

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, 10 September 2020

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins)** took the chair at 14:16 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.

Condolence

KENEALLY, HON. G.F.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:17): I move:

That the Legislative Council expresses its deep regret at the recent death of the Hon. Gavin Francis Keneally, former minister of the Crown and member of the House of Assembly, and places on record its appreciation of his distinguished public service.

In speaking to the motion, I suspect that on my side of the chamber I might be the only member who knew Gavin Keneally. His career spanned 1970 to 1989, so he served for 19 years in the House of Assembly, representing the electorate of Stuart. He was one of a small number of Labor members of parliament who represented regional areas of South Australia.

He was born in Quorn, so I am advised, and was an active member of the Port Augusta Labor sub-branch. He had previously worked as a Commonwealth Railways purchasing officer before entering parliament at the relatively young age of 36 in May 1970. That was the election that saw the start of the Dunstan decade.

He served not only as a local member and representative member for Stuart but he held ministerial office in a number of respective portfolio areas, including the portfolio we used to have of chief secretary for two years from 1982 to 1984. He also served in the portfolio areas of tourism and local government and as minister for transport, as well as serving on various parliamentary committees.

From the information kindly provided by the parliamentary library—and I knew a little bit of this history—he was a renowned country sportsman. We are told he excelled in football, cricket, tennis, table tennis and basketball. One of the stories the library has recounted to all of us is that in Barrie Robran's very first senior game, when he played in Whyalla as a lanky 16 year old, he stood Gavin Keneally. So that was Gavin's claim to fame.

Of course, members who follow South Australian football, and even national football followers, would know the legend of Barrie Robran in terms of his performances in country football first, then in Adelaide and then for South Australia on the national stage.

Gavin Keneally's main work that would be recognised by people in the community would be as minister for transport. At the time of his retirement, his listed highlights were that he introduced the state's first red-light traffic camera. I am sure that all those who have been caught by red-light traffic cameras will acknowledge that he was the leader of the pack. He, as the minister, and the government made baby safety capsules mandatory in cars and introduced a number of other road safety related measures. In addition to that, his listed accomplishments included commencing planning for the tunnels to improve road safety through the Adelaide Hills roads to the freeway.

As I said, I knew Gavin Keneally through the early part of my parliamentary career. He was an amiable person, a very easy person to get along with. I am sure he had friends within his own party and certainly across the political spectrum as well, but he had a number of friends within the Liberal Party at that particular time. He was certainly someone who made friends easily and was always prepared to listen to constituents or complainants or other members of parliament making representation on behalf of their constituents to him as the minister in his various portfolio areas.

On behalf of members of the government, we thank him for his service to his party, to the parliament and to the South Australian community. We pass on our condolences to his family, his former colleagues, his friends and acquaintances.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): I join with the Treasurer and on behalf of the Legislative Council express our regret at the recent passing of Gavin Keneally, a former member of the House of Assembly and a former minister in the Bannon and Dunstan governments. I place on record our appreciation for his distinguished public service. We are honouring a dedicated member of parliament who served our parliament, state and community, as the Treasurer has outlined, for almost two decades.

Sadly, Gavin Keneally passed away on 5 September 2020 at Hope Valley. He was a valued and long-serving representative of the seat of Stuart for almost 20 years, from 30 May 1970 to 24 November 1989. He was elected to Stuart the first time he contested it at the age of 36 and 18 years later retired at 56, as has been noted in media reports at the time, at the top of his game after being re-elected six times. A news article from September 1977 described Gavin as 'one of the most popular on either side, with either side'. He viewed his role of representing people in the district as a great honour.

Gavin was born in Quorn on the edge of the Flinders Ranges. He had five children, six grandchildren and ten great-grandchildren. He was a proud Port Augusta local and Gavin's early days recount a Central Augusta footballing legend, a loved family man and an industrial worker with a razor-sharp tongue.

He left a strong legacy in the Port Augusta community, particularly, as has been mentioned, on the football ground. He was a well-known legend in footballing circles and was described as a 'nuggety on-baller'—and I think the use of the word 'nuggety' was probably meant in a better way than it is often used when some of us in this chamber are described as being nuggety. He was only five foot seven but played centre half-forward and captained his team, the Central Augusta Bloods.

He represented his community not just in football and as captain of the Port Augusta representative side but in cricket, tennis, table tennis and basketball. He was a basketball player of some renown, much like the current member for Stuart and I dare say with somewhat more basketball skills than the Treasurer has displayed in his basketballing career, which I think has sadly come to an end only recently.

He even ran his own radio program and wrote for the local newspaper. He was a worker in regional SA before starting his career in politics. He had previously worked at the Commonwealth Railways as a purchasing officer in Quorn, making a bit of a name for himself in the railways.

We can reflect on his story as one of ambition, service and support for South Australians—for working people in South Australian regions at a time when they were looking for a better deal for country people. His background as an industrial worker reflects a time when regional South Australia was a stronger, more vibrant place and there were significant industrial opportunities outside Adelaide.

He campaigned to strengthen South Australia's regional centres, advocating for increased amenities, housing, education, transport and health services. He said in his final speech to the House of Assembly, 'there should be no financial penalty imposed upon those who choose to be country dwellers'.

He started his political career as secretary and president of the Port Augusta Labor sub-branch after he left his work at Commonwealth Railways. In parliament he joined the ranks of landmark ministers in both the Bannon and Dunstan governments in the 1980s and was one of the longest serving MPs in the Bannon government. He was a frontbencher during what people can look back on as a golden time in South Australian politics when Don Dunstan was premier and Des Corcoran was deputy.

Over the years, he held a range of ministerial portfolios and contributed to many sectors in South Australia. After being appointed deputy speaker and chairman of committees from 1977 to 1979 he was chief secretary from 1982 to 1984, minister of tourism from 1982 to 1985, minister of local government from 1984 to 1985 and minister of transport from 1985 to 1989.

In his role as minister of transport Gavin oversaw or initiated multiple seminal transport projects. He led such far-reaching infrastructure projects as the sealing of the Stuart Highway between Port Augusta and the NT border, something I am eternally grateful for when driving up to the APY lands a couple of times a year. It is almost unthinkable for younger motorists today that major interstate roads would be unsealed. Only literally in the last few weeks we have heard stories as many South Australians have gone to the Northern Territory on what is now a sealed road that was led by Gavin Keneally.

He was a strong advocate for public safety, introducing, as the Treasurer outlined, the first red-light traffic cameras, pre-licence training for motorcyclists to counter rising motorcyclist deaths and making baby safety capsules mandatory, while establishing a pool of capsules to ensure they were easily accessible to hire.

I know that Gavin, like many Labor MPs, stayed heavily involved in the Labor Party after his time representing the party in parliament. I know that in my time, nearly every time I have been in Port Augusta for a Stuart sub-branch meeting Gavin has turned up as an active contributor. From my time as state secretary of the party, whenever we had country membership forums Gavin was almost always one of the first ones there and left you in no doubt about what his views were and where the party was heading, what it should be doing, what it had done wrong but also what we have done well.

I think that speaks tremendously to the sort of person Gavin Keneally was, that after reaching the heights of service as a minister he still stayed heavily involved with the party at a local sub-branch level in Port Augusta. We bid farewell and remember Gavin Keneally for his landmark, long service to his local community, the Stuart electorate, the Labor Party and the South Australian parliament. Our thoughts and prayers go out to his loved ones. May he rest in peace.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: I acknowledge the presence in the gallery today of a former President of the Legislative Council, the Hon. Ron Roberts—welcome, Ron—and also the former member for Norwood, Ms Vini Ciccarello.

Condolence

HERON, MR V.G.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:30): With the leave of the council, I move:

That the Legislative Council expresses its deep regret at the recent death of Mr Victor Stanley Heron, former member of the House of Assembly, and places on record its appreciation of his distinguished public service.

In speaking on behalf of government members, Vic Heron, as he was known, was the Labor member for Peake for a relatively brief period from 1989 to 1993. Mr Heron entered parliament at the age of 50. Prior to that he was president of the ALP State Executive and he was an organiser and secretary of the old Missos union, the Miscellaneous Workers' Union. I think he had some 15 years or so serving in various positions with the Miscellaneous Workers' Union. He was also a president and executive member of the United Trades and Labor Council (UTLC).

He had been a Senate candidate in 1987 and then was duly elected to what was then the safe seat of Peake in the western suburbs—it broadly corresponds with the current electorate of West Torrens, not exactly but broadly.

The interests and the passions of Vic Heron were made evident in his maiden speech. They were issues relating to the promotion of award restructuring, as he saw it, occurring at that particular time. He certainly opposed what was, at that stage, the new trend of enterprise agreements, and the variation of that which occurred in Queensland at that particular time called voluntary employment agreements. He warned against the use of enterprise bargaining and enterprise agreements and much preferred the model of award restructuring as being the preferred course of pursuing the interests of working-class South Australians.

In his maiden speech he supported the greater provision of child care, which remained an interest of his, and he spoke at length about the important issues of occupational health and safety as they appertained at that particular time. There have been significant changes in that area, of course, since then but it was, nevertheless, an important part of his maiden speech contribution.

My career briefly traversed the same time as Mr Heron's from 1989 to 1993. As I said, his electorate seemed to be a safe Labor electorate but the electoral tsunami of 1993 swept Mr Heron and a number of other members of parliament out of the House of Assembly. During the 1993 post-State Bank election the vote for the Labor Party in that electorate dropped by 17 per cent. It was no particular criticism of Mr Heron, it was just reflective of the across-the-board swing against Labor Party members and candidates post the State Bank disaster. There was a two-party preferred vote swing of 10 per cent and the seat was lost for a brief period of four years.

I recall because the member who was successful in the Liberal Party was Heini Becker. Heini Becker had legendary status in the Liberal Party as the member for the marginal seat of Hanson, which broadly covered the West Beach area, which traverses bits of Colton and, I suspect, bits of Mr Patterson's electorate of Morphett.

Heini Becker, as I said, had legendary status as a marginal seat campaigner, a bit like the former and current lions of Hartley in terms of winning marginal seats for the Liberal Party. He decided to retire at that particular election and was sort of prevailed upon to stand in a safe Labor seat at the election. I recall a conversation with him when he said that he believed he could win the seat. No-one else actually believed him, including myself, but nevertheless he was proved right and constantly reminded us that he had been proved right.

As I said, the electoral circumstances of 1993 swept away a lot of members of parliament and it is no particular criticism of Mr Heron that he was unable to stand against what was an electoral tidal wave of support away from one party towards another party.

In his short career, he also served on the Social Development Committee. He pursued a number of interests with his work on the Social Development Committee. In the period of time that I knew him as a member of parliament, somewhat like Mr Keneally he was always very easy to get along with, not only, I am sure, with his own colleagues but also members of the opposition or government parties on the opposing side. He was ever open to discussions with people about a whole variety of political issues, never forgetting his roots within the trade union movement and continuing to prosecute the very strong views that he held on behalf of trade unions and members of trade unions at that particular time.

On behalf of government members in this chamber, can I acknowledge his contribution to his political party but also his long-serving contribution to the trade unions he represented and the trade union movement more generally in South Australia, and his contribution, albeit brief, to the parliament and the broader community. On behalf of government members, we pass on our condolences to his family, former colleagues, friends and acquaintances.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:37): I join with the Leader of the Government on behalf of the Legislative Council to express sorrow at the passing of the former member of the House of Assembly, Mr Victor Heron, or Vic as he was more commonly known, in September of this year. We place on record our appreciation of his esteemed public service and commitment to the trade union movement across South Australia. Vic leaves behind his partner, Maxine, and siblings, Patricia and Ros. We pass on our sincere condolences to them and all of their families.

As the Treasurer outlined, Vic was a representative of the seat of Peake from 25 November 1989 until 10 December 1993. A Hilton resident in the western suburbs during this term, Vic understood the needs of his electorate, representing and assisting his electorate as needed. A staunch unionist, we commend his great achievements and contributions in the parliament and to the trade union movement.

A former president of the Labor Party, Vic joined the Labor Party in 1980 and in his earlier days was an organiser and a secretary of the then Miscellaneous Workers' Union. He also served as an executive member of the United Trades and Labor Council. In his years before parliament, he worked tirelessly to protect industrial workers and their rights. He worked for 15 years at the Missos

(now known as the United Workers Union). The Treasurer is occasionally wont to talk about union bosses and I suspect Vic, being a union boss, would have worn what is supposed to be an insult as a badge of honour.

While in parliament, Vic continued his advocacy for workers' rights and empowered all workers with continued education, new skills training, as well as supporting working women and young people through social equality measures.

As the Treasurer mentioned, during his parliamentary career Vic was a member of the Social Development Committee from 1992 until 1994. There, he contributed to a number of inquiries about improving the quality of life for South Australian communities and families. In Vic's time on the committee, they led a pivotal inquiry in the health space in 1993, covering one of the most significant challenges of the era, the HIV/AIDS pandemic.

The committee report, tabled in 1993, was entitled 'AIDS: Risks, rights and myths', and focused on the need for government-led education programs to dispel myths about HIV transmission. The committee championed a more progressive educational approach to combat public health risks, recognising the need to provide factually correct education programs and to stop prejudice and discrimination against the gay and bisexual community and against people engaged in intravenous drug use.

We bid Vic Heron a farewell and honour him for his dedicated contributions to this parliament, the union movement, the state and his community. Our thoughts and prayers are with his family and friends.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:41): I would like to also pay my respects to Vic Heron, who, as other members have said today, served this state as the member for Peake. I worked on Vic's campaign. I worked closely with Chris in his office for many years, and I knew Vic as a passionate defender of the rights of working people. He fought for their rights to receive fair pay and safe working conditions in the workplace. He built a reputation as someone who is committed to improving the lives of working people in this state and for those particularly who he felt were left behind in an increasingly deregulated industrial environment.

On his election to the other place in 1989, he spoke at length about the importance of ensuring that our laws protected the most vulnerable workers in our community. He talked about the importance of ensuring that workplaces were safe for everyone but with a particular focus on women, young people and low income workers. He made particular reference to ensuring that childcare workers had their skills and responsibilities recognised and rewarded and given a fair pay rate. As already noted, prior to his election, he spent 15 years working for the Missos as an organiser and rising to be its secretary.

I remember, when I was quite a young man, Vic very kindly gave me an interview for a position within the union when perhaps he should not have done. I was certainly the youngest applicant for the job and certainly the least qualified of all those who were given an interview that day, but he kindly gave me one. He also broke the bad news to me personally, somewhat later. In his sort of gruff but kindly way he said, 'Buck up, lad. You really had no chance, but I suspect your future lies elsewhere in the movement. Don't take it too hard.' Of course, I did take it very hard, but with the virtue of hindsight I will always be grateful to Vic for giving me the opportunity to interview and to learn some skills but also to point me in a different direction.

I would like to say thank you to Vic for the valuable work that he has provided the movement, the parliament and our state. He made our country and our state a better place for his efforts for working people. I would like to pay our condolences in particular to his partner Maxine and his sisters Patricia and Ros.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:43): Vic has made a great contribution to our state through both the union movement and his work in this parliament. The hardships that he faced growing up with limited education and opportunities from a poor working-class family background shaped his outlook on life and motivated him to improve the lives of others. He was a blue-collar worker who understood worker issues and spoke for and on behalf of workers in this state.

I was fortunate enough to work with Vic for several years while working in the Federated Miscellaneous Workers' Union. He was my boss at the Missos. For two and half years, I worked under his leadership as a migrant workers' rights officer. We devised programs and strategies for inclusion of people of non-English-speaking background within union structures. At the time, non-English-speaking background workers in low-paid jobs were a significant proportion of the workforce within the sphere of union membership for the Missos. They were not visible, however, within the union structures.

Vic recognised the value of migrant workers and through his leadership encouraged workplaces to embrace the diversity of our state and to support migrant workers. Subsequently, my role was primarily to encourage and equip non-English-speaking background workers to have a more active role in the workplace and in the union structures. Education served as a gateway for migrant workers. We set up English language classes in work time for workers in public and private enterprises. These programs gave workers the opportunity not only to learn a skill but to change their lives for the better, including increasing their participation rates.

Even after leaving the Missos I continued to work with Vic in my role as a union educator at the Trade Union Training Authority. I would liaise with the unions and employers in terms of industry-specific training union and other courses. Vic strongly supported union structures that grew workers' ability to participate in the workplace and organisational structures. I coordinated and established a union-specific training program for their delegates and representative leadership training for future organisers.

Vic was a traditionalist when it came to running the union but a true progressive with worker equality in mind, ensuring that workers' rights and a decent standard of living were at the forefront. Prior to his leadership, all union officials in the Missos were men. However, during his leadership four women officials were appointed. Decisions like these show the true quality of leadership Vic had. Though a traditionalist, he was responsive to and supportive of change in the union and the workplace.

He was very much a unionist through and through. His work within the union and the labour movement was his primary focus and took precedence over all else. It is not surprising that his maiden speech in parliament also reflected his life goals. There was also very little commentary on his personal life but a focus on labour and industrial issues, which were core issues for him. As the member for Peake he was my local member. I want to farewell Vic and offer my condolences to his family.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: With the leave of the council, I move:

That as a mark of respect to their memory the sitting of the council be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Motion carried.

Sitting suspended from 14:48 to 14:59.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the President—

Report of the Ombudsman on Ombudsman's own initiative investigation in relation to issues surrounding the death in custody of Mr Wayne Fella Morrison dated August 2020

By the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas)—

Leases Granted for Properties Held By Commissioner of Highways 2019-20

By the Minister for Health and Wellbeing (Hon. S.G. Wade)—

Coronial Inquest into the death of Ms Martina Morgan—Report of the actions taken by the South Australia Police dated 10 September 2020

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: I welcome in the chamber the member for Schubert emeritus, Mr Ivan Venning. Welcome, Ivan.

Ministerial Statement

MORRISON, MR W.F.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:00): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to Mr Wayne Fella Morrison for the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services from another place.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

Question Time

SUICIDE PREVENTION

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:04): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding suicide prevention.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: As was just described in the giving of a notice of motion, the Hon. John Dawkins MLC, now President of the Legislative Council, has received a national Lifetime Achievement Award from Suicide Prevention Australia for the years of work and advocacy in this area. The award was officially announced today and was accompanied by a statement:

Suicide Prevention Australia is delighted to announce the Hon. John Dawkins MLC as the recipient of the 2020 Lifetime Achievement Award.

The Lifetime Achievement Award is the highest of accolades for outstanding and sustained contribution to the suicide prevention sector. It is presented at the discretion of the Suicide Prevention Australia Board.

The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has often praised the work, quite rightly, of the Hon. John Dawkins MLC in this chamber in response to questions or contributions. Most recently, just after World Suicide Prevention Day last year, the Minister for Health and Wellbeing said, 'I again recognise that the Hon. Mr Dawkins has been a long-term, passionate advocate for suicide prevention, and I welcome his continued energy in this area of public policy.'

We understand that staff who supported the Hon. John Dawkins in this role have been told to no longer take direction and have been informed that the Hon. John Dawkins will no longer have a role as the Premier's suicide prevention advocate. My question to the minister is: why would the Hon. John Dawkins be sacked from a role like this on a day like this, and who is better qualified in this parliament to undertake this work?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:06): Immediately, I doubt the facts of the honourable member's statement. The honourable member suggests that most recently I congratulated Mr Dawkins for his contribution to suicide prevention a year ago. I am sure that I would have done it repeated times since. The fact of the matter is that I congratulate the President on the conferral on him of a lifetime award by Suicide Prevention Australia. His contribution to this area is long and distinguished, and that award is truly earned.

In terms of the Premier's Advocate for Suicide Prevention, the honourable member may wish to ask a question of the Premier, because clearly, by its very name, it is not a position that is in my

gift. Sufficient to say that it is my understanding that it would not be appropriate for a President of the Legislative Council to hold a government appointment such as that. I am disappointed that the events of this week mean that the Hon. Mr Dawkins will no longer be able to continue in that role, but I have no doubt that the Hon. Mr Dawkins' contribution to suicide prevention—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I wish to hear the minister.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: As I was saying, I am disappointed that the events of this week mean that the Hon. Mr Dawkins will no longer be able to continue in the role as the Premier's Advocate for Suicide Prevention, but I am sure that the Hon. Mr Dawkins' contribution—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter will remain silent.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: But I am sure that Mr Dawkins' contribution to suicide prevention will continue.

SUICIDE PREVENTION

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:07): Supplementary based on the original answer: were the supporting staff to the Hon. John Dawkins' role as the Premier's Advocate for Suicide Prevention from the health department?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:08): The Premier's advocate is supported by both ministerial office staff and by public sector staff. The suicide prevention function has significantly shifted to Wellbeing SA, but there are some aspects of suicide prevention that remain with the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist.

SUICIDE PREVENTION

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:08): I have a supplementary question arising from the original answer.

The PRESIDENT: The last supplementary question, I think, the Hon. Mr Maher.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: What advice was the minister relying on when he said that a person could not hold such a role as the Premier's advocate at the same time as being President?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:08): Let's be clear: I said 'my understanding'. I am not relying on advice.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I make—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I make it clear: when ministers are on their feet answering questions, I would like to hear their answer, and I couldn't hear that. I call the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: My understanding is that it would be inappropriate because a President is meant to be an independent officer of the parliament. To at the same time hold an appointment from the government would be inappropriate.

MEMBERS, ACCOMMODATION ALLOWANCES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:09): My question is to you, sir, regarding ICAC investigations. I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We are aware that in addition to the request from ICAC to several MPs who have been the subject of public commentary and statement and their staff in relation to the country members' accommodation allowance, there have been requests made to both chambers of parliament in relation to the provision of certain documents and information.

My questions to you, sir, are: does that request for information to the chambers of parliament from ICAC still stand and have there been any variations to it? Secondly, will you release a copy of the request from ICAC to this chamber or officers of this chamber?

The PRESIDENT (15:10): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. Members would recall that on my first day in this chair and within only a matter of minutes of having the privilege of taking this office, I did make a short statement in regard to these matters. I have had a brief opportunity to undertake some consideration of those and it is my intention to make a further statement in the next sitting week.

DEBELLE PROTOCOLS

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:11): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Human Services regarding disability.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The arrest of a Department of Human Services employee for sexual offences was first reported by multiple media outlets on 11 August this year. The alleged offender was yesterday named in public and appeared in court charged with sexual intercourse without consent and other offences.

Media reports of the past month state that the minister's department 'notified police of the alleged offences' and 'people receiving support, their families and guardians are being notified'. When asked about notification protocols yesterday, the minister said:

I don't have those exact details in relation to what the Debelle protocols are, but my department is fully aware of those and uses them.

My questions to the minister are: what are the notification protocols, and if you don't know how can you be sure that the department has followed them? How have the protocols been adjusted for adults in disability care, rather than children in schools? How have the protocols been adjusted to deal with changes to the law that allow sex offenders to be named after their first court appearance rather than being committed for trial?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:12): I thank the honourable member for her question on this matter, which is the subject of quite some distress for people within the services, their families and guardians, staff of the services and, indeed, the entire department.

In relation to the Debelle protocols, they have been modified. They are something that were brought into existence and have been promulgated, if you like, through the education department in response to those matters. They have been modified for the Department of Human Services, particularly in relation to people with disabilities. My understanding is that they exist so that, firstly, for people who may be impacted by a sexual assault or something of that nature, guardians, family and so forth are made aware of it, and also to encourage anybody who may have had some experience or some information to be supported to come forward.

In relation to how the department has contacted families, it has a notification chain in terms of the people who are most likely to be impacted. They have advised me that they have contacted all the people who are likely to be impacted across the full service. Within a school system I think it's possibly easier to describe what might take place in that regard if there's a sexual assault of an individual: then the families would have a face-to-face meeting. Clearly, when you have a large number of families in the schools, that goes through to a letter system.

So it is sensitively managed in terms of face-to-face meetings, telephone calls and emails or letters, as may be required. But my department has assured me that they have been in contact with everybody across the service.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary question, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

DEBELLE PROTOCOLS

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:14): The minister did not answer the third part of my question, which was how the protocols have been adjusted to deal with changes to the law that allow sex offenders to be named after their first appearance.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:15): The protocol is a modification from the education modification. I think the honourable member would like me to be prescriptive in my response. What I can say is that the department has followed its modified Debelle protocols through, particularly in relation to this case, as is appropriate.

The PRESIDENT: Further supplementary, the honourable deputy leader.

DEBELLE PROTOCOLS

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:15): Again, the minister has not answered how those protocols have been adjusted to deal with the changes to the law, and that raises the question of how, minister, you can—despite the fact that you demand to be notified about critical incidents, it appears that you don't demand to be notified about protocols. Can you explain why that is the case?

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary question, so you need the question only. I will call the minister.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: My question is: why is that the case? Why does the minister not know the protocols when she is so involved in—

The PRESIDENT: No, look, I will make it clear. Supplementary questions are a question only, and there is no explanation. I think I gave you a fair bit of latitude. I call the minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:16): I am delighted to answer this particular question. I would defer to your wisdom in that you have identified the honourable member has not been following the due process in terms of supplementary questions and I think was trying to go down a different path, but I am delighted to respond, because—

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: After the third request.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I have listened to her in silence. I would just appreciate the same courtesy, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: No, I am listening to you, and I ask others to do so.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Thank you, Mr President. I think this is another tactic of the Labor Party in question time. We have got the open book exam—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —which is not an open book. We have got the gotcha moment, and now we have got these inference moments where ministers need to be phoning everybody themselves and understanding every complete detail of everything in order to be effective ministers—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Leader of the Opposition will remain silent, and so will the former President, the Hon. Mr Wortley.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —rather than trusting our staff to know what they are doing.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I want to hear the minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: And I would like to respond to some of the slurs, in effect, which is what the Labor Party is doing, slurs that—

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Point of order, Mr President: the minister appears to be reflecting on members, presumably myself, since I was the one who has asked the questions, and I have not made any slurs whatsoever.

The PRESIDENT: No, please be seated. There is no point of order. However, this is an answer to a supplementary question. I am keen that answers are concise, so I will ask that the minister continue her answer, and I am sure she will be concise. Minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Thank you, Mr President. I will wrap it up. The team that works in the Department of Human Services is extremely professional. I don't like the inference that they need me to check up on every last detail they do. Indeed the Incident Management Unit, if I can advise, includes a current SAPOL officer who is in that role on leave without pay. We also have other staff, including a former SAPOL officer, two former police officers from other jurisdictions, two solicitors and several staff who have also been involved in government investigations.

I say that because those inferences and slurs have been made in relation to the investigations within the Department of Human Services by the Australian Labor Party, and they are inappropriate. In the case of accommodation services, the department takes its support for all of the clients and other staff within those services extremely seriously. I am more than happy to outline a range of the reforms that we have undertaken in the disability services accommodation which clearly demonstrate that we take these matters seriously and that we are rectifying a number of matters that were sadly neglected by the previous administration.

CORONAVIRUS, HOMELESS ACCOMMODATION

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:19): My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding measures to address homelessness. Can the minister please provide an update to the council about how the Marshall Liberal government has provided support to South Australians experiencing homelessness during the COVID-19 pandemic?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:20): I thank the honourable member for her question and for her interest in this area. The South Australian Housing Authority strongly recognises work with the specialist homelessness sector, which is a range of non-government organisations and community housing providers throughout South Australia. One area that is well known is the Adelaide Zero Project, which focuses on functional zero homelessness for the City of Adelaide. My understanding is that we are closer to that goal than ever.

It has been essential, as people have been at risk of homelessness or domestic and family violence, that we provide additional support particularly during the COVID restrictions. From 23 March this year, the authority was providing commercial accommodation through hotels for people who were sleeping rough or who did not have safe accommodation.

At 12 June, the program, called CEARS, ceased accepting new rough sleepers into the program. There are services that existed previously which we are now reliant upon to continue responses as appropriate. After 10 June, these include regular homelessness responses through the Homelessness Gateway service, which operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

The four specialist homelessness services agencies support the inner city response and they have received additional funding to employ case management to ensure that people are connected with support. All participants who were eligible and maintained accepted support were transitioned into longer term housing with a 12-month package of support, which has included linking up necessary services and long-term supports.

As of 4 September, there are no longer any rough sleepers under the CEARS program. We have accommodated 250 people through that program and, as a Vanguard City under the Institute of Global Homelessness, Adelaide has been described as one of the bright spots during the COVID crisis, so we are very grateful to all of our non-government partners.

I express gratitude particularly to all the frontline workers who have been involved in case managing and assisting people through this process, and we look forward to placing people through Adelaide Zero and through the continued reforms in the homelessness sector.

CORONAVIRUS, HOMELESS ACCOMMODATION

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:22): Supplementary: can the minister outline to the chamber how many people who are at risk of homelessness are currently accommodated in hotel accommodation in Adelaide according to the latest statistics?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:22): I think I might have mentioned that the CEARS program, which is the COVID-related one, has ceased operating, so not through that particular program. There is an emergency support program which has operated alongside and has continued throughout the height of restrictions but that is a statewide service.

CORONAVIRUS, HOMELESS ACCOMMODATION

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:23): Final supplementary arising from the original answer: is the minister able to indicate the number of people who, during the COVID-19 pandemic, have been accommodated in hotel accommodation who have ceased to be there and have been effectively evicted back into homelessness?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:23): I'm not sure the data actually tells me whether they were evicted into homelessness. There were certainly people who were evicted for property damage and other forms of antisocial behaviour, but there were also a number of people who re-entered hotel and motel accommodation and, of course, some people left voluntarily.

As I said previously, the antisocial behaviour policy was broadly followed in relation to motel accommodation. The difference with this program is that, unlike having a tenancy, it's up to the motel proprietors to determine whether somebody was evicted or not. I think in most instances they have been incredibly supportive of the program and very reasonable.

ADELAIDE FOOTBALL CLUB

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:24): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the minister for industrial relations on the topic of SafeWork investigations into the Adelaide Crows.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The minister would be well aware that on 21 July he provided an answer to my previous question on this topic to the effect that SafeWork SA had confirmed that:

No notifications or complaints against the Adelaide Football Club in relation to their pre-season camp in 2018 have been received by SafeWork SA. SafeWork SA is looking into the matter and no further information can be shared at this stage.

The SafeWork statement came some years after, of course, the AFL, through their integrity unit, found that the Crows camp had 'no breach of industry rules'. My questions to the minister are: is there an update? Has SafeWork SA progressed further in any investigation? Is SafeWork SA satisfied with the AFL's industry rules to safeguard against the psychological harm of players that may have occurred in this case?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:26): I'm happy to take the honourable member's question on notice. I do believe that SafeWork SA has progressed. At the very least they have made, or are making, further inquiries in relation to the issues that the honourable member has addressed in her question and previous questions, but as to how far they have advanced with those inquiries, I will take advice and provide her with an answer.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:26): My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding disability in relation to the notification of people after the recent alleged rape of a woman with an intellectual disability. When exactly were people notified and how exactly were people notified? How many people or families have been notified? Has any relevant party been identified but not notified and what efforts are underway to find them?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:27): My understanding is that, broadly speaking, all of the residents, their guardians and families across the entire service have been notified. We have roughly 500 clients at any one time in supported accommodation services and my understanding is that they have all been contacted, and the means in which they have been contacted is through the system I described earlier, which is to triage those who are the most impacted to those who are the least likely to be impacted.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:27): Supplementary arising from the original answer: can the minister please confirm how many people exactly were notified?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:28): I'm not quite sure what the honourable member thinks that is going to achieve in terms of getting that exact number because we are talking about, as I said, 500 residents. Some of those are under guardianship and some of those have family members. It is all of the people who are associated who have been contacted through this process.

The PRESIDENT: Final supplementary, the Hon. Ms Bourke.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:28): Considering the offender has now been named, have residents been re-contacted just to identify who that person was?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:28): I understand there were two rounds. There was the round of contact made immediately after the arrest and now that the matter is public and before the courts everybody has been contacted again.

SUICIDE PREVENTION

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (15:29): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister please update the council on suicide prevention?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:29): I thank the honourable member for his question. It's a particularly relevant day to talk about suicide prevention, obviously: it's World Suicide Prevention Day, and of course it's also R U OK? Day. 2020 has seen significant challenges to the global community and here in Australia. Those challenges have been exacerbated by the droughts of recent years, the severe bushfires of the past summer and of course the shock, really, of the health and economic crisis that coronavirus has brought to our world, our nation and our state.

Marking R U OK? Day and World Suicide Prevention Day this year is more important than ever. The Marshall Liberal government is working tirelessly to support the wellbeing of the community in these circumstances, building on our strong commitment to suicide prevention, which started with a \$4 million investment in our first budget to support the work of prevention.

In direct response to the wellbeing challenges presented by the pandemic, a COVID-19 mental health support line was established in late March. Since March, we have had additional supports put in place through the Virtual Support Network, supports that involve responses in alcohol and drugs, Aboriginal communities, the youth population, frontline health workers and older South Australians.

Another initiative to support the health and wellbeing of our state during the pandemic and in the recovery is Open Your World, a single source of wellbeing information for South Australians on a groundbreaking new wellbeing strategy. The website shares information to support mental, physical, social and community wellbeing, bringing together government and non-government organisations.

More broadly, the government last year launched the Mental Health Services Plan. This provides a roadmap for mental health services from 2020 to 2025, and aims to improve access and timeliness of mental health care and in particular, in the context of suicide prevention, included a commitment to Towards Zero suicide prevention.

The government also continues to support the establishment of community-based and run suicide prevention networks and other suicide prevention initiatives across South Australia. Today and every day, I encourage everyone in our community to reach out and ask the question: R U OK? of family, friends, workmates and colleagues. It's also important that you take time to check in with yourself. Self-care is important. If you or someone you know is experiencing emotional, social or mental distress, seek help and support. There are services and support lines that are here for you.

I am pleased to again take this opportunity to congratulate the President on the conferral by Suicide Prevention Australia of a Lifetime Achievement Award. The President, of course, is a deserving recipient.

AGED-CARE CCTV TRIAL

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:32): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing about the government's aged-care CCTV trial.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: The minister has indicated that the government would invest a significant amount into the CCTV trial on top of the \$500,000 promised by the federal government. Under the original trial proposal endorsed by the Premier and the minister, the then preferred provider Care Protect, a world leader in aged-care surveillance, the total cost of covering five facilities was to be \$125,000 plus 12 months of monitoring, which would have amounted to around \$20 a day per resident who signed on, and Care Protect would install its own equipment and at their cost. My questions to the minister—and I would be quite comfortable if the minister chose to take these on notice:

1. Can the minister provide the full costing of the trial which will now be in just two of the five initially promised sites?
2. What will be paid to Sturdie for their equipment?
3. Which company will be conducting the independent monitoring?
4. What will the cost be to monitor each patient?
5. How much is the government going to invest?
6. How much of the \$500,000 in federal money has already been spent?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:34): I thank the honourable member for his questions and also for his recognition that those questions are, by nature, questions that I will need to take on notice. I would stress that the Care Protect that the honourable member mentioned was free to submit to the tender and didn't, so it's not actually possible to compare Care Protect's bid against Sturdie's bid because they didn't participate.

In terms of the evaluation, I certainly will take that on notice. My understanding is that the selection of the evaluation partner was still in progress the last time I was briefed, but I will certainly come back with an answer. As I have also indicated to the member, I am very happy to give him a personal briefing on the trial.

AGED-CARE CCTV TRIAL

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:35): The minister said Care Protect chose not to re-tender for the project. Does the minister know why they didn't do that?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:35): No, I don't.

AGED-CARE CCTV TRIAL

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:36): To the minister: why would a company that initially was the preferred tenderer then indicate—not indicate, actually tell the government—it was pulling out because of concerns over probity? Why would you expect them to then put in a tender?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:36): The point I was making is that the opportunity was there, and because they didn't take the opportunity there's not an

opportunity to compare. The decision-making within Care Protect is a matter not within my—I don't access those decision-making processes.

AGED-CARE CCTV TRIAL

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:36): Can the minister confirm that the word 'probity' concerns Care Protect in relation to the tender process?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:36): My recollection is that Care Protect put that on the public record.

INTEGRITY CARE

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:37): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Human Services a question regarding Integrity Care.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: On Tuesday in this place, the minister said that all South Australian HACC-funded services had been advised that:

...they cannot subcontract state government-funded services without permission. We have not found any records granting current permission to subcontract to Integrity Care.

My question to the minister is: what exactly has the minister done to ensure that no local council in this state did in fact subcontract HACC-funded services to Integrity Care?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:37): I thank the honourable member for his question. My department contacted any of the councils that received HACC funding.

INTEGRITY CARE

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:37): Just like the minister believed her department about the DeBelle protocols without even knowing what they were, how is the minister certain that the advice is correct?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:38): I am not sure what the honourable member expects me to do. Perhaps to sit in on every telephone call, check every email and check every last piece of correspondence within my department.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order on my right!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The advice—

An honourable member interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: And on my left.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —from my department is that there were several requests made by the department to double-check with any HACC providers that that was the case and that they followed all of those up.

FEDERAL-STATE FUNDING AGREEMENTS

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:38): My question is to the Treasurer. Treasurer, given the federal government's recent statement about reducing the number of federal-state funding agreements, can the Treasurer update the chamber on the South Australian government's view on this particular issue?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:39): The South Australian government, as with most other governments, was broadly supportive of the commonwealth government's proposal. There were approximately a hundred federal-state agreements of varying sizes and complexities, which had been generated over many, many years. In recent times, we have seen quite a number of recent federal-state funding agreements as a result of COVID-related issues.

There was broad agreement in terms of the reduction in numbers. However, from the state and territory viewpoint, the view of the Board of Treasurers in particular was that, although in and of itself the mere reduction of the number of federal-state funding agreements is noteworthy and laudable as a goal, there was much more that could be achieved, if the process was also utilised to try to reduce the extent of complexity of some of those agreements, in particular through giving greater discretion to state and territory governments in terms of the funding that might be applied by state and territory governments through those agreements.

That is, reducing the extent of federal requirements, which had increasingly become more prescriptive over recent years in these federal-state agreements, and reducing the extent of the latitude that state and territory governments might have in terms of the funding that was being provided. That was a view that was shared by state and territory governments of all persuasions, Labor and Liberal.

We welcome the fact that the first stage of that process has been achieved. A significant number of agreements has been reduced, and I will need to bring back the precise number we have arrived at. It is somewhere between 10 and 20 from, as I said, about 100 agreements. They have now been broadly collapsed into a number of broader category areas and all new agreements are to be incorporated as attachments or appendices to the reduced number of agreements.

For example, on behalf of the state government, together with other state and territory treasurers, I signed five federation funding agreements in the broad categories of health, education and skills, infrastructure, environment, and affordable housing, community services and other. The state and territory governments remain interested, and we are engaging through the Council on Federal Financial Relations (CFFR) with the federal Treasurer in what we would see as an important second stage. The federal government has given broad agreement in terms of continuing those discussions to see whether or not the level of prescription that might exist within those particular agreements might be reduced and greater discretion given to state and territory governments.

It is likely that when push comes to shove that will be a difficult goal to achieve because federal governments and federal bureaucrats have increasingly been interested in being more prescriptive with those agreements, so when we get to the stage with portfolio ministers and treasurers in trying to see greater discretion for state and territory governments, it will be an interesting challenge for the initial cabinet process to see whether or not that particular goal can be achieved.

I will conclude by saying it is my very strong view, supporting the Board of Treasurers' position, that it is in the best interests of the federation, certainly in the best interests of state and territory governments, if greater flexibility can be given to state and territory governments in relation to how that federal funding is able to be applied in pursuit of what might be shared goals. We agree they should be shared goals and they should be measurable, which is the most important issue from the federal government's viewpoint. They want to see goals, which are able to be measured, and state and territory governments measured against their performance in achieving their shared goals.

PUBLIC HOUSING ENERGY POLICY

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:44): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Human Services about solar panels on public housing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: As part of the land tax bill debate last year, the Greens secured a number of commitments from the government which were outlined by the Treasurer during the committee stage of the bill on the afternoon of 28 November last year. One of these commitments was to install solar panels on a minimum of 75 per cent of all suitable existing public housing. My questions of the minister are:

1. Can the minister provide an update as to the progress of this commitment?
2. How many public housing properties have been identified as suitable for solar panels to be installed?
3. How many of these properties have had panels actually installed so far?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:44): I thank the honourable member for his question. In relation to solar panels on public housing, my colleague the Hon. Dan van Holst Pellekaan has just released the third phase of the expansion of solar on South Australian Housing Trust properties. The first rounds were in effect a trial to see what the uptake was, how the configurations would work and test the properties themselves in terms of whether they were even suitable for having solar panels on them due to age, structural integrity and the direction that the panels needed to be in order to have the capacity to transfer solar energy into electricity.

The scheme with Tesla has been expanded from 100 to 1,100 homes and is working towards over 4,100 properties across the state. We are very excited that this project has reached a new phase. Clearly, electricity prices are a significant issue for all South Australians and we recognise that a lot of South Australians on lower incomes, including people who are in public housing, would benefit from participating in having solar power on their roofs or through the Tesla Virtual Power Plant. That project has moved into its next phase and we are looking forward to deploying those to people's properties.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Supplementary arising from the answer, sir.

The PRESIDENT: I will go to the Hon. Mr Parnell first and then I will come to the Leader of the Opposition. The Hon. Mr Parnell, a supplementary.

PUBLIC HOUSING ENERGY POLICY

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:47): A supplementary, and I thank the minister for her answer and I note she referred to the Tesla batteries. I am happy for her to take on notice the questions that I asked, which are how many properties have actually been identified so far and how many have had solar panels installed? I would be more than happy if she wanted to bring back how many have batteries as well as an additional item. But I am happy for her to take that on notice.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:47): Yes, I don't have those details in front of me, so I will get those details.

The PRESIDENT: I am sure when the minister referred to the Hon. Dan van Holst Pellekaan that she really meant to refer to him in his ministerial title, and I am sure we will continue to do that in the future. The Leader of the Opposition.

PUBLIC HOUSING ENERGY POLICY

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:47): Supplementary arising from the answer: is the minister able to inform the chamber if the solar panels on public housing will be subject to the government's proposal to be switched off at the direction of the government?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:48): I suspect that that is a question of timing and contractual arrangements, so I will need to take that one on notice and get back to him about those details. Whether it is a timing issue or a contractual issue, that may well impact on whether those ones are affected or not.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:48): My questions are to the Minister for Human Services regarding disability and the alleged rape of a woman with intellectual disability. Firstly, was the person who is accused of raping a woman with intellectual disability subject to any complaints or concerns during their DHS employment prior to their arrest; and, secondly, has the minister ensured that the alleged offender did not fail the advanced psychological testing that is applied to residential child protection workers before being employed in disability care?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:49): Can I just check in relation to the second question that the member was talking about the residential child protection test.

The Hon. J.E. Hanson: Correct.

The PRESIDENT: Yes. Minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: If I take that one first, in relation to those psychological screenings, I think that my suspicion would be—and I would need to go and double-check—that the individual would not have applied for that particular test unless he had been working in a residential care setting. It is quite a specific test. It doesn't apply to all child protection workers. It only applies to those child protection workers who are working in residential settings.

The test, from what I understand, is a bit of a yes/no answer, in that the test is to determine whether somebody is suitable or not. The response that comes back from that particular test to the child protection department is a yes/no answer, but it does not just relate to somebody's potential psychological dysfunction in relation to safety for those residents. It also encompasses issues that relate to whether someone who sought to work in child protection may be retraumatized, because it is a very challenging environment.

That is an important element, I think, when referring to those particular tests. We do see that often people who have lived experience want to seek people who are in a situation similar to themselves and therefore they will go for that particular type of work. That is noble. Those people, if they seek to work in residential settings, will undergo that test and that may determine that they would be unsuitable because there would be psychological harm to themselves.

In relation to the first question, I need to advise that matters that relate to any details that the department has that are germane to the court case I am not able to comment on.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:51): Supplementary question: thanks for the answer. Did the minister check if the individual that we are discussing, who possibly failed one of the psychological tests, was rejected from working in DHS and therefore came to work in the disability industry instead?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:52): I am not sure that question has been framed correctly: someone who had failed a test applied through DHS and then was working in disability. It is a child protection test. The Department for Child Protection is provided with that information. That information, as I have outlined to this chamber, or somewhere in the past, the list is provided to DHS for their screening and so that forms part of their assessable information. It has some value, but it certainly doesn't tell the full picture in relation to someone who might have a history of care concerns or things that have been officially notified to the department.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:53): Supplementary: I appreciate the previous supplementary was awkward. Exactly how many workplaces has the alleged offender been employed at while working for DHS?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:53): The individual was working for a particular unit which provided rostered services across a range of sites within, if you like, a business unit, the accommodation services of the Department of Human Services.

YOUTH JUSTICE SERVICES

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (15:53): My question is to the Minister for Human Services about youth justice services. Can the minister please update the council on how the Marshall Liberal government is working to improve safety and security for staff and residents of the Kurlana Tapa youth justice centre?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:54): I thank the honourable member for her question and for her interest in this area. Honourable members obviously took a keen interest in relation to the banning of spit hoods. We have been able to end that particular practice as of the end of the 2019-20 financial year, in accordance with the recommendations of the Ombudsman, and that is something that we are very glad of.

We have also introduced a number of other initiatives that we think are going to go some way to ensuring that Kurlana Tapa is providing a modern service with a therapeutic approach. A range of things, including a trial for body-worn cameras started in February, which we know is going to be some deterrent to incidents at that centre. We know from interstate that that has been quite successful at providing a deterrent to incidents, which is something we are very keen on.

We started a trial of body-worn cameras on 6 April—I did just mention that. That is going to improve the safety of staff and residents. The body scanning technology has been installed at Kurlana Tapa and that is full-size body scanning technology. That reduces the need for partially clothed searches, which is important for the dignity of residents, and the safety issues can be addressed without them having to remove any of their clothing.

We also have the new strategy in place, which was released in June. It has a strong focus on reducing the over-representation of Aboriginal children and young people in the youth system. There's recruitment and cultural training that's taking place, greater engagement with community providers and other works, which will be taking place at the site to improve the amenity for young people in that system.

Clearly, we would like to see the number of young people in our system reduced. I am pleased that the numbers have reduced over time. I think the current count for the number of young people in the centre is less than 30. We are still working through consolidating onto a single site. In spite of COVID, we are able to do that at this time.

We are looking towards improving the services that are being provided at that site and also through our community service, the government and the non-government partners, to assist young people to lead fulfilling and productive lives into the future.

LAND TAX

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:57): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer advise how many responses to land tax letters sent to owners, companies and owners of land held in trust have been received by RevenueSA, how many owners have not yet responded and what action is likely to be taken after land tax accounts are sent out in October, November and thereafter this year where an owner complains about the account but did not respond to any letters sent to them initially from RevenueSA?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:58): It might surprise the member, I don't have those numbers with me but I will take the question on notice and bring back a reply.

CORONAVIRUS

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (15:58): I seek leave in the first instance to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding health figures.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS: On 18 August, the minister appeared on Sky News in what has been described by South Australian commentators in less than favourable terms. Sky News summarised the eight-minute interview with host Chris Kenny—

The PRESIDENT: The member is entitled to make a brief explanation. It should not include commentary. Continue, but it is meant to be an explanation to inform your question. Please proceed.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS: Sky News summarised the eight-minute interview with host Chris Kenny as follows, and I quote:

South Australian Health Minister fudges COVID-19 infection numbers.

South Australian Health Minister Stephen Wade struggled to answer questions about why students from coronavirus-infected Singapore will be allowed to enter his state while the border remains shut to Melbournians.

And finally:

In an interview with Sky News host Chris Kenny on Tuesday night, Mr Wade also drastically inflated the number of active cases in Victoria while playing down the severity of thousands of active COVID-19 cases in Singapore.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I want to listen to the Hon. Ms Pnevmatikos, and her own colleagues ought to give her that opportunity.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS: My questions to the minister are:

1. Does the minister recognise that as the minister responsible for our state's COVID-19 health response he should have been able to recall basic facts such as the number of active cases across Australia?

2. Was the minister reprimanded by the Premier for his performance during this interview?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (16:00): I would like to remind the house that I am actually involved in combating a pandemic. I'm not involved in some sort of pop quiz. On that—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order on my left!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: On that particular occasion—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Laughter is totally out of order. I want to listen to the minister. Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: On that particular occasion I conflated two different sets of figures. I completely reject the assertion of a Sky News-related journalist that I was trying to mislead anybody. I find that comment offensive. Of course, data is always changing and, thank God, since I made those statements the number of active cases in Victoria has more than halved. That is what we should be celebrating. We shouldn't be playing political games, some sort of pop quiz about what numbers are what. I also reject the assertion—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Members on my left will be silent. Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —that we are not willing to provide a service to Victorian students that we are willing to provide to international students. The right to return to South Australia, supported by the South Australian government and quarantine, applies to students returning to South Australian institutions whether they come from overseas or Victoria.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Pnevmatikos, and I would like to hear her, and I think her colleagues ought to listen to her as well.

CORONAVIRUS

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (16:02): Supplementary arising from the original answer: is the minister aware of how many active cases of COVID-19 there are in Singapore at the moment?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (16:02): As I said, I have got no intention—

The PRESIDENT: No, no, minister, minister—

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —of getting involved in a pop quiz.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The minister is scarcely responsible for things happening in Singapore. I didn't hear the minister's response.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order on both sides! The Hon. Ms Pnevmatikos, a further supplementary.

CORONAVIRUS

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (16:02): Is the minister aware of how many active cases there are in Victoria?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The minister will be heard in silence.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (16:03): I have no intention of responding to that question.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Terry Stephens has the call, and I would like to hear him.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wortley!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Terry Stephens has the call.

HOSPITAL SERVICES

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (16:03): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: Will the minister update the council on current hospital activity?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has the call and will be heard in silence.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (16:03): I thank the honourable member for his question.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The Marshall government is committed to delivering quality health services closer to home. That is being delivered in spades through the Southern Health Expansion Plan, an \$86 million project to expand our emergency department and broader hospital services in South Australia. Just a few hours ago I was at the Repat providing an update on this plan, and the start of the demolition works on the next stage of the Repat revitalisation.

I would like to highlight the three different aspects that the Southern Health Expansion Plan deals with. First of all, the \$86 million that is being invested is a substantial investment in reactivating the Repat, by building on the care of older people with dementia. Let's remember, in the shadow of Oakden, this government committed to investing in dementia services, and that is exactly what we are delivering on the Repat site. The Southern Acute Dementia Unit is being established at the former Ward 20 site, which is a complementary service to the dementia village and also the neurobehavioural unit. It's part of building a centre of excellence in dementia care to try to put the shame of Labor's Oakden disaster behind us.

Also, the Southern Health Expansion Program (SHEP) will see a significant step in undoing the damage of Labor's failed experience, Transforming Health. It will improve the clinical capability and the medical care provided at Noarlunga Hospital. That will enable the Noarlunga Hospital team to retain more of the ED presentations made at that hospital. I'm told that it is likely that there will be up to 1,000 ambulance transfers a year that will be avoided, and that will help ease the pressure on the Flinders Medical Centre.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Let me go to the point as to how this will stop ambulance ramping.

The PRESIDENT: I trust the minister is going to wrap up fairly soon.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Sorry, Mr President, we have only just—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, continue.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I'm very surprised that the members opposite would actually want to raise ambulance ramping because this is a key strategy of eliminating ambulance ramping.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order! I want to hear the minister. This place is built on respect and has been over many, many years, and I want to continue that. The minister will continue but he will wrap up soon.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Indeed I will. The \$86 million investment will see a significant improvement in the capacity of the Flinders Medical Centre ED and reduce transfers from Noarlunga. The Flinders Medical Centre is already the busiest emergency department in the whole of the state. Under this government's \$86 million investment, it will become the biggest emergency department in the state. It is currently operating 30 per cent above its design capacity because of the failure of the former government to continue to invest. The southern hospital expansion will help reactivate the Repat, it will help undo the damage of Transforming Health, and it will help stop ambulance ramping.

The PRESIDENT: The time for question time has expired but I ask members to stay in the chamber for a few moments because we do need an absolute majority. I call the Treasurer.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:07): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move motions without notice concerning the appointment of members to the Environment, Resources and Development Committee, the Statutory Authorities Review Committee, the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee and the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee, and an alternate member to the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee.

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

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Committees

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:08): I move:

That pursuant to section 21(3) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 the Hon. T.J. Stephens be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. D.G.E. Hood (resigned).

Motion carried.

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:08): I move:

That pursuant to section 21(3) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 the Hon. D.W. Ridgway be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. D.G.E. Hood (resigned), and the Hon. T.J. Stephens be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. N.J. Centofanti (resigned).

Motion carried.

CRIME AND PUBLIC INTEGRITY POLICY COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:09): I move:

That pursuant to section 21(3) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 the Hon. D.W. Ridgway be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. D.G.E. Hood (resigned).

Motion carried.

ABORIGINAL LANDS PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:09): I move:

That pursuant to section 10 of the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee Act 2003 the Hon. T.J. Stephens be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins (resigned).

Motion carried.

JOINT PARLIAMENTARY SERVICE COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:09): I move:

That pursuant to section 5 of the Parliament Joint Services Act 1995 the Hon. N.J. Centofanti be appointed as the alternative member to the Hon. D.G.E. Hood on the committee and that a message be sent to the House of Assembly transmitting the foregoing resolution.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:10): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended to enable me to move motions without notice concerning the substitution of members on the select committees on poverty in South Australia, wage theft, health services in South Australia, matters relating to SA Pathology and SA Medical Imaging, the redevelopment of Adelaide Oval, findings of the Murray-Darling Royal Commission and Productivity Commission as they relate to the decisions of the South Australian government, and the Budget and Finance Committee and the COVID-19 Response Committee.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Committees

SELECT COMMITTEE ON POVERTY IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:11): I move:

That the Hon. T.J. Stephens be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. N.J. Centofanti (resigned).

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON WAGE THEFT IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:11): I move:

That the Hon. D.W. Ridgway be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. J.S. Lee (resigned).

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON HEALTH SERVICES IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:11): I move:

That the Hon. T.J. Stephens be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. D.G.E. Hood (resigned).

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON MATTERS RELATING TO SA PATHOLOGY AND SA MEDICAL IMAGING

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:12): I move:

That the Hon. D.G.E. Hood be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. D.W. Ridgway (resigned).

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON REDEVELOPMENT OF ADELAIDE OVAL

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:12): I move:

That the Hon. T.J. Stephens be appointed to the committee in place of the Treasurer (resigned).

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FINDINGS OF THE MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION AND PRODUCTIVITY COMMISSION AS THEY RELATE TO THE DECISIONS OF THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:12): I move:

That the Hon. D.W. Ridgway be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. D.G.E. Hood (resigned).

Motion carried.

BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:13): I move:

That the Hon. D.W. Ridgway be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. J.S. Lee (resigned).

Motion carried.

COVID-19 RESPONSE COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:13): I move:

That the Hon. T.J. Stephens be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. N.J. Centofanti (resigned).

Motion carried.

*Bills***LEGAL PRACTITIONERS (SENIOR AND QUEEN'S COUNSEL) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 July 2020.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (16:14): I rise to speak on this bill and indicate that I will be the lead speaker for the opposition. In the other place, there was much debate on this bill, and given the time that has been spent by the parliament so far you would be forgiven for thinking this was a grave matter of importance for the governance of the state.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I would ask members to take their conversations out of the chamber if they could and give the Leader of the Opposition the due respect that he deserves.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: As I was saying, you would be forgiven, given the time and effort that has been spent on this bill so far, for thinking that this was a matter of grave importance for the running of this state. It is our contention that, given the things that we have to deal with at the moment, this issue is not of that great an importance. We have had legislation on our response to the COVID-19 pandemic that we are waiting to debate in this place after briefings have taken place. We have legislation that is about the protection of our community, things like serious repeat-offender sentencing, things like guilty-plea sentence reduction that are apparently not as important as what lawyers called themselves that this bill deals with. It is our contention that there are more important things for us to be dealing with.

This bill is trying to fix an apparent problem between some barristers and the judiciary. The importance that the government attaches to this was demonstrated by the fact that the Attorney-General herself came to Parliament House to brief the opposition on this bill and that is if not the only time then one of the very few times that has occurred during the course of this parliament that the Attorney-General herself has briefed the opposition on an Attorney-General's bill.

The Attorney-General's reasoning in support of this bill is as flawed as it is misguided. The Attorney-General has said in the other place that it will strengthen the legal profession in this state, especially the relationship between the bar and the bench. It will remove confusion that exists between the use of the title Senior Counsel awarded to eminent barristers and Special Counsel adopted by experienced solicitors in a particular field of law in legal firms around the country.

She has argued that a legislative model is better than any other solution or model, and that there is strong support from the legal profession. I think the quote is that it is a 'unified position of the bar and the Law Society'. The Attorney-General has argued that value is added to the profession by the reintroduction of the title Queen's Counsel, giving the next generation of would-be counsel a chance. These are all things the Attorney-General has said are reasons and necessities for the passage of this bill.

There is no actual evidence being provided to this parliament or to the opposition that there are tangible benefits to barristers in relation to the passage of this bill. It is a good argument that this is a matter that should be left to the legal profession to sort out. During any scheme change, such as the postnominal title of QC or SC, there is always a transition period and in this state we moved to the title of Senior Counsel back in 2009. So, as in most of the other jurisdictions that have made similar moves, there exists practitioners who were appointed Queen's Counsel prior to that date.

That is also the case in other jurisdictions where they have moved to using postnominal Senior Counsel instead of Queen's Counsel. The Queen's Counsel postnominal is a title that simply reflects that they were appointed at a time earlier than societal shifts in thinking about what a modern judiciary should look like and what titles they should adopt. Yes, the opposition accepts that Queensland has relinquished the use of the term Senior Counsel and resurrected Queen's Counsel as their preferred postnominal. But, quite frankly, so what? That does not mean we have to follow what Queensland does.

The Attorney-General in the other place said that she did not think the New South Wales model was a 'suitable model'—but it is one that works. New South Wales is the biggest state with the biggest economy. They have had the scheme of appointing only Senior Counsel for almost 30 years.

Another argument made by the Attorney-General is an economic one. The argument goes something along the lines of that counsel who are Senior Counsel are not getting the range of briefs because they are hamstrung by their title; that is, Senior Counsel. We have asked a number of times of the Attorney-General for evidence to support that. The Attorney-General admitted in the other place under questioning that there was no actual economic modelling to suggest anything of the sort that there is evidence that there is an economic benefit by reintroducing the postnominal Queen's Counsel.

At best, there are anecdotes, stories and things one hears, the sort of unattributed, uncorroborated stories that would not be acceptable in any court of law as evidence. Even then—even then—with these anecdotal stories, the government has not provided any actual stories or things that can be relied upon. It is apparently out there, but it cannot be cited. I repeat myself when I say that this parliament ought to be focused on more pressing matters, not on what lawyers want themselves to be called.

This bill proposes three new clauses and some transitional provisions for the Legal Practitioners Act 1981. The first proposal is a new section that would allow the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of South Australia to appoint persons in the legal community to the position of Senior Counsel. This is interesting, as the Chief Justice does not actually require the permission of the Legal Practitioners Act nor the permission of the parliament to make such an appointment. The Chief Justice already has the right to do so and has done so through the rules of the court, which are made by the justices of the Supreme Court.

The second new clause would give the Attorney-General a direct role to play. Once a person has been appointed a Senior Counsel, under this new and completely unnecessary legislative scheme they can then apply to the Attorney-General to request that they be appointed as Queen's Counsel instead of Senior Counsel. Under the second new clause, upon request by a Senior Counsel the Attorney-General must recommend to the Governor to appoint them as a Queen's Counsel. So,

at the stroke of a pen, the person no longer is an SC but a newly minted QC. This is then granted by the Governor, with a notice that appears in the *Gazette*.

The third new clause states that the Chief Justice can revoke the appointment of a Senior Counsel or a Queen's Counsel and that this must also be published in the *Gazette*. It also states that a person who is a Senior Counsel or a Queen's Counsel can resign from their appointment by notifying the Chief Justice, who must publish this in the *Gazette*. Again, these are things that are already readily available to the Chief Justice and can be set out in the rules of the court.

This bill also contains transitional provisions that recognise previous appointments as Senior Counsel and Queen's Counsel before the commencement of these new provisions. This presumably is to allow any current Senior Counsel to make an application to the Attorney-General to be known as Queen's Counsel, if this bill passes.

The Treasurer, in moving the bill in this chamber, has not really provided any more cogent reasons for supporting the bill than the Attorney-General did in the other place. Relying on the second reading explanation that was given in the other place, he merely restated without any actual reasons being given as to why this is necessary. So we are left with the following reasons why we ought to be supporting the bill, reasons that the opposition maintains are pretty unconvincing.

Firstly, there is the argument that the bill offers choice and gives greater flexibility to a person appointed Senior Counsel to elect to be known as Queen's Counsel. This choice is really an elusive concept and comes back to the flawed economic argument the Attorney-General has tried to prosecute in support of this bill without any actual evidence.

It comes back to the assertion that Senior Counsels in South Australia are somehow disadvantaged by not being able to call themselves Queen's Counsel and thereby do not compete on an even playing field with their interstate counterparts, notwithstanding, as I mentioned earlier, that in the biggest state with the biggest economy, New South Wales, for some almost three decades there have been no Queen's Counsels appointed and they seem to do just fine.

The other supporting assertion the government makes is that there is confusion around the term 'Senior Counsel at the bar' and those lawyers who are called 'Special Counsel' in their respective law firms. This, quite frankly, is another ridiculous argument. Once again, having been asked for any evidence for this, except for anecdotes that would be hearsay upon hearsay in any ruling on evidence in court, there is nothing that has been provided by the government.

You would think that it is common sense that a reasonable person who is engaged in court matters where they need to brief a barrister, and perhaps a very experienced barrister, would be relying in almost all circumstances on their instructing solicitor to make recommendations on who to brief and why. It is an insult to the legal profession to suggest that an instructing solicitor is going to be confused as to who they ought to be briefing on behalf of their client and will be confused into thinking that a special counsel at an in-house law firm is somehow a practising barrister and confuse them for senior counsel. It is an insult to instructing solicitors.

The second argument that the government pursues in support of this bill is that there is widespread support amongst the legal profession, and I will quote the government:

It reflects a clear position of a majority of the legal profession in South Australia and aligns opportunities for other senior advocates with other jurisdictions already making this change.

Once again, as with some of the other reasoning that is put forward in prosecuting the necessity of this bill, that reasoning does not have any substance to it.

In terms of numbers, they just do not stack up as the Attorney-General is claiming. Even a person with simple maths knowledge can see from the Law Society of South Australia's survey of members that 843 people out of a possible 3,444 members does not equal a majority. It is actually 24.4 per cent of the legal profession, less than one-quarter of the legal profession responding in favour of the change. The Attorney-General claims it is 'a majority of the legal profession'. The Attorney-General might not be a mathematician either, but in my books 24.4 per cent does not equate to a majority of the profession and the reasoning that that is a majority of the profession I think is riddled throughout the reasoning in support of this bill.

In fact, the majority of the legal profession did not even respond to the survey, so to suggest that it is a majority of the profession in favour makes no sense whatsoever. I think it is rather telling of the arguments that the government has made in support of this bill that they are seeking to misuse statistics to support it.

The opposition just cannot support the bill in its current form. We are putting forward amendments to make changes to what is a flawed bill, a bill that has been put forward with arguments that make little sense, a bill that has been put forward with modelling statistics that misrepresent the views of the profession. In the committee stage, we will be prosecuting the amendments and I will outline at clause 1 the nature and effect of those amendments, but in effect we have a couple of different scenarios, depending on the will of the chamber, about how to try to make some improvements to what is a bad bill.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:27): Of all the iconic Australian movies, the one that has added more to the Australian lexicon than any other is undoubtedly the 1997 classic *The Castle*. There would be very few people in this country who have not heard these phrases: 'Tell him he's dreamin', 'How's the serenity? So much serenity!', 'What do you call this, love?', 'Suffer in your jocks!', and the lawyer's favourite, 'It's the vibe.' Apparently there is a prize for any barrister who actually uses that phrase in a real courtroom, especially in the High Court, 'It's the vibe, Your Honours.'

I raise *The Castle* because there is another exchange in the movie that is less remembered but far more relevant to this bill. In the film, retired lawyer, Lawrence Hammill, played by Charles 'Bud' Tingwell, visits Darryl Kerrigan at his home and says, 'I don't think I introduced myself fully. I'm what's called a QC.' Darryl replies, 'Oh, a QC. You're one of those.' Darryl's wife, Sal Kerrigan, then asks, 'What's that?' Hammill responds, 'A Queen's Counsel.' Sal Kerrigan says, 'Oh, you counsel the Queen?' Darryl Kerrigan then chimes in with a fine bit of mansplaining, 'They're the lawyers rich people use, love.' To which Hammill replies, 'That's probably the most accurate way of describing us.'

At the end of the day, there is nothing more to this bill than the objective of enabling lawyers to extract more money from rich people. The legal profession, my original profession, has decided that they will be able to make more money if they are able to use the old royal moniker of Queen's Counsel rather than the more accurate but less time-honoured postnominal of SC or Senior Counsel. I appreciate that this bill has the support of the Law Society and the Bar Association. I understand their arguments, but I do not agree with them.

If there was no other consideration than simply doing what the legal profession wants then it might be a reasonable response to just shrug your shoulders and say, 'I don't really give two hoots what lawyers call themselves provided professional standards are maintained, services are affordable and they all have insurance in case something goes wrong,' but it is not that simple. As Australia emerges all too slowly from under Queen Victoria's skirts and inevitably, in my view, towards a republic, there are incremental opportunities that arise to symbolically and legislatively proclaim our true independence. In my view, the direction should be forwards, not backwards.

Many of us scoffed at former prime minister Tony Abbott's decision to go back to the age of knights and dames and to give the first new knighthood to a member of the royal family. That was a backwards step. Similarly, going backwards to designating senior lawyers as Queen's Counsel is in the same boat.

Some might scoff and say that reintroducing Queen's Counsel has no bearing at all on our nation's sovereignty or our independence. Legally, that might be the case, but symbolically it is very important. Recently, we have seen the 45-year-old palace letters released from the Australian Archives. The delay in releasing these important documents was largely due to legal interference from the palace in London.

Ultimately, it took a persistent historian, Jenny Hocking, and an Australian High Court decision before the letters were released. Whilst the letters do not appear to contain the smoking gun many had imagined, they do show that our then head of state, John Kerr, was far more open communicating about Australian constitutional matters with the hereditary British monarch than he was with the democratically elected prime minister of our nation.

Whether or not The Queen knew about the dismissal in advance is secondary, in my view, to the bigger story of the divided loyalties of her man in Yarralumla. I very much enjoyed Peter Goers' column on this topic in the *Sunday Mail* back in July. He said:

So an unelected foreigner, her representative, and a flunkey all discussed dismissing a democratically-elected Australian government. Then the Queen's representative, the governor-general, sacks the prime minister and dismisses the government and appoints another and then tells the Queen—although she was fully aware that this may happen—and did not advise against it.

So Sal Kerrigan in *The Castle* was on the money at least in relation to Sir John Kerr QC and counselling The Queen. Before the winter break I introduced a private member's bill to change the state constitution and the Oaths Act to remove the requirement for members of parliament and other public officials to swear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, her heirs and successors according to law. It will not be lost on members that, having moved such a bill, it would be unlikely that the Greens would be embracing a return to Queen's Counsel. It would be inconsistent, to put it mildly.

I would now like to briefly address the issue of the amendments. Whilst the Leader of the Opposition said they would be explained in more detail in clause 1, this is my understanding, and I am sure I will be corrected if I have got it wrong. Firstly, Labor's proposed replacement section 92 ensures that no QCs or KCs can be appointed by the Governor, the Attorney-General or a minister. It does not prohibit the appointment by the Chief Justice, but since the Chief Justice does not have that power anyway, presumably there would never be any new appointments of QCs or KCs under this model. It looks to be an effective ban on QCs, which I would support.

Secondly, Labor has not indicated that it will oppose section 93, presumably because it relates to existing SCs, QCs and KCs and not just to newly appointed counsel. Incidentally, I also find it odd that under the government's model appointment of QCs or KCs is the prerogative of the Governor, but removal of the appointment is the prerogative of the Chief Justice. This makes sense for SCs where the Chief Justice has both roles of appointment and revocation, but I am not sure it makes sense for QCs and KCs. It is the opposite to other models regarding appointments or declarations where the rule is 'easy in, hard out'—for example, removal of a serving judge.

Thirdly, Labor's alternative amendment to section 92, which replaces the word 'must' with 'may', appears to be a fallback position, which has the effect of allowing any government that did not want QCs or KCs the ability to simply withhold the names and never present them to the Governor. In other words, new QCs would presumably be allowed under a Liberal government but potentially not under a Labor government if that was the policy of the day. Also, whatever shade of government, the attorney-general of the day could pick and choose whose name to put forward. That is my understanding of the amendments; no doubt the leader will tell me if I have got any of that wrong.

One final point I would make is that, as others have pointed out, the current British monarch is elderly and will not live forever and the next few in line to the throne are all male. This would mean that any Queen's Counsel created under this bill would presumably become King's Counsel or KC. The bill reflects this, but the term KC is a term that most people have never heard of, which does bring into question the name recognition argument raised by supporters of the bill. Whilst probably none of us have ever met a barrister who was a KC, most of us have heard of KC and the Sunshine Band, the iconic funk and disco band out of America.

What does this have to do with the bill? As it turns out, by sheer coincidence, if we go back to November 1975, to Remembrance Day, that fateful day in Australian constitutional history, we can find the link. In November 1975, The Queen's representative in Australia, Sir John Robert Kerr AK GCMG GCVO QC, infamously sacked a democratically elected government. Also in November 1975, KC and the Sunshine Band released their greatest hit, 'That's the way (I like it)'.

Going back to the past, going back to an age of deference to an unelected hereditary monarchy living in a foreign country is not the way I like it. To finish, I will quote that other great constitutional lawyer from *The Castle*, Dennis Denuto, who brilliantly sums up why this bill should be opposed. He said in court, 'It's the vibe of it...It's the constitution. It's Mabo. It's justice. It's law. It's the vibe and, no, that's it, it's the vibe. I rest my case.'

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. J.E. Hanson): Thank you, the Hon. Mr Parnell. That was a great contribution: so many pop culture references. I thought you said you were not across that.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Commentary from the chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. J.E. Hanson): Excellent commentary from the chair, the Hon. Mr Maher.

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

HEALTH CARE (GOVERNANCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 June 2020.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (16:38): I rise to speak on this bill and indicate that I will be the lead speaker for the opposition. This bill is the reintroduction of the government's second governance bill, following the previous bill lapsing in the house last year. What we have is, 2½ years after the government was elected, they are still progressing legislation for their governance reforms. We have seen in our hospitals a worsening of ambulance ramping, a worsening of mental health patients stuck with inadequate care and a worsening of emergency department waiting times, bed closures and staff cuts.

By any measure, the Liberal government's reforms to health have failed to deliver for patients. There is now an increased silo'd health system with varying quality of patient care. There are now more buck passing problems between local health networks, entrenching a mindset of 'Not my geographical patch, not my problem'. There is no central coordination of dealing with the systemic problems facing the health system, and the health boards and the government are at open warfare, with all metropolitan health boards refusing government demands to sign a service level agreement over funding disputes.

This legislation certainly has been a long time coming. In 2018, the government introduced their so-called phase 1 of their legislative changes as part of a devolution of responsibility away from the chief executive of SA Health. That legislation passed in late 2018 and it was months until we finally saw the phase 2 legislation introduced in May 2019, near identical to the bill we have before us today—some 16 months later.

That phase 2 legislation passed through the Legislative Council in June last year, with the inclusion of several important amendments that I will return to shortly. Then, that bill sat on the House of Assembly *Notice Paper* for five long months.

Labor was completely prepared to debate the bill in the house, but to the government apparently it was not a priority before December last year, at which point parliament was prorogued. Almost five months into the parliamentary calendar year, only then was this legislation reintroduced. It has taken months since to get debated again in this council—15 months after we previously debated and passed a bill in an amended form.

When reintroducing the 2020 version of the bill, the minister in his second reading, put it this way:

Unfortunately, while the amendment bill did pass this place with amendments it did not pass the other place before parliament was prorogued.

That is a very roundabout way of saying that the government deliberately did not prioritise the bill for five months because they did not like the improvements made to the bill by this council in its important role as a house of review. It remains unclear why it could not have been reintroduced in the first week of February when parliament resumed. That was just before the full impact of the first wave of COVID-19 in SA understandably absorbed resources, time and attention in a multitude of areas across SA Health.

If there were substantive changes made following a period of further reflection on the SA government's governance structures, perhaps consideration of the Hon. Bruce Lander QC's

comments regarding the governance of SA Health for example may explain the delay of the reintroduction, but there were no changes brought forward in relation to the ICAC report—in fact, ignoring the warnings that I will go into a bit later.

If the lessons learned from COVID-19 has brought about substantive proposed changes to the legislation, that would have made sense, but the legislation before us is near identical to the legislation received in the House of Assembly some 16 months prior, but just with amendments the council had considered and which the government did not like taken out. Those amendments were presented following a range of stakeholders raising issues with the opposition and crossbenchers after being ignored by the government. The same stakeholders, unsurprisingly, have now raised those same issues again. They have not changed their views and neither have we.

The South Australian Council of Social Service and the coalition of stakeholders have come back together with an important list of proposed amendments. For the benefit of the council, the stakeholders asking for substantial change to the bill include: the South Australian Council of Social Service, the Health Consumer Alliance of SA, the Aboriginal Health Council of SA, the Lived Experience Leadership and Advocacy Network, the Australian Association of Social Workers SA, Occupational Therapy Australia, the SA Network of Drug and Alcohol Services, the Australian Health Promotion Association SA, the Public Health Association SA and the Mental Health Coalition.

I want to state for the record that this government first met with stakeholders about the bill after introducing the bill. They also told these stakeholders that, while this legislation had already been introduced, it should not be taken as an indication that the bill was done and dusted. Thoughts and amendments were welcome.

My opposition colleagues, during a later briefing, asked the government what time frame was provided to stakeholders for collating any feedback. We were told there were no precise deadlines given to stakeholders, but more a sort of general understanding or a vibe, if you will, that stakeholders would have a few weeks to get their thoughts through.

That was completely at odds with the government's decision a couple of months ago to list the bill as a priority and to try to rush it through the council. Just over a week after making a commitment to stakeholders to take their feedback on board, the government has evidently since delayed debate on the legislation for a number of months, but their incredibly poor form on stakeholder engagement still stands. The government could wait a year to progress this legislation, but apparently they did not have more than a week to try to take into account stakeholders' views.

For the benefit of the council, I will provide an overview of some of the changes that the opposition will be seeking to make during the committee stage. The opposition will once again support amendments that block the government's attempts to dissolve the Health Performance Council, an independent body tasked with oversight of the health system.

The Health Performance Council provides independent oversight and reporting to parliament, taking a statewide view of the health system. This government bill seeks to dissolve the council, taking away that independent voice. The newly created Wellbeing SA and the Commission for Excellence and Innovation in Health, bodies the minister suggests might pick up the work of the council, are not independent: they are offices of the department. They do not need to report to parliament. They do not consider the health system in the same way the council does, and they are subject to the direction of the minister. The SACOSS coalition of stakeholders put it this way in a letter to the minister:

If the Government wishes to replace the Health Performance Council...with a new Commission, it should come to the Parliament with a Bill to enshrine that Commission, its powers, oversight, reporting and independence—prior to advancing the dissolution of the HPC.

Occupational Therapy Australia, SA, states:

[Occupational Therapy Australia] is concerned that dissolving the Health Performance Council will limit the government's capacity to make informed decisions around service funding and to minimise health related disparities between segments of the South Australian population.

This is because these decisions will no longer be externally verified under the lens of interdisciplinary clinical expertise...

Rather than abolish the council, the minister should be considering ways the council might be improved, perhaps by empowering the council with a greater ability to collect and analyse data and to work with the researchers on designing improvements to the health system.

In the time this bill has sat waiting to be discussed, the previous Health Performance Council members finished their terms last month. They were advised before the winter break that the minister was 'considering a number of options' if this bill was still before parliament come August. Well, August has come. It turns out the minister's options were just to reduce the size of the council from six members down to just four.

The government is already cutting the council, ready for dissolution. The health minister is gutting it, ready to kill it off completely. Just last week we were provided a clear example of the ongoing relevance of the council. The council last Thursday released an alarming audit revealing the extent that SA Health is failing to deliver for Aboriginal people. The council audit labelled all but one of our health services as evidencing 'very high institutional racism'.

The audit itself was initiated after the council's recommendations to improve Aboriginal health outcomes, which they handed directly to the health minister almost two years ago, were ignored. So at the same time the health minister is ignoring their recommendations to improve health care, the minister is punishing the council by seeking to axe them and remove independent oversight.

It is vital that the council continue its operations or audits such as this, exposing the minister's failure to act, or much-needed improvements to the health system will simply not happen. I am sure it is uncomfortable to the minister to receive such a damning report on the treatment of Aboriginal people by the health system, but it is vital for our system that such a report be delivered. But if the minister has his way, that will be the last independent report he ever sees. He is shooting the messenger, removing the oversight and independence, and ensuring the health system faces less scrutiny in the future.

Also, Labor will again support amendments to enshrine the role of the mental health commissioner, a role that has disgracefully fragmented into three part-time commissioners and been stripped of resources, an office, independence, influence and powers under this government and this health minister. The axing by stealth of the Mental Health Commission was an unforgivable act undertaken by this government and this health minister.

Out of all the aspects of our health system requiring the utmost level of oversight and accountability, mental health is right at the top, yet this government has seen fit to strip to bare bones the one entity tasked with the power to provide that oversight. As Lived Experience Australia told the opposition:

We are concerned that LHNs, and mental health services in particular, have become increasingly hospital and emergency department focused, with less focus on community mental health services.

We are concerned that the economic imperative is the predominant driver for the LHNs, rather than the quality of care to consumers.

And as the CEO of a non-government organisation delivering mental health services put to us:

...the Mental Health Commissioner...should be a properly legislated part of our health system, and the reducing of the position to part time is a slap in the face of an industry already under resourced and battling to help some of society's most needy participants. The position should be full time, legislated, and then backed up with appropriate resources and authority!

We will do what we can with this legislation to try to restore what has been destroyed under this government by enshrining the commission in statute. The opposition will also move to enshrine in legislation the existence of a consumer advisory body funded by government. This seeks to reverse the government's \$1.5 million cut to the Health Consumers Alliance, leaving South Australia as the only jurisdiction, the sole jurisdiction in Australia without a consumer voice. The SACOSS coalition of stakeholders suggested the following:

Amend the Act to give consumers and those with lived experience an independent voice.

This could be done by inserting at section 7, that the Chief Executive shall ensure a percentage (to be set by regulation) of the funding amount allocated to LHNs, through their service agreements, is directed to an independent, non-government health consumer organisation, for individual and systemic representation and advocacy, and to

enable evidence-informed consumer and community engagement in health care services policy, planning and services.

While recognising the constraints on the Legislative Council for introducing this amendment verbatim, the opposition will move amendments that give effect to the overall intent of the stakeholder coalition's suggested course of action. This is yet another way the government is moving to remove independent oversight and voices on the delivery of healthcare services. Consumer voices in the future will not be independent if the government has its way. Consumer voices will be subject to the control of health regions.

The opposition will once again vote against government attempts to loosen the eligibility requirements over governing board members. These changes that the government is seeking to make would mean that individuals working for a consultancy firm providing services to an LHN, unbelievably, could also sit on the governing board of the same LHN. As SASMOA summarised it:

The newly proposed change to this section now places a significant risk that the interest of the individual's non-pecuniary and pecuniary interest could have a priority over the public hospital interests and the community who subsidise our State hospital services, eroding confidence in the governance...

The closer the individual is to influence the outcome of a hospital tender or procurement process, in provision of a service to a hospital or selection of senior executives, the greater the public requires protection from such misconduct.

Perhaps the most strident criticism of this amendment has come from the outgoing ICAC commissioner, the Hon. Bruce Lander QC, who warned that these proposals could heighten the risk of conflicts of interest within SA Health. Members would know, of course, that the ICAC has delivered a scathing report of SA Health, the same report that the health minister did not read before he announced his report for setting up a weak task force response.

One of the areas the commissioner was particularly scathing was in relation to conflicts of interest. He said this was a dangerous risk for SA Health and one of the areas of risk for maladministration and corruption, so it seems strange to the opposition that following this scathing report on conflicts of interest the government would seek to introduce a change that would, in fact, increase the risks of conflicts of interest.

The opposition wrote to the ICAC commissioner asking if he had been consulted and asking for his views on the proposal from the government in this area. The response we received from the ICAC commissioner is extraordinary. It is definitely worth reading and considering before voting on this dangerous proposition, and the opposition will seek to table a copy of the letter from the ICAC commissioner when we get to this area in committee. The commissioner's written feedback included this specific warning about the amendment:

...could heighten the possibility that a Governing Board member will have a conflict of interest.

He went on to say:

Relaxing the eligibility criteria for membership to a local health network Governing Board will tend to heighten the risk of actual, perceived and potential conflicts of interest emerging for those Board members who may provide services to a relevant local health network.

In light of the existence of this control measure, I regard it as a question for the Parliament if the Parliament wishes to remove eligibility criteria that would further reduce the risk of the occurrence of conflicts of interest.

The commissioner has rightfully called out these proposals for what they are, a clear risk to the integrity of our health system. I take this opportunity to once again remind the council of the minister's comments upon the introduction of the first phase of the government's reforms. He said:

I would urge members not to create conflicts of interest problems, probity issues, for the boards.

Yet, here he is again attempting to remove protections against potential conflicts of interest that the minister himself established in 2018. The minister is ignoring the ICAC report and ignoring the review of the ICAC on these provisions. If this clause goes ahead, there is no doubt there will be greater risk of conflicts of interest—exactly the opposite lesson the government should be learning from the ICAC report.

For the record, we asked the government for concrete examples of what the current conflict of interest rules are holding back from participation and, as you would expect, we never received any

examples. We will absolutely be voting against this provision and would encourage other members to reflect on the views of the ICAC and not allow this risk for corruption or maladministration to creep into the legislation.

As a result of discussions with stakeholders and further consideration of the bill since it was last brought before this council, the opposition will remove several additional amendments, increasing transparency and accountability over the new governance model. As Lived Experience Australia summarised in their submission to the opposition:

...the assumption and expectation is that LHNs will be increasingly autonomous and be able to report on their information and activity. We have concerns about independence of reporting when an organisation is reporting on itself without independent oversight.

Labor will seek to go some way to addressing these concerns about a lack of oversight and accountability by moving amendments to:

- subject board member appointments and removals to publication in the *Government Gazette* (at the moment, there is no notification to anyone of decisions that the minister makes in relation to board appointments, and some pay very lucratively);
- require that the disclosure of board members' conflicts of interest be published on a website, as opposed to the current register of interest, which is only accessible via a visit to the physical register at the individual hospital, and officers have told us they were unable to take records if requested; and
- require that any direction made by the minister in relation to the service agreements of governing boards is published on a website within 14 days of the direction being given.

This last amendment seeks to provide some transparency over an ongoing concern the opposition has with this bill: how disputes between governing boards and SA Health over funding agreements are managed.

Again, during the opposition briefing, my colleagues were assured that minister involvement in service agreements would only come as a last resort and only after a range of other strategies had been attempted and exhausted. But what we have seen is that, in disputes over service agreements, we have already reached what appear to be irreconcilable clashes. We have heard that governing boards with concerns about fulfilling their director's duties feel they cannot accept the level of funding put to them by SA Health, including significant cuts, and so we witnessed many stalemates over service agreements for the 2019-20 financial year.

My opposition colleagues confirmed during their briefing on the bill that, if a service agreement between a governing board and SA Health is not on the website, it means an agreement has not been signed. At the very end of the 2019-20 financial year, all four metropolitan LHNs were operating without a funding agreement for that year, let alone moving to consider the current year's agreement. It is just extraordinary that metro LHN boards are all refusing to sign the minister's service level agreements for all of the past financial year and none of them have signed up for this year either.

Clearly, there are already big disagreements over our major services, so telling the opposition the minister would only intervene where all other options have been exhausted does not seem completely out of the question. Clearly, the minister would immediately use these provisions to overrule objections of his own boards.

One chair of a board said to the opposition that board members might have to consider resigning as the only option available if they were unsatisfied with the service level agreement presented. The ANMF has also raised concerns regarding the potential negative impact of two proposed amendments upon the consistency of those employed across LHNs and the ability of governing boards to have control over their CEOs with regard to employment matters outside of 'hiring and firing'.

We understand these concerns and proposed amendments to alleviate these concerns have been clearly provided to the government. We will be seeking to ensure those proposed amendments are passed through this council.

The disagreement and stagnation on funding agreements is one clear example of where the minister's reforms are failing, but I will finish with another one. We know that South Australia's health response to COVID-19 has been very good under the fantastic leadership of Professor Nicola Spurrier and deputy chief public health officers, along with police commissioner Grant Stevens. But there are some lessons to be learned and one of those was very clearly outlined by the nurses' federation in their appearance before parliament's COVID-19 committee a couple of months ago.

The Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation outlined serious concerns about delays and widespread divergent policies across the local health networks when it came to the supply and use of personal protective equipment in our hospitals. Associate Professor Elizabeth Debars of the ANMF outlined the poor experience the federation had in trying to get clear information about PPE and then went on to say:

We have had very serious concerns about the LHN and this alleged decision-making at the local level.

That's ideal in one sense, but on the other hand it provides for continuing inaction and lack of consistency and transparency when things are or could be directed from a single overseeing level.

We think: why on earth would you produce five different policies or five different procedures just based on your geographical location when surely, in most instances, there should be one clear way of doing things in a health context?

It is clear from the fragmented nature of governance brought about by this government that it is already creating challenges and unfortunately one of those challenges came to the forefront at the worst possible time for our health system. At a time when South Australia needed rapid and consistent statewide action in responding to COVID-19 and ensuring our clinicians were appropriately protected by PPE, that clear communication rollout was lacking.

While the opposition remains open to supporting this legislation to provide further clarity to the operation of these governing boards, that support will be predicated on a number of important amendments gaining the support of this council, just like the council has previously done. It is a disrespect to the Legislative Council and the people of South Australia that the minister would seek to just reintroduce this bill and ignore the significant improvements that were made by the council to the previous bill and, more importantly, completely ignore the findings of the ICAC last year.

The opposition looks forward to again working with members to improve this bill and discussing the many outstanding concerns with this legislation during the committee phase.

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

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (ACCOUNTABILITY AND OTHER MEASURES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 July 2020.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (17:02): I rise to indicate that I will be the lead speaker for the government on this bill. In August 2016, the former Jay Weatherill Labor government announced its reducing reoffending 10by20 Strategic Policy Panel to investigate the best practice and strategies of reduced rates of reoffending and promote rehabilitation and reintegration outcomes. A commitment of \$79.13 million was made to implement the six strategies and 36 recommendations of the panel, a clear pillar of which was to amend the Correctional Services Act.

These amendments would support a reduction in reoffending through a greater emphasis on individual case management, access to rehabilitation and vocational training for people on remand and enhancements to prison security. In 2017, the then minister for correctional services, the member for Kaurua in the other place, introduced the Correctional Services (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2017. Due to the time constraints of parliament, all stages of that bill in both chambers were not completed and the bill was not passed.

In 2018, the current Liberal government introduced the Correctional Services (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2018 to honour election commitments relating to serious and

organised crime and alcohol and drug testing of staff. Bizarrely, the 2018 bill did not replicate any of the measures aimed at reducing reoffending by 10 per cent by 2020.

Indeed, while the opposition is deeply committed to supporting these measures that we instigated, we fear these measures are being delayed for so long that it may make them unlikely to have the desired effect. Despite the lip service we have seen paid to bipartisanship around the principle of 10by20 (reducing recidivism rates by 10 per cent by 2020), we have seen no real action up until this point. It will not have escaped members' notice that it is in fact 2020 now.

According to the data available, we have seen a trend downwards in recidivism rates over the last five years. We will know, in January 2023, when the final review of government services figures comes out, whether we have been successful in reducing the rate by 10 per cent by this year. It seems self-evident that, if your aim is to reduce reoffending by a significant amount by the year 2020, you would have to put some measures in place before 2020 to make that happen. It begs the question of why it has taken so long to get these measures in place. It is not as though the work has not already been done.

There is every chance that these measures, designed to reduce reoffending by 10 per cent by 2020, may not even be enacted until 2021. The government has now introduced the Correctional Services (Accountability and Other Measures) Amendment Bill 2020. This bill is largely identical to the former government's bill, with only minor amendments and some additions, which the opposition believes are worthy of support. The bill therefore completes the work of the 2017 bill proposed by the former Labor government.

The bill inserts an objects and guiding principles section. The bill places a greater emphasis on end-to-end case management as part of prisoner and offender assessment, planning and review functions, including specific provisions around work undertaken as a condition of parole. The bill contains new provisions allowing the chief executive to compel staff to participate fully in post-incident reviews and investigation processes, as well as new provisions around staff integrity and the chief executive's power to remove suspect staff from sites.

The bill provides that remuneration of Parole Board members will now be determined by the Remuneration Tribunal, bringing the Parole Board into line with other government boards. The bill introduces buffer zones for the purposes of possession of drugs under the Controlled Substances Act 1984 and increases penalties for possession. It also increases penalties for unauthorised mobile telephones within a buffer zone surrounding prison sites. The bill introduces an enhanced independent prison inspection scheme.

The bill prevents automatic parole for offenders for offences of dealing or trafficking drugs. Currently, offenders who are sentenced to less than five years' imprisonment for offences of dealing or trafficking drugs are eligible for automatic parole. To maintain the integrity of prison operations, the bill contains new provisions to safeguard prisons from the potential risks associated with drones and other forms of aircraft.

The bill provides better support for the principles in the Public Sector Data Sharing Act 2016 and the information-sharing guidelines by improving access to information in appropriate circumstances and to relevant people, such as family and kin, and to agencies. Appropriate release of certain information will create greater transparency and accountability. The bill also allows for the recording and dissemination of recordings of calls, including to a court, by external justice agencies for intelligence and investigative or evidentiary purposes.

The bill includes new provisions for the protection of biometric data from misuse. The bill limits prisoners' use of mail in certain circumstances, including preventing prisoners from directly or indirectly contacting any victim, alleged victim or person associated with their offending.

The bill provides for the automatic suppression of a victim's name, where a victim makes a civil claim against a prisoner in regard to an amount awarded to a prisoner that is paid into the Prisoner Compensation Quarantine Fund. The bill provides that 50 per cent of funds held to a prisoner's credit at the conclusion of the quarantine period be credited to the Victims of Crime Fund, with the remaining 50 per cent credited to the prisoner's resettlement account, to be used for rehabilitation and reintegration at the conclusion of the prisoner's sentence.

The bill introduces new criminal offences around prisoners assembling and rioting to give correctional officers greater authority to control disorder in prisons. It is worth noting that when the 2018 bill was introduced the shadow minister in the other place introduced some of the above measures as amendments, which reflected measures in the previous government's bill. These were:

- preventing automatic parole for drug traffickers;
- protecting victims from mail contact from prisoners and preventing contact with co-offenders by mail; and
- establishing buffer zones around prisons, where drug offences are essentially amplified.

These measures were not supported by the government in 2018 and the opposition has still not received any satisfactory answer as to why nor why they appear in almost identical form in this bill two years later.

While supporting this bill, the shadow minister in the other place put forward some further amendments which addressed some of the recommendations of the 1991 Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody. There were hundreds of recommendations, many of which have been implemented in various jurisdictions, just not in corrections but in police departments and across government generally. The amendments brought in by the shadow minister gave expression to one particular recommendation of the royal commission, recommendation 168, which states:

That Corrective Services effect the placement and transfer of Aboriginal prisoners according to the principle that, where possible, an Aboriginal prisoner should be placed in an institution as close as possible to the place of residence of his or her family. Where an Aboriginal prisoner is subject to a transfer to an institution further away from his or her family the prisoner should be given the right to appeal that decision.

The Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement in South Australia supported the amendment in this area and expressed a view that it would very much improve the rehabilitation prospects of Aboriginal offenders and, therefore, reduce recidivism. The intention was to insert in the objects and principles a new principle to recognise the particular importance of family and community involvement, and participation in the rehabilitation of prisoners and probationers who are Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander persons.

The former minister, to his credit, accepted the premise of this recommendation, yet he then bizarrely introduced his own amendment which meant that the prisoner or family were only entitled to seek a review of the transfer 'in relation to regional transfers where the person will be 200 kilometres or further from the correctional institution they are being transferred from'. We believe that this is an unnecessary alteration. It would in fact mean that, in most cases, a prisoner transfer would not be reviewable. This makes a mockery of the recommendation of the royal commission.

I will be introducing an amendment to remove this part of the provision so that every transfer of an Aboriginal prisoner is subject to this section and is able to be reviewed under this regime. I will be seeking the support of the council with that amendment. Having said that, we look forward to the successful passage of this bill with its Labor amendments and note it has been a long time coming.

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

Parliamentary Committees

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE STATUTES AMENDMENT (ANIMAL WELFARE REFORMS) BILL

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.A. Franks:

1. That the number of members who shall form a quorum of council members necessary to be present at all sittings of the Joint Committee on the Statutes Amendment (Animal Welfare Reforms) Bill be one member;
2. That it be an instruction to the Joint Committee on the Statutes Amendment (Animal Welfare Reforms) Bill that during the period of any declaration of a major emergency made under section 23 of the Emergency Services Act 2004 or any declaration of a public health emergency made under section 87 of the South Australian Public Health Act 2011 members of the committee may participate in the proceedings by way of telephone or videoconference or other electronic means and shall be deemed to be presented and counted for purposes of a quorum, subject to such means of participation remaining effective and not disadvantaging any member; and

3. That a message be sent to the House of Assembly transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence to the instruction.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (17:13): This is a motion moved by the Hon. Ms Franks. I and I think the opposition whip are unaware of its genesis yesterday, but evidently there had been discussions that went on with our colleagues, perhaps in another place. Whilst the Hon. Ms Franks is indisposed because of illness or injury at the moment, I am comfortable and I think the Hon. Mr Hunter, on behalf of the opposition, may well be in the same position to support the motion to allow the work of the committee to continue in a potentially COVID-impacted environment. I am advised through, I think, the minister in another place, but the minister who is handling the bill in our chamber, minister Lensink, that we are prepared to support the motion.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (17:14): On behalf of the opposition, we are prepared to support the motion.

Motion carried.

Motions

REGIONAL BUS SERVICES

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. C.M. Scriven:

That this council—

- (a) acknowledges the importance of regional city and township bus services to rural communities;
- (b) calls on the state government to conduct a review of all regional city and township bus services to ensure they are adequately funded and are providing a transport service that meets the needs of those communities; and
- (c) calls on the state government to provide the completed report to this council by 30 October 2020.

(Continued from 22 July 2020.)

The Hon. T.T. NGO (17:14): I rise to support this motion of the Hon. Clare Scriven about regional bus services in South Australia. I bring members' attention to the Hammond electorate. With its closest boundary not far from Adelaide, Hammond includes Murray Bridge. In this regional area, South Australians do not have access to a public transport network and services like there are in Adelaide.

Murray Bridge is at a distance where locals might feasibly want to regularly commute to Adelaide, maybe even daily, for work. Google Maps suggests a car-bound commuter from Murray Bridge reaches Adelaide in about an hour, yet research by my staff suggests that someone living in Murray Bridge wanting to use transport services to Adelaide, perhaps because they do not own a vehicle, needs to catch a privately operated bus, with one-way ticket prices around \$24. Or they can choose a train, catching the *Overland*, which I understand costs around \$30 one way and looks to take at least two hours.

My staff might be wrong about the limited transport options for Murray Bridge residents travelling to Adelaide. In fact, I hope they are. It appears that someone living in Gawler driving to Adelaide has a similar travelling time as a Murray Bridge to Adelaide commuter. Google Maps suggests it is about a 50 to 55-minute drive from Gawler to the city, yet the Gawler commuter can pay around \$5 for an adult fare on a publicly run train into the city, where they arrive around 50 to 70 minutes later, depending on stops along the way. This suggests to me that, if you live regionally, getting into Adelaide when you do not own a vehicle costs you more time and obviously more money.

The Marshall government's recent attempt to cut bus access in Adelaide highlighted to me that some people build their lives around public transport. For some, these are essential services and the only way they can, and can afford, to travel to school, work, doctors and other services. In our regional communities, without public transport services comparable to Adelaide and suburbs, people without a driver's licence and car likely live near what they need and use.

At this worrying economic time, there may be others living further from amenities, unable to afford to run cars and without public transport networks as a back-up. Again, I hope they can be corrected, but my staff struggled to find information about public transport services in Murray Bridge

that could in any way be compared to services that we have in Adelaide. Adequate and affordable transport services are crucial for regional commuters and they are key in helping people move around their communities and into other communities.

If this pandemic has exposed nothing else, it has made it clear that people need to be engaged with those around them. It is part of the human condition. If the Marshall Liberal government cares about regional South Australians it must do more for regional communities and the people living within them. This government must pursue accessible, affordable and available transport for all South Australians so they can get to work, to school and to the services they need no matter where they live.

Furthermore, this government must stop making the few existing services harder to access. No doubt members recall the recent Marshall Liberal government's funding cuts to the *Overland* train service, which was picked up by the Victorian Labor government that now runs services only twice per week. If you care about regional South Australia then I call on you to accept this motion to review bus services in the regions, with a view to identifying if services are funded adequately and if they meet the needs of locals.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:19): I rise to say that we support the motion of the Hon. Clare Scriven and the intent of this motion, because it is clear that our regional communities are at a disadvantage. Only today, I was told of a child who needs to come to Adelaide regularly and has to take an infrequent bus service for hospital treatment. The child and the family must remain in Adelaide for four days before getting a bus to take them back home. I think this is unfair and discriminates against the people who live in our regional areas.

Of course, as members in this place would know, I have often spoken of the need for a visionary government to look at reinvigorating our regional rail, which has been allowed to fall into disrepair. We no longer have regular passenger train services to some areas of our regions, and that really is shameful. Again, the regions are being left at a disadvantage by having to rely on infrequent bus schedules just for things that we take for granted here in the city, when they have to take trips from the country into the city for various reasons, whether they be for health reasons or other business they may have.

Is it any wonder, when we do not have such reliable or frequent transport to our regional areas, that these areas are not able to attract more people to live and work there? I imagine that if we did have a good and reliable system of public transport to these regions we would see a boom in some of these areas, particularly in times such as now when our economy is being torn apart by the coronavirus.

It will not be long now before it comes into the summer fruit picking season, and I am sure that people in the Riverland and other parts of the state are going to be reliant on fruit pickers. The transient workers that they have been used to in the past, such as backpackers, are no longer here, and they are going to be crying out for help. People are going to need to get to those regions. They are going to need to get to those regions on a reliable and frequent basis. These are things that I think the government really should start to address. In saying that, I speak on behalf of my colleague the Hon. Connie Bonaros and we wholeheartedly support the motion.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (17:23): I move to amend the motion as follows:

Delete paragraphs (b) and (c) and insert new paragraphs (b) and (c) as follows:

- (b) acknowledges that the state government established the South Australian Public Transport Authority to identify future options for regional public transport; and
- (c) notes that the last time such a review was undertaken was more than 20 years ago.

I have to say that when I listen to speeches from members of the Australian Labor Party, such as the Hon. Ms Scriven and the Hon. Mr Ngo, on regional services and regional bus services, I nearly gag on the hypocrisy I hear dripping from every word they utter from their well-prepared speeches on the issue.

The Australian Labor Party, the former Labor government, could not give a stuff about regional services. They did nothing. They did stuff all for 16 years in government and they sit there on the opposition benches pontificating about the need for regional bus services to here, there and

everywhere, when for 16 years they steadfastly ignored every single plea, every single submission, every single request from regional areas to have a look at it.

It is the wonderful joy of being in opposition that they can enjoy the joy of pretending to care, but they can also accept the criticism that will rightfully come, not just from the government but from people in regional areas because, as I said, they know the hypocrisy of the Australian Labor Party when it comes to regional services. They know the hypocrisy of the Australian Labor Party when it comes to regional bus services in this particular case, but a whole variety of other services as well.

The government is committed to supporting public transport services in regional areas and currently provides \$6.1 million in operating subsidies to operators and \$5.3 million in concession reimbursements for concession fares as provided to eligible passengers. The Department for Infrastructure and Transport currently administers 28 contracts for public transport bus services in regional South Australia, with varying contracting and financial models.

Regional public transport services include long-distance services between Adelaide and regional centres (Country Bus Services) and localised services that provide access in and between towns (Provincial City and Integrated Services). These arrangements were borne out of a review done in the early 2000s—more than 20 years ago.

After the 16 long years of hard Labor, of the Labor Party ignoring the regions and its services, today's motion is a fig leaf of care for the regions—political pointscoring at its worst. The regions are undoubtedly better off with a Liberal government on the Treasury benches and are already reaping the rewards.

The government is continuously working with service providers to ensure services remain viable and improvements can be introduced wherever possible. This process includes regularly reviewing all services across the regional network with regard to resource allocation, route design, service frequency and patronage demand. All contractors are encouraged to review services regularly to determine if the services are continuing to meet the requirements of the community and to see whether there are any opportunities to change these services to increase patronage.

Given the diverse range of transport needs of regional communities, the government also supports different models of service provision. This includes on-demand transport services which are operating in Port Lincoln, Victor Harbor and the Barossa Valley. This flexible, demand-responsive model is effective in meeting specific needs of communities, particularly for people with mobility constraints or people with disabilities.

While on-demand transport services have been in place for some time, technological advancements that allow online booking, payment and real-time vehicle tracking have prompted investment in trialling this technology in both the regional and metropolitan context. In Renmark, in May 2018, the Future Mobility Lab Fund invested in a two-year trial to utilise fully electric EZ10 autonomous shuttles. That was put on pause because of COVID, but it is hoped that the trial can start again soon.

Further, in 2019, as part of this investment, \$857,893 to be precise, from the Future Mobility Lab, administered by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport, was allocated for a trial of an on-demand transport service in the Barossa Valley for a six-month period. This trial was a temporary upgrade of the existing dial-a-ride service operating in that region, however enhanced the service through additional vehicles, lower fares and increased operating hours.

Ticket prices were reduced from the dial-a-ride price of \$11.60 for an adult and \$5.80 for concessions to \$6 for adults and \$3 for concessions, including seniors. The trial introduced the Via app to the service where passengers could book their travel, track their vehicle and pay for their trip through the app. Telephone bookings and cash payments were maintained in parallel to the trial to maintain these options for those passengers who were not confident or comfortable to transition to the app.

The trial ended on 13 August 2020 and while the service parameters and operating hours have reverted back to pre-trial levels, the Department for Infrastructure and Transport was able to secure the reduced fares and the use of the app as permanent features of the existing on-demand transport service. The government is committed to continually identifying new and innovative service

models that meet the diverse and changing needs of our regional communities that were left in the cold too long.

The government also supports 16 community passenger networks in South Australia across the regions. These community passenger networks provide a resource to enable the community to make better use of existing passenger transport services in the region and ensure that all people who are transport disadvantaged, including the frail aged and people with disabilities, can access community services, facilities and social activities.

From 1 July 2020, the government established the South Australian Public Transport Authority with one of its key responsibilities to identify future options for regional public transport to ensure services continue to remain viable, while also providing affordable and accessible services to their communities. The government and the South Australian Public Transport Authority remain committed to exploring strategies to ensure regional services remain viable and will continue to advocate for funding to enable a detailed review to be undertaken.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (17:29): I indicate that the opposition opposes the amendment moved by the Treasurer. More on that in a moment, but I would like to thank the Hon. Mr Ngo, the Hon. Mr Pangallo and the Treasurer for their contributions. Since moving this motion in our last sitting week, I have been appointed as Labor's shadow minister for regional development, so it becomes even more important in terms of those new responsibilities to ensure that there is a widespread review of regional public transport.

The amendments the Treasurer has moved I would suggest to this chamber cannot be supported simply because they are not true. His first amendment acknowledges that the state government supposedly established the South Australian Public Transport Authority to identify future options for regional public transport. If that were the case, given that the Public Transport Authority was a promise of the Liberals when they were in opposition, I would have thought we would find such a thing in their policy document.

'What we'll do', in their policy document on the first page is: 'We want a public transport system that ranks with the best in the world for a city of Adelaide's size'—and I quote that. There is no mention there of any regional services.

Looking at SAPTA, the South Australian Public Transport Authority, the Liberals said that they needed a public transport system which 'increases the number of people who can get around our city and suburbs more efficiently'. It then talks about the various functions of SAPTA, and there are about seven of them. Seven functions of SAPTA, but none of them, not one, mention regional services, so it is a little hard to see how the Treasurer can move that first part of the amendment.

Looking further into that document, it talks about the 'City centre tram services', the city being Adelaide, just in case anyone was wondering—I do not think anyone was in any doubt, but just in case; the O-Bahn; the north-south rail connection, which is not connecting the north and south of the state, I might add; and the north-western suburbs. All of those no doubt have merit, but none of them relate to regional services.

So I went to the Department for Infrastructure and Transport website—because again, if this was one of the purposes of SAPTA, I am sure we would be able to find reference to it in detail on the website. When one browses by topic under public transport, we get Adelaide Metro; ferries—I do acknowledge ferries are regional, but perhaps not what most people think of in terms of public transport; taxi and chauffeur car review; and taxis.

Then, under the public transport projects there is the city tram extension; the electrification of public trains in Adelaide; Flinders Link, which is referring to the Flinders University area, not anywhere else in the state; Gawler; north-east; Port dock; O-Bahn; Hove; and Ovingham. So there is no reference there at all to this supposed role of SAPTA to identify future options for regional public transport. The second part of the amendment says that this council:

...notes that the last time such a review was undertaken was more than 20 years ago.

Again, that cannot be supported because it is not true. The Environment, Resources and Development Committee of this very chamber did a review of public transport, including regional public transport, commencing in April 2008 and published on 1 December 2009. So I put to the

chamber that for those reasons the amendment cannot be supported, because we would be acknowledging and noting things that were simply incorrect.

To sum up the overall reason for the motion, we are looking at a number of issues for regional residents when we are talking about public transport. A number of contributors have quite rightly mentioned the difficulty, or in some cases inability, to get from a regional area to Adelaide, be it for medical reasons, study or other reasons, unless one has a car—that people cannot use public transport options because they are either non-existent or very minimal.

The bus companies that currently have contracts to provide services within regional towns and regional cities on the whole do a very good job, considering the constraints they are under, but because of those constraints the services that are provided do not meet the needs of regional residents.

I mentioned when I moved this motion that even people in major population centres such as Mount Gambier cannot use the public bus service to get to a job within the city that perhaps starts at 8.30 or 9 o'clock. It is a major barrier to employment if you cannot get to your job using anything other than your own vehicle. If you do not have a vehicle or you cannot drive, then that is simply an impossibility for you.

If we are to succeed in the plan to grow the regions, to attract people to our regional areas, to increase populations in regional towns and to stem the decrease and contraction of smaller townships, we need to ensure that basic services are available such as public transport. In the major population centres, that needs to be transport where people can get around the towns or regional cities in a way that enables them to access the services they need and to attend things such as study and employment. In the small, outlying areas there needs to be some option to access major towns in the area.

An example relatively close to Adelaide is the member for Mawson's advocacy for the town of Myponga to be connected to regular and reliable public transport. The member for Giles has raised the issue of being able to travel between Port Augusta and Whyalla. Each of those two regional cities have specific services that are available only in those two cities in that region and yet there is no viable option to travel between them. That might be to access health services or study options or other purposes.

The member for Frome has spoken with me about the difficulty of people, for example, who live in Gladstone or Laura who cannot get to Port Pirie for medical appointments or TAFE or for other such matters. In the Riverland we find that, again, there is a bus service but it starts at around 9.30 in the morning. It does connect Loxton, Berri, Renmark and Paringa but it is not able to be used if the reasons you need to be in those towns are for reasons before 9.30 in the morning—work being an obvious one for many people.

There is a Red Cross bus for medical transport but, again, that is the type of service that we see has risen in many regional areas which does not work for everyone. It is valuable where it is but there should be a more integrated and coordinated system available so that people are not disadvantaged because they are living in a regional area. I have mentioned on a number of occasions the difficulties within Mount Gambier and, for example, trying to move between Mount Gambier and Millicent for work or study, and other townships as well.

I will briefly address a couple of other problems in the Treasurer's response and draw to his attention that there were improvements, for example, in 2016-17 to services in Port Pirie. The criticism that he is levelling at Labor is simply a shield to try to avoid supporting this review now. If, indeed, as the Liberals often say, they support regions, why would they not support a simple review into the public transport options that are available, the needs of regional residents and, therefore, support this motion in its original form? The answer is that they only pretend to care about regions. I urge the council to support the original motion as moved by me and to reject the amendments, which are untrue, of the Treasurer.

Amendment negated; motion carried.

Bills

TRAINING AND SKILLS DEVELOPMENT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

Parliamentary Committees

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE STATUTES AMENDMENT (ANIMAL WELFARE REFORMS) BILL

The House of Assembly agreed to the Legislative Council's resolution.

At 17:50 the council adjourned until Tuesday 22 September 2020 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***CORONAVIRUS**

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (21 July 2020).

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

The barrier serves to delineate the COVID-19 clinic space and limit entry to those attending the clinic.

The height of the barrier is 2.7 metres which is deemed appropriate to the droplet transmission of COVID-19.

In the area where the gaps above the barrier are present there are no procedures occurring; it is a waiting room. As per protocol, all patients in the COVID-19 clinic waiting room wear surgical masks. There are no aerosol generating procedures being undertaken in the COVID-19 clinic. There are no small gaps between the wall panels.

The swabs are performed in closed clinic rooms and this is the only area where the patients remove their masks and reapply their masks prior to exiting the clinic room after the swabs have been taken.

CORONAVIRUS, HEALTH ADVICE

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (23 July 2020).

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

1. SAPOL has observed excellent compliance by the community of South Australia and is undertaking regular compliance checks with details updated daily on the sa.gov website. If a person is found to be missing, inquiries are conducted to locate the person. The ability to identify people who are not complying has also improved through better processes for monitoring the testing regime.

2. SAPOL advise Australia Border Force have not approved any offshore leave for international vessels. crew members are permitted to undertake loading and unloading tasks providing they apply correct personal protective equipment whilst interacting with others. The only exception to offshore leave is for urgent medical reasons which occurs via police escort there and back via a sterile corridor.

CORONAVIRUS RESTRICTIONS

In reply to **the Hon. J.A. DARLEY** (23 July 2020).

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

1. SAPOL has observed excellent compliance by the community of South Australia and is undertaking regular compliance checks with details updated daily on the sa.gov website. If a person is found to be missing, inquiries are conducted to locate the person. The ability to identify people who are not complying has also improved through better processes for monitoring the testing regime.

2. SAPOL advise Australia Border Force have not approved any offshore leave for international vessels. crew members are permitted to undertake loading and unloading tasks providing they apply correct personal protective equipment whilst interacting with others. The only exception to offshore leave is for urgent medical reasons which occurs via police escort there and back via a sterile corridor.