

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**Tuesday, 11 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.

*Parliamentary Procedure***PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas)—

Fee Notices under Acts—

Bills of Sale Act 1886
Community Titles Act 1996
Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing) Act 1994
Passenger Transport Act 1994
Real Property Act 1886
Registration of Deeds Act 1935
Roads (Opening and Closing) Act 1991
Strata Titles Act 1988
Valuation of Land Act 1971
Worker's Liens Act 1893

Regulations under Acts—

Harbors and Navigation Act 1993—
Motor Vehicles Act 1959—
Fees
National Heavy Vehicles Registration Fees

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

Fee Notices under Acts—

National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972

Regulations under Acts—

National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972—
Fees Revocation
Wildlife Fee Notices

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

Fee Notices under Acts—

Education and Children's Services Act 2019

Regulations under Acts—

Teachers Registration and Standards Act 2004—
Amendment of Schedule 1 of Act
General
Saving and Transitional Provisions

ANSWERS TABLED

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

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

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

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice concerning the replacement of members on the Standing Orders Committee in place of the Hon. I.K. Hunter (resigned) and the Hon. R.A. Simms (resigned).

Motion carried.

The PRESIDENT: I note the absolute majority.

Parliamentary Committees

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

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

That the Hon. I. Pnevmatikos be appointed to the Standing Orders Committee in place of the Hon. I.K. Hunter (resigned) and the Hon. T.A. Franks be appointed to the Standing Orders Committee in place of the Hon. R.A. Simms (resigned).

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

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

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice concerning the replacement of a member to the Select Committee on Wage Theft in South Australia in place of the Hon. T.A. Franks (resigned).

Motion carried.

The PRESIDENT: I note the absolute majority.

Parliamentary Committees

SELECT COMMITTEE ON WAGE THEFT IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:22): I move:

That the Hon. R.A. Simms be appointed to the Select Committee on Wage Theft in South Australia in place of the Hon. T.A. Franks (resigned).

Motion carried.

Question Time

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): My question is to the Minister for Health. Minister, what would you say to Geoff, who rang into ABC radio to reveal that his son suffered a seizure and was left to wait more than two hours for an ambulance yesterday morning? Do you have any advice that Geoff's son was downgraded from a priority 2 to a priority 3 ambulance status, against clinical guidelines?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:23): I thank the honourable member for his question. I haven't got details about the case, but in terms of a general comment to South Australians, the Ambulance Service strives to deliver the highest possible care. Of course, there are times when ambulances need to be diverted to respond to more clinically urgent cases. SAAS, in this context, I am sure would have had line of sight of the patient and would be actively trying to deliver the appropriate care in a timely fashion.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): Supplementary in relation to the answer just given: to be clear, minister, are you advising the chamber that you had no information

on a matter that was raised in the media this morning, that is, Geoff's son waiting more than two hours for an ambulance? You have absolutely no information on that?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:24): I haven't been provided with any advice on that case.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:24): 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: The Ambulance Employees Association yesterday evening reported that an 84-year-old woman was, at that point, on the Flinders Medical Centre ramp for three hours 50 minutes and counting. The association described the situation as 'elder abuse'. My question to the minister is: can the minister explain why an 84-year-old woman was left to wait more than four hours on the ramp at Flinders Medical Centre after suffering a fall?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:25): I don't have details on that case.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Bourke has the call and her own backbench will help her if they remain silent.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:25): 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. E.S. BOURKE: Yesterday, the daughter of Agatha, Annalisa, phoned ABC radio to reveal her mother was, for the second time in the past month, ramped outside the emergency department. Annalisa said:

She's not doing very well, she says she's had enough and she just wants to die because she's got to wait in an ambulance...

What is it going to take for them to actually do something about it and open up some more beds?

The Premier told ABC Radio Adelaide this morning:

What I can say though is that everybody is triaged, and if there was a situation where that patient needed to be seen more urgently, then that's exactly and precisely what would have happened.

My questions to the minister are: can the minister explain why 93-year-old Agatha was left to wait three hours on a ramp at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and does the minister stand by the Premier's response to Annalisa's case that if she needed to be seen more urgently she would have been?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:26): SA Health and I apologise unreservedly to the patient and her family for what was clearly a deeply distressing experience yesterday. The Central Adelaide Local Health Network chief executive officer also apologises on behalf of the network for the experience.

I am advised that at the time of her presentation to the Royal Adelaide Hospital approximately 80 patients were present in the emergency department. This surge of patients also included several urgent walk-in cases, some of which required resuscitation and catheterisation lab intervention. There were several stroke patients and a patient suffering from an aneurysm. Notwithstanding this surge, I understand the anger and concerns expressed by the patient's family, and I share those concerns.

I think it is important to appreciate that a number of the government's initiatives will significantly benefit older South Australians who need urgent care. The priority care centres in particular are, in my view, particularly well suited to older South Australians, because they are

GP practices with emergency nurse support and they are well placed to deal with a range of conditions that older South Australians may need care for.

It has certainly been pleasing in recent weeks to see some very strong attendances at the priority care centres, and SA Health is actively working to enhance the model and increase the uptake, particularly in terms of the guidance of ambulances to that service, where it's clinically appropriate.

There has been an increase in chronic patients, who would often be older patients, and certainly the health system is seeking to develop critical care services so that more people can get the urgent care they need in the community. It is often much better for the patient and it helps ease pressure on our emergency departments.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): Supplementary: is the minister able to outline to the chamber what processes he has in place, his office has in place and his department has in place that allow him to have information about this case but none of the others asked today, or indeed asked last week?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:29): In relation to the CALHN case I just referred to, I sought a briefing on it yesterday. I would actually make the point that the case the honourable member refers to—I think the parent's name was Geoff—was earlier today.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): Further supplementary: in relation to another case that was raised in question time already today that happened yesterday, as did the one the minister seems to have information on, why has he got information about that and not the other case? What processes are in place in his office and the department to make sure he is informed of these things?

The PRESIDENT: I am not sure that that is any different to the previous question, but if the minister wishes to answer I will let him.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:30): Certainly, my office and the department seek to be alert to issues raised in the public domain but, as I said, I don't have a briefing on the case where the parent was called Geoff.

SINGLE TOUCH PAYROLL

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (14:30): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer update us again on the latest Single Touch Payroll figures for this week, please?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:30): I am sure all members excitedly await the fortnightly release of the labour force Single Touch Payroll figures by the independent Australian Bureau of Statistics. I am pleased to be able to report that the most recent fortnightly figures, which were as recent as 24 April, indicate the very strong position in terms of jobs recovery for South Australia post COVID.

As I said, the latest figures for the fortnight ending 24 April, when compared to the low point of COVID-19, which was the middle of April 2020—just on 12 months—show a 13.4 per cent increase in jobs in South Australia, the second highest of all the states and just behind Western Australia at 13.5 per cent. A number of the other jurisdictions, such as New South Wales, Tasmania and Queensland, have job growth rates of only 10 or 10½ per cent or approximately in that order and the Australian growth rate is 11.2 per cent. It is encouraging, again, to see the very strong job growth figures on the most recent figures compared to the low point of the pandemic in April of last year.

As I have indicated before, the more interesting number from my viewpoint as Treasurer is the number that for the first time actually measures employee wages. Again, that shows South Australia's wage growth figures for employees between the most recent fortnight and the low point of the pandemic in mid-April last year showing a 10.9 per cent growth, bearing in mind that this measures the fact that some households may well be getting more work and therefore the total wages for the household might have increased. It does not measure wage increases from that particular

viewpoint but is the total wages going into a particular household; a combination of both wage increases but also potentially increased working hours for particular households.

That 10.9 per cent employee wage growth figure compares with the Australian figure of 9.7 per cent and the lows of New South Wales, for example, at just 8.3 per cent. South Australia's wage growth figure there is third behind Western Australia and just behind Victoria. Again, when you look at that together with some of the figures to come out, which have only just been released this morning by Business SA in relation to business conditions and business confidence, they are good indicators in terms of the state's economic recovery post COVID-19.

YOUTH DEATH, PORT LINCOLN

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:33): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Human Services, representing the child protection minister the Hon. Rachel Sanderson and the Premier as the minister responsible for Indigenous affairs, about the tragic death of a youth in Port Lincoln today.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: A 13-year-old boy was crushed to death by a garbage truck in Port Lincoln after it emptied a large rubbish bin in which he and two friends were sleeping. We, as a community, should be shocked and appalled that three children, whom I understand were Indigenous, had to find shelter in a rubbish bin. I understand the boys had been under the care of the Aboriginal Family Support Service for some time. My questions to the ministers are:

1. Why were these children not in any shelter or government care at the time of this shocking tragedy?
2. What has the department done to ensure their safety and wellbeing?
3. Where are the other two boys now being cared for, and why were they not able to return to their families?
4. Had the department previously contacted the deceased child's mother or family in relation to his safety or wellbeing at any time, including last night, and if so when?
5. When did the service provider become aware that these three children were on the streets and not in secure accommodation? What did they do and when did they do it?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:35): I thank the honourable member for his question. I think it is fair to say that there is a deal of opinion in some of his questions, which I think is potentially unhelpful. It is indeed a tragedy that this situation has happened in Port Lincoln and that a child has died.

The matter is a matter which is subject to a police investigation. All agencies involved are cooperating in this. As I will state again and again in relation to these individual matters, particularly where someone is in the child protection system, there are very specific statutory clauses which prevent anybody who is involved in these cases from commenting publicly, as also applies, indeed, if anybody is in the youth justice system.

So I will couch that in those terms. These are matters which are before SAPOL and investigations will take place, and therefore I am unable to make any comment.

YOUTH DEATH, PORT LINCOLN

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:37): Can the minister explain what was unhelpful about my question? Gauging her response, it appears there is an odour of a cover-up developing.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:37): Look, I reject that. I think any speculation at this time is unhelpful, and I'm not going to make any further comment.

YOUTH DEATH, PORT LINCOLN

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:37): Does the minister think it is acceptable that there should be children in our society that need to find shelter in dumpsters?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:37): Again, the honourable member is speculating, and I'm not going to make any further comments on this case. It is a matter for the police, and that's the appropriate channel for all lines of inquiry.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:38): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding health. I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking that question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS: Ramping has escalated to break an alarming new record in each of the past three months: 1,992 hours in February, 2,098 hours in March and a shocking 2,281 hours in April. This represents the worst ramping in South Australia's history. My questions are:

1. Does the minister take responsibility for presiding over the worst ambulance ramping in our state's history?
2. Can the minister explain why 37 ambulances were ramped outside our hospitals yesterday afternoon?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:39): There is no doubt that we are experiencing very high levels of ambulance ramping, and in that we are not alone. Emergency departments right around Australia are experiencing increased pressure during COVID. What we are particularly seeing, as I mentioned earlier, are the higher acuity presentations particularly in relation to older, chronic patients. The more chronic patients, the more complex cases often necessitate a longer stay and that has put increased pressure on our emergency departments.

Of course, COVID itself is also putting pressure on the supply of critical care through our emergency departments because of matters such as social distancing, increased use of infection control measures, such as single rooms and, of course, if there is any concern as to the person's COVID-positive state they might need to have testing.

The latest data confirmed what we all knew, that the first part of this year has been a very busy time in our emergency departments. The government continues to develop critical care services. I have already mentioned priority care centres. Another example is the Urgent Mental Health Care Centre in the CBD, which is in the process of increasing to full capacity.

The other initiative which will help ease pressure in the emergency departments—one amongst a number—is the My Home Hospital initiative. Again, this is particularly useful for people with chronic and complex conditions. It is particularly relevant for people who might have cognitive impairment. There are challenges with an ED presentation and inpatient care for a person with cognitive impairment—such as dementia—particularly in relation to orientation, and so being able to get care at home is of particular benefit for those people.

The Marshall Liberal government's investment in emergency departments I believe will be a significant factor in helping to address ambulance ramping, particularly in relation to improved patient flows. The Flinders Medical Centre I am told will have improved patient flows when the redevelopment there is completed. When the redevelopment is completed, there will be up to an additional 30 treatment spaces at the Flinders Medical Centre and an approximately 50 per cent increase.

We will continue to deal with the issues facing our emergency departments. We will be doing that collaboratively because other states and territories are experiencing increased demand as well as increased pressure. We are keen to work together to get a better understanding of the factors that are contributing to this increase.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Pnevmatikos has a supplementary

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:43): Will the minister now release monthly ED presentation numbers since coming to government?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:43): Well, your government didn't.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:43): I have a supplementary: the minister spoke about longer term plans to ease pressure at ED presentations. What are his plans to relieve pressure at EDs in the coming weeks when the flu season starts to mount?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:43): I thank the honourable member for his question. Directly relevant to that are the two initiatives that I have already mentioned. The Urgent Mental Health Care Centre will be increasing its capacity and also the Flinders Medical Centre redevelopment will be coming online in the next two months.

URGENT MENTAL HEALTH CARE CENTRE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:43): How many presentations have been made to the Urgent Mental Health Care Centre since it opened, and how have those presentations been referred there?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:44): I am very happy to get that data for the honourable member. I might refer back to the comment I made earlier about the system getting used to new referral pathways.

It would be fair to say that I have been receiving overwhelmingly positive feedback from consumers in terms of the urgent mental health care model, but there are days when presentations are low and the system is busy. What that says to me is that sometimes when services such as the Ambulance Service or emergency departments are busy they are almost too busy to think about the alternatives, so we are certainly keen to work together as a health system to make sure that we use the alternative pathways that are available to us.

WOMEN'S SAFETY

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding women's safety. Can the minister please provide an update to the council on how the Marshall Liberal government is improving regional responses to domestic and family violence?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:45): I thank the honourable member for her question and for the opportunity to talk about some of our specifically regional-based services that are assisting women and children more at the community level before matters have escalated to achieve some support when they need it.

Last Friday, it was my great pleasure to open our fifth domestic and family violence hub in the community in Mount Barker. I was joined there by Assistant Minister for Domestic and Family Violence Prevention, Carolyn Power, the local state member, Dan Cregan, the local federal member, Rebekha Sharkie, and Her Worship Mayor Ann Ferguson.

This particular service opened on 16 March. It is another one that we are calling The Haven and it is located at the community centre, which is an independent community-based community centre very well located to things like the local TAFE, the Mount Barker community centre and other services at Auchendarroch House.

It provides a supportive space for women who are at risk of or are experiencing domestic and family violence. It is centrally located with accessibility to public transport and offers a range of universal and targeted services that will provide a sense of privacy to women, in addition to accessible pathways to other co-located services, such as financial counselling, emergency relief, training and social inclusion programs.

This particular centre is run by dedicated board members, staff and volunteers, who are extremely positive about having The Haven come on board. It is a co-located site with the Women's Information Service, which recruited some 16 volunteers for the service and has done some extensive training with those volunteers to assist them with counselling, identification of issues and the like.

We know from our experience with other havens that particularly for the volunteers, for whom we are extremely grateful for their support for these programs, and through a lot of other volunteering programs, that there's always a benefit for those people who volunteer. It gives them that sense of wellbeing and giving back to their community. We also know that some of our volunteers have gained confidence in those roles to go on and gain employment.

So it has been a fantastic initiative, the fifth of these that we have opened up in a regional area and we look forward to rolling more of these particular services out to our regions so that people can get that assistance as they need.

RURAL HEALTH SERVICE FUNDING

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:48): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question on the topic of funding for rural health services to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Last year, we saw funding extended to boost the SA Ambulance Service community paramedic program in Robe and Ceduna until this year. The purpose of this funding was ostensibly to assist with an increased capacity to deal with the COVID-19 pandemic. Of course, the pandemic is still here with us and a year later we are seeing a mental health tsunami across the nation and, as the minister has mentioned many times, increased emergency department presentations.

SAAS has also previously noted that the placement of additional community paramedics would provide general and emergency health care as well as play an important role in community education around public health issues and not just COVID-19. The program itself has, of course, prevented hundreds of emergency ambulance calls and hospital attendances by delivering preventative health screening and pre-hospital health care and education in the community. My question to the minister is:

1. Will there still be funding after this year to support community paramedics in those two locations of Robe and Ceduna, given the clear success, benefits and importance of this program?
2. Are there any plans to expand the program?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:50): I thank the honourable member for her question. My understanding is that funding has been confirmed until the end of June 2022, so 15 months, but I will certainly come back and correct the record if that isn't accurate.

In relation to the two that the honourable member mentions, the community paramedics at Robe and Ceduna, the honourable member quite rightly highlights the versatility of paramedics in terms of not just critical care but supporting the whole continuum of care. The Robe community paramedics work with Dr David Senior, the GP there. Robe certainly doesn't have a hospital.

My understanding is it might be the largest town in South Australia without a hospital, so the community paramedic model is particularly relevant. The honourable member talks about the diversity of the community paramedic role. My understanding is that the community paramedics there not only work with the local GP and support broader health care but also support the local volunteer ambulance crews.

In relation to the Ceduna practice, it was my privilege when I was in Ceduna recently to meet with members of the community paramedic team, who highlighted the exact point the honourable member makes in terms of the relevance of community paramedics for primary care. Those particular community paramedics have a role in supporting primary care for particularly Aboriginal South Australians in that local community, and I think highlight the opportunity of community paramedics to, if you like, be navigators amongst the different services. You have Yandu Health Aboriginal Corporation, which is co-located with the Ceduna hospital, and you have the town camp and other services in Ceduna, so I think the community paramedics play a valuable role there.

While I was there, it was a privilege to have a conversation with a community paramedic and some senior SAAS people about ways the model could evolve. In that regard, I will take the opportunity to respond to the member's final question, I seem to recall, which was: are there any plans to expand the use of community paramedics? Yes, there are and, yes, we are.

We have a pilot operating in the south coast using community paramedics for in-reach to nursing homes. I think it is just nursing homes; I don't think it involves visitations to homes. I think it is a good example of what many people were hoping might come out of the royal commission into aged care. I know there will be a lot of people looking very closely at the federal budget tonight to see whether there is any support for what I would call in-reach health services, whether that's into a person's home or into their home if it's a nursing home or a retirement village.

We see this in-reach model being used in both state and federal-funded services. In fact, on the Repat site we have both a Dementia Support Australia service, which is funded by the federal government, delivered in South Australia from that site by HammondCare, which provides in-reach, as I understand it, both into nursing homes and people's homes, and also we have the SA Health service located in the same facility.

I am strongly of the view that we need to be agile in using the skills of our health professionals. It was my privilege earlier today to attend a morning tea to celebrate International Nurses Day tomorrow and to remember International Midwives Day last Wednesday. I had cause to reflect on how much this year has demonstrated the versatility of the nursing profession. Who would have thought a year ago that we would have nurses being key members of teams that would be delivering medi-hotels, testing, mass vaccination clinics, border controls and so many other things? I for one pay tribute to our health professionals and to their versatility and agility.

RURAL HEALTH SERVICE FUNDING

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:55): Supplementary: given the outstanding results of the community paramedic program, both in Robe and in Ceduna—and I would also like to pay tribute to Dr David Senior in Robe and Lucindale and the excellent work he does—why won't the minister commit funding that would allow greater certainty rather than the short periods that he is referring to, something such as four-year or five-year funding?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:56): I think one of the factors here is the fact that this is co-funded. I might caution my words there by saying my understanding is both the Ceduna and the Robe projects are partnership funding with the Country SA PHN, I think is what they call themselves. I will seek clarification on the south coast one, but my understanding is the south coast pilot is a pilot.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding health:

1. How many emergency department presentations are there across our metropolitan hospitals compared to the same time in 2019 pre-COVID?
2. How many patients have been admitted from emergency departments across our metropolitan hospitals compared to the same time in 2019 pre-COVID?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:57): I am happy to take those questions on notice.

REGIONAL DIALYSIS SERVICES

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister update the council on the government's plans to increase access to dialysis in regional South Australia?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:57): I thank the honourable member for his question. In the lead-up to the 2018 election, the Marshall Liberal team promised to invest heavily in health facilities and services in regional and remote South Australia to make it easier for country people to access care and treatment should they need it. Delivering on that commitment has been an unwavering focus of the Marshall Liberal government, something we have boosted in the context of the global pandemic as both an opportunity to increase access to services and a way of sustaining the South Australian economy.

Our pre-election commitment included a promise to support the establishment of a permanent dialysis facility at Pukatja on the APY lands, something the previous government failed to support over a number of years. With the support of the Marshall Liberal government and others, the Pukatja facility opened in August 2019. At this point, I pause to acknowledge the contribution of the Greens leader, the Hon. Tammy Franks, for her long-term advocacy for the Pukatja facility.

The Pukatja facility has made it possible for people who need regular dialysis—perhaps three times a week for around four or five hours at a time—to remain with their families on their traditional lands. Prior to the opening of the facility, the only choice for anyone needing regular dialysis was to relocate hundreds and hundreds of kilometres from their homes in facilities such as Adelaide, Port Augusta, Alice Springs and the like.

Needless to say, that experience of dislocation doesn't only affect dialysis patients on the APY lands. Securing ongoing access to a dialysis chair is a challenge for every person with end-stage renal disease in regional and remote Australia. That is why last year the Marshall Liberal government committed \$200,000 towards the cost of establishing a purpose-built dialysis facility in Coober Pedy, and why in the last week the Marshall Liberal government announced a quarter of a million dollar investment in the Ceduna hospital to expand its dialysis service.

Pausing to reflect, that is at least the third shout-out for Ceduna this week. I had cause to reflect on the sterling work of their midwifery service last week; today we are celebrating an expansion of their services in relation to dialysis; and of course the Hon. Tammy Franks has reminded us of the stellar work of the community paramedics amongst the Ceduna community.

This investment in the dialysis service will make it possible for more West Coast dialysis patients to receive life-saving treatment closer to home—patients who might otherwise have to relocate permanently to Adelaide, Port Lincoln or another regional centre. Last Tuesday—sorry, the Tuesday of the week before last, because of course I was on duty here last Tuesday—I had the opportunity to visit the dialysis unit in the Ceduna hospital and talk with staff there about the expansion and what it will mean for them and for the patients they care for. Around 85 per cent of their clients are Aboriginal South Australians.

On the ground in Ceduna the redevelopment is being driven by the hospital's director of nursing, Andrew Lane, and Emma Collins, the nurse unit manager. My discussions with Andrew, Emma and Samantha Fleming, a registered nurse who works in the unit, underscored how vital and life changing these types of investments can be, and how determined local staff are to deliver them as quickly as possible. The redevelopment is planned to be completed this year.

I also want to acknowledge two other people who were part of the visit: one, the outgoing member for Flinders, Peter Treloar, who has been a strong advocate for strengthening access to health services for the people of Eyre Peninsula and the West Coast; and the other is Mr Warren Miller, the Acting Chief Executive Officer of Yadu Health Aboriginal Corporation (formerly the Ceduna Koonibba Aboriginal Health Service).

It was clear from my discussions with both Mr Miller and Mr Lane that Yadu, the local Aboriginal community controlled health service and the Ceduna hospital, the government-operated hospital, have a strong and positive working relationship and see the value and exciting opportunities that an expanded dialysis service will mean, not only for clients but also for the staff who support them, both in the service and vital support services.

REGIONAL DIALYSIS SERVICES

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:02): Supplementary: where the minister referred in his answer to pre-election promises for health in regional areas, when will the government fulfil its pre-election promise to return maternity services to Millicent hospital?

The PRESIDENT: I am not sure that that arises out of the original answer. I call the Hon. Mr Darley.

RESTRICTIVE PRACTICES

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:02): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Human Services questions on restrictive practices applying to vulnerable groups.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: With this chamber having passed the Disability Inclusion (Restrictive Practices—NDIS) Amendment Bill on the sixth of this month, it is an opportune time to ask about the expansion of the scheme. The NDIS bill protected and improved the rights of people with a disability under NDIS who may be subject to restrictive practices. The use of restrictive practices impacts on basic human rights and needs to be kept to an absolute minimum, and be a last resort reflected in the bill just passed by this chamber. My questions to the Minister for Human Services are:

1. When will the government bring forward further legislation to safeguard other vulnerable groups, including the aged with their in-home services and residential care?

2. Given that the existing bill for NDIS providers notes that the use of restricted practices is not authorised to address inadequate levels of staffing, equipment and facilities, why is this not also a priority for aged care and other vulnerable groups?

3. Does the minister see merit in the argument that legislative safeguards for vulnerable groups who may be subject to restrictive practices should lie with the Attorney-General in her role as chief law officer, rather than the service and delivery agencies?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:04): I thank the honourable member for his question. In response to the last question, that was a matter we did discuss in this chamber, that the management, if you like, of the restrictive practices, the narrow scope of what we were dealing with in parliament recently, is such that the government has decided the best place for that is with the Department of Human Services, given that it has been intimately involved since and post the transition to the NDIS in terms of the policy leavers and so have that body of knowledge in it. The proposed regulation will sit in a separate part of the department from our service delivery arm, which is in our accommodation services. Because it is a larger department, it can manage those particular areas quite separately.

I may have spoken in this place before about the overall process to reach the stage that we have reached in terms of restrictive practices. The development of a restrictive practice regime was actually referred to in the Governor's speech, following the proroguing of parliament, so that's going back to earlier than 2019, but I stand to be corrected. So it has been something that has been in process for quite some time.

The original concept across government was to bring together all the agencies that may well be engaged in restrictive practices to develop what the honourable member is advocating for, which is an overall piece of legislation for all restrictive practices, because it's not just in disability services or aged care, as he has identified, it also takes place in mental health and takes place to some degree in child protection, education, corrections, a whole range of settings.

It certainly is the intention of the government to implement the legislation he has identified to minimise the use of restrictive practices. We agree with him that it can be a breach of human rights. Some practices have taken place in previous times because it was at the convenience of the providers and the like. We certainly are of the view that restrictive practices should be minimised. They should only be used for the safety and wellbeing of the person who is under the restrictive practice and/or other people who are around them.

It's been tasked to the Attorney-General to manage the overall process. We wanted to make sure that this legislation was introduced and implemented, because South Australia has been behind in terms of its legislation. Without the legislation that is currently before the assembly there are a lot of practices that take place that are actually unlawful, and for that reason a very large amount of reporting goes to the Quality and Safeguards Commission as part of their collection of information. So it is in process.

I can seek a response from the Attorney in terms of the time frame, but it is something that the government has been working on for quite some time with a range of representatives from most of those agencies that I have identified where restrictive practices take place. It's something that's very front of mind for us and is a very large work in progress at this stage.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:07): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, regarding health. What does the minister have to say to Robyn Adams, a 61 year old who is reported to have waited eight hours before receiving treatment at the RAH for blood clots that developed after receiving a COVID vaccine? Does the minister have a response or does the minister yet again have no info about cases that are widely reported in the media?

The PRESIDENT: The member shouldn't presume that anything is going to come out of the minister's mouth in the way that he thinks it will. I call the minister.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:08): I thank the honourable member for his question. I apologise to the patient and her husband for their recent experience at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The Central Adelaide Local Health Network also apologises for the delay in treatment and understands this would have been distressing to both the patient and her family. The patient has been clinically assessed and has received treatment, which has included being seen by a clinician in a CALHN specialist vaccination clinic to offer further counselling and advice. This consultation and advice will continue to be provided for as long as it's needed.

There have been no reports of thrombosis—let me spell that, or let's call it the TTS syndrome—related to AstraZeneca in South Australia. The Central Adelaide Local Health Network reports all adverse events following immunisation to the Therapeutic Goods Administration.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:09): Supplementary arising from the answer: when exactly did the events outlined by the minister occur?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:09): My understanding is that the patient presented soon after 8 o'clock on 5 May 2021. At the time of her presentation, there were 87 patients in the emergency department.

FEDERAL BUDGET

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:10): My question is for the Treasurer. Given that the federal budget will be delivered tonight, does the Treasurer have any insight into the GST distributions that we can expect over the forward estimates?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:10): Certainly, there has been a lot of financial and economic commentary about the state of the national economic recovery and the flow-on impacts, potentially, on GST numbers to be released tonight in the federal budget. We are not advised prior to the release of the figures at 7 o'clock tonight, although Treasury officers are in lock-up, I think, as we speak, in terms of being briefed on the details of the federal budget, including, clearly, the revenue projections on GST.

I think, certainly from the publicly available information from the federal Treasury secretary and the federal Treasury, that the national economic recovery has been a credit to the commonwealth government, the federal Treasury, the Reserve Bank and indeed all involved in managing the COVID-19 crisis infinitely better than virtually every other jurisdiction around the world. The flow-on impacts of that have meant that restrictions have been eased much more quickly in Australia, and in South Australia, than, again, in most other jurisdictions around the world.

The flow-on impact of that has been the extent of engagement of industry sectors returning to pre-COVID levels in many respects, with the exception, of course, of those that are directly impacted by international travel bans. Tourism, hospitality and international education in particular are industry sectors that continue to be impacted by international travel bans and will be whilst those bans remain in place.

We are expecting that the national GST pool will significantly recover in the figures that are released tonight. It may well be that they actually return to pre-COVID estimates in terms of the size of the national GST pool, which will be of enormous benefit not only to the national economy but to each of the states and territories in terms of the size of the GST cake that has to be distributed, bearing in mind that I think this time last year for this year I think we were predicting a decline in GST revenue from pre-COVID levels of about \$1.3 billion.

We believe that the national GST pool impacts will be significantly removed from that; that is, we will see a significant increase in projected GST income for South Australia for next financial year and also some increased GST revenue for this financial year. However, in South Australia's case the other impact, which is the slicing up of the cake by the Commonwealth Grants Commission, will mean that those impacts will continue to be felt by South Australia. We will still see lower GST collections compared to the pre-COVID estimates, potentially not because of the size of the national pool but because of the way the cake is actually cut up and distributed between the states and territories by the Commonwealth Grants Commission.

From that viewpoint, we are hoping that tonight's federal budget will reveal a GST pool that has grown significantly because of the economic recovery, and secondly, that therefore the size of the decline in the GST estimates for South Australia will be significantly less, but nevertheless there will still be a not insignificant GST reduction that we will have to continue to incorporate in our budget estimates when we bring our budget down in June.

SA HEALTH WORKPLACE CULTURE

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:14): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question about workplace harassment and bullying in SA Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: During the last sitting week in this chamber, my colleague the Hon. Frank Pangallo asked the Treasurer a question about the rate of work-related harassment and/or bullying within the Department of Treasury and Finance. While those figures were very disturbing, it turns out that they were much worse within SA Health.

Figures released by the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment last week revealed that the number of workers compensation claims for worker-related harassment and/or bullying in SA Health totalled more than 330 cases over a five-year period, including seven cases of sexual harassment, and that the total claims cost to the taxpayer was more than \$8.2 million.

They are off the back of findings of the Medical Board of Australia, which undertook its medical training survey that I have asked the minister about previously. That survey found that 34 per cent of doctors in training reported they had experienced and/or witnessed bullying, harassment or discrimination over the last year alone. My questions to the minister are:

1. Are you concerned that 330 public servants employed by SA Health reported that they have been harassed or bullied in the workplace, including those cases of sexual harassment that I have alluded to?
2. Given the Medical Board of Australia survey, how many of those victims were doctors, junior doctors and nurses?
3. How many victims were harassed by consultants and specialists, nurses or midwives, and patients and family carers?
4. Given the latest statistics, do you believe there is a serious problem of bullying and harassment in the state's public health system?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:16): I certainly join the honourable member in condemning bullying and harassment in the workplace and I, too, recognise the valuable work done by the Medical Board of Australia in their medical training survey.

The most recent report, for example, indicated that 20 per cent of South Australian respondents had experienced bullying, harassment and/or discrimination in the previous 12 months. That was slightly below the national level of 21 per cent but still completely unacceptable. It was also down compared with 2019—it was 22 per cent in that year. So, whilst any level is unacceptable, I am pleased to see movement in the right direction and I am very keen to continue to work with the employee representative organisations, professional associations and management at all levels to drive better culture.

I thank the honourable member for mentioning the responsibility for professional colleagues. I think there is a growing awareness amongst professional colleges of their responsibility in terms of

their contribution to culture. Certainly, the culture of the individual workplace impacts on the teams that work in there, but there is also no doubt that the professions themselves drive a culture that people take into the workplace.

In that regard, I would particularly commend the work of the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons, which has, at a national level and in its state chapters, driven a much better culture. I know a number of professions are looking to improve that. There is, of course, work being done at the local LHN level as well as at the departmental level.

The honourable member particularly highlights the issue of students. I know that the South Australian medical education accreditation committee, I think it is called, is very keen to play its part, through the accreditation process, to improve the safety of the workplace for South Australian students and doctors in training.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Bonaros, a supplementary.

SA HEALTH WORKPLACE CULTURE

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:19): Based on that answer, does the minister also accept that simply adopting a zero tolerance approach in words won't achieve the outcomes that he has pointed to but that we need direct and decisive action in these areas?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:19): I certainly believe that we need more than words. I am confident that leadership at many levels are working together to drive positive change. In that regard, I particularly highlight the work of the outgoing president of the AMA(SA), Chris Moy, who convened a summit on this very issue last year.

HOMELESSNESS ALLIANCES

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:20): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Human Services regarding human services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Under the new homelessness alliance model, specialist mental health provider Neami has lost its funding that delivers the Street to Home program. Street to Home literally goes out into the Parklands early in the morning to find rough sleepers and offer them support. This will cease on 1 July. My questions to the minister are:

1. After 1 July, who exactly is going out into the Parklands in the middle of winter to find people sleeping in the cold?
2. With the expected closure of 67 crisis beds on 1 July, where exactly are people supposed to sleep, if they engage with the support services?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:21): I thank the honourable member for his question. It is a little bit like groundhog day in responding to these particular matters in terms of the questions that the Labor Party is continuing to choose to ask on these matters in relation to homelessness reforms.

We are unashamedly looking for better services. I could read the entire TACSI report to people to explain to them why this is so important that we reform our services. The Centre for Social Innovation did a report where they interviewed 93 people with lived experience, to inform our reforms going forward, about existing services, which is no reflection on individual services. What I am talking about is the system as a whole is broken and doesn't work for people. Some of the direct quotes, which are from this report, include someone who says:

I've got one worker for housing, one for health, one for my kids. There's no one to join the dots.

Another one says:

I am tired of being a reference number or a box. The system makes people feel like they are worthless and something is wrong with them.

Someone else says:

It is like the secret service. Trying to get information or support is a nightmare. We are left wondering what the criteria is and who makes the decisions.

That is some of the direct feedback we had from people with lived experience—who have experienced homelessness—about the services they were receiving in South Australia, which again I say is no reflection on individual services but a reflection on the system.

We are increasing funding for homelessness. The crisis bed numbers will remain the same. We have a specific mental health service, which is part of the southern and Adelaide bid—Sonder Care, which will provide a peer support outreach service to regularly engage with people in the inner city. The mobile support team can offer mental health services, meaning the client doesn't have to wait to receive an appointment at a later date.

The successful tender alliance is continuing to work with the existing providers to ensure that people will get services through the transition process, which we understand takes some work for that to occur. The number of crisis beds in the system has remained the same.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (LOCAL GOVERNMENT REVIEW) BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

(Continued from 30 March 2021.)

Clause 119 passed.

Clauses 120 to 128 passed.

Clause 129.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I move:

Amendment No 34 [Bourke-1]—

Page 68, after line 38 [clause 129, inserted section 262F(3)]—After paragraph (c) insert:

and

- (d) a member nominated by a registered industrial association that represents the interests of employees of councils specified by the Minister by notice in the Gazette.

This amendment was made possible due to the successful passage of amendment No. 2 in my name, which inserted the definition of registered industrial association under the interpretation section of the bill. This amendment puts into the substantive clause that a member nominated by a registered industrial association be included on the behavioural standards panel.

While the reasoning for this amendment was discussed when introducing amendment No. 2 in my name, I note that many weeks have since passed and we have a new member in our chamber, so I will take a few moments to remind the chamber of the significant nature of this amendment. Under the current requirements laid out in the government's proposed behavioural standards panel, the panel will consist of three members appointed by the LGA and the minister.

I agree with many of the comments made by the Minister for Local Government through media reports that the behavioural panel will give the councils tools they need to investigate misbehaviour more quickly and efficiently. But there is an important voice missing from this panel: the voice of the people who are often impacted the most, that is, council employees. We know this sense of power imbalance does not stop at local government. This is a serious matter that is impacting employees across the political spectrum.

We have heard stories from this house, federal parliament and local government that employees feel the power held by elected political representatives can exacerbate feelings of intimidation. One of the defining features of recent events in federal and state parliaments has been the lack of support that victims feel when they are faced with the poor behaviour of their boss or their

employer. They feel that they do not have a voice and that there is not anyone in the room who will lend support and acknowledge their experience, their trauma and their distress.

Since introducing amendment No. 2 in my name, an independent review into the behaviour of the Tea Tree Gully mayor has been discussed extensively through media reports. While the incident report compiled by Norman Waterhouse outlines a number of disturbing instances of misconduct between the Tea Tree Gully mayor and a fellow councillor, there are also reports of misconduct towards a female council employee. The report alleges that the mayor deliberately hit the employee on her bottom with a rolled up paper, document or the like. It also alleges that the mayor blamed management for the way the employee dresses and referred to her as 'dressing like a \$2 tramp'.

I am sure all in this chamber would agree that these comments and this behaviour is completely unacceptable. We have seen employees of parliament, across all three levels of government, suffer greatly when behavioural standards are not maintained. Here in this parliament a recent report has highlighted that staff have been harassed, intimidated or treated poorly whilst trying to carry out their duties in their very own workplace. The Hon. Frank Pangallo revealed in this place only last week, through an FOI document, that \$40 million of taxpayers' money was used to pay off 841 victims of harassment over the past five years.

By including an employee representative on the behavioural standards panel, we ensure that victims will have a voice and that employees will have a voice. This will ensure that complaints made by victims will not merely be assessed by panellists appointed by employers or employer advocacy groups but that these complaints will be assessed by an employee advocate. Perhaps the most important question to ask is: why not have an employee representative on the panel?

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I rise on behalf of the Greens to speak in support of these Labor amendments. We certainly support the statements made by the honourable member. We agree with the Labor Party that it is important for a registered industrial officer to have a voice at the table and so we will be supporting this and the associated amendments.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The government opposes these amendments. This amendment seeks to expand the membership of the proposed behavioural standards panel to four members, to include a member nominated by a registered industrial association. I am advised that this panel is to be established to deal with complaints of serious and repeated council member behaviour. It will not deal with employee behavioural matters.

While an initial complainant may be a council employee, a complaint can only be referred to the panel by a council resolution, the mayor, at least three members of council or a responsible person under the new section 75G, most likely to be a council chief executive officer. A council employee, who may be an initial complainant or relevant witness, can, of course, seek the support of a registered industrial association through any process of matters before the panel.

It should be noted that the role of the panel members is not to represent council members or any other person. I am advised that this panel is meant to be an independent body, whose job it will be to independently and impartially assess complaints of serious or repeated misbehaviour by a council member. That is why the bill is proposing that members cannot be sitting members or current council employees.

I am also advised that they cannot be a council member or employee of any other council. It is not just of the particular council. If the complaint is in relation to a particular council, clearly the people sitting on this panel who are meant to be independent cannot be sitting council members or employees but they also cannot be sitting council members of another council or employees of another council.

The intention is that these are serious complaints being made against a serving elected council member and that the three persons who are going to be nominated to make an independent judgement about his or her behaviour, as to whether it is acceptable or not, are actually three independent people. They are not intended to be there to represent particular views or the like, they are there to, in essence, sit as an independent panel making a judgement about either the serious behaviour or misbehaviour of a particular council member.

Whilst I understand from the Labor Party and others this notion that union representatives have to be on everything, this is actually a serious issue about misbehaviour of a member possibly against other members of council, possibly against staff members, but it may well just be the internecine warfare that we have become familiar with in one particular prominent council that the new member may well be familiar with, where it may well be that it is just warfare between a council member and another council member.

The purpose of the bill is to seek a resolution of three independent persons to make a judgement about the accuracy of the complaints that might be made about serious misbehaviour by a particular council member. For those reasons, the government does not support the amendment and, whilst we understand the background to wanting to put a union rep on everything, we believe in this particular case it really misses the point in terms of what this is meant to be about and that is an independent judgement about the behaviour of a council member, as I said, possibly against their behaviour, attitude or actions towards potentially even another council member of that same council.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I am rising to say that SA-Best will be supporting this amendment and certainly the words that have been expressed by both the Hon. Emily Bourke and the Hon. Robert Simms. There is absolutely no reason why staff on a council should not have some kind of representation when dealing with disciplinary matters. As the Hon. Emily Bourke has already pointed out, there have been many instances in recent times that show there needs to be some sort of representation on behalf of staff.

I note that the behavioural standards panel will be constituted by one member nominated by the minister, one by the LGA and one jointly. Even that, going by the history of this government with other panels that it has put in place in some bills last year, has led to a number of questions being raised about the appointments. I often have suspicions when the minister gets to have a big say in the appointment of particular panels and then representative bodies like unions are left out of it, so we are supporting the amendment.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: For the record, I will not be supporting this amendment.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I just wanted to clarify a couple of comments made by the Hon. Rob Lucas. He highlights that maybe we are missing the point; I fear maybe he is missing the point. This is a serious issue, as the Treasurer has highlighted. He has also highlighted that, yes, complaints can be made by a councillor, but quite often the reason the councillor may need to appear before the panel is because of their behaviour towards an employee.

The Treasurer refers to section 75(1) of the Local Government Act, which talks about the health and safety duties of members of council. It specifically mentions that a member's behaviour should not adversely affect the health and safety of other members of the council or employees of the council. The government's amendment to this section means that, in the cases where a council's employees' health and safety is adversely affected by a member's behaviour, a complaint relating to that matter should be referred to the behavioural standards panel.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I move:

Amendment No 35 [Bourke-1]—

Page 69, line 26 [clause 129, inserted section 262G(3)]—Delete 'unless the LGA consents to the making of the recommendation.' and substitute:

unless—

- (a) in all cases—the LGA consents to the making of the recommendation; and
- (b) in the case of a member appointed following nomination under section 262F(3)(d)—the registered industrial association that made the nomination consents to the making of the recommendation.

This amendment is consequential on the previous amendment and simply requires the minister to consult with a relevant registered industrial association when removing an employee representative from the behavioural panel.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 130 to 144 passed.

Clause 145.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I will not be moving amendment No. 36 [Bourke-1] as it is consequential to amendment No. 25 regarding a travel register of interests.

Clause passed.

Clauses 146 to 149 passed.

Clause 150.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I move:

Amendment No 37 [Bourke-1]—

Page 85, line 13 [clause 150(1)]—Delete '12 members' and substitute:

the number of members that a council may be comprised of under section 11A(1) of the principal Act

This amendment is consequential to amendment No. 7 in my name and is required because of the chamber's will to not cap elected council members' representation at 12. This is a small technical amendment and is required so that we can bring the transitional provisions in line with section 11A. This will be achieved by removing the reference to '12 members' in the transitional provisions and substituting it with 'the number of members that a council may be comprised of under section 11A(1) of the principal Act'.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I move:

Amendment No 38 [Bourke-1]—

Page 85, line 16 [clause 150(1)]—After 'section 11A' insert:

(unless the council is granted an exemption certificate under section 12(11b) of the principal Act (as amended by section 10 of this Act))

I move this amendment for reasons similar to those for the previous amendment. This amendment is consequential to amendment No. 8 in my name, which relates to council representation exemption certificates under section 12(11b), which determines if a community would benefit from comprising of more than 13 members. This amendment is also required to bring the transitional provisions in line with the amendments made throughout the act.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 151.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Pangallo-1]—

Page 86, after line 8—Insert:

(a1) Section 4(1), definition of *designated person*—after 'who is' insert:
an Australian citizen and

This amendment changes the definition of a designated person and inserts that the person who is able to vote in a local government election needs to be an Australian citizen. As I have already pointed out in my second reading speech, I think South Australia and one other jurisdiction are the only ones that permit ratepayers who are not Australian citizens to vote in local government elections. It is at odds with what happens in federal and state elections, where it is insisted upon. I find it odd that, in this jurisdiction, there seems to be some kind of opposition to having only Australian citizens being able to vote.

This amendment was inspired by a letter I received a couple of years ago from a long-serving regional councillor by the name of Ken Grundy from Naracoorte. He drew this to my attention. I found

it quite incredible to think that, while we do insist upon it in the first and second tier of government, the third tier of government—local government is now becoming quite important and is generating a lot of interest, even within the community. The community is interested in what happens in its own backyard now, and they would like for people who are either representing them or who are voting for their membership on a council to be Australian citizens.

The other area I think I outlined, which I thought was an issue, particularly in the City of Adelaide, is that we know that in the pre-COVID era something like 13,000 international students resided in the city. These students have absolutely no skin in the game as far as property ownership or what goes on in the City of Adelaide: they do not pay rates, they do not contribute in that regard to the economic welfare of the city, yet if they have been in residence for 30 days or more they can apply to the CEO and be eligible to vote.

The other aspect of this is that you cannot eliminate the possibility that an enterprising candidate in a city election could muster enough votes very quickly to be elected to the council. In South Australia you can be eligible to be on the local council's roll if you are a resident or a non-Australian citizen who has lived at your residential address for one month or more. So technically, as I have pointed out, you can come here on an extended backpacker's holiday and still be able to determine who would be the mayor or a councillor for that particular ward.

As I have pointed out, it could lead to stacking, much like what happens in political parties and unions. This is a glaring anomaly and, even though I realise I may not have the support for this, I believe it is an important measure, particularly with regard to the City of Adelaide, to avoid the type of vote rorting we could possibly see. Australian citizenship should be mandatory for people to have the right to vote.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The government opposes the amendment. Vive la différence! We celebrate the different franchises of local government to state and federal government. It is different. We do not seek to reflect everything that occurs at the commonwealth and state level in terms of either the franchise or the operation. That is not a sin in and of itself, it is just celebrating the difference in terms of local government as opposed to state and federal government.

I understand the position of the correspondent who has prompted the Hon. Mr Pangallo to embark on this series of amendments. I have had correspondence from the same correspondent over the years as well, but again our government's view, and certainly my view as well, is that we do not think we have to directly replicate all of the eligibility requirements in relation to state and commonwealth government at the local government level. There are significant differences—this is one of them—there are others in relation to the property franchise, and there are other differences as well in relation to how people are elected at the local government level.

I guess the overarching view has been over many decades. I am told this provision has been there for decades—for a very long time. Essentially, people who make or potentially make a contribution to their community or who are involved in their community or neighbourhood ought to be able to have a say in who represents them at the local level on their local council.

I accept the view that as councils, in particular metropolitan councils, have become bigger and bigger there has been more of an argument to support the view the Hon. Mr Pangallo and his constituents have put. It was a more powerful argument, potentially, about how the smaller and more localised councils are and continue to be, generally, in regional areas but also in a number of our metropolitan council areas in the Hills as well. For all those reasons, the government will not be supporting this amendment and related amendments from the Hon. Mr Pangallo.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: For similar reasons, we will be opposing the honourable member's amendments. Again, whilst we understand the intent of the member's amendment to the act, we feel that local government is the level of government in which everyone should be able to participate and have their say about how their streets and their community look. We feel that local government is just that; it is local. The way the bill is currently structured it enables everyone to have a say about what their community looks like.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Similarly, the Greens will not be supporting this amendment. Whilst I understand the honourable member's intentions, like the Hon. Emily Bourke and the Hon. Rob Lucas we are of the view that we need to encourage more diversity in voting in council elections.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: As it will not receive any support, I will not move amendment No. 2 [Pangallo-1], which would be consequential.

Clause passed.

Clauses 152 to 164 passed.

Clause 165.

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

Amendment No 1 [Treasurer-2]—

Page 93, lines 28 to 36 [clause 165(2)]—Delete subclause (2) and substitute:

- (2) Section 28(2a)—delete subsection (2a) and substitute:
- (2a) If, on application, SACAT is satisfied that published electoral material contains a statement purporting to be a statement of fact that is inaccurate and misleading to a material extent, SACAT may order the publisher to do 1 or more of the following:
- (a) withdraw the material from further publication;
 - (b) publish a retraction in specified terms and a specified manner and form.
- (2b) For the purposes of the *South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2013*—
- (a) an application to SACAT under subsection (2a)—
 - (i) will be taken to come within SACAT's original jurisdiction; and
 - (ii) must be referred to a Presidential member or senior member of SACAT, or a magistrate designated as a member of SACAT; and
 - (b) an order of SACAT under subsection (2a) may not be the subject of an application for internal review under section 70 of that Act, but, despite section 71(2a) of the *South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2013*, an appeal against the order may be instituted under section 71 of that Act.

This amendment will provide for the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (SACAT) to have the ability to order a person to withdraw election material or to publish a retraction if SACAT is of the view that the material is inaccurate and misleading to a material extent. The amendment will remove this task from the Electoral Commission of South Australia, which I understand strongly supports this change. The amendment also enables an appropriate review mechanism through SACAT, rather than referral to the Supreme Court by the Electoral Commission of South Australia as the bill currently proposes.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I rise to indicate that the opposition will be opposing this amendment. Labor opposes this amendment that seeks to have SACAT replace the Electoral Commissioner as the umpire for when considering whether misleading material has been published. The Electoral Commissioner and staff have combined decades and decades of experience and corporate knowledge in dealing with electoral matters. They are best placed to make decisions of this sort. They make decisions in a timely and impartial fashion, which is essential in the middle of a fast-moving and dynamic election campaign.

Taking these issues to SACAT has the potential to increase delays and, furthermore, we are concerned about the resources and workload that would be put on SACAT at short notice. It is inconsistent with current practices that occur at a state level, where decisions about whether material

is misleading are made by the Electoral Commissioner. I strongly urge all members to oppose this unnecessary amendment.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: For the record, I will be opposing this amendment.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: The Greens join the Labor Party and the Hon. Mr Darley in opposing this amendment as well.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: We will be opposing it as well.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 166 to 169 passed.

Clause 170.

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

Amendment No 1 [Treasurer-1]—

Page 94, after line 17—Insert:

- (1) Section 37(1)—delete 'Voting' and substitute:
Subject to section 41A, voting

I am advised that this amendment is consequential to a proposed insertion of a new section 41A in the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999 and is detailed in amendment No. 2 filed under my name, but they are related and we can have the substantive debate on this particular amendment.

I am advised that this amendment was requested by the Electoral Commission of South Australia, which was responding to requests to help vision-impaired people participate in elections. The proposed new section will allow for electronically assisted or telephone voting for a prescribed elector. This will be a vision-impaired elector or another kind of elector as prescribed by the regulations. I also note that the Local Government Association will be consulted on any regulations that are needed to make this new section operate.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I will be supporting this amendment put forward by the government. The amendment enables the provision of assisted voting methods in local council. Making it easier for citizens to vote is an essential element of our democracy, and these amendments do just that. These assisted voting methods are similar to assisted voting methods adopted in the Electoral Act in the former Labor government's successful electoral reforms in 2017, and are supported.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: We will be supporting the amendment.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: We will also be supporting this amendment, recognising that it makes our elections more inclusive and therefore more democratic.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: I will be supporting this amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 171 and 172 passed.

New clause 172A.

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

Amendment No 2 [Treasurer-1]—

Page 95, after line 11—Insert:

172A—Insertion of section 41A

After section 41 insert:

41A—Assisted voting

- (1) The regulations may make provision in relation to voting in an election or poll by prescribed electors by means of an assisted voting method.

- (2) Without limiting the generality of subsection (1), regulations made for the purposes of this section may—
- (a) determine, or provide for the determination of, 1 or more assisted voting methods and, in relation to each such method, determine, or provide for the determination of, the following:
 - (i) matters related to voting using the assisted voting method, including the provision of assistance to electors using the method, requirements to be followed after an elector has used the method and matters of privacy and secrecy;
 - (ii) the number of places where the assisted voting method is to be available, the location of those places (if relevant) and the days and times at which the method is to be available;
 - (iii) which electors may use the assisted voting method; and
 - (b) require the making of a record of each person who has voted using an assisted voting method; and
 - (c) specify the information that is to be included in a record; and
 - (d) provide for the production of a record of the vote each person has cast, which must not contain any means of identifying the person who cast the vote; and
 - (e) provide for the appointment by the returning officer of officers in relation to the conduct of an assisted voting method; and
 - (f) provide for the application of this Act, or provisions of this Act, in relation to votes cast using an assisted voting method, including the modification of the application of this Act or a provision of this Act in relation to such votes; and
 - (g) make provision for any other matters related to assisted voting.
- (3) To avoid doubt, nothing in this section (or in regulations made for the purposes of this section) authorises any elector to vote in more than 1 capacity at an election or poll.
- (4) An assisted voting method must be such that an elector using the method in relation to an election or poll—
- (a) receives the same information (in the same order), and has the same voting options, as would appear in the ballot paper for the election or poll that the elector would be given if the elector were voting by postal vote under this Part; and
 - (b) is able to indicate a vote in a way that, if the elector were marking a ballot paper, would not be an informal ballot paper.
- (5) Subject to this section, if an elector votes using an assisted voting method (an *assisted vote*)—
- (a) this Act applies (subject to any modifications prescribed under subsection (2)(f)) in relation to an assisted vote as if it were a vote delivered to an electoral officer for the relevant council in a sealed envelope; and
 - (b) the record of the assisted vote produced in accordance with the regulations is to be taken to be a ballot paper for the purposes of this Act; and
 - (c) the requirements of this Act in relation to the elector's right to receive a ballot paper are to be taken to have been satisfied.
- (6) The returning officer may, by notice in the Gazette, determine that an assisted voting method is not to be used either generally or at 1 or more specified places.
- (7) A notice under subsection (6) must specify the election or poll in respect of which the determination applies.
- (8) In this section—

prescribed elector means a sight-impaired elector or an elector of a class prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this definition;

sight-impaired elector means an elector whose sight is impaired such that the elector is unable to vote without assistance.

The amendment standing in my name is consequential on the successful passage of that last amendment.

New clause inserted.

Clause 173 passed.

New clause 173A.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Pangallo-1]—

Page 95, after line 16—Insert:

173A—Insertion of section 44A

After section 44 insert:

44A—Compulsory voting

- (1) Subject to subsection (2), it is a duty of every elector to record their vote at each election in the area or ward for which the elector is enrolled.
- (2) An elector who leaves the ballot paper unmarked but who otherwise observes the formalities of voting is not in breach of the duty imposed by subsection (1).
- (3) Within the prescribed period after the close of each election, the returning officer must send by post to each elector who appears not to have voted at the election a notice, in the prescribed form—
 - (a) notifying the elector that they appear to have failed to vote at the election and that it is an offence to fail to vote at an election without a valid and sufficient reason; and
 - (b) calling on them to show cause why proceedings for failing to vote at the election without a valid and sufficient reason should not be instituted against them,

but the returning officer, if satisfied that the elector is dead or had a valid and sufficient reason for not voting, need not send such a notice.
- (4) Before sending any such notice, the returning officer must insert in the notice a date, not being less than 21 days after the date of posting of the notice, on which the form attached to the notice, duly filled up and signed by the elector, is to be received by the returning officer.
- (5) Every elector to whom a notice under this section has been sent must complete the form in the indicated place by stating the reasons (if any) why proceedings for failing to vote at the election should not be instituted against them, and then sign the form and return it to the returning officer not later than the date inserted in the notice.
- (6) If an elector is absent or unable, by reason of physical incapacity, to complete, sign and return the form, within the time allowed under subsection (4), any other elector who has personal knowledge of the facts may complete, sign and return the form, duly witnessed, within that time, and, in that case, the elector will be taken to have complied with subsection (5).
- (7) An elector must not—
 - (a) fail to vote at an election without a valid and sufficient reason for the failure; or
 - (b) on receipt of a notice under subsection (3), fail to complete, sign and return the form (duly witnessed) that is attached to the notice within the time allowed under subsection (4).

Maximum penalty: \$50.

Expiation fee: \$10.

- (8) An elector has a valid and sufficient reason for failing to vote at an election if—
- (a) the elector was ineligible to vote at the election; or
 - (b) the elector was absent from the address to which their voting papers were posted for the period commencing on the date on which the voting papers would, in the ordinary course of post, have reached the address to which they were posted and concluding on polling day; or
 - (c) the elector had a conscientious objection, based on religious grounds, to voting at the election; or
 - (d) there is some other proper reason for the elector's failure to vote.
- (9) A prosecution for an offence against this section—
- (a) cannot be commenced except by the returning officer or an officer authorised in writing by the returning officer; and
 - (b) in the case of a prosecution for failing to vote at an election or failing to return a notice to the returning officer in accordance with subsection (4)—may be commenced at any time within 12 months of polling day.
- (10) In proceedings for an offence against this section—
- (a) a certificate apparently signed by the returning officer certifying that an officer named in the certificate was authorised to commence the prosecution will, in the absence of proof to the contrary, be accepted as proof of that authority; and
 - (b) a certificate apparently signed by an electoral officer certifying that voting papers were posted to an elector at the address appearing on the electoral roll, on a date specified in the certificate, will be accepted, in the absence of proof to the contrary, as proof—
 - (i) that the voting papers were duly sent to the elector on that date; and
 - (ii) that the voting papers complied with the requirements of this Act; and
 - (c) a certificate apparently signed by an electoral officer certifying that the defendant failed to vote at a particular election will be accepted as proof of that failure to vote in the absence of proof to the contrary; and
 - (d) a certificate apparently signed by an electoral officer certifying that a notice under subsection (3) was posted to an elector, at the address appearing on the electoral roll or at a postal address provided by the elector, on a date specified in the certificate, will be accepted, in the absence of proof to the contrary, as proof—
 - (i) that the notice was duly sent to the elector on that date; and
 - (ii) that the notice complied with the requirements of this Act; and
 - (iii) that it was received by the elector on the date on which it would, in the ordinary course of post, have reached the address to which it was posted; and
 - (e) a certificate apparently signed by an electoral officer certifying that the defendant failed to return a form under this section to the returning officer within the time allowed under subsection (4) will be accepted, in the absence of proof to the contrary, as proof of the failure to return the form within that time.

This is in regard to compulsory voting in local government elections. I realise in reading the mood of the Legislative Council that this amendment will not be supported by either the government, the opposition or the Greens; however, I will still make an impassioned plea that it is time that we started to recognise the importance of local government, the importance it plays in the affairs of our community, representation in local government and the responsibilities that we now place on

members of councils, from the mayors down through the elected representatives. In fact, we found councillors so responsible that they are now also receiving a stipend for the work they do.

I acknowledge the work councillors do in local government today. It is certainly a far cry from the earlier days, and certainly the days when I used to cover council elections as a young reporter, when you found most of the elected representatives—in fact, all of them—were basically volunteers from within the community, people who were putting their hand up to do a service for their community. Generally, not much attention had been paid to the affairs that went on in local government in those days.

Thankfully, today the community is quite aware and takes quite an interest in what happens at a local government level. You only have to see the attendance rates these days, and certainly at larger council meetings, where the community do want to have a say in the affairs of what goes on and do want to be heard.

I think we also need to start to recognise the fact that compulsory voting needs to come into local government if people want to make their elected representatives and their potential candidates accountable. It happens in state and federal government, where we have compulsory elections, but not in local government.

I just find it incredible when we see criticism, particularly at a state government level, of the carryings on that go on in local government by either the elected members or whomever that, 'How can somebody make such an outrageous decision on something and only receive a handful of votes to get in there?' It is easy to make that distinction and that criticism but we need to do something about it.

Quite frankly, at the 2018 election, 400,000 people out of an eligible 1.2 million cast their votes. That is not good enough. That is 32 per cent. A significant number did not bother to turn out and have a say in what happens in their own backyard. An advantage of compulsory voting is that people will suddenly start to get interested in what happens at a local government level. They will also start to be interested in their candidates or their incumbent members. They will start to do some research and take a more active interest and that is what we want.

We want greater representation of voters at the local government level. The critics of compulsory voting, and I think the LGA may be one of them, although I understand that they seem to be supportive of having a trial, point to the increased costs and oversight by the Electoral Commission. Quite frankly, that is the price we pay for democracy, and that is what we need to do.

Interestingly, I received a letter from the Lord Mayor, the Hon. Sandy Verschoor, recently. She wrote to me about City of Adelaide elections. She is of the view that perhaps we look at legislation to amend the City of Adelaide Act to allow at least a trial of compulsory voting to see how it would work. She writes:

The Local Government Association has proposed a review of compulsory and online voting as the sector has advocated for these reforms for some time. At a LGA Briefing on the reforms late last year, a number of Mayors and independent Members of the Legislative Council (Upper House),—

myself included—

indicated support for a trial by one or more councils of compulsory and electronic voting to help address costs, low voter engagement, and turnout across the sector. If this does not get addressed as part of Section 44 of the Local Government Review Bill, the City of Adelaide would be an obvious first choice to trial compulsory voting.

She goes on to say:

The City of Sydney Act 1988 and the City of Melbourne Act 2001 as well as the Local Government Electoral Act 2011 (QLD) provide that voting is compulsory for anyone listed on the roll. In Sydney and Melbourne fines also apply for failure to vote as an added incentive. Voting is also compulsory for the ACT and NT Legislative Assemblies (which perform the function of a city council).

Lord Mayor Verschoor then goes on to make a case for the proposal for electronic voting. I will not go into that much at this point because it is something we need to address further down the track. However, she makes a case that we need to now have a discussion on utilising the technology that exists today for electronic voting to encourage greater participation in local government elections and certainly in the City of Adelaide, which is, of course, our biggest council.

So you have the office of the Lord Mayor strongly supporting compulsory voting. We already have it in other states. Often on other pieces of legislation I hear the argument in this chamber, 'Look, it's already happened in New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland. Why are we the only state out?' Here is a prime example of why we should not be the only state out and should also have compulsory voting. I think it is important. I think the people of South Australia would probably support it, and perhaps it is something the Treasurer could consider as a referendum at the next state election.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Given the honourable member's prolific use of the argument that, 'The other states are doing it; why shouldn't we?' he might like to apply that to shop trading hours reform as well, but we will not introduce that element, as he sought to do, into this particular debate. The consistency of the argument can be used both for and against an individual member as an individual member so chooses.

For similar reasons to the earlier amendment the Hon. Mr Pangallo moved, unsuccessfully, the government opposes this—again, for the same reasons. We celebrate the difference between state and commonwealth governments and local government, and we are not supportive of imposing compulsory voting. To be frank in relation to the Hon. Frank Pangallo's amendments, the compulsory voting probably makes more sense if his other amendments had got up; there would be a more consistent package of amendments. It seems to make less sense given that one set of amendments have already been unsuccessful. Nevertheless, for similar reasons the government will be opposing the compulsory voting amendments.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: The opposition will also be opposing this amendment, but we do appreciate the true intent of the member's intention for why this amendment is required. However, we feel that more work needs to be done in this space for such a large reform, particularly around the cost of this change and the impact on the election time frames. Again, I think it is fantastic that the honourable member has brought this discussion to the chamber and it is one that we should continue.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: The Greens also welcome the opportunity to discuss this issue. Might I say that I certainly share the Hon. Frank Pangallo's passion for local government. I have had some experience there myself and I recognise the really important role that it plays. However, like the Labor Party, we do have some concerns around the resourcing implications of this, some of the elements that have not yet been ventilated within the community.

The suggestion that the honourable member has advanced around investigating a trial down the track is something that we may well be open to considering in the future, and perhaps the City of Adelaide Act would be a more appropriate place to advance that, but in terms of compulsory voting across the board, we are not in a position to support that.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: For the reasons already expressed by other members, I will be opposing this amendment.

New clause negatived.

Clauses 174 to 180 passed.

New clauses 180A and 180B.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Simms-1]—

Page 98, after line 25—After clause 180 insert:

180A—Amendment of heading to Part 14

Heading to Part 14—after 'donations' insert 'and disclosure'

180B—Insertion of Part 14 Division A1

Part 14—before Division 1 insert:

Division A1—Disclosure of political party memberships

79A—Disclosure of political party memberships

- (1) A candidate for election to an office of a council must, at the prescribed time, notify the returning officer, in the manner determined by the returning officer, of—
 - (a) whether or not the candidate is a member of a registered political party (within the meaning of the *Electoral Act 1985*); and
 - (b) if the candidate is a member of a registered political party—
 - (i) the name of the party; and
 - (ii) when the candidate became a member of the party.

Maximum penalty: \$10,000.
- (2) The returning officer must make a copy of each notification given under this section in relation to an election available on a website maintained by the returning officer within 7 days after the day on which the notification was required to be given.
- (3) In this section—*prescribed time* means—
 - (a) in the case of a periodic election—within 21 days after the close of nominations for the election; or
 - (b) in any other case—within 7 days after the close of nominations for the election.

This amendment seeks to improve transparency in local government elections, but from the outset I do want to thank honourable members for their indulgence. I recognise that there has been significant discussion about this bill before I came to this chamber, and so I will make my remarks brief. It is for that reason also that the Greens' amendments are modest in nature.

What we are seeking to do here is improve transparency, and this amendment No. 1 [Simms-1] relates to requiring people to disclose their political party memberships. What we are requesting is that this happen within 21 days after the close of nominations, and that it be published within seven days after the notification, so the returning officer would put this information on the website.

Why is this important? Presently, candidates who are standing in local government elections are required to disclose their political party memberships along with their memberships of a range of other organisations after the community has cast their votes. It has been a long-held principle of the Greens that members of the community should get all the information they require to enable them to make an informed choice. It seems really wrong to us that we have a scenario where members of the community are voting without that vital information. Somebody could be a member of a political party and that information has not been disclosed to the elector at the time they have cast their vote.

Elections for local council should not be a lucky dip where the community just kind of puts their hand in the hat and pulls out whatever they land with. Members of the community have a right to that information so that they can make an informed decision. We have seen situations in local councils where you have members of particular political parties who have not disclosed and then may form some sort of a faction or informal grouping, and there are some that have been very well advertised involving, in particular, the conservative side of politics, and there have been a number of scenarios where that membership has not been made clear to members of the community at the time that they cast their votes. So we are seeking to clear that up, and there are a few amendments that relate to that.

It is my understanding that the government is intending to pursue this element through regulation, but I have received no information about how that is going to be done. Today, I would welcome some clarification from the government about that on the public record.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am happy to provide that clarification on behalf of the government. This amendment is not supported; however, the government intends to deliver the intent of this amendment to require candidates in local government elections to disclose whether they are a member of a political party or have been in the past 12 months through regulations.

It is intended that regulations will require candidates to include this information in the profile that all candidates must produce under section 19(2) of the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999. This ensures that not only is this information disclosed but that it is also released online by the Electoral Commission of South Australia, as the bill proposes.

I note that the proposal in these amendments is that the returning officer in the Electoral Commission of South Australia will publish the information online within seven days of receiving it. However, including the information in the candidate profile would ensure that all information about a candidate that voters may wish to refer to is available in a single place rather than having two separate disclosure and publication processes in place.

This is also a much simpler process for the Electoral Commission, rather than establishing two requirements for publication. Noting that the proposal for each disclosure that could be provided by hundreds of candidates over a period of time would need to be published individually, I am happy to make a clear commitment on behalf of the government that the government intends to make regulations under section 19(2)(b) of the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999 to require candidate profiles to include information on whether the candidate is a member of a registered political party or has been within the preceding 12 months, as this amendment proposes.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I rise to oppose this amendment and I understand that it will be consequential to amendments Nos 4 and 5 that the mover is putting forward. I do so also acknowledging that the government is moving regulations towards this area and caution them strongly to consider the wording because, while I cannot speak on behalf of every registered South Australian political party, I will quickly put on my president of the South Australian party hat.

These amendments, as they stand, do not take into consideration that a political party, like the Labor Party, do not undertake a formal preselection process for local government candidates. Party members, individuals, who are members of a community standing as a candidate for local government have not been endorsed by the Labor Party. They are purely individual members of that community. The disclosure of this information in a formal capacity from the Electoral Commissioner could result in voters believing otherwise.

In addition to this concern with this particular amendment, while this has been covered by the Treasurer in his regulation comments, it does not provide a time frame that would capture if a prospective candidate resigned from a political party in the past 12 months or even on the day of nominating to run as a candidate. The omission of such a time frame may result in the candidate simply sidestepping this disclosure requirement and therefore not achieving the mover's desired outcome.

The ACTING CHAIR (Hon. D.G.E. Hood): I will go to the Hon. Mr Simms, if I may, and ask if he intends to proceed with the amendment. It is entirely a matter for you, of course.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Yes, I do.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I rise to say that we will support the amendment by the Hon. Robert Simms. He, and a couple of other members in this chamber, the Hon. Tung Ngo and the Hon. Justin Hanson, who have been members of local government councils, would know precisely what goes on in local government when it comes to affiliations with political parties.

The intent of his amendment is openness and transparency so that the voters in a local government election know who their candidates are and what affiliations they may have. It may not just be political; they could probably be required to reveal affiliations to organisations like Greenpeace or other wildlife or environmental groups. That gives voters an opportunity to get a better picture of who their candidate is.

Political affiliations are just as strong, and we know that it happens throughout the local government sector. We know that there are very strong representations from all political spheres, ours included. We have had members on councils ourselves, and we have insisted that their affiliations be disclosed so that the electors and people in their local government ward area know exactly where they stand and where they may stand politically as well. I think this is the intent of the honourable member's amendment.

I welcome what the Treasurer has just told us, that it will be included in regulations and that these disclosures will be made. I am not so sure of the time frame, Treasurer. I did not get when these disclosures will have to be made—before a local government election or when? He could probably answer that afterwards. I am saying that it is important that the people know what their representatives stand for and whatever ideologies they may also have when it comes to their

positions. It is very important that openness and transparency apply not just in areas like federal and state government but also in local government.

The Hon. Emily Bourke seems to think that, if we pass this amendment, it may then be incumbent on political parties to be preselecting candidates for local government elections. That may be, but at least the community, the voters, will know that, and that is the important thing. Following a council election, there is always some conjecture, some furore that blows up, over a particular member's affiliations that were not known during the election campaign and they only come out afterwards.

I think it is important that voters, before they go into selecting a candidate, before they start filling out the ballot papers, know exactly what the person who is standing actually stands for and they know precisely their views on particular issues. Again, it is all about openness and transparency, which is why I welcome the amendment of the Hon. Robert Simms and the Greens and also welcome what the government is doing. There is no reason we cannot enshrine that in a piece of legislation.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: I indicate that I will be opposing this amendment. I thank the Leader of the Government for outlining the government's intentions in respect of this matter.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I was not going to rise, but I do rise to support the Hon. Robert Simms and associate myself with his comments. Also, during the Hon. Frank Pangallo's contribution I wanted to make an observation. It is not just important that electors know who a candidate is affiliated with. The case that the Hon. Frank Pangallo gave was perhaps that they are a member of Greenpeace.

The current Mayor of Hornsby, Philip Ruddock, when he was Minister for Immigration, used to give the impression that he was a member of Amnesty International. I worked for Amnesty International at that time. We could not get him to take off our pin. He purported and presented as a member of Amnesty International when he was not. In fact, the reverse is just as important: sometimes people present to be what they are not in the election. This transparency will add to that as well.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: When you have the numbers I do not tend to prolong the debate, but there have been a couple of questions raised. The Hon. Mr Pangallo asked a question about the timing of the regulations. I am advised that they will be done well and truly before the next round of elections, which are scheduled for November 2022, so you can rest assured on that. In terms of when they are circulated, the information that will be provided gets provided with the candidate profile, and I understand the candidate profile has to be submitted with the nomination by the individual prospective council members, so that would be revealed.

I was not sure that I understood entirely the contribution of the Hon. Ms Bourke on behalf of the Labor Party, but if it did suggest that a prospective candidate could resign from the Labor Party a day prior to nominating, the proposed regulation that we have given a commitment to says 'a membership at the time but also for any preceding 12-month period'. So if they were going to do that, they would have to resign 12 months prior to when they intended to nominate for council.

I guess the only other commentary I would make in relation to the Labor Party's position on this—that they are not formally endorsed by the Labor Party—is that I think a former very prominent member of the House of Assembly, who will be quite familiar to the Hon. Tung Ngo, used to conduct his own personal preselection processes for one particular council prominent in the north-western suburbs.

So whilst I agree with the Hon. Ms Bourke that the Labor Party might not have endorsed various candidates, a former very prominent member of the Australian Labor Party in the House of Assembly conducted his own personal preselection processes. If the Hon. Ms Bourke needs further information about that, she might like to speak to the Hon. Mr Ngo about the processes that were conducted by that particular member in relation to formal endorsement or otherwise for nomination for a particular council.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I recognise that this amendment is not going to be successful today. I do recognise the undertaking that the Hon. Mr Lucas has given on behalf of the government that they will be dealing with this matter through regulation. The Greens certainly welcome that. My

predecessor, the Hon. Mark Parnell, I understand had been a long-term advocate for this position and it has long been a focus of the Greens to ensure we have this level of transparency in our local government elections so that electors can make informed decisions, so I welcome the commitment that the government has given today.

New clauses negatived.

New clause 180A.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I move:

Amendment No 4 [Pangallo-1]—

Page 98, after line 25—Insert:

180A—Insertion of Part 14 Division A1

Part 14—before Division 1 insert:

Division A1—Prohibition of donations from certain donors

79A—Preliminary

In this Division—

associated entity has the same meaning as in Part 13A of the *Electoral Act 1985*;

party means a body or organisation, incorporated or unincorporated, having as 1 of its objects or activities the promotion of the election to Parliament or a council of a candidate or candidates endorsed by it or by a body or organisation of which it forms a part.

79B—Meaning of political donation

- (1) For the purposes of this Division, a *political donation* is—
 - (a) a gift made to or for the benefit of a candidate for election to an office of a council, the whole or part of which was used or is intended to be used by the candidate—
 - (i) solely or substantially for a purpose related to an election; or
 - (ii) to enable the candidate to make, directly or indirectly, a political donation; or
 - (iii) to reimburse the candidate for making, directly or indirectly, a political donation; or
 - (b) a gift made to or for the benefit of an entity or other person (not being a candidate for election to an office of a council), the whole or part of which was used or is intended to be used by the entity or person—
 - (i) to enable the entity or person to make, directly or indirectly, a political donation; or
 - (ii) to reimburse the entity or person for making, directly or indirectly, a political donation.
- (2) An amount paid by a person as a contribution, entry fee or other payment to entitle that or any other person to participate in or otherwise obtain any benefit from a fundraising venture or function (being an amount that forms part of the gross proceeds of the venture or function) is taken to be a gift for the purposes of this section.
- (3) An annual or other subscription paid to a party by—
 - (a) a member of the party; or
 - (b) a person or entity (including an associated entity or industrial organisation) for affiliation with the party,
 is taken to be a gift to the party for the purposes of this section.
- (4) Uncharged interest on a loan to an entity or other person is taken to be a gift to the entity or person for the purposes of this section.
- (5) Uncharged interest is the additional amount that would have been payable by the entity or person if—
 - (a) the loan had been made on terms requiring the payment of interest at the generally prevailing interest rate for a loan of that kind; and

- (b) any interest payable had not been waived; and
- (c) any interest payments were not capitalised.

79C—Meaning of prohibited donor

- (1) For the purposes of this Division, a *prohibited donor* is—
 - (a) a property developer; or
 - (b) a building entity; or
 - (c) an industry representative organisation if the majority of its members are prohibited donors; or
 - (d) any other person or organisation that holds or has, within the preceding 7 years, held a contract for services of an annual value of more than the prescribed amount with the relevant council.
- (2) In this section—

prescribed amount means \$100,000;

relevant council means the council for which a candidate to whom a political donation is made, or is proposed to be made, is standing for election.

79D—Political donations by prohibited donors unlawful

- (1) It is unlawful for a prohibited donor to make a political donation.
- (2) It is unlawful for a person to make a political donation on behalf of a prohibited donor.
- (3) It is unlawful for a person to accept a political donation that was made (wholly or partly) by a prohibited donor or by a person on behalf of a prohibited donor.
- (4) It is unlawful for a prohibited donor to solicit another person to make a political donation.
- (5) It is unlawful for a person to solicit another person on behalf of a prohibited donor to make a political donation.
- (6) A person who does any act that is unlawful under this section is guilty of an offence if the person was, at the time of the act, aware of the facts that result in the act being unlawful.

Maximum penalty: \$10,000.
- (7) If a person accepts a political donation that, by virtue of this section, it is unlawful for the person to accept, an amount equal to the amount or value of the gift is payable by that person to the Crown and may be recovered by the Crown as a debt by action, in a court of competent jurisdiction, against the person.

79E—Meaning of property developer and building entity

- (1) Each of the following persons is a *property developer* for the purposes of this Division:
 - (a) an individual or a corporation if—
 - (i) the individual or corporation carries on a business mainly concerned with the residential or commercial development of land, with the ultimate purpose of the sale or lease of the land for profit; and
 - (ii) in the course of that business—
 - (A) 1 or more relevant planning applications have been made by or on behalf of the individual or corporation and are pending; or
 - (B) 3 or more relevant planning applications made by or on behalf of the individual or corporation have been determined within the preceding 7 years;
 - (b) a person who is a close associate of an individual or a corporation referred to in paragraph (a).
- (2) Any activity engaged in by an individual or corporation for the dominant purpose of providing commercial premises at which the individual or corporation, or a related body corporate of the corporation, will carry on business is to be disregarded for the purpose of determining whether the individual or corporation is a property developer unless that business involves the sale or leasing of a substantial part of the premises.

- (3) Each of the following persons is a *building entity* for the purposes of this Division:
- (a) an individual or a corporation if—
 - (i) —
 - (A) the individual or corporation carries on the business of performing building work for others; or
 - (B) the individual or corporation carries on the business of performing building work with a view to the sale or letting (whether by lease, licence or other agreement) of land or buildings improved as a result of the building work; and
 - (ii) in the course of that business—
 - (A) 1 or more relevant planning applications have been made by or on behalf of the individual or corporation and are pending; or
 - (B) 3 or more relevant planning applications made by or on behalf of the individual or corporation have been determined within the preceding 7 years;
 - (b) a person who is a close associate of an individual or a corporation referred to in paragraph (a).

- (4) In this section—

building work has the same meaning as in the *Building Work Contractors Act 1995*;

close associate of a corporation means each of the following:

- (a) a director or officer of the corporation or the spouse or domestic partner of such a director or officer;
- (b) a related body corporate of the corporation;
- (c) a person whose voting power in the corporation or a related body corporate of the corporation is greater than 20% or the spouse or domestic partner of such a person;
- (d) if the corporation or a related body corporate of the corporation is a stapled entity in relation to a stapled security—the other stapled entity in relation to that stapled security;
- (e) if the corporation is a trustee, manager or responsible entity in relation to a trust—a person who holds more than 20% of the units in the trust (in the case of a unit trust) or is a beneficiary of the trust (in the case of a discretionary trust);
- (f) in relation to a corporation that is a property developer referred to in subsection (1)(a) or a corporation that is a building entity referred to in subsection (3)(a)—a person in a joint venture or partnership with the property developer or building entity (as the case requires) in connection with a relevant planning application made by or on behalf of the property developer or building entity who is likely to obtain a financial gain if development that would be or is authorised by the application is authorised or carried out;

close associate of an individual means each of the following:

- (a) the spouse or domestic partner of the individual;
- (b) in relation to an individual who is a property developer referred to in subsection (1)(a) or an individual that is a building entity referred to in subsection (3)(a)—a person in a joint venture or partnership with the property developer or building entity (as the case requires) in connection with a relevant planning application made by or on behalf of the property developer or building entity who is likely to obtain a financial gain if development that would be or is authorised by the application is authorised or carried out;

officer has the same meaning as in the *Corporations Act 2001* of the Commonwealth;

related body corporate has the same meaning as in the *Corporations Act 2001* of the Commonwealth;

relevant planning application means an application for planning consent or building consent (within the meaning of the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*) relating to land within the area of the council for which a candidate to whom a political donation is made, or is proposed to be made, is standing for election;

spouse—a person is the spouse of another if they are legally married;

stapled entity means an entity the interests in which are traded along with the interests in another entity as stapled securities and (in the case of a stapled entity that is a trust) includes any trustee, manager or responsible entity in relation to the trust;

voting power has the same meaning as in the *Corporations Act 2001* of the Commonwealth.

79F—Loans included as political donations

- (1) A loan that, if it had been a gift, would be a political donation is to be regarded as a political donation for the purposes of this Division unless the loan is from a financial institution.
- (2) In this section—

financial institution means an entity whose principal business is the provision of financial services or financial products, and includes an authorised deposit-taking institution;

loan means an advance of money, the provision of credit or any other transaction that in substance effects a loan of money.

This is in relation to donors. Again, this is all about openness and transparency in local government. Just as we demand it at the federal and state levels, I think it is important that we do it in local government. Many of the important issues in local government surround development in the council area.

We know that a lot of their business is rates, roads and rubbish, but another important aspect that has to impact on local councils is development, whether they be commercial developments in their area or whether they be things like domestic dwellings they need to approve. Quite often, of course, they involve representations from the building sector with the interaction between planning departments of councils and also with builders.

The intention of this essentially is as an integrity measure, to ensure that there is no favouritism, that there is not any fear that there may be some form of corrupt activity at that level. What I am proposing in this is that, for the purposes of political donations, certain sectors be prohibited from being donors to candidates. These include property developers, a building entity, an industry representative organisation if the majority of its members are prohibited donors, or any other person or organisation that holds or has within the preceding seven years held a contract for services of an annual value of more than the prescribed amount with the relevant council.

I have an article here from ABC News, written by Rebecca Turner, published on 1 March this year, and it states:

Property developers are among the biggest political donors in Australia, but should they be allowed to be?

The article goes on to say:

Property developers are among the biggest industry donors in Australia, according to independent think tank, the Centre for Public Integrity. After scrutinising donation disclosures to the Australian Electoral Commission, between 1999 and 2019, the centre found that the property and construction industry donated more than \$54 million in this time. Although the West Australian branch of the Liberal Party has struggled to raise funds in recent years, the centre found it received almost \$3.7 million, the fifth biggest share of this pool of funds.

Local company Furama Pty Ltd was even in the top 10 of property and construction donors around Australia over the two decades, but in 2019 the think tank found that prominent Perth development company the Satterley Property Group Pty Ltd, was Western Australia's most generous property donor. However, its donations—of more than \$36,000—went to both the Western Australian and Victorian branches of the Labor Party.

Some companies contribute to organisations which run political campaigns, such as the Business Council of Australia and the national office of the Construction, Forestry, Maritime, Mining and Energy Union. These political campaigner groups now have to disclose donations to the AEC.

Why do they donate? As many donors explain, they like to support politicians and parties they admire. Chief executive and managing director of the Satterley Property Group, Nigel Satterley, told 6PR Radio earlier in March that Western Australian Premier Mark McGowan ran a seriously good government, and Satterley Property Group's political

donations got the company 'no favours'. Donations aren't always just a straight cash transaction from a donor to a political party. They can also involve attendance at events or membership of clubs where people can have easy access to politicians.

Why do property developers want access to politicians? The property industry is in the business of land whose use is controlled by governments.

Of course, it is in the business of land that is not only controlled by state government but also in some cases by local government. The article continues:

Economist Cameron Murray said governments—from ministers to planning bureaucrats—made many discretionary decisions which were worth a lot of money to developers. Dr Murray, a research fellow at the University of Sydney, likes to call these decisions 'the golden pen tick'. The golden pen tick can be a subdivision approval or a rezoning of land, which can make your parcel of land suddenly worth a lot of money.

In a book called *Game of Mates*, Dr Murray, with fellow economist Paul Frijters, scrutinised six big land rezoning developments in Queensland to argue that access to power is the most important factor in getting discretionary planning decisions in your favour.

I've had people in the property industry say, 'Your research is not that interesting. I could have told you that,' [said Dr Murray].

But the Centre for Public Integrity report said that the access to politicians bought by developers weakened public confidence in Australia's democracy.

So I say that it should also apply to local government. Again, as I have said before, this is all about ensuring integrity in local government. I hope that my fellow members support the intent of this amendment.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The government opposes this particular amendment. We are advised that, on this particular proposal, there has not been consultation with councils, or other parties I presume. I am not talking about political parties but other stakeholders, perhaps. I am advised that the legislation in other jurisdictions that has banned or capped political donations from particular groups has been subject to a number of challenges in the High Court. From the government's viewpoint, this emphasises the need to carefully consider any amendments of this nature before progressing them.

I do not intend to interrogate the precise details as to exactly how some of these particular amendments would work, should they be passed, but certainly on the surface they are extraordinarily complex. I look at 79B(3), for example. I am not entirely clear on what the impact of that would be but, on the surface of it, it says that, 'An annual or other subscription paid to a party by...a member of the party...is taken to be a gift to the party for the purposes of this section.'

That appears to me to read that if somebody joins the Labor Party and pays their \$100 subscription fee, or whatever their affiliation or subscription fee is, it is taken to be a gift to the party for the purposes of this section, whereas certainly the Liberal Party would just see it as a membership fee for membership. I am not sure what work that particular subclause or provision is intended to do in relation to the honourable member's suite of amendments.

I am not sure what the position of the other groups in this chamber is to these particular amendments, but if ultimately they are to pass the Legislative Council I would suggest there will be significant issues in terms of trying to understand all the implications of this particular suite of amendments, which may well serve to delay the passage of the entire bill. I do not know the potential fate of the amendments in this particular chamber, but certainly these are very complex and complicated issues for which, if they are to be instituted by the parliament, everyone will need to fully understand the implications of what they are about to do and what it is they are about to impose upon councils and individuals.

Let's put aside those who have bad intentions in relation to the purpose of political donations but think of those who do not have bad intentions but nevertheless either want to be supported by a political party or indeed want to be supportive of a candidate for a particular election, or want to attend a lunch or a dinner or whatever it might happen to be, even at modest cost. There are a whole range of questions.

All I am flagging is that if this chamber ultimately were to support this particular amendment, I would foreshadow a complicated series of discussions that would need to ensue in relation to this

suite of amendments. Given the long history of this particular bill, I am hoping that will not be required. I indicate the government's opposition to the package of amendments.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I rise to indicate that the opposition will be opposing this amendment. The amendment proposes to ban political donations from a range of prescribed categories. Whilst we again understand the genuine intent of the amendment, the opposition would want to see more detail about the justification for these changes, including determining whether the issue of political donations from developers is widespread at a local level and why only developers. We will be looking at supporting the Hon. Rob Simms' amendment that he will be putting forward, which will cover donations, as we feel it captures all donations that are being made above \$500.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I rise in support of the amendment moved by the Hon. Frank Pangallo. The Greens have long been very concerned about the corrosive influence of donations from developers on our politics. The old saying, 'He who pays the piper plays the tune' comes to mind here, and I think the Hon. Mr Pangallo is correct when he says that people who are standing for local council should not have their campaigns bankrolled by developers who have a clear financial interest in getting particular outcomes through that level of government.

It is completely inappropriate, and I suspect if you were to have a referendum on such a question, were the government to be so minded to do that—I know that they are a big fan of those, generally when they relate to issues like workers' rights, though—I suspect most members of the community would agree that it is not appropriate for developers to be able to make donations and to exert, or to attempt to exert, influence over our political process in this way. It is for that reason that the Greens will be supporting the amendment. If the amendment is unsuccessful, I will call a division so that the views of members can be recorded.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: For the record, I indicate I will not be supporting this amendment.

The committee divided on the new clause:

Ayes 4
Noes 17
Majority 13

AYES

Bonaros, C.	Franks, T.A.	Pangallo, F. (teller)
Simms, R.A.		

NOES

Bourke, E.S.	Centofanti, N.J.	Darley, J.A.
Hanson, J.E.	Hood, D.G.E.	Hunter, I.K.
Lee, J.S.	Lensink, J.M.A.	Lucas, R.I. (teller)
Maher, K.J.	Ngo, T.T.	Pnevmatikos, I.
Ridgway, D.W.	Scriven, C.M.	Stephens, T.J.
Wade, S.G.	Wortley, R.P.	

New clause thus negated.

Clause 181.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

Amendment No 2 [Simms–1]—

Page 98, line 33 [clause 181, inserted section 80(1)(a)]—Delete 'within 30 days after the conclusion of the election' and substitute 'at the prescribed times'

If it pleases you, Chair, I will make some general remarks about the thrust of a series of these amendments because they all relate to the same topic, so in the interests of time I will deal with it that way. These relate to the disclosure of donations received. Currently, candidates who are

standing for election to council disclose their donations that they have received after the election period.

What I am proposing, on behalf of the Greens, is that there now be two disclosures: one before the voting period and one after. This is a modest measure but it is an important transparency measure. I have always believed that sunlight is the best disinfectant and giving the community the most information possible I think is really vital so that people can make informed decisions.

If someone who is standing for council is being bankrolled by developers or another vested interest group, then, if this amendment is carried, for the first time members of the community will have access to that information. I think that would really enhance democracy at a local level. That is why we are pursuing this amendment.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The government is opposing this particular amendment. The government understands the principles and the purpose behind the honourable member's suite of amendments, which is to address the issue in local government elections of how to release information about campaign donations so that voters can consider this information as they are casting their vote.

It is the government's contention that this is difficult to achieve in local government elections due to the extended voting time frame. I have been advised that the only way to guarantee this information is completely available before the close of voting is to prevent candidates from receiving donations after a certain time, which is not possible as it could impinge on our implied constitutional rights to freedom of political expression.

These amendments tackle this question by requiring candidates to furnish a campaign donations return twice: once within a period of 21 days from the close of nominations and again within 30 days of the conclusion of the election. The government considers that a requirement for an additional return would put undue pressure on candidates during the time they are focused on campaigning, particularly noting that council candidates are typically managing their campaigns without the support of a party or other organisation behind them.

The government's policy on this issue is to require candidates who receive larger donations, which is expected to be an amount in the order of \$2,500, to disclose this information in a much shorter time frame—within five days of receipt. I am advised that if a candidate receives a larger donation at any time prior to the election, they will be required to disclose that on the Electoral Commission website within five days of receipt of that particular donation. This will maximise the opportunity for voters to be aware of these larger donations, which the government assumes would tend to be of most interest to electors.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As indicated when discussing the Hon. Frank Pangallo's amendment referring to donations, the opposition will be supporting the Hon. Robert Simms' amendment. I acknowledge the mover's changes to his original amendment and thank him for changing the donation disclosure reporting time frame. This is an important change that will capture the true intent of his amendment: a form of live donation reporting.

Increasing donation transparency mirrors changes the Weatherill government made to funding and disclosure requirements. These amendments will give ratepayers access to a candidate's donation history before they cast their vote—donations made by any organisation or individual. It is important to note that this would only impact donations over \$500.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I wholeheartedly support this amendment. It seems to be a roundabout way of my previous attempt to have disclosure of political parties. We may well have this in this amendment. I certainly endorse the intent of this amendment and what it can actually achieve. With that, we support it.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: For the record, I will not be supporting this amendment.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Simms-1]—

Page 98, after line 38 [clause 181, inserted section 80]—After subsection (2) insert:

- (3) For the purposes of this section, the *prescribed times* for furnishing a campaign donations return are—
 - (a) within 7 days of the end of the period commencing from the start of the disclosure period for the election (within the meaning of section 81B(a)) and ending—
 - (i) in the case of a periodic election—21 days after the close of nominations; or
 - (ii) in any other case—7 days after the close of nominations; and
 - (b) within 30 days after the conclusion of the election.

I do not propose to speak to this amendment. It is a consequential amendment and tied to the previous measure.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 182 to 187 passed.

Clause 188.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

Amendment No 4 [Simms-1]—

Page 101, lines 29 to 31 [clause 188(1), inserted subsection (2)(b)]—Delete paragraph (b) and substitute:

- (b) in the case of a campaign donations return required to be furnished at the prescribed time applying under section 80(3)(a)—within 7 days after that prescribed time; and
- (c) in the case of a campaign donations return required to be furnished at the prescribed time applying under section 80(3)(b)—within 8 weeks after that prescribed time,

I do not propose to speak to this amendment. It is a consequential amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 189 to 191 passed.

Clause 192.

The CHAIR: We move to amendment No. 5 [Pangallo-1].

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I believe this might be consequential, so I will not be moving it.

Clause passed.

Clauses 193 to 197 passed.

Clause 198.

The CHAIR: We now move to clause 198 amendment No. 6 [Pangallo-1]. Is that consequential as well?

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Yes, it is. I will not move it, thank you.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

Amendment No 5 [Simms-1]—

Page 109, after line 6—After subclause (16) insert:

- (16a) Schedule 1, heading to Part 8—delete 'and expenditure' and substitute:
, expenditure and disclosure

Amendment carried.

The CHAIR: There is a further amendment on clause 198, amendment No. 6 [Simms-1].

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I am going to withdraw that amendment. That relates to the previous amendment No. 1 [Simms-1], which was related to political party memberships. I move:

Amendment No 7 [Simms-1]—

Page 109, lines 14 to 18 [clause 198(18), inserted clause 23(1)(a)]—Delete paragraph (a) and substitute:

- (a) at the prescribed times—a campaign donations return under this Division; and
- (ab) within 30 days after the conclusion of the election—a campaign expenditure return under this Division; and

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

Amendment No 8 [Simms-1]—

Page 109, after line 23 [clause 198(18), inserted clause 23]—After subclause (2) insert:

- (3) For the purposes of this clause, the *prescribed times* for furnishing a campaign donations return are—
 - (a) within 7 days of the end of the period commencing from the start of the disclosure period for the election (within the meaning of clause 24B(a)) and ending—
 - (i) in the case of a periodic election—21 days after the close of nominations; or
 - (ii) in any other case—7 days after the close of nominations; and
 - (b) within 30 days after the conclusion of the election.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

Amendment No 9 [Simms-1]—

Page 111, after line 40 [clause 198(30), inserted subclause (2)]—After paragraph (a) insert:

- (ab) in the case of a campaign donations return required to be furnished at the prescribed time applying under clause 23(3)(a)—within 7 days after that prescribed time; and
- (ac) in the case of a campaign donations return required to be furnished at the prescribed time applying under clause 23(3)(b)—within 8 weeks after that prescribed time; and

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (199 to 209) and title passed.

Bill recommitted.

New clause 103.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move new clause 103, in lieu of deleted clause 103:

Amendment No 1 [Treasurer-4]—

Page 56, after line 20—Insert:

103—Amendment of section 194—Revocation of classification of land as community land

Section 194(2)(b)—delete 'follow the relevant steps set out in its public consultation policy' and substitute:

undertake public consultation on the proposal

I have moved this amendment on behalf of the government to resolve the matter that has resulted in relation to the process by which community land status can be revoked. The government acknowledges that the amendments to section 194 of the Local Government Act, revocation of community land, were not supported. However, it has come to our attention that the failure of these amendments means that the act will retain a reference to a council's public consultation policy in section 194(2)(b). This relates to the current scheme in the act that requires certain actions to take place when councils are required to consult.

Honourable members will recall that other amendments supported the proposal to replace this inflexible one-size-fits-all scheme with a new scheme that will require councils to consult in accordance with both the community engagement charter and any other standards and actions

councils may include in their own consultation policies. The government, therefore, wishes to ensure that all obsolete references to public consultation policies are changed to the new community engagement scheme so that there is no lessening of expectations in regard to consultation.

This is particularly important in regard to community land revocations where the community may well have a keen interest in their council's proposal. This community engagement is a significant part of the process that councils must undergo when seeking to revoke the community land status of land in their area and also forms an important part of the minister's consideration of a request for approval.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I rise on behalf of the opposition to support this amendment, which is technical in nature. The opposition does this in good faith that the government will uphold the true value of community consultation that has been discussed throughout the bill.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: SA-Best will be supporting the amendment.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: I will be supporting the amendment.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: The Greens will also support the amendment.

New clause inserted.

Clause 198.

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

That subclause (16a) be deleted.

We are a very collaborative government. I am advised by parliamentary counsel that I should move to assist the comprehensive settlement of a suite of amendments from the Hon. Mr Simms. Evidently, in the suite of amendments from the Hon. Mr Simms we inserted subclause (16a) but we should have deleted it.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I wish to thank the Hon. Rob Lucas for moving that amendment, and please accept my apologies for the error—newbie's nerves, I suspect. Thank you for your cooperation.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (17:05): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (TRANSPORT PORTFOLIO) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 May 2021.)

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (17:06): I rise to speak on the Statutes Amendment (Transport Portfolio) Bill 2020 and indicate that I am the lead speaker on behalf of the opposition. The opposition is inclined to support this bill in its entirety and its passage through this house because there are largely good measures in it and in no small part because many of these measures have been on the table for some time. We need to see their speedy passage.

Indeed, a number of the changes are those that have been proposed by members of the opposition in the other place over the last couple of years and have been opposed by the government. We are glad to see that they have now come to the table. For example, in May 2018, the Labor opposition and the member for Elizabeth introduced a bill to allow police to search vehicles of persons who have tested positive to a roadside drug test, which the Road Traffic Act currently

prohibits. Many may find it hard to believe that, but the Road Traffic Act does currently prohibit that. It is very specific about what acts a positive roadside drug test can provide evidence for.

The change that the opposition wanted to make was simply to extend it to the Controlled Substances Act, which would have the effect of allowing police to have both the authority to search for drugs when someone tests positive on a roadside drug test and also to use that initial test, both the breath test and the blood test, as evidence for other offending against the Controlled Substances Act.

The opposition introduced that bill in May 2018 in the other place. At the time, the transport minister was the police minister, and I believe he spoke against it at the time, saying that it was unnecessary. Perhaps more importantly, the Attorney-General, who some say considers herself the state's premier legal mind, spoke against it in the other place, also saying it was unnecessary. We fast-forward nearly three years and we have a bill before us that in its last clause exactly duplicates that bill from May 2018—the bill put forward by the opposition.

I am pleased that the government has finally seen the light. We have been saying this since May 2018 and in fact even longer than that. We have been saying it, the police have been saying it and the police commissioner is on the record as saying it. There is a letter to the Budget and Finance Committee in 2019 where the police commissioner makes no bones about the fact that he was for that measure. That is why, presumably, we now see it included in this bill at this very late stage. The opposition supports this bill not least because it reflects many of the measures we have been talking about for a very long time now, and we will not stand in the way of its progress.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (17:09): I thank the honourable member for her indication of support for the bill.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: It is my understanding that the Leader of the Government in this place may want to place some information on the record at this stage, which I shall welcome.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I rise on behalf of the government—the Hon. Ms Bonaros is correct. The government thanks the Hon. Ms Bonaros in particular for her detailed consideration of the bill and for her contributions to the debate. The government acknowledges that the honourable member has acknowledged that she will not insist on her proposed amendments, and she can be assured that the government intends to introduce another bill dealing with road traffic matters as soon as is reasonably practicable. I think that is the undertaking that we undertook to give on behalf of the government to the honourable member.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: It is important to get that on the record because we have been having discussions with both the government and the opposition in relation to these amendments. I acknowledge that this was opportunistic on our part in terms of drafting these amendments to this bill, but when there is a bill before us and the scope is wide enough, then obviously it is well within our remit to do so.

That said, my office has been in very lengthy discussions with the Minister for Police and his staff, who I understand have now provided the assurances that the Treasurer has referred to insofar as they relate to the amendments. The only reason I would support that is that I trust that the work we have done has highlighted a willingness on the part of the government to support those measures, but as they relate to changes to the Road Traffic Act. I am happy to accept that they are best dealt with in the next raft of amendments that will deal specifically with the Road Traffic Act. I am also happy to accept that, although the Treasurer says that will be as soon as is reasonably practicable, I am told it is also very imminent.

So on that basis I am happy to foreshadow to all honourable members that I will not be proceeding with the amendments today, but that is only on the basis that they will be reconsidered in the context of another bill that is being proposed by the government that will go to the heart of the

issues that we have canvassed in our amendments. Support for these amendments seems to be growing, so I am very pleased about that. I thank the Treasurer and Leader of the Government in this place for his commitment to that effect.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (2 to 64) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (17:15): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Members

SIMMS, HON. R.A.

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

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).

(Continued from 4 May 2021.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (17:16): I rise to support the motion before us today and welcome our newest member, the now honourable Robert Simms. It does beg the question: if he is now honourable, what has he been up to that he was not honourable before? I do not know Robert well, but I know a lot of people who do know him well, and the company he keeps I think speaks volumes to the sort of person he is and the sort of member he is going to be here.

I note that we saw a former member, the honourable—and I use that term loosely, given his desertion of this chamber—Andrew McLachlan, demoted to the Senate from this chamber. Now we see the Hon. Robert Simms promoted from the Senate, via the Adelaide City Council, to this chamber, which is a good thing. It is rare that someone has the experience at the various levels of government that the Hon. Robert Simms has.

I know a number of people who know the Hon. Robert Simms well, and I asked whether there were any stories that were both funny and embarrassing for Robert and fit to tell in this chamber. I got a whole lot of stories that met the first set of criteria, but I am afraid did not fit the second set of criteria of being fit to tell in this chamber, so I do not have any of those anecdotes that have been passed on to me that I can share with this chamber.

It has been reflected upon a couple of times the shoes the Hon. Robert Simms is filling, left by the founder of the Greens party in South Australia, the Hon. Mark Parnell. I am sure Robert will carry on that tradition of integrity and decency that he has left behind in this chamber, and I look forward to working with him into the future.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:18): On behalf of SA-Best I, too, rise to support the motion and to formally extend a very warm welcome to our newest member, the Hon. Robert Simms, in this place and associate myself with the remarks of other honourable members of this and the other place. We are very much looking forward to sharing the halls of the lower ground floor with you—it is a little bit different down there—and this chamber. I know the Hon. Robert Simms has described himself as a bit of a nerd, and I assure you that you are in very good company in this place.

It has been well established now, through all the speeches that have been made, that you have some big shoes to fill. Your predecessor, the Hon. Mark Parnell, was, as others have said, a mentor, a statesman, a diplomat, a gentleman and a friend to many in this place—a green giant, as the Leader of the Government in this place put it, and one of the finest examples of what all parliamentarians and good citizens aspire to be. He epitomised the often quoted words of the 19th century author and theologian James Freeman Clarke, who distinguished, 'A politician thinks of the next election; a statesman, of the next generation.'

You, too, have spoken of your commitment to positive social change for generations to come. Your record across all three levels of government speaks for itself, as does your commitment to issues that go to the very heart of Greens platform issues, including things like the climate crisis and the environment, inequality, marriage equality, poverty and homelessness, advances in LGBTI rights, social housing, the list goes on.

We may not always agree on issues being debated in here but, in my view, the Hon. Mr Simms has quite rightly highlighted that while we make laws it is people who drive social change. There is no doubt that your party has played a pivotal advocacy role in that process. We all have a responsibility to do just that. Your political journey is clearly only part heard, and we look forward to you paving your own path here in this place. With those words, and on behalf of SA-Best, I, too, welcome the Hon. Mr Simms to the Legislative Council and look forward to working with you, your office and your team for years to come.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:20): Unsurprisingly, I rise to support the motion and welcome the Hon. Rob Simms to this place. It has been a long time coming, in many ways, for him to arrive here, and I look at it as a little bit of a Goldilocks effect. He has finally found a place in the middle: just right, not too big and not too small but just right. I hope that he will make himself a welcome home here, not just to the next election but well beyond that.

The Hon. Robert Simms and I actually go back to when he was 17. I know a lot of those stories the Hon. Kyam Maher has alluded to, and I shall not share any of them here. I think the Greens will be well served by Robert's presence in this place. Our shared values and our four pillars—environmental sustainability, social justice, peace and nonviolence—and of course grassroots democracy, will be adequately and with amplitude personified in this place.

The Hon. Robert Simms and I will share one of the portfolios the Hon. Mark Parnell used to hold. We will have a shared portfolio of climate change and environment because we believe that is too important to divide amongst us. We also think that it will double our capacity in those areas. We look forward to working collaboratively as team Greens but also collaboratively with all members of the council. I cannot wait to get on with the job, and I know the Hon. Robert Simms has already proven this afternoon that he cannot wait either.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (17:22): I would like to quickly add my comments to the welcoming of the Hon. Mr Simms to this chamber. It is always good to see a new member come, fresh faced and full of enthusiasm and energy.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Three weeks.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Three weeks, yes. It will be fun to see if he can maintain much of that enthusiasm and energy. Welcome; it is great to see you here, a new face. I was discussing with the President some weeks ago the number of people who have come through this chamber in the nearly 20 years that I have been here—and he has been here a bit longer, and the Hon. Rob Lucas is approaching the 40-year mark—there have probably been several football teams of people who have been through here. Welcome, the Hon. Mr Simms.

I was away, and I think I had a pair, visiting some constituents in the regions when we spoke about the Hon. Mark Parnell. I want to say that I had the great fortune to be the Leader of the Opposition for 11 years of Mark's 15-year term, so I had a lot to do with Mark. We spent some time together on the ERD committee.

I remember the Hon. Russell Wortley and the Hon. Mark Parnell wanted to inquire into coastal development. They wanted to go in September, not really being aware that the weather is much better in March. So I suggested that we amend that motion and not do the inquiry in September but do the trip to the West Coast in March. I think that was one of the most memorable ERD trips that we had. We all enjoyed having a good look at the Far West Coast; it is a beautiful part of South Australia. We also enjoyed some of the wonderful fruits of the sea while we were over there.

I remember very fondly offering Mark Parnell what I could only ever say was a wheelbarrow full of turf, not a wheelbarrow full of grass. I had some instant lawn that I did not need, he was laying a bit of lawn and he said, 'But don't ever say it's grass.' I can say it is grass now. I gave him a

wheelbarrow full of grass. Sadly, it had been out of water for a little bit too long and he claims none of it actually grew. Maybe he needed to put a bit more water on it.

There are two things I would say to wrap up regarding the Hon. Mark Parnell. We had a select committee into wind farms and a very memorable night when Mark, the Hon. Mr Wortley and I and a number of journalists slept in a deserted house in the Clare Valley on a very stormy and windy night. We were there to listen to the infrasound and the vibrations from wind farms, and all we had were vibrations from the storm that blew through and we did not hear anything other than rain.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: And your snoring?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: And maybe my snoring, yes. Well, we were tired by the time we finished. I do recall that the journalists with us wanted to actually film us getting into bed so they could relax. I think we might even have posed as if we were getting out of bed within a couple of minutes so that they could get all of their vision and then we could actually enjoy each other's company and sleep the night.

The other thing I would like to say is about the tragedy that befell the Parnell family with the death of Mungo. To see somebody in this chamber and their family, Mark and Penny, go through that was quite—for them, I am sure it is something they will never forget and it has changed their lives forever. I think it was really important that we all shared in the grief with them, and we did that pretty much universally as a chamber. It was a pretty moving time. You might not share their political views, but when times were tough we tried to do the best we could to support Mark and Penny and the family.

I wish them both all the very best in their retirement. I did see him flashing his Seniors Card around last week for his public transport free travel. He has worked hard. He has been a great servant of the people he was representing here and a great servant of the people of South Australia. I do wish Mark and Penny and the rest of their family all the very best in his retirement.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:26): I wish to add to the very well-chosen words by my colleague the Hon. Connie Bonaros in welcoming the Hon. Robert Simms to the Legislative Council. He may be a greenhorn—sorry to use that pun—but in actual fact I am quite impressed by the Hon. Robert Simms' experience in three tiers of government. For such a young man, I think that is a notable achievement. I have already pointed that out to my younger son, who may have political aspirations one day, to look at what the Hon. Robert Simms has achieved in such a short period of time.

He is now my neighbour; he has taken over the office of the Hon. Mark Parnell. I look forward to working with the Hon. Mr Simms, as I do with the other crossbenchers and the Hon. Tammy Franks and other members in this place. I have been extremely impressed by Robert's enthusiasm, even since before he entered this place, for the issues that we will be tackling and will continue to tackle.

As the Hon. Connie Bonaros has pointed out, there may be some issues that we will not agree on, and we may not support them on certain issues. However, as a party, SA-Best certainly shares some common interests with the Greens, in particular those social justice issues that I know both the Hon. Robert Simms and the Hon. Tammy Parnell—

The Hon. C. Bonaros: Tammy Franks.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: —the Hon. Tammy Franks are quite passionate about. I have Mark on the brain. I do miss Mark's presence on the floor and seeing him wheel his bike in and out each day, and certainly his enthusiasm and presence in this place and what he has contributed to legislation in the Legislative Council. I am sure the Hon. Mr Simms will follow in those large footsteps that have been embedded in this place by the Hon. Mark Parnell. I would like to welcome the Hon. Robert Simms to the Legislative Council. I can see that he will probably have a long career in politics, if not in the Legislative Council certainly with the Green movement.

The PRESIDENT: I call the Treasurer to conclude the debate, and I understand he may or may not have a limerick.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (17:29): I can assure you I do not have a limerick. No, I am limerick-less. I rise to conclude the debate formally and thank all members who have welcomed

the new member, the Hon. Mr Simms, to the chamber. The fact that a number of other members of the chamber have not joined in is no indication of lack of welcome to the Hon. Mr Simms; I am sure they have all in their own way personally welcomed him to the chamber and look forward to working collaboratively with him over the coming months or years, depending on their respective lengths of service. I thank honourable members for their contribution to the debate.

Motion carried.

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2021

Introduction and First Reading

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

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (SAFETY) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (FUND SELECTION AND OTHER SUPERANNUATION MATTERS) BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to the amendments made by the Legislative Council without any amendment; and agreed to the suggested amendments without any amendment and has amended the bill accordingly.

FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES (GOVERNANCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to the amendment made by the Legislative Council without any amendment.

DISABILITY INCLUSION (RESTRICTIVE PRACTICES - NDIS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 17:33 the council adjourned until Wednesday 12 May 2021 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***STATE BUDGET**

In reply to **the Hon. M.C. PARNELL** (11 November 2020).

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

1. The government met this commitment and provided an additional \$7.5 million per annum for 10 years to the South Australian Housing Authority (SAHA). The preventative maintenance expenditure budget is included in the SA Housing Authority's capital investment program, which can be found in the 2020-21 budget, Budget Paper 3, chapter 5, page 75, refer to Public Housing Capital Maintenance program.

Please note that \$10 million was brought forward into 2019-20 and 2020-21 as part of the government's stimulus and economic recovery package. Details on this measure can be found in the 2020-21 budget, Budget Paper 5, page 133.

Consistent with the commitment, SAHA is on track to spend \$9.7 million on preventative maintenance in 2020-21, including the portion of the \$10 million brought forward into 2020-21.

2. The government met this commitment and provided an additional \$2 million per annum for 10 years to SAHA. The increase in the provision for emergency accommodation and transitional housing for people in need, including women and children affected by family violence and people experiencing homelessness, is included in the SA Housing Authority's operating budget which can be found in Budget Paper 3, chapter 5, page 71.

SA Housing Authority undertook an expression of interest process seeking innovative solutions from homelessness service providers. The competitive tender process resulted in the first \$4.5 million being awarded to two new projects, which aim to deliver reductions in homelessness across the state.

3. The government has met this commitment and the five-year trial applies for relevant agreements entered into from 1 March 2020. The Affordable Community Housing Land Tax Exemption Pilot provides eligible property owners with ex gratia relief, equivalent to a land tax exemption for property they rent through a participating community housing provider for affordable housing purposes. Land tax ex gratia payments are recorded as a refund and remission expense in the Department of Treasury and Finance Administered Items Account, which can be found in the 2020-21 budget, Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 198.

The Affordable Community Housing Land Tax Exemption Pilot and the affordable housing land tax concession details are available on Revenue SA's website.

4. The government is meeting its commitment to install solar panels on 75 per cent of suitable existing public housing through the SA Virtual Power Plant project. The government is supporting the project through a \$2 million grant and \$20 million loan from the Renewable Technology Fund and \$10 million grant from the Grid Scale Storage Fund. These commitments are reflected in the financial statements of the Department for Energy and Mining, which can be found in Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, pages 109 (refer to key agency outputs) and 120 (refer to Subprogram 1.6: Clean Energy Transition).

The trial phases of the SA Virtual Power Plant project involved 1,100 SA Housing Authority properties being fitted with solar and Tesla home battery systems. Installations under the trial phases were completed in 2019.

Tesla is now rolling out phase 3 of the SA Virtual Power Plant project to another 3,000 SA Housing Authority properties.

5. The government is meeting its commitment to install batteries, together with solar panels on 75 per cent of new public housing through the SA Virtual Power Plant (VPP) project. References in the budget papers are consistent with those set out in relation to solar panels above.

For 2020-21, SA Housing Authority will achieve a minimum of 75 per cent installation of batteries and solar panels for new public housing.

SECURITY OFFICER LICENCES

In reply to **the Hon. J.A. DARLEY** (1 April 2021).

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

- Licensing for security agents is administered by Consumer and Business Services (CBS) with input from South Australia Police (SAPOL).
- CBS performs initial vetting of applications for security personnel with respect to eligibility and qualification checks upon lodgement.
- CBS sends applications to SAPOL within three days for more rigorous probity checks, which include fingerprinting and detailed background checks of the applicant and their associates.
- I understand the current waiting time for applicants to have their fingerprints taken is around six weeks. However SAPOL commences background checks during this time. Applications with missing information or probity issues can take longer.

- CBS finalises applications within two weeks of receiving the results of the probity checks by SAPOL.
- Processing times are affected by application levels. These have been high recently, with the number received in March being the highest monthly level for the last two years.
- CBS is working with SAPOL to streamline background checks and reduce workload for liquor and gambling approvals. This will have a flow-on effect that will improve processing times for security agents.