

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, 4 May 2021

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins)** took the chair at 14:15 and read prayers.

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

Bills

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (CAUSING DEATH BY USE OF MOTOR VEHICLE) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (ACCOUNTABILITY AND OTHER MEASURES) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

Members

MEMBERS, SWEARING IN

The President produced a commission from His Excellency the Governor authorising him to administer the oath of allegiance to members of the Legislative Council.

The President produced a letter from the Clerk of the Assembly of Members notifying that the Assembly of Members of both houses of parliament had elected Mr Robert Andrew Simms to fill the vacancy in the Legislative Council caused by the resignation of the Hon. M.C. Parnell.

The Hon. Robert Simms, who made an affirmation of allegiance, took his seat in the Legislative Council, in place of the Hon. M.C. Parnell (resigned).

Condolence

GROOM, MR T.R.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:21): I move:

That the Legislative Council expresses its deep regret at the recent death of Mr Terry Robert Groom, former minister of the Crown and member of the House of Assembly, and places on record its appreciation of his distinguished public service, and that as a mark of respect to his memory the sitting of the council be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

It is with much regret that I rise to speak to this particular condolence motion. Sometimes, I am sure, as with other honourable members, we speak to condolence motions for people with whom we have had not much connection over the years. In the case of Terry Groom, a number of us I suspect—probably more so in the Labor Party, but certainly from my side—had a long, ongoing association with Terry Groom. I knew Terry mainly in a political sense, as will become apparent from my comments. I know I speak on behalf of all my colleagues when I say we regret the fact that we are speaking to this particular condolence motion this afternoon.

Terry Groom was first defeated in 1975 at the election for the seat of Hanson, which was then in the western suburbs, a coastal seat. It was an election during the Dunstan decade that was called early, as all the elections during that decade were called. There were elections in 1973, 1975, 1977 and 1979. They were called on a two-yearly basis for differing reasons. One reason for the 1975 election was the controversy about the handover of country railways to the commonwealth government.

Those of us who have connections to the South-East—the Hon. Ms Scriven, the Hon. Mr Maher, the Hon. Mr Ridgway and myself—would be familiar with the passions that that aroused at that particular time, probably not as much as the passions in relation to the forestry privatisation, but nevertheless during the 1970s it was an issue of some controversy. Terry Groom was elected in 1977, again for the western coastal seat of Morphett, and then lost two years later. With the early election called upon the resignation of Don Dunstan, Des Corcoran took over and he took the state to an early election in 1979.

Of course, that saw the defeat of the then Labor government after almost a 10-year period, and the election of the Tonkin Liberal government for a three-year period. Mr Groom was out of parliament for that period. He then moved from west to east. He negotiated within the halls of power, within the Labor Party, to move to the eastern suburb seat of Hartley, and that is where I became more familiar with Mr Groom—because I had been a member of the Liberal Party in the electorate of Hartley since around 1981-82—when he was elected as the member for Hartley in 1982, and successfully defeated a series of Liberal Party candidates in that particular electorate in 1982, 1985 and 1989.

There were some unhappy experiences—and I might address some comments on that in a little while—in the period between 1989 and 1993. In 1993, having moved from west to east, he then moved north to contest the seat of Napier as an independent Labor candidate, and at that particular time was defeated by the endorsed Labor candidate, Annette Hurley.

He also served for a period of time from October 1992 to December 1993 as the Minister for Primary Industries and Minister Assisting the Premier on Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs. He maintained an ongoing connection with the multicultural and ethnic affairs community, not only through his period in parliament but subsequent to that. I was listening to the proceedings in the House of Assembly and a number of former colleagues from the Labor Party in Hartley are in the other place as we speak listening to the condolence motion—former member Grace Portolesi and I think the Hon. Mario Feleppa might be down there, because he was actively associated with campaigns in the Hartley electorate. I think that Joe Scalzi, the 'lion of Hartley', might also be down in the House of Assembly listening to the condolence motion.

As is often the case, you go back to early contributions that members make in the chamber. It was an unusual set of circumstances for Terry Groom as he gave his first speech, almost a budget-related speech, and a few weeks later gave a very long considered speech in the Address in Reply debate, talking more about his electorate and his background. In his first contribution he referred to the time he had spent in the law but also working in the community welfare department. A significant part of his contribution was about various government policies in relation to what was then called the community welfare department, and its responsibilities largely have morphed into the human services department and, in part, child protection. The community welfare department no longer exists by that particular title.

He spoke, as I said, on a range of issues in relation to community welfare policies, the Social Welfare Advisory Council, the McNally Training Centre at Magill—which was not too far from his soon-to-be electorate of Hartley—and the Aboriginal affairs department, and talked about policies as they related to the unemployed. There was one aspect that was clearly apt in 1977 when he gave this speech, and here we are, 43 years later, and it is probably still the case, where he talked about the significant impacts of unemployment on mental health, and I quote:

Unemployment has profound psychological effects which are likely to increase the degree of mental disturbance in the community. I have already mentioned that the May figures at Glenelg showed that 50 per cent of those registered were under 21 years of age.

Prolonged unemployment amongst young people may in some cases lead them to turn to drugs as a way out and eventually to more serious crime. I believe that the number of research papers currently being published add weight to what I have said. I believe it is far better to provide people with work through unemployment relief schemes than to make the unemployed rely solely on welfare benefits.

He then proceeded to have a bit of a dig about the then federal Liberal government in relation to unemployment relief schemes. When one goes back through his early contributions, they are littered with commentary and strong views one way or another on a whole variety of things, from sales tax

to payroll tax to the cost of sporting goods in South Australia for families, the unfair imposts on South Australian or Australian-based manufacturers compared to imported products, and the like.

I talked earlier about making some comments about my interactions with Terry Groom over the years. By and large, because I was a member of the Liberal Party out at Hartley and I was paired and assisted in the various campaigns from that particular period onward, the early eighties onward, we were engaged in Labor versus Liberal, the Liberal candidate versus Terry Groom. In recent years—I do not know whether it was on every occasion but it was certainly on a good number of occasions—he was either the campaign manager for the Labor Party in Hartley or a very senior and prominent advisor to the Labor candidate in Hartley.

As each election transpired our paths would cross. He was a vigorous campaigner—if he saw a head he was prepared to kick it—and he gave as good as he took. He played his politics hard, but when the occasion merited he was always cordial and friendly in terms of engagement with his own colleagues I am sure but also with opponents from opposing political parties.

A lot has been written about what happened in the period 1989 to 1993, and I will address only a few comments to those circumstances. During that time, I was still actively engaged in the party's various contributions to electorate redistributions and was amused when I saw, in that particular period, the Labor Party submission to the Electoral Commission that effectively turned Terry Groom's seat of Hartley from a relatively safe Labor seat into a marginal Liberal seat.

It did so by a very unusual type of dogleg around the Aldersgate nursing home, which added about 100 or 200—I cannot remember the exact number—strongly Liberal voters into the seat and made it a very unusual looking seat. Clearly, it had been designed with good effect. There were other seats, of course, that were turned from Liberal to Labor, but that particular seat—which we were very happy about—was turned from a Labor-leaning seat to a Liberal-leaning seat.

I assume it was the subject of much angst within the party at that time, and it led to a very public falling out of Terry Groom with his then party. One story by Peter Hackett, amongst very many in *The Advertiser* at that particular time, quoted Terry Groom as follows:

'Reflecting on what occurred last weekend—

which was at the state Labor convention—

I was just appalled...appalled that the party is in the grip of the factional system. I thought that if they want to knock off a loyal sitting member they would do so at their own peril. If they are going to do this then no-one is safe.'

The 47-year-old father of three said that in the days before the preselection convention 'all sorts of deals' were put to him. 'But I felt that if I succumbed to these deals I would be entrenching the factional bosses in power. I would have sacrificed my integrity and how I see myself. I would have been letting down the rank-and-file party members on a personal level—nothing more. We have been friends for about 20 years.'

So there was a public falling out. He then became an independent Labor member, and history in South Australia has a good number of examples of people leaving either the Labor Party or the Liberal Party and becoming either an independent Labor or an independent Liberal. During that particular period, the power of Terry Groom and a colleague, Martin Evans, was considerable in terms of what occurred in the South Australian parliament during the period from 1989 to 1993.

Recent debates that we have seen in relation to the fairness clause only came about as a result of the intervention of the two independent Labor members and their influence over potential votes in the House of Assembly. It was those particular provisions and ultimately the referendum of 1991 I think it was (the early nineties) that saw the successful passage of the fairness provisions into electoral law in South Australia.

There were other significant influences. In terms of the precursor to our current parliamentary committee system, Martin Evans in particular but also Terry Groom had a considerable passion in relation to committee reform and they used the power that they had in that particular period for a significant rewrite of the parliamentary committee system. So the genesis of the parliamentary committee system as it exists now, and it has obviously been added to over recent decades, was the influence that Terry Groom and Martin Evans had back in the period between 1989 and 1993.

As I said, Terry was a man who played his politics hard, I am sure both within the party but also in the parliament. Nevertheless, I think the fact that a number of former opponents and former colleagues in another place today are paying respects in their particular condolence motion indicates the respect and the regard in which he was held. Since leaving parliament—I do not know if he immediately went back to law, but I occasionally ran into him in the streets of Adelaide and he was just coming or going to a legal practice—he continued to, at least in part, practise law subsequent to his parliamentary career.

In concluding, I know I speak on behalf of all my colleagues, but more particularly I suspect former colleagues as well, in passing on our condolences to his family, his friends and his acquaintances and in paying public tribute to his contribution to his party, to the parliament and to the broader South Australian community over many years of distinguished service.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:37): I rise to speak on this condolence motion and to endorse most of the comments that the Leader of the Government, the Treasurer, made. I must admit, I do not have a good working memory of electoral politics in the 1970s, as the Treasurer does, so I am at a slight disadvantage in rising to speak today.

Terry Groom spent 13 years in the parliament, first in the seat of Morphett and then, as has been recorded, in the seat of Hartley. Not one to back down from a challenge, Terry won four elections out of seven attempts, which is quite a remarkable feat—to not just win so many but to get back in the ring after many so bouts at elections. When he won the seat of Morphett, it was only by 112 votes, despite the seat being a notionally Liberal seat under the 1976 redistribution. I suspect Terry probably remains the only non-Liberal member person to win the seat of Morphett.

As the Treasurer has outlined, Terry resigned from the Labor Party to sit as an Independent after failing to win preselection for the seat of Napier. Despite this, in an example of South Australian Labor's good working relationship with Independents, Terry became the Minister for Primary Industries and the Minister Assisting the Premier on Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs under the Arnold Labor government. Terry also chaired the Economic and Finance Committee while an Independent.

As the Treasurer has recounted, Terry Groom was involved in the discussion and the debate around electoral reform that saw the system that we have had up until recently. I know that a few years ago, Terry Groom—I think in an article in InDaily in 2016—revealed that at the time of the discussion around electoral reform he warned Liberal members that the so-called fairness clause they were pushing would not work.

Terry Groom recounted that if his warning had been heeded several subsequent elections since those reforms may have been won by the Liberal Party and that they were the authors of their own predicament. I think, as the Treasurer has outlined, Terry did not pull any punches and played politics hard but fair.

Terry came back to the Labor fold in the mid-2000s and continued to support campaigns in the east. I know, as the Treasurer has outlined, that Terry Groom was heavily involved in many campaigns in the eastern suburbs and was very well respected by a generation of Labor figures for his knowledge and his campaigning abilities.

Terry's commitment to his community was legendary. He learned to speak the Italian language which, along with his work in the Italian community, made him much loved and very well regarded. In his first speech to parliament in 1977, he praised the Labor government's improvements in social welfare and looked to what needed to be done as a Labor agenda. Terry was a fierce supporter of small business, going on the record on things like defending the Adelaide Railway Station pie cart when he saw the new Casino begin to represent a threat to its operation.

After politics, Terry continued in the law and also served on the boards of such important bodies as the Motor Accident Commission, the Repatriation Hospital, the Environment Protection Authority, the Parole Board, Renewal SA and as a member of the Flinders University and Roseworthy Agricultural College councils. I wish to pass on my condolences and thoughts to Terry's partner, Kay, and his three children.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:41): I rise also to add my remarks in our tribute today to a Labor stalwart, Terry Groom. I am advised that in a statement on his passing the Hon. Grace Portolesi said

that Terry loved the business of politics. That is true, as speakers before me have said; he did love parliament. He loved the cut and thrust of the game. He did not quite so much love the late-night sittings or the endless committee meetings, unless he had the numbers, but in reality the thing about politics that he really loved was mingling and mixing with people. It was the people he loved, and the people loved him back.

He got out into the community, dragging candidates and, I have to say, campaign managers such as myself, with him to the Gepps Cross markets very early on Sunday mornings and introducing them to the community. He took them around Norwood Parade coffee shops and introduced candidates and the campaign managers to the people there. He loved shaking hands and bumping shoulders and being out and mixing with the community.

He threatened to take me to many festas, and luckily I had many excuses to get out of most of them—but not all. As has been noted by speakers previous to me, his deep and lasting connection to the Italian community was well known. He did learn the language. There were a few encumbrances to him learning the language. One of his closest friends was Gracie Portolesi, whose dialect was Calabrian, which is not all that close to proper Italian. We had to continually remind Terry that his pronunciation needed to be corrected and not to hang out with Gracie quite so much and pick up that southern dialect.

In fact, I remember Gracie's mother saying at one stage that I spoke better Italian than Gracie did and Terry should be listening to me in terms of pronunciation. It is not true—Gracie speaks much better Italian than me—but perhaps my pronunciation was slightly better in those days. He did learn the language and he did go out and draw in, effectively, the Italian community, and they loved him for it.

He also had a love affair with his portfolio as primary industries minister and had a penchant for long drives in the country in the chauffeur-driven car, taking as many staffers with him as he possibly could. He took every opportunity to get out and about in the rural and regional communities, and that also endeared him to those communities. It did not translate quite so much in terms of the votes at election time, but he was always welcome.

Though his tenure as minister was cut short in 1993 by the election he still had a deep and abiding love for the party. The honourable leaders of the house have spoken about the fallout when he was no longer endorsed for the seat that he sought in the northern suburbs, and that hurt him—that hurt him quite a bit—but he did not carry that grudge for very long.

That grudge, I suspect, was largely held and directed towards the then State Secretary of the Labor Party, Terry Cameron, later the Hon. Terry Cameron. Terry held that one for quite a long time. He warned many of us about Terry Cameron, and of course we found out when Terry Cameron came into this place as a Labor member only to cuddle up with the Hon. Mr Lucas over there and vote with him on the privatisation of ETSA. We should have listened to Terry Groom in those days, but we did not.

He was not a card-carrying member for many years, but during that time he was officially out of the party he did have some special friends that he would help and mentor in the party. He picked his favourite candidates and he pushed them for preselection, and he backed them all the way with his advice and, occasionally, his money. He never really stopped being a Labor man at heart and it was not too long before he paid up his dues and became a card-carrying member once more.

I would like also to acknowledge the great support of his family—his wife, Kay, and his sons, who live in the USA at the moment, which is a difficult period for them, and his grandsons. This will be a great loss for them and one which will be very difficult to get over. Terry was a very loving family man. His family meant everything to him and they reciprocated in kind. I know the passing has been very hard for them and I would like to send my best wishes and, if I can, those of everybody in the chamber to them at this difficult time.

Terry lived a remarkable life. He will be greatly missed by his family, including, of course, his Labor family, and by those who worked very closely with him over the years at his law firm, Duncan, Groom and Hannan, those in his electorate offices—he had many loyal staff—those in his ministerial

office and those of us who were dragged out to work with him in his unofficial office, the cafes of Norwood Parade. Vale, Terry Groom.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:46): I want to speak briefly about Terry Groom. Our paths crossed several times in my previous career as a journalist, and I always found Terry quite an honourable man—sincere and quite informative. I think we were often the beneficiaries of some good stories from Terry. The Italian community particularly loved Terry, especially in the eastern suburbs. He was a common sight at some of the bigger festivals, including the San Pellegrino festival, where he was always welcome.

He always took a strong interest in what was happening in the parliament. I think the last time I bumped into Terry was a couple of years ago during the land tax debate, or debacle as it turned out. Terry had attended a couple of the forums that were in the eastern suburbs and he made his feelings known—how he was opposed to it and thought it was something that was going to destroy the investments of many mum-and-dad investors. He encouraged us and also Labor, of course, to continue our fight.

He will be sorely missed in the Italian community because many of them often went to him for help and assistance, and Terry was the sort of bloke, from what many in Hartley have told me, who would never close the door and would always listen and try to give any assistance or advocacy where he could. So on behalf of SA-Best, the sincerest condolences to Terry and his family and to the Labor family.

The PRESIDENT (14:48): I wish to make a few remarks to add to the motion. While I did not know Mr Terry Groom that well I did take, as an active farmer and a representative of various groups within the stud sheep sector in South Australia, note of his period as the Minister for Primary Industries. He also had served in this parliament with my father, and I think when he became Minister for Primary Industries he was given some considerable advice by my father about how to handle primary industries. I am not sure how much of it he took, but he no doubt listened to it.

Also, having lived just north of the Gawler River, I was not very far from the Napier electorate and when Terry Groom stood as an Independent Labor candidate in that seat he ran a very active campaign. Other members have talked about his connection to the Italian community and I think he flourished in his connections with that community in Angle Vale and other areas that, at that stage, were in the seat of Napier.

I well remember the last shift I did one night handing out how-to-vote cards in the 1993 election. I used to spend most of my time handing out how-to-vote cards in seats that the Liberal Party was not going to win but hopefully getting those important votes in the upper house. My last shift that day was at the Angle Vale Primary School booth and I remember Terry being there right at the end, still within the realms of the state electoral laws, encouraging the good people to vote for Terry Groom. I pass on my condolences to the Groom family and their friends and acquaintances. I ask honourable members to stand in their places and carry the motion in silence.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

Sitting suspended from 14:51 to 15:05.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: I would like to acknowledge the presence in the gallery today of Mr John Shepherd AM and his wife, Jan. Mr Shepherd would be known to many members as the former long-serving executive director of Operation Flinders Foundation. Welcome.

ANSWERS TABLED

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the President—

Minutes of the Assembly of Members of the two Houses held on Tuesday, 4 May 2021, to fill a vacancy in the Legislative Council caused by the resignation of the Hon. Mark Charles Parnell [Ordered to be published]

By the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas)—

Fee Notices under Acts—

Legal Practitioners Act 1981—Fee Notice—(No. 3)

Regulations under Acts—

Liquor Licensing Act 1997—General—Emodka Prohibition

Retail and Commercial Leases Act 1995—Prescribed Lessee

Spent Convictions Act 2009—Decriminalised Offences

Determination of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 4 of 2021—Auditor-General, Electoral Commissioner, Deputy Electoral Commissioner, Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner

Report of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 4 of 2021—Review of Remuneration for the Auditor-General, Electoral Commissioner, Deputy Electoral Commissioner and Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner

Review of Undetermined Natural Causes of Death—Section 29 of the Coroners Act 2003 (as amended by Coroners (Undetermined Natural Causes) Amendment Act 2020)

By the Minister for Health and Wellbeing (Hon. S.G. Wade) on behalf of Minister for Human Services (Hon. J.M.A. Lensink)—

Regulations under Acts—

Single-use and Other Plastic Products (Waste Avoidance) Act 2020—

Plastic Spoon Exemption

Regulations under Acts—

Firearms Act 2015—Gel Blasters

Ministerial Statement

COVID-19 INDIA

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:08): I table a copy of a ministerial statement made by the Premier in another place today on the subject of the COVID-19 situation in India.

DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:08): I table a copy of a ministerial statement made by the Deputy Premier in another place today on the subject of domestic and family violence prevention.

REVIEW OF HARASSMENT IN THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN LEGAL PROFESSION

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:08): I table a copy of a ministerial statement made by the Deputy Premier in another place today on the subject of harassment in the legal profession.

Question Time

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:14): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The Ambulance Employees Association reported yesterday morning that the family of an 11 year old with an uncontrolled haemorrhage called for an ambulance. No ambulance was available to respond, despite the priority 2 lights and sirens response required.

Apparently, it took 34 minutes for the ambulance to arrive, which is more than double the 16-minute target time. My question to the minister is: why did an 11 year old with an uncontrolled haemorrhage have to wait 34 minutes for a priority ambulance to arrive yesterday?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:15): The claims by the head of the ambulance union this morning are somewhat difficult to follow up. The honourable member refers to an 11 year old. My recollection was that the claims in this morning's media related to a 10 year old. The SA Ambulance Service has identified not a client on Monday morning but a client on Sunday morning. On Sunday 2 May, a 10-year-old patient experienced a medical episode at a conservation park, and a 000 call was received at 11.05.

Any suggestion that the patient waited over 20 minutes for an ambulance response is simply incorrect. Any claim that the Ambulance Service didn't have an ambulance to cover is incorrect. The patient was triaged as a priority 1, and an ambulance and a solo extended care paramedic were immediately dispatched. The paramedic arrived, I am advised, with the patient in a difficult location in a conservation park, within 10 minutes of the call to SAAS. Extended care paramedics are highly trained paramedics who have a key role in delivering life-saving treatment. Solo paramedic response models are used around the world, and the approach is extremely effective.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:17): Supplementary: is the minister not aware of an incident on Monday morning of an 11 year old with an uncontrolled haemorrhage?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:17): In relation to the comments that were made by the Ambulance Employees Association this morning, the Ambulance Service has identified a case on Sunday. I haven't been advised of a case on Monday.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:17): Supplementary arising from the original answer: would the minister expect to be advised promptly of a case, if it was the case that on Monday morning an 11 year old with an uncontrolled haemorrhage waited 34 minutes for an ambulance?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:18): One point I would make is I think the honourable member is referring to a case that he describes as a P2. The response time for a P1 (priority 1) is eight minutes, and the goal is to achieve that eight minutes 60 per cent of the time. We certainly have targets to drive quality services, but we don't expect that every case will be responded to within that time.

In relation to the Sunday case of the 10 year old, the location of the patient itself was a delaying factor. As I am advised, the paramedic came and found the patient in a difficult location within a conservation park. Within the metropolitan area, we have targets. We certainly strive to achieve them, but there are times when the response time is not met.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:19): Final supplementary: is the minister embarrassed that he has not been informed or does not know about the case that the ambulance association made public earlier this morning about an 11 year old on Monday morning?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:19): No.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:19): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: This morning on ABC radio, Dr Mark Morphett, chair of the SA Australasian College for Emergency Medicine, said in response to a question on how many times Adelaide hospitals have been placed on Code Yellow in the past six or 12 months:

In the past six to 12 months we've been in code yellow more than I've ever known. I hesitate to say weekly, but it must be getting close to that.

Dr Morphett went on to say that, prior to the beginning of last year:

It was unheard of and now it's relatively a regular occurrence.

My question to the minister is: how many times have our Adelaide hospital emergency departments been placed on Code Yellow over the past six months?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:20): Obviously, that is a detailed data question, and I will get the information for the honourable member on notice.

The PRESIDENT: It is very hard to get a supplementary out of that.

The Hon. E.S. Bourke interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will listen to the deputy leader and make a judgement.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:20): Supplementary: is the minister embarrassed that he does not know how many times there has been a Code Yellow in six months, given that it was raised in the media today?

The PRESIDENT: That does not arise from the answer at all, but if the minister wishes to respond I will let him do that.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:21): Perhaps I will just take the opportunity to say that there was one Code Yellow that the Ambulance Employees Association identified this morning that they claimed was called yesterday and it was not.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:21): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding health. Why has the government hidden ambulance ramping statistics for the past four months, and will the minister commit to publicly releasing the latest monthly statistics on ramping?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:21): The government has not hidden data on ambulance ramping, and the data is released by the Ambulance Service. The fact of the matter is that that was not a regular publication data set and we re-release them from time to time.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:22): A supplementary arising: can the minister confirm what the ramping statistics were for the last four months?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:22): I am happy to get those for the honourable member.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Ridgway has the call.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Hunter is out of order. The Hon. Mr Ridgway has the call and will be heard in silence.

SINGLE TOUCH PAYROLL

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (15:22): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer please outline to the house the latest Single Touch Payroll figures for South Australia?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Ridgway will not point.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Leader of the Opposition and the Hon. Mr Ridgway seem to have this habit of having a conversation across the chamber, which is not welcomed. The Treasurer has the call.

The Hon. C.M. Scriven interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:23): I am delighted to be able to report to members the latest details of the Single Touch Payroll figures, which were released last week. As members know, they are released fortnightly, and they are one of the latest measures of payroll jobs and wages data being released by the independent Australian Bureau of Statistics. For the fortnight ending 10 April 2021, I am pleased to be able to report that, when compared over the last 12 months to the depths of the pandemic in April of last year, the total employee jobs in South Australia has increased by 12.5 per cent in that 12-month period.

We were only just pipped by Western Australia at 12.6 per cent in terms of being the state with the strongest jobs growth in the last 12 months, recovering from, as I said, the depths of the global pandemic in April of last year. Both Western Australia and South Australia, at 12.6 and 12.5, were well above the national average of just 10.2 per cent. Most of the Eastern States had percentage increases below the national average in the 9 per cent region, ranging from 9.4 per cent to 9.9 per cent.

As members will be aware, I also report to the house on a regular basis the other measure that the bureau reports on, the Single Touch Payroll, which is for employee wages. Again, that indicates that the strongest state, by some way, since the depth of the pandemic was actually Western Australia, with an increase in employee wages being paid of 12.6 per cent compared with the national figure of just 8.8 per cent. Victoria was second at 10.1 and South Australia was just behind at 9.8 per cent. New South Wales had, by far and away, the lowest increase in employee wages at just 6.9 per cent.

The Single Touch Payroll figures, together with the other surveys and together with the mixed messages we see in the monthly labour force figures, which have taken South Australia from being the best in the nation at the end of last year to being the lowest in the nation in the last month, paint—

The Hon. E.S. Bourke interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Bourke!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —mixed messages in terms of the state of the economic recovery within South Australia post COVID. However, the Single Touch Payroll figures, which are the most recent figures—and, as I said, touch not only on jobs but also on wages being paid—are critical determinants in terms of how healthy the economic recovery is in each of the states. We remain pleased to see the relatively strong performance of the South Australian economy in terms of the Single Touch Payroll figures released last week.

FLAMMABLE BUILDING CLADDING

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:27): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Treasurer on the topic of flammable cladding.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The 2014 fire at the Lacrosse apartment building in Melbourne's Docklands, and of course the tragic Grenfell fire in London in June 2017, highlighted the fire safety risks arising from the noncompliant use of combustible cladding. In Victoria and New South Wales the state governments are providing funding and loans to fix cladding on private buildings. No such support has been established in South Australia.

As members may be aware, residents in twin apartment blocks on the Lefevre Peninsula—those being the Tarni Court and Pilla Avenue buildings—are currently faced with the challenge of

removing flammable aluminium composite cladding from the buildings, which currently poses a quite high fire risk. These buildings were put up 13 years ago, and residents are now facing potential evacuation if the cladding is not removed from them.

Despite the presence of the cladding not being the fault of these residents, they are currently facing a cost of some \$1.6 million to remove that cladding. Port Adelaide Enfield council has given the 166 apartment owners a 12-month deadline to remove the cladding, but the community corporations for these buildings have indicated that they can't afford that within that time frame. That is not to mention, of course, the fact that these buildings are now classified as high risk, meaning that many contractors will not carry out the work due to lack of insurance cover.

Residents have been asking the local council and the state government for help, and it is very cold comfort indeed that state governments elsewhere are providing funding or loans yet the residents in our state have been left high and dry. My question is: why is the Marshall government not providing support to South Australian residents unwittingly caught in this terrible predicament to remove that dangerous cladding from the buildings?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:29): My recollection is that the responsibility for this particular area is with the building minister who, in a past life, was my former ministerial colleague the Hon. Stephan Knoll. In recent months, that responsibility rests with the Attorney-General, who has taken over responsibility for that particular area, together with, of course, responsibilities that local government have in relation to these issues.

My understanding of the position, and if I am wrong I will correct the record later on, is that not all state and territory governments have provided assistance along the fashion that the member has outlined—one or two might have. My understanding also is that the legal advice to the government is that there is no legal responsibility on the state government in relation to this particular issue. So it is certainly correct to say that the state government has not provided either grants and/or loans in relation to the circumstances that the member has outlined.

FLAMMABLE BUILDING CLADDING

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:30): My supplementary is: why is the Treasurer passing the buck when he is the one who controls the bucks? In Victoria it's the Treasury that provides financial support through grants and loans to address this pressing issue.

The PRESIDENT: Treasurer, I am not sure that arose out of the answer, but I will let you answer it if you wish.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:30): I can just repeat the answer I gave earlier; that is, my understanding is that the legal advice says that this state has no lawful responsibility.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:30): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: On Thursday 15 April, the Ambulance Employees Association reported that a 93-year-old patient was taken to the Flinders Medical Centre after a fall. Noarlunga Hospital refused to accept referral of the patient, so they remained at Flinders. The elderly patient was ramped for over six hours. She was kept lying completely flat in spinal precautions on a hard ambulance side stretcher, which is not designed for long-term use by elderly patients who are at high risk of pressure injuries. The patient could not drink or toilet properly. My question to the minister is: can the minister explain why a 93 year old was left ramped for six hours at the Flinders Medical Centre?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:31): I will take the honourable member's question on notice and get details of the case.

PAEDIATRIC HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (15:32): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question about paediatric health services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Before the last election, the Marshall Liberal team committed to building a new Women's and Children's Hospital co-located with the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. Can the minister please update the council on this election commitment?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:32): I thank the honourable member for her question. The Marshall Liberal team went to the 2018 election with a clear position on building a new Women's and Children's Hospital co-located with the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. We rejected Labor's plan to build a new women's hospital co-located with the new Royal Adelaide Hospital while leaving the children's hospital stranded in the existing facility at North Adelaide. This plan would have seen children separated from their mothers and children's health services abandoned in ageing infrastructure for an undefined period.

The AMA and the ANMF also rejected Labor's position in 2017, expressing disappointment in the plan to separate the women's hospital from the children's hospital. South Australians agreed with them: they did not want Labor's plan, instead choosing to keep families together and provide them with a world-class hospital.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The Marshall Liberal government is delivering on that commitment.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, resume your seat, please.

The Hon. R.P. Wortley interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wortley knows well enough not to point in the chamber.

An honourable member interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The minister will be heard in silence.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Thank you, Mr President. As I was saying, the Marshall Liberal government is delivering on this commitment. However, there are some, such as the Women's and Children's Hospital Alliance, who refuse to accept the verdict of South Australian voters. Led by Professor Jones, they continue to run Labor's line, put out before the 2018 election. Just as he did before the 2018 election, Professor Jones continued to call for separation of services in the media yesterday.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The model of having a co-located Women's and Children's Hospital at the Royal Adelaide Hospital site was put forward by this government and backed by the majority of South Australians. Let's be clear, the Marshall Liberal government was elected with that clear commitment and we will deliver on it.

We have already committed \$650 million towards the new hospital, while investing an additional \$50 million in works on the current site to ensure quality services are maintained during the build. We have engaged in lengthy consultation with our clinicians on the design for the hospital, with further clinical workshops planned. We have spent \$600,000 supporting that clinical consultation, an unprecedented investment in engaging our clinicians.

The Hon. E.S. Bourke interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Bourke!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: We are also backing the health advice, and I think it's really important to be clear here. The World Health Organization and many reputable birthing studies support the ability of mothers to have as much skin to skin contact with their newborn as possible. While some women will find urgent care post birth—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Hunter and the Hon. Ms Bourke, order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: While some women will need urgent care post birth, this requirement should not necessitate a mother being separated from her baby because we have a women's hospital in one location and a children's hospital across town. If you separate mothers and babies from each other by having each receiving care at different hospitals, you are removing the ability for known benefits of early skin to skin contact, including greater respiratory, temperature and glucose stability, and significantly less crying.

The Hon. E.S. Bourke interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Bourke, you can't help yourself. Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: We can't back away from our commitment—

The Hon. E.S. Bourke interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Ms Bourke!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —to South Australian families simply because the Women's and Children's Hospital Alliance refuses to accept the verdict of the South Australian community three years ago.

The PRESIDENT: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has the call for a supplementary arising out of the answer.

PAEDIATRIC HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:36): Could the minister advise when will the costings be released, and when will the hospital become operational?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:36): The business case is scheduled to be released this quarter.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter has the call. Supplementary.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:36): I direct my question to the minister. Why is the government spending upwards of \$1.9 billion on a hospital that will have fewer beds than the existing Women's and Children's Hospital?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:37): Yet again, we are peddling information that is still subject to consultation. There is consultation that has only recently concluded. That feedback will be assessed, and then decisions made by government. Only then will you know how many beds are in the new hospital.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:37): Further supplementary.

The PRESIDENT: Is that a follow on?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: It is, sir. Minister, why did you tell FIVEaa on 14 April that there will be 25 fewer overnight beds in the new Women's and Children's Hospital?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:37): I was discussing a consultation document released in February.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The joyful glee of the Labor Party, which didn't even bother to consult with clinicians on the new Royal Adelaide Hospital—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —which led to design flaw after design flaw.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: We are doing the hard yards of consultation—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —and credible consultation—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —is consultation which doesn't have the conclusion before the consultation. That's what the Hon. Ian Hunter is inviting me to do. That is not an invitation I will take up.

The PRESIDENT: Before calling the Hon. Ms Bonaros, I remind the Hon. Mr Hunter that he asked a couple of supplementaries and then interrupted the minister the whole way through his answer. That is not helpful to the chamber. The Hon. Ms Bonaros has the call.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:38): Supplementary: while in opposition, did the minister ever say to any medical practitioner that the only reason—the only reason—that this hospital was being built on that site, in the way that the Liberal Party has proposed, was to differentiate itself from the Labor government's policy at the time?

The PRESIDENT: Yet again, I am not sure that that came out of the original answer, but I will let the minister answer it when he can be heard.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:38): The answer is no.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:39): Further supplementary arising out of the original answer.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Bonaros has a final supplementary.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I've got several, Mr President, but I will ask a final one. Are there plans to have a separate gynaecology ward at the new Women's and Children's Hospital and, if not, why not?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:39): The plans for the new Women's and Children's Hospital are subject to consultation at the end—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Well, I'm sorry, we don't spend \$600,000 on a process that's not happening, and it is happening.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:39): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question about mental health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Some of the state's most experienced and indeed passionate mental health experts last week attended a government-organised round table to discuss the decaying state of mental health services in South Australia and, critically—they believed—also formulate a road map to address the current crisis. They were joined by more than 60 other clinical, consumer and carer stakeholders, who attended out of a genuine concern they share about the lack of mental health services in our public health system.

The eight-hour forum was organised by the minister in direct response to dire concerns raised by Adjunct Professor John Mendoza. Disappointingly, those who attended believe they were let down again by the state government. I quote Professor Mendoza:

When a forum called to address a crisis has no agenda or running sheet, no list of participants, no means to connect people not in the room, no decision-makers, it's clear it's a snow job.

My questions to the minister are:

1. Why did SA Health CEO, Dr Chris McGowan, only attend the morning session?
2. Why weren't the local health network CEOs invited to attend, or the ambulance union, which we know is at the coalface of the problem?
3. Is the minister concerned at the breakdown of the working relationships between Dr McGowan and the LHN CEOs, which I am told was the reason why they were not invited to attend the meeting?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:41): In terms of the invitation list, every single LHN had representatives. My recollection was that they had between three and four representatives each. In addition to that, there were clinicians who worked in the LHNs and who were associated professional organisations. The LHNs were well represented—

The Hon. C. Bonaros: By their CEOs?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: They were represented by their mental health leaders—allied health, nursing, medical and the like. I think I would be roundly condemned if all I invited to a workshop was executives, not the people who are actually involved in delivering the services on the ground.

In terms of the complaint about a lack of agenda, I seem to recall Adjunct Professor Mendoza—one of his comments before the event was that it was scripted, that it was going to be a scripted event. Well, the fact that the workshop itself identified the problems it saw in the mental health system and developed implementation plans that they considered would be effective at addressing them I think demonstrates it was not scripted.

I can remember the very crowded whiteboard that the facilitator had compiled as a result of the day. There was myriad issues, but there was also a strong consensus, if you like, in terms of responses. One of the clearest themes, if you like, was workforce. There were a lot of comments made about not only how to develop, recruit and retain our workforce but how better to manage them across the LHNs. These are issues that will be addressed coming out of the workshop. I believe it was a very useful stocktake of where we are a year and a half into the Mental Health Services Plan.

Of course, you only have a chance to stocktake a plan if you have got one. What we came into government with was a situation where the former government did not even have a mental health services plan. In November 2019, when we published our Mental Health Services Plan, it had been a seven-year hiatus without a plan. So we are not going to apologise for having a stocktake on a plan in a context of a COVID pandemic. Labor should be ashamed that mental health was such a low priority they didn't even have a plan for it.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:44): Supplementary: can the minister respond to my first question—why wasn't the ambulance union invited to the round table—and has there been a breakdown of the working relationships between Dr McGowan and the LHN CEOs?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:44): I would make the point that the chief executive officer of the Ambulance Service did attend. With all due respect, considering that we had already invited I think in the order of eight unions and professional associations, I didn't actually think we needed another union at the table.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The minister will continue.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I put the question back to the Hon. Connie Bonaros: if the ambulance union was so crucial, why did Adjunct Professor Mendoza not invite them to be part of his group?

The Hon. E.S. Bourke interjecting:

The Hon. S.G. WADE: No, no—why did the—

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Ms Bourke!

The Hon. R.P. Wortley: She's outraged.

The PRESIDENT: I can say she's outrageous today, but the minister will continue.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Let's clarify, I'm not talking about the invitation to the round table, I'm talking about Mendoza's—I think they call themselves the Mental Health Coalition. The fact that the peak body for non-government organisations has the same name is a bit confusing, but they refer to themselves as the Mental Health Coalition. SASMOA, ANMF, the AMA and the ACM were all members of this group, but the AEA wasn't included. You will have to ask them why they didn't.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:46): Further supplementary: how long did the minister spend at the round table?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:46): I spent two hours—

The Hon. C. Bonaros: Two hours—

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I'm sorry, could I be given the courtesy to answer your question?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I just think—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I would like to hear the minister and I presume the Hon. Ms Bonaros would like to hear the minister and perhaps the Leader of the Opposition might want to hear the minister.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Yes, I'm just a simple man. I just assumed that if somebody thinks an issue is important enough to ask a question about it, they might think the answer is important enough to hear.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: In relation to the workshop, I attended the last two hours. The format was that different tables highlighted the issues that they wanted to raise. I was given the opportunity to dialogue and ask questions. It was a very useful conversation. The facilitator's view and my view was that it would facilitate, if you like, the proceedings of the workshop if I was to join the final session and not the whole workshop.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:47): Final supplementary: is the minister aware of suggestions of Dr McGowan referring to one of our LHN CEOs as a tea lady?

The PRESIDENT: I'm not sure where that comes from from the original answer.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: From the original answer, Mr President; it's talked about.

The PRESIDENT: No, I will rule that out of order. The Hon. Ms Pnevmatikos.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Pnevmatikos has the call.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (15:47): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding health.

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

The PRESIDENT: There is a point of order. Is this a point of order?

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Yes, I object to the Hon. Emily Bourke suggesting that you are offering me protection.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will protect the integrity of members of this house. I will protect the integrity of this house generally, and I think sometimes some members need to reflect on assisting me in doing that. The Hon. Ms Pnevmatikos has the call.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS: My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding health. Does the minister think it is acceptable to have 139 patients stuck in our emergency departments waiting for a bed, as was the case yesterday morning? Secondly, why at 12.30pm today were there only 714 out of a possible 812 capacity beds occupied at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, with 34 patients waiting for a bed between 12 to 24 hours?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:49): I thank the honourable member for her question. In relation to the first question—do I think it's acceptable that more than 100 people were waiting in the ED for a bed?—I think the waits that we saw yesterday were unacceptable. Of course there will be, shall we say, waits as people wait for their room to be prepared or the like, but certainly the levels that we were seeing in recent days are unacceptable, and I know that our clinicians do not accept them.

One of the issues leading into this week was that we had a lower level of patient discharges last week than normal. That risk was identified over the weekend, so our management and our clinicians were already having teleconferences on the weekend to try to ease the pressure on the hospitals so that, as we came into the week, we would have more beds available for incoming patients.

In terms of the question the honourable member raised in terms of, I think, the stats as at 12.30 this afternoon, I am certainly happy to seek further information but the fact that there might be people waiting in the ED, and there are beds that are available in the hospital but they are not being transferred to them, may be a matter of transfer timing, but more likely I suspect it's about the specialist bed needs. For example, a person with mental health challenges we would hope to be able to transfer to a specialist mental health bed. Likewise, there are other specialty wards within the hospital, but I am happy to make inquiries.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (15:50): Supplementary: can the minister assure this council that all the beds at the Royal Adelaide Hospital are open and being utilised?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:51): I am more than happy to make inquiries.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo has a supplementary.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:51): Does the minister accept what the AMA's Dr Christopher Moy said, that the new Royal Adelaide Hospital is far too small to accommodate patients? Is the

government looking at other alternatives and, if so, can he explain what they are, to house people who cannot find a bed?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:51): The comments that the honourable member refers to haven't been brought to my attention, but I will certainly make inquiries and would appreciate a copy of the comments that the honourable member is referring to. I can assure you that this government is not interested in further investment in the Royal Adelaide Hospital site. We are a government that was elected to undo the damage of Labor's Transforming Health experiment and to build up suburban and rural hospitals, so we—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter is out of order.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: The worst ramping of any health minister in our history on your watch.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, order! Cease!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Also, the government prefers to actually provide patients what they want and, more and more, they want their care at home. So whether it's palliative care, which we will be discussing tomorrow afternoon, I'm sure—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: It's great to know that the Hon. Ian Hunter really understands what a home hospital is. An ambulance doesn't need to get to a hospital if the hospital care is coming to their home, and that's why there will be—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter is out of order.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —care that is quality care, delivered at home.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: It will help ease the pressure on our hospitals and our Ambulance Service.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, one final supplementary and then we will move on.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:53): I am seeking an answer to my question previously: what are the other alternatives the government is considering? Just to expand upon that, there has been mention that the government was leasing hospital beds at private hospitals. Can the minister expand upon that and also reveal the cost of that and how many beds are being leased and at which hospitals?

The PRESIDENT: Well, here again, I am not sure that this came out of the original answer, but if the minister wishes to respond I will let him.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:53): I am certainly happy to answer the honourable member's question. You were saying, 'What are the alternatives?' One of them is My Home Hospital. My Home Hospital started in January this year, and it's focused on a particular set of conditions that are quite readily handled in a home environment, maintaining the highest level of acute care in a partnership with Medibank Private and Calvary.

I should also make clear that My Home Hospital-style services are provided by public providers as well. An example of that was—I am being distracted by the arrival of another minister. The My Home Hospital-style service is actually being used in the Central Adelaide Local Health Network for mental health care at home. I was privileged to be welcomed into the home of a family in Modbury for a My Home Hospital-style service delivered by the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network for people with geriatric care needs.

The South Australian health system has had hospital beds in the community for a number of years. It is this government that is taking it to another level, making sure that we take the opportunity to drive even better quality care through the use of technology.

EXPORT FIGURES

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:55): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer outline the latest export figures for South Australia?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:55): I am pleased to be able to report to members the latest export figures released last week. Clearly, there are significant concerns amongst Australian exporters about the potential impacts of trade barriers and/or bans from China in particular, but certainly the 12-month figures to March 2021 indicate a very healthy performance by South Australian exporters, which clearly, from the state's economic recovery viewpoint, is heartening.

The increase in the value of overseas goods exports in South Australia was up 9.5 per cent. Western Australia was up 8.5 per cent, whereas Victoria was down 13 per cent, New South Wales was down 14 per cent and Queensland was down 28 per cent year on year. That is the growth and export markets to March 2021 compared with the growth and export markets or the performance and export markets through to March 2020.

Somewhat surprisingly—I guess there will be changes in this particular figure as we continue into the near future—exports to China were actually up \$512 million in that period, or 18 per cent. Saudi Arabia was up 371 per cent, the Philippines was up 97 per cent, Canada was up 13 per cent and Thailand was up 55 per cent.

The Hon. R.P. Wortley: Hasn't helped our unemployment rate.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The countries where exports declined, interestingly, were Malaysia, which was down 19 per cent; Japan, down 20 per cent; South Korea, down 22 per cent; France, down 43 per cent; and Singapore, down 18 per cent. Clearly, there are mixed figures in relation to the relative export performance to various countries. As I said, there are encouraging figures there for China, up 18 per cent through to March and unlikely to be significantly impacted over the coming months by the ongoing impact of trade and/or other bans that the Chinese government has imposed upon Australian exporters in particular.

Nevertheless, in concluding, the prospects of economic recovery and jobs recovery in the state are going to be significantly impacted by the ongoing export performance of South Australian exporters. Certainly, the government's continuing emphasis in its three years is on opening up trade offices across the world, opening up offices that were formerly closed by the former Labor government, which was one of the more intriguingly bad decisions of the former government in relation to a small regional economy like South Australia, reliant on performance of exports.

To actually embark on a process of closing down trade offices all over the world—it seemed to be very difficult to understand the logic behind that, but I am sure it made sense to the former government and the best friend of the Leader of the Opposition, the former Minister for Trade, who—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —as the Leader of the Opposition continues to say, was 'a very good minister' in his view. How he could defend the policy—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —of closing down trade offices across the world and trying to encourage exports is, as I said, very hard to understand. But this government has set about opening up a significant number of overseas trade offices in an endeavour to assist South Australian exporters to continue to export to countries across the world.

DECLARATION DAY

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:59): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Treasurer on the topic of Declaration Day.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Declaration Day, as outlined in the book to be released and launched in state parliament this week, is associated with 'buraadja', which means 'tomorrow'. New South Wales Senator Andrew Bragg has sought contributions for his book on reconciliation. The contributors include our own Premier. Certainly, the Premier has given his warm support and welcoming for this book.

In the book the New South Wales Liberal senator has called, among other things, to back a new public holiday on 27 January, following of course the controversial current public holiday on 26 January. I understand—not that I have read the book—it is to be called Declaration Day. As the minister responsible for the public Holidays Act 1910, has the Premier or the senator consulted with you about this new proposed public holiday? What is the process for declaring a new public holiday, and why would it be called Declaration Day?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:01): I suspect the member might be referring to the Holidays Act. I can indicate to the member I have no interest in adding a further holiday to the very significant number of public holidays that we already have in South Australia. Senator Bragg has made no contact with me to answer the question, and I have had no discussion with the Premier in relation to a further public holiday to be added to the Holidays Act.

In answer to the final question as to what the process might be, I suspect it would be an amendment to the Holidays Act that would be required to move down that particular path. But, as the minister responsible for the Holidays Act, I have no interest in adding a further public holiday to the considerable number of public holidays we already have in South Australia.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (16:02): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: On Friday afternoon, a schoolgirl was taken to the Flinders Medical Centre in a crew car after staff were told it would take four hours for an ambulance to arrive. This schoolgirl had collapsed with heart issues. My question to the minister is: does the minister think it's acceptable for a schoolgirl with a cardiac condition to wait four hours for an ambulance to arrive?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (16:03): I don't believe this case has been brought to my attention. I will seek details on it.

The Hon. E.S. Bourke interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Bourke, be silent.

REPAT HEALTH PRECINCT

The Hon. J.S. LEE (16:03): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing about better health facilities. Can the minister please update the council on the government's progress on the Repat Health Precinct?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (16:03): I thank the honourable member for her question. Last month, I was privileged to participate in the opening of the Veteran Wellbeing Centre, which is part of the Marshall Liberal government's \$115 million redevelopment of

the Repat. The building redevelopment, where several veteran-specific services will be located, has been made possible by another successful partnership between the state and federal governments.

Through an expression of interests process, four anchor tenants have been identified, each with their own distinct services which they provide to Australian veterans and their families. The services will be provided at the wellbeing centre, which is located centrally within the Repat Health Precinct.

The four foundation service providers are: first, RSL South Australia, which focuses on advocacy and sustainability of the veteran community and has over 9,000 members; Soldier On, an organisation that provides pathways and assistance in building better futures for returning servicemen and servicewomen; the Plympton Veterans Centre, which works to develop and create learning opportunities for our veterans to learn from each other's experiences; and Open Arms, which provides clinical counselling and mental health support for those who serve and their families.

These services are another example of why the Marshall Liberal government fought to save the Repat from being sold off by the former government. The community reach and benefits of these services will continue for years to come to ensure that those who serve or who have served are getting the support they need.

In addition to opening the Veteran Wellbeing Centre, I was also very pleased to see the refurbishment of the SPF Hall. This fantastic and historic building has been given a new lease of life and will provide a space for meetings and other group gatherings that will complement the other services being provided at the Repat. It is great to see the progress on a range of other construction works across the precinct; the brain and spinal building continues to move ahead rapidly, along with the construction of the new gymnasium.

The redevelopment works I have mentioned are just a fraction of the services we are providing or are in the process of building as we make the Repat a thriving health precinct once again. In just over three years we are well on the way to revitalising a site that was on the cusp of being sold by the former government.

LAND TAX

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (16:06): My questions are to the Treasurer concerning land tax. I am still receiving several inquiries from people who are yet to receive their 2020-21 land tax notices. Therefore, my questions are:

1. Can the Treasurer provide an update regarding how many owners are yet to receive their land tax notices for 2020-21?
2. Will all owners receive their tax notices with sufficient time to make a payment and claim in their 2020-21 tax return?
3. Given that we are now less than two months from the end of the financial year, what is planned for owners who have not received their land tax notice for payment this financial year?
4. Finally, for those owners wanting to claim a tax deduction in this year's tax return, will they be given the option to pay what they paid last year as full and final settlement, and if this is greater than the actual 2020-21 tax, will a refund, together with interest, be paid?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:07): I thank the honourable member for his question and the fact that he did provide me with some early notice so that I could get advice on some of the issues. In relation to the last question, the Commissioner for Taxation has advised me that there are no provisions in the Land Tax Act 1936 to cover circumstances where owners who do not receive their land tax assessment in the financial year can have the option of receiving last year's payment as a full and final settlement, or the sort of circumstances the member outlined as being an option. The commissioner has advised that that is not possible.

In relation to the earlier questions from the honourable member, the commissioner has advised that, for the reasons I have outlined before, there are still a significant number of ownerships yet to receive their land tax assessments. Again, for the reasons I outlined before, the complexity of in particular the trust arrangements have proved to be much more difficult in terms of trying to ensure

accurate resolution of the land tax payments of the complicated trust and, in some cases, related company grouping provisions of the act.

The commissioner has indicated that in each year there are a small number of land tax ownerships where the bills are too complicated and have been rolled over into the following year. This year, in my view, it is likely to be significantly greater than that. Whilst the commission and Revenue SA are aiming to get as many done prior to the end of the financial year as they can, it is my judgement that it is likely to be significantly larger than the previous year's experience.

The honourable member has asked, and I think someone else has asked, about the issue of what happens in those circumstances, and I think the Hon. Mr Pangallo, or someone, may have asked a question on an earlier occasion. Clearly, if someone is in the position of being part of the significant majority who will be paying less land tax than under the former arrangements, they may not be as significantly concerned as those who are paying more.

However, irrespective of whether it is less or more, if the late arrival of this year's land tax bill and potentially the on time arrival of next year's land tax bill creates any problems for an individual land tax payer, the commissioner has indicated that they would continue to negotiate with land tax payers, as they have in the past, in relation to sensible deferral or payment options for anyone who believed there would be a significant impact on their financial situation as a result of receiving two lots of bills in a relatively short space of time.

The commissioner's advice is that, whilst it has been a small number in the past where that might have occurred, they have had the power to come to an arrangement where there can be either a time payment or a deferral arrangement in relation to the payment of the next year's land tax bill. As I said, if the circumstances are—as I suspect they might be—that there is a significantly increased number this year, then those same principles would be applied by the commissioner.

Coming back to the first question, which I answered earlier, the commissioner's very strong advice—not surprisingly, given that she says she has no power in relation to tax arrangements, and I'm sure the Hon. Mr Darley would have advised the constituents similarly—is that in these circumstances, in relation to tax deductions and the Australian tax office, the very strong advice is that they take independent tax advice regarding their tax circumstances. I'm sure, knowing the Hon. Mr Darley's background, that he would have already advised his constituents along those lines.

The simple answer to the question is that the commissioner's advice is that she is not in a position, under the Land Tax Act, to undertake the option the honourable member outlined in his question.

LAND TAX

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (16:12): A supplementary arising from the original question: the Treasurer confirmed in his statement that he was given prior warning from the member to ask this question—

The PRESIDENT: This is simply a question.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: It is simply a question: on 29 March this year, the Treasurer confirmed, in this chamber, that 18,000 land tax assessments—

The PRESIDENT: No; it is just simply a question, the Hon. Ms Bourke, no explanation.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Did the Treasurer, on 29 March this year, confirm that 18,000 land tax assessments were yet to be sent? If so, how many from that 18,000 still remain to be sent?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:13): I will need to go back. If the honourable member is reading from a statement that I made or issued on whatever the date was, I am sure it was accurate at the time I gave it, but I will need to go back and check the date and the statement.

HEALTH WORKFORCE

The Hon. T.T. NGO (16:13): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing about health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: There have been 120 nursing positions made redundant by the Marshall Liberal government in the past two years. These include nurses in emergency departments, intensive care, cardiology, general medicine, gastroenterology and neurosurgery. The Auditor-General has confirmed that in the past 12 months there was a reduction of 112 nurses overall across the health system. My question is: why has the government approved redundancies for frontline nurses in vital positions across the health system?

The PRESIDENT: In calling the minister, there was a fair bit of opinion in that explanation, but I'm sure the minister will handle it as he sees fit.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (16:14): This government is proud that we continue to invest strongly in health. In terms of the health workforce, it continues to grow, particularly in relation to nurses and midwives. What the Auditor-General's Report shows is that, since the election, nurses and midwives have increased by 286. The honourable member almost gives me an opportunity to start my International Nurses Day speech now, because one thing that I think has been a very strong demonstration through the pandemic is the versatility and skill of the nursing community.

We have had nurses running medi-hotels and we have had nurses running vaccination clinics and testing clinics and providing in-reach mental health services. The success of the SA Health response to the COVID-19 pandemic is fundamentally built on the skill and professionalism of the nursing workforce, and that's why we continue to invest in nurses and midwives.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (FUND SELECTION AND OTHER SUPERANNUATION MATTERS) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from the 16 March 2021.)

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (16:16): I rise to speak on the Statutes Amendment (Fund Selection and Other Superannuation Matters) Bill. I support the additional choice and portability these provisions provide to public sector employees. The bill is supported by several large public sector unions and associations: the Public Service Association, the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation and the Australian Education Union.

In any altered superannuation arrangements, the government should ensure that advice is provided to all public sector employees so that individuals make sound and informed decisions in their own best interests. The status of Triple S as a constitutionally protected fund (CPF) has significant tax benefits for members. It is important that the CPF status of Triple S is maintained and protected. It is understood that the Super SA Board sought and obtained legal advice that these amendments will not put the CPF in further jeopardy. It is incumbent on present and future state governments to keep this status and not trade it away, so that existing public sector employees' benefits are kept. I support the government's bill.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:17): It is with pleasure that I rise to conclude the second reading debate of the bill. In doing so, I want to thank my very good friends and comrades, the union bosses, who lead the public sector unions in South Australia: the PSA, the nurses' federation, the Australian Education Union and other public sector unions, but the first three were the main ones that were engaged in terms of discussion. As I said, whilst we occasionally differ in the public arena in relation to matters, nevertheless, on issues like this that are of mutual importance to both members of the public sector unions and the government, we work collaboratively and cordially together.

I think, as I indicated in very good humour, I had a gang of union bosses in my office only last week, and we enjoyed some merriment at my flattering description of them as union bosses. As I said to them, I saw it as a term of endearment because I saw bosses as a good thing, and I was just unsure as to how they would see it as anything other than a term of endearment that I would

refer to them as union bosses. But seriously, in relation to this we have worked productively with the representatives of various unions.

I also acknowledge and thank the Hon. Ms Bonaros for her very active engagement in this particular role and her patience. A couple of years ago now, she moved a bill in this chamber, which made it even more difficult because we got advice that it really needed to be moved in the House of Assembly because of the nature of the issues that had to be resolved.

It has morphed from a matter of choice to be now a limited public offer, to allow a further degree of optionality for Super SA, so that it can attract people who are working in both the public and the private sector, for example as nurses or teachers, to be able to, if they were previously investing in a private superannuation fund, also invest in a public sector superannuation fund.

There have been further developments, but nevertheless I pay tribute to the fact that the Hon. Ms Bonaros moved the original bill but was also, as I said, prepared to be patient and accept the fact that government was supportive of the proposition. At the outset, I said it was more complicated than we thought, and as the two years went on it was much more complicated than we thought, not just because we added a limited public offer.

Even at the very end of the day, in the latter weeks, the Police Association took a different position because they have extraordinarily complicated insurance arrangements. Whilst they were initially sympathetic, in the end their advice was that they preferred to maintain the current arrangements, and we were prepared to accommodate that in particular.

As I said, whilst I said to the Hon. Ms Bonaros at the outset that this was going to be much more complicated than originally outlined, it ended up being much more complicated than certainly even I envisaged. Nevertheless, as complicated as it was, it was worth the effort of working together. The Hon. Ms Bonaros was prepared not to push ahead with forcing a vote on her bill and preferred to see what I think she has acknowledged is a more comprehensive package now and one which, because the public sector unions have supported it, embraces broad support from the public sector unions in relation to the optionality.

I also want to thank the hardworking officers within Super SA. It has been a complicated process for us. It has been their responsibility, together with parliamentary counsel and others, to resolve some of these complications, to engage in the negotiations with the public sector unions and ultimately to advise me and my officers in terms of the details of the legislation. So I thank also the hardworking staff within Super SA in relation to their contribution to what we would hope is going to be the speedy passage of the bill this afternoon.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I have just a few questions that relate to the overall scheme as it currently operates and how it might be changed, which I suspect might most easily and appropriately be reflected upon on in clause 1. Firstly, can the Treasurer explain what legal instrument confers the tax-free status of South Australia's public sector superannuation funds?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am advised they have an exemption under the commonwealth tax act.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Is it part of the legislation itself, or is it a schedule to regulations that confers this tax-free status?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am advised it is a schedule to the regulations.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Does it follow, then, that it can be changed via a regulatory instrument at the federal level—that is, by, essentially, an executive act of the federal government rather than a legislative change from the federal parliament?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yes, but of course that would be subject to potential disallowance by either house of the federal parliament.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Is it the case that it is completely out of the hands of the government of South Australia or the Parliament of South Australia as to whether this tax-free status is maintained?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It is exactly the same as it has been for decades, I suppose—that is, there has been, as there is in many areas, an understanding between both the federal government and the state government that this is not an issue the federal government would act on without the agreement of the state government. So the answer to the question is: as with many things, if the federal parliament decides to either legislate and/or regulate, it has enormous powers to do all sorts of things which might be contrary to the interests of individual states.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Without the change that is being proposed by the legislation which we are debating, could the federal government make this change by regulation?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The federal government already has the power, and it could have done it at any stage, and with or without this particular bill it has the same power.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Just to be very clear, is the Treasurer advising the chamber that the passage of this legislation will in no way affect what is required by the federal government should they choose to change the tax-free status—just to be abundantly clear?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: That is our advice. As I understand it, that has been provided to various members of the opposition in the briefings.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Does the Treasurer have a figure on, approximately—if it was changed—what the implication would be for South Australia's public sector superannuation?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, we have not even contemplated that particular set of circumstances. There has been no suggestion from anyone that we need to.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Is the Treasurer able to confirm that the Super SA Board considered and approved the future outsourcing of its insurance services, in his many discussions that he gleefully outlined with leaders of unions?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: My understanding is there has been no decision taken by the Super SA Board. They certainly always look at their insurance arrangements in terms of how they might be improved. I am sure there have been plenty of discussions over a period of time in relation to how that can be improved, but something like that, I suspect, would probably have to eventually come to me; it eventually has to come to me for approval.

I think I might have indicated this at the estimates committee last year when it was asked, that ultimately whatever the views are of Super SA on these sorts of issues, on that particular issue it would need to come to me and then ultimately, possibly, to cabinet for approval. It has certainly not come to me for approval or to cabinet for approval.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Again, just for the sake of clarity, is the Treasurer aware of any current discussions by Super SA or any potential or actual recommendations in relation to the future outsourcing of insurance services?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am aware that Super SA is currently and always has been looking at how it might improve its insurance services. Why? Because there is a lot of criticism from public sector members about the quality of insurance services that are being provided. Certainly, in the discussions I have had with representatives of Super SA, I have indicated to them that they need to have a look at the quality of the services they provide across the board, in particular in relation to insurance.

Can I hasten to say that, as much as I would like to have an extended discussion about insurance, this is not actually a bill about insurance. The estimates committee and question time and other useful fora within the parliament can be usefully explored. I was happy to answer a series of questions, but I am not going to spend an inordinate amount of time in the committee stage of the superannuation bill on something which is actually not in it.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will leave it at a final question I have on this whole bill. In relation to Super SA and the potential insurance services, is it fair to say that the Treasurer is predisposed to approving the outsourcing of such insurance services?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Say again, please?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Is it fair to say that you are predisposed to the outsourcing of such insurance services? This will be the last one.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am not predisposed to anything. If a sound case is made for a proposition I am always prepared to consider it, but my advice in relation to this particular area is that ultimately it would have to go to cabinet. I am a mere one member of the cabinet and if it has to go to cabinet it would not only be my predisposition, to use the word the member has used, it would also require the view of the cabinet.

As I said, I am aware that Super SA has been doing a considerable amount of work in relation to the quality of the service and I am sure they have been looking at a range of options in relation to the quality of the service. In the recent discussions I have had with Super SA I have indicated that, under whatever the current arrangements are, they ought to be looking at improving the quality of the service to meet some of the criticisms they are receiving from public sector members about the quality of the insurance product they offer.

Finally, one of the issues that will need to be considered by Super SA, and indeed a treasurer or a cabinet, is the capacity of Super SA to provide the sort of detailed and complex insurance advice that has been provided and will need to be provided in the future.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 6 passed.

Clause 7.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Treasurer-1]—

Page 5, line 23 [clause 7, inserted subsection (2)(b)(ii)]—Delete 'the person's selected fund' and substitute 'a complying superannuation fund (within the meaning of Part 3A)'

This is a consequential amendment to proposed section 19(2)(b)(ii) to reflect that membership in Triple S will cease where a member exercises full portability and rolls over their entire accrued balance to a complying superannuation fund, rather than just their selected fund as initially proposed under part 3A.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 8.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 2 [Treasurer-1]—

Page 5, lines 34 and 35 [clause 8(2), inserted paragraph (b)(ii)]—Delete '—to the selected fund' and substitute:

in their capacity as a police member—to the fund selected for the purposes of that fund selection

This amendment is that fund selection for police members is limited under the bill to Super SA Select, Super SA's tax fund. This amendment complements this rule to clarify for the avoidance of doubt that police members are required to make their compulsory contributions under section 21B to the Treasurer or to Super SA Select if they have made a fund selection to that fund, even if they have also made a fund selection to another fund in respect of other government employment that they may have.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Treasurer-1]—

Page 6, line 9 [clause 8(3), inserted subsection (1b)(a)]—After 'subsection (1)(a) or (b)' insert:

as a deduction from the salary received by the member from the employer to which the fund selection relates

Members who make a fund selection are precluded under proposed section 21B of the bill from making contributions to the Treasurer as a deduction from salary and must instead make such contributions to their selected fund. This amendment clarifies in proposed section 21B that such a person may make a contribution to the Treasurer, i.e. after tax contribution, in respect of salary being paid by any other government employer they may have who is still making employer contributions to Triple S.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 4 [Treasurer-1]—

Page 6, lines 15 and 16 [clause 8(4)]—Delete subclause (4) and substitute:

- (4) Section 20(2)(b)—delete paragraph (b) and substitute:
- (b) require specified members, or members of a specified class, to make contributions as a deduction from salary at a prescribed rate—
- (i) to the Treasurer; or
- (ii) if the member has made 1 or more fund selections—
- (A) to a fund selected by the member for the purposes of a fund selection; or
- (B) if the regulations so require, to a fund specified in the regulations,
- (and a regulation under this paragraph may prescribe different rates or specify different funds in respect of different members or different classes of member); or

This amends the regulation-making power in section 20(2)(b) of the act to clarify the same issue as for amendment No. 2 but in respect of those who are prescribed by regulation to make compulsory contributions, i.e. operational ambulance members. In other words, compulsory contributions are required to be made to Triple S or Super SA Select, even if they have another fund selection in play for another government employer.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 9 passed.

Clause 10.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Treasurer-2]—

Page 8, lines 26 and 27 [clause 10, inserted section 21A, definition of *existing member*]
—Delete the definition

Amendment No 2 [Treasurer-2]—

Page 8, lines 29 and 30 [clause 10, inserted section 21A, definition of *new member*]
—Delete the definition

These amendments remove the definition of 'existing member' and 'new member', as they are specific to the seven-day rule for new members, which proposed amendment No. 13 seeks to remove for simplification of administration.

Suggested amendments carried.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Treasurer-2]—

Page 8, lines 33 to 35 [clause 8, inserted section 21A, definition of *selected fund*]
—

Delete 'the fund specified by the person in the fund selection notice given to the person's employer' and substitute 'a fund specified by the person in a fund selection notice given to an employer of the person'

This is a technical amendment to clarify that where a person has multiple government employers, the fund selection regime applies separately in relation to each individual government employer.

Suggested amendment carried.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 4 [Treasurer-2]—

Page 10, line 5 [clause 10, inserted section 21C(1)(a)]—Delete 'the person's employer' and substitute 'an employer of the person'

Amendment No 5 [Treasurer-2]—

Page 10, line 16 [clause 10, inserted section 21C(3)]—Delete 'the person's employer' and substitute 'an employer of the person'

These are technical amendments to clarify that where a person has multiple government employers, the fund selection regime applies separately in relation to each individual government employer.

Suggested amendments carried.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 6 [Treasurer-2]—

Page 10, after line 27 [clause 10, inserted section 21C]—After subsection (5) insert:

- (5a) If a notice given by a person to their employer for the purposes of making a fund selection does not comply with all requirements under this section, the employer may nevertheless accept the notice if satisfied (whether on receipt of the notice or after consultation with the person) that it complies substantially with those requirements, and, in that case—
- (a) the notice will be taken to be a fund selection notice; and
 - (b) the person will be taken to have given a valid direction under subsection (3).

This introduces a new subsection (5a) into section 21C to clarify that invalid fund selection notices will still be treated as valid if the employer is satisfied, or becomes satisfied, that they are substantially correct.

Suggested amendment carried.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 7 [Treasurer-2]—

Page 10, line 28 [clause 10, inserted section 21C(6)]—After 'fund selection' insert 'in respect of a particular employer'

Amendment No 8 [Treasurer-2]—

Page 10, line 29 [clause 10, inserted section 21C(6)]—Delete 'their' and substitute 'that'

These amend proposed section 21C(6) to clarify that, where a person has multiple government employers, the fund selection regime applies separately to each government employer.

Suggested amendments carried.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 9 [Treasurer-2]—

Page 10, line 31 [clause 10, inserted section 21C(7)]—Delete 'in relation to a person' insert 'for a person in respect of a particular employer of the person'

This amends proposed section 21C(7) for the same reason as amendments Nos 7 and 8.

Suggested amendment carried.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 10 [Treasurer–2]—

Page 11, lines 16 and 17 [clause 10, inserted section 21D(2)]—Delete 'the member's selected fund' and substitute:

a complying fund (which, in the case of a designated member, must be the eligible fund selected by the member in their capacity as a designated member)

Section 21D(2) of the bill permits those members who make a fund selection to exercise full portability, i.e. roll over their entire accrued balance to cease membership of Triple S. This amendment clarifies that, subject to amendment No. 11, a member of Triple S but not a prescribed member, who has made a fund selection, may exercise full portability to any complying fund, not just the selected fund, and ensures that prescribed members—i.e. police and ambulance members and described as designated members in the bill—may exercise full portability only to Super SA Select, being the only fund they can choose for a fund selection under the bill.

This is consistent with the current rights they have to join Super SA Select. They may, however, exercise partial portability to any complying fund under the existing provisions of the bill, subject to a minimum amount being retained in Triple S or Super SA Select, as the case may be.

Suggested amendment carried.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 11 [Treasurer–2]—

Page 11, after line 21 [clause 10, inserted section 21D(2)]—After paragraph (b) insert 'or'

- (c) another employer of the member is required to make contributions to the Treasurer on behalf of the member under section 21.

This amendment clarifies that for a person who has multiple government employers but has not made a fund selection in respect of all such employers full portability will not be permitted. This is because closure of membership is a consequence of full portability, which is not possible where other government employers are still contributing to Triple S. Transfers will instead be limited to partial portability under the existing provisions of the bill.

Suggested amendment carried.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 12 [Treasurer–2]—

Page 11, line 28 [clause 10, inserted section 21D(4)]—Delete 'subsection (2)' and substitute 'section 19(2)(b)'

This is a technical amendment only by which the number of the subsection is corrected.

Suggested amendment carried.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 13 [Treasurer–2]—

Page 11, lines 30 to 42 and page 12, lines 1 to 15 [clause 10, inserted section 21D(5) to (8)]—Delete subsections (5) to (8) and substitute:

- (5) If a member makes a fund selection, the member's employer must commence making contributions required under section 21 to the member's selected fund within 2 months, or such other period as may be prescribed by regulation, following the day on which the fund selection notice is received by the employer.
- (6) The regulations may prescribe variations or additions to the procedure set out in subsection (5) (and any such regulation has effect according to its terms).

This amendment removes the requirement in sections 21D(5) and (6) of the bill for members who commence government employment after the commencement of the bill to make a fund selection within seven days, with a six-month restriction if they do not. This has essentially been removed for ease of administration and means that the same fund selection process will apply for all members, new and existing.

This also makes a technical amendment to existing subsection (8), now (5), to clarify that employers must commence making contributions to the chosen fund within two months of receipt of the fund selection notice in respect of all members who make a fund selection and not just existing members.

Suggested amendment carried.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 14 [Treasurer-2]—

Page 12, line 31 [clause 10, inserted section 21E(1)(b)]—Delete 'is a new member' and substitute 'becomes a member of the Triple S scheme after the commencement of this Part'

This amendment is formal. It deletes the superseded definition of a new member and clarifies that the requirement to provide a form upon the commencement of new public sector employment applies with effect from the commencement date of the bill.

Suggested amendment carried.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 15 [Treasurer-2]—

Page 12, line 34 [clause 10, inserted section 21E(1)(c)]—Delete 'not' and substitute 'no longer'

Amendment No 16 [Treasurer-2]—

Page 12, lines 35 and 36 [clause 10, inserted section 21E(1)(c)]—Delete '(whether the person is a new member or an existing member)'

Amendment No 17 [Treasurer-2]—

Page 12, line 37 [clause 10, inserted section 21E(1)(c)]—Delete 'not' and substitute 'no longer'

These are technical amendments to clarify that an employer is required to give a member a replacement fund selection form upon learning that their selected fund is no longer able to accept contributions or is otherwise no longer an eligible fund. The deletion of the references to new members and existing members is formal and consequential to amendment No. 13.

Suggested amendments carried.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 18 [Treasurer-2]—

Page 13, lines 13 to 29 [clause 10, inserted section 21G]—Delete the section

This amendment removes proposed section 21G, which provided for a fund selection to continue seamlessly upon change of government employer; however, this is not possible to administer, having regard to the different payroll systems in government. In addition, it is not in members' best interests for the new employer to automatically determine or assume that they want their fund selection to continue for the new employer. They will instead be given a new fund selection form upon commencement of employment to confirm their intention regarding fund selection.

Suggested amendment carried.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 19 [Treasurer-2]—

Page 14, line 5 [clause 10, inserted section 21H(3)(a)]—Delete 'section 21D' and substitute 'section 19(2)(b)'

This is a technical amendment only by which the number of the subsection is corrected.

Suggested amendment carried; clause as suggested to be amended passed.

Clause 11.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

Amendment No 5 [Treasurer-1]—

Page 14, line 27 [clause 11(1), inserted text]—Delete 'to the Treasurer'

This clause is formal. It is a technical amendment to remove the reference to contributions being made to the Treasurer. This is necessary because a government employer of a person in respect of whom section 24 of the Triple S act applies will not be making contributions to the Treasurer. If the member has made a fund selection, that will instead be contributing to the selected fund.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (12 to 18) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:45): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:46): Very briefly, I would just like to place on the record again my sincere thanks, firstly, to the Treasurer for seeing this issue through. I have not at any time had reason to question his commitment to this cause, and I have been extremely grateful for the regular updates he has given us to get us to this point. There is absolutely no question that it has been an extremely complicated piece of legislation, as it turns out.

Nothing about this final bill has been easy, but, true to his word, the Treasurer has seen it through to the end for the very simple reason, as he articulated several times now, that, as we know, Super SA is fully supportive. They have done a mountain of work on this proposal to get us to this point. The Public Service staff impacted by super choice are supportive, the unions are supportive; everyone is supportive because it is a no-brainer.

I am extremely grateful, firstly, to the Treasurer for sticking to his word and getting this bill through but also to those hardworking people at Super SA who have committed so much time and work to this project. In particular, I thank Ms Bennett and her team and Mr Patrick McAvaney. I thank them all for their work, and again I commend the government for seeing this bill through to its final passage through this place.

Bill read a third time and passed.

DISABILITY INCLUSION (RESTRICTIVE PRACTICES - NDIS) AMENDMENT BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

(Continued from 1 April 2021.)

Clause 5.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: My next amendment, No. 13 [Scriven-1], is consequential and I will not proceed with it.

The ACTING CHAIR (Hon. D.G.E. Hood): Is that the case for amendments Nos 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: It is, sir.

The ACTING CHAIR (Hon. D.G.E. Hood): What about No. 20? Can you just clarify that one, please?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I have a question on that part of the clause and then I intend to move amendment No. 20 [Scriven-1].

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I move:

Amendment No 3 [HumanServ-1]—

Page 10, line 25 [clause 5, inserted section 23L(1)]—After 'person' insert:

who holds the qualifications, and has the experience, prescribed by the regulations

This amendment seeks to prescribe in the regulations the authorised program officer's qualifications and experience. This amendment is consequential to one of my prior amendments, which was to prescribe what I have just said. This will enable greater detail and consultation on the requirements for the role.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I thank the government for taking on board the opposition's amendment to ensure that there are minimum qualifications for the senior authorising officer. Can the minister advise what she would see as the minimum qualification appropriate?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The advice I have received is that it is the department's intention for these matters to be developed through the consultation, because we really want to give to people with lived experience, family members and the like, the opportunity to tell us what they think is most important.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Does that mean that the minister does not currently have a view on what should be the minimum qualification—not in regard to all qualifications but simply the minimum?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I am not prepared to express a view without us having actually gone to consultation first.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The amendment that was filed in my name is very similar, except that the minister's amendment refers to someone having the 'qualifications or experience or both' prescribed by the regulations, whereas the opposition amendment was 'the qualifications and experience'. Can the minister indicate why she thinks it should not be skills and experience as proposed in the amendment filed in my name?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I am not sure I am able to give a really explicit reason on that particular matter for the honourable member. The request would have gone to parliamentary counsel, based on our instructions, and I am assuming that the opposition's instructions were slightly different. That is the only explanation I can provide on that particular issue.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Does the minister think it should be that the person has skills and experience or that one or the other is sufficient?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I think we are splitting hairs a little bit here. The intent is fairly clear from these amendments.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: It is a pity that the minister cannot or will not answer that, but if that is her approach then so be it. Is there a reason that the role of senior authorising officer has already been advertised before any legislation is passed, obviously including matters to do with qualifications and experience?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Yes; the reason it has already been advertised is that we clearly need to crack on with this. We wanted to make sure that we had that out in the field, if you like, for people to apply for. It is not the sort of position you can find every day of the week, so the sooner we put the information out that we are looking for someone to fulfil this role the greater the likelihood we will get a quality candidate to fill this role in the time we require.

The CHAIR: The Hon. Ms Scriven's amendment is a very similar amendment but it is one that is different from the minister's amendment. Do you wish to move your amendment?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Yes. I think having skills and experience is important. Both amendments will improve the bill, but Labor's understanding is that for providers in the NDIS market there are benefits in requiring people to have both skills and experience. I move:

Amendment No 20 [Scriven–1]—

Page 10, line 25 [clause 5, inserted section 23L(1)]—After 'person' insert:

who has the qualifications or experience (or both) prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this subsection

The CHAIR: The question will be that the words proposed to be inserted by the minister be so inserted. Those members supporting the Hon. Ms Scriven would vote no to that.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I indicate that the Greens will be supporting the government. I also note that the wording of the Labor amendment was:

who has the qualifications or experience (or both) prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this subsection

So it already allowed for it to be one or the other.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: For the record, I indicate that we will be supporting the government's position in relation to this amendment.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink's amendment carried.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Amendments Nos 21, 22 and 23 are consequential and I will not be proceeding with those.

The CHAIR: Thank you. That takes us to amendment No. 24 [Scriven-1].

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Before I move the amendment, I have a question for the minister. This part, and the amendment that I will be moving shortly, is in regard to the maximum length of orders. The current bill is silent on the maximum length of orders in terms of restrictive practice authorisations. Why is it not considered necessary to have an end date to authorised restrictive practice?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I think as I had already outlined—it may well have been in a contribution at clause 1, because this was an issue that the Labor opposition had raised in their second reading speech, and bearing in mind that this piece of legislation has been drafted to dovetail into the national rules, but I will repeat that for the benefit of the honourable member—the NDIS (Restrictive Practices and Behaviour Support) Rules 2018 require that a comprehensive behaviour support plan that contains a regulated restrictive practice be reviewed at least every 12 months or if there is a change of circumstances that requires the plan to be amended. I can speak to the honourable member's amendment. Is the honourable member still intending to move her amendment?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Yes.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I will speak to the reasons why we are not supporting it at that point.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I move:

Amendment No 24 [Scriven-1]—

Page 12, lines 28 and 29 [clause 5, inserted section 23N(2)(c)(iii)]—Delete subparagraph (iii) and substitute:

(iii) the date on which the authorisation ceases to have effect (being a date not later than 6 months after the authorisation is granted); and

As I mentioned, the current bill is silent on maximum length orders, notwithstanding the response that the minister has just given that this dovetails into other legislation that requires review every 12 months. We need to be aware that certain provisions in terms of restrictive practices might result in really very major impositions on a person's physical and psychological wellbeing, so it is critical that authorisations are the subject of regular review so that people do not fall through the cracks. The last thing we could afford is another Annie Smith case, where someone has been forgotten.

The NDIS behaviour support plans may have varying lengths, and therapy of course may change a person's behaviour, so we need to ensure that restrictive practices are genuinely a last resort and not just at the time that they are first imposed. Whilst noting the undertaking from the minister that other legislation requires a 12-monthly review, 12 months for provisions that really result in major impositions on a person's wellbeing is quite a long time.

If therapy is indeed affecting their behaviour in a positive way, a review every six months, as proposed by this amendment, would ensure that there is appropriate review and potential change and removal of those restrictive practices as soon as it is appropriate for them to be removed.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I indicate that the government will not be supporting this amendment. The bill itself requires that the authorised program officer who authorises the use of restrictive practices must set out:

- (iii) the date (if any) on which the authorisation ceases to have effect; and
- (iv) any other information required by the regulations;

Further, subclause (7) of the same section requires that:

- (7) An Authorised Program Officer may only authorise the use of level 1 restrictive practices in relation to a prescribed person—
 - (a) for as long as is reasonably necessary to prevent the prescribed person from causing harm to themselves or others; or
 - (b) until the prescribed person's behaviour support plan expires or otherwise ceases to have effect, or is varied such that the use of level 1 restrictive practices is no longer consistent with the behaviour support plan,whichever is the lesser.

The concern we have with inserting this particular clause into this bill is not just that it duplicates it, notwithstanding a number of comments the honourable member made that restrictive practices should only be used as a last resort, which I think everybody agrees on. The concern is that this amendment could create inconsistency and confusion for all those involved and therefore is potentially going to muddy the regulations.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I thank the minister for her response. I think that particular term that she referred to is one of the items of concern. It currently says that the authorisation must set out 'the date (if any) on which the authorisation ceases to have effect'. There is potentially no end date and we have seen that, unfortunately, there are cases where within the NDIS things do not happen in the way that they are supposed to, including in the way that is the required time frame of 12 months, potentially.

This will in fact ensure that things are not let through the cracks, that there is a regular review every six months. If nothing has changed, then that would be a relatively simple review and process, so that if the person still does need to have those restrictive practices imposed for their safety or the safety of others that would still be able to continue, but we do not have to rely solely on things happening as they should within the NDIS. This is an extra safeguard, and of course there is nothing stopping us from having a standard that is higher than the NDIS, which is what this amendment proposes.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I beg to differ with the interpretation of the honourable member. The NDIS rules are quite clear, so for the honourable member to claim that there is not an end date is simply incorrect. I am not quite sure what she means by we would set a high standard, because the body that is charged with enforcing any of the standards continues to be the Quality and Safeguards Commission, which is an independent statutory authority under federal regulations. I do not think she acknowledges the potential difficulty that she is going to cause with this particular amendment, and I reject a lot of the comments that she made in her previous contribution.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I just want to note the minister's comments and thank her for those, but really what we are trying to make sure is that there is no danger involved with a person potentially having these very intrusive restrictive practices imposed for longer than is actually appropriate.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I do not want to let that comment go unchallenged. I will just reiterate that this entire legislative regime is about minimising the use of restrictive practices, so for the Labor Party to try to construe that this amendment is somehow improving a situation is incorrect.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I, too, am not convinced by the arguments made by the opposition in relation to this clause. I think previously I have spoken about this matter in terms of the practical implementation of these sorts of provisions, and I have spoken firsthand about the role SACAT also plays in that process. We know that there are time limits which apply in relation to the use of restrictive practices already. Ordinarily, these sorts of practices would be reviewed at least on a six-monthly and at most on a 12-monthly basis in any event.

I can say with certainty that I have had firsthand experience in relation to these sorts of restrictive practices and the way they are dealt with under the NDIS and by SACAT. It is not even the standard course for SACAT to review these on a 12-monthly basis but rather, when we are dealing with restrictive practices, I would argue that the standard course that is followed by SACAT under the NDIS is indeed a shorter period, knowing full well that the maximum is actually 12 months. So I think that we already have safeguards in place.

I think the processes we are supposed to be facilitating today are those which work towards consistency rather than inconsistency. My concern is that the opposition's amendments provide further confusion and inconsistency, and I think the minister is right to challenge the opposition in terms of the argument that was just made. I think the safeguards and the level of protection that we are seeking does exist and that this does indeed cause confusion where it is not warranted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The Greens associate themselves with the remarks of the Hon. Connie Bonaros, and we will not be supporting the opposition amendment.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes..... 8
Noes 13
Majority 5

AYES

Bourke, E.S.	Hanson, J.E.	Hunter, I.K.
Maher, K.J.	Ngo, T.T.	Pnevmatikos, I.
Scriven, C.M. (teller)	Wortley, R.P.	

NOES

Bonaros, C.	Centofanti, N.J.	Darley, J.A.
Franks, T.A.	Hood, D.G.E.	Lee, J.S.
Lensink, J.M.A. (teller)	Lucas, R.I.	Pangallo, F.
Ridgway, D.W.	Simms, R.A.	Stephens, T.J.
Wade, S.G.		

Amendment thus negatived.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Members

SIMMS, HON. R.A.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (17:16): By leave of the council, I move, with much pleasure:

That this council welcomes the Hon. Robert Simms, elected by an Assembly of Members of both houses on 4 May 2021 to replace the Hon. M.C. Parnell (resigned).

In speaking briefly to this motion I know I speak on behalf of all members of the Legislative Council in warmly welcoming the Hon. Mr Simms—that will be the first time it has been put on the public record. In doing so I am not going to spend any more time in saying nice things about the Hon. Mr Parnell, a Green giant that you are following in this particular chamber. I thought my very kind comments about the Hon. Mr Parnell were buried in the annals of *Hansard*, only to find the Premier digging them up and quoting them back at me this morning in terms of the welcome at the Assembly of Members to you, the Hon. Mr Simms.

As I said, we welcome you here today. In terms of the process today, this is an opportunity for you to make your first speech—we have moved on from 'maiden' speeches to first speech—to the Legislative Council. It will then be adjourned, soon after your speech, and one or two other

members will speak on another occasion. We will not delay the dinner break unduly for both you and others, and will allow you the opportunity to speak.

In welcoming the Hon. Mr Simms, I have just one simple message as the Leader of the Government to the Hon. Mr Simms. As I said, he is following a Green giant in this particular chamber, the Hon. Mr Parnell, but the simple message is: I am from the government and I am here to help you. With that, we welcome you to this particular chamber.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: Before calling the Hon. Mr Simms, firstly, I would like to welcome to the chamber former senators Natasha Stott Despoja and Penny Wright, and also—I will not use the words 'Green giant'—our former Legislative Council colleague the Hon. Mark Parnell.

Members

SIMMS, HON. R.A.

The PRESIDENT: Before calling the Hon. Mr Simms, can I remind members that it is his maiden speech and I would request that the normal courtesies be afforded to him.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:18): Thank you, Mr President, and thank you, Treasurer, for your kind words. I want to start by acknowledging the traditional owners of this land, the Kaurna people. I pay my respects to their elders past, present and emerging. This is and will always be Aboriginal land.

I want to begin my first speech in this chamber by recognising the tremendous contribution of my predecessor Mark Parnell. You are right, Mr Lucas, he is a giant of Green politics and indeed of state politics more generally.

I can tell you it is a daunting thing to have the honour of following two great leaders in our Green movement in South Australia: Penny Wright in the Senate and now Mark Parnell in this chamber. It really is wonderful to have them both here today. The South Australian Greens were formed in Mark and Penny's lounge room 26 years ago and it is a credit to their vision and leadership and also the tireless work of our Greens members and volunteers that this movement has extended its reach from that very lounge room to the floor of the Senate and to this Legislative Council.

Mark was the first South Australian Green elected to represent our party in the parliament, back in 2006. He has been a remarkable advocate, a strong and tireless voice for our environment and for social justice. From fighting for workers' rights—who could forget the legendary eight-hour speech that was given in this place?—to standing up for renters and defending the rights of residents to shape their neighbourhoods, Mark has always fought for those who are traditionally shut out of politics.

So thank you, Mark, for your service to the Greens and to the people of our state. While you have retired from this parliament, you have left a very big mark on South Australian politics. To quote my colleague Tammy Franks, it is clear that the Greens are a movement, not a moment, in South Australia. Mark, you have been integral to cementing our place here, so thank you for that. I wish you all the best for your retirement, and may the fourth be with you.

I must say how excited I am to be working with my friend Tammy Franks. Tammy and I have been friends for nearly 20 years. We have supported each other through many of the highs and lows that are so often part of political life. I know that we are going to make a great team. I want to thank Tammy and her office for welcoming me into this parliament. Tammy and I first met through former Senator Natasha Stott Despoja's office. It was Natasha who gave me my first political job when I was a 17-year-old uni student. It is great to have Natasha here with us today. I know that her remarkable public service continues to inspire young people.

I want to thank the members of the South Australian Greens for giving me this remarkable opportunity to represent them and the people of South Australia. I can tell you, as a young person growing up in the southern suburbs, I never imagined that I would have the honour of representing our community at every level of government in our country. It really has been an amazing ride over

the last six years from the city council, to the Senate, back again, and now here in this Legislative Council. I hope I will be here for some time to come. Robs have a very good track record of long service here, I note.

Reflecting on my political journey and the twists and turns that have happened along the way, I am really grateful to my family and my friends for the love and support they have given me. My family has expanded a little over the last few years and I am now dad to Ava. I have had some really amazing opportunities in my life, but I must say, being asked by my friends Jess and Emma to be a donor dad and to help them start their family really has been the greatest gift. Ava has brought a huge amount of joy into all of our lives, and together we have created a big rainbow family—three sets of grandparents, aunties and uncles—so thank you very much, Jess and Emma, for that.

I also want to thank my mother and father, Marion and Brian, and my brother, Michael, for always supporting me during my public and private life and for giving me the confidence I need to pursue my passions. All of us who do political work know how vitally important that support from family is.

I was born in Leeds in the United Kingdom—do not worry, I gave up my citizenship some time ago—and I moved here with my parents when I was a boy. It is fitting that the Leeds Town Hall, near where my father worked more than 50 years ago, served as the architectural inspiration for this very building. So while my English family cannot be here today, there is a strong influence from the UK here in this place. My mum and her sisters were from Broken Hill and I spent a lot of time there, as a young person growing up, on family visits. My aunties and uncles have been a big part of my life as well and it is great to have them here today too.

I grew up in the southern suburbs, in Flagstaff Hill, and I am a proud product of public education. I went to Flagstaff Hill Primary School and later Aberfoyle Park High, but I started my political journey at Flinders University—I think there are a few Flinders alumni here. When I started, I signed up for the campaign against the government's push to increase HECS fees.

While we did not win that fight, it demonstrated to me the importance of working with the collective and with social movements to bring about change. That has always underpinned my approach to politics and it is going to guide me in this place. I was proud then to be a member of my student union and I am proud to have maintained my union membership in my many workplaces over the years.

If a week is a long time in politics, six years feels like a lifetime. I am reminded of the dramatic changes that have unfolded across our planet since I gave my first speech in the Senate back in 2015. Indeed, the world is now a very different place: Brexit, the rise and fall of Donald Trump, a reckoning on racism and misogyny in public life, a pandemic that has killed more than three million people worldwide and an unfolding economic crisis that continues to destroy lives and livelihoods, and all of this against the backdrop of a climate crisis that has shaken our state with catastrophic drought and fire. To say that we are living during a challenging period in world history is an understatement.

While we talk about South Australia being lucky in terms of our exposure to COVID-19, and it is true that we have fared a lot better than many places around the world, there is little cause to celebrate for many people in our community. As well as being a public health emergency, COVID-19 has shone a light on the pandemic of inequality that has been spreading across our globe for decades and has taken hold in our own state. It is clear that 'business as usual' is simply not working. We need a new direction.

In my first speech in the Senate, I quoted Martin Luther King Jr, and today I draw inspiration from his words once again. In 1967, Dr King warned that:

We must rapidly begin the shift from a thing-oriented society to a person-oriented society. When machines and computers, profit motives and property rights are considered more important than people, the giant triplets of racism, extreme materialism and militarism are incapable of being conquered.

Fast-forward 57 years and Reverend King's words seem more prescient than ever. Rather than becoming a people-oriented society, the move towards the thing-oriented society has continued at great pace.

If we are to overcome the crises that we face, we can no longer put private profit above the public good. We need to confront the economic system that is destroying our planet and our communities. Now is the time to restore the balance. Now is the time to advance people-focused policies to finally close the gap between the rich and poor, because everybody has a right to a good life. That should be the right of each and every South Australian.

Sadly, for many in our community, their lived experience is very different. South Australia faces the highest unemployment rate in our nation and many will be hard hit by the federal government's refusal to increase the rate of JobSeeker payments in a meaningful way. I fear that this decision is going to plunge more and more South Australians into poverty in the days ahead. It is time for all sides of politics to commit to increasing JobSeeker and to stop punishing those who are hardest hit by this recession. These people need our help.

Our state also faces a housing crisis. Housing is a human right and yet it is treated as a commodity in South Australia. We do not have enough social housing or affordable housing stock and walking through the CBD you will see buildings that are literally sitting there empty while we have people sleeping on the street. What kind of society allows that to happen? Other places around the world are looking at what can be done to incentivise landlords to make their vacant properties available, but not here in South Australia. We need to remedy that.

With house prices on the rise, home ownership is becoming increasingly out of reach for many in our community, yet South Australian renters have some of the worst protections in our country. In our state there is no presumption in favour of pets. That forces those who are seeking rental accommodation to make the difficult choice between moving into a new place or leaving a member of their family, their family pet, behind. Once someone secures a rental, they operate in a system that is heavily skewed in favour of their landlord. Having lived in shared housing and rental accommodation during my 20s and 30s, I know these pressures all too well.

Rental prices in South Australia continue to soar. Adelaide is the second least affordable capital city in Australia. The government's moratorium on evictions is due to expire at the end of this month, and many renters will be really concerned about what comes next for them. The government needs to extend this moratorium to give them certainty.

South Australians should no longer be forced to accept a housing system that puts private profit above the public good. It is simply not good enough to say, when it comes to housing, 'Hands off; let the free market decide.' Surely, now is the time for us to introduce rent controls or rent capping so that we can protect vulnerable people from rent hikes.

Change is also desperately needed when we look at our approach to the environment and to our climate. COVID-19 has caused a huge disruption. It has impacted on virtually every aspect of our lives, but the grim reality is that this will be a rehearsal. This will be the curtain-raiser for the climate crisis unless we take dramatic action, and we need to take that action today.

Our state has made some encouraging strides when it comes to reducing carbon emissions, but there is still much work to be done. Once again, we are seeing vested interests doing everything they can to try to tip the scales in their favour. We know, for instance, that gas is the new coal, and it has a terrible environmental impact. Despite this, South Australia continues to mandate gas connection and gas use for new homes.

This kickback to the fossil fuel industry makes no sense at all. It drives up prices for South Australian families and it drives up their carbon emissions. We know that all electric homes, those powered by solar, save households an average of \$14,000 over 10 years. South Australia's love affair with gas needs to come to an end, and this is something that I intend to tackle during my time in this place.

Transport policy is another area that is in need of attention. While so many cities around the nation and around the world have used COVID-19 as an opportunity to expand cycling networks and to improve pedestrianisation, transport policy in our state continues to focus on cars at the expense of everything else. It is an appalling indictment on our state's capital city that it can hold a car month, yet it cannot complete the east-west bikeway. What kind of a disgrace is that?

It is time for us to stare down the critics and show the leadership we need to make cycling infrastructure actually happen in our state. We need this if we are going to reduce carbon emissions, and we need it if we are going to improve community health and wellbeing.

This vision is needed when it comes to fixing our public transport system as well. For years, governments of both persuasions have viewed public transport as a system of last resort for South Australians. Having grown up in the southern suburbs, I know all too well the impact of state government cuts to those services. Privatisation of transport has been a disaster for our state.

It is time to take back control of our public transport network and build an integrated network that people actually want to use. Rather than cutting stops, let's put a stop to the cuts. Let's expand the reach of our trains, our trams and buses and make public transport free. This would reduce carbon emissions and it would also reduce congestion on our roads.

Protecting our green space is also essential in this fight against the climate crisis. The natural world so often provides a space for refuge and quiet reflection, and it cools our homes and our streets. Like so many South Australians who were working from home last year, I was reminded of just how vital that public green space is to our community health and wellbeing. Sadly, we are seeing it being compromised in pursuit of the mighty dollar.

Consider the Adelaide Parklands, the lungs of our city, the biggest urban park system in our country. Sadly, over the years we have seen this viewed as free land for developers or even sporting clubs. Well, our precious green land should not be carved up and sold off to the highest bidder, because once it is lost we can never get it back. Like my predecessor here, I intend to continue to be a strong voice for our public green space.

There are jobs to be created in Dr King's transition to a people-oriented society. Building social housing, building public transport infrastructure, caring for our public space, better resourcing our schools and hospitals—all of these things would create meaningful long-term work. We can kickstart our economy and create jobs that are good for people and that are good for our environment.

Imagine if South Australians had a jobs guarantee, a commitment to providing meaningful work at a living wage, a job for everybody who wants one, a guarantee for jobs that reduce inequality and that fight the climate crisis. These are the kinds of bold ideas that we need to embrace if we are going to build a better tomorrow for our state.

I have talked a lot about the challenges that lie ahead, but there is also a lot for us to celebrate. Through all the trials that we have endured over the last 12 months, we have also demonstrated what can be achieved through cooperation—global, national and local cooperation. Global efforts to develop vaccines, temporary increases in JobSeeker payments, pop-up bikeways in Melbourne and Sydney, temporary hotel accommodation for people who are homeless—there is so much that we can achieve when there is the political will to do so, and we have seen the powerful role governments can play, particularly state governments, in delivering positive outcomes for our communities.

As a gay man I am reminded of the remarkable strides that have been made in the fight for equality in recent years. As Nelson Mandela once said, it always seems impossible until it is done. During my time in the Senate the fight for marriage equality was front and centre, and it was a wonderful day when that reform passed the parliament. It has played a big role in increasing visibility for LGBTI people and in reducing stigma.

I want to recognise the leadership of this parliament in finally axing the homophobic gay panic defence, which has been a long-term campaign for the Greens, and legislating to remove spent convictions for gay men. These are big achievements, and I am hopeful that this parliament will also take action on other vital areas: banning conversion therapy and ending religious exemptions that allow discrimination of LGBTI people.

For me, the recent advances in LGBTI rights serve as a reminder of what can be achieved through community action. I have always believed that, while the parliament makes the laws, it is the people who drive positive social change. That has been the story of every activist's struggle throughout our history. I know that, while the challenges we face are great, through collective action

we can and we will achieve the change that we need, and I am really looking forward to being able to play my part in amplifying the community voice here in this parliament.

Our state has been very well served by the work of LGBTI rights activists, and I really am so grateful to them for making life easier for people like myself. I want to acknowledge trailblazers like the late Ian Purcell, Greg Mackie, Margie Fisher, Jenny Scott, and so many others who have been bold and inspiring advocates for our LGBTI community in South Australia. Of course, I want to acknowledge the work of the Hon. Ian Hunter as an out gay man in this parliament over many years. I look forward to working with you, Ian, and I am very pleased that we have doubled our LGBTI representation here in the parliament today.

I want to thank the many Greens friends, members and supporters who are watching this stream online. There is a watch party happening in our Greens state office as we speak. I hope you guys have some popcorn happening. I am really so fortunate to have a strong and supportive friendship group in my life. While I cannot mention everybody, I want to acknowledge some of my close friends in the Greens, who I have worked with closely over the years: Lisa Adams, Emily English, Sean Callun-Macaskall, Malwina Wyra and Dominic Mugavin have been big supporters on my political journey, and I thank them for that.

It really is an honour to be here. Might I say, as somebody who has experienced the ups and downs of political life, nothing worth having comes easy. I will be working very hard to ensure that my tenure in this place is a little longer than the nine months I served in the Senate. I have a sense that this sequel might be even better than the original.

It is a real privilege to have this opportunity to serve the community, and I look forward to working with you. Thank you very much.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

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

At 17:40 the council adjourned until Wednesday 5 May 2021 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***KANGAROO CULLING**

9 The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (4 March 2021).

1. What supporting evidence has been used to determine the 'damage and significant impacts caused by kangaroos' referred to in the South Australian Commercial Kangaroo Management Plan 2020-24?
2. How is this 'damage and significant impact caused by kangaroos' determined in reference to the South Australian Commercial Kangaroo Management Plan 2020-24?
3. In correspondence with my office, the Department for Environment and Water have indicated that certain 'information, reports and field research in relation to the damage and significant impacts caused by kangaroos did not directly feed into the development of the South Australian Commercial Kangaroo Management Plan 2020-24'. Could the minister please explain why?
4. What are the figures for all non-commercially killed kangaroos in each South Australian individual harvest zone or subregion (not region) from 2009-20?
5. Why quotas for the commercial kangaroo harvest have continued to increase?
6. Are changes in the environment, such as droughts, factored into the quota system for the commercial kangaroo harvest?
7. What reports have been prepared by the Department for Environment and Water specifically about alleged kangaroo damage to crops, stock or other property? Could these reports be provided?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): The Department for Environment and Water has advised:

The South Australian Commercial Kangaroo Management Plan 2020-2024 (the management plan) has been developed to guide the sustainable management of commercial kangaroo harvesting in South Australia, including setting sustainable harvest quotas to be calculated based on population surveys.

The kangaroo population can increase to unsustainable numbers, which can result in impacts to the environment, agriculture, built infrastructure and public safety. The management plan is not intended to go into detail about the impacts caused by abundant kangaroo populations, however, the impacts are detailed in published literature, which are referenced in the management plan.

The management plan considers changing environmental conditions—including the impact of droughts—and provides for the reduction in quota or closure of harvest zones when populations are low. Since 2019, commercial quotas have been reduced in some areas due to a natural decline in kangaroo numbers during drought conditions.

Non-commercial destruction statistics at the harvest region level are published annually as part of the Commercial Kangaroo Harvest Report, which is available on the Department for Environment and Water website. The Department for Environment and Water does not prepare specific reports in relation to damage to crops, stock or other property.

CHERRY GARDENS AND CLARENDON BUSHFIRES

10 The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (17 March 2021).

1. What funds have been made available to victims of the recent Cherry Gardens bushfire?
2. Of those funds, how much has been taken up by victims of the recent Cherry Gardens bushfire?

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

1. The Cherry Gardens fire destroyed two houses. The disaster recovery funding arrangements (DRFA) were not activated and disaster grants have not been provided.

Appropriate levels of government support are being provided, including wellbeing and personal support, financial counselling, clean up, legal assistance, livestock management, fencing and business support.

2. Not applicable.

CHERRY GARDENS AND CLARENDON BUSHFIRES

11 The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (17 March 2021). Can the Minister for Environment and Water advise:

1. What is the extent of the environmental and biodiversity impact from the recent Cherry Gardens bushfire?
2. What is the extent of the environmental impacts of tree clearing and potential resulting soil erosion?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): The Department for Environment and Water has advised:

1. The Cherry Gardens bushfire burnt approx. 2,600 hectares of native vegetation, including two-thirds of the largest continuous area of intact heath in the southern Mt Lofty Ranges.

Important areas of habitat were burnt for 13 nationally threatened species (listed under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity and Conservation Act 1999) including regional strongholds for the Southern Brown Bandicoot, Mt Lofty Ranges Chestnut-rumped Heathwren, and seven threatened orchid species.

While the bushfire may have had an immediate, short-term impact on habitats and threatened species, in the medium term the impact of fire can provide some habitat benefits, as the vegetation recovers. This recovery is supported on national parks by the National Parks and Wildlife Service South Australia through activities such as weed management, herbivore control and the reintroduction of critically endangered plants.

2. The clearance of native vegetation, including native trees, after a bushfire is regulated under the Native Vegetation Act 1991. The associated regulations allow for clearance in a number of scenarios, which can support landowners to recover after a bushfire, this includes clearance along fence lines and around built structures. Landowners may also apply for approval under the Native Vegetation Act 1991 to clear native trees on their property in other situations.

An assessment of soil erosion will be undertaken by the Department for Environment and Water as part of an assessment of the environmental impacts in national parks following the fire.

HEALTH SERVICES

12 The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (31 March 2021).

1. What measures are currently in place to prevent airborne spread or spread through ventilation of infectious disease/viruses in SA Health facilities, and hospitals in particular?

2. Are there any plans to revise current standards for SA Health facilities, especially for emergency departments and hospitals, regarding airborne spread—particularly through ventilation—of infectious disease/viruses?

3. Regarding the new Mt Barker Hospital emergency department, how is the potential for airborne spread of infectious diseases going to be managed given that current plans look like they leave the negative pressure room in a corner so that the treatment area has to be traversed by possibly infectious patients to get to it?

4. Is the issue of airborne or nosocomial spread of infectious diseases/viruses—particularly COVID-19—within SA Health facilities and particularly hospitals something that has been raised by clinicians with the Minister and/or SA Health?

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

1. There are a range of measures currently in place at SA Health facilities to help mitigate airborne transmission such as:

- Designated COVID-19 care areas and patient flow pathways.
- Physical segregation of COVID-19 patients via distancing, barriers, single patient rooms and negative pressure isolation rooms.
- Good ventilation of COVID-19 patient care areas.
- Use of appropriate personal protective equipment (PPE), including surgical or N95/P2 masks where required, and hand hygiene for staff, patients and visitors.

Airborne transmission through air conditioning and ventilation systems is unlikely; however, SA Health facilities are designed to comply with the relevant standards and guidelines that recommend measures such as:

- Suitable quantities of fresh air supply and exhaust air.
- Minimum number of air changes per hour.
- Minimum filtration efficiencies for return air.
- Airflow directions, and pressure differentials where required, to support infection control principles.

Taken together these measures ensure that internal air within patient areas is continually replaced with fresh air, and any possible airborne viruses are exhausted, captured and diluted to help minimize the risk of airborne transmission.

In specific higher risk locations (such as the RAH emergency department), the air conditioning can be converted to provide 100 per cent fresh air in designated areas to prevent any recirculation of air, and enhanced airflow directions for the area to improve containment, as additional measures to help minimize the risk of airborne transmission.

2. The relevant standards and guidelines will be reviewed and revised (where necessary) in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. The Department for Health and Wellbeing has been proactive in considering lessons learned from the COVID-19 pandemic in the design of new hospital buildings and redevelopments currently in progress. In addition, the Department for Health and Wellbeing continues to collaborate with interstate health

jurisdictions including monitoring any potential changes to the Australasian Health Facility Guidelines literature as a result of COVID-19.

3. The new Mt Barker Hospital emergency department considers COVID-19 and pandemic management throughout the facility design, including relevant control measures such as:

- Waiting areas will have the ability to 'cluster' chairs (rather than consolidated), enabling families to group or single patients to socially distance.
- A negative pressure isolation treatment bay has been included within the new facility that will be designed for infectious diseases; complete with an independent mechanical ventilation system.
- A patient bay special room has also been provided with its own ensuite bathroom to isolate patients requiring privacy and infections such as gastroenteritis.
- Hand washing basins are distributed throughout the department and hand sanitising stations will be provisioned throughout.
- The mechanical ventilation system has been designed as a 'block', separable to the remainder of the hospital, with pressure control to the ED as a whole. This allows the space to be effectively isolated from the rest of the hospital via the building management system (BMS), through air pressure and airflow control, minimising potential transfer of airborne contaminants through departments.

Additionally, patients will be triaged on entry. If a patient is suspected to have an infectious airborne disease, they will be required to adopt the appropriate PPE before moving through the emergency department into the negative pressure isolation room or other areas.

4. There has been open communication and consultation between the local health network clinicians and the Department for Health and Wellbeing throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. The Department for Health and Wellbeing has provided ongoing advice and guidance in relation to airborne transmission evidence, learnings and recommendations.

STRIKE FORCE WYNDARRA

13 The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (1 April 2021).

1. Did SA Police receive a request from NSW Police and/or Strike Force Wyndarra for permission to travel to South Australia to interview the complainant in the case regarding historical rape allegations against former Attorney-General Christian Porter?

2. What documentation has been kept, received, and/or created by SAPOL (including any relevant policies, advices, memorandum, other guidance, and records of phone calls/meetings/discussions) relating to any proposal or request regarding travel by NSW Police and/or Strike Force Wyndarra to South Australia to investigate historical rape allegations against former Attorney-General Christian Porter? Can and will the minister provide copies of these documents?

3. What documentation has been kept, received, and/or created by SAPOL (including any relevant policies, advices, memorandum, other guidance, and records of phone calls/meetings/discussions) regarding the original report to SAPOL of the historical rape allegations against the former Attorney-General Christian Porter, including their referral of the case to NSW Police and any follow up to the investigation? Can and will the minister provide copies of these documents?

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

1. South Australia Police (SAPOL) do not have any cross border travel registrations submitted by New South Wales Police Strike Force Wyndarra.

2. No documents exist.

3. Notes from the conversation held on 15 November 2019, operational briefing paper and SAPOL computer record. As this documentation is owned by SAPOL, the Minister for Police is not in a position to provide.

COVID-19 HOTEL QUARANTINE WORKERS

In reply to **the Hon. J.E. HANSON** (3 February 2021).

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

1. The nurses who work in medi-hotels are entitled to the same pay and conditions as other nurses in the public health system.

COVID-19 HEALTH WORKERS

In reply to **the Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS** (3 February 2021).

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

2. The number of additionally mobilised staff deployed by SA Health fluctuates depending on need and as requests for additional resource are received. Additionally, mobilised workers are currently deployed within the

State Control Centre—Health, COVID-19 contact centre, COVID-19 operations within Communicable Disease Control Branch, community testing stations, vaccination program, medi-hotels, procurement and supply chain management, Department for Health and Wellbeing (DHW), workforce services and the Central Adelaide Local Health Network.

SA Health will continue to use already deployed workers, wherever possible, to assist in the vaccination program.

COVID-19 VACCINE

In reply to **the Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition)** (3 February 2021).

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

1. SA Health does not undertake popularity polling.
2. SA Health has not commissioned market research dedicated to gaining public views into the confidence in the government.

WELLBEING SA

In reply to **the Hon. M.C. PARNELL** (3 February 2021).

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

The Department for Environment and Water and SA Water are continuing to investigate options to provide shared-use access across the Sturt Gorge to strengthen the existing recreational trail network.

A viable option is yet to be finalised, noting that SA Water are currently also undertaking works to assess a potential upgrade of the capability of the dam to withstand a large flood event.

The provision of a shared-use bridge across the Sturt Gorge needs careful consideration to maintain the integrity of the dam wall and ensure the structure does not interfere with any future operation of the dam in achieving its intended purpose. I understand discussions will continue between the two agencies to investigate options to improve access across the Sturt Gorge.

SOUTH EASTERN FREEWAY SPEED CAMERA TESTING

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (4 February 2021).

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

1. Since 3 April 2019.
2. In October 2020, while preparing for the first trial, potential administrative issues were raised. The legal impact of those issues required analysis and advice to determine if it had any impact on the prosecution. On 1 February 2021, the prosecuting authority determined that there was no reasonable prospect of conviction.
3. Yes.
4. See answer to question 3.
5. The testing procedure error has existed since the Leawood Gardens camera on the South Eastern Freeway commenced operation on 3 April 2019. On 2 December 2020, the camera ceased operation due to road works and remains inactive. As such, a revised testing procedure has not yet been utilised to test this camera.
6. The South Eastern Freeway cameras have been tested every 28 days since commencement.
7. As at 19 February 2021, 153 cases were still before the courts.
8. Matters that have been expiated are considered finalised by SAPOL.

COVID-19 QR CODE SECURITY

In reply to **the Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition)** (16 February 2021).

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

In addition to my statement that misuse would be a breach of the Public Sector Code of Ethics, and may result in disciplinary proceedings, misuse of this data may also constitute offences under s93 of the Health Care Act 2008, s99 of the South Australian Public Health Act 2011, and s31A of the Emergency Management Act 2004, all of which have penalties against them. Access to this data is highly restricted and controlled to reduce the risk of misuse.

COVID-19 HOTEL QUARANTINE WORKERS

In reply to **the Hon. J.E. HANSON** (17 February 2021).

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

The Emergency Management (Supervised Quarantine No 4) (COVID-19) Direction 2021, which includes the requirement for staff to have a PCR (nasal swab COVID-19 test) every eight days and daily onsite saliva testing, came into effect on 17 February 2021. Before this, voluntary saliva testing was available across all medi-hotel sites.

There have been no refusals since the direction came into effect.

GAMBLING REGULATION

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (17 February 2021).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Attorney-General has advised:

1. The Liquor and Gambling Commissioner has advised an independent inquiry into the operations of SkyCity Adelaide is not necessary at this time.

The commissioner has received no adverse information regarding the operations of SkyCity Adelaide from AUSTRAC (Australian Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre) or South Australia Police that the conduct identified by the recent inquiry undertaken by the Hon. Patricia Bergin SC is evident in the operations of SkyCity Adelaide.

The commissioner's office also continues its daily inspection operations of SkyCity Adelaide.

If any adverse information about the conduct of SkyCity Adelaide is brought to the commissioner's attention the requirement for an independent inquiry would be considered at that time.

2. As stated, the commissioner has received no adverse information regarding the operations of SkyCity Adelaide from AUSTRAC, SAPOL or his inspections team.

However, in the wake of the findings of the Hon. Patricia Bergin SC, the commissioner has commenced his own review process and has issued a formal notice to SkyCity Adelaide for detailed information in relation to specific matters addressed in the Bergin report that may similarly apply to the operations of SkyCity Adelaide.

SkyCity Adelaide's response will allow the commissioner to further assess the controls that it has in place to protect against the same or similar failings occurring in relation to the management and operations conducted at the Adelaide Casino.

3. The commissioner has inspectors undertaking daily operations in SkyCity Adelaide, which include the monitoring of commission programs.

SkyCity Adelaide undertakes probity checks on junket operators and representatives.

SkyCity Adelaide also has a two-yearly independent review of its processes in place in relation to its anti money laundering and counterterrorism financing obligations.

The commissioner liaises with AUSTRAC and SA Police in relation to the operations of SkyCity Adelaide as required.

The commissioner recently met with AUSTRAC to discuss further information sharing arrangements.

The commissioner will determine if any further inquiries or action is required based on SkyCity Adelaide's response to his request for further information about its operations, in the wake of the Bergin report.

4. Based on this information the Attorney-General supports the regulation of SkyCity Adelaide remaining with Consumer and Business Services led by the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner.

COVID-19 HOME QUARANTINE APP

In reply to **the Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition)** (18 February 2021).

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

The total payment to Genvis Pty Ltd will be \$25,300.00 (incl. GST).

ST KILDA MANGROVES

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (18 February 2021).

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

SA Health officers work closely with local councils with mosquito-prone areas through a program to monitor and manage mosquitos.

Tidal mangrove environments, such as those found in the St Kilda area, do not support significant mosquito breeding as they are naturally flushed on a regular basis by tidal movements.

While there is no expectation that the St Kilda mangroves will experience higher than expected mosquito numbers or present any increased risk of mosquito-borne disease transmission this season, officers of the City of Salisbury and SA Health will continue to work closely to maintain active mosquito surveillance to identify any impacts on mosquito populations associated with changes to the mangrove environment.

BELAIR NATIONAL PARK

In reply to **the Hon. M.C. PARNELL** (2 March 2021).

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): The Department for Environment and Water has advised:

The former Belair Golf Course and Country Club precinct forms part of the Belair National Park, where DEW manages considerable conservation programs, revegetation, and restoration activities. These activities occur to improve conservation of wildlife in a natural environment and to provide enjoyment and public benefit to the wider community.

DEW is currently seeking input from the community on a draft master plan for the Belair National Park, which also considers the best opportunity for the former Belair Golf Course and Country Club. Feedback which was received in response to public consultation held during 2018, following the vacation of the former golf course and country club by the previous operators, consistently highlighted that the community:

- enjoy access to the site, including the network of trails;
- favour a range of activities on the site, rather than a single use;
- value the site's natural setting;
- support commercial activities on the site, including accommodation, hospitality, tourism and recreational opportunities; and
- support the site becoming a hub for arts, events, cultural, educational and recreational activities.

The draft master plan and draft amendment of the Belair National Park Management Plan seeks to provide a framework for the future management of the site and is currently out for public consultation. This is an opportunity for the community to be involved with shaping the future for Belair National Park.

ELECTRIC VEHICLES

In reply to **the Hon. M.C. PARNELL** (3 March 2021).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised:

1. At 28 February 2021, there were nine vehicles in the fleet that were purely electric. There were 38 plug-in hybrid electric vehicles and 1,614 hybrid electric vehicles in the fleet.

2. Currently, there is limited availability of electric vehicles that are suitable for government operational needs. There are 18 vehicle segments in the government's passenger and light commercial motor vehicle fleet, and only two of these segments have purely electric vehicles available that have been deemed appropriate for government use. These are the Hyundai Ioniq in the passenger small segment, and the Hyundai Kona and MG ZS EV in the sport utility vehicle small segment.

As new models are released, charging infrastructure improves, charging times decrease, and the whole-of-life cost gets closer to parity with an internal combustion engine vehicle, the uptake of battery electric vehicles will increase.

From 1 January 2021, there has been an opt-out policy in place, where a government agency ordering a vehicle in a segment that has a plug-in electric vehicle available is to select the electric vehicle. To 'opt-out', agencies need to demonstrate that a plug-in electric vehicle is not fit-for-purpose, not cost-effective or cannot be integrated through further fleet efficiencies. Currently, costs are high and infrastructure is in its infancy. With \$18.3 million committed to the Electric Vehicle Action Plan, and vehicle manufacturers intending to import a range of battery electric vehicles into Australia, it is expected that the uptake will be slow in the first couple of years, before increasing from 2025 as infrastructure and cost improve.

RETIREMENT VILLAGES

In reply to **the Hon. J.A. DARLEY** (4 March 2021).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Attorney-General has advised:

The current Valuer-General has been communicating with various stakeholders through a number of means since the seven recommendations of the Joint Committee on the Valuation Policies and Charges on Retirement Villages were tabled in November 2019, where not all of the recommendations are applicable to the Valuer-General.

A comprehensive process of consultation commenced in July 2020 when the Valuer-General's service provider, Land Services SA, wrote to retirement village owners requesting nomination of a liaison officer.

In August 2020, with the retirement village owners now fully engaged in the process, 'land owner returns' were issued which requested information designed to assist in the valuation process. There were 530 such land owner returns issued, and as at March 2021 the Valuer-General has advised there has been over a 95 per cent response rate.

This comprehensive consultation was designed to assist the Valuer-General to deliver upon recommendation one, which was based on her preferred approach, to create an assessment record for each retirement village, which will include a valuation of the whole of the property and a separate tenancy apportionment for each independent living unit.

More recently, on 23 February 2021, the Valuer-General hosted webinar information sessions with local government (including representation by the Local Government Association) around valuation matters, including an update on the valuation of retirement villages and independent living units.

Then on 25 February 2021, there was a further webinar information session for key stakeholders, such as retirement village operators and resident association(s), which was also attended by the Property Council of Australia. To assist the Valuer-General with stakeholder enquiries, the session was attended by Land Services SA, SA Water, Concessions SA, Department of Treasury and Finance (Land Tax and Emergency Services Levy) and Office of Local Government.

I have been advised the Hon. John Darley MLC was also invited to participate in the session.

At the webinar information sessions, there was the opportunity for participants to submit questions to be addressed by the Valuer-General, and participants were provided with links to fact sheets and other communication tools such as information videos.

The Valuer-General will continue to provide ongoing communication up until the valuations come into force on 1 July 2021 for the 2021-22 financial year, and if necessary provide assistance for residents with the objection process.

Further, whilst the joint committee recommended the convening of a working group to oversee consultation and creation of a new memorandum of understanding as part of recommendation four, the Valuer-General was advised by my office that the memorandum of understanding and working group are no longer applicable.

WAITE GATEHOUSE

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (16 March 2021).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Minister for Infrastructure and Transport has advised:

1. The state government entered into a confidentiality agreement with Mammoth Movers in May 2020 in relation to their initial quotation, which included costings. The confidentiality agreement contains clauses to the effect that no information is to be disclosed to any person except as required to carry out the project and then only on a confidential basis.

2. The updated quotation from Mammoth Movers included the initial confidentiality agreement entered as part of the initial quotation.

The \$3.6 million (GST inclusive) estimated for the relocation of the Urrbrae gatehouse included the updated quotation from Mammoth Movers, of which these specific details cannot be disclosed due to the aforementioned confidentiality agreement. The \$3.6 million (GST inclusive) also included costings, not forming part of the updated quotation relating to works such as the installation of new services to the building, design and management fees, landscaping works around the building and an appropriate contingency.

On 22 January 2021, Mammoth Movers were advised of these costings and acknowledged the \$3.6 million (GST inclusive) estimate.

3. On 15 March 2021, the state government announced it had reached an agreement with the University of Adelaide to decommission, rebuild and repurpose the Urrbrae gatehouse.

The \$2.5 million (GST inclusive) estimated to undertake these works, is based on a like for like relocation of elements with significant heritage value including chimneys, roofing, windows and stonework. Any items damaged during the rebuild will be expected to be replaced like for like or replicated to a standard accepted by Heritage SA. This will form part of the contract to undertake the works, which will be procured by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT).

The University of Adelaide has advised that it is intending to use the relocated building as a workspace, meeting and gathering space, for volunteers who maintain the arboretum and Urrbrae House gardens. Therefore, the relocated building's interior will be furnished for use as offices, meeting rooms, and amenities, to ensure it is fit for purpose both now and into the future.

DIT will continue to work collaboratively with the University of Adelaide to deliver this outcome.

PROJECT ENERGYCONNECT

In reply to **the Hon. M.C. PARNELL** (18 March 2021).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Minister for Energy and Mining has advised:

All the Project EnergyConnect Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) chapters for the Robertstown to SA / NSW border are complete and have now been lodged by ElectraNet for adequacy review against the EIS guidelines (guidelines) gazetted by the State Planning Commission on 27 September 2019. The guidelines were prepared by the

state government in line with the commonwealth government's requirement for assessment of Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act matters. The South Australian Minister for Planning and Local Government is expected to release the EIS for public consultation in the next few months.

In regard to the route, the selection methodology developed by ElectraNet and TransGrid, together with a number of specialists, was reviewed and endorsed by the Project EnergyConnect steering committee, which includes representatives from the following government departments: SA Department for Energy and Mining, SA Environment Protection Authority, SA Department for Infrastructure and Transport, SA Planning and Land Use Services, SA Department for Environment and Water, NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment, and Commonwealth Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment. It was also presented to key stakeholders for feedback.

The Project EnergyConnect steering committee has actively encouraged ElectraNet to evaluate various route alternatives. After identifying an initial investigation corridor, ElectraNet considered detailed alternative route options within that refined investigation corridor. The committee has actively engaged on ecological sensitivity, particularly in regard to Calperum and Taylorville Stations which were traversed by the investigation corridor.

Alternative route options as part of the detailed multi-criteria analysis process were identified based on local constraints and opportunities, and evaluated with regard to engineering, ecology, cultural heritage, visual, land access and compensation, stakeholder concerns, project cost and schedule impacts.

The results of the analyses have been presented by ElectraNet to the relevant district councils, Regional Development Australia Murraylands and Riverland, and the public via extensive engagement activities including community drop-in sessions and an interactive mapping portal and the Project EnergyConnect website.

A preferred route alignment was tested with landholders and government with subsequent refinements made to this alignment based on ecological and cultural heritage inputs throughout 2020. The Australian Landscape Trust was a key stakeholder during this testing process and following feedback ElectraNet made route amendments to skirt the southern and eastern boundaries of Calperum Station and the southern boundary of Taylorville Station. The result of this extensive engagement is the proposed route alignment that is to be assessed in the EIS.

PUBLIC SECTOR

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (18 March 2021).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised:

The Commissioner for Public Sector Employment is not consolidating a process to investigate public sector leaks.

Rather, the commissioner advised the Budget and Finance Committee that her office is establishing a panel of external investigators who are suitably qualified to undertake investigations of any nature at an agency's request.

The procurement of the panel is currently underway, and is expected to be in place in the second half of this year.

The circumstances of any investigation in which an agency chooses to engage an external investigation will be determined by that agency's chief executive or delegate.

MIMECAST

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (30 March 2021).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Premier has advised:

The SA government first began using Mimecast Secure Email Gateway to protect SA government employees from malicious and spam emails in 2016 as part of the transition from Telstra to Dimension Data. Preceding this, Ironport devices were used by Telstra for the management of mail hygiene.

A key feature of the Mimecast system is URL protection, which safeguards the SA government against the growing threat posed by advanced phishing and spear phishing attacks in inbound email.

The service works by funnelling all government emails through the Mimecast system, where they are then scanned for the presence of malicious URLs. All URLs in inbound and outbound messages are then rewritten, meaning an employee is only taken to a website if it is deemed safe. If it is not deemed safe, the website is blocked. This product ensures employees who click on links are protected in real time.

Globally, email is responsible for a large proportion of all cyber attacks so products like Mimecast help mitigate the growing number of threats that the government deals with on a daily basis.

The SA government uses the Mimecast product for cybersecurity purposes only.

SHACK LEASES

In reply to **the Hon. J.A. DARLEY** (30 March 2021).

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): The Department for Environment and Water has advised:

The government's election commitment to retain shacks for holiday accommodation purposes is well on track to be delivered prior to March 2022.

For those lessees who have already applied to the Department for Environment and Water for longer tenure at their site, whether on Crown land or in a national park, they will start to receive their offer to lease in the coming months.

ALBERTON OVAL

In reply to **the Hon. M.C. PARNELL** (31 March 2021).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Minister for Planning and Local Government has advised:

1. The Port Adelaide Football Club grounds are located within the recreation zone of the Planning and Design Code. In accordance with the procedural matters of the zone, a redevelopment of the clubrooms in a manner which has been speculated would require public consultation, a process which requires:

- Notice being given by direct mail to adjoining landowners/occupiers within 60 metres of the site; and
- Notice being given to the public in general through a sign being placed on the site, and publication of the application and supporting plans, drawings and specifications on the PlanSA portal.

The public have 15 business days to make a submission to the relevant authority.

As can be observed by the process described above, the public consultation process under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 (PDI Act) is not limited in its reach. Rather, it establishes a broad consultative process wherein any member of the general public that has an interest in the development can submit a representation to the relevant authority.

The default relevant authority for the development application would be the City of Port Adelaide Enfield's (council's) council assessment panel.

Under the Development Act 1993, a proposal of the same nature would have required category 2 public consultation in accordance with the requirements of council's development plan. Under the old Act, public consultation would have been limited to direct notice being given to the adjoining landowners, only, and for a period of 10 business days. The general public (other than adjoining owners/occupiers) would have had no legal right to have been notified, nor to be heard by the relevant authority, which would have been council.

2. Under the Local Government Act 1999 (LG Act), Alberton Oval and the area of reserve along Seventh Avenue, Alberton, are community land under the care, control and management of the City of Port Adelaide Enfield (council).

Pursuant to s194 of the LG Act, council must adopt a management plan for land held as community land. Further, council must undertake public consultation before adopting or amending a management plan. The land affected by the proposed redevelopment is identified in council's Community Land Management Plan – Commercial Property, which is publicly available on its website.

As the custodian of the land, council will be required to uphold its obligations under the LG Act, and, where necessary, undertake public consultation independent of the development application process in accordance with the legislative requirements, if it wishes to change the management plan. The LG Act requires councils to publish a notice in a newspaper circulating within the area of the council and on a council website, and to allow at least 21 days for interested persons to make a submission on the matter.