were okay, I said, 'Of course we are. We've got nothing to complain about. We have each other.' We had plenty of things to keep us occupied in terms of home schooling. Oh, what a joy that is! I realise now why I did not become a teacher. My husband did a great job of that.

I also was incredibly busy fielding so many inquiries from people who were struggling. People were struggling with the rules of isolation and also struggling to get supplies. As we saw through the early times of the declared pandemic and the situation in our neighbourhood, we ran down on essentials—sanitary supplies, like toilet paper, hand sanitisers, soap, tissues, and then came the wave of staple items for pantries as people rediscovered home cooking.

The butchers did very well, I am told. They are telling me that their sales have gone through the roof because people are not able to eat out. I think that some of this has connected us in a very different way, but in a way that is intended by Neighbour Day. We have been able to look out for each other. We have been making more of an effort to connect with each other and we have decided through this time that we do actually need each other.

From the inquiries, the requests and contacts that were made to me throughout the period of early isolation and confusion around the pandemic and where it was heading, we did have many requests put to us about things that were anticipated to be required, and it gave us as a team the opportunity to look at ways that we would offer some solutions, be constructive and work with the government to provide some support and some ideas for the community.

I will just list off a couple of things I wrote about to the minister in the other place, the Hon. Michelle Lensink. I also spoke to her on the phone about an issue. Early in the piece we reached out to all the peak bodies and to many of the not-for-profits, and we have continued that conversation with them. Obviously it is very important to speak to the people who are working on the ground.

Even before we dove too deeply into social isolation—or physical isolation, which has ultimately become social—we identified that volunteers would not be able to volunteer anymore because they were at high risk, and these volunteers support our neighbours and our communities. Some of the special places they carry out these roles were also not going to be able to open; we are talking about community centres, neighbourhood centres, sporting clubs, a whole range of places across our community that are usually the heart of the neighbourhood.

I spoke to the people who operate these places, such as Kylie Ferguson from Community Centres SA, and spent time talking with Evelyn O'Loughlin from Volunteering SA & NT, asking them if there were any ideas. Interstate there had been some funding given to these peaks and organisations in order to support the programs and good work that would be needed in the future, and we wrote to the minister about that.

We identified very early on that food security was going to be an issue. That sent us on a journey of looking at who was providing what in the community, and we advocated on behalf of a number of organisations. There was an excellent program kicked off in Victoria by the Daniel Andrews government which supported the provision of supplies to people in isolation, and that was a partnership between the already well-established program being operated by the Red Cross, where they reach out the community, and Foodbank, which provided the hampers to be delivered to the community.

We have seen, through the commitment of money from the state government and the federal government and many great conversations with our emergency food networks, our local councils, and other organisations throughout South Australia, funding for the provision of hampers and meals across South Australia. In particular we have given support to funding the Puddle Jumpers program, which is doing drive-through food pickups for vulnerable people. I volunteered there a couple of weeks ago and have offered support for their program. It is quite confronting to see the number of people who need to come and get food because they are unable to afford it, because they have been stood down from work and are not eligible for payments.

People are very humbled by the generosity of these organisations. Foodbank is doing an amazing job, as they always have, and OzHarvest and SecondBite, Meals on Wheels—all of these fantastic organisations are doing a great job. We have advocated for Treasure Boxes with the Minister for Child Protection, and with the member for Badcoe and other great local people we attended the official opening of their warehouse down in Edwardstown. Sadly, they had to close their doors for some weeks because of the lack of volunteers to support the operation, so I have also written to the minister requesting support for that.

I am really happy to see the parliamentary kitchen delivering meals out to the community, and I also want to congratulate our team on supporting Our Neighbourhood with 11,000 calls this week, bringing it to a total of 40,000 in the last few weeks. That is what neighbourhoods are about.

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (12:44):** I thank the member for Elder for introducing this motion. One of my favourite days of the year is Neighbour Day and I have been going for several years now. I have been in this house for 10 years, and probably for most of those it has been widely celebrated in the Adelaide city council area, in particular.

As we have already heard, this started out of a 2003 tragedy in Victoria when there was a story of a woman found dead in her home; she had been there for three years. That sort of sparked the movement by Andrew Hislop and he came up with the idea that was then taken on.

A similar thing happened for me not long after being elected. I vividly remember in 2011 hearing a story on the news of a woman in Sydney who had also died in her home and had not been discovered for eight years. I remember being a local member thinking, 'I do not want that to happen in my electorate. I want my community to be connected, I want to know what is going on for them, I want to be part of including them and connecting them back into the community.'

One of the things that I set about doing early on as a local member was to put together information sheets by council of everything that was on because, as a new member of parliament, what I found not only through my doorknocking was that I was finding little halls and sports and things that I was not aware of, and I had grown up in the area. I thought, 'If I had known there was a ballet school down this side street, maybe I would have joined.' There were so many activities and things that happened.

As a local member, you are invited to functions at the local churches, there are eat-and-greets, there are different exercise activities, there are all these things, and I thought, 'How does everyone else find out about this?' Unless you are good on computers, which many elderly people are but not all, and not all of them have computers, and unless you know what it is that you are actually searching for, how do you know what to look for and how to find it?

Back in 2010 and 2011 when I was new, there was not really much hard copy information, or any that I saw, going out to people in my electorate, so I put together a directory that was hard copy, posted out that told you what was on, when it was on, how much it cost, whether there was a free local bus in Prospect—they have a community bus and there is one in the city—that could take people. Walkerville and Prospect often share. They have combined community lunches for the seniors and they also have pickup with bus services.

I put that together and posted it out to give people an idea and try to connect my community. Again, through working with Meals on Wheels, I was quite surprised by how many people live alone and that the only visitor they had was the Meals on Wheels person. We put their blinds down and re-fixed their television stations that had stopped working and did little odd jobs for them because there were no other visitors. In the Adelaide electorate I believe we have the highest number of single

people living alone, so social isolation is a huge issue. As a local member, I have really sought to do what I can to connect people back into the community.

Because I try to get out and meet people, I went to one of the cooking classes in North Adelaide at the community centre that I had actually put on my list. One of the ladies I sat next to said that she had not actually left her house for two years after her son had died by electrocution. She was so upset, distraught and traumatised by that she had not left the house. It was actually receiving my information in the mail that gave her the idea and told her what was on and when it was on in a very easy format—she did not have to go online and find it—that actually prompted her to leave the house for the first time to do a social activity.

I was absolutely thrilled that the information that I had put together was actually beneficial and it had achieved its intent, which was bringing people together as a community. I went on further to develop a directory for parents and babies, which was well received, particularly by new migrants who do not have families or connections here and who are not aware of the kindergyms, the rhyme times, the library readings and the free creche at the Aquatic Centre, things that were available to them.

Many of them contacted my office to say that it really gave them their life back and that they could actually connect with the community in a way and meet other people because they did not know anyone here. That was the same for people who grew up here as well who were used to being professional working women and were then at home for the first time, particularly women who had children later, who did not have a cohort of all their school or uni friends having children and were really pleased to get information to help connect them back into the community.

It is a real shame that this year, for the first time, we did not have Neighbour Day. However, over the years I have been able to go to some wonderful events. I commend particularly the Adelaide city council for the work that they have done and their support in closing off side streets and laneways and providing giant chess sets and Jenga sets and all kinds of things. The council has been very supportive and proactive in encouraging that connectedness throughout the community, particularly in the city and North Adelaide.

I recall there was a regular community movie night and sausage sizzle in the Wita Wirra park (Park 18), which is on South Terrace. Everyone was set up, all comfortable with their beanbags and chairs. The city council had forgotten to turn off the automatic sprinklers. When they came on, everyone grabbed all their gear and took off very, very quickly. That was fixed for the following year. Everyone was a bit hesitant to get too comfortable before they made sure that the sprinklers were not going to come on.

I have been to Neighbour Day events on Claxton Street, which included garage sales and tree planting. Reeces Lane also included planting one year. Stanley Street has an amazing function. They actually close off part of the street every year. The kids ride their bikes around and do chalk drawings on the road, and they have several different barbecues. A couple of years someone has even brought their horse down to go for a bit of a ride along the street. It is wonderful to see neighbours meeting each other for the first time and people who have moved into the street making wonderful connections.

I have been to barbecues for newly arrived students of St Mark's College. Common Ground had a wonderful morning tea. I have met people at Uno who now are still my Facebook friends and I see the pets that they have. It has been a really wonderful connection. The Box Factory has shared meals and barbecues. One year they had a quiz night that I attended. There are really some wonderful ideas, particularly when they have gardening and shared meals. Some of them set up very formal, long tables down the middle of their street. For others it is more casual, but it is a really good opportunity.

As we know, we could not celebrate Neighbour Day this year—and the theme, ironically, was social connection—as we are now living in an era of social distancing and social isolation. However, we are learning new ways to connect. We are having driveway dinners. I have had several Zoom dinner parties where we all compare what we have cooked and what we have been doing. I have now started to go to Teams and Zoom meetings for Neighbourhood Watch, Rotary and different community meetings. I went to a Kiwanis Zoom breakfast meeting yesterday. There are people

dropping off notes in letterboxes, offering help and meals. It is really a different way of showing neighbourly love and community spirit.

Being home more often than I have ever been before on weekends because there are fewer community events, I have been able to see my neighbours and give them some of my eggs from my bantam Minorcas that are producing more eggs than I can eat personally. It is wonderful. We are looking at a new way of community. I think there are a lot of positives that we can take into the future of ways that we can connect. With Zoom dinner parties I am catching up with friends from interstate that I often do not see for several years, so you can actually connect—it is just in a different way.

As we come out of this COVID crisis, we are doing a fantastic job as a community by keeping our distance from people, remaining healthy, keeping our hands clean and doing all the right things. In South Australia we really are leading the country, if not the world, in our outcomes. Let's just hope that we can come back after this, stronger than before.

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (12:53):** I, too, rise to speak in support of this motion and to acknowledge Neighbour Day, our annual celebration of community and connection, held on the last Sunday of March each year to encourage neighbours to connect with one another. As for so many other great annual events, physically getting together for this year's Neighbour Day was of course curtailed by this COVID-19 crisis. Our willingness to safely connect, however, with kindness is absolutely not curtailed, with rich examples of people looking out for each other, safely reaching out to one another during this crisis, being celebrated every single day in a demonstration, not just on Neighbour Day, of what being a good neighbour is all about.

In many ways, prior to COVID-19 many people were expressing disappointment at feeling less connected with their neighbours than in the past with technology on the rise, the art of dropping in on the decline, less face-to-face conversation and people less likely to allow their kids to play out the front. Many people are now reflecting on that lack of connection and more than ever thinking about how they can authentically reach out to others, see how they are going, see if they need a hand.

My own street had an online Easter party, heartily lit up the dawn to pay our respects on ANZAC Day, coordinates taking the bins in and out for those who need a hand and is just about to coordinate an online quiz night. Kindness is on the rise. New or perhaps old ways to reach out in adversity to fellow community members are being voraciously explored and celebrated, and our compassion for the plight of those doing it toughest is thankfully on the rise.

Children are writing letters thanking health workers, neighbours are shopping and baking for each other, schools are encouraging their local communities to come up with new dance moves, communities are delivering home-cooked dinners to those who cannot get out, friends everywhere were sharing footage of Italian community members connecting balcony to balcony via song and relishing in the joy and connection of that.

People are innovating and thinking about how they can safely check in and be in touch with one another, how they can offer help, how they can make sure everyone gets their share of toilet paper, and an opportunity to relentlessly sanitise their hands. This kindness is inspiring. It is to be treasured and held onto long after this crisis finally passes. It is what we often pride ourselves on as being all about. It is so simple but so at the core of what we should always focus on: authentic human connection and community conversation.

The theme for Neighbour Day 2020 was social connection. Social connection is what keeps so many people free from loneliness, what keeps them mentally, emotionally and physically healthy, and it is at the core of our community being safe, healthy and kind. When I call to check in on people in our community, I am hearing lovely stories of what people do to look after one another to keep people socially connected, and these stories give me hope about just how aware our community is about what makes a difference and about what makes people know that they are noticed, included, seen and heard, and how willing we are to keep people connected, about how a real conversation—simply listening to someone—can change someone's day.

Neighbour Day is all about authentic relationships, creating new relationships, renewing past relationships, creating ongoing connections between people and their communities, between neighbours and neighbours. It is what community life should always be about. Attending Neighbour

Day events in previous years has often led people to join community groups or begin organising their own events. This year, as the organising committee moved activities online, new, safe ways of joining groups was established. New connections were made.

Neighbour Day reminds us all of the deep value of the social, emotional and mental health benefits that come from connecting with others, of actively participating in social groups and in every aspect of community life. This is particularly often the case for older South Australians who can often experience isolation due to a lack of mobility.

As I mentioned, over the past few weeks I have had the opportunity to talk with many older South Australians in our southern community and I have to say that one of the most enjoyable parts of being an MP, of being a member of our human family, is just having a chat with a fellow community member, seeing how someone is going, someone who has lost sometimes a lifelong partner or whose children have grown up and moved away. Just to share that brief human connection lifts your spirits, and Neighbour Day is all about just that: genuine human connection that creates relationship.

I thank all who organise Neighbour Day, and I commend our southern and broader community for all they are doing to keep connected to raise the spirits of their neighbours and all in our community on Neighbour Day, around Neighbour Day and always.

**Mrs POWER (Elder) (12:59):** I would like to thank all the members who made a contribution to this motion. The member for King was prepared to make a contribution but, due to time restraints, has not been able to do so.

Motion carried.

*Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.*

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **SITTINGS AND BUSINESS, SPEAKER'S STATEMENT**

**The SPEAKER (14:00):** Earlier today, the member for Kaurana raised a point of order concerning the member for Heysen leaving the chamber during the calling of a quorum. I advised the house that I did not see the member for Heysen leave the chamber but that I would look at the footage, take it up and, if required, come back to the house.

I have had the opportunity to look at the footage this morning and it appears that both the member for Heysen and the member for Florey left the chamber during the ringing of the bells when the call for an absolute majority was in progress. I would like to refer members respectfully to standing order 403, which states:

When it is moved without notice to suspend any Standing or sessional order or orders, the Speaker counts the House and if a majority of all of the Members is not present, the bells are rung for up to three minutes, during which time no Member may leave the Chamber, and if a majority of Members is still not present the motion lapses.

Of course, there is standing order 44, which has a similar provision requiring that 'No member may leave the chamber while the bells are ringing for lack of a quorum'. I do appreciate that there are arrangements in place because of the current social distancing arrangements and consequently leading to pairs, but I wanted to caution members and just issue a gentle reminder for future reference.

#### *Petitions*

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

**Mr BASHAM (Finniss):** Presented a petition signed by 451 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the House of Assembly not to pass the second phase of the South Australian Public Health (Early Childhood Services and Immunisation) Amendment Bill unless it allows all children to continue to enrol in and attend kindergarten in the year before school regardless of their vaccination status.

*Parliamentary Committees***LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:04):** I bring up the fourth report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

*The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** When you don't read what you're meant to, you get into trouble.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens is called to order.

*Question Time***CORONAVIRUS**

**Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:05):** My question is to the Premier. Exactly how many ventilators does our state have right now, how many additional ventilators are on order and when will those ventilators arrive? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr PICTON:** On 25 March, I asked the Premier this question and he committed to come back with an answer. That was 35 days ago and no answer has been provided.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:05):** I apologise that no answer has been provided but, as I advised the house at that point and I advise again today, we have significantly increased the number of ventilators that are available—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —as well as other requirements to make sure that we are ready should there be a significant surge in the requirement for hospitalisation. To date, we have been extraordinarily fortunate; in fact, as of yesterday at 3.45, when we provided the most recent update, there were four people in hospitals in South Australia, two of them in ICU. My understanding is that both of those are in a critical condition. At least one of them is on a ventilator and it could be both of them in ICU, so we have a very small percentage of our existing ventilator capability utilised.

**Mr Picton:** And how many is that?

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Kurna!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** There is some complexity regarding the issue of ventilators. One is the issue of what is available in South Australia. The honourable member would know that we have signed a new agreement with the private hospitals in South Australia so that we have access under the NPA to the private ventilators that are available in South Australia. Beyond that, there has been fairly significant procurement activity, both on behalf of SA Health and with regard to the commonwealth. The commonwealth now has a very significant stockpile that has been procured and a further stockpile that has been purchased for ventilators. It is not clear to me just yet whether a final, if you like, distribution of that national stockpile has been determined. I will make inquiries—

**Mr Picton:** That's what you said last time.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —and I will certainly be happy to come back to the house. The member interjects, suggesting that that's what we said last time. I just thought I had provided some fairly significant update to the information that had been provided last time with regard to the NPA that has been done with private hospitals, which is new information to the house, and with regard to the national stockpile. I am happy to get an update and provide that to the member.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Kurna and the member for Lee are both warned for their interjections.

**CORONAVIRUS**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:08):** My question is to the Premier. Exactly how many ICU beds do we currently have in this state and how many are being created? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr PICTON:** On 25 March, I asked the Premier this question and he said he didn't have the answer with him at the time. That was 35 days ago and no answer has since been provided.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:08):** I'm more than happy to provide an update on this issue. As you would know, going into the COVID-19 pandemic we already had a number of ICU beds in South Australia. We committed to expanding the number of beds, but of course there is no point in expanding the number of beds if you can't expand the ventilator capability, the ECMO capability, the consumables and, of course, most importantly—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Sir, I think we will just leave that. I'll come back—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I remind members that interjecting is disorderly. If it continues, members will be departing on both sides. Member for Kaurna, would you like another question? That will be three.

**CORONAVIRUS, NURSE EMPLOYMENT**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:09):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. If it pleases the Premier, I would like to ask the Premier a question. How many casual public hospital nurses were without pay and without shifts over the past month? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr PICTON:** On 7 and 8 April, I asked the Premier this question and he committed to come back to the house with an answer. He even said that he would provide it outside of session. That was 22 and 21 days ago and no answer has been provided.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:10):** In fact, we have provided an update to the people of South Australia yesterday about the rate—

*Ms Cook interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hurtle Vale interjects. She is called to order and warned.

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** You make King Charles look good.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee has already been warned once. I remind him that interjections are disorderly. Member for Kaurna, I did see the member for Colton. I have given you three, and it's been five minutes. I am going to give you one more, then I am going to switch to the member for Colton.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** You know the rules. The member for Kaurna has the call.

**PREMIER MARSHALL**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:10):** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier believe that he has a responsibility to answer questions to this house of parliament?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:10):** Yes.

**CORONAVIRUS**

**Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:10):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney update the house on the measures—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Sorry, member for Colton, I didn't hear the start of that question. I want to make sure that it is in order. Can I hear it again.

**Mr COWDREY:** My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney please update the house on measures put in place by the Marshall Liberal government to assist tenants, as well as landlords, during COVID-19?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:11):** I am very happy to provide to the house an update of the circumstances relating to how the government are acting in this regard. Members will remember that on 29 March the Prime Minister announced to Australia that a decision had been taken by members of his national council, including our own Premier, that action would be taken to protect the tenancy of people's homes during COVID-19. Obviously, comments were also made about commercial tenancies, and my colleague the Minister for Transport gave an update to the house on that.

Can I explain the very vulnerable circumstance of residential tenancies and the tenants' opportunity to stay in their home during this period. Indeed, they need to do so as a result of the directions of the State Coordinator to ensure that we minimise the spread of COVID-19. Following the Prime Minister's announcement, the government recognised that the impact of COVID-19 on private rentals would be unsettling for many during this time, which is why we decided that we would act quite swiftly in this area. There are new measures to help ease the financial strain for renters who are concerned about their ability to pay rent.

We had tenants who were in an often increased financially impecunious circumstance arising out of a reduction in their employment, loss of employment, the need to go to care for others during this period and assisting with elderly and children's care, particularly for those who need to be educated. So there is a major impact on people's income as tenants; correspondingly, if they were unable to pay all their rent, or even a portion of their rent, there is a very significant impact on landlords, who of course are largely represented in South Australia by persons, as distinct from corporate ownership.

In fact, there is quite a large corporate ownership, relatively, but most of those are headquartered interstate. The overwhelming majority of people who are landlords in South Australia are persons who are family members, husband and wife teams, individuals and the like. The things that must now be considered by the law that we changed a week or so ago are that:

- the temporary emergency measures include that agreements can't be terminated solely on the ground of unpaid rent, but the tenant must of course establish that they are suffering financial hardship as a direct result of COVID-19;
- SACAT must consider COVID-19-related factors in cases of undue hardship to tenants or landlords;
- SACAT may suspend an order for possession, having given consideration to the need to avoid homelessness during the public health emergency;
- SACAT may make an order that it considers appropriate in the circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic, including in relation to costs associated with the termination of an agreement; and
- landlords cannot increase the rent and tenants cannot be listed on residential tenancy databases in certain circumstances as a result of COVID-19.

There's limited retrospective operation, obviously, from 30 March because that was the day after the Prime Minister had made the announcement of the national cabinet decision. With respect to a moratorium on rental evictions, similar to the existing section 89 of the Residential Tenancies Act, SACAT must be satisfied there is hardship, and in this case the financial hardship is related to COVID-19. There are a number of aspects in relation to this that I discussed with Justice Hughes of SACAT and I am pleased to have had her advice during the implementation of these measures.



**CORONAVIRUS, EMPLOYMENT**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:15):** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier agree that a front-line essential worker should get presumptive access to workers compensation if they contract COVID-19 through their workplace? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr PICTON:** The Premier was previously asked this question, took it on notice and has not provided an answer to the house.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Mr Speaker, I would like to inquire with you whether or not that question is actually—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —it is a point of order—something that is subject to a bill that is currently before the house.

**The SPEAKER:** I am going to take it on face value and allow the question. It might be able to be answered without infringing.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Mr Speaker, the Return to Work (COVID-19 Injury) Amendment Bill is actually something that is sitting as an order of the day on the *Notice Paper*.

**The SPEAKER:** I am going to allow a general answer. Obviously it cannot go to the specifics of a bill. If someone would like to answer.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:16):** I can provide a general answer. I think one of the great things about the health response in South Australia is that we have extraordinarily good contact tracing capability. This is a unit of government that is headed up by Dr Louise Flood. She heads up the Communicable Disease Control Branch. It was originally quite a small capability within SA Health. It has expanded very significantly. In fact, I think at the moment it sits at around 290 people, with a further 150-person surge capacity.

What this really does is it provides great certainty for anybody who contracts the COVID-19 virus that we can do the analysis in a very short period of time to determine how and when they acquired this illness. I think this clears up this issue. We don't need to have this presumption of where it's been determined because we do have, in this case, in this instance, the perfect information in very quick time.

**VIRAL RESPIRATORY DISEASE PANDEMIC RESPONSE PLAN**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:17):** My question is to the Premier. Were staff screening procedures established in all SA Health facilities, in line with the SA Health Viral Respiratory Disease Pandemic Response Plan? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr PICTON:** I previously asked this question of the Premier. He was unable to answer, took it on notice and the house is yet to be provided with a response.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:18):** I am not sure what date that question was taken on notice, but usually there is a time period in which members can reply to questions. I think that might have been the last sitting week, which was certainly not within the normal 30 days. I would have thought—

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** That's the questions with notice.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens is warned for interjecting.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I would have thought those opposite would appreciate that we are in the midst of a global pandemic and, in fact, Australia is doing particularly well at the moment and that, quite frankly, our number one priority is looking after the health, safety and wellbeing of all South Australians. I think it's a bit much for those opposite to get on their high horse—

*Mr Brown interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Playford!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —and be throwing rocks at people who are working very hard in public health administration. If we haven't been able to return the information—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Can the Premier be seated for one moment, please. Members on my left!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order: they are personal reflections on members and impugning improper motives.

**The SPEAKER:** Throwing rocks? I hear the member for West Torrens' point respectfully. I would ask that the decorum please improve.

**Mr Pederick:** Instead of a lettuce leaf.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hammond is called to order. Premier, can we please come back to the substance of the question.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Yes, as I was saying, it's quite difficult for people working on the front line within SA Health at the moment who are I think, and we certainly on this side of the house believe, doing an exceptional job—best in Australia, best in the world. We are sorry on their behalf that they have not been able to prioritise the lengthy questions that have been posed by those opposite within the time frame that was—

*Mr Brown interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Now, we get a time frame to respond to those, and we will ask again. We will say that those opposite are asking SA Health to prioritise the answer to all these questions that they would like answered.

*The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Innovation is called to order.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Personally, I hope they continue to set their own priorities because what they have done so far is absolutely exceptional—

*The Hon. R. Sanderson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Child Protection is called to order.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —and every single South Australian, and certainly all of us on this side of the parliament, feels very proud of the response that has been given to date.

#### **VIRAL RESPIRATORY DISEASE PANDEMIC RESPONSE PLAN**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:20):** My question is to the Premier. Has each hospital developed standard operating procedure for personal protection equipment use and distribution as must be prepared according to the SA Health Viral Respiratory Disease Pandemic Response Plan, and were those procedures released? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr PICTON:** This same question was previously asked of the Premier by me. The Premier didn't have the answer to the question. He took it on notice and said that he will provide an answer to this important question to the house and for the public.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:21):** And I intend to do so, but I will not be instructing SA Health to prioritise answering that question over saving lives in South Australia. That has got to always be—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —their number one priority.

*The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Lee!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** For those opposite to suggest that I would know the answer to all of those questions is just preposterous—

**Mr Picton:** What? You're the Premier!

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Kaurna is warned a second time.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** How on earth do those opposite think that a person in this house representing the minister would know detailed knowledge about various aspects of the health workforce testing protocols and PPE—the last two questions—at various hospitals in South Australia? This is extraordinary.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** One of the practices of this house is that we are given time to respond to these questions. These were questions that were asked only two weeks ago. There is a normal practice of four weeks to respond to these questions, but if those opposite are seriously suggesting that I leave the chamber, get on the phone now, get on to SA Health and say, 'Drop everything you're doing because the member for Kaurna has an important question he wants answered now'—is that what you're asking us to do?

This is extraordinary, absolutely extraordinary, that, during a global pandemic, that's what the member for Kaurna's number one issue is.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** It's extraordinary, and it just points out why, if that lot ever—

**The SPEAKER:** Premier, there is a point of order.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —end up back on the treasury bench our state would be in an absolutely dire situation.

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier has concluded his answer.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Thank you, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** During that outburst, sir, the Premier was debating the question.

**The SPEAKER:** I was distracted and there was mass interjection. I ask that to cease. He may have been, but he has concluded his answer, and if he does it again I will be pulling him up. Member for Hammond, and then I will come to the member for Lee.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader! The leader will not interject. I do not want to remove the leader from the chamber today. The member for Hammond.

#### SA PATHOLOGY

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:23):** It's alright. It's their question time. I'm happy to wait.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader and the member for Playford know better. The member for Hammond.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Thank you, sir. My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is warned for a second and final time. The member for Hammond.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Thank you, sir. I can go all day.

**The SPEAKER:** Please don't. The member for Hammond.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr PEDERICK:** Calm the farm. My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister provide an update on the contribution made by SA Pathology in response to COVID-19?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:24):** I am very pleased to have this question from the member for Hammond, and it gives me an opportunity to talk about some of the great work that has been done not just by SA Health but by SA Pathology in particular. To date, and despite four tragic deaths, each one of which of course is a tragedy in its own right, South Australia has thankfully avoided the worst of COVID-19, certainly compared with jurisdictions overseas and indeed even compared with other states in Australia.

This is no time to become complacent, but the success so far in flattening the curve has been extremely encouraging. The house noted this morning the great work of the public health officers, the health workforce, without exception. It is also not a matter of luck. This is the result of strong planning and preparation to protect South Australians, working closely with other Australian jurisdictions through the national cabinet. We have followed closely the advice from the AHPPC and our own Chief Public Health Officer, Professor Nicola Spurrier, her deputies and her team.

A key part of this plan was South Australia's world-leading testing regime. Our current testing rate is 3,000 per 100,000 of our population, which is 50 per cent higher than the Australian average of 2,000 tests per 100,000 population. We know of course that, despite being 50 per cent higher than the national average, that's despite Australia being one of the highest testing countries in the world. We have also developed innovative testing techniques. We opened Australia's first drive-through testing clinic—as I understand it, only the second in the world. I think that was an absolutely outstanding achievement from all who were involved in the process.

SA Pathology has truly shown its mettle in this response, building on the reform process begun by this government. We commissioned a review, as members may recall, by PricewaterhouseCoopers, which reported in April last year. We appointed a new leadership team—Dr Tom Dodd as Clinical Service Director and Mark McNamara as Executive Director—replacing the single point of leadership of the previous model. Importantly, we engaged extensively with staff and with stakeholders.

These reforms were already delivering significantly improved services ahead of the COVID-19 pandemic. For example, on-time delivery for time critical diagnostics had risen from 66 per cent to 90 per cent, while turnaround times for non-critical diagnostics improved by 18 per cent. At the same time, SA Pathology delivered savings to the taxpayer of around \$15 million, money which was then available for the COVID-19 response.

There are certain sections of the public debate where fear and anxiety have been sought to be encouraged about SA Pathology's ability to deliver services during the pandemic. The fact is SA Pathology has been in a position to demonstrate its viability and its nimbleness in responding to COVID-19 like few other services around the world. The organisation scaled up its testing potential to be able to perform an average of around 1,500 per day during the current blitz—indeed, some days substantially more.

This is direct empirical evidence of SA Pathology's maturity as an organisation and of the success of the Marshall Liberal government's reform and sustainability project for SA Pathology. In

light of SA Pathology's demonstrated commitment to reform and high-quality value for public money services, the government has committed to maintaining SA Pathology in public hands. This is just one example of the way the government's health reforms have helped South Australia prepare for the pandemic.

I congratulate the hardworking staff of SA Pathology whose dedication and expertise have driven the success and, indeed, Dr Tom Dodd and Mark McNamara in particular on their leadership and efforts on behalf of the organisation.

### SA PATHOLOGY

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:28):** Supplementary question to the minister: how was the minister able to provide that information and answer to the house without diverting essential public health resources during the pandemic?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:28):** The member would be, I think, much better served and would much better serve the community of South Australia by asking serious questions—

**Mr Brown:** He did!

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

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** —in this house—

*Mr Picton interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, be seated for one moment. The member for Kaurna can leave for the remainder of question time under 137A. He is on two warnings and he keeps interjecting. When he does, I would like to hear the minister's answer.

*The honourable member for Kaurna having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** By asking serious questions the member for Kaurna would do the people of South Australia well. By asking frivolous questions, by repeating questions, by asking whether questions that have been taken on notice are going to be responded to, he does the public a disservice.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Has the minister concluded his answer? He has concluded his answer, member for West Torrens.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Sir, that was debate implying improper motive on a member, I think in particular debating it to make a political point.

**The SPEAKER:** I have the point of order. The minister has concluded his answer and we are moving on to the next question on my left if there is one. If the leader would be quiet, I will ask the member for Lee for his next question.

### ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:30):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier now advise the house how much of the government's stimulus spending is in fact new money and not reallocated funding that was already budgeted for over the forward estimates?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:30):** I refer the honourable member to the answer that I provided yesterday.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee can have one more and then the member for Flinders.

### ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:30):** Supplementary, of course, to the Premier: can the Premier advise under what time frame he intends to answer these important questions?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:30):** We are given a period of time to respond to those. Obviously we need to prioritise our activity during a global pandemic. We made it

clear yesterday, I think in a fulsome answer, in fact three or four fulsome answers on this line of questioning, that it is a combination of expenditures which are essentially brought forward in accordance with the recommendations that were provided to COAG and then to national cabinet by Dr Philip Lowe, who is the Governor of the Reserve Bank of Australia.

We haven't been trying to suggest for one second that this is new money, but it is money, much of which is brought forward from future periods into this period so that we can support jobs here in South Australia, but it is a very substantial package of more than \$1 billion that is there to help preserve businesses and jobs through this period. It is quite extraordinary that those opposite would find a global pandemic and the response of a government funny, but what we have had today in parliament is I think an extraordinary response from those opposite, given the seriousness of the issue which we face here in South Australia.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Point of order: I don't appreciate the reflection which has been cast upon me by the Premier.

**The SPEAKER:** I don't think it was a reflection on an individual, but what I would ask is for the interjections to cease because I am struggling to hear sometimes the question but definitely the answer when interjections continue, so if they could please stop I would appreciate it. Has the Premier concluded his answer? He has. We are moving to the member for Flinders and I will come back to the member for Lee.

#### GRASSROOTS SPORTS GRANT

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:32):** My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Can the minister inform the house how the Marshall Liberal government is supporting South Australia's recovery from the impacts of COVID-19 through grassroots sports grants?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:32):** I thank the member for Flinders for his question and very much acknowledge his passion for grassroots and community sporting events. As we know, grassroots sport is incredibly important to the whole of South Australia, and amongst this COVID-19 crisis people are telling me more than ever they are missing their sport. Not anyone that I have met hasn't said how much they love their sport and how much they want to see it back.

Players, supporters, volunteers—grassroots sport is about bringing communities together and that is something that we do all want to return to. Hopefully very soon our parks, our grounds and our courts will be able to cheer on local athletes and make us all very proud but, as we know, the decisions around this will be led by SA Health and Dr Nicola Spurrier and the great work that SA Health has been doing. As a government we are making sure we are working with all our sporting organisations to be as prepared as possible when SA Health do give us the all clear to work our way back into sport.

Until that day, we are making sure we are doing all we can to get our sporting clubs and sporting groups and sporting organisations as ready as ever before. Before this crisis, things were ticking along well, and we want to make sure that when we come out of this crisis we are stronger than before. What we want to do is build sport in South Australia and building sport is a major priority for this government.

That's why we have been rolling out our highly successful grassroots football, cricket and netball program. The power of this program has been working with the SANFL, the SACA and Netball SA as key partners in this program working with the Office of Rec and Sport. As we know, the SANFL and the SACA have actually put skin in the game, financial input into this program, and they have been leading the way in the recommendations of the decisions that are being made on the final outcomes.

Round 1 of the grassroots footy, cricket and netball program was incredibly popular, just proving how sports mad South Australians truly are. That's why I was proud to announce that round 3 was brought forward. It was meant to be next financial year, as the Premier has been outlining, but we have brought that forward, so another \$5 million is going into grassroots sport, which is just

outstanding. So far the investment has yielded more than \$40 million worth of projects out in our communities, again delivering better services, which is what we are about.

Can I run through a couple. I know the people in the member for Kaurana's electorate and the member for Reynell's electorate around the Hackham sports complex—a wonderful investment in new change rooms for them, so a great project there. Flinders Park as well in the member for West Torrens' electorate is another great project that is rolling out. The Eastern Parade Reserve in Ottoway, I think it is in the member for Port Adelaide's electorate, is another great project again helping community sports.

Constructing new comprehensive multipurpose sporting facilities with family-friendly change rooms has been the key, change rooms that can be used by everyone. Depending on who is playing there, we can get families in and around sport, which is outstanding. In round 2 was the announcement of the Goolwa Oval Sporting Precinct in the member for Finniss's electorate. These were some of the worst change rooms I had ever seen when the member for Finniss took me down there, so it was a pleasure to see their application be successful as well.

I was up in Whyalla earlier in the year for the Bennett Oval launch and the development that went on there. Again, I do truly congratulate the people of Whyalla, the region and the council on coming on board with this project. Bennett Oval looked a treat when Port Adelaide did beat the Western Bulldogs in a preseason game. It seems like a long time ago. The Clare sports complex has had facility upgrades, and they say their facilities were antiquated for the last 30 to 40 years, so grassroots will be benefiting.

There are a number of others: the Mount Lofty Devils, the North Clare Football Club, the Mid Hills Netball Association, the Victoria Park sporting grounds in Jamestown, and even Paul Caica, the President of the Henley football club, was ecstatic when they received a grant under this program. Again, when we return, when we get back to sport—and hopefully that is soon, but we will be guided by Health—we will be stronger than before.

#### **ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE**

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:36):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier now advise the house how much of the government's announced stimulus funding has actually been spent out in the community?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:36):** No, I don't have that information with me. Of course, it is changing on a daily basis, and I am sure that the Treasurer will be providing a reconciliation sometime soon.

#### **SMALL BUSINESS GRANTS**

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:37):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier now advise the house how many \$10,000 emergency cash grants have been paid to the more than 11,000 small businesses that were reported to have been registered for the grant as of 15 April?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:37):** No, I don't have anything to add to my statements yesterday. There have been a small number that have already been distributed, but the bulk of those will be going out towards the end of next week.

#### **PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:37):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Is the government still committed to its original timetable for the privatisation of Adelaide's train network?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:37):** The short answer is, yes, we are. In fact, we believe that, if we look at how South Australia is going to recover economically from this difficult situation, those things which the government was undertaking both from a stimulus standpoint and from a microeconomic reform standpoint, the things that were good ideas beforehand, are even more important and good ideas during and post this pandemic. The reason I say that is that we are—

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** Other than privatising pathology.

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

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —in a situation where we are going to have to work overtime to help our economy recover. In fact, we have a goal here in South Australia of having our economy recover better and more quickly than other jurisdictions around the country. We see this as an opportunity for us to be able to move South Australia forward quicker than our interstate counterparts, and to do that we need to undertake reform.

When it comes to the outsourcing of our trains and our trams, bringing them alongside longstanding bus contracts that those opposite thought were a good idea to renew on a number of occasions in government, this is still a good idea in government. It allows us to provide better services, it allows us to provide more cost-effective services and it allows us to deliver to our customers more of what they want.

The reason this is important is that every person we can get to use our public transport is somebody who is not driving their car to work, to the shops, to school or to whatever other activity they want to undertake. The only way that we can do that is by driving better and more focused customer service delivery outcomes as part of this change. That is precisely why we are doing it and it is precisely why it is important to move forward with.

We have had to change a number of consultation processes with staff during this time. Because of COVID-19, what we have done is change the way we are going to undertake consultation with staff, making sure that, especially for tram services, which are being outsourced on 1 July, we comply with social distancing requirements but also all the consultation requirements.

The fact that we have seen a massive reduction in patronage on our network, and the fact that Footy Express services haven't been going ahead, provides us with the opportunity to be able to spend more time on a one-on-one basis or small group basis with staff so that we can talk through with them what these changes are going to mean for them.

But the great news is that we are on track for everything to proceed as it has done. This is going to drive patronage growth across South Australia. We are going to deliver better outcomes for our customers and it is important that, as we come out of this socially restricted environment, this government gets on and delivers the micro-economic reform that it promised.

*The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:*

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

### **PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:40):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister advise on what date he expects to announce the awarding of the contract for the privatisation of the train network?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:41):** We aren't privatising the train network in South Australia. The public will continue to own the assets. The public and the government will continue to set the fares. The government will still continue to set the service delivery levels that are required. We will maintain control of our public transport network. What we are doing is outsourcing the running of our trains and trams, in exactly the same way as has been done for 80-odd per cent of our network in our bus network for the entire duration of the former government's tenure.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is on two warnings.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** 2005, 2011—

*The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Deputy Premier!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —and 2015: all opportunities for those who now suggest that they are against outsourcing to have made a different decision.



**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order: discussing the actions of the former Labor government is debate. The question was: when will the minister announce the privatisation? The contract has been signed.

**The SPEAKER:** I have allowed some compare and contrast to a point. Minister, you then need to come back to the substance of the question.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** We are actually in tender at the moment with a number of companies or consortia that are tendering for our train network. That work is ongoing. We expect later on this year to announce the successful tenderer, with the change in services to happen some time in Q1 next year.

### FRUIT FLY

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:42):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Why are fruit disposal bins for motorists travelling along the Sturt Highway into South Australia from Victoria located several kilometres inside the border rather than at the border? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Ms BEDFORD:** Everybody supports and acknowledges the importance of a fruit fly free Riverland, yet on approaches into the Riverland fruit fly quarantine zone departmental information indicates it is only on the Sturt Highway that fruit disposal bins are located inside the fruit fly zone. This means travellers disposing of fruit at the bins are just as culpable of a technical breach of the Plant Health Act as those who surrender fruit at the quarantine station.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:43):** I thank the member for Florey for her very important question. It is an important question because we do have our fruit fly free zones here in South Australia, particularly around the Riverland. As the member might understand, we have bins at Bede Road, between the South Australian border and the Yamba roadblock or the border control centre. We also have a bin south of Blanchetown and bins that are at the border of what we call the quarantines zones. Those bins are strategically placed there so that it complies with our strict regime of fruit fly control within the Riverland compound.

I must say that those bins have been put at Bede Road for a number of reasons. They give those motorists the opportunity to pull off the Sturt Highway and deposit or voluntarily put fruit into those bins. There are two at Bede Road. There is one at Blanchetown. There are also bins on the Swan Reach road, there are bins on the Pinnaroo road and there are also bins on the Broken Hill road. There are bins on a number of strategic roads that come into the region so that fruit is deposited into those bins in accordance with fruit fly compliance.

Just last week, I visited the Victorian border. I didn't go over the Victorian border, to comply with isolation guidelines. We have installed one new very large sign to reassure people that we are giving them every opportunity to deposit fruit into those bins so that they don't come to the border crossings and incur a \$375 fine. Again, I think it is important to acknowledge that the zero tolerance approach is a piece of legislation that was introduced by the previous Labor government. We are only enforcing that legislation.

Zero tolerance is such an important part of protecting horticulture not only in the Riverland. Many of you would understand that at the moment metropolitan Adelaide is going through a significant fruit fly outbreak with Mediterranean fruit fly. There are 180 suburbs in metropolitan Adelaide, from Cross Road down to Salisbury and from the coast up to the base of the foothills, that are currently in a restricted zone. That just typifies the vulnerability of South Australia being the lens between the west, from Western Australia, coming into South Australia and heading east with Mediterranean fly. It also gives us an understanding of the pressures on our borders from the east with Queensland fruit fly.

Queensland fruit fly has been a long-term pest. It's one of the world's worst, most destructive pests for fruit and vegetables and our fruit production areas. Again, I make no apology that here in South Australia the zero tolerance approach is there for very good reason. The enforcement with the

zero tolerance approach is there to protect our industries so that we have a market advantage and so that people in Adelaide metropolitan areas can also have fruit trees and pick fruit, unlike in Victoria and New South Wales, which currently are having those trees removed due to the endemic Queensland fruit fly, and unlike in the west due to the Mediterranean fruit fly.

#### FRUIT FLY

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:47):** Supplementary: in light of that answer, minister, why do you think, in spite of your important zero tolerance initiative, there are so many outbreaks in suburban Adelaide?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:47):** Again, a very good question. Yes, there are five outbreaks in metropolitan Adelaide of Mediterranean fruit fly. They are introduced; they are brought into the state. They have come over from the west.

**Ms Bedford:** From the west?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** They have come over from Western Australia. What I would say to the member is that the pressure on our horticulture sector, and on the capability of having a backyard fruit tree or a vegetable patch, has never been greater. We have increased pressure at our borders, both east and west. As you have rightly pointed out, here in metropolitan Adelaide 180 suburbs are currently in a restricted area.

That means that no fruit can be taken out of that restricted area and taken anywhere else in the state. If people do, they will be issued with a fine. We have 100 PIRSA biosecurity staff dressed in orange overalls who are currently doorknocking, asking people to pick up their fruit. If they have ripe fruit or ripe vegetables that are there to be picked, harvested and eaten—please do so. If you can't consume it all in one hit, make something. Make some preserves; make some jam.

It is only proper that every person in South Australia play their role. If it's about looking after metropolitan Adelaide so that we can enjoy the fruits of our own backyards, or if we are looking to support a \$1.28 billion horticulture industry in the Riverland, everyone in South Australia needs to play their role in giving us the advantage that we have in our markets, making sure that our protocol markets are happy and comfortable with the protocol measures that we put in place.

Again, I make no backward steps in making sure that we protect every South Australian from fruit fly, whether it be Mediterranean or whether it be Queensland fruit fly. Again, it has to be enforced. If we don't use the enforcement tool, people will go about doing what they have always done, and that is putting more and more pressure on industry and putting more and more pressure on South Australia, which has a unique situation that many of the other states don't have.

Going into Western Australia, you find very few vegetable patches or fruit trees in backyards because of the endemic Mediterranean fruit fly. If you go to Mildura, just across the border, there are very few backyards there that have the capacity to plant a fruit tree or a patch of vegetables that can actually give the capacity to bite into a peach without getting a mouthful of larvae or a mouthful of maggots. The reason it is like that is because Victoria and New South Wales have dropped the ball and have allowed fruit fly to be endemic. They have allowed it to run rampant. That costs the industry many millions of dollars, and it also costs those local communities the capacity to enjoy what we take for granted here in South Australia.

Again, South Australia is in a unique position in that we are a lens, as I said, from east to west. We have to do everything that we can to make sure that South Australia remains fruit fly free and that we also protect those industries that rely so heavily on having that market advantage. We get a premium for our fruit and vegetables. We also go into protocol markets because they know that they can rely on non-contaminated fruit and vegetables that haven't been treated. Once fruit or vegetables have been either fumigated or cold sterilised, they lose shelf life, they lose taste and they lose quality. So South Australia is in the box seat for being part of a great initiative, and that is what this government is here to support—because we know that fruit fly free matters.

### ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE

**Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:51):** My question is to the Minister for Planning. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is supporting South Australia's recovery from the impacts of COVID-19 through local projects?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:52):** I can. For the benefit of the house—and I also thank the member for Colton for the question—I look forward to further announcements being made around projects under the government's Planning and Development Fund, a process which is underway at the moment. As part of this government's \$350 million stimulus package, the first in the nation, \$50 million was a local government and state government co-contributed funding grant round to help improve the amenity in our local communities.

There are projects to help green parts of Adelaide, projects that normally used to help upgrade main streets and upgrade play spaces, but generally the focus this year is around this government's ambition to improve tree canopy cover here in Adelaide. It's a cause very dear to my heart, and it's a cause very dear to the Minister for Environment and Water's heart. Using this \$50 million will be a great step forward for South Australia, for Adelaide in particular, helping to reverse some of the effects of the urban heat island that we see happening in various pockets of our community.

It gave me great pleasure—great pleasure—to announce, in conjunction with the member for Black, a \$2.44 million contribution, matched by the Marion council, towards improving the coast path down at Marino, which is an important part of the coast path network. It was an ambition that was actually first put forward by the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, who said that the part of our metropolitan coastline from Port Adelaide right through into the southern suburbs needs to have a continuous path that provides the opportunity for people in Adelaide, as well as tourists to our city, to be able to enjoy the phenomenal coastline that we have.

Over time, successive governments have invested more and more into this coast path, and it is exciting that this government is getting on and finishing Diana Laidlaw's legacy. Helping to repair the boardwalk in the member for Black's electorate is an important part of that—helping to repair, reopen and extend the existing boardwalk, which was dilapidated over a number of years of neglect. We will see a new section of the trail sensitively designed, built from Heron Way Reserve to the Field River mouth.

The sections of the boardwalk that span the Grey Road and Kurnabinna Terrace gullies will be entirely rebuilt. This also helps to reinforce and improve another great Marshall Liberal government initiative and that is Glenthorne Farm, a national park that is going to benefit from this coast path upgrade. This means that there will be 30,000 people a year will be able to walk the full eight-kilometre length from Marino to Hallett Cove.

Importantly, this project is commencing immediately with on-site works to begin within months. This is one project, one of 159 projects totalling some \$290 million, that has applied to be part of the government's Planning and Development Fund grant round. These projects are going to help provide stimulus into local communities right across South Australia. They are going to help improve the natural amenity and tree cover in the City of Adelaide.

I look forward to making those announcements, especially around how we can improve and continue the great legacy of Diana Laidlaw's vision for a coast path up and down our metropolitan coastline, for all South Australians to be able to better enjoy their city and also for the jobs that it creates, especially during this global pandemic.

### PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:56):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Approximately how many public servants are currently working on the government's privatisation plan for the Adelaide train and tram network?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:56):** I am trying to define the scope of who is working on

it. There are some 900-odd employees who work within public transport within the government space. The government has—and it was a promise that we took to the election—created the South Australian Public Transport Authority. That authority is actually the one that is tasked with delivering the reforms that this government sees as important to improving public transport in South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Ramsay! Leader!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** We have put together a board and that advisory board provides very strong advice to me, to the chief executive of the department, as well as to those senior leaders within our Public Transport Authority around how we move forward to improve customer service delivery in this space. The exact number of people who at any one time are specifically working on the outsourcing project I think is a number that's going to be very difficult to nail down. But suffice to say that we are a government that can walk and chew gum and the South Australian Public Transport Authority can do the same.

We also have an opportunity at the moment where we see some 80 per cent reduction in the number of people using our public transport network. We have, as a result of that, seen a reduction in services where quite obviously those services aren't being used, whether that's the J1X to the Airport, whether that's the City Connector or whether that's the Footy Express service. We have a great opportunity at the moment, whilst we are in a lull in the number of people using the services, to be able to focus more on how we can improve service delivery across our network.

I know it is the singular goal of the South Australian Public Transport Authority. I know it's also the shared ambition of the people who work within this space. Improving services is something that we are all united in and wanting to do. I look forward to this government's reform agenda being rolled out because we know it is going to, as it has done in jurisdictions right across the world, improve customer service outcomes as well as deliver a more efficient service, allowing us—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister has the call.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —to be able to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The minister has concluded his answer. Is there another question on my left? Member for West Torrens.

## ROAD UPGRADES

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:59):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. How much of the \$52 million allocated to be spent on the Stuart Highway, the Yorke Highway, the Dukes Highway and the Riddoch Highway—announced in March of this year—has been spent?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:59):** Can I say again that this government with its \$350 million stimulus package, the first in the country, is moving faster than any other jurisdiction around the country to get projects out of the ground.

I outlined to the house yesterday the methodology we used around picking projects, ones that we could get out of the ground the most quickly. I did advise the house yesterday that the tender for Adventure Way is already out in the marketplace at the moment, and in fact we expect that contract to be awarded in a few weeks' time and for works to begin on that capping solution as well as the airport upgrade to commence in June.

The member specifically asks about the Stuart Highway, which actually is going to receive quite a lot of money and works as part of the \$120 million package. I can say that we are actually utilising existing contracts that we've got at the moment for a number of packages of works around South Australia and we will actually see works commence within a few weeks' time up on the first sections of the Stuart Highway.

But, more broadly about the \$120 million package, there is \$35 million as part of this package for resurfacing works for the South Eastern Freeway. At the moment the South Eastern Freeway—and the member for Heysen as well as the member for Kavel—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order, sir: I didn't ask about the South Eastern Freeway. I asked about the Dukes Highway, the Yorke Highway—

**The SPEAKER:** The point of order is: how much was spent?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —the Dukes Highway and the Riddoch Highway.

**The SPEAKER:** I have the point of order about how much was spent. I believe the minister began talking about issues that are related to expenditure and I ask him to come back to that.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** We are talking about a package of works the sum of which totals \$120 million of works right across South Australia.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** No, I'm asking about the \$52 million package.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Yes, I'm listening.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Part of that package is upgrade works on the South Eastern Freeway, and we already have—

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** No, I asked about the \$52 million—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —a \$7.39 million package of road rehab and reseal works happening at the moment on the South Eastern Freeway. The member for Hammond—

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** He's distracted. What are you distracted about?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —will know this is important because it is work around Callington, and I am sure for his drive down from Coomandook that's an important part of the road. We also, as I said yesterday, put out a \$15 million tender for the mid-cycle refit of the tunnel. We also, though—

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

**The SPEAKER:** The minister will be seated for one moment. Point of order?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** As part of the \$350 million stimulus package, sir, I am asking about a specific portion of the \$52 million package, and I have asked the minister how much of that \$52 million has been spent.

**The SPEAKER:** I have the point of order. I am listening to the minister's answer.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Also, a project that was on the books—I think the member for Kavel and I date it back some 10 years—as the Managed Motorway Project on the South Eastern Freeway is actually also underway under this government's \$14 million that I know the member for Heysen and the member for Kavel have been working for. Again, the reason I bring those projects up is that what I outlined to the house yesterday was the fact—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —that this government is trying to utilise existing procurement contracts, existing contracts, to be able to get work to market more quickly. There are already works going on on the South Eastern Freeway with the \$7 million rehab reseal. We already have work underway on the \$14 million Managed Motorway Project, and on top of that is the \$15 million for the tunnel upgrade and \$35 million worth of work that we are looking to utilise as much as we can as part of existing panel contracts to be able to get that work underway as soon as possible. This government has moved faster than any other jurisdiction around the country. We already see work underway now.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** In the coming weeks, we will be signing contracts on top of utilising existing contracts, and this work will be out in the field when it needs to, and that is for the duration of this COVID pandemic, as well as getting into that recovery phase that we hope happens as soon as possible.

### FISHING INDUSTRY

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:03):** My question is to the Minister for Regional Development and Primary Industries. Can the minister explain the reason why he has deferred rather than waived fees for commercial fishing and aquaculture sectors for six months, and doesn't this mean that the commercial fishers and aquaculture businesses will simply have a feedback log to pay later on 21 January 2021? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will further explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** On 9 April, the minister issued a media release announcing a government decision to waive annual fees for the charter boat sector for six months but only deferring fees for commercial fishing and aquaculture sectors until 21 January 2021.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:04):** I thank the member for Frome for his important question. We know that all the fishing sectors have been impacted not only by the COVID-19 experience but also by the restrictions on snapper. What we saw as a support package for the fishing sector—commercial, charter and recreation—was that we've put significant money into deferring some of those fees and charges into the commercial sector with regard to their levies and fees.

The charter boat sector have had their fees waived. The reason that we have given the charter boat sector a fee waiving is that they have been impacted not only by the closure and the restrictions of snapper here in South Australian waters but also by the social spacing and the regulations that have been put in place for COVID-19. We have put significant money into restocking. The recreational fishing sector has also been a beneficiary, not so much in monetary terms, but what we have seen is that the restocking program is of significant importance.

All these three sectors have been promised so much by previous governments and have had little to nothing ever delivered. We are also implementing the reform of the marine scale fishing sector at the moment and looking at ways that we can bring that sector into sustainability. We know that for many, many years the previous government had seen fit to promise the reform package—never put a cent towards it. We saw the previous government put in marine park sanctuary zones that impacted on the sustainability of the commercial, recreation and charter boat industry. There has been so much goodwill lost through the lack of government action over such a long period of time, but the Marshall Liberal government is putting action into play.

We can say that not only are we supporting all sectors of the fishing industry with the reform packages that we are either delivering or developing at the moment but we are making sure that we are giving our commercial sector some level of comfort, some level of reprieve, through COVID-19. We are also making sure that we've got sustainable fish stocks here in South Australia. For far too long we have seen governments walk away from their responsibility, particularly those that were in the previous administration, particularly with snapper. We look at all the main species that have seen a lack of care and responsibility over a long period of time.

The Marshall Liberal government will act. We will reform. We will make our fishing sector sustainable. We will rebuild our stocks, and to do that we are working with the sector. Not only will we give them a level of support today but, should COVID-19 go on, we will again look at ways that we can give support. We have put significant money in fee relief through the snapper closure; half their fees have been waived. Now, through the COVID-19, the further half of those fees has been deferred, so they are getting a win-win, not only taking the pressure off their being able to pay those fees today but making sure that that 50 per cent of fees has already been waived.

Again, this is about sustainable fishing and it's also keeping our fishing sector alive and sustainable and dependable because, while we are going through COVID-19, these industries will come out better and stronger at the end of the day. What I will say is that we will not shirk away from the responsibility to give every sector within the fishing industry a sense of governance and sustainability and make sure that the fishing sector is being accounted for.

*Grievance Debate*

**PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:08):** There is no doubt that in South Australia during this pandemic our public health experts have served us very well. More than that, the people of South Australia have served us very well, and so far we have done an excellent job, but that does not mean that we should have a suspension of democracy in South Australia. That does not mean that we should have a suspension of the ability of questions to be asked, legitimate questions about the management of our public health services. Nor does it mean that the Premier should use this crisis to make political attacks on people for doing their job as members of parliament and raising concerns.

Every day, there are doctors, there are nurses, there are other health experts, there are patients who raise concerns, who raise questions that they want addressed, who raise suggestions that they want addressed, and we have been working to constructively ask questions, to constructively raise suggestions over the past few months. We are delighted that a number of the constructive recommendations that we have made have now been enacted by the government and we congratulate them for listening to those.

These include, for instance, the suspension of voluntary separation payments; the job cuts in our health services; the closing of the state's border that the Leader of the Opposition raised and then the Premier acted on; abolishing the government's plans to privatise SA Pathology; broadening the testing criteria—

**Mr Malinauskas:** Sacking KordaMentha.

**Mr PICTON:** —yes, as the Leader of the Opposition says, suspending the KordaMentha contract; hand sanitiser and soap in classrooms, as the deputy leader has been raising; and free car parking for our hospital staff. All of these are things which we have raised constructively and we are very glad have been taken up. Yet today, what we had, despite this constructive approach, is that the Premier was asked a number of serious, constructive questions about the management of this response, including things that he had been asked weeks, if not over a month before, and had full notice of.

These are things such as the number of ventilators and ICU beds, a very particular issue, and you only have to look around the world to see that; how many casual nurses have been left with no pay, our hardworking health heroes who have been left on the Centrelink queues; screening of visitors to hospital to protect our health staff as the government plan says should be happening; and whether hospitals have procedures in place for PPE use to protect our health staff as the plan that the government has in place says should be happening.

The Premier either refused to answer these questions or answered in an angry tirade, upset that he had even been asked these questions. Yet when a member from the other side asked a question about health, we had a four-minute long answer in great detail. When a constructive, thoughtful question on this side is raised, apparently it is diverting resources from front-line workers, but when the Liberals ask a question, then it gets a fulsome response. This is just playing politics, it is childish and it should not be happening.

People are looking for parliament to be doing its job in representing the people of South Australia, asking questions and doing its job constructively. It is not about questions from us personally; it is about questions from those doctors, those nurses on the front line, and it is about answers for those patients who are very concerned about what might happen. These are the people who need parliament to be doing its job and to be asking questions that need to be asked.

We know that until we raised temperature screening in hospitals, there was no temperature screening of visitors to hospital, whereas other states were doing that and we had a state plan that

said that should be happening in a pandemic. It is still very unclear as to whether that is happening across the board. That is a legitimate question for the parliament to be raising and the dismissive nature of the Premier in not answering that question, and thinking that it should not even be asked in the first place is clearly, I think, disgraceful and an angry tirade.

These doctors, nurses, front-line workers deserve answers to these questions, particularly when it comes to personal protection equipment and what procedures are in place for them. We have heard many concerns, particularly from doctors, that there are not enough masks being used in a variety of situations, and it is potentially unsafe for those health staff. That is a question that the parliament deserves to ask and that a responsible government—parliamentary democracy—should be prepared to answer without an upset angry tirade.

### **NEWLAND ELECTORATE SPORTING CLUBS**

**Dr HARVEY (Newland) (15:13):** There is no doubt, and we would all certainly be aware of the fact that the COVID-19 crisis has brought many challenges to our community. Many members of my community are self-isolating at home to protect their own health, there are many businesses that have had to close or significantly scale back their operations and, of course, many people are out of work. On top of this, there have also been some challenges for our community.

Community sport, for example, has had to stop, and sport is pretty integral to the fabric of my community and is ordinarily such an enormous part that it not going ahead has made a really big difference to our area. In fact, also in the north-east of Adelaide we have some of the oldest football clubs in the country, including the Tea Tree Gully and Modbury football clubs. There is a very strong sporting culture in my community.

Importantly, the Marshall government is continuing to invest in grassroots sport to help ensure that, whilst those sporting clubs are not operating at the moment, their facilities will be well underway in being upgraded coming out the other end of this. That work is also important for stimulating the economy and creating jobs, particularly in construction.

One particular area of interest to me is the Tea Tree Gully sports hub, where the Tea Tree Gully Tennis Club, the Banksia Park Netball Club and Tea Tree Gully Netball Club are based, which will be expanded, seeing six extra courts. I am thrilled to see that construction on that project will be commencing in May. This is a project that started and was first put on the agenda when I was a candidate. I brought the shadow minister for sport and recreation out to the clubrooms during a cold winter in 2017.

We put this project on the agenda and it is really exciting to see that it will be underway in only a matter of weeks. I am also very pleased to see the state government and Tea Tree Gully council working together to deliver this project. While there has been some squawking from some of the usual suspects on the council—I must say I am somewhat bemused that the Labor councillors would be surprised that the council would invest in its own facilities—this project is nevertheless going ahead, which I think is ultimately what is important for our community.

These six new courts will increase the capacity for tennis and netball at that site. Jason Todd, Scott Sheridan and the rest of the team at the Tea Tree Gully Tennis Club are particularly excited, because this will dramatically increase the range of tournaments that they will be able to host there. The netball clubs that use that facility, mostly for training a couple of nights a week, including the Tea Tree Gully Netball Club with Helen Burvill in charge at the moment, are very excited about that. It will mean they will be able to put more teams on.

Renae Walker and Nada BouChebli are from the Banksia Park Netball Club, which is a slightly smaller netball club. Nevertheless, they have plenty of people willing to join their club and participate in netball, and this will help them do that. Importantly, these courts, which are present already, are constantly being used. I know that the clubs are very keen to see these new courts being open to the community in those periods of time when there is not anyone there. So they will be very, very well used.

I was also thrilled a couple of weeks ago to see the announcement that the Tea Tree Gully Sportsmans Club was successful in round 2 of the government's Grassroots Football, Cricket and Netball Facility Program. The Sportsman's Club hosts the Tea Tree Gully District Football Club and



the Tea Tree Gully District Cricket Club, two big clubs in my community. I was very pleased to officially announce this grant with the Minister for Sport and Recreation. We did this on Microsoft Teams with Peter Martin and Des Trussell from the Sportsman's Club.

This is a thoroughly hardworking committee, and I am very pleased to see that they will be getting upgraded unisex change rooms, which will allow for more teams, particularly the fast-growing female teams. They will also be improving and upgrading the lighting at the main oval there, which will expand the use of that ground for football games and also training. It is a great outcome for both clubs.

Importantly, we are also looking forward, so we recently announced the opening of round 3 for the Grassroots Football, Cricket and Netball Facility Program. Again, the minister joined myself via videoconference with a number of local clubs, including the Houghton Oval committee, Tango Netball Club, the Modbury Hawks Netball Club and Hope Valley Netball Club to brief them on the grants that are available in the future. I would like to thank them for volunteering their time and continuing to work for their clubs during these times.

Community sport is such an important part of our community. It is important that we continue to invest and support the facilities of those clubs. No doubt, when this pandemic passes, sport will be back better than ever.

### CORONAVIRUS

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:19):** As people in communities across South Australia grapple with the ongoing COVID-19 crisis, we are witnessing with heartbreak people deeply struggling. However, we are also witnessing the best of humanity, with people finding new ways to reach out to one another in kindness, checking that they are okay, finding out if they need anything and authentically connecting and lending a hand.

As we all physically distance from one another, there are remarkable examples every day and everywhere of people and organisations finding ways to safely connect and reassure people that, whilst we are not physically connected, we are not alone. I find many of those people in our sporting communities in suburbs and regions right across our state. They are selfless volunteers who, despite their competitions, training and other gatherings being cancelled, are getting in touch with their fellow members and supporters. Their efforts continue to be at the heart of our community, showing care and making a difference in people's lives.

I thank every one of our local clubs, leagues and associations and every leader and all volunteers for doing this. But like many other organisations, our local clubs themselves are struggling as we confront this pandemic. They are struggling to pay rates, lease costs, water bills and utility costs and are worrying about how they will continue to operate in the months and years ahead as income from fees, events, bars and canteens disappears and as any tiny reserves they did have diminish. They are worried about how they will survive. They need our help.

On 20 March, the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing initially communicated with clubs, leagues and codes to let them know that, whilst he heard they are struggling, they should reflect that they are not the only ones. Along with that rather interesting assessment, the minister told clubs that funding for the Sport and Recreation Development and Inclusion Program is on hold and that clubs will need to find innovative solutions to offer value to members in alternative ways. With so many clubs struggling financially, yet continuing to reach out to members, it is an interesting time for the state government to withhold vital grant funding that is focused on including people.

These clubs absolutely still need our help. I have written to the minister in support of local clubs, leagues and associations about this funding and to consider a range of measures to support our local sporting community. I am eagerly awaiting a response. Since that communication, the government announced a \$250 million Community and Jobs Support Fund. Together with clubs, leagues and associations, we have sought more detailed information about how to apply. Unfortunately, the information is limited. These clubs still need our help and we need them to be able to access this much-needed funding.

In the last sitting week, the member for Frome also advocated for help for these clubs. He rightly proposed an amendment to the emergency response bill. The member suggested relief

through the waiving of various water fees and other charges—a great suggestion. Whilst the amendment thankfully passed, unfortunately the amendment was not supported by the government in the other place.

As we continue to grapple with this ongoing COVID-19 crisis and when we come out of it, local clubs in every community across our state must, as they always have been, be enabled and empowered to be there for people. They are the places that are and will be so deeply important to the mental, physical and emotional wellbeing of South Australians in every suburb and in every region of our state.

More than ever, people will need somewhere to turn, and for many South Australians their local club has been that place for a very long time—for some the only place. Their clubs are where they see their mates, where they celebrate, where they talk, where they look after each other and where people are brought together and supported. Sport is an incredibly powerful tool in including people, looking after them, giving them a sense of belonging and a sense of community family. Sport enables volunteering and for people to be part of teams, just show up and chat, and to be involved.

I urge those opposite to take up the suggestions that I have made, that the member for Frome has made and that clubs, leagues and associations are making to ensure that community sport continues to be there for people and making a difference in their lives. I urge them to reconsider some of their cuts to sport over the past two years and I urge them to keep sporting clubs properly informed about how they can access that much-needed funding.

### NEIGHBOUR DAY

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:23):** Today, I would like to rise to recognise Neighbour Day, which is Australia's annual celebration of community, encouraging people to connect with those who live in their neighbourhood. I am sure we would all agree that there has never been a more important time to find ways to creatively connect with neighbours, families and workplaces. This is so important because positive social interactions, even remotely, can help reduce loneliness. Showing genuine interest in others, sharing positive news and helping our neighbours enhances people's lives and our own lives too.

Positive social support improves resilience for coping with stress and this is certainly needed in this challenging time. This is imperative because loneliness and isolation are associated with an increased risk of earlier death and it is just sad. It is not just older people in our neighbourhood; one in three young adults are reported to be lonely as well, and this affects their mental health.

On Neighbour Day in the past, people have probably thought about their street, their block or maybe even their suburb. I normally think about my neighbours across our whole King electorate; however, during this COVID-19 pandemic, we have been reminded how dependent we are across our state, our borders and internationally. Today, I want to acknowledge a couple of neighbours in King who are to be commended for their kindness and proactivity in connecting people in our neighbourhood.

One special angel in our King community is Helen Hide. I met her when I was calling people to check in on them. Helen has lost her own job during this crisis, which is sad, but now she is using her time to offer her assistance to her neighbours. She has found a unique way for her neighbours to signal that they need her help, that they need her to do some shopping or that they need support. She has also offered her volunteer services to me in case I come across any other neighbours in King who might need her support. She is wonderful and I say thank you to Helen.

Another special person I wish to thank and recognise on Neighbour Day is Sonia Blackwell. Sonia started up and administers a community Facebook page that aims to connect people living in our local area. This group is called Tea Tree Gully Area 'What's Up' and has more than 15,000 members who live locally. They ask their questions, share information and help each other out. Sonia has created a virtual neighbourhood for people to connect any time of the day or night.

An example of a recent question Sonia posted on the page is: 'It is so important for us to keep positive and remember we have so much to be grateful for every day. Can you tell us what you are grateful for today?' This post received a flood of positive comments, positive stories and people sharing about their families and about their neighbours. For instance, one lady told the group how

she gave her neighbour some toilet paper and in return her neighbour gave her some pumpkin soup. Posts like this make us feel good and spread positivity.

Sonia is a volunteer who does this from home with the help of a couple of volunteer admins who post questions and share local information. I commend Sonia Blackwell for creating a very interactive and successful online community that is successfully connecting people and, importantly, also helping our local businesses. It is a 2020 way of people popping in to say hello to their neighbours.

Neighbour Day was founded in 2003 in response to the remains of an elderly woman named Mrs Elsie Brown being left undiscovered in her home for two years. It is with this in mind that I remind this place and our community about a recent domestic violence incident in SA that resulted in the death of a young mum, Kim. I send my sincerest condolences to Kim's family, who I know. Kim was a sister, an aunty and a cherished mum of young children. She was our neighbour. She was murdered by her ex-partner in a street, where her cries for help were ignored.

I hope this never, ever happens again in our South Australian neighbourhood. When it comes to family violence in our neighbourhoods, we must do better. We must step up, we must speak up, we must call for help. Silence condones violence and that is not the type of neighbourhood that I or most people I know would like to live in. Let's speak up.

#### LIGHT ELECTORATE

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:29):** Today, I would like to bring to the house's attention a few matters that relate to my electorate of Light. Firstly, I would just like to put on the record the fact that our local paper, *The Bunyip*, has returned to publication. After 157 years of publication, it ceased for a period of time as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, in the sense that it lost quite a bit of revenue. It was great to see *The Bunyip* return and play an important role in informing and educating our community and also in holding our government to account. I understand that it has been well received by the community.

I would also like to mention the ANZAC Day commemoration services. As members would be aware, all the public commemoration services were cancelled as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, which is understandable. We are trying to keep our community safe, and that is understandable. However, it is interesting how the community responded to that. ANZAC Day is when, as a community, we want to acknowledge and honour the contribution made by previous and current service personnel. That is certainly very clear. What really impressed me were the rather unique ways that people in our community found to do that.

We did not hold a service in Gawler, which we hold annually and which normally attracts somewhere between 5,000 and 10,000 people, but I think that an equal number of people were involved in their own way. I would like to put on the record some of the things people did because it is quite instructive, as there was quite a range of unique ways. Common to all the ways that people decided to commemorate the day was that they were solemn events, they were respectful events and they were quite proud, in the sense that they were proud to be part of something bigger and proud to be part of a community, whether that community was a street, a family, a neighbourhood or the town they live in.

During this period, I was very fortunate to meet up with Mrs Jean Evans, a 97-year-old lady who had a particular interest in the ANZAC Day commemoration. Her two brothers and her late husband had actually fought in World War II; one of the brothers never returned. ANZAC Day is very important to her to enable her to be part of an event that shows her respect, and our community's respect, to the people who gave their lives.

One of the things she did was to proudly wave the Australian flag, and she flew the Australian flag on her home. She also had a red item on her letterbox to symbolise the women during wartime who waited for mail to come from a loved one saying that they were safe or with some news about that loved one. Sadly, in many cases, when a letter did arrive it told them that the person had died in the conflict. Often, it would only come some months later, or much later after the person had been killed.

In terms of some of the things that people did, Janet Delaney stood under her flag with lanterns and candles, listening to the Triple M broadcast, and her neighbours were out at the same time. Marc Webb was on his farm by his flag, with a candle burning and rum and coffee in the other hand. Aaron McCulloch stood outside his parents' house, listening to the national dawn service, and about eight people in his street were doing the same. Everybody went silent to show their respect at that time. Conor Roche, a member of the town band, stood with other members at the end of their driveways to pay their respects, with a number of them performing *The Last Post*. I noticed that right across the town of Gawler the bugles could be heard in the morning as the candles broke the darkness.

Maurusie McKenzie from Gawler West and her neighbours stood on their driveways at 5.55am, and she made the comment that it was wonderful to see the dotted candlelight down the road as *The Last Post* was played. It was very emotional for her and her neighbours. I would like thank the community for showing their respect to our ANZACs.

### MOBILE BLACK SPOT PROGRAM

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (15:34):** I rise to address the much-needed matter of improved mobile telecommunications for our regions. The Adelaide Hills community rightfully has been calling for improved connectivity over a sustained period of time. I am thrilled to have secured a new tower to be built at Kuitpo as part of the latest round, round 5, of the Mobile Black Spot Program. In late April, the Minister for Regional Development, alongside the federal government, announced that \$7.9 million would be invested in South Australia as part of this round and more than \$900,000 of that will be contributed by the South Australian government.

Kuitpo is one of 12 base stations to be delivered in South Australia in the current round, round 5, and it is going to go a long way to continue to improve mobile coverage for our regional and remote communities. The proposed location of the Kuitpo tower is close to Brookman Road, between Meadows and Willunga. It is going to cover an area of five square kilometres. It will go all the way to Prospect Hill, a mountain bike area, and Kuitpo Forest, an area much frequented by people who are looking to get outdoors and enjoy that forest area. It has been identified as a public interest premise and it is going to make a particular contribution to the communities in that immediate vicinity.

I am proud to have long advocated for these kinds of improvements for the Hills. They are especially needed in my local area. As a candidate in 2017, and then after I was elected as member for Heysen in 2018, I advocated for towers including at Kuitpo and along the Long Valley Road, a well-known blackspot, also at Scott Creek, at Aldgate Valley and on the Macclesfield to Strathalbyn road. The last round, round 4 of the program, delivered a new tower for Gemmells on the Long Valley Road, one that is much needed, and I am very pleased that it has been announced. I am advised that the other locations in particular need have been added to the priority list.

Across South Australia, we have inherited a massive backlog of over 500 mobile blackspots. Unfortunately it reflects the previous Labor government's disinterest in this area, among so many other areas of disinterest in regional South Australia. It is another reason why, from regional South Australia's point of view, it has been good riddance to that old government and welcome to the Marshall Liberal government and its commitment to regional South Australia.

The federal government is ultimately responsible for determining the proposals and which ones are accepted, but it is a particular help to have a motivated Marshall Liberal government that is prepared to put money towards these much-needed regional towers. I understand that the Minister for Regional Development is already in discussions with telecommunications providers about further opportunities. I will be pleased to work with the minister and with providers to see that the needs of my community are addressed as best as possible. I welcome the news that the commonwealth is considering a round 5A to deploy those much-needed funds, with a focus on working out better ways of funding coverage through transport corridors and also disaster resilience, which will be of huge benefit to the Hills.

I am delighted to announce and share with this house the great news that sports grant funding is strongly alive and well in the Hills. We have very recently enjoyed the announcement, together with the Minister for Sport and Recreation, of an additional \$490,000 to the Mount Lofty oval and the clubs that use that oval. Just last weekend, Scott Taylor, the President of Mount Lofty District

Football Club, wrote a letter thanking the state government for that additional nearly \$500,000 to go with the \$500,000 already allocated, which will see dramatically improved sports facilities at Mount Lofty oval. It is a credit to everybody involved.

*Bills*

**EQUAL OPPORTUNITY (PARLIAMENT AND COURTS) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:39):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Equal Opportunity Act 1984. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:40):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased today to introduce the Equal Opportunity (Parliament) Amendment Bill 2020, and I commend in opening the groundbreaking work of the late Hon. David Tonkin, who introduced the first equal opportunity law in Australia, in South Australia, after he became the member for Bragg in 1970. Whilst there was a government change shortly after that time, I commend him for that groundbreaking work, and indeed acknowledge the Dunstan government, which came into power, agreeing to conclude that so that South Australia would be at the lead of equal opportunity law.

In 2020 we are a long way down the track—it is 50 years since the development of equal opportunity law in this state and later across the country. We are again here to provide amendment to the Equal Opportunity Act 1984 to address a contemporary matter, to address a matter which has been left unattended. As with so many things there is an expectation in the 21<sup>st</sup> century that we do contemporise and we do acknowledge where there is inadequate protection or need for reform, and that we are prepared act on it.

I am very proud to be part of a Liberal Marshall government that has taken up the initiative here to do so, and it comes after nearly 20 years of being here in this parliament where I have observed the direct interaction between members of parliament—some of their own political party and some with others—and matters surrounding sexual harassment, which has a very specific area of resolution opportunity through the Equal Opportunity Act which they do not have access to and which many people in the community have access to, and that is a confidential process of mediated outcome with transfer to what was the equal opportunity tribunal but which is now the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal.

I just give that background because under this government we are prepared to act and to recognise the importance of acknowledging the limitation that was on the legislation in respect of protections for members of parliament against sexual harassment by other members of parliament. Before outlining the importance of this legislation and how it will operate, may I also identify that the current Equal Opportunity Act application does not also apply to judges and it does not apply to elected council members of our local council entities.

I indicate to the parliament that this bill does not purport to operate in relation to disputes between judges or between elected council members. However, I do want to say to the house that, in the consultation on this bill, I contacted back in February the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of South Australia as the head of the courts council to inquire as to whether he felt the need for judge-to-judge conduct, or misconduct if it were to occur, to be incorporated. He reminded me that, in South Australia, the conduct of judges is dealt with by the Judicial Conduct Commissioner.

Members might recall that under that legislation the current Judicial Conduct Commissioner in South Australia is Bruce Lander QC, who is probably more well known in his role as the commissioner in respect of the Independent Commission Against Corruption. They have access to and are able to have matters referred there by complainants. He did indicate and confirm in writing earlier this month that he has appointed two judges of the Supreme Court to have a closer look at that legislation to see whether it might be something that he would want to pursue. To date, he has not come back to me in relation to that, but I am comforted by the fact there is a process in place for

judge-to-judge conduct or misconduct. I again remind members that if you are an employee, though, in a court you have the same protections as other workplaces in relation to any conduct that may come from a judge.

The second area is in relation to local government, by way of identifying the exclusion of them from this bill. Most members probably are aware, from consideration in their own electorates, that the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government and Minister for Planning has undertaken a very comprehensive review in relation to local government reform. In that, as members may again be aware from consultation within their own electorates and, no doubt, conversations they have had with elected representatives and/or mayors and CEs of councils, questions of code of conduct and how that might be implemented with any reforms is a matter under consideration in that local government reform.

Bullying and harassment are within that, and it is still a matter which of course is under consideration and is being developed. However, I am confident that that is going through its own process and therefore I have not sought to bring into this bill elected local government persons and any conduct or misconduct in this area of sexual harassment. Having excluded those, the act promotes equality between the citizens of the state and seeks to prevent certain kinds of discrimination based on race, sex, disability, age, or various other grounds.

The act empowers the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity (hereafter referred to as the commissioner) to undertake a range of functions, including assisting people to resolve complaints of discrimination, sexual harassment or victimisation. At present, it is unlawful under section 87(6c) of the act for a member of the parliament to subject to sexual harassment a member of his or her staff, a member of the staff of another member of parliament, an officer or a member of the staff of the parliament, or any other person who in the course of employment performs duties at Parliament House.

The subsection does not currently provide that it is unlawful for a member of parliament to subject to sexual harassment another member of parliament. In the government's view, section 87(6c) no longer reflects community standards around sexual harassment in the workplace and the expected conduct of members of parliament as leaders in the community. The bill seeks to address this imbalance by inserting new paragraph (ab) into subsection (6c) to make it clear that sexual harassment between members of parliament is also unlawful under the act.

Where there is a complaint of sexual harassment by a member of parliament the bill does not change the current position in section 93AA that it is a matter for the Speaker or the President to determine whether or not dealing with the complaint could impinge on parliamentary privilege. Section 93AA includes:

- provisions for the appropriate authority to investigate and deal with the matter as the authority thinks fit if it is of the opinion that dealing with the complaint under the act could impinge on judicial independence or parliamentary privilege (for the purpose of today's bill that relates to parliamentary privilege);
- provisions for the appropriate authority to request that the commissioner conciliate a complaint;
- a requirement that the appropriate authority must notify the commissioner as to the manner in which the complaint has been dealt with by the authority;
- provision for the commissioner, when unsuccessful in conciliating a complaint, to make recommendations to the appropriate authority relating to the resolution of the complaint; and
- provision for the appropriate authority to have the same powers to investigate a matter as the commissioner has under section 94.

Finally, the bill seeks to amend section 93 of the act so that the commissioner may postpone any investigation, conciliation or other action in relation to a complaint under the act if the commissioner becomes aware that a criminal investigation is being conducted or a person has been or is to be charged with a criminal offence in relation to a matter that is the subject of a complaint.

Members would be aware, for those who are familiar with the Coroner's Act, for example, that obviously he has a very important role to determine the cause of death in relation to persons who die in the state of South Australia, and has various processes to undertake that work and some mandated obligations to investigate certain types of death. But he too is obliged not to pursue his investigations—his or her, although it happens to be a 'he' at the moment; 'their' investigations, I should say—into a coronial death if there are criminal matters under investigation or where a person may be charged. It is not uncommon where other investigative bodies delay or at least suspend their own investigations pending the criminal matter being pursued and completed.

With that, I commend the bill to members. I seek leave to have the explanation of clauses, which is quite brief, inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it. It is a very short bill.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

###### 1—Short title

###### 2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Equal Opportunity Act 1984*

###### 3—Amendment of section 87—Sexual harassment

This clause amends section 87 to make it unlawful for a member of Parliament to sexually harass another member of Parliament.

###### 4—Amendment of section 93—Making of complaints

This clause amends section 93 to ensure that any investigation, conciliation or other action by the Commissioner in relation to a complaint is postponed if a police investigation in relation to the conduct is commenced or if charges are laid in respect of the conduct.

###### 5—Amendment of section 93AA—Manner of dealing with complaints of sexual harassment by judicial officers and members of Parliament

This clause makes a minor technical amendment to section 93AA.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Picton.

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

#### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:53):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Immunisation is one of the most cost-effective health interventions and is supported by the World Health Organization and all levels of the government in Australia. Although immunisation coverage in South Australia is very good, despite free vaccines, adequate vaccine supplies for all children and ready access to immunisation services, the latest available data shows that 5 to 12 per cent of children in South Australia still do not get timely or complete routine vaccinations scheduled for the early years of life. Outbreaks of vaccine-preventable diseases continue to occur, such as the large ongoing outbreak of measles in New Zealand, which has recently spread to the Pacific Islands, including Samoa, where around 6,000 people have been infected and 83, mostly children, have died.

In 2019, the first phase of changes to the South Australian Public Health Act were made to strengthen the ability of public health officials to respond to outbreaks of vaccine preventable disease in early childhood services. From the beginning of this year, parents have been required to provide immunisation records to staff at early childhood services when they enrol a child and at ongoing and specified times, and the early childhood services are required to keep these and provide them to the Chief Public Health Officer on request.

The Chief Public Health Officer can exclude susceptible children during an outbreak of a vaccine preventable disease. This amendment bill, the second phase of measures to strengthen immunisation requirements, was developed after extensive public consultation. This bill prohibits enrolment of children who are not up to date with their vaccinations or provision of those services if the child does not remain up to date, unless they meet certain specified exemption criteria. I commend the bill to the house.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Do you have any clauses you wish to insert, minister?

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

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Only if you have them.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Maybe I won't.

**The SPEAKER:** That is fine.

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:55):** If there has ever been a time to recognise the importance of vaccinations, this is the time. We currently have the whole world turned on its head by one disease that we do not have a vaccine for.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am sorry to interrupt, member for Kaurna, but you will need to indicate that you are the lead speaker.

**Mr PICTON:** I was just getting on a roll.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Yes, but you are the lead speaker; we need to identify that.

**Mr PICTON:** I am the lead speaker. We currently have a world upended by a disease that we do not have a vaccine for. There are many, many other very deadly diseases that we do have vaccines for and that we do have the ability to protect ourselves from. While we are encouraging, supporting and hoping that the medical researchers from around the world are able to make very dramatic progress towards a vaccine for SARS-CoV-2, we have a whole range of other diseases that are not on the front page of the paper or the top story on the nightly news because of vaccines that are available.

We need to do everything we possibly can to make sure that people do not contract those diseases where they are preventable. The vast majority of South Australians do the right thing. The vast majority of South Australians get their children vaccinated, take them to the doctor or take them to the local council clinic and fulfil the requirements of their national Immunisation Register. My wife recently took my two children to get their next step of vaccines. They were not particularly thrilled about it, but it is very important that all children get their vaccines.

But, sadly, there are some people who do not do that. Sadly, there are some people who do not, either through choice where they have decided that they do not want to vaccinate their children or they have been remiss in doing it. What that means is that other children are potentially at risk, particularly those children who cannot get vaccinated because they have a medical condition that prevents them from being able to be vaccinated. They are the children who need herd immunity in our community to ensure that they are protected. This legislation seeks to ensure that we provide that herd immunity and that these vaccines are being used.

This is a piece of legislation that is not new this year and was not new last year or even the year before, but stems back to 2017 when it was first introduced into the Legislative Council. It was introduced in the Legislative Council by the now Leader of the Opposition before the last election. Ever since then we have been advocating and pushing very hard that this legislation should be enacted here in South Australia. We are delighted that we have finally got here, but we are very disappointed that it has been over two years since this legislation was first introduced in the parliament and that it is now at the stage where it is hopefully going to be passing through both houses today.

After the election, when the bill lapsed, I reintroduced the legislation. We tried Wednesday morning after Wednesday morning of sitting in this house to get the legislation considered and every single time it was put off and deferred by the government. We then had the minister eventually say



that he thought that something should be done, but he was reluctant to introduce legislation in the form that we have here.

He introduced another bill, which he called his stage 1 bill, which dealt with information requirements that children in childcare facilities and preschools should have to provide, but it did not mandate vaccination, as is the case in this piece of legislation and as was the case in the legislation from 2017—a wholly inadequate response to the situation. It did not introduce no jab no play, as had been proposed originally here in South Australia and as had been proposed originally by former prime minister Malcolm Turnbull and as has been in place and legislated in New South Wales and in Victoria for a number of years and in Western Australia over the past year. It did not meet that threshold whatsoever.

We had the minister raising concerns about this back then. He pointed to concerns raised by one of the medical colleges but was not willing to get to this point. We then tried to amend his inferior bill to put in these provisions. They were voted against by the government and by the crossbench in the Legislative Council as well. So time after time we have been pushing for this legislation and time after time the Liberal government has been either blocking it from being discussed or voting against those provisions in the Legislative Council.

That is very disappointing because, if this legislation had been in place a year or two years ago, it would mean that more children would be protected right now. It would mean that we would have the protections that are in place in Western Australia, in Victoria and in New South Wales. We would have them right here in South Australia because this is all about protecting those children. This is all about protecting those kids particularly who cannot get vaccinated because of their medical conditions.

This is a bill where we get people emailing us with their views against it. We had a petition against it tabled today by the member for Finniss. This is something where a lot of people will find things on the internet where they disagree with this proposal. But we have been steadfast in our support of this measure over the past 2½ years, or even longer since it was first promoted while the consultation was originally happening, and it is disappointing that it has had to get to this point.

I remember that when the original bill the minister proposed, which was just the information requirements, we tried to insert these provisions in this house and had a debate in this house. I remember very clearly last year the member for Waite, who is no longer with the government benches, questioning significantly why the opposition would seek to do this and how we had not consulted enough, etc. It was disappointing that this would not be supported back then.

This has been knocked down by the government more than 30 times, and there is nothing particularly new in here whatsoever that could have caused that delay over the past two years. Ultimately, they have landed on the same piece of legislation. Ultimately, the government's consultation, which finished last year, produced almost exactly the same piece of legislation that happened out of the consultation in early to mid-2017, so we had two years of delay, two years of obfuscation, but the same result—the same piece of legislation.

As was the case with the bill 2½ years ago, this bill requires children to be appropriately immunised to attend early childhood care. There is a maximum penalty of \$30,000 for any person who provides an early childhood service or enrolls a child without the appropriate exemption or immunisation history required, with a good faith defence to protect providers who are necessarily relying on the statements provided to them by parents and guardians.

These immunisations are the same ones on the national schedule: hepatitis B, whooping cough, polio, measles, mumps, rubella and those strains of meningococcal that are currently on the national schedule. Hopefully, the national schedule will one day include meningococcal B as well, which we have had a lot of discussion over the past few years about in South Australia.

This is a piece of legislation that has our wholehearted support because it is essentially the same piece of legislation we have been trying to get passed by the parliament for the past 2½ years. It will lead to higher rates of immunisation and it will lead to higher rates of protection for our community. There is no doubt that scientifically proven vaccines are good for our society and that people should be vaccinated unless they have a medical condition that says they otherwise cannot.

There is a lot of pseudoscience on the internet that says differently, but we on our side back the science, we back our medical professionals, we back our scientists, who say very clearly that these vaccines save lives. We have no better example of that than what is happening around the world right now, where we have a disease for which we desperately hope there will be a vaccine soon. We desperately hope that vaccine could be added to this register within months—hopefully, not years—and people will have protection against that in the same way they have protection against all these other vaccines. This bill has the opposition's support.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:07):** I rise to speak on the South Australian Public Health (Early Childhood Services and Immunisation) Amendment Bill 2020 and indicate my appreciation to the Minister for Health for progressing this matter in the parliament. Whilst there appears to be some criticism from the opposition as to the pace with which this has been developed, advanced and now presented for the final part of stage 2, I do note that the member for Kaurana was part of a government that had 16 years to develop this. Really, in the dying days of that government—

**Mr Picton:** Since I was at uni?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —yes—they advanced this as an important initiative. I can recall minister Portolesi making comment in this house about how important it was to have no jab no play and, as usual, there were lots of promises in that regard and no delivery. Nevertheless, I agree with the member for Kaurana on two things: one is that this is an important piece of legislation and it is an important issue to be resolved and, furthermore, I appreciate and am very pleased to hear that, as a parent himself, he endorses the benefits available for immunisation generally.

Can I firstly address the bill itself, which is really part 2 of the legislative program of reform. What has been in the first stage is the passage of the first amendment to permit the Chief Public Health Officer to exclude children who are at material risk during an outbreak of a vaccine-preventable disease and to obtain immunisation records from early childhood services during an outbreak or risk of an outbreak.

The second stage—which is what we are dealing with now, phase 2 of the bill—proposes financial penalties of up to \$30,000, as has been indicated, for someone who breaches the obligations there. In particular, it allows a child to fail to be up to date with immunisations in order to continue to attend at an early childhood service, obviously with the usual regulation powers to be able to be effected and enabling a penalty to be applicable also to a childhood service provider who does not comply with the exemption requirements.

Some commentary has been made about the need to ensure that, while we value and applaud the benefits of immunisation and COVID-19 is a contemporary example of exactly why it is so important, nevertheless there are children who are unable to be safely immunised. They may have a respiratory condition or some other medical circumstance that would place them at risk in relation to that. Parents need to be able to have oversight in respect of their child's health, and that includes immunisation in those circumstances. They need to be able to have some exemption, and provision has been made for that, as it should be.

As to the conscientious objectors generally, can I say this: whilst there are very strongly held views by some that there should be no population health immunisation and that there should be a capacity to dissent from the benefits of this and therefore have some exclusion, I appreciate that they are passionate about that, but if I could just recount the situation. As the shadow minister for health, about 15 years ago I attended the World Health Organization in Switzerland, and I was briefed on a number of matters.

The thing that surprised me more than anything was the urgency of those who were providing advice as to the two things they saw as the 21<sup>st</sup> century problems in respect of health. I expected them to talk to me about poverty-stricken countries, cholera in water and all sorts of things of that nature. In fact, they described to me the problems of infectious disease—in countries where we would expect it to be, perhaps in Africa and those less fortunate economically, but also in our own communities—and, secondly obesity, which was at a pandemic stage from their description. I found it a very enlightening period of meetings on that day.

Two things were very passionately put within this envelope. Firstly, they wanted to know about the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science because they knew that it was headquartered in Adelaide at the time. Of course, what was left of it after the previous government stripped it down and took pathology in-house is now our SA Pathology entity, which members are quite familiar with. They wanted to commend the IMVS because of the work that it was doing and had done over a number of years with polio and smallpox. I think they also suggested that they were quite active in both the testing and treatment of tuberculosis.

This work was having international benefits. They wanted me to be very proud—I was—but also to be aware of how much they appreciated, in the World Health Organization public health arena, the importance of the work that the institute was doing here in South Australia and the significance of its testing and advancements, its published activity that it had presented over the years and the extraordinary gift that it was giving to the world in relation to communicable disease.

Bear in mind that, certainly in my time in the eighties and nineties, we came through what I think was also a really difficult period, which was the transmission of HIV. In the 1980s, if contracted it was likely to be a death sentence. As a transmission through bodily fluids, it was something that resulted in the death of a very large number of adults. Often there were practices of unprotected sex between consenting adults, who were either same sex or opposite sex.

I recall there was a terrible period in South Australia when blood was being provided for transfusions, often for newborn babies, and the blood was contaminated in the donation system that used to operate in those days and a number of babies died when they contracted the disease and, of course, it developed into AIDS. As I say, it was a death sentence.

From time to time we are faced with these really difficult periods and real challenges and we are in one at the moment. The World Health Organization were very keen to say that this issue of infectious disease is something that is a plague across the world and we ought to be aware of it because it was a big challenge still for the 21<sup>st</sup> century, even though, at first blush, I thought we had got through all that. I had not personally lived through polio epidemics, but my parents' generation did.

Recently, but not that recently now, I launched a book in relation to the John Martin's pageant and the author provided pictures of children wheeled down from the Royal Adelaide Hospital and what was then the children's hospital. They were in beds, having been sentenced to bed rest as a result of polio being contracted, and there were rows and rows of them lined up along Rundle Street to watch the John Martin's pageant.

Sometimes it brings home these really tragic periods during which whole generations of our children, and sometimes into adulthood if they have not had measles or chicken pox as children, contract these diseases and to have these conditions as adults can be very difficult and sometimes fatal. The World Health Organization were very keen to recognise the IMVS, but reinforced to me the importance of us being really vigilant in this area and that it really is a very serious situation in parts of the world. We might episodically find out about it, but it is really a killer across the globe.

I agree with the member for Kaurana that it is important that those who are having children now consider this matter seriously and not only think carefully about the future of their children, their education and their own advancement but make sure that in the health space they seriously look at this question of immunisation. I am very pleased that my own children and their wives have made decisions to immunise their children.

I think I said to one daughter-in-law at one stage that this would probably be the one issue when I would have to suppress my otherwise genteel approach to relationships like that and have to have something to say about it if they made the decision that their children would not be immunised. Fortunately, I was spared that. So, in my usual mild way, I was quietly able to compliment them on making that decision and not express how I really felt about it. That was pleasing in itself.

Probably, sometime in May, I would have been lining up with my eldest granddaughter, Adelaide, to have all our immunisation shots for Africa. COVID-19 has put that trip on the backburner and hopefully we can do it next year. There are meningococcal and other conditions, which again we

are largely isolated from, in the regions that we would be visiting. I had trips with my late husband to regions on the African continent, and we had to be really vigilant.

Sometimes, looking outside the comfort of our own little area like Adelaide, we realise how much the world relies on us doing the responsible thing, especially when we have access to vaccines and funding to be able to support that—a lot of this is publicly funded—and that we need to make sure we do everything we can to ensure that as many of our community as possible are immunised.

I also remember that minister Portolesi at the time raised this question about what she might do in relation to childcare centres and the obligation for children to either be immunised or not be able to have access to these facilities, and it was a bit of a challenge. Obviously, there was a concern about having something mandatory. Everyone gets a bit unnerved about that, but overwhelmingly the parents that I spoke to, who also had children at childcare centres at that time when my grandchildren were at childcare centres, were very clear about having immunisation. They did not want their children to be attending a centre where other children were not immunised. They did not want the risk of that, and they wanted that to be very clear.

Of course there are occasional exceptions to that, but the sentiment was very strong, and I think that it is one that we need to respect and, of course, keep ourselves up-to-date with to make sure that we understand how our parents of today are making decisions in relation to that for their children and to make sure that we give them every support possible, including through this legislation, to protect those children and to give them a future.

I thank the minister for bringing the matter to the parliament's attention, that is, the Minister for Health, and of course my colleague the Minister for Transport for ably presenting it to this house.

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (16:21):** I rise briefly to commend the bill to the house and to make, perhaps, brief observations about the current global pandemic that we are living through and to emphasise that South Australia is leading the world in living through it. We have just heard in the last hour or so that we have achieved now seven days in a row with zero cases here in South Australia, and it is tremendous news and a source of confidence, I hope, for all the people in South Australia for the fantastic efforts that everyone has been making in the face of this pandemic.

If ever there was a time when people are daily reminded of the importance of the great work of public health authorities in making available to the public vaccines that can prevent the spread of disease then it ought to be now. I think that one of the things that might come out of this current emergency is a greater consciousness and appreciation of the risks to health that exist when available vaccines are not taken and the benefits to the public—to all of us—when we have widespread vaccination.

This bill now comes along and imposes quite serious penalty provisions, along with prohibitions. It introduces penalty provisions to apply of up to \$30,000 for enrolment or for the provision of childcare services where vaccination has not happened. It makes it very, very clear that the provision of services absent vaccination is simply not on in South Australia, and that is a very welcome development in my view.

I might say that I am thoughtful in this debate about the smart one in our household. My wife, Dr Maria Teague, is an immunologist and knows all about this area, and we have discussions at home with her and among our children—perhaps Maria is Bridgewater's answer to Professor Nicola Spurrier. We have the opportunity to hear in the household about the importance of vaccination where it is available as well as the insidious capacity of these microorganisms, viruses, to come along and cause such destruction, as we have seen with the COVID-19 virus.

I welcome the imposition of these new prohibitions and serious penalties. I hope it augers towards an outcome where in South Australia we aspire to not only be world leaders in finding vaccines but world leaders in responding to circumstances in which public health is challenged by the lack of them and, where they are available, that we universally take the opportunity to vaccinate our children and remain as healthy as we can possibly be in this state. I commend the bill.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (16:26):** I would like to thank all members who spoke on this bill. I look forward to its passage through this chamber this afternoon.

Bill read a second time.

*Committee Stage*

Clause 1.

**Mr PICTON:** I welcome Dr Koehler from the Communicable Disease Control Branch. I am sure he has been very busy. Thank you for your assistance here and thank you for your hard work through the pandemic. I do have a few questions; the first one is in relation to clause 1. Given that the consultation on the revised legislation—not the 2017 consultation but the new consultation—closed in June 2019, what happened between the close of consultation and the introduction of the bill, given that the bill is ostensibly a replication of the original legislation that has been around since 2017?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** As I outlined in my second reading explanation, this is phase 2, essentially CDCB. We are implementing phase 1 and obviously setting up the protocols and everything needed to make sure that early childhood education centres that are involved in this act have in place what they need to comply with the record-keeping provisions. Given that phase 1 was already legislated, that work took precedence.

**Ms BEDFORD:** Can the minister indicate what consultation has been undertaken in preparing this bill? By way of explanation, I have been approached by a constituent whose child has a medical contraindication for vaccination that the federal department has refused to register on the Australian immunisation register.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** I thank the member for Florey for her question and say that there was a month-long consultation process that was undertaken with a discussion paper that was released. There were three options put—(a) (b) and (c)—in that discussion paper, and 600 responses to the consultation were received over the course of that period.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

**Mr PICTON:** In the other place, the minister referenced a potential start date of 1 July for the legislation. Is this still the government's intention, or has this been postponed under the current pandemic circumstances?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Essentially, we are now saying three months after assent, provided it passes here in the coming weeks, and so we are looking at an August start date. The reason for the slippage is that the Communicable Diseases Control Branch has been dealing with a global pandemic that has caused the slippage.

**Ms BEDFORD:** What was the date you said, minister?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** August.

**Ms BEDFORD:** Can the minister advise why the bill does not include a grandfathering provision for children already enrolled, on a similar basis to all other jurisdictions? By way of explanation, I am advised that in other jurisdictions no jab no play legislation does not apply to children who are enrolled in a childcare centre, kindy or school prior to the commencement of the legislation, and that means those children can complete their schooling or enrolment. Whereas it is my understanding that with this bill, in effect children who are not immunised by the commencement date are expelled.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** I have been advised, member for Florey, and I thank you very much again for this question, that not all jurisdictions have grandfathering provisions in relation to them. This is phase 2. A phase 1 process has already been in place, so obviously there would be a heightened awareness amongst the parents of this cohort of children that this applies to as to what their obligations are.

If we were to put a grandfathering provision in place, it would mean that it would be a further six years before the intent of this bill would become fully operational. In terms of the issues we are having at the moment, where again we have between 5 and 12 per cent of students not completing their vaccinations, we believe that it is important to have this in place as soon as possible to provide the impetus as soon as possible and provide the benefits that come with high rates of vaccination and herd immunity as soon as possible.

**Ms BEDFORD:** If it is not in all other jurisdictions, which ones is it not present in?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** That is information I do not have to hand at the moment.

**Ms BEDFORD:** I do not understand how you can dismiss automatically that it is not in all jurisdictions if you do not have that information to hand; that is all. I am just surprised.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** I can only refer to my previous answer and also say that in this instance our understanding and our response to vaccination rates and using vaccines in our community are evolving. We can see this year, for instance, the way we have evolved our use of the influenza vaccination in response to COVID and a whole series of measures have been undertaken; and last year, for instance, where we had to try and bring forward the flu vaccine because our flu season started a little bit early.

This is an evolving space especially in relation to the COVID pandemic, where we see on a daily basis that our understanding of vaccines evolves. The opportunity here for us as a jurisdiction to evolve and move further than other jurisdictions have I do not think is a negative step, especially when what we are seeking to do here is for those children who cannot get vaccinated. They are the ones we need to protect. We are likely talking about children with cancer.

If this means that there is a little bit of an impost upon other children to be able to provide that herd immunity to those immunocompromised children, I think that is a very worthy goal and one that this bill seeks to have implemented as soon as possible.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4.

**Mr PICTON:** I wonder if the minister can outline the requirements for children who are already enrolled in early childhood education. By when will they need to meet the vaccination requirements?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** I will answer this in two ways. I will answer the easy bit first, and that is that it will come into place as children age. Obviously, there are immunisation requirements at various ages. Essentially, as I am advised, the threshold falls due a couple of months after the time when those vaccinations should have taken place. There is a couple of months' grace period. For those children, as they age, that is essentially the operable date after which these measures come into force, and at that time they will start to be excluded.

In relation to what I think is the intent of the question, when this comes alive in August there will be a cohort of children who have not been vaccinated and who will in August immediately fall foul of these provisions and then be excluded. Between here and when these measures come into effect, there will obviously be a strong community communications plan, but again under phase 1 of the measures that we have previously undertaken the records being held by early childhood facilities will help to gather the information necessary to know which children will potentially be affected by this.

Essentially, it is the job between assent and when this goes live for that communication to occur so that we do give every opportunity for those children who will be excluded as a result of these measures we are debating today to fix those vaccination records and get the injections they need so that they can continue to take part in early childhood education.

**Mr PICTON:** Let me clarify that because this is an important point that I think a lot of people will be paying attention to and be interested in. I have already outlined that my children are vaccinated, but let's say hypothetically that I have a child in child care who is not vaccinated. This legislation comes in from 1 August. At what point would that child be told that they could no longer

go to that child care? Is it immediately? Is it upon the next date of their vaccine schedule that they miss? Or is it in the next year of enrolment when they start their enrolment next year and they check the records?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** I refer to my previous answer. Again, it will be different. The two-month grace period comes in, but I think you are talking about the cohort of children who are not vaccinated now and are already beyond two months behind. For that cohort, it is August that they will start to be excluded.

**Ms BEDFORD:** Does the bill rely upon the provisions of the A New Tax System (Family Assistance) Act 1999 of the commonwealth, which in turn relies upon the Australian Immunisation Register Act of the commonwealth?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** The answer is yes. The reason that it is yes is that the federal government obviously has their own no jab no play provisions in place. We wanted to make sure that there was no added complexity by diverting from the criteria that they defined, so we essentially mirrored those federal acts to make sure there is no confusion or a different cohort or for whatever reason there is further complexity. So, yes, we are essentially mirroring those acts.

**Ms BEDFORD:** Is the minister aware the form issued by the federal health department providing for certification of medical contraindications by medical practitioners limits the contraindications to a preset list which appears to be unsupported by the provisions of section 6(3)(a) of the A New Tax System (Family Assistance) Act or the *Australian Immunisation Handbook*, which that act refers to as the authoritative clinical document? Will the minister undertake to draw this potentially improper administrative practice to the attention of the federal minister for his action?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Yes, this form and that preset list of contraindications are the first port of call. In relation to that, that form and that list were compiled by experts and that is why that list has been put together, but there is a special immunisation service that is run out of the Women's and Children's Hospital where parents can seek an expert opinion and it is staffed by paediatric immunologists.

Failing that, as a provision in here, there is the ability for the Chief Public Health Officer to make a determination as well. I assume we are talking about a child who has some sort of medical condition and parents who believe that their child should be exempt from vaccinations but their contraindication is not on the preset list. So there is, ultimately, a pathway via the Chief Public Health Officer for that to be considered and the first port of call would be the special immunisation service run by the Women's and Children's Hospital.

**Ms BEDFORD:** In relation to the exemptions, can the minister advise why exemptions under this bill are made by the Chief Public Health Officer rather than by regulation, as are similar laws in other states? Does the minister think proper public scrutiny required the potential for parliamentary disallowance, as is provided, for example, elsewhere in the South Australian Public Health Act in relation to notifiable conditions?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** The reason it is the Chief Public Health Officer is precisely for the situation that your question implies, in that we have a preset list that will deal with almost everybody. We will then have a very small number of cases where a child is immunocompromised and somebody believes they should have an exemption but cannot according to the preset list.

We need to have a flexible arrangement where somebody can make that decision. In this case, the Chief Public Health Officer is the highest authority on this in the land and I think Associate Professor Nicola Spurrier is somebody whom all of South Australia respects very deeply and whose opinion I think everybody respects very deeply.

Essentially, it is about having a flexible arrangement. If we were to put a set of regulations in place, that would need to be prescriptive. Anytime we create prescription, we would then need some sort of specific process outside of that prescriptive list to be able to provide flexibility to deal with cases that crop up and occur from time to time.

Clause passed.

Clause 5.

**Mr PICTON:** In relation to the compliance requirements, the minister in the other place was asked if there had been any issues with noncompliance in relation to the so-called first phase of these reforms, the requirement on education providers to collect immunisation records. The minister said, 'I would assume that, if there was noncompliance, we would be aware of it.' I am just wondering if there is any update on that. Has there been any information provided in relation to noncompliance? Has this assumption by the minister been investigated and confirmed?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Essentially, the mechanism is that the Education Standards Board are the people who audit the early childhood education centres on whether or not they are holding that information. If there is a breach or some sort of issue, as you point out, that then gets escalated to the Communicable Disease Control Branch. To date, I am advised that there has not been any notification of any breach or difficulty in that regard.

**Mr PICTON:** What penalties would a parent or guardian face if they forged an immunisation history statement or otherwise were misleading regarding their child's immunisation history statement?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** A \$30,000 fine.

Clause passed.

Remaining clause (6) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (16:48):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

### **PUBLIC TRUSTEE (PUBLIC TRUSTEE AND GUARDIAN) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 March 2020.)

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (16:49):** I indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition. As is often the case, I am representing the shadow attorney-general in consideration of this piece of legislation. I indicate that the opposition is undertaking further consultation and, as has been the case for a number of pieces of legislation, is reserving its final position on this legislation until the other place. However, I indicate that we have some significant reservations about the legislation as it is being presented and it is likely that we will be opposing this when it comes to the Legislative Council.

In simple terms, this bill seeks to merge two statutory positions and their offices: the Public Trustee and the Public Advocate. The Public Trustee and the Public Advocate are key institutions in our state. They have different and critical roles. The Public Trustee is largely responsible for the preparation of wills and enduring powers of attorney, acting as the executor for deceased estates and acting as the administrator of estates, appointed by SACAT, for persons when they are unable to look after their own health, safety or welfare or manage their own affairs.

The Public Advocate is appointed as guardian of last resort by SACAT for persons unable to look after their own safety, health or welfare or manage their own affairs. Services provided by the Public Advocate typically include management of the accommodation, health and access needs of the protected persons.

There are many reasons why these statutory roles and their offices were developed and maintained as separate bodies. Only two other jurisdictions in Australia have merged their advocate and trustee roles. The Attorney-General herself referenced the key differences between the two bodies in her second reading explanation. These include that one is subject to ministerial direction but the other is not. Under the proposed bill, the combined position of the public trustee and guardian



would be subject to ministerial direction depending upon what piece of paper they were holding or what email they were reading at any given time.

The vast majority of those who use the Public Advocate or the Public Trustee use just one of them. A small number, around 700 people, use both services. They are amongst the most vulnerable people in the state, who require a state body to make important life decisions and administer their day-to-day affairs. Many also receive support with day-to-day tasks from medical, disability or aged-care workers. The overlap of these 700 people is the so-called justification for merging these roles.

There are claims from the government in relation to generic improvements to customer service and streamlining that they are justifying this bill with, but they have not referred to the tension that quite properly arises in tribunals and less formal settings between the two bodies that represent what is best for a person and what they can afford. This commonly manifests in debates about housing. The advocate may push for a more expensive form of housing that better meets a person's needs, while the trustee may push back on affordability. Both parties have the interests of the client at heart, even though they hold different views.

The arguments between them often uncover the best solution for the client. Where agreement cannot be reached, there are processes for a third party to make a determination. This makes sense. It is what has been done for decades. It is what happens in three-quarters of our states and territories. The opposition believes that there is a significant risk that, where these roles are combined, worse decisions could be made. This is critical because the state has full decision-making power for these vulnerable people. Our initial consultations have uncovered significant concerns about the welfare of our most vulnerable clients.

The Attorney-General has acknowledged that, under this bill, all the various functions of the two bodies will be maintained. The only practical difference is the management or streamlining of mutual clients. The government's own talking points on the bill say:

It is anticipated that as a result of the merger there will be greater opportunities for:

1. A single entry point or point of contact for general client matters or enquiries;
2. Coordinated communication with clients around their needs and the management of their affairs;
3. Improved responsiveness for complex matters that have urgent or pressing needs; and
4. Better information sharing through the use of shared ICT systems.

It is strange that the government cannot find a way to improve customer service and information sharing without abolishing one statutory role and creating confusion with the new one. This raises significant questions. The Attorney-General has claimed that this is not a budget savings measure, but they have chosen their words very carefully. The Attorney-General has not committed to no further or future budget cuts; they have said that this bill is not linked to a budget savings measure in previous budgets. The government's talking points also state:

Work is already being undertaken by the Public Trustee and the Public Advocate to manage implementation issues that may arise.

The government should be up-front about whether this means that their agencies are pre-empting any decision by parliament or whether there are implementation problems that they are not willing to discuss in public.

This bill could be like asking a lawyer to be both the prosecution and the defence in the same case because one client is sometimes on each side of the law. This bill is like asking ambulance officers and paramedics to undertake police duties because one of their patients sometimes needs the police as well. The arguments do not stack up.

When we are dealing with the most vulnerable people in the state, the arguments need to be watertight. The bill allows, but does not require, different people to undertake the trustee and guardianship roles when someone requires both. This is not good enough, and the 700 people in this situation deserve better.

We also note the limited consultation that was undertaken in relation to this bill: 22 groups were approached for comment, feedback was provided by eight, but only three of these were from outside the government. No feedback was sought or received directly from those under guardianship or under administration, nor from their families. I again indicate that the opposition has significant concerns about this legislation. We will be finalising this position between the houses, but, as indicated, there is significant consultation that we are undertaking and significant concerns that we have in relation to this legislation.

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (16:57):** I take the opportunity to rise to make some observations in commending the bill to the house. It will continue a path of reform in this most vital area of advocacy in our state. As the Office of the Public Advocate has noted, the intention of the government is to merge the offices of the Public Trustee and the Public Advocate, and that is the work that this bill puts into place. The aim in progressing these reforms, as adverted to by the Office of the Public Advocate, is to improve the services that are available to vulnerable South Australians.

In that regard, these reforms should be welcomed, as they will better facilitate the provision of those services by bringing the functions into one office. As the office indicates, the Public Trustee acts as the financial administrator for South Australians who cannot manage their own affairs, preparing wills and managing enduring powers of attorney for eligible customers and acting as executor for deceased estates. The reforms mean that those areas of advocacy and trustee functions will now be able to be performed within the combined role.

While this bill amends quite a number of different acts in bringing about this reform, I just note that the main work that it does is to amend the Public Trustee Act 1995 so as to bring the appointment of the new public trustee and guardian within the functions of that act. So there is therefore to be seen amendment to section 4(1) of the Public Trustee Act so that the office relevantly of the Public Trustee becomes the Office of the Public Trustee and Guardian. In the same vein, part 2 of the Guardianship and Administration Act 1993 is repealed, and part 2 as it presently stands is that part of the Guardianship and Administration Act that deals with the creation of the Office of the Public Advocate and the appointment process to that role.

As I say, there are a number of amendments to different acts, but the primary function, in terms of consolidation of the role, the appointment and the functions, is to be found in the amendments that are made to the Public Trustee Act. Also noteworthy are the expanded functions and powers of the public trustee and guardian that are to be set out in section 5(2) of the amended act. I note in particular section 5(2)(b), that the public trustee and guardian is to act as the guardian of last resort for persons with a mental incapacity.

What is appropriately emphasised by the government in the course of consolidating these roles and bringing about these reforms is that this is not about reducing funding and it is not about a measure to reduce the public investment in this area. On the contrary, it is about ensuring that the public resources that are devoted to this area are most efficiently deployed for the provision of better services to those who require the services of the public trustee and guardian.

In this context, I want to make particular mention of the reforms that have occurred in this area over the course of the last 20 years, including in particular reforms in a related way that have occurred in the last decade in relation to the community visitor program that has been established in South Australia. When one reflects on the reforms that have established the Community Visitor Scheme in order to do the very valuable work that it does in support of those with mental incapacity, I think of the former public advocate John Harley.

He was a long time public advocate in our state—nine years in all—and as I understand it only the second public advocate. He was followed by Dr John Brayley who is now the state's Chief Psychiatrist. So significant was John Harley's contribution that when John Brayley was taking on the role he was known as John the Third, following on from his predecessors. John Harley practised law extensively in South Australia. He held a number of significant positions consistent with his professional and personal commitments, and they included roles at the top level of the legal profession. He was president of the Law Society and he was chairman of the guardianship board, among other roles.

One of the key disappointments, as I understand, that John took with him on his retirement from the role of Public Advocate was that, notwithstanding having seen a great deal of advance in relation to advocacy for those who came to his role, he was not able to leave the position having a community visitor scheme in place. It is something that then began to occur and was introduced in the years following John's time, and it has since become an important part of the range of services that are now well established in South Australia.

In recognising the tremendous service of John Harley in the role, I emphasise that this is an area which is by definition within the responsibility of government to structure and provide services, and it is naturally evolving and changing over time. So, just as we have seen reforms in relation to the establishment of the Community Visitor Scheme, particularly over that last decade, as I indicated, it should not be surprising that over time we see where the consolidation of services, the bringing together of different agencies and individuals who are able to make a contribution in this space, should be welcomed. The public and the community should expect that governments will have a constant eye to reform in this space with a view to maximising the benefits to those who receive these services while also ensuring that where public funds are applied it is done so in the most appropriate way.

As I indicated at the outset, I commend the bill to the house. I commend those who have served in the role of Public Advocate. I have singled out for some observations the very good work of John Harley in his role, now some years ago, and I look forward to the continued good work of the new public trustee and guardian, the subject of the bill.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (17:09):** Firstly, I thank both the member for Kaurana from the opposition and the member for Heysen for their contributions. Restructuring government entities is sometimes of great interest to members in the parliament, but often not, so I appreciate the attention that has been given by two of our members to this.

I would urge all members to give some thought as we go through the management of this bill, and obviously in committee and the like, to think about the occasions in their own constituencies when there has been some tension exposed between a constituent or within a constituent's family and the draw upon these two resources, either the Public Trustee and that agency or, indeed, the Public Advocate. These matters are usually fraught with distress, if I can be as general as possible there.

Sometimes it relates to the access to funds that the Public Trustee might hold on behalf of a constituent or a member of a family who has come to complain about failure to give adequate resource or access or timely provision of their funds. I suppose even more distressing are circumstances where someone is under a guardianship order, and a person under the Public Advocate has been appointed to manage either some decision-making in sometimes all matters but it might be access to health treatment, an aged-care facility or a disability service, about which there is again conflict amongst family members.

As members of parliament, it is probably one of the most difficult areas we are called upon to assist with because frequently we are dealing with somebody who has some diminished capacity, whose money is either being held by the Public Trustee or their decision-making has been curtailed as a result of a Public Advocate representative taking responsibility. Quite often with that, the person has a split family around them. If they have family at all, it is a split family. Some think that the appointed advocate or trustee is doing a good job, and they think they should be continuing to manage the estate or decision-making, and others are objecting to it and will be laying out all sorts of allegations and accusations as to the failings of this public entity.

As I have said before in this parliament, these two agencies pick up areas of responsibility and work in circumstances where nobody else can do it. Obviously for members who are in happy families, they are able to sort these issues out, they are able to support someone within their family or friendship group to get through a difficult period, or it may be prolonged but they are able to manage that. Of course, with less intrusive supports, they are able to do that and sometimes completely on their own to support someone who is in the situation.

But, invariably, when an order is made ultimately by a court and/or in which there has been appointment by agreement for the management of estates, it is to serve a purpose that frankly nobody else wants to do. So I have some sympathy for the obvious conflicts that will continue to be there but which the workforce in both Public Trustee and Public Advocate officers are skilled at addressing.

Of course, there are situations from time to time, and I have had them brought to my attention. For example, when there is a complaint, often by a family member, that with the sale of the deceased's home—who might have been a relative or a person who needs to go into some other care and the sale of their home is needed to be done—there has been an unacceptable delay in the arrangements for the sale of that property.

One often finds in these sorts of complaints that there is a need for the proceeds of the asset to either support the person who is under care to be able to access other accommodation, such as a smaller flat, an aged-care facility or a disability service, and/or there is a very impatient beneficiary who is going to get access to some fund or asset. We can talk about self-interest and we can talk about family disputes, but the reality is that they are there. I place on record the appreciation we should all have for these public entities that undertake this responsibility.

The whole purpose of this legislation is to bring together these two valued and valuable entities that have a massive overlap of clientele and to ensure that we provide a better service for the customers. There are at least 700 of them that are already directly overlapped; that is, the trustee is handling money or an asset base and, similarly, they have a guardian appointed who has some role in relation to decision-making on behalf of the person.

It should not be beyond the wit of a responsible government and a parliament to make sure that we come up with a legislative framework to protect the consumer, to protect the person who is the client here, but also provide a degree of accountability, accessibility and transparency for the relatives who are often sitting on the perimeter and, sadly, are often in conflict. We have that responsibility to do it.

In trying to bring this matter together in a model that is effective, the government has obviously looked around the country. The last time I looked at guardianship and administration models around the country was when SACAT was established in South Australia—that is, our South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal—which brought together the two big jurisdictions: the review of administrative decisions made by the Guardianship Board and the Residential Tenancies Tribunal, and progressively since that time areas of work of other jurisdictions have been transferred to their responsibility.

These two big bodies of work came together—that is, tenants seeking relief or landlords seeking enforcement in relation to residential tenancies and guardians seeking to have either continuation and/or variation or extinguishment of guardianship orders, and the Guardianship Board to do that. So two quite different roles were brought together under the same roof. In fact, they came together under a statutory roof to start with. Attorney-general Rau was the architect of bringing those two entities together in that legislation, and we dealt with it here in the parliament.

More recently, since our government has come into office, we have continued the recommendations of His Honour former justice David Bleby, who conducted a review of that agency and who recommended that they geographically come together, and that is exactly what has happened. The Collinswood Guardianship Board facility where the Public Advocate was has changed in its structure and it has come over out of Collinswood, in the old ABC building as it was often called, and into the city. It is now co-located with other members of the SACAT and it operates together. We have had a transfer legislatively and we have had a bringing together physically of the personnel who do those two main roles. As I said, other jurisdictions have been added to it. So it can be done.

One of the things that the previous attorney-general was very mindful of, I think, and quite rightly so, was firstly to bring together a gradual transfer of jurisdictions from other courts and tribunals and not overload the new structure too quickly. I think he was right. There have been several tranches of SACAT legislation to transfer. I think the last lot that was transferred over included the Equal Opportunity Tribunal.

**Mr Picton:** The previous attorney was right.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Yes, he was, absolutely, at the time, and we recognised the significance from opposition of that being transferred and not simply overloading something too much. In fact, the previous government, again via minister Rau as the minister for industrial relations, came to the parliament with a new structure for SAET, which was to take over responsibility of industrial tribunal matters and the industrial court and set up a new model, except for the words in referencing the South Australian Employment Tribunal as also being a court. There is a very short clause at the beginning of that model.

The whole structure of SAET was exactly the same as SACAT, and the minister of the day, minister Rau, said, 'Look, I have done it that way because it is the ultimate intention that SAET will combine with SACAT, but it is too early to do that and so we will be doing that a bit down the track.' As it turned out, of course, they did not ever do it and it is now well known that the members who are sitting in the SAET were not at all happy about the prospect of having to be put in with SACAT. That is fine. That was the position they took and the previous government backed off that idea.

But minister Rau was right in saying, 'Don't overload a new structure with too many areas of responsibility too quickly.' In this regard, we are not in any way seeking to add on other areas of responsibility. However, what has happened, and I think it is important I advise the parliament of this, is that the Public Advocate has attracted—probably because she is so good at what she does—some extra responsibility. I want to explain to the parliament what that is.

She is currently our acting community visitor. As members would be aware, we have a Community Visitor Scheme, which helps to provide an unannounced audit process of visitors to mental health institutions. It was established under the Mental Health Act when that was reformed a number of years ago. Until recent years, Mr Maurice Corcoran was the Principal Community Visitor. He retired from that position and Anne Gale, our Public Advocate, is at present the acting Principal Community Visitor and we thank her very much for taking on that responsibility.

Another thing that happened is that we established an extra role for the Community Visitor Scheme only a couple of weeks ago under COVID-19 law where we needed to set up a structure to be able to set guidelines and review a process for detention of people with a disability during COVID-19. I will not go into all the detail, but it was largely to deal with the fact that disability facilities were concerned about keeping people in a confined area or in their room to try to manage social distancing, especially if there was a lack of understanding as to the behavioural need to keep separate from people—for example, people who might be intellectually disabled who go up and hug people. It is a wonderful thing to do, but with COVID-19 it is obviously not a good thing to do.

We dealt with that a couple of weeks ago. We asked the Community Visitor Scheme to take on an extra role and we appointed Dr Bruggemann as a reviewer. I think he is called an 'authorised person' under that legislation.

So the Public Advocate's role over the years has changed, but in more recent times some extra areas of responsibility have been taken on by that office and part of that—I suppose really a third area—is that the Public Advocate has had a very significant role in assisting a number of their clients to access the NDIS arrangements, that is, the establishment of their plan and funding under that new structure. There are a few quite onerous areas of responsibility that have come about just as a result of the events in the last couple of years.

With that, I just want to say that we as a government have had to look at how we might provide a better service. We think this is the best model available, following the ACT. We agree with the strategy that was established under the establishment of SACAT under the former attorney-general, John Rau, that we have to be gradual about that and we do have to respect the need for the client base that we are dealing with to be able to cope with that transition, as well.

There has been a significant amount of consultation and we think we have it right. I hear from the member for Kaurua that he may have some areas of additional reform or restructure or amendment. I am not sure how far his comments go to potentially translating into amendment, but if there are extra matters that need to be accommodated to make this work we are happy to consider

them. We are happy to hear about those, but I have to say that quite a lot of people have been consulted in relation to this area.

Finally, because the staff are so critical and are so trained in the specialty service provision of both trustee and guardianship matters, it is absolutely critical that they be brought with us in this transition for this to work. There has also been a significant period of ongoing negotiation and consultation with the Public Service Association (PSA), because they, of course, are the representative for many of those employed in that way. We will see how we go in that regard.

I am happy to move into committee. We might not get too much of it done tonight, but I am happy for us to get started. I have our officer with us here and ready to go. I commend the bill to the house and seek that it now be read a second time.

Bill read a second time.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (17:27):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

This is refreshing; nevertheless, I confirm the invitation to the opposition if they have any matters they want to raise between houses. If there is an opportunity for us to work through and resolve this, we would like to do so as best we can. If the member for Kaurana has any other questions in relation to consultation, I am happy to provide those.

For the benefit of the house, I will just find my submissions list, because in my second reading explanation, I briefly referred to the importance of the ongoing consultation with the Public Service Association. In addition to that consultation, the acting Public Trustee, Ms Nicolle Rantanen, whom I think I have mentioned before, has been consulted, and the Public Advocate, Ms Anne Gale, is frequently consulted. I meet with these two on a three to four-weekly basis to try to keep up to date with what is happening in their divisions and obviously to provide any support and receive any requests from them that need to be advanced.

Consultation was undertaken with a number of the staff at the Office of the Public Advocate—there are some 16 of them; the Public Service Association, which I have referred to; the acting Chief Psychiatrist; the Legal Services Commission; the Aged Rights Advocacy Service; Purple Orange, which, for those who are not aware, is an entity that provides support to the disability community and is a disability advocate; the Crown Solicitor on technical points in relation to part of the bill that is before us; and South Australia Police, who, incidentally, have given their indication of support.

Also consulted were the Law Society of South Australia; the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal, which, for obvious reasons, has a role in relation to the making and review of guardianship administration orders; Aged and Community Services; Carers SA; Council on the Ageing; Intellectual Disability Association SA; Mental Health Coalition of SA; Spastic Centres of South Australia; the South Australian Council of Social Services; the South Australian Council on Intellectual Disability; National Disability Services; the Department for Health and Wellbeing; and the Department of Human Services. I do not have any particulars of any others.

I am advised that that is the entire list. I was just checking to see whether the Supreme Court, Magistrates Court or District Court were consulted, but they do not actually have a role in relation to the review of these matters, although I think I should place on the record that they do of course deal with the administration of estates. They make orders sometimes for probate or administration of estates that are ultimately put into operation by the Public Trustee, who then becomes the appointed agency to do that. That is really the position we have in relation to consultation. If that assists the opposition to check between the houses with any of the people who have been consulted, then I hope it does so because we would like this matter to be advanced in an effective manner.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**SUMMARY OFFENCES (TRESPASS ON PRIMARY PRODUCTION PREMISES) AMENDMENT  
BILL**

*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

**THE WYATT BENEVOLENT INSTITUTION INCORPORATED (OBJECTS) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 17:33 the house adjourned until Thursday 30 April 2020 at 11:00.