

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, 4 June 2020

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens)** took the chair at 14:15 and read prayers.

The PRESIDENT: We acknowledge Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the traditional owners of this country throughout Australia, and their connection to the land and community. We pay our respects to them and their cultures, and to the elders both past and present.

Parliamentary Committees

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (14:17): I bring up the fifth report of the committee on an inquiry into use of off-road vehicles in South Australia.

Report received.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Human Services (Hon. J.M.A. Lensink)—

Standard for Dual Reticulation Infrastructure Published by the Technical Regulator pursuant to the Water Industry Act 2012

Ministerial Statement

HEAVY VEHICLE INSPECTION SCHEME

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade and Investment) (14:18): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the Heavy Vehicle Inspection Scheme made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

Question Time

HUMAN SERVICES SCREENING UNIT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Human Services a question about disability services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: When asked about disability careworker screenings in one particular media interview, the minister said all of the following, in this order: 'I can't comment on those sorts of details', 'I can't comment', 'I don't have that information', 'That's a rather inappropriate question', 'I'm not going to talk about screening' and 'I'm not going to respond to this line of questioning'. Minister:

1. Why exactly do you refuse to answer media questions about the screening process of workers who are not under police investigation?

2. Since the death of Ann Marie Smith, how many screening applications have been received from Integrity Care?

3. In the two years before the death of Ann Marie Smith, how many screening applications were received by your department from Integrity Care?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:23): I thank the honourable member for his question. As I stated in recent weeks in relation to a question about whether the state government was cooperating in relation to any investigations into Integrity Care, the emphatic answer was, 'Yes, absolutely. We are.' There are several investigations taking place specifically into the circumstances of Ann Marie Smith's terrible death. That is through SA Police, and we expect a coronial inquest as well.

We do know that there is an independent inquiry, which is to be conducted by Alan Robertson SC. In addition, the federal regulator, the Quality and Safeguards Commission, is also undertaking various investigations, and the screening unit is working very closely with the federal regulator and the South Australian police. As such, I am unable to provide any details of those investigations.

HUMAN SERVICES SCREENING UNIT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): Supplementary arising from the answer: can the minister inform the chamber what part of which government is responsible for the screening of disability careworkers?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:25): There is in effect a collective responsibility in that there are a number of agencies that provide details to the screening unit in terms of the sort of information that needs to be taken into consideration as to whether somebody should be provided with a screening or whether their screening should be revoked. I outlined a number of those yesterday in relation to—yesterday or the day before the honourable member asked me about the process for disability screening. I have outlined those.

HUMAN SERVICES SCREENING UNIT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): Supplementary arising from the original answer, where screenings were canvassed: does your Department of Human Services provide the screenings for disability careworkers in South Australia?

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: Do we do what, sorry?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Does your department provide the screenings?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:26): Well, obviously we do.

HUMAN SERVICES SCREENING UNIT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): Supplementary arising from the original answer: can the minister outline why and on what advice she relies upon that she cannot speak about how screenings work generally and about whether there have been screenings submitted from a particular company and how that would compromise an investigation?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:26): I have already outlined to the chamber about how screenings work in some detail in response to a question yesterday. These matters are currently under investigation—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Not how screenings work, and I spoke about that yesterday. In relation to the specific—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: There are specific matters which are under investigation by the federal regulator, by SA police. The DHS screening unit is closely working with those investigative agents, and therefore I am not able to comment further—full stop.

HUMAN SERVICES SCREENING UNIT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): Supplementary arising from the answer: is the screening unit itself under investigation, or any officers within the screening unit under investigation?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:27): For the same reason, if they were, then I wouldn't be able to comment on that either.

HUMAN SERVICES SCREENING UNIT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): So is the minister confirming now to the chamber that there are—

The PRESIDENT: Is this a supplementary?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Supplementary: is the ministry confirming to the chamber—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I can't hear the supplementary question.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: If there were no officers of the screening unit under investigation, would the minister then be able to confirm that there is no-one under investigation?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:28): The Leader of the Opposition is clearly putting words in my mouth. May I say, I'm not sure where some of these inferences are coming from. Certainly, there have been some inferences on radio yesterday attacking public servants which I thought were grossly out of line. If the honourable member wants to start making accusations about inappropriate activities within the screening unit, then he should refer those to ICAC.

HUMAN SERVICES SCREENING UNIT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): Supplementary arising from the original answer—

The PRESIDENT: Last supplementary question arising from the original answer.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Thank you, sir. Is the minister confident that all processes within the screening unit have been followed?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:28): To the best of my knowledge, yes.

HUMAN SERVICES SCREENING UNIT

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:28): Supplementary: is the minister aware of any family links between—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wortley, just hang on. I can't hear the Hon. Mr Wortley's supplementary.

The Hon. S.G. Wade: We are getting a bit excited.

The PRESIDENT: Minister! The Hon. Mr Wortley.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Is the minister aware of any family links between the care of Ann Marie Smith and anyone associated with Integrity Care?

The PRESIDENT: Minister for Human Services, I am not sure how that links up with the original answer.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:29): I have already said this week that any of these matters are subject to current investigations—I might say this slowly, sir—and therefore I am unable to comment.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Dawkins, you are not helping.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Leader of the Opposition, your next question.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding disability services. Can the minister assure the chamber that there are no unscreened disability careworkers providing disability services in South Australia? Are there any penalties for a company that has unscreened workers providing such disability care services?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:30): The records of employees are held by the organisations themselves and the Quality and Safeguards Commission is responsible for regulating those records, and the penalties lie with the federal agency for people not being screened.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): Supplementary arising from the answer in relation to the various governments and departments that hold records: is sharing information about disability careworkers and their screenings subject to any of the information-sharing agreements that the minister assigned her department to in this area?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:30): I made some comments yesterday—I'm not sure whether the honourable member was listening—but in terms of information sharing between the federal regulator and the screening unit, that is something that we have been very keen to progress. In discussions with the Quality and Safeguards Commissioner, he has agreed that those arrangements would be expedited.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): Supplementary, and for the sake of clarity: is the minister saying that at the moment there is no sharing of the information about the workers who are providing disability care services from the federal authorities and the state authorities who provide those screenings?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:31): I didn't say that, and I refer him to my previous answer.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): Supplementary arising from the answer: are there any state penalties that can be imposed on companies that are providing disability care services from unscreened workers?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:31): Let me just find those in our screening material. Disability services are currently under the Disability Services Act of South Australia and the Disability Services (Assessment of Regular History) Regulations, and they are the appropriate pieces of legislation that apply. State-based offences, I understand, only applied prior to 2018. The offence of performing a prescribed function without a relevant history assessment as a sole trader was \$10,000, and failure to provide evidence of relevant history assessment conducted as a sole trader was \$10,000. From 1 July 2018, the commonwealth practice standards worker screening rules apply, and I understand there are 250 penalty units for not abiding with those.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:33): Supplementary arising from the original answer: does the state have information from the commonwealth on all of those people who are providing disability care services?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:33): We don't keep those employment records. We are responsible for providing a screening check to someone who applies

either as an individual or via the organisation that has applied for them. We don't have access to employment records.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:33): Final supplementary: does the commonwealth have access to the state information on disability careworkers who have successfully had a screening check completed?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:33): My understanding of the way it works is that the federal regulator has a requirement for the organisations that are registered as NDIS providers to have all of their employees screened and, therefore, we provide the screening.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding disability services. Minister, have you asked the commonwealth minister for the NDIS, Stuart Robert, to reveal information about checks on Ms Smith that he claimed in a media interview to know about but would not share? Do you agree with the comments from the co-chair of your task force that the commonwealth minister's actions are outrageous and unforgivable?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:34): In relation to the first question, I have had a range of discussions with my federal colleague Stuart Robert. I am not going to go into details of those discussions. On the second question, I would say that the Hon. Kelly Vincent speaks for herself. She does not need my affirmation, my endorsement or any of those things. This goes to the heart—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —of the sort of ableism and paternalism that we have seen—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —in the Labor Party's response to this issue.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Do you agree with her comments?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am struggling to hear the minister. Minister, please continue.

The Hon. R.P. Wortley: We're struggling—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wortley, you should know better.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: People with disabilities have fought hard for their rights. They have fought hard to be seen.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: We're asking you: do you agree with the comments? You are the minister—do you agree?

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, you may have a supplementary, but at the moment the minister is trying to answer a supplementary.

The Hon. C.M. Scriven interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! You don't speak when I'm speaking, the Hon. Ms Scriven. The Hon. Mr Hunter, you may wish to ask a supplementary question. At this stage we are going to let the minister provide an answer, and then we're going to go from there. Minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I think we have seen in the last 24 hours Kelly speaking for herself and asking that those of us who do not have lived experience can respect people with disability for who they are, stop being paternalistic, stop fighting over semantics and just try to get on with trying to find some solutions.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: You just won't tell us any facts, will you? What about an opinion: do you agree with her comments?

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, enough! Minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Kelly Vincent speaks for herself, as we know. Those of us who were colleagues of herself for eight years—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Do you agree with her comments?

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, let the minister finish her answer.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: She's not answering.

The PRESIDENT: She can't because you're interrupting!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Mr President, forgive me if I am wrong, but I thought it was out of order for ministers to be asked their opinions on things. That aside, I would like to make the point that the Hon. Kelly Vincent, who has been a colleague of a number of us for eight years in this chamber and whom we have had the great honour of being good friends with since, has a voice of her own, and that is something that people with disabilities have fought for for years, not to be paternalised and not to have people without lived experience speak on their behalf.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Kelly Vincent does not need me to endorse her comments; she speaks for herself.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:37): Supplementary arising from the answer.

The PRESIDENT: The opposition will give your leader the courtesy of listening to his supplementary question without interruption. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Minister, were the comments of federal minister Stuart Robert outrageous and unforgivable?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:38): I have responded to this question.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:38): Further supplementary arising from the original answer: in your original answer, minister, you mentioned that you have had a range of discussions with the federal minister. Do you know whether there were checks on the care provider to Ms Ann Marie Smith or not?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:38): I already responded to this in my original answer.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:38): Final supplementary arising from the original answer: approximately how many conversations has the minister had with the federal minister since the death of Ann Marie Smith?

The PRESIDENT: Minister, answer how you see fit.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:39): It is dangerous to guess, but there have been many.

MENTAL HEALTH CLINICIANS

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (14:39): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing in relation to mental health support for clinicians.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: During my long period of working in the mental health and suicide prevention sectors, I have constantly been reminded of the need for personal self-care and support for health professionals and volunteers involved in assisting others. Will the minister update the council on how we can all help to support the mental health of our clinicians?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:39): I thank the honourable member for his question. Even on a good day, our doctors and health professionals have a tough job. They are entrusted with our health, diagnosing illnesses or injuries, administering treatment and counsel and often providing a critical source of comfort and support for families and patients.

This year, the daily challenges have been added to, as they responded first to the bushfire crisis that engulfed our state and now to the global coronavirus pandemic. It is important for all of us to look after our mental health and wellbeing, especially as the pandemic continues to impact on our lives. That is particularly the case for those who provide vital care to others. We need to support our doctors and health professionals and encourage them to prioritise their own mental health and wellbeing.

We have all been shocked by the images from around the world, where we see hospitals overrun with patients and a rising global death toll, but fortunately for most of us we can turn off our television sets, put down our mobile devices and put the images aside. But for our doctors and health professionals on the front line who are responsible for delivering the massive on-the-ground defence against the virus, these images are particularly confronting. At the same time they are preparing our health system for a range of catastrophic scenarios they are continuing to provide care and treatment to patients for their ongoing health issues.

Our health system and community has responded with incredible strength and resilience. However, the support doctors and health professionals provide for others can come at a significant personal cost. The National Mental Health Survey of Doctors and Medical Students, originally published in 2013 and updated in June 2019, found that doctors reported substantially higher rates of psychological distress and suicidal thoughts compared to both the Australian population and other Australian professionals. We can help. We need to care for those who care for us. This Friday 5 June is Crazy Socks 4 Docs Day, which aims to raise awareness of the mental health of doctors and health professionals.

Dr Geoff Toogood started Crazy Socks 4 Docs Day in 2017 in response to his own experience. Wearing odd socks to work, rather than starting a discussion about whether he was okay, he heard his colleagues whisper behind his back about his own battle with mental illness. In reality he only had two odd socks to wear that day after the rest had been eaten by his puppy. Dr Toogood started Crazy Socks 4 Docs Day to make it okay for a doctor not to be okay and to help doctors around the world not suicide. This initiative is now a global movement, and I would encourage everyone to wear fun socks on the first Friday in June to help raise awareness and normalise the mental health conversation.

Each year, as Minister for Health and Wellbeing, I have enjoyed taking part in Crazy Socks 4 Docs Day. This year I will again be putting on a pair of crazy socks in appreciation for our doctors and the work they do to keep us safe. This Friday I would encourage everyone to join me in finding some really crazy coloured socks and putting them on. The Crazy Socks 4 Docs Day movement encourages people to take a photo of those socks and put that photo on social media. We can all help start the conversation. Putting on crazy socks is one way of caring for those who care for us.

SPRINGBANK SECONDARY COLLEGE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:43): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the minister representing the Minister for Education on the topic of ministerial powers to close or amalgamate any school, but specifically the Springbank Secondary College.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: As you would be aware, the minister does not have the power under his own volition to close or amalgamate a South Australian state school, unless of course a prescribed process of either a voluntary vote or a review, as set out under the act, is followed and strictly adhered to. In correspondence to a concerned parent of a child studying at Springbank Secondary College, the Minister for Education this past week has informed that parent that:

The Education Act 1972 legislates the terms of a review process and as part of the process, the Review Committee will provide me with a report and their recommendations...

The minister goes on to say:

Within three parliamentary sitting days of informing the school, I must table in the SA parliament a copy of the report, the recommendations and reasons for making the decision.

1. Does the minister acknowledge that in fact that report from the Springbank review committee is not required by the act to be tabled in parliament, unless, of course, the minister intends to act in contravention of the recommendations of a review committee and proceed with the closure or amalgamation against their recommendations?

2. Does the minister understand and respect that he only has the power to close or amalgamate a school if he has fully followed the provisions of the act to the letter?

3. Finally, given the minister has already flagged his intention to table a report to the parliament within three days of receiving it, has the minister actually followed all the relevant provisions of the act to the letter of, specifically, part 2A, or does he intend to go through with this process regardless of the law?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:45): I am happy to refer the honourable member's question to my colleague, but knowing my colleague and how meticulous, assiduous and exceptional he is in handling his portfolio, I am sure he is following everything that he is required to do by the law of the land.

SPRINGBANK SECONDARY COLLEGE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:46): Supplementary: given the assurance that meticulous following of the act has been undertaken, if the act has not been followed to the letter will the government abandon this review?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:46): I am not sure that that is actually supplementary to my answer. My answer was that I will refer the honourable member's question to the appropriate minister, the Minister for Education, and I said some very kind words about the minister. The answer will come from the minister.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Point of order: is it in order for other members to make rulings about what is in order or not?

The PRESIDENT: Your point of order is well made. No, it is not, but I am sure the Treasurer meant no offence, and I am pleased to have your support. The honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:47): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing about infant safety.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: It was revealed only yesterday that a rare bacteria, *serratia marcescens*, has been identified in five babies in the Flinders Medical Centre intensive care unit. The first baby was identified two weeks ago. The second baby was identified on the weekend, but public notification was made only yesterday.

In January 2018, it took four days for families to be informed about a baby bottle washer in a hospital that was being incorrectly connected to a descaler. The Hon. Stephen Wade described this at that time as a 'culture of cover-up' and 'outrageous'. The minister said at that time:

It is outrageous that the parents of the infants affected were not notified immediately.

He said that the then minister for health:

...needs to reveal when he first became aware of the bungle and why there was a delay in revealing the mistake...

And:

If I am fortunate enough to be the minister for health in a Marshall Liberal government, I will be demanding an open and transparent approach to mistakes in the health system.

My questions to the minister are:

1. Does the minister still believe that a four-day delay in notifying parents of infants affected is a culture of cover-up and outrageous?
2. Given that the hospital knew of the second infection last weekend and public notification only happened on Wednesday, how does that pass the minister's own standard of open and transparent approach?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:49): The reality is that families were progressively engaged from the weekend when the second infection occurred. In that context, the families were still being notified as of yesterday. It was not appropriate to make a public announcement until all relevant families had been notified.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:49): A supplementary arising from the answer: is the minister saying that he does still consider that a culture of cover-up and outrageous because it was more than four days?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:49): No. What—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: What I'm saying to the honourable member—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: The shoe is on the other foot now.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Sorry; Mr President—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The question was asked in silence.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: What I'm saying to the honourable member is that her question is completely fallacious because it asserts that parents were not told for four days, and they were told within four days; so it's completely distinguishable.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:50): Supplementary: when was the minister first informed of the rare bacterial infection in the neonatal intensive care unit at Flinders Medical Centre?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:50): My understanding is that it was oral advice late on Monday.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:50): A further supplementary: when exactly were all of the parents of children at the neonatal intensive care unit first advised of the infections?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:50): If the honourable member was listening to my earlier answer, my understanding is that the final parents were advised yesterday. That's why the public announcement occurred after the last family had been advised. I will certainly seek clarification on that. I will take that question on notice and provide the honourable member with an answer.

HOMEBUILDER PROGRAM

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:51): My question is to the Treasurer. Treasurer, given the recent announcement in the last 24 hours by the federal government with respect to the HomeBuilder grant scheme, what, if any, assistance does the state government plan to stimulate the building construction industry?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:51): The state government is delighted with the announcement by our federal colleagues in relation to HomeBuilder. What it essentially means, put simply, is that new first-home buyers in South Australia will have a total of \$40,000 available for the period through to 31 December—\$25,000 from the federal government and the existing \$15,000 state government grant. The federal government grant extends beyond just that because it does take into account extensive renovations as well as new home construction.

As the Hon. Mr Hood will know, in last year's budget the state government announced a \$45 million housing stimulus package, and I pay credit to my hardworking ministerial colleague, minister Lensink, and then again in the Mid-Year Budget Review under her leadership, together with the Premier, there was an announcement of a 10-year plan for about \$550 million in terms of a housing strategy. It included a program for a thousand new housing opportunities and included a homelessness fund.

In the earlier scheme we announced HomeStart starter loans, funded out of an affordable housing fund, and we expanded on that again and extended the period. I think it was in the Mid-Year Budget Review as well. There were significant commitments to maintenance and affordable housing in those packages, as I said, led by my colleague minister Lensink and the Premier. Whilst we welcome what the federal government has done, the state government has worked with the federal government and we will announce in the next week or so a further stimulus package for housing construction in South Australia. It will complement the announcements by the federal government.

As I said, until we were aware of the final detail—and I did see something last night with tracked changes in it, so clearly some of the detail in relation to the renovation schemes were still being worked on until yesterday—until we had seen the final detail of that both last night and this morning, we are now in a position to know the precise detail of that. As I said, in the next week or so we will conclude our decision-making as a cabinet and we will announce in the next week or so a range of initiatives that will further stimulate the housing and construction sector.

What we have made clear today, as I have said consistently for a period of time, is that we will not be adding to homeowner grants, we will not be abolishing stamp duty, as has been called for by some in the industry. What I have said this afternoon is that it is now counterproductive to continue to raise the possibility that the state government, in the public's perception, might move down that particular front. We now have a decision from the federal government, there is a clear decision from the state government, and potential home purchasers now need to make their decisions quickly because this is only a six-month period.

We don't want to see the media reports of earlier this week, where national builders were saying that potential homeowners were delaying their purchases because they wanted to know how much they were going to be given by federal or state governments in relation to both grants or stamp duty concessions. We don't need people who are looking to purchase, and are able to purchase, delaying those decisions because they believe there may well be further grants being considered or being implemented.

People are now quite clear. The federal government is being very generous with their \$25,000 grant. There is now \$40,000 for new first-home owners in South Australia and a range of other incentives that the federal government has announced. We are now certainly going to support the federal government in implementing that particular scheme.

The federal government, in conclusion—this is their estimate, not ours—believe there will be approximately 2,000 grants issued in South Australia. We hope, of course, it might be more because it is uncapped. The federal government has indicated they are not putting a cap or a limit on the number of grants prior to 31 December, so if the number happens to be higher than that because of the generosity of the combined grants schemes, that will be excellent news for the residential housing sector in South Australia.

HOMEBUILDER PROGRAM

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:56): Supplementary: given the Treasurer states that he doesn't want residents of South Australia to be delaying their decisions, can he be more specific about when this package will be announced from the state government?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:56): Yes, I can be, Mr President: in the next week or so.

HOMEBUILDER PROGRAM

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:56): Supplementary question: can the Treasurer tell us whether the government will make any moves or introduce any legislation to ensure that there are no delays when it comes to development plans being submitted to councils in relation to this stimulus?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:57): That's an excellent question from the Hon. Mr Pangallo. It is an issue my colleague minister Knoll was discussing with myself and colleagues this morning. Clearly, there are shared roles with state and local governments. There are industry sector representatives who are expressing concern about planning delays in local councils, and I am sure the Hon. Mr Pangallo would share the government's frustration if that was to delay the potential implementation of this generous federal government scheme.

The state government is looking to see what powers we do have currently under the COVID-19 package of bills, which were supported through the parliament. The state minister will look to see what we might be able to do collaboratively, working together with local government, but there are two concerns that industry representatives have expressed this morning. One is: let's make sure planning approvals get through more quickly. The other one is the finance industry, and banks in particular, the delays potentially in the processing of finance and banking loans.

There is only a three-month window of opportunity from the signing of the contract—this is according to the federal government rules—and the commencement of the build, so it is a tight time frame. It is a six-month period but there is a three-month period from the signing of the contract to the commencement of the build.

We all must work together (local government, state government and industry) in the interests of ensuring any potential blockages such as planning approvals and recalcitrant local councils—we can all regale the parliament with stories of how long it takes to get through some minor planning approvals for redevelopments in some council areas in metropolitan Adelaide. Equally, we need to work with the finance sector, in particular banks, to make sure there are no delays there as well.

HOMEBUILDER PROGRAM

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (14:59): Supplementary question to the Treasurer: is the government considering a model where, if a planning approval is not obtained within a certain shortened period of time, the approval will be automatic?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:59): I am not aware of that. The details of the federal government scheme were only finally revealed to us last night and this morning, so this issue that the industry sector has raised has only been as of this morning. Whether it is since 10 o'clock this morning and 3 o'clock this afternoon that this particular proposal the honourable member has raised

has been canvassed, I have no knowledge. All I know is that I think we would all share the concern, expressed through the Hon. Mr Pangallo, that unnecessary local government planning restrictions that might hold up access to this particular generous grant scheme would be counterproductive, both to the individual and to our housing sector and jobs in South Australia.

HOMEBUILDER PROGRAM

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:00): Supplementary: if it transpires that local councils are inundated with unexpected additional applications, will the state government assist councils by providing resources to help them more quickly process the applications?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:01): The state government won't commit—I can't commit and won't commit—at this stage to a hypothetical position. I hope the circumstances the honourable member outlines transpire, that is, that there is a large number of applications. However, I would hope that local government would be efficient enough and productive enough to process those within their own resources. Certainly, my suggestion to them would be: if they don't have sufficient resources, I can think of a large number of things they do where they might be able to reduce their expenditure and reprioritise their expenditure into this important area.

SUPERLOOP ADELAIDE 500

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:01): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Trade and Investment on the Superloop 500.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Considering that Virgin Airlines, a major sponsor of the Supercars, has gone into voluntary administration, and Holden, or General Motors, have announced that they will pull out of the Supercar event at the end of 2020, which will impact on eight of the 13 teams, is the event under threat of not having enough entries, or will the format have to be revised?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade and Investment) (15:02): I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest in South Australia's motorsport. Indeed, the Superloop Adelaide 500 has been a wonderful success. Certainly, with the demise of manufacturing, especially Holden here in this state, Virgin is a major sponsor of not only the Supercars but other big events in Australia. Their current financial situation is a concern for us all, especially for the travelling public. I will refer the details of the question to the Minister for Tourism and the Premier in the other place and bring back a reply.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Human Services, regarding disability services. Minister, are you aware of any death of any person in state disability care, following a critical incident report this year? Can you outline exactly what is meant by 'critical incident' in the context of state disability care?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:03): I think I took on notice this week that I would get back to the honourable member in relation to any death that I had become aware of, and that is still the case. If I can outline for him what the incident management process is: we have an incident management system within the Department of Human Services, which started in December 2016 and brought together the functions of the former care concern investigations unit, the employer relations unit and the Disability SA feedback and incident review team.

The IMU has responsibility for triaging and determining appropriate response to all allegations of inappropriate care for DHS clients, staff misconduct, critical client incidents, related disclosure assessments, reportable death and subsequent coronial inquests relating to a CCI. This includes incidents that occur within accommodation services and the youth justice training centre.

Other areas of responsibility include the review of spent conviction applications relating to the care of vulnerable people to determine if intervention is required, the provision of technical consultancy across the department on conducting investigations and a contact point for information sharing with the South Australian police. The IMU is also responsible for investigating matters relating

to DHS by the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption for matters of misconduct or maladministration. The IMU also has a coordination role in relation to the National Redress Scheme.

In relation to any CCIs, I am alerted to those by email; I am on the distribution list. They are then followed up to advise what action, if necessary, has taken place.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:05): Supplementary: can the minister confirm that she is on the distribution list and notified of any such critical incidents?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:06): That's correct.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:06): Further supplementary arising from the original part of the original answer—the start of the original answer, where the minister outlined that she had in fact been asked a similar question on Tuesday. Since being asked the question on Tuesday, has the minister asked any questions of her office or her department about whether she has been informed of a death following a critical incident?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:06): I undertook that I would bring back an answer to the chamber, and I will be doing that.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:06): Further supplementary: has the minister in fact been curious enough to ask her department had she been made aware of any death this year?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:06): I have just responded to this question.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:06): Further supplementary—

The PRESIDENT: Last supplementary question.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Thank you, sir. Can the minister outline the type of incident which would be the minimum level that she would be informed of as a CCI?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:07): That is quite a detailed question. I have actually outlined this in relation to previous questions; I think I went through it in great detail in the last couple of years about what all the steps are in the critical incident process. So that is a matter of the public record.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (15:07): My question is to the Minister for Trade and Investment. Can the minister please provide an update to the council about how the Marshall Liberal government is maintaining international engagement during the coronavirus pandemic?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade and Investment) (15:07): I thank the honourable member for her second question, and I have had the honour and privilege of receiving both of those questions. It is a very important question. The international coronavirus lockdown has had obvious ramifications for South Australian exporters and our other businesses who find themselves unable to meet with their business partners and travel overseas to trade shows as well.

At this time it pays to have people on the ground in our key markets. Fortunately for South Australian businesses, our government has been hard at work to re-establish South Australia's overseas trade office network. Our new representatives in Shanghai, Guangzhou, Tokyo and Houston are providing invaluable support in facilitating business deals and providing timely market intelligence.

Our officers have been reaching out to our businesses over the past two months and, as I informed the chamber earlier this week, we have run a number of webinars—in fact, I think 24 market

webinars—into China, Hong Kong, Malaysia, Singapore, Japan, the UK, the US and India. In fact, as we sit here, I think it is just concluding—an in-market webinar in India with Austrade that we are jointly hosting.

We are following through on our election commitment to grow our international trade network, and I can advise the chamber that the Department for Trade and Investment is very close to finalising the recruitment for our Dubai office, which will head up the engagement through the Middle East, North Africa and the subcontinent. This will include seeking opportunities for our state when the world visits the region in the upcoming World Expo and the Qatar World Cup when the dates are finalised for them, given the delays due to the coronavirus.

Furthermore, considering our half a billion dollars a year trade with India, the Marshall Liberal government has also made a decision to embed a trade officer with an Austrade in New Delhi. In a move to further diversify our markets we will be embedding another trade officer in Seoul, South Korea. Interestingly, after China, the US and Japan, South Korea is Australia's fourth largest trading partner and sits just 10th for South Australia so its potential for growth is quite clear.

There are many challenges in today's increasingly volatile trade environment but you can be assured that the Marshall Liberal government is dedicated in its efforts to continue our international engagement to support local exporters to grow jobs and make South Australia stronger than before.

OPCAT AGREEMENT

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:10): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing questions to the Leader of the Government, representing the Attorney-General, about the OPCAT agreement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: Three years ago, Australia ratified an international agreement known as OPCAT, which stands for the Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. The primary objective of OPCAT is to prevent the mistreatment of people in detention. At the time of signing, the then Liberal prime minister Malcolm Turnbull hailed the treaty as a significant victory for human rights.

Under OPCAT, Australia has agreed to establish an independent, national preventative mechanism to conduct inspections of all places of detention and closed environments by the end of this year. In addition, Australia has also agreed to international inspections of places of detention by the United Nations Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture. Given what we have seen in recent days from overseas and interstate in relation to the brutal treatment of powerless people, the need for this international regime has never been clearer.

We also have the ongoing shame of Aboriginal deaths in custody, 432 since 1991, with no convictions, and many of the royal commission's recommendations still not implemented after nearly 30 years. It was alarming to read the front page report in *The Australian* today which claims that the South Australian corrections minister, Corey Wingard, wrote to the commonwealth Attorney-General Christian Porter last November effectively rejecting OPCAT on the basis that existing oversight mechanisms were sufficiently robust without United Nations inspections. The newspaper quotes Mr Wingard's letter as stating:

It was the collective opinion of the Ministers that such mechanisms are already an adequate means of preventing torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

The Australian further claims that the South Australian government remains strongly opposed to the treaty's implementation. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Does the government support the implementation of OPCAT?
2. Does the government intend to nominate a national preventative mechanism for South Australia by the end of this year and, if so, which organisations or bodies are likely to be involved?

3. Does the Attorney-General agree with the views attributed to minister Corey Wingard that OPCAT is not necessary and that existing oversight mechanisms are sufficient to prevent torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:13): I am happy to refer the honourable member's questions to my ministerial colleague and bring back a reply. However, in relation to my, again, hardworking ministerial colleague minister Wingard, I would be surprised—although I don't profess to be the expert in this particular area—if he would be issuing a statement on behalf of the government himself without having properly consulted with all of us as cabinet colleagues. Given that he has referred—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Given that he has referred the question not to minister Wingard but to the Attorney-General, I shall seek the Attorney-General's response to the question.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:14): My question is to the Minister for Human Services on disability services. Minister, what exactly is the impediment that prevents your department from providing the federal authorities with a simple list of all people who have received a screening to provide disability care services?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:15): I thank the honourable member for his question. I am not sure that I have ever said that. The way he has framed his question is to put it in the negative, as if we haven't. We do have cooperative arrangements with the Quality and Safeguards Commission because, clearly, they have shared concerns for people who may be working with people with disabilities.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:15): A supplementary arising from the answer: minister, are you legally able to provide a list of all people who have received a screening for disability care services to the Quality and Safeguards Commission?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:15): I am not sure why he has inserted the word 'legally'. We certainly have cooperative working arrangements with the Quality and Safeguards Commission.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:16): Supplementary arising from the answer: very simply, minister, does your department provide the Quality and Safeguards Commission with a list of all people in South Australia who have received clearance to provide disability services?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:16): I have explained previously that the way the regulation flows is that it is the responsibility of organisations to ensure that their workers or volunteers who work with disability have the relevant disability screening check. The Quality and Safeguards Commission has oversight of that role, and there are penalties for organisations that do not undertake that.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:16): Supplementary arising from the answer: minister, can you understand how people would think it would be much easier just to provide that list so that it can be matched up to see whether anyone is actually providing care that the federal authorities have with those who have permission to do so from the state authorities?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:17): These are things that we have been actively engaging with. We also have the task force to look at whether there are particular gaps in the screening process, and if the honourable member has any suggestions then he might like to provide those to the task force.

I have already asked if the Labor Party would cooperate with the task force. It is an independent organisation. I am sure there are ideas from those independent members so that we can make improvements to those processes, and if the honourable member has any suggestions he can provide them to me and I would be happy to provide them to the task force as well.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:17): Supplementary arising from the original answer: minister, have you asked your department, quite simply, 'Why don't we provide that list to the federal authorities?'

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:18): I have outlined what the particular process is, and the screening unit—

The Hon. E.S. Bourke interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I tell you what I require is your silence. Minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The screening unit is actively engaged with the Quality and Safeguards Commission.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:18): Final supplementary, and quite simply: minister, does your department provide that list to the federal authorities or not?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:18): I have already responded to this question.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Lee.

CORONAVIRUS

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:18): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing about community health. As we are all grateful that South Australians have united in tackling the coronavirus better than most places in the world, will the minister please update the council on community health during the COVID-19 pandemic?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:19): I thank the honourable member for her question. In the context of community health, before I start addressing the answer, I pay tribute to the work the Hon. Jing Lee did in the early stages of the pandemic to help engage the Chinese community. It was a very stressful time, and she provided great leadership.

The Marshall Liberal government recognised early the threat of COVID-19 and our response, based on the advice of our outstanding public health officers, has seen the state move successfully from the containment phase to the suppression phase after the first wave. This has given us the opportunity to reopen our economy sooner than expected, providing South Australians with the opportunity to return to work and enjoy their social life again. However, we cannot become complacent. We need to maintain a vigilant public health regime while supporting the state's economic recovery.

A key part of maintaining our vigilance is building our capacity to identify any new cases early on and, with rapid contact tracing and isolation, preventing the virus spreading. The government has worked to prepare for this stage. SA Pathology has rapid testing available for urgent cases, and we have significantly boosted the contact tracing team in the Communicable Disease Control Branch.

The commonwealth's COVIDSafe app will also support our efforts. I urge South Australians to download and activate the app. Of course, the government recognises that not everybody will find it easy to navigate smart phone technology to download and use the app. I know that both the Premier and I have had the privilege to sit down with members of our family and help them put the app on the phone.

To provide assistance to the wider community, the Interim Chief Pharmacist, Naomi Burgess, has contacted over 500 pharmacies in South Australia, seeking their assistance in both promoting

the COVIDSafe app as well as promoting our Keep Well, Keep Connected campaign. As honourable members will recall, the Keep Well, Keep Connected campaign is trying to remind South Australians that they should not allow their concern in relation to COVID-19 to distract them from maintaining oversight of their ongoing health issues, particularly chronic issues.

Pharmacists are ideally placed in the community to provide assistance and to raise awareness, particularly among some more vulnerable people who visit pharmacies more frequently for ongoing medical needs. Following the contact from the Interim Chief Pharmacist, SA Health has provided flyers to pharmacies in relation to both the Keep Well, Keep Connected campaign and in relation to the COVIDSafe app to promote the campaign.

Certainly, SA Health is using both mainstream media and social media to promote the COVIDSafe app. I am going to take the opportunity this afternoon to make my little contribution to encourage every member of this house and anybody who might be listening on the facilities of the parliament to take the opportunity to download the COVIDSafe app.

There certainly has been talk that there is some sort of magical threshold we need to reach to be able to have an effective contact tracing mechanism. The federal Chief Medical Officer stressed that every sign-up helps. None of us know the circumstances where, in the future, we might be sitting alongside somebody who turns out to be a positive case. To be able to support our public health clinicians to identify people who have been close contacts of positive cases is a great support for them to be able to trace and isolate possible contact.

I would like to thank South Australian pharmacies for their support for this initiative. It is another way that we can see the South Australian community has come together to combat the pandemic. I urge all South Australians to remain vigilant in physical distancing and personal hygiene, and of course to download the COVIDSafe app.

Bills

TEACHERS REGISTRATION AND STANDARDS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:24): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation and the detailed explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

The Teachers Registration and Standards (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2020 will amend the *Teachers Registration and Standards Act 2004* to modify the size and composition of the Teachers Registration Board (the board) and expand its functions, support the implementation of relevant recommendations from national reviews related to teacher registration, improve oversight of persons granted special authorities to teach, and address various other technical and operational issues with the Act.

The education and development of children and young people is essential to an informed, productive and well-functioning society. The success of a society will, in many ways, depend on the quality of its teachers.

The purpose of the Teachers Registration and Standards Act is to ensure every teacher working in South Australia is appropriately qualified, competent to teach and a fit and proper person to have the care of children. The Act establishes the board and provides it with the functions and powers it needs to administer and oversee the registration of over 35,000 teachers in both government and non-government schools, preschools and early childhood services.

Since the commencement of the Act there have been significant changes to the regulation of the teaching profession across Australia, including through the introduction of a National Framework for Teacher Registration and the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers.

In more recent years, the Education Council has commissioned substantial reviews into teacher education and registration, including a review of the preparation of student teachers by higher education institutions in Australia undertaken in 2014 and the National Review of Teacher Registration undertaken in 2017. The findings of these reviews supported the need for changes to the education and regulation of teachers across Australia to improve teacher quality, strengthen child safety, and streamline registration processes.

In addition, the findings of both the Child Protection Systems Royal Commission here in South Australia and the national Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse have prompted significant reform of child protection in South Australia including substantial changes to the screening and oversight of registered teachers. While these reforms have introduced increased child safety measures in respect of teachers, the government believes more can be done to improve child safety and respond to the outcomes of these Royal Commissions.

The Bill will address these issues and ensure the Act continues to provide a sound framework for the registration and oversight of teachers in this state.

In particular, the Bill will amend the Act to provide that the welfare and best interests of children is the paramount consideration in relation to the operation, administration and enforcement of this Act.

The Bill will provide a number of new functions to the board and codifies and strengthens some existing activities the board undertakes. This includes functions for the board to:

- accredit Initial Teacher Education programs
- undertake or support reviews of research and data collection
- develop and maintain a code of conduct for registered teachers and
- recognise quality teaching and leadership in the teaching profession.

The Bill updates provision for the membership of the board to provide improved flexibility in the size and composition of the board. Members of the board are currently appointed on the basis of nominations by particular stakeholders. The government is introducing changes to ensure members of the board are appointed on the basis of the knowledge, skills and experience the board needs to carry out its functions effectively.

Importantly, the Bill will ensure the board's membership includes practising teachers in the areas of preschool education, primary education and secondary education, the expertise of a legal practitioner, and the perspective of a parent representing the community interest. The board, through amendments to provisions for committees of the board, will also be able to draw on the expertise of persons who are not members of the board.

The Bill will clarify the current arrangements for the employment of staff of the board and make it easier for a member of the staff of the board to be appointed to act for the registrar in the registrar's absence.

The Bill will introduce a number of amendments to the requirements for teacher registration to improve administrative efficiency in the board's operations and improve the registration and renewal process for teachers. This includes, for example, extending the term of registration from 3 years to 5 years and providing an option for the annual payment of fees for registration. This measure will assist those registered teachers who may have difficulty paying registration fees upfront for 5 years.

The Bill includes various amendments to improve the oversight of persons granted a special authority to teach to ensure that, as far as possible, they are subject to the same rigorous requirements as registered teachers.

The Bill also includes various amendments to improve provisions of the Act that enable the board to deal with unprofessional conduct, incompetence, incapacity and issues of fitness and propriety in the teaching profession. This includes, for example, providing the registrar with the power to suspend a teacher's registration where the registrar forms a reasonable belief that a teacher poses an unacceptable risk to children.

The Bill will make a number of amendments to the Act to improve information sharing where necessary for the protection of children. In particular, the Bill provides for the board to disclose information to an appropriate person or body if the board is of the opinion that to do so is reasonably necessary to prevent harm being caused to a child.

The Bill will further provide for the sharing of information between the board, other teacher regulatory authorities, employers, and state authorities, relevant to the health, safety, welfare and wellbeing of a child or class of children, or to manage risks to a child or class of children. These changes, among others in the Bill, support recommendations of the national review of teacher registration and the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse.

The development of the Bill was subject to a significant amount of consultation, including an extensive consultation with teachers and other stakeholders on potential reforms to the Act and targeted consultation on a draft version of the Bill. The feedback from stakeholders helped shape the final form of the Bill. I thank anyone who has contributed feedback to this important reform.

I seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Teachers Registration and Standards Act 2004*

4—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause consequentially amends terms defined in section 3 of the principal Act.

5—Amendment of section 6—Functions of Teachers Registration Board

This clause adds the specified functions to those of the TRB set out in section 6 of the principal Act.

6—Substitution of section 7

This clause inserts a new section 7 into the principal Act, expressly providing that the welfare and best interests of children is the paramount consideration in relation to the operation, administration and enforcement of the principal Act.

7—Substitution of section 9

This clause substitutes the following new provisions for current section 9 of the principal Act:

9—Membership of Teachers Registration Board

This clause provides for the membership of the TRB, including a requirement that the Minister call for expressions of interest before nominating members for appointment.

9A—Presiding member

This clause allows the Governor to appoint a presiding and deputy presiding member of the TRB.

8—Amendment of section 10—Terms and conditions of membership

This clause amends section 10 of the principal Act, placing a cap on the maximum period a member of the TRB can hold office and limiting the number of deputies that can be appointed in respect of members.

9—Amendment of section 14—Procedures of Teachers Registration Board

This clause amends the quorum and other procedures of the TRB consequent upon this measure.

10—Amendment of section 15—Registrar of Teachers Registration Board

This clause repeals section 15(3) of the principal Act.

11—Amendment of section 15A—Appointment of acting Registrar

This clause repeals section 15A(2) of the principal Act.

12—Insertion of section 15B

This clause inserts new section 15B into the principal Act, providing for the employment of staff by the TRB.

13—Amendment of section 16—Committees

This clause amends section 16 of the principal Act to allow the regulations to make provisions in respect of committees.

14—Amendment of section 17—Delegations

This clause amends section 17 of the principal Act to make consequential changes to the power of delegation provision.

15—Insertion of Part 3A

This clause inserts new Part 3A into the principal Act, which empowers the TRB to accredit courses of initial teacher education provided they comply with prescribed accreditation standards.

16—Amendment of section 22—Application for registration

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 22 of the principal Act.

17—Amendment of section 24—Conditions of registration

This clause inserts a new condition of registration into section 24(2)(a) of the principal Act, requiring a person who is dismissed from employment as a practising teacher in response to allegations of incompetence, or resigns from employment as a practising teacher following allegations of incompetence to give written notice to the TRB.

18—Amendment of section 24A—Automatic cancellation of registration of prohibited persons

This clause amends section 24A of the principal Act to clarify when a cancellation of a teacher's registration under that section has effect.

19—Amendment of section 26—Term of registration

This clause amends section 26 of the principal Act to extend the term of teachers' registration to 5 years (up from 3 years).

20—Insertion of section 26A

This clause inserts new section 26A into the principal Act, requiring registered teachers to pay an annual fee and providing regulation making powers in relation to such fee.

21—Amendment of section 27—Requirement for provision of information

This clause amends section 27 of the principal Act to extend the meaning of 'registered teacher' to include a person who was, but is no longer, a registered teacher.

22—Amendment of section 28—Register

This clause amends section 28 of the principal Act to require the Register to contain details of any highly accomplished or lead teacher certification held by a person.

23—Amendment of section 30—Special authority for unregistered person to teach

This clause amends section 30 of the principal Act to expressly require that persons granted a special authority to teach be fit and proper.

24—Substitution of section 31

This clause substitutes section 31 of the principal Act to set out the requirement that the TRB keep a register of persons granted a special authority to teach, and makes procedural provisions related to the register.

25—Insertion of section 31A

This clause inserts new section 31A into the principal Act, empowering the TRB or Registrar to require certain persons to provide information. It is an offence to fail to comply with a requirement.

26—Insertion of Part 6A

This clause inserts new Part 6A into the principal Act as follows:

Part 6A—Codes of conduct and professional standards

31B—Codes of conduct and professional standards

This clause allows the TRB to publish or adopt codes of conduct and professional standards for the purposes of the principal Act.

31C—Recognition of quality teaching and educational leadership

This clause allows the TRB to accredit, certify or recognise certain attainments by teachers and others.

27—Insertion of section 32A

This clause inserts new section 32A into the principal Act, setting out the constitution of the TRB for the purposes of Part 7 of the principal Act.

28—Amendment of section 33A—Suspension of teacher's registration if working with children check not current etc

This clause amends section 33A of the principal Act to enable the Registrar, rather than the TRB, to suspend the registration of a teacher where a working with children check has not been conducted in relation to the teacher within the preceding 5 years.

29—Amendment of section 34—Registrar may conduct investigation

This clause amends section 34 of the principal Act to allow the Registrar to require a teacher to submit to a medical examination, and provide reports, in specified circumstances. The clause also empowers the TRB to suspend the registration of a teacher who fails to comply with a requirement under the section.

30—Amendment of section 34A—Suspension of registration where teacher charged with certain offences or unacceptable risk to children

This clause amends section 34A of the principal Act to extend the circumstances in which registration can be suspended under the section to include where the Registrar reasonably suspects that the teacher poses an unacceptable risk to children.

31—Substitution of section 37

This clause substitutes a new section 37 into the principal Act, setting out requirements for employers of practising teachers to notify the TRB of certain matters. A number of the requirements have simply been relocated from sections repealed by this measure.

32—Repeal of section 39

This clause repeals section 39 of the principal Act, its content having been relocated to new section 37.

33—Amendment of section 40—Notification by Registrar of action or suspension etc under Part

This clause amends section 40 of the principal Act to extend the circumstances in which, and the persons or bodies to whom, the Registrar must give notice on certain action being taken under the Act.

34—Insertion of Part 9A

This clause inserts new Part 9A into the principal Act as follows:

Part 9A—Information sharing

49A—Disclosure of information to prevent harm

This section authorises the TRB to disclose information obtained in the course of the administration or operation of the Act to an appropriate person or body where the TRB is of the opinion that to do so is reasonably necessary to prevent harm being caused to a child.

49B—Sharing of information between Teachers Registration Board and certain persons and bodies

This section authorises the exchange of certain information between the TRB and other relevant persons or bodies.

35—Amendment of section 50—Provision of information by Commissioner of Police

This clause extends the operation of section 50 of the principal Act to include persons holding a special authority to teach.

36—Amendment of section 51—Arrangements between Teachers Registration Board, DPP, and Commissioner of Police for reporting of offences

This clause extends the operation of section 51 of the principal Act to include persons holding a special authority to teach.

37—Amendment of section 52—Notification of offences to employer etc

This clause amends section 52 of the principal Act to include in its operation notification of employers etc of persons holding a special authority to teach.

38—Amendment of section 61—Regulations

This clause modernises section 61 of the principal Act to reflect current drafting practice.

39—Insertion of Schedule 1

This clause inserts new Schedule 1 into the principal Act, setting out persons and bodies that are designated entities for the purposes of the principal Act.

Schedule 1—Transitional etc provisions

This Schedule makes transition and saving provisions for the purposes of the measure.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

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

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 May 2020.)

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:25): I rise on behalf of the opposition and indicate that I am the lead speaker in this place. This legislation was not developed by the state government or by the cabinet, it was developed nationally. South Australia is in the unique position that we have been tasked by the nation to be the lead legislator in a number of areas, namely, energy policy and rail safety law. I am advised that COAG has decided, in consultation with the other jurisdictions, that

there need to be amendments to the definition of 'rail worker'. There is a longstanding process in this parliament that this opposition will support national reforms.

The Australian Railway Association raised concerns about the definition of 'rail safety worker' in the rail safety national law. The ARA's primary concern was that the definition was open to broad interpretation, which resulted in workers who have no impact on safety being classified as rail safety workers. As a result, there is unnecessary overlap with work health and safety legislation that results in increased costs and a regulatory burden for industry.

My advice is that the definition of a rail safety worker will be changed through this legislation to align with the objectives of the Rail Safety National Law to capture only work that could pose a risk to railway operations, current or future, and to clearly distinguish between the risks from the work and the risks to the person performing the work. I am advised that the amendments also remove risk to workers who are not specific to railway operations and who are therefore adequately addressed under other work health and safety legislation. The opposition accepts the government's argument and will be supporting these changes.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:27): I rise today to speak in support of the Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) (Rail Safety Work) Amendment Bill 2020. I understand this is a very simple bill that has come about from a COAG decision made in response to concerns raised by the Australian Railway Association and that South Australia is the lead legislator for rail safety law. The COAG decision was to amend some definitions in the Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) Act 2012 (RSNL) and all jurisdictions have agreed to these reforms.

We have been assured by minister Knoll that this legislation has been broadly supported by industry and the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator. However, we do not know if the relevant unions were consulted on the bill or what their views were. This is a concern, since the bill narrows the definition of who is a rail safety worker, a topic I would have thought unions might have a position on. I note that Labor did not mention this at all in the other place.

The bill addresses concerns that the definition of rail safety work in the RSNL was open to broad interpretation and therefore prone to overlap with other work health and safety provisions and that some of the people who currently come within the definition do not undertake rail safety work at all. Clarifying the definition of who is a rail safety worker and what work could pose a risk to railway operations is also intended to reduce the rail safety work assessment burden for the industry.

I am told there is no direct cost to the industry from these amendments and that indeed there should be a reduced administrative burden. Importantly, the bill talks about safety work being done properly and managing the risk of workers' exposure to moving rolling stock.

The member for Flinders, Mr Peter Treloar, noted in the other place that many lives have been lost in building and maintaining railways in South Australia over the years. I sincerely hope that this bill contributes to ensuring that no workers are put at risk in performing their duties in any area of rail operations, construction or maintenance.

Although I enjoyed Mr Treloar's nostalgic historical journey of rail on Eyre Peninsula in his second reading speech in the other place, it was a great disappointment that he as the local member, with so many family ties to rail in that regional area and with so many constituents employed in agriculture, rail and associated industries, did nothing to stop the closure of the Eyre Peninsula rail line over 12 months ago.

The government sat by and watched that rail line degenerate until, after four years of fruitless negotiations, the private operator, Genesee & Wyoming, and Viterra gave up. The aged and neglected rail line needed an injection of funds that this government was not prepared to make. Viterra decided to discontinue using the service and, with no government intervention or support, the future of rail on the peninsula was doomed.

Viterra transferred all their grain freight to road transport to ensure future efficiency and cost effectiveness of their supply chain, and to remain internationally competitive. As a consequence, 33 local people lost their jobs with Genesee & Wyoming. Not only did minister Knoll do nothing at the time to stop the closure of the line, minister Knoll has also done nothing since then to deal with the estimated additional 30,000 truck movements on substandard roads per year.

The impacts of forcing grain onto the road include the unknown increased cost of road maintenance to the state and local councils, and an exponential increase in risk to the personal safety of people sharing our roads with these very heavy articulated vehicles. So it was indeed a sad and disappointing day to see rail go after more than 100 years of serving Eyre Peninsula communities.

As I have said previously, this government and the previous Labor governments have an aversion to rail. It is a vile four-letter word in their transport ideology. Yes, Labor did spend up big on electrification, even though it failed to complete the job. They went back to the future to extend trams in the city and to Hindmarsh, but that is where their vision ended.

Rail presents governments with worthwhile nation-building projects. In 2017, the federal government set aside \$10 billion for its National Rail Program. It is designed to make our cities more liveable and efficient as they grow and reduces the burden on our roads—unlike what is happening on Eyre Peninsula. It provides more reliable transport networks and supports efforts to decentralise our economy and grow regional Australia. Take note of that last goal: grow regional Australia, not regional South Australia.

Successive governments have allowed our regional network to fall into rack and ruin because they have refused to enforce the conditions of the lease on the company that has them: Genesee & Wyoming (now One Rail Australia). Infrastructure SA paid scant notice to a very good submission by the South Australian transport action group to revitalise our flagging economy while also providing a foundation for future mining and manufacturing expansion in Whyalla, in the Spencer Gulf region and on parts of Eyre Peninsula where there are iron ore and goldmining leases and the proposed site of a low-level radioactive waste facility in Kimba.

The report, titled South Australia: Building the Future, outlines some innovative initiatives like a standard gauge line connecting Port Augusta, Whyalla, Kimba and Wudinna, and also extending the network of rail in the Adelaide Hills to take in the massive growth in Mount Barker and ease traffic congestion on the South-Eastern Freeway. While the rest of the world and other Australian states continue to embrace rail as an economic and competitive form of transport, South Australia's regional network is being left to stagnate due to a lack of vision and financial commitment.

Railways are dominant throughout Britain, Europe, the United States, Africa and Asia because of the enormous social and economic return. Rail travel is very popular and the movement of freight on rail rather than roads is much cleaner and safer. They are the backbone of some of the world's biggest economies and they continue to invest and expand in them. There was a time not so long ago that this state built locomotives at Islington. All that now seems lost. This government is content to allow rail to hurtle backwards to an era pre-dating Robert Stephenson's Rocket and the industrial revolution.

There are a couple of exciting projects I would like to touch upon. One is the Iron Road Cape Hardy project, which would create a multicommodity deep-sea port with capsized berths. This is a unique development that presents enormous potential because it would bring together mining, agriculture and Indigenous businesses on Eyre Peninsula. However, this state government appears to have stalled in giving this initiative some support, even though it is the only deep water port that has approvals in place.

I was recently speaking with farmer Tim Scholz, who is Iron Road's principal advisor for stakeholder engagement and business development for port operations. Mr Scholz believes Port Hardy should take precedence over other proposals in the works such as Lucky Bay, which is considered too shallow. Most farmers on Eyre Peninsula want to be part of the deep port build and support the rail infrastructure.

There are 60 farmers already committed to a co-op whose production output is worth more than \$800 million. However, for this to proceed it needs the state government to show some leadership, vision and commitment. To get established, the co-op is seeking \$10 million over five years under regional development grant funding.

Mr Scholz informs me they are in a catch 22 situation and the only impediment to being eligible to get access to the funding is a requirement for a AAA bank guarantee. In the meantime, they have a big multinational ready to invest. The federal government has committed \$25 million to

Iron Road but it also requires the state government to chip in to avoid a real lost opportunity. While on lost opportunities—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, just before you continue, your speech as been very wideranging—

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Yes, it is, but it is on rail.

The PRESIDENT: Did you say 'It's unrelated'?

The Hon. C. Bonaros: It's on rail.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Well, I am about to be derailed.

The PRESIDENT: We are indulging you, the Hon. Mr Pangallo, but I am really failing to see how a lot of this actually comes back to the bill at hand. Please continue, but you are really testing my patience with this.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I am nearly through, Mr President. I will continue because it gives me an opportunity to speak about an area that I am quite passionate about. It is not often that this area actually manages to come up in our parliament.

I will just get back on lost opportunities. The transport minister does not believe there is a place for a tourist wine train into his own electorate, which contains the world-famous Barossa Valley. Passionate Barossa tourism business operator John Geber reminds me of that famous storybook *The Little Engine That Could*, with its theme of optimism and hard work.

Mr Geber wants to get the train up and running again using his own money and that of a wealthy Fijian-based Canadian businessman and entrepreneur, David H. Gilmour, who I am informed is up there with the likes of Warren Buffet and Bill Gates. Here is a glimpse of his CV. He is a longtime investor in Australia and founder of several companies, including the Southern Pacific Hotel Corporation, which had 36 properties now owned by Intercontinental Hotels, Barrick Gold Corporation and Fiji Water, which you may have seen on sale around the world.

They are also prepared to invest in a much needed five-star hotel in Tanunda. It is an incredible opportunity for tourism investment, which is being shunned by the minister and his government, particularly at a time when our tourism industry is on its knees and crying out for visionary projects like this one which could mirror the extremely popular rail journey through California's Napa Valley region.

Mr Geber and his backers are not necessarily looking for an injection of funding from the government. All they are calling for is for the neglected rail line from Gawler to Nuriootpa to be brought up to a standard to take a train and a few carriages, just like the lease to One Rail Australia demands. But these plans were frustrated recently when the government did a deal with One Rail to take back and then rip up 120 metres of rail line at the Kroemers Crossing so that it could build a \$6 million roundabout. It effectively cut in half 108 years of rail history to the region. Mr Geber's effort to stop this government sanctioned act of rail vandalism has cost him \$150,000 in legal fees. The minister has dismissed Mr Geber's expression of interest for the Barossa line this year by saying:

Following an impartial, evidence based evaluation of the submissions, it was determined that none warranted further development as all proposals relied on taxpayer funding and/or presented unacceptable risks for the State Government and the community.

Mr Geber's proposal was to be entirely self-funded.

I understand the Barossa Valley community is now enraged by the minister's stance on reopening a section of rail for tourism that they say is sorely needed and would be on par with the successful Cube development by the d'Arenberg family in McLaren Vale. As Mr Geber pointed out, the original plans for the \$6 million Kroemers Crossing roundabout kept the rail line intact. That has been acknowledged by The Barossa Council, Pernod Ricard and the chocolate factory.

He says he has made five formal requests to meet with Mr Knoll to discuss the vast economic potential of rail tourism in the valley, as has been proven in the Napa Valley which attracts 100,000 tourists each year, yet he has had no response. How disappointing! However, I am going to meet with Mr Geber because I firmly believe his proposal has so much merit and potential for the

region. Mr Gilmour wrote to the Premier last month imploring him to intervene to save the rail line, describing minister Knoll's actions as being extremely short-sighted, alarming and an irreversible miscalculation at the expense of the Barossa region.

Of course, minister Knoll responded for the Premier saying that removing the line was the most efficient use of public moneys to deliver the roundabout in the absence of any viable proposal for immediate use of the rail corridor, to which Mr Gilmour responded to the Premier on 30 May:

It is astoundingly short-sighted and discouraging for a potential investor to comprehend such a lack of judgement especially in this day and age. I implore you to investigate before this opportunity evaporates.

So there you have it: a government looking a gift horse—in this case, a gift train—in the eye and proceeding on its inevitable course to a train wreck. With those comments, I will commend the bill to the Legislative Council. I thank you for your indulgence.

The PRESIDENT: And we did indulge the Hon. Mr Pangallo. I call the minister to sum up.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade and Investment) (15:43): I thank the members for their contributions. I thank the Hon. Clare Scriven for her brief, concise and constructive contribution.

The PRESIDENT: Hear, hear!

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I thank the Hon. Frank Pangallo for sharing his passion for regional rail with the chamber and airing some of his other concerns around deep-sea ports and wine trains and things. It was pleasing to note, as members have said, that we are the lead legislator. This piece of legislation has been agreed. I think it was back in 2019 that the officials agreed and then the transport ministers agreed on 22 November 2019. It is something we all support and, as the Hon. Clare Scriven says, the opposition has a habit or a practice of supporting national reform. I think all oppositions in the time that I have had the pleasure of being in this chamber have done so.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

Bill taken through committee without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade and Investment) (15:46): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY (PARLIAMENT AND COURTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 June 2020.)

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:47): As Australians, we like to think of ourselves as equal before the law and that regardless of one's position or status in society we are all bound by the same laws. As legislators, we know that this is not true. At worst, the law can be plain discriminatory. At best, there are inevitably loopholes and unintended consequences in our state laws. Technical matters are easily fixed, but fixing institutional problems always takes more effort.

When it comes to institutional reform, this is rarely more difficult than it is with parliament. In many fields, parliament has had to be dragged, kicking and screaming, into the modern world. As a consequence, parliament has been described in many unflattering terms, including likening it to a 19th century boys club.

When it comes to laws governing the safety of the workplace and appropriate behavioural standards, most Australians would expect that these laws would be universal. When confronted with unacceptable behaviour, the average Australian would say, 'I don't care who you are; you can't

behave like that.' Australians expect the same processes and consequences to follow inappropriate behaviour regardless of where you are in the workplace hierarchy.

Back in February, when debating a motion calling for the equal opportunity commissioner to be asked to conduct an inquiry into the conduct of the member for Waite at the now infamous 2019 crossbench Christmas party, I said:

When high profile people behave badly there is usually plenty of collateral damage, and that is the case here. That is why I think we owe it to our work colleagues to not only sort out the events of Friday the 13th but also to make sure that if something similar ever happens again in the future, it would be dealt with quickly and appropriately...

Which brings us precisely to the purpose of this bill.

The problem this bill seeks to remedy is that section 87 of the Equal Opportunity Act does not explicitly state that sexual harassment by one member of parliament against another member of parliament is covered. The act is quite clear that a member of parliament cannot sexually harass staff, whether that be their own staff, the staff of other MPs, the staff of the parliament or in fact anyone else who in the course of employment performs duties at Parliament House. So external contractors working in the building are covered and so, too, are unpaid workers such as interns and work experience students, but there is no explicit mention of harassment against other MPs. This bill makes it clear that this circumstance is covered.

Back in February, I stated my view that the provisions of section 87(6c)(d) could be interpreted to cover the situation where one MP sexually harasses another. However, it does require some legal gymnastics because the words are 'any other person who in the course of employment performs duties at Parliament House.' I said back in February that this is probably broad enough to cover situations where the victim is another MP; however, I also said back in February that it would be far better to make it explicit rather than relying on convoluted legal interpretation. This bill clarifies and makes explicit what was previously a potential lawyers' picnic.

As an aside, I would be interested if the minister could answer a question I have about the scope of section 87 as it relates to conduct by MPs outside Parliament House. For example, there are dozens of staff, contractors, interns and work experience students who do not necessarily work in Parliament House but work in a member's external electorate office: are they covered by section 87?

The act also prohibits sexual harassment in any workplace, but I am always nervous when it comes to statutory interpretation because when you have a specific provision in an act—as we have in the case of members of parliament and subsection (6c)—it can be regarded as the final word on the matter, or covering the field, with other catch-all provisions interpreted as not applying to that situation. I would appreciate if the minister could look at this because it would be most unfortunate if the rules that cover Parliament House do not also cover electorate offices. If it proves to be a potential problem then this bill would be the place to fix it.

In conclusion, I think it would be a shame if this bill was to be seen only as a minor technical fix-up. I think it is far more important than that, and that is because the institution of parliament needs to be and needs to be seen as a leader in best practice and a model for others to follow. We make the laws of this state and the public rightly expects us to ensure our own house is in order before we tell others how they should behave. I am pleased to support the second reading of the bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins.

Motions

CENTOFANTI, HON. N.J.

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. R.I. Lucas:

That this council welcomes the Hon. N.J. Centofanti, elected by an Assembly of Members of both houses on 7 April 2020 to replace the Hon. A.L. McLachlan (resigned).

(Continued from 2 June 2020)

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:52): I am delighted to rise today to support the motion to welcome the Hon. Dr Centofanti to this chamber. I counted recently and there have been about

55 different members of this chamber that I have served with in my time here, and I am delighted that the Hon. Dr Centofanti is the latest one. I am particularly pleased about that because when she first became very much involved in the Liberal Party's volunteer section and the administration of it on the state executive, I encouraged her to run for the Legislative Council Liberal preselection in 2013.

She was selected at No. 5 on our ticket. Sadly, that meant that she was not elected at that stage, but she was not that far away; however, she subsequently had three children. I remember that even though she was at No. 5—and we certainly had not had a No. 5 elected, I think, sir, since you were first elected to this place—the Hon. Dr Centofanti worked very hard as a candidate in the lead-up to the 2014 election, and was a very willing participant in the regional tours of South Australia that I organised for members of the Legislative Council and candidates in different parts of South Australia. She also took on a very active role (I think I had three marginal seats in that campaign) as campaign manager in the seat of Florey, with the then candidate Damian Wyld, who is now the Deputy Mayor of the City of Tea Tree Gully.

The association with members of the Dawkins and Andrew families, which of course was the honourable member's maiden name, goes back a very long way to the very early days of the Riverland community and irrigation community, which the honourable member talked about in her maiden speech. My mother's family, the Wilkinsons, were on soldier settler blocks around the Berri area, originally between Berri and Glossop, and my mother's family were then out in the area very close to Martin's Bend, with which the honourable member would be very familiar.

So there were strong connections, largely because of the Methodist Church but also because I think many of those pioneers in the irrigation industry relied very much on their ability to run ideas past each other. I know there was that connection way back many years ago—probably at least eight decades ago. There was also, on the Dawkins side, my father and the honourable member's grandfather, Jack, who she mentioned the other day, who were great friends within the old Liberal and Country League.

We heard about Mr Jack Andrew's efforts in the seat of Ridley many years ago. They were great friends and colleagues within the Liberal and Country League but also within the Methodist Church. I think they were both on the state and federal bodies of the Methodist Church and had similar clashes at times, being from the farming/conservative side of the Methodist Church; there were always elements, as they remain today, within the Uniting Church whose political views were far afield from their views.

But there was a great regard by my father for Jack Andrew, and my mother and the honourable member's grandmother, Mavis, were great friends until their high ages. I remember very much taking my mother up to Waikerie on one of my trips to the Riverland and leaving her for the day with Mavis, and I think much commentary was made in my absence, probably. So there were great affiliations there.

I had the privilege to work for the honourable member's Uncle Neil, who of course we all know as the Hon. Neil Andrew, who became the speaker of the House of Representatives. I worked for him in a part-time capacity for the best part of a decade while still farming, some of which was in the Commonwealth Bank building, but from the very late eighties he was the first member for Wakefield to have an electorate office in the electorate in Gawler. I still have a close association with Neil today on many issues on which we share a keen interest.

Then, there is his brother Stuart, who is the Hon. Dr Centofanti's father, as she referred to the other day. Stuart is one of the great characters I have dealt with not only in my parliamentary career but well before that. I always enjoyed his company. I could tell a number of stories about Stuart, but I should not do that. We have not always agreed on everything. I think his views on certain matters to do with the Murray-Darling Basin are probably a bit different to mine, but I think we have always shared a mutual respect. I know that he and Sue are very proud that their daughter is now a part of this great institution of the Legislative Council.

I have a stud sheep breeding background. British breed or Australian breed sheep probably require more management, particularly when they are lambing, than many other breeds. Some of that aspect has been bred out by selective breeding. I did a bit of that before I gave up my active

farming, but certainly with that aspect of breeding, particularly Dorset sheep, the assistance of veterinarians was enormously important. We had a great association with the veterinary practice in Gawler, which was originally established by the Hon. Dr Bruce Eastick.

I think it is great to have that profession again represented in this parliament. We have had a number of veterinarians in the parliament over the years, but I think that until you came in we lacked one. I have great memories of working with some very good veterinarians. I think it is a group that adds to the professional background that we have in the parliament. It is vital that we have as broad a brush of backgrounds in this building as we can.

I know the honourable member has shared my passion for suicide prevention and working in mental health generally. The minister talked today about support for clinicians and self-care for health professionals. I think the veterinary industry is one that is particularly forgotten about at times. I know the honourable member will support me in saying that we need to do more to support people in that industry because it is one where largely it is working alone. It is working long hours and in difficult circumstances. So I am very happy to work with her in relation to more work we can do with the Australian Veterinary Association. I had some discussions with those people last year at the valedictory celebrations of veterinary students at the Roseworthy campus.

There is another thing that the honourable member and I share. She was the chair of the Rural and Regional Council of the Liberal Party. As she said in her maiden speech, she was also the federal chairman for the Liberal Party in that capacity. We share the fact that we chaired that body. I actually did not chair the Rural and Regional Council because the name was changed basically the moment that I gave up the chairmanship. The decision was made to change it. It was the Rural Council in those days. I am delighted that another chair of that body has come to this parliament because it has been a very important one in the development of policy within and beyond the Liberal Party over a very long time.

We share a passion for small rural communities. I think, having recently been in places like Peterborough and with the district councils of Mount Remarkable, Ororoo Carrieton and the Flinders Ranges, and some others, we have a very large proportion in South Australia of those smaller communities. I think we have a far greater proportion of those communities than some other states. Of course, Winkie is one that I am well aware of. The honourable member mentioned the Croatian hall, and I have been to some events in that facility over the years, so I was not surprised to learn that it was a polling booth.

We also share a passion for, I think, country community sport, including football, of course. My wife, Sheila, will ensure that I say Australian Rules Football, because she is a passionate supporter of another code that likes to think that they are the original football. We will leave that for another day. The honourable member is a passionate supporter and volunteer for the Berri Football Club—the Demons, I believe; red and blue. I barrack for another red and blue team called the Redlegs, but the Demons are at Berri. I know that the Hon. Tammy Franks has a connection to the Berri Demons.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: I think I have invoked some discussion there about the Berri Demons.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: That is very appropriate, because I did note the other day that the Hon. Dr Centofanti put a post on Facebook about what would have been the 10-year celebration of the Berri premiership in 2010. I think the Hon. Tammy Franks' son might have been a ruckman in that team.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Again, interjections are out of order.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: I am passionate about country football in particular, I suppose, because I played a fair bit of it—not very well, but I played a fair bit of it—and my joints and bones are suffering for it today. It is a very valuable part of community. I think the people who experience

the associations with people that develop out of those groups come to this place with a greater aspect of what makes South Australia such a great place to be, to live in and to represent the people across the state.

With those words, I am delighted to welcome the Hon. Dr Centofanti to this place. I know she has already hit the ground running and is very active on a range of committees, at least a couple of which she has replaced me on. I wish her all the best and I will always be very keen to support her in her work in this place. With those words, I support the motion.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.G.E. Hood.

Parliamentary Committees

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins:

That the third report of the committee on an inquiry into workplace fatigue and bullying in South Australian hospitals and health services be noted.

(Continued from 19 February 2020.)

The Hon. T.T. NGO (16:10): As a member of the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation, I join with the Hon. Mr John Dawkins MLC in bringing this report to the chamber's attention. The committee undertook the inquiry into workplace fatigue and bullying in South Australian hospitals and health services, and provided its findings in its third report now before the chamber.

The honourable member gave a broad summary of the context of the report when he spoke on this motion. My remarks will be brief, but I wish to highlight those who made submissions and came forward to share their experiences, knowledge and concerns as part of this inquiry. In undertaking this important work, the committee was presented with 66 submissions. Of these, 47 submissions came from individuals and 23 from organisations. In addition, there were a further 24 supplementary submissions.

During the inquiry, the committee also heard directly from 48 individual witnesses. Through these submissions and hearings, people and organisations bravely came forward for themselves and their workplaces. They participated in a process to improve those workplaces and work lives. While we feel comfortable within this building and sitting on committees, we cannot underestimate how daunting these processes are for members of the public. I thank all those people and organisations who brought their knowledge and experience to the committee to be considered in this inquiry.

Through this inquiry, the committee developed a deeper understanding of these high-pressured work environments in which staff are working long hours, doing shift work, overtime and being on call. From the significant experiences and information about workplaces presented, the committee brought together 27 recommendations in the report, representing the culmination of our work on this inquiry. These recommendations address improvement to systems and processes, complaint management and resolution, appropriate levels of accountability and accreditation.

During the coronavirus pandemic, the community has been able to bear witness to some of the great demands facing workers in health care. No doubt, many have gained insights into the stress and extremity of work in the healthcare sector. It is against this context that I urge the government to carefully consider and swiftly address the recommendations in this inquiry report. It is important we do all we can to provide safe, supportive workplaces where workplace culture issues and complaints can be expediently addressed and fairly resolved.

In closing, I acknowledge the efforts of all OSRC committee members who worked on this inquiry: the member for Morphett and Presiding Member, Mr Stephen Patterson MP; the Hon. John Dawkins MLC; the Hon. Tammy Franks MLC; the member for Taylor, Jon Gee MP; and the member for Davenport, Steve Murray MP. I also thank the committee's secretariat staff, who provided great support to members through their exceptional administrative and coordinating skills during the inquiry and in finalising the report.

On behalf of the committee, I thank our former parliamentary officer, Mr Simon Macdonald, and the committee's research officer, Mr Eugene Braslavskiy, for helping the committee to undertake this inquiry. We were well supported with their great dedication and commitment. I also welcome our new parliamentary officer, Mr Phil Frensham, and look forward to working with him. I urge members to review this report and for the government to act on it as a matter of priority.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (16:15): The Hon. Ms Franks, who is also on the committee, has indicated that she does not wish to speak. In summing-up, I thank the Hon. Tung Ngo for his comments, and I thank the members of the committee for their commitment to this inquiry and to the other significant areas that we have looked at over the six years in which I was a member.

I am no longer on that committee, as the Hon. Dr Centofanti has taken my position, but I wish to reflect on my time under the former presiding member, the Hon. Steph Key, in the first four years, and more recently, as the Hon. Tung Ngo has said, under the member for Morphett in another place. I think we have achieved quite a bit on that committee over this time. I certainly will not delay the council with those details, but there is one aspect in which I think I and other committee members have failed: that is, to come up with a new name for the committee.

In telling someone that this is the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation, most members and others have asked, 'Can't you come up with a new name for it?' I will accept that I have failed in this area in my time on the committee and I hope that others come up with a new title. I think there is a select committee looking at the parliamentary committee structure. Maybe we could task that committee with finding a name that is probably easier for the general public to digest, more so than worrying about any of us. With those words, I commend the motion to the council.

Motion carried.

At 16:19 the council adjourned until Tuesday 16 June 2020 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***PRIORITY CARE CENTRES**

In reply to **the Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS** (6 February 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

In the first six weeks of operation in 2020, across the three priority care centres (PCCs) operating at that time, a total of 445 patients have been seen who would otherwise have been seen at an emergency department. The fourth PCC commenced in March following completion of renovations.

The overall weekday average number of people seen per site is 4.1. Numbers vary day to day across sites with up to 12 people receiving their care at a single site on a single weekday.

SA HEALTH EMPLOYEES

In reply to **the Hon. C. BONAROS** (19 February 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

My office raised the issue directly with SASMOA to seek details to enable an investigation.

As of 19 May 2020, no details have yet been provided.

As of 19 May 2020, a complaint or concern from a clinician in relation to this alleged incident had not been received by the relevant local health network.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

In reply to **the Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition)** (20 February 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

I have spoken directly to SASMOA and clinicians, including: Dr David Pope, Ms Bernadette Mulholland, Drs Brett Ritchie, Ben Saxon, Michael Yung, Peter Muller, Sam Crafter, Jenny Couper, Antonia Chan and Steve Keeley.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

In reply to **the Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition)** (20 February 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

1. The contract is for one year with a value of \$988,797.60 (excl. GST) and a one-year extension option.
2. All voluntary separation packages were for administrative staff, including administrative staff with nursing qualifications.

PRETERM BIRTHS

In reply to **the Hon. I.K. HUNTER** (20 February 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

There has been an increasing trend in all preterm births in South Australia from 2010 to 2017 from 8.9 per cent to 9.6 per cent.

- In rural South Australia, preterm births from 2010 to 2017 rose from 8.8 percent to 9.7 per cent.
- In metropolitan Adelaide, preterm births from 2010 to 2017 rose from 8.5 percent to 9.1 per cent.
- Among Aboriginal women, preterm births from 2010 to 2017 rose from 17.1 percent to 19.1 per cent.
- Among non-Aboriginal women, preterm births from 2010 to 2017 rose from 8.6 percent to 9.2 per cent.
- Among mothers aged less than 19 years, preterm births from 2010 to 2017 rose from 9.7 per cent to 14.9 percent.
- Among mothers aged over 35 years preterm births from 2010 to 2017 rose from 9.2 percent to 11.6 per cent.

KORDAMENTHA

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (3 March 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The engagement of 2020 Delivery and the commercial terms are between KordaMentha and 2020 Delivery.

The cost is within the cost of KordaMentha's year 2 contract.

This contract has been suspended due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

UNLEY HIGH SCHOOL

In reply to **the Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition)** (24 March 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): The Minister for Education has advised:

The Unley High School site was temporarily closed on 17 and 18 March, as per the department protocol with SA Health following a confirmed case of COVID-19. Staff returned to the site to work on 19 March and students returned on 20 March.

It should be noted that Unley High School did pilot a remote learning approach at the end of term 1, bearing in mind they had a large cohort of students under required self-isolation.

Public schools remain open and are delivering learning on site as well as supporting children learning from home, where possible.

CORONAVIRUS

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (24 March 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

No.

CORONAVIRUS

In reply to **the Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN** (24 March 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

South Australia has a world-leading testing regime based on these criteria, with 4.69 per cent of the population tested as of 19 May 2020, ahead of most other Australian jurisdictions and one of the highest in the world.

Clearly defined epidemiological criteria for COVID-19 testing are set by the Australian Health Protection Principal Committee.

CORONAVIRUS

In reply to **the Hon. E.S. BOURKE** (24 March 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

SA Pathology has secured sufficient supply of reagents over a number of testing platforms to ensure there is an ongoing capability to maintain COVID-19 testing in South Australia.

CORONAVIRUS

In reply to **the Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition)** (24 March 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

1. In accordance with the national guidelines at the time, the contact tracing undertaken for the Unley High School student determined that the infectious period for their infection did not include the bus trip.

2. Yes.

3. On 24 March 2020, the test criteria included persons with an acute respiratory infection or fever, who had travelled interstate or overseas, or were in contact of a known case; healthcare workers with acute respiratory infection and fever; and persons critically ill with bilateral community acquired pneumonia with no identified cause.

4. The AHPPC is guided by the testing criteria noted in the COVID-19 National Guidelines developed by the Communicable Disease Network Australia. The testing criteria have changed during the course of the pandemic. South Australia has followed the national guidelines, with the addition of specific high-risk settings.

CORONAVIRUS

In reply to **the Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN** (24 March 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Modelling changes over time. The latest modelling released by national cabinet indicates we are well supplied with ICU facilities.

The first peak of the COVID-19 pandemic has passed in South Australia. The peak usage of ICU beds was 11.

Upskilling of staff continues.

CORONAVIRUS

In reply to **the Hon. E.S. BOURKE** (25 March 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Modelling changes over time. The latest modelling released by national cabinet indicates we are well supplied with ICU facilities.

The first peak of the COVID-19 pandemic has passed in South Australia. The peak usage of ICU beds was 11.

Upskilling of staff continues.

CORONAVIRUS

In reply to **the Hon. E.S. BOURKE** (25 March 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The government's commitment of \$45 million to cut overdue elective surgery lists put South Australia in a strong position leading in to the COVID-19 suspension of non-urgent elective surgery, with 782 on the overdue waiting list as of 1 April, compared with 1,583 as at March 2018. This meant that appropriate surgery could be undertaken within sustainable stocks of personal protective equipment.

CORONAVIRUS

In reply to **the Hon. E.S. BOURKE** (25 March 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

1. The SA Health Distribution Centre delivers reusable goggles and disposable face-shields to the Royal Adelaide Hospital on a regular basis.

2. Stock levels fluctuate on a daily basis but appropriate supplies have been closely monitored and maintained.

3. Health workers in high-risk acute settings undergo fit testing to respiratory products prior to utilisation.

VIRAL RESPIRATORY DISEASE PANDEMIC RESPONSE PLAN

In reply to **the Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition)** (7 April 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

1. Yes. Staff screening procedures have been established in all SA Health facilities, in line with the SA Health Viral Respiratory Disease Pandemic Response Plan.

2. The plan does not advise this. The intent of the plan is to provide whole of agency strategic guidelines to respond to COVID-19. It does not replace individual hospital work instructions, which would include clinical triage.

KORDAMENTHA

In reply to **the Hon. R.P. WORTLEY** (28 April 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

1. A total of \$3,725,846.81 (incl. GST) has been invoiced by KordaMentha from the current contract.

As at 19 May 2020 the contract has been suspended due to the COVID-19 pandemic. No compensation payment has been paid as a result of the contract pause.

2. Mr Mark Mentha's administrator contract concluded on 7 February 2020. The administrator contracts of Mr Chris Martin and Ms Sophie Gibbons were suspended on 16 April 2020.

ABORTION

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (28 April 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I am advised:

1. No.

2. The data from the South Australian Abortion Registry demonstrates no impact on the number of women seeking abortion services this year up until March. Further, the number of early medical abortions are similar to that in previous years for the same month. Early indications from April data, which are still incomplete, similarly show no apparent impact on access to abortion services.

ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE

In reply to **the Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition)** (29 April 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The initiatives comprising the \$15 million regional stimulus are detailed in the table below. All of these initiatives are programmed for construction delivery via the Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure within financial year 2020-21.

Site	Scope of Works	Budget
Waikerie	Electrical distribution network upgrade (switchboards and cabling)	\$705,000
Bordertown	Electrical distribution network upgrade (switchboards and cabling)	\$495,000
Clare	Electrical distribution network upgrade (switchboards and cabling)	\$820,000
Peterborough	Electrical distribution network upgrade (switchboards and cabling)	\$463,000
Coober Pedy	Electrical distribution network upgrade (switchboards and cabling)	\$492,000
Gawler	Back-up power capability upgrade (new generator and switchboards)	\$800,000
Strathalbyn	Back-up power capability upgrade (new generator and switchboards)	\$500,000
Naracoorte	Central Sterile Services Department (CSSD) compliance upgrade	\$3,115,000
Angaston	Central Sterile Services Department (CSSD) compliance upgrade	\$1,300,000
Kapunda	Central Sterile Services Department (CSSD) compliance upgrade	\$882,000
Eudunda	Fire services compliance upgrade (fire tanks, pumps and sprinklers)	\$350,000
Kapunda	Fire services compliance upgrade (fire tanks, pumps and sprinklers)	\$385,000
Loxton	Fire services compliance upgrade (fire tanks, pumps and sprinklers)	\$2,155,000
Clare	Mechanical ventilation (air-conditioning) upgrade	\$400,000
Kingston	Back-up power capability upgrade (new generator and switchboards)	\$250,000
Bordertown	Site nurse call (patient alert) system replacement	\$300,000
Naracoorte	Hospital central hydraulic services upgrade (hot-water system)	\$400,000
Riverton	Bathroom (resident ensuites) structural rectification works	\$120,000
Kangaroo Isl.	Lift replacement (vertical transportation)	\$100,000
Kimba	Structural remediation works	\$100,000
	Program Contingency & Staging Allowance	\$867,000
	Total Allocated	\$15,000,000

LIVE MUSIC SECTOR

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (29 April 2020).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Minister for Innovation and Skills has provided the following advice:

1. The Premier and the Minister for Innovation and Skills have been conducting dedicated creative industries round tables since the onset of COVID 19 which have included Music SA, the Australian Hotels Association (SA) and other key stakeholders. The Premier is also working closely with the minister who, through the government's Music Development Office (MDO), has been engaging with venues, and the local music industry more broadly.

2. There are a number of measures in place to support businesses in the live music sector. The Jobs Rescue Package includes one-off emergency cash grants of \$10,000 for small businesses and not-for-profits that have suffered a significant loss of income. The \$300 million Business and Jobs Support Fund and the \$250 million Community and Jobs Support Fund aim to help entities to survive and minimise job losses.

There is also payroll tax relief in the form of a six-month waiver; a land tax package of up to 25 per cent waiver on current land tax liabilities for properties leased to tenants financially impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic; a waiver for annual liquor licensing fees; and a cost-of-living concession available to households receiving JobSeeker payments.

In a further assistance measure, the Minister for Innovation and Skills recently approved a bespoke program through the MDO offering \$1,000,000 in funding to aid the development of creative IP and new strategies and initiatives that support music businesses and/or stimulate the music sector. Grants of up to \$5,000 were available for artists focussed on creative development. Music businesses, including live music venues, and those with industry wide

initiatives, could apply for up to \$20,000. Funding was provided to 73 successful applicants, 21 of which were live music venues. A grant of \$300,000 was also awarded to The Governor Hindmarsh Hotel to support its vital role in the local music scene.

The MDO will continue to work closely with the local music industry and will be reshaping its strategy to assist in stabilising and rebuilding the sector.

3. These are unprecedented times and the Marshall Liberal government has demonstrated a quick and flexible response in accommodating support mechanisms to help combat the impacts presented by COVID-19 on South Australian businesses. Currently however, an owner of a property has the legal right to sell to whomever they may want to. The government would not consider legislating restrictions on the owners of specific property types from placing their property on the market. If an individual makes the commercial decision to sell their property it is a decision for the new owner if they want to continue with the existing use, in which case existing use rights as a hotel or live music venue would continue. If however, they wished to redevelop the building/site then they are able to lodge an application and seek development approval for a different use of the land. The decision on whether the new use should be approved is based on an assessment against the relevant planning rules. Without specific examples it is not possible to say what could potentially be developed on a particular site.

CORONAVIRUS, EDUCATION

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (30 April 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): The Minister for Education has advised:

1. Site leaders determine when a business-related risk assessment is to be undertaken.

The Department for Education has assessed the risk of COVID-19 across the organisation in collaboration with the advice of SA Health, and has put measures (controls) in place to mitigate the risks for all sites. This includes business continuity plans.

The department has not required risk assessments of individual schools to be provided centrally, as risks differ between sites. As per normal practice, the department has provided advice to sites to manage the risks associated with COVID-19 in line with health advice, and this is managed locally. Some sites have undertaken risk assessments for particular areas of concern. Typically, this is done through discussion with relevant employees.

The risks, and advice provided to control the risks, are reviewed at an agency level against Australian Health Protection Principal Committee and SA Health guidance. The department ensures the most current advice is provided to sites for implementation to manage risks.

2. The department has been clear that where an employee falls into a vulnerable category they are to be supported to work flexibly where possible or access leave.

CORONAVIRUS, EDUCATION

In reply to **the Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition)** (30 April 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The SAMHRI COVID-19 evidence update entitled 'What is the evidence for transmission of COVID-19 in schools and what is the impact of closing schools on the transmission and the pandemic' was released 26 March 2020.

An updated version was released on 2 May 2020.

Both reports are available on the SAHMRI website at <https://www.sahmri.org/covid19/>.

KAPUNDA HOSPITAL

In reply to **the Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS** (12 May 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing):

1. The project has sustained employment to local architects, engineers and cost management professionals throughout its planning and design phase. Subsequently, it will also sustain and provide opportunities for work in the construction industry.

BORDERTOWN MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

In reply to **the Hon. J.E. HANSON** (12 May 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

2. Consistent with the requirements of Premier and Cabinet Circular 028, the Department for Health and Wellbeing has engaged the services of the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure to facilitate procurement of the Bordertown Hospital electrical distribution upgrade.

RENAL DIALYSIS SERVICES

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (12 May 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

1. The patients most directly impacted by kidney transplant changes were those patients on the active kidney transplant waiting list. These patients were contacted by a direct telephone call from the transplant doctors and nurses at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and Flinders Medical Centre. Patients with a scheduled living donor kidney transplant were also contacted directly by telephone by the transplant team. Subsequent contact with both groups was maintained electronically via weekly email.

2. Patients who were directly affected by suspension of kidney transplant were prioritised for communication by the kidney transplant team.

3. All health services, in general, use a number of modalities for patient communication including, but not limited to; direct contact (appointments, letters, phone calls), information sheets, pamphlets and surveys. The range of modalities has been developed for easy access to a wide range of information on any given health service by the patient, patient carer, patient relatives and stakeholders.

As is current practice, service information for patients, carers, patient relatives and stakeholders will continue to be updated and made available online or in print at the service's location. Further, staff are always happy to speak with patients, carers or relatives about suggested changes to their service.

Specific communications relevant to a particular patient will continue to be by letter or phone call from the service directly to the patient and/or the patient's general practitioner.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

In reply to **the Hon. C. BONAROS** (12 May 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

1. The staffing of Central Sterile Supply Department (CSSD) at Modbury Hospital is through the hotel services contract currently with ISS. They are the only contracted CSSD technicians in South Australian public hospitals.

2. The management of Modbury Hospital was outsourced to Healthscope in 1995. Healthscope proceeded to outsource all hotel services within Modbury Hospital including CSSD to Spotless Services.

3. ISS has consulted with CSSD staff and reallocated them into alternate roles within their contracted hotel services in the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network (NALHN). In addition, NALHN and ISS have agreed, on an as-needs basis, that the ISS CSSD staff can be included in the roster and activities of the Lyell McEwin Hospital CSSD during the period that the Modbury theatres are closed. There are no plans to employ the ISS CSSD staff as public sector employees.

COVIDSAFE APP

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (13 May 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The Privacy Act 1988 (Commonwealth) permits public health officials to access and use the COVIDSafe app data in the event that permission is provided by the case.

INFLUENZA VACCINATIONS

In reply to **the Hon. E.S. BOURKE** (14 May 2020).

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Since the beginning of the influenza program in late March, all immunisation providers registered with my department, including all members of the Immunisation Coalition, have been provided with weekly updates on the total volume of vaccine distributed for those aged 65 years and over.

SMALL BUSINESS GRANTS

In reply to **the Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN** (14 May 2020).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been provided the following advice:

Under the small business grant guidelines, if a business has received any other government of South Australia grants to address COVID-19 related business impacts, the value of these payment(s) will be deducted from the \$10,000 small business grant.

As at 19 May 2020 over 5,000 small business grants had been paid, of these 51 applicants had been approved for a payment of less than \$10,000.

In each of these cases, the total of state government COVID-19 related grants paid was \$10,000.

Forty nine of these successful applicants had received financial support from the South Australian Tourism Commission; one had received a taxi industry ex gratia payment; and one had received COVID-19 related vocational education and training funding available to registered training organisations.

CORONAVIRUS RESTRICTIONS

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (14 May 2020).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has provided the following advice:

The Emergency Management (Gatherings No 2) (COVID-19) Direction makes a gathering of more than 10 persons a prohibited gathering, except in a range of circumstances, including specified workplaces, such as parliament, offices, and schools. A copy of the direction can be found at [COVID-19.sa.gov.au](https://www.covid-19.sa.gov.au).

SMALL BUSINESS GRANTS

In reply to **the Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition)** (14 May 2020).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been provided the following advice:

The first of the small business COVID-19 grant payments was made on Tuesday 21 April 2020.