

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**Tuesday, 25 May 2021**

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

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

*Bills***LANDSCAPE SOUTH AUSTRALIA (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL***Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (RECOMMENDATIONS OF INDEPENDENT INQUIRY INTO CHILD PROTECTION) BILL*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES (GOVERNANCE) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (FUND SELECTION AND OTHER SUPERANNUATION MATTERS) BILL*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (TRANSPORT PORTFOLIO) BILL*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

DISABILITY INCLUSION (RESTRICTIVE PRACTICES - NDIS) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

COVID-19 EMERGENCY RESPONSE (EXPIRY) (NO 2) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Parliamentary Procedure***PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the President—

Report of the Auditor-General—Probity of the processes for the heavy rail service contract,
Report No. 9 of 2021

By the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas)—

Fee Notices under Acts—

Aquaculture
 Controlled Substances
 Fisheries Management
 Forestry
 Industrial Hemp
 Livestock
 Pastoral Land Management and Conservation
 Plant Health
 Primary Produce (Food Safety Schemes)—
 Eggs
 Meat
 Plant Products
 Seafood

Regulations under Acts—

Electronic Communications Act 2000—Government Agency
 Explosives Act 1936—Security Sensitive Substances
 Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013—Miscellaneous
 Public Sector (Data Sharing) Act 2016—Data Sharing—Relevant Entries
 Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) Act 2012—Modification of FOI Act
 Freedom of Information—Shop Trading Hours
 Management Plan for the South Australian Commercial Northern Zone Rock Lobster
 Fishery dated July 2021

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

Regulations under Acts—

Police Act 1998—Merit Pool

*Parliamentary Committees***SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:19): I bring up the report of the committee on the Inquiry into the Surgical Implantation of Medical Mesh in South Australia.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*Question Time***COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT**

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding vaccinations. Given that Victoria, New South Wales and Western Australia all have policies to ensure that all medi-hotel workers are vaccinated, exactly how many and what percentage of our medi-hotel workers in general are fully vaccinated in South Australia?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:22): I am advised that medi-hotel vaccination rates continue to fluctuate between 75 per cent and 85 per cent. Tom's Court frontline staff, I am advised, continue to be vaccinated at 100 per cent, and likewise clinical staff at other medi-hotels.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): Supplementary arising from the answer: minister, are you aware if in a number of other states that figure is at or close to 100 per cent of medi-hotel workers being vaccinated for all medi-hotel sites?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:23): I think it is important to appreciate that vaccination is primarily for the protection of the person, and it has been the practice of SA Health to not make vaccinations mandatory—for example, in the flu context. We will continue to act on the basis of clinical advice.

It is important to see that vaccination is only one part of the protection for our workers in medi-hotels and other parts of the quarantine pathway. Obviously, personal protective equipment is extremely important. The AHPPC and our clinical teams continually have been assessing the PPE needs within our medi-hotels. We started doing daily saliva testing in medi-hotels earlier this year, and workers are subject to regular PCR testing.

Of course, the quality of the medi-hotel itself is an important part of protecting workers. For example, following the Parafield cluster in December last year, significant measures were taken to upgrade the ventilation, particularly in the establishment of Australia's only dedicated COVID-19 facility, Tom's Court. That, of course, in itself is also a risk-mitigating factor for people working in the other medi-hotels. By having a dedicated facility, that means that a positive case is relocated to the Tom's Court facility as needed.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): A supplementary arising from the original answer: minister, given that jurisdictions directly to the east and west of us in Victoria and Western Australia require vaccination of all medi-hotel workers, what is the primary reason that you have elected not to do this in South Australia?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:25): The honourable member might not direct that at me. The honourable member might remember that this COVID-19 response is fundamentally being led by clinicians. This government has not politicised the COVID-19 response and I continue to rely on the advice of my clinical team. I am advised that—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —Professor Nicola Spurrier, the Chief Public Health Officer, continues to look—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, on both sides of the house!

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, Minister for Human Services!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I am advised that Professor Nicola Spurrier, the Chief Public Health Officer, continues to look at the requirements for the COVID-19 vaccination of staff and contractors who enter quarantine facilities.

In line with SA Health's immunisation for healthcare workers and quarantine workers policy, if an employee chooses not to be vaccinated against COVID-19, they must have a detailed risk assessment of their work activities, the area in which they work and the population cared for in that area in order to identify appropriate actions to manage risk arising from vaccine-preventable diseases. As I said, I am advised that Professor Spurrier continues to look at the requirements for vaccination of staff and contractors who enter quarantine facilities.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): Final supplementary: has the minister sought briefings or detailed explanations about why bordering jurisdictions require all medi-hotel workers to be vaccinated but we have elected not to in South Australia?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:27): Yes, I have had detailed discussions with Nicola Spurrier and other clinicians. I continue to respect their advice.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:27): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding health. Given footage showing 11 ambulances ramped outside the Flinders Medical Centre last night, can the minister explain why patients are yet again spending hours queued outside our hospitals?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:27): I thank the honourable member for her question. One of the points I have been making in recent months is that the increased pressure on our emergency departments, particularly the last month or two of last year and the first four months of this year, has been significantly related to an increased complexity in cases.

My advice—and it is only oral at this stage, because yesterday was only yesterday—was that in the last few days the pressure in the EDs was more related to presentations. I am advised that some of our hospitals actually had their busiest day on record in terms of presentations to their EDs in recent days.

Flinders Medical Centre was certainly a hospital that was under pressure yesterday. I want to thank all the paramedics, the ED staff and the hospital staff who responded to that situation. Talking to people involved in the response at Flinders Medical Centre, I am advised that it was significantly in relation to the demand within the ED, not so much in terms of availability of beds.

I am also advised that the hospital was able to clear the ramp—I think it was between 11 and 12—and that there was no more ramping overnight. I certainly appreciate that it was a high demand day for the Flinders Medical Centre and I thank the staff who responded. Of course, the Flinders Medical Centre is particularly vulnerable at the moment because we are in the process of upgrading it, so we are currently 14 treatment bays down. This is part of the government's more than \$100 million investment in emergency departments in this state.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I appreciate my honourable colleagues' concern that I have underestimated the government's investment. The \$100 million in relation to emergency departments is part of the broader \$1 billion investment in health and it is a very needed investment. In terms of the Flinders Medical Centre, I was absolutely delighted to be able to go down to the opening of the paediatric emergency department recently and see what the purpose-built facility will provide for children and adolescents in the south.

The Hon. J.E. Hanson interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Hanson!

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Chuck him out.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ridgway is not helping.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: In terms of the completion of the upgrade to the emergency department, which I think is late June or early July, I know the Flinders Medical Centre emergency department team and, for that matter, the whole hospital are looking forward to having a fully upgraded hospital to take them into the years ahead.

AMBULANCE RESPONSE, WHYALLA

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:31): 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: The opposition understands that on 22 December last year a person collapsed at Westland Shopping Centre in Whyalla but there was no ambulance available to respond after a 30-minute wait. The patient was then driven in a private car to the hospital and passed away a short time later. My question to the minister is: was the minister notified of this death and, if so, when?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:31): I will certainly need to consult my records and come back to the honourable member.

SINGLE TOUCH PAYROLL

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (14:31): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer please update the chamber on the latest Single Touch Payroll figures—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: —for South Australia?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will ask you to repeat the question. I didn't hear it because of the interjections.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: They are very excitable, the members opposite. My question is to the Treasurer and the question is—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Leader of the Opposition!

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: —can the Treasurer please update the chamber on the latest Single Touch Payroll figures?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: And the members opposite might like to listen.

The PRESIDENT: The Treasurer has the call.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Treasurer has the call and will be heard in silence.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:32): Thank you, Mr President. I am delighted to inform all members, I am sure, that the Single Touch Payroll figures that I regularly report to the house on were released today at 11 o'clock.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: What they demonstrate is that, since the low point of the pandemic in April of last year, there has been a 13.5 per cent increase in employee jobs in South Australia—13.5 per cent—which is the highest increase in jobs in any state in the nation and considerably higher than the national average for the nation, which was still a healthy 10.7 per cent but nevertheless significantly below us. The Eastern States were all at 10.1 per cent, with Queensland, Victoria and New South Wales at 10.3 per cent. It is very pleasing to be able to report that, since the low point of the pandemic in April last year, the number of employee jobs has increased significantly and at the highest rate of any of the states.

The Hon. C.M. Scriven interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: As I have indicated before, from our viewpoint anyway, the equally important measure the Single Touch Payroll provides is the measure of employee wages, which is wages going into households. Again, that shows South Australia with the second highest increase of all the states. Western Australia again leads the way with 12.4 per cent, but South Australia's growth since the low point of the pandemic is 10.7 per cent.

It is significantly ahead of the national figure at 8.7, and again comparing it with Queensland at 7.5 and New South Wales at 7.5. Employee wages, that is wages going to households, rising at such a significant rate is obviously enormously encouraging for those people who want to hear good things about what's going on in the South Australian economy at the moment.

It is also pleasing, whilst I have indicated before that the monthly labour force figures jump around significantly, only five or so months ago we were the lowest unemployment rate in the nation. For the last two or three months, we have been the highest unemployment rate in the nation. Very pleasingly, we are no longer the highest unemployment rate in the nation, on the most recent figures released last week. Our unemployment rate had plunged to 5.7 per cent, the national rate is

5.5 per cent, so almost the same as the national rate and, again, no longer that mantle of the highest unemployment rate in the nation. But as I said—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: It's the second highest.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, third, third highest.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: But as I said, a mere five months ago we were the lowest unemployment rate in the nation. The labour force figures jump around. That's why it's useful to look at a number of measures: the Single Touch Payroll and the monthly labour force figures. On this occasion, they are happily reporting very good signs for the state of economic recovery in the state.

Finally, those labour force figures are demonstrating that there had been a recovery of some 43,000 jobs year-on-year in South Australia: from April to April, 43,000 additional jobs. If you go to the low point of the labour force figures, which was a month later in May, it's actually an increase of 53,000 jobs in South Australia over the last 11 months, so encouraging signs. There is still much more work that has to be done, but for those people who want to hear and see good things about economic recovery in South Australia, the labour force and the Single Touch Payroll figures are important signs of recovery in the state's economy.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: Before calling the Hon. Mr Simms, I would like to acknowledge the presence in the gallery of the Hon. Ian Gilfillan, a former esteemed member of this house.

Question Time

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:37): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing on the topic of the COVID-19 vaccine rollout for those experiencing homelessness.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: With an estimated 6,000 people in South Australia currently experiencing homelessness, their ability to access the COVID-19 vaccine is particularly unclear, especially given this vaccine requires a follow-up shot. The pace of Australia's vaccination program is under increasing scrutiny and many experts are concerned some of the most vulnerable will be left behind. My question to the minister is: what is the current plan to ensure those experiencing homelessness have access to and receive the vaccine?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:37): My understanding is that, particularly in relation to the homeless cohort, homeless South Australians will be relying on our local health networks to reach out to them. This morning, I was talking to the Chief Executive Officer of the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network, Professor Sue O'Neill, specifically on this topic. The approach that they are taking there is to take out a van. My understanding is it's a food van, which already provides food services to homeless people. My understanding is that that is obviously to facilitate familiarity and trust.

It's intended that there would be an ambulance attending with the van. Obviously, the risk of anaphylactic shock or other adverse effects is just as great for a homeless person as any other South Australian; in fact, I suspect it would be higher because of their likely relatively low health status. I certainly know that the Central Adelaide Local Health Network has a strong and proud heritage of providing outreach services to homeless people. My understanding is that they are activating those relationships, but I will seek more information for the honourable member and provide it to him separately.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary, the Hon. Mr Simms.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:39): Noting the minister's answer, can he advise what arrangements will be put in place to ensure that a follow-up shot is provided to people who are homeless?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:39): No, it's a good point, and I failed to mention in response to the honourable member's question that Professor O'Neill indicated that this outreach service would use Pfizer shots so that the gap between the first shot and the second shot would be shorter. I don't think that means that there won't be problems in terms of follow-up, but that at least helps.

A three-week gap rather than a three-month gap is going to help delivery there. That is also, I think, one of the reasons why, in the context of the recalibration of the national vaccination program, Pfizer is being considered for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities—often more mobile communities.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:40): Supplementary on vaccines: can the minister tell the chamber if the government is considering or looking at introducing incentives or rewards to lift the uptake of vaccines, particularly AstraZeneca?

The PRESIDENT: I will call the minister. I am not sure that arises from the answer, but I will call the minister.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:41): It is an interesting point. You remind me of, I think—was it the Russians who were giving out ice creams? But that was so long ago I think it must have been about COVID tests rather than COVID vaccines. There certainly are reports in some parts of the United States of America of incentives being given, including I think one jurisdiction is putting on a lottery and participating in the vaccine program.

SA Health continues to look at all opportunities to encourage people to get vaccinated, but there is certainly no formal proposal that's been provided to me for an incentive program. I will take this opportunity, though, if I could, to put a plug in for the mass vaccination clinics. I just remind South Australians that not only did the Adelaide Showground site open on 31 April but I was delighted to be at the Noarlunga mass vaccination clinic this morning when it opened, and I look forward to being at Playford next Monday when it opens.

All three sites have free car parking. This will make it easier for people to come and be vaccinated. Both the Playford site and the master site are close to shopping centres, and, of course, they also have their own car parking.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:42): Supplementary arising out of that—

The PRESIDENT: From the original answer?

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Well, from this answer.

The PRESIDENT: No, from the original answer. It has to be from the original answer.

CENTRAL ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:43): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: There's not much of an explanation here, but:

1. Now that the minister has had two weeks, has he read KordaMentha's tranche 2 savings plan for our central hospitals?
2. Can the minister rule out any additional redundancies for frontline staff under the plan?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:43): It seems to remind me of a claim that was being peddled amongst the media that KordaMentha had been re-engaged. This document, as I understand it, is work that was related to CALHN's work with KordaMentha under the original contract. In that regard it's an internal working document of CALHN, and I have not read it.

CENTRAL ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:44): Supplementary: will the minister release the tranche 2 savings plans for public scrutiny and, if not, why not?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:44): Because it's an internal working document of CALHN.

VOLUNTEERING STRATEGY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (14:44): My question—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, order! I will get the Hon. Dr Centofanti to start again and members on my right will remain silent as well.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding volunteering. Can the minister please update the council on the Marshall Liberal government's vision for the future of volunteering in South Australia?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:44): I thank the honourable member for her question and for her interest in this area. Indeed, we have launched a refreshed volunteering strategy for South Australia, following the first volunteering strategy, which was in 2014-20. This is a strong partnership between the government, Business SA, the Local Government Association and the peak volunteering advocacy body, Volunteering SA&NT. This strategy was completed in December 2020.

We had the privilege of launching this second volunteering strategy last week to coincide with National Volunteer Week and the parade that took place in Victoria Square. The partnership board comprises of representatives of each partner, with an independent chair to oversee and monitor the implementation of the second volunteering strategy.

The achievements of the first strategy matched each of the strategy's focus areas and targets and builds on the achievements of the first volunteering strategy. This one will be in place for six years and ensures the partnership's sustained focus on and commitment to the volunteering sector. It was developed in several stages, obviously including various rounds of consultation, and it includes focus areas and a road map for the way forward.

We do have a very professional volunteering sector and approach in South Australia, quite mature in the sense that we have a number of formal arrangements. Particularly going forward, we want to ensure that we maintain the status and profile of volunteers in South Australia and that we continue to encourage young people to volunteer and increase the flexibility available to volunteers.

Obviously, last year we saw a significant dip. Some volunteers have not returned and a number of organisations have found ways to deliver things more flexibly, so we are having to pivot many things now that we are in this pandemic. We want to continue to ensure that there are vibrant opportunities for people to volunteer in South Australia. I say thank you on behalf of the South Australian government to the many people who volunteer in such a diverse range of areas in this state.

UNPAID CARERS

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (14:47): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing questions on unpaid carers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: In October last year, Carers New South Wales, for Carers Australia, completed a national survey revealing a perception by carers of a lack of their inclusion and consideration in the health system. Nearly two-thirds of carers reported that hospitals did not ask them about their needs. Nearly 40 per cent did not consider hospitals provided sufficient information and nearly one-half thought that there was insufficient carer support and options and facilities. Inclusion by GPs was better, but still more than one-half of the carers noted that GPs didn't ask about their needs and nearly half did not consider the GP was providing the carer with adequate information. My questions to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing are:

1. What response has SA Health made to better include and support unpaid carers in the hospital system since October 2020?
2. Has the AMA and the Royal Australian College of GPs been approached to see what the issues may be with GPs? Is there a need for a Medicare item code to cover support advice to carers? Is there a privacy issue to be addressed? Is there a need for an education and information campaign?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:49): If I could answer the honourable member's last question first, I certainly believe there is a need for ongoing information and education within the health system to alert them to the responsibility and the need to engage carers, whether they be family members or otherwise. It highlights the general point that was made most recently by the coronial inquest into the death of a young girl in Western Australia that was released recently: the importance of listening to people who know the patient, and that will often be a carer.

In relation to GPs and the possibility of a Medicare item number to facilitate carer engagement, the funding of the GP network and the arrangements in relation to the Medicare schedules, and for that matter the commonwealth Privacy Act, are all matters for the federal government but I will see what information I can obtain for the honourable member. In relation to the very specific question about what has been done since October 2020 by my agency, I will seek further information and come back to the honourable member on that.

CATHERINE HOUSE

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding human services. How many women have moved from hospital into Catherine House in the past five years, and where exactly will these women go when the minister's funding cuts come into effect and Catherine House can no longer provide crisis accommodation in a few weeks' time?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:51): I thank the honourable member for her question. I think there are a number of erroneous assumptions in her question, so I will respond to a range of issues and correct the record. I don't think that we keep information about any direct referrals from the hospital sector to Catherine House, but I will double-check that to see whether we hold that information.

As I have said in this place before, and as I have said in the public domain on radio, the South Australian government is not cutting homelessness services. There is actually an increase in funding to the sector in South Australia in this financial year compared to the previous financial year. We had a process where we sought five alliances to cover South Australia, those being northern country, southern country, northern Adelaide, southern Adelaide (including the city) and a specialist domestic and family violence service which was to operate statewide.

For four of those we received one tender, and that was of all of the existing providers, except for one particular service in the Riverland which chose not to participate. But in all instances, apart from the city and the southern area, there was one submission of all of the existing service providers. So there will continue to be the Women's Safety Services and a range of their partner alliances that will continue to operate crisis accommodation. I think it's quite disturbing if the Australian Labor Party is going to peddle that there aren't crisis beds. We actually have increased the number of crisis beds in South Australia and those services remain.

The one contested area was the Adelaide and southern area. The existing services decided to break into two separate tenders. As soon as that happened, that meant there were going to be

winners and losers. That is the reality of any competitive tender process ever since governments have been tendering for services in the sector. There is nothing new about how this works.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: So you are happy to dump Catherine House.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: What we have done, as I have stated before—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: So you are happy to dump Catherine House.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: That's your choice. That's your government's choice.

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. E.S. Bourke interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: And the Hon. Ms Bourke!

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The minister will continue.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: What we required of the tenderers in this process was to display a number of things, which I can read out for honourable members again. I did that a couple of weeks ago and am quite happy to run through all of that again.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Callous indifference.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter! Continue, minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: We required all of the alliance bidders to demonstrate that the existing services in that area would continue to be provided for, so there is a range of services—

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: Where will women's crisis beds be?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: That's what you haven't told us: where will they be?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Mr President, the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition just demonstrates that she hasn't even listened to a thing I have said, because we have a statewide domestic violence service, which has managed to come together—

The Hon. C.M. Scriven interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —to collaborate, as they have done. I have congratulated them before, where the range of DV services in the metro area in particular—eastern, western, southern and northern—are now under the same umbrella of Women's Safety Services. They have been operating for some time, so to try to suggest that there won't be DV crisis beds is erroneous and misleading.

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: Where will they be in the city?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The alliances were required to demonstrate that the existing number of crisis services—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Callous indifference.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —would continue, and they have done so. We had a rigorous process that those organisations went through. Those decisions have been made, and my plea to any of the providers who were in the unsuccessful tender is to continue to talk to the successful alliance.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, continue, and conclude your answer in due course.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Hunter!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Wortley is not helping.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The successful tenderers have reached out to all of those organisations. Those organisations, I would have thought it would be in their best interests to talk to the successful alliance to see how they may fit into that. I understand that that has been taking place. I don't think it's particularly useful for these issues to be politicised by the Australian Labor Party.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: And I am confident that—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I am very confident that into the future we will see a much better system, which is going to improve homelessness services for South Australians, and the sorts of experiences—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —that people with lived experience told us they were going through—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —where they cycled through services and couldn't actually get a service, will cease.

CATHERINE HOUSE

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:57): Supplementary: which agencies are going to take, in terms of a transition program, the mental health work that Catherine House has been involved in primarily?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:57): The specifics are probably under negotiation.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Pnevmatikos has asked a supplementary question and no-one can hear the response because of her opposition colleagues.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The specifics are under negotiation. I don't think it's helpful for us to be canvassing all these issues in a public way while parties are negotiating.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: So we need the parties to work together.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I might also add that the successful tender alliance has a very novel approach, where they have a specific mental health organisation as part of their bid, Sonder care.

WELLBEING SA

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:58): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister update the council on the government's efforts to improve the health and wellbeing of South Australians?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I warn the opposition they will lose a primary question. The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:58): I thank the honourable member for his question. The Marshall Liberal government is committed to improving the physical, mental and social wellbeing of all South Australians. Following the McCann review, the former Labor government took millions of dollars out of preventive health programs. The Marshall Liberal team, from opposition—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —recognised the importance of preventive health. Preventing health problems is better—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —both in terms of health outcomes and in terms of sustainability of health services. The Marshall Liberal team made a number of clear commitments and we are delivering on them.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. E.S. Bourke interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Ms Bourke!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: In January 2020, we established WellBeing SA to lead the renewed focus on prevention and health promotion. We have released the WellBeing SA strategic plan, which establishes the goal for WellBeing SA—

The Hon. J.E. Hanson interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —to lead the system change required to support health and wellbeing and embed prevention across the life force.

The Hon. J.E. Hanson interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hanson!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: One of the priority actions under the plan is the expansion of Get Healthy, which is a free, confidential, telephone-based coaching service for all South Australians. As

part of our commitment to improve the health and wellbeing of South Australia's population, the state government has committed an additional \$1 million to boost the Get Healthy program.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: This contribution will help around 800 South Australians—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —access this evidence-based free telephone coaching each year.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Get Healthy offers support to assist participants to eat more healthily, increase physical activity, manage weight and reduce alcohol consumption. There is also a Get Healthy in Pregnancy module to support pregnant women to achieve a healthy weight gain through their pregnancy. Participants work with their trained coach, who is either a qualified nurse or an allied nurse professional, over a six-month period. Coaches provide expert and tailored advice to identify goals—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —plan actions and manage barriers to motivation and success.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Coaches can help people make changes to their eating and activity habits and to achieve and maintain a healthy weight. An SMS follow-up service is also available at the completion of the program.

Get Healthy is suitable for a variety of clients, whether to reduce risk for the development of chronic diseases, such as type 2 diabetes, heart disease and some cancers, or to support the recovery from illness or ongoing management of health problems. Based on initial screening, some participants may be referred to the type 2 diabetes prevention or alcohol reduction brief intervention modules.

The Marshall Liberal government is committed to evidence-based programs. What the evidence shows is that, on average, participants in Get Healthy lose almost three kilograms and around 3.4 centimetres off their waist circumference over the life of their involvement in the Get Healthy program.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: For each kilo lost, the risk of developing diabetes can be reduced by 16 per cent. The Marshall Liberal government is committed to reversing the damage inflicted by the former Labor government on our health system—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —while they gouged out funding from preventive health initiatives.

WELLBEING SA

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:02): Supplementary: minister, does the evidence show that waiting hours and hours in an ambulance outside an emergency department is bad for your health?

The PRESIDENT: That did not arise from the original answer. The Hon. Ms Bonaros has the call.

GAMBLING REGULATION

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:04): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer, representing the Attorney as the Minister for Consumer and Business Services in the other place, a question about gambling regulation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: In March, SA-Best called on the state government to undertake an independent investigation into the Adelaide Casino operations of the SkyCity Entertainment Group for any evidence of criminal activity. This was on the back of two disturbing revelations, the first being the scathing findings of the Bergin report into the interstate operations of the Crown Resorts casino activities, which uncovered major flaws in Crown's corporate governance which in turn facilitated money laundering and links to criminal gangs in the company's operations in Victoria and Western Australia. That report was undertaken by former New South Wales Supreme Court judge Patricia Bergin, which prompted the royal commissions in Victoria and WA into Crown's activities.

The second disturbing revelation was the legal action launched in the South Australian Supreme Court by Chinese millionaire, Mr Linong Ma, against SkyCity Adelaide and junket operators Xiongming Xie and Fang Zhuangqian. In Mr Ma's statement of claim, as I have outlined in my previous questions to the Treasurer, serious allegations have been made about whether Mr Xie is a dangerous and violent criminal and has any links with Asian triad criminal gangs. SkyCity has since announced it has stopped working with junket operators.

At the time, the Treasurer said an independent investigation was not necessary, pinning that decision on advice received by the commissioner for consumer and business affairs, which is the state's regulator. My question to the Treasurer is: has the government sought any further advice from the commissioner on whether an independent inquiry needs to be conducted into SkyCity Casino's operations? If so, what does that advice say?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:07): I have answered questions in this house on this issue and also publicly in the media. If there is any further information that I can usefully add, I will bring an answer back. But my understanding is that there is no further information over and above what I have already indicated on behalf of the government—and the commissioner, more importantly—in this place but also publicly.

GAMBLING REGULATION

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:07): Supplementary: can I take it from that answer that the Treasurer is not aware that shortly after the release of the Bergin report, the commissioner commenced a review of SkyCity's operations here in South Australia?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:07): No, the member can't take that into account. That's not the understanding. My statements stand. That is, I have answered questions in this place but also publicly in relation to further media inquiries about events that occurred after questioning in parliament. As I said, if there is anything further that I can usefully add, I will bring a response back to the honourable member. But if there is not, my responses—both in this chamber and publicly—stand as the current state of play from the government's viewpoint.

GAMBLING REGULATION

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:08): Further supplementary.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Bonaros, arising from the original answer?

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Yes. Can the Treasurer also confirm whether the commissioner issued a formal notice to SkyCity requesting detailed information relating to matters 'consistent with those considered by Hon. Patricia Bergin SC'?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:08): No, I can't add anything further to what I have already said. If there is anything further that's useful that I can bring back to the house, I will be happy to do so. But in response to the questions that have been asked in this place, and also publicly, both statements that I have issued on behalf of the government and the commissioner directly or indirectly through statements to my house which I have conveyed publicly, if there is nothing more that I can add then there is nothing more that I can bring back for the honourable member's benefit.

GAMBLING REGULATION

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:09): Final supplementary: can the Treasurer also provide details in that answer in terms of what is involved in the daily inspections by Consumer and Business Services liquor and gambling inspectors of SkyCity's operations?

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Sorry, you will have to speak more slowly. I didn't hear the question.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Can the Treasurer also provide details of what is involved in the daily inspections by Consumer and Business Services liquor and gambling inspectors of SkyCity's operations?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:09): If there is anything useful that I can bring back that provides an answer to the honourable member's question I will do so—that is not already part of the public record.

CATHERINE HOUSE

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:09): My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding human services. How many of the women in Catherine House today are going to end up ramped at a hospital in an overcrowded emergency department when funding for their home and supports disappear on 30 June?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:10): That has to be one of the most peculiar questions I have ever been asked. I don't even know how to begin to answer something that is a hypothetical in the future. I know that the assumptions behind it are wrong and I would refer the honourable member, in terms of the assumptions that have been made in putting this rather peculiar question together, to my previous answer.

PUBLIC SECTOR EXECUTIVES

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (15:10): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer indicate whether the government has made any decisions about wage increases for Public Service executives?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:11): I had some recent media queries in relation to this particular issue and I am happy to place on the record the government's position in terms of salary increases for Public Service executives. As members will be aware, the government has settled a significant number of enterprise agreements for tens of thousands of public sector workers over the last 18 months—nurses, police, teachers and many other occupational groups within the public sector. Generally, the government has settled those public sector wage increases at a level somewhere between 1.2 per cent at the low end to around about 2 per cent at the high end.

Three occupational groups did not receive any salary increase last July—I suspect you might be aware of this. One of them was members of parliament, the second was public sector executives and the third was contract employees within ministerial offices, or ministerial advisers. I acknowledge and place on the record that, whilst there was no increase for public sector executives last year, the government is determined that from 1 July this year there will be a 1.5 per cent increase for public sector executives and, as is the convention under the former government and continued under this government, that 1.5 per cent salary increase will flow through to that group of employees known as ministerial advisers.

I can't advise you, Mr President, of the situation in relation to members of parliament because, as you are aware, salaries of state members of parliament are tied ultimately to an independent decision taken at the federal level in relation to salaries paid to federal members of parliament by a decision of the Remuneration Tribunal at the national level. Insofar as the state government has power to make decisions, there will be, as I said, a salary increase of 1.5 per cent, which is at the lower end of that continuum, for a group of employees who won't have had a salary increase for two years.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:13): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question on the topic of the COVID-19 vaccination rollout to pharmacies to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: With lots of GPs and medical centres booked out for COVID-19 vaccinations, some for as many as a few months into the future, people are being advised by their regular doctors to go to other clinics or indeed, as the minister has mentioned today, the vaccination hubs. Some clinics have told patients that they are no longer taking bookings and, as has been raised with me by my constituents, this has actually caused quite a level of uncertainty, making vaccinations difficult to make an appointment for.

For example, some people have become quite distressed that they are now being asked to present to new GP clinics with their patient health summary to fill out new patient registration forms just to get a vaccination, and they don't want to share that private health information with a new doctor or practice and they don't want to become a patient at that practice. I would note that many of those practices are refusing new clients who simply only want to get a vaccination, in my own experience.

Other patients just don't want to go to the vaccination hubs because they are large and, while they might have car parking, as the minister noted earlier in question time, they are unfamiliar and patients are not confident in getting to them. I certainly have seen information on various pharmacy websites saying they are proud community partners and will be part of the vaccination rollout come phase 2a. My reading says that we are now at phase 2a, so my question to the minister is: when will pharmacies have vaccinations for COVID-19?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:15): The COVID-19 vaccination program is fundamentally commonwealth-led. The commonwealth did an expressions of interest process for GPs earlier this year and, subsequently to that, an expressions of interest process for pharmacists. Certainly, the engagement of pharmacies is being considered by the national cabinet and the Australian governments that are represented there.

I would take the opportunity to stress that, whether or not a particular pharmacy is providing the COVID-19 vaccination, the pharmacists are providing a very valuable vaccination service as we speak in relation to the flu vaccine. It is disappointing to see lower vaccination rates for the flu than we have had in previous years. I would urge South Australians not to miss the opportunity to get a flu vaccine and, in that regard, one's local pharmacist will often be the site of choice.

The honourable member makes a very valid point: pharmacists are trusted health professionals, often better known by their customers than even their own GP, depending on the health issues they have and the way they manage them. Certainly, this government is very keen to continue to partner with pharmacies and we certainly see pharmacists as a potential resource moving forward in the COVID-19 vaccination program.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:17): Supplementary arising from the answer: can the minister explain what will happen to the vaccine clinic at the Wayville Showground during the period of the Royal Show? Did the government take into consideration that the venue was likely to be used for that event?

The PRESIDENT: Minister, that's a fairly loose fit from your answer, but I will let you respond.

The Hon. F. Pangallo: Well, he did talk about—

The PRESIDENT: No; I have allowed the minister to respond.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:18): I am happy to answer, but I must admit I can't see any element of that question that relates to any element of my previous answer.

The Hon. F. Pangallo interjecting:

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The COVID-19 vaccine? Okay. So that was—

The Hon. F. Pangallo: You spoke about the program.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Let's have the response.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I will let the President consider the standing orders. I am happy to make the point that SA Health of course knew that the Showground might be used for a show. In that regard, we are having positive discussions with the Royal Show Society.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:18): Supplementary: has the minister spoken to or advocated the federal minister in terms of getting the community pharmacies on board quickly in terms of vaccinating the population?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:18): Certainly, at the health ministers meetings, which are, shall we say, becoming more frequent again, the issue of particularly the engagement of a range of health professionals in vaccinations is often discussed, including health professionals such as GPs and pharmacists.

POLIO SA

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:19): My question is to the Minister for Human Services about polio. Will the minister agree to meet with Polio SA to discuss their funding agreement, which is coming to an end soon and, if not, why won't the minister meet with sufferers of polio and their representatives?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:19): I thank the honourable member for his question. Polio SA is one of four tenants of a property in South Australia which has a service agreement which is due to expire on 30 June which provided for support for that site. This has been a longstanding arrangement the state had while the state transitioned to the National Disability Insurance Scheme. My understanding is that the Department of Human Services has provided approximately \$54,000 per annum to Polio SA through the Community Business Bureau for support for the organisation.

DHS staff have met with Polio SA and written to them outlining strategies to support them in transitioning to the national disability as well as aged-care schemes. From the information that has been provided to me by the Department of Human Services, most people receiving services through Polio SA are over 65 and are ineligible for the NDIS, and many of those people have indicated they receive services through My Aged Care. The Department of Human Services is continuing to work with Polio SA to ensure people are able to access services they are entitled to receive.

Polio SA, I understand, has communicated a desire to remain at that property. I understand they may have reached an agreement with one of the other organisations, which has negotiated a lease with the building owner to remain at that site. My department has had considerable discussions with this organisation to reach a satisfactory conclusion for all of those organisations. There is discussion, I understand, in relation to unexpended funds for the end of their agreement period. I would encourage Polio SA to continue those particular discussions with my department. I don't believe there is any additional need for Polio SA to engage with myself directly, because I will just be reiterating the advice of my department.

*Bills***SUPPLY BILL 2021***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 12 May 2021.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:23): I rise to speak on the Supply Bill and indicate that Labor will support the bill. There is one area of government funding that I wish to speak on briefly in my contribution today, and that is an area where I think the government is significantly letting down a number of South Australian people. It is in the area of funding in Aboriginal affairs and services for Aboriginal people.

First, I want to speak briefly about the Marshall government's decision to reduce funding for policing on the APY lands. We know from I think it was the 2019-20 budget that there were savings built into the budget of \$1 million per year, a reduction in the funding available for policing on the APY lands. I think it is fair to say that this caused a huge amount of concern for people on the APY lands. I think if you asked nearly anyone would they like to see an increase or a decrease in funding, a decrease is not what people would wish for for policing on the APY lands.

We have seen the original model to bring about those savings modified. We have been briefed and told that the current version of the reduction of funding for the APY lands will result in not the original \$1 million estimated but somewhere in between \$350,000 and \$400,000 a year. This will be brought about, we are informed, by changing the rotational basis for policing the APY lands.

Whereas currently police stationed to the APY lands do two weeks on country on the APY lands and then one week off, this will be changed to one week on the APY lands and two weeks off. So, essentially, where people spent two or three weeks on the APY lands as a police officer, they will now spend only one of three weeks at any given time. Again, I have had a great deal of discussions and representations about this model and if you ask people on the APY lands if they would prefer more consistency of the same police or less, almost universally people prefer more.

I acknowledge that there are, in my experience over a couple of decades, many very dedicated and very good police officers who serve the APY lands communities very well. I have been impressed over the years that many integrate very well with the community. Often it is a proactive policing model, rather than a reactive one, where officers come to understand some of the nuances and relationships in communities on the APY lands and are able to head off trouble before it starts.

To halve the amount of time in each three-week period that officers are on the lands will result in less continuity and that certainly, in representations to me, is the opposite of what people think will work. It has been pointed out to me that police officers in similar jurisdictions across the border in remote Aboriginal communities in the NT and WA are permanently based police officers, not any sort of fly-in fly-out model. As has been pointed out to me, if you look immediately across the highway from the APY lands—literally across the highway—police in Marla are permanently based police officers, not any sort of fly-in fly-out model.

We have been briefed about this and were told that, in fact, on the APY lands, the police stations in Mimili, Pukatja, Kaltjiti and Amata and the headquarters in Umuwa are the only places in South Australia that have a fly-in fly-out model. I know that many people on the APY lands are questioning why a government would move to have even less consistency of officers on the APY lands if they are changing the service model.

Of course, the answer is that it is a result of the Marshall government's directive that the funding be cut. As I said, it was originally budgeted a couple of years ago as a million dollars a year. What we have been told is that this will not achieve all that funding being slashed for police on the APY lands but will achieve somewhere in the order of \$350,000 to \$400,000 a year.

Upon coming to government, in the area of Aboriginal affairs, we saw the ceasing of both the regional authorities program and the treaty process that had been commenced in South Australia. The incoming Premier, who has responsibility for Aboriginal affairs, called the process a cruel hoax and said his government would focus on practical outcomes over symbolic action.

The very first decision for Aboriginal South Australians was not to appoint a minister for Aboriginal affairs. The very first decision, after coming to government, was that there would no longer be—and for the first time since we have had a minister for Aboriginal affairs in Australia I think we now stand alone in all the commonwealth and the states—a designated minister for Aboriginal affairs, but someone who has responsibility for the acts that are dedicated to a minister for aboriginal affairs rather than having a minister.

What the minister responsible for the acts committed to the minister for Aboriginal affairs, the Premier, did soon after coming to government was to put out a glossy brochure called an Aboriginal Affairs Action Plan. If we are looking for things that could constitute a cruel hoax in Aboriginal affairs, this certainly has to be one of the cruellest hoaxes that has been perpetrated by a government.

The original so-called Aboriginal Affairs Action Plan for South Australia, the 2019-20 version, which is the first—it has had another reincarnation that I will speak about in a moment—had 32 items in the glossy brochure that was released. Of those, more than two-thirds of the items were actually things that departments were doing anyway. Moreover, they were things that the former Labor government had commenced doing. The Premier had rounded them up, put them into a glossy brochure and claimed them as his own items for his action plan.

For example, the Aboriginal Ranger Employment Pathways program was actually created and started in 2012, yet it was deemed an initiative of this government some seven years later and put as an item into a glossy brochure. Reconciliation action plans, which were begun under the previous Labor government, were part of the original so-called Aboriginal Affairs Action Plan, but in reality these went backwards in the December update and were totally left out of the newest Aboriginal Affairs Action Plan.

Another example is the Aboriginal interpreter service, which was funded, from memory, in 2017 by the former Labor government and was included as one of the 32 action items in this new government's Aboriginal Affairs Action Plan. Their Aboriginal Affairs Action Plan includes things that Labor had decided upon and Labor had funded. In relation to this particular part of their action plan, it has not even commenced. They have taken something that a Labor government funded and have not even commenced it, even though the Premier has put it as one of the 32 items in his so-called Aboriginal Affairs Action Plan that he published in his glossy brochure.

We had a progress update in May 2021 that, curiously, had only 28 of the 32 items included. Twelve of those—more than a third—were still incomplete and 16 were claimed to be completed. It should be noted that of those 16 that were claimed to be completed, 11 of them—about two-thirds—were actually initiated by the former Labor government. Four were missing completely and many of them were simply plans to make more plans.

When you do not have anything to say, when you do not even appoint a minister for Aboriginal affairs, what you do is ask departments, 'What are you doing anyway?' You collate all the answers into 32 separate dot points, you put them in a glossy brochure and then you claim you are doing something. That is the cruellest hoax I think any government has perpetrated on Aboriginal South Australians in a long time. When you combine that with the funding cuts for policing on the APY lands, it is not just a cruel hoax, it shows a fundamental misunderstanding of what is important and what is necessary.

We saw an update to the Aboriginal Affairs Action Plan for 2021-22. It now has 41 items, so it has expanded. Obviously, the Premier has gone and looked at what departments are already doing anyway and put some more dot points in the glossy brochure. Some of the things that have been included in the glossy brochure are things such as a custody notification service, which both the opposition and the Greens have pushed through the parliament and dragged the government kicking and screaming to do something about.

It is stark that one of the things the government is so proud of that they put it as one of the 41 items in their new glossy brochure is something that they refused to do for years. When they have done it, they have only done it by half measures. It is not the legislation that either myself or the Hon. Tammy Franks had before parliament to legislate for a custody notification service; it is doing it by regulation, which can be removed much more easily.

Some parts of the new action plan are simply ordinary functions of government and more are plans for further plans. While I support the Supply Bill, I note things like cutting funding for policing on the APY lands. To claim that your government cares because they put items that are already ongoing, have already started or are plans to make more plans in a glossy brochure does not constitute providing services and meaningful change for Aboriginal South Australians.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:34): I rise today in support of the Supply Bill. According to the 2020-21 state budget, state debt is set to reach \$33.1 billion by 2022-23 with debt to revenue of 133 per cent. Debt was doubled by the Marshall Liberal government before the pandemic began. That's right: a doubling of debt before the pandemic began by this Marshall Liberal government. The total of \$33.1 billion compares to just \$12.9 billion of state debt under the former Labor government.

During a global pandemic or a financial crisis, the notion of increasing the amount of government intervention to stimulate economic activity is not disputed by this side of the council. Those opposite have sought to win elections by running scare campaigns on the Labor Party, saying they will run up huge levels of debt, so the current position of the Liberals is certainly very ironic.

Stimulating the economy via government intervention is sometimes necessary and appropriate, so we on this side of the chamber certainly do not oppose that. Labor understands that jobs and job security are vitally important to society and should be protected, but we expect a return on our investment, an economic uplift from this government intervention. However, while the rest of the national economy seems to be performing reasonably well coming out of the pandemic, ours is by far the worst in the nation, which then begs the question: if the Liberals are increasing our state debt to unprecedented record levels, where is the economic uplift?

We have the highest youth unemployment rate, at 15.1 per cent. We have the second highest unemployment rate of any state and have had the highest unemployment rate in the nation for many recent months. We were the only state—the only state—to lose jobs coming out of the pandemic, with over 10,000 jobs lost since March 2020, whereas Queensland gained 62,500, WA gained 28,100, Tasmania gained 2,800, New South Wales gained 2,700 and even Victoria, with all its lockdowns, gained 2,000 jobs.

Our economic growth is the lowest in the nation, a contraction of 1.4 per cent in 2019-20. Serious questions need to be asked about this state debt that is being accrued in the name of economic stimulus. It seems there are two possible explanations. Either it is not getting out fast enough due to, obviously, incompetence by this government or it is simply being spent in the wrong areas, which are not creating economic growth and not creating jobs, which also, of course, suggests incompetence by this government. The Premier and Treasurer desperately want to give the impression that everything is going swimmingly. This may be politically convenient for them, but self-preservation is not leadership and nor does it serve the interests of South Australians.

An area in which a government does have control to quickly stimulate the economy is infrastructure, but despite much talk about funding which has been allocated to projects and projects which apparently will get underway, government inaction on these projects has seen delay after delay. Significant infrastructure like the new Women's and Children's Hospital, the north-south corridor and the duplication of South Road at Seaford have all been delayed, costing vital jobs and economic activity. The recently released CommSec State of the States report found that construction work in South Australia is now 4.1 per cent below the decade average, with construction work in SA down 8.8 per cent on a year ago and the worst of all states.

One area in particular that I want to address today is the state government's regional plan—or should I say, lack of a plan. While the state government likes to state at any opportunity #RegionsMatter, I think the recent front-page headline in *The Border Watch* is far more accurate. It said, '#RegionsMatter?' with a big question mark. Why? Because the Marshall Liberal government's recently released Regional Development Strategy was a genuine disappointment to regional South Australians. The Liberal government's new plan for the state's regions has no new funding, no new ideas and in fact no substance whatsoever, raising very serious questions about whether regional South Australia does truly matter to Steven Marshall of Norwood.

The Regional Development Strategy fails to outline any new major infrastructure projects for country South Australia or even invest any new money into the regions. It also claimed credit for

numerous projects that were implemented under the former Labor government. I know South-East residents are particularly disappointed at the lack of vision and interest in our region.

The 48-page glossy document features two pages on the Limestone Coast, but it does not include any future funding or major infrastructure projects for the region, despite the South-East being home to the state's second largest city. Residents in the South-East do not want to hear the state government say that they will 'consider, investigate or continue to examine projects'. The Marshall Liberal government has had three years—three years—to consider, investigate and examine potential projects. When will we see the action on these projects? Residents want actual funding for projects in our region.

For example, the state government listed the Green Triangle freight action plan as a future opportunity, but when is the question I would ask. When will we see funding for this plan? Why not now, and why will you not tell us how much you will actually spend to make it happen, or is it what many people in the Limestone Coast suspect—nothing more than lip service? Yet, this government can announce a \$700 million city basketball stadium.

The Supply Bill also does very little to add value and assist many of the other important industries in our state, including forestry, agriculture and horticulture, and there is no direct support for the agricultural sector impacted by the China situation. Again it has been all talk, lots of deflection to others and very little action from this government.

In terms of timber and the forestry sector, our state has a very real timber shortage. Nothing has been done in the Supply Bill to address those concerns. Wait times for the construction of a timber-framed house is being felt in the housing industry. I receive regular feedback from key stakeholders who raise these concerns and who feel that they are being ignored by the Marshall Liberal government on this issue.

Kangaroo Island Plantation Timbers (KIPT) has offered the government a very fair and reasonable solution, it seems, to the timber shortage, yet this offer has been ignored. The Marshall Liberal government came to office promising to double the forestry industry by 2050, yet we see consistent years of failure by the government to do anything substantive to grow this sector. In fact, latest data shows that the forest industry is going backwards in terms of economic output.

In terms of business investment in general, according to a recent Deloitte Access Economics report business investment in South Australia is the lowest in the nation. It is going backwards in South Australia despite growth nationally. The report found that the willingness of business to take a punt on extending capacity was a key inhibitor, and this indicates a lack of confidence, despite the Premier and Treasurer telling us that business confidence is supposedly great.

CommSec's State of the States report for April found that equipment investment in South Australia is down 7 per cent on a year earlier, with Victoria recording a decline of only 1.6 per cent. What of our jobless rate and our economy sitting among the worst in the nation. What do we see the government focusing on? Our state debt reaches record levels, hospital ramping continues to spiral out of control, yet the Premier and Treasurer, in the midst of this global pandemic, have chosen to focus their time and energy on fighting our ambulance and hospital cleaners.

Our paramedics are considered heroes wherever you go in South Australia, and rightly so. Our cleaners in our hospitals are considered heroes, and rightly so, but the Premier and Treasurer are happy to attack our heroes instead of supporting them in the superb work they do. No doubt they will come to the people of South Australia before the next election claiming to have changed, but it is clear in their actions that they lack the basic empathy and leadership that this state needs.

Whether it is running our economy or our hospital system into ground, or our overworked paramedics into feelings of helplessness, this government lacks vision and a heart, and they will be judged for it. I also urge the Minister for Health to provide certainty to regional South Australia by guaranteeing long-term funding to the community paramedic program, which operates both in Ceduna and in the South-East. This is a program that was previously facing cruel cuts by the Marshall Liberal government, until the community rallied together and pressured the government to reverse their cut.

The minister has told this chamber that funding has only been confirmed until the end of June next year. This creates ongoing uncertainty and concern for local people. It is an excellent service, and I would like to again pay tribute to Dr David Senior, who works from Robe and Lucindale, for the excellent work that he does.

The community paramedic service helps people manage chronic disease at home, provides regular checks on elderly people who are living alone and delivers allied health services that would otherwise need a trip to hospital. So it reduces admissions to hospitals and it eases the pressure on country hospitals. Surely, given the outstanding results of the community paramedic program, both in Robe and in Ceduna, this government should commit longer term funding so that the local community can be confident that the excellent service will continue and enable longer term planning to take place.

We move now to regional development grants. We know that the Marshall Liberal government loves to hand out jobs for the boys. Members probably remember that we saw the member for Unley in the other place excel at this with his questionable appointments to various positions. But now we have seen that regional South Australia fell victim to the Liberal government's captain's picks, which saw former minister Whetstone withdraw regional development grants from recommended projects in Blyth and Kadina in favour of projects of his own personal choosing from the list.

It was not just the opposition calling this out. The Auditor-General was scathing in his assessment of the former minister and his denying of funds to valid projects that had been recommended by the assessment panel. They were recommended to receive the funding but they missed out, and why? We do not really know. There was no documentation recorded as to why minister Whetstone apparently simply made the decision and the projects in Blyth and Kadina just missed out. The Auditor-General also criticised the lack of transparency that this entailed.

The opposition will support the Supply Bill in accordance with tradition, but there are many aspects that have been overlooked, particularly for regional South Australia, and we urge the government to reconsider these and consider what is really required for the future of our state.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:46): I rise on behalf of the Greens to support the Supply Bill. It is somewhat of a tradition. Since the constitutional crisis at a federal level, we have seen oppositions and crossbenchers quite loath to oppose supply and security. In a public health pandemic, confidence and security and certainty are things we do need. This Supply Bill will buffer a budget yet to come that we know will be responding to that pandemic.

We have lived through some very interesting times in this past year and a bit. They have been stressful times, they have been difficult times and they have been transformative times. What I have heard said about the pandemic is that, if COVID-19 was the earthquake, then mental health is the tsunami to come. The ramping in our hospitals, and in hospitals across the nation, and the extraordinary number of presentations in regard to mental ill health show that that mental health tsunami is indeed upon us. I guess my question is: will the budget ensure that we are kept safe and secure and given certainty? Will we build back better than we were before the pandemic or will we see people who are the most vulnerable in our community sacrificed after the emergency has had its first flush?

I note that I have spoken in this place many a time about a very small program—a mental health intervention program—called The Jam, The Mix, The Gig. It is with sadness that I note that tomorrow may well be the very last gig for The Jam, The Mix, The Gig at The Parks Recreation and Sports Centre tomorrow afternoon. That music and mental health program that has been funded in the past by the SA Department for Health and Wellbeing, and run by wonderfully enthusiastic and musically inclined participants and peers, may well be presenting its final show. I will be joining them and I suspect the shadow minister for human services will too.

I note that previously in this place, when it was a Weatherill government, this chamber gave resounding support to the continuance of The Jam, The Mix, The Gig. Back then, some of the words expressed in that place noted that this was a very simple mental health intervention. The Jam was a music jam session where you could go and share your music skills with others, try out some ideas, write some songs or just have a go and be part of having a good time with other people with music.

The Mix was a music skills development session and a chance to present those songs or your poetry or whatever it was that you had to share with the group. To get help in developing that confidence and those skills that are so vital in our lives was also part of The Mix. Then there was The Gig, which audience, participant and performer alike would all be quite familiar with. Those participants in the JMG mental health program potentially performed but were also definitely audience members or in various technical roles.

There were various performances over many years that gave great joy to the people involved and, indeed, improved their mental health. Musicians such as Heather Frahn and Chris Finnen have been involved with this program and have lauded it, but I will leave the words of why The Jam, The Mix, The Gig is so important to some of the participants. One notes:

This program contributed to saving mine and many others' lives. It gave me purpose and strength and courage to follow my passions and be the artist that I am today. I believe this would be a great mistake to pull the funding for this amazing program.

That participant, Keith, wrote that the last time The Jam, The Mix, The Gig faced its final curtain under the Weatherill government. Bonnie noted:

Such a worthy cause, music has that feel good vibe, it can bring [you] out of a low moment or take you to your wildest dreams.

Dino noted:

There is no question about the value and therapeutic benefits of music...countless scientific studies can validate that the benefits are enormous! Let's hope that individuals and groups using music for the purposes of healing and promoting optimal states of health and well-being can continue to be supported.

I hope that in the coming weeks and months we will see The Jam, The Mix, The Gig given an encore and funding found. So far, they have been unable to access funding under this current government. They have not found a way for that wellbeing program based on music, which has significant mental health gains and impacts for the positive wellbeing of those participants and those who are in their friend and family groups, to be continued. That is a very sad piece of news and I urge the Minister for Health and Wellbeing to take a second look at this.

I note that in Victoria the importance of mental health has been recognised by that government. A massive injection has been made into building back better by ensuring that, as we weather the tsunami that is to come of mental ill health caused by the uncertainty of this pandemic, they are going to be taxing big business to ensure that the programs, the supports, the professionals and the pathways are in place.

I note, listening to ABC radio, that our Treasurer has said he will not be in the business of taxing big business in his budget, but he has given some assurances that mental health will be a priority. We look forward to holding him to that word. I promise that if there is a massive injection that is going to improve the mental wellbeing of South Australians I will be the first in congratulating him.

This should be something that is non-partisan. We should be, as we have under the pandemic, looking to the science. We should be ensuring that public health outcomes are put first. We should be realising that the world can turn upside down in almost a moment and that we can fix some of the problems that we once thought intractable.

In the first weeks of the pandemic, we saw people who were homeless in this city found homes in hotels. We saw people fed and we saw people who were on welfare support have that welfare support raised to above the level of poverty. In the last few weeks, we have seen them plunged back into poverty and we have seen attempts to make it more difficult to keep secure housing.

Over the course of the last two decades, time and time again we have seen the sell-off of public housing and a lack of investment in social services, and an abrogation of public ownership of public transport, a public transport that is seen as the alternative option rather than the preferred option. We know that public transport should be safe, regular, affordable and the preferred option if we are to build back better and meet our climate targets.

We listened to the science during the pandemic, and South Australia did very well by taking that course. We listened to our public health professionals. It is now time to invest in those scientific

professionals across the board and to listen to them on the science, to listen to the public health professionals who tell us about the social determinants of health in this state, the importance of good food, the importance of a clean environment, of clean water, of fresh air that is not polluted, and the importance of healthy homes that people can afford to live in that do not make them sick and that do not plunge them into poverty.

This is the future the Greens look forward to seeing. We hope that the Marshall budget to come will take steps to build back better, but should they not we will be putting that firmly and squarely on the election agenda to come and working with whatever government will give us those values. Those Greens values in government will be what we will be fighting for.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:56): I rise to thank honourable members for their indications of support for the second reading of the Supply Bill. As I indicated, this will ensure that our public servants can continue to be paid, which is obviously a shared goal for us all as we wait for the budget to be delivered in June and its eventual passage weeks or months later.

In response to the somewhat bleak picture that some have portrayed as the situation in South Australia, I want to respond briefly on behalf of the government in relation to the state of economic recovery in South Australia. I have referred to that briefly in question time today, so I will not refer to the Single Touch Payroll figures and the fact that we no longer have the highest unemployment rate in the nation.

Other independent commentators—the ANZ bank's regular monthly or quarterly Stateometer index, as they refer to it, released just last week, I think it was, on 20 May—said for South Australia their index was currently at its highest level on record, which is a measure of economic performance. ANZ notes that net population outflow to other states has reversed, largely due to fewer departures, with positive interstate inflow in the final three-quarters of 2020 for the first time since 1991.

For 20 or 30 years we have seen more people fleeing the state, going interstate, than coming in, because of the brain drain and the lack of job opportunities in the state. As I have highlighted before, I think in the last four years of the Labor government there were about 6,000 more people who fled the state than were attracted to come into the state. That has now been reversed and has been noted by ANZ and other economic commentators.

In their analysis of the economy, Deloitte said that South Australia handled COVID superbly and that 'with the virus in check South Australia's economy sprung back to life, getting a lead on its counterparts', but noted that, 'After a fast start out of the blocks, South Australia's economy is now coming back to the pack.' In March, Westpac noted that South Australia's success in controlling the virus has seen a brisk recovery from the COVID recession and that, despite all states seeing slow population growth, South Australia has fared well relative to other jurisdictions.

There are a number of independent reports that point to the relative health, in comparative terms, of the state of economic recovery post COVID in South Australia. The Hon. Ms Scriven, by inference, referred to the construction industry as being in dire straits. I note that ABS data in April showed that the number of housing construction starts in South Australia rose 11 per cent in the December quarter of 2020. The HIA in February forecast dwelling commencements in South Australia to rise by 7.8 per cent in 2021 but to fall in 2021-22—as we see the bringing forward of demand from HomeBuilder, it will inevitably leave some decline post the HomeBuilder impact.

In terms of business confidence and consumer confidence there are two regular measures of that. Business SA this month reported that South Australia's business confidence rebounded substantially in the March quarter, whilst business conditions also rose strongly to be at their highest level since the December quarter of 2007. So business conditions as measured by Business SA in their regular monitor measured at the highest level for almost 14 years.

The other regular monitor is the one done by BankSA. In February of this year, it reported that South Australia's business confidence has reached its highest level since 2005, attributed to success in handling the pandemic. Consumer confidence or household confidence also grew strongly in both metro and regional areas for a variety of reasons.

The issue of confidence is critical in terms of economic recovery. I have spoken about this often before. As we emerge from COVID, businesspeople—those who own and operate or manage

businesses—have been through a terrible period and they will need confidence not only to (a) invest in their businesses but (b) create jobs by employing more South Australians. Measures of business confidence in South Australia are important indicators of the potential strength of economic recovery. So all that we do that drives business confidence down acts against the best interests of South Australia and South Australians; all that we do to lift business confidence in the state assists South Australia and South Australians in terms of emerging from COVID-19.

The massive economic stimulus announced late last year, in November, in the budget—a \$4 billion economic stimulus over two years, which was determined by the independent commonwealth Parliamentary Budget Office as being pro rata either the strongest or the second strongest of that of all of the state governments—demonstrates that the taxpayers of South Australia are making a significant commitment through their government with significant increases in state debt but in terms of driving economic recovery and economic performance and the creation of jobs over the two-year period of the economic stimulus, which will take late last year, all of this year and part of next year as well.

I turn to the two final points I will make. One is that the Hon. Ms Scriven made some comments in relation to regional development. Having recently visited Mount Gambier for the opening of the new regional airport facility there, the feeling in the South-East was one of warm support for the support that both the federal and state governments had provided in relation to that investment. Through the Local Government Infrastructure Partnership Program we announced as part of the economic stimulus, new infrastructure projects agreed with a number of the local councils in the South-East region were warmly supported by the representatives of local government and the community in the South-East.

The significant number of regional road projects that the commonwealth and state governments are rolling out in regional areas is a complete reversal of the position over almost 20 years of the former government, which essentially worked from a mantra that South Australia stopped at the tollgate. There was precious little interest in anything beyond the tollgate because, with great respect to our political opponents, the regions are represented not by members of the Australian Labor Party, they are represented by non-Labor members, whether they be Liberal members or generally Liberal leaning members in those particular electorates.

There has been a very significant investment by this government in just three years in regional communities in regional development and we stand proudly behind what we have done, what we are doing and what we have committed to do over the coming years should we be fortunate enough to be re-elected in 2022.

As a final point, I place on the record again what I have said publicly, and the Hon. Ms Franks referred to one aspect of what I have said publicly, in relation to the focus of the budget. Not unexpectedly, the focus of our budget will obviously be on jobs—the creation of jobs and secure jobs—and also continuing to reduce the cost of living for households and businesses in South Australia.

We were elected on that commitment in 2018. We have delivered on that commitment over three years and it will remain a focus of this particular budget, which is the reason why I ruled out going down the Labor way, as demonstrated by the Victorian Labor government, of massive increases in state taxes as a response to the COVID pandemic, which is their recipe for economic revival in their state. What I have indicated—and I repeat it again today—is that this government is committed to ongoing significant and further investment in the health portfolio. We have significantly increased taxpayer-funded investment in the health portfolio. We recognise the critical needs in terms of mental health services.

To its credit, the commonwealth government has announced significant new funding for mental health services in its most recent budget, and my colleague the Minister for Health and the government will be in a position to announce significant new initiatives in the mental health service area as one of the key imperatives that will be outlined in the June state budget in South Australia. With that, I thank honourable members again for their indication of support for the second reading of the Supply Bill.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

Bill taken through committee without amendment.

Third Reading

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

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CIVIL ENFORCEMENT) BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 May 2021.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (16:09): I rise to speak on this bill and indicate that I will be the lead speaker for the opposition. The bill arises from a review by government and non-government groups, we are told, with amendments now proposed to the Enforcement of Judgments Act 1991 and the Sheriff's Act 1978. The review, we are informed, included representatives of the judiciary, the Courts Administration Authority, the Sheriff's Office, the Law Society, the Attorney-General's Department and solicitors with some expertise in these areas. A supplementary report, we are told, was also prepared by the Sheriff's Office.

A key proposed change is to allow garnishee orders to include salaries or wages without the debtor's consent. It would also allow term deposits to be included in garnishee orders, even if they have not yet matured. Currently, unmatured deposits are excluded from the reaches of garnishee orders. Also, under the proposals in this bill, creditors will be able to serve a less formal investigations notice on a debtor to provide answers or documents prior to issuing the more formal investigations summons with its additional costs and delays. We are informed that the investigations notice is based on the system that is currently used in New South Wales and may provide an opportunity to resolve certain issues without attending court.

Under this bill, the powers of the Sheriff and their officers are to be significantly expanded. These new proposed powers include the ability to order a person off land that is subject to a sale order or prevent interruption to inspection or auction, to authorise police to assist the Sheriff or their officers in their activity and to issue warrants for the provision of information to debtors or third parties who may have an interest in the debtor's property. That last item, we are informed, may be used where a bank or other third party may be involved in a particular asset or group of assets via mortgages or other means.

Whilst we are broadly supportive of attempts to modernise processes, which this bill does in part, we note with concern that, in particular, greatly expanding the powers of the Sheriff and the Sheriff's Officers could be seen as somewhat problematic. The Sheriff's Office has been the subject of concerning reports and findings arising from the investigations and deliberations of a parliamentary committee.

The opposition also has concerns about people on very low incomes and social security payments and the effect that garnishee orders without their consent could have on their ability to meet the basic needs of human life. Whilst a certain level of payment is protected from being garnished, once that payment lands in a person's bank account no statutory protections apply to social security payments. It appears, in some circumstances, a garnishee order may apply without the debtor even being aware the order is in place. This poses a risk of both severe and unexpected hardship.

The Attorney-General's office has provided some details and an initial briefing to the opposition, but there is further information that we await that will either need to be provided by the office or by the government in contributions. That includes additional information on how fees or penalties for breaking term deposits will be applied.

Under the proposed laws, if someone has a term deposit that is subject to a garnishee order, for the early maturation of a term deposit there may be some fees or penalties, in some cases significant fees or penalties. If those fees or penalties eat a large amount into that term deposit, it might be unreasonable to require the early maturing of that term deposit. For example, if there is only a month or two to run of that term deposit and a large percentage would be by way of a penalty for the early maturing of that deposit, requiring that to mature may actually serve significant hardship on the person whose name the term deposit is in.

We are also interested—and we have asked questions and are awaiting answers—in the impact on social security payments from garnishee orders on wages and salaries where no consent is required. We have outstanding questions on the potential effect on superannuation, and also cryptocurrency as an asset type to attach orders to. As I said, the opposition will support this bill at the second reading and looks forward to answers to questions we have raised in the committee stage.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.J. Stephens.

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

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 May 2021.)

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (16:16): I indicate I will be the opposition's lead speaker on this government bill and in doing so will take this moment to thank the shadow minister for child protection and member for Reynell from the other place for her ongoing commitment to this portfolio area and for her ongoing briefings. In the past 18 months, around 500 additional children have gone into state care.

While we talk in statistics, these numbers are individual children, some of the state's most vulnerable children. We have all heard one too many alarming stories, shared through media reports, of children and young people being abused in state care. They are not only stories; they are the horrific and life-changing experiences of individuals in state care.

The bill before the chamber, the Children and Young People (Safety) (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2020, was introduced in the other place by the minister and member for Adelaide with the intent to further strengthen the legislative framework to protect people who, for whatever reason, are in state care. It is disappointing that I do not stand today to talk to a bill that achieves this necessity, that ensures children and young people who rely on state care feel protected and are able to thrive.

I know the member for Reynell has taken the time to meet with many stakeholders across the board to hear their concerns and feedback regarding the government's proposed bill. This appears to be in stark contrast to the minister's consultation process. Many of the key stakeholders have expressed their disappointment at the lack of consultation from the minister. In some cases, alarmingly, individuals and organisations felt they had not been consulted or spoken with at all.

This is also in contrast to the minister putting on the record in her second reading that this bill honours her commitment to prioritise a 12-month stakeholder review of the act and that the bill had been developed in consultation with stakeholders. Further, the minister went on to note that stakeholders overwhelmingly supported the minister's proposed amendments.

Considering the cultural sensitivities and the vulnerability of children and young people who will be impacted by this bill, it was disappointing to hear that the minister's words do not reflect the experience of stakeholders. Stakeholders have dedicated their expertise and resources to working to ensure children and young people facing difficult circumstances can live their best lives, safe and in a thriving environment. Their expertise was overlooked by the minister.

As a consequence, the bill as it stands will not provide the appropriate legislative protections. In fact, the minister has also made amendments to her very own bill. These organisations and individuals, these stakeholders, rely on a strong legislative framework so they can provide the best

care and support possible. However, the proposed changes put forward by the minister, the member for Adelaide, specifically around adoption laws, have raised significant concern with stakeholders.

The minister's changes seem to remove key protections from children and adults by altering the role courts play in adoption processes and the crucial ability for children to be heard. Unlike similar New South Wales legislation, this bill seems to establish a two-tiered adoption system that has the potential to erode the rights of children in state care when it comes to adoption.

Stakeholders have raised concerns that the very voices that should be heard will go unheard. The South Australian Council of Social Service stated through correspondence, 'We believe that the bill is inconsistent in its application for the principle of the best intent of the child or young person.' The South Australian Adoption Act is designed to ensure that children's voices are heard and listened to at every stage of the adoption process.

Prior to the minister's amendment, amending her own bill, the proposed changes removed a child's right to agree to or have a say about their adoption, and the ultimate decision-making powers were transferred elsewhere. While the minister may have gone into this review process with the best intentions, the bill as it stands could have a range of consequences—consequences that would have been avoided through an inclusive and thorough consultation process.

Moves to prevent or limit the court's capacity to make an alternative order to an adoption, even when the other orders could be in the best interests of the child, could prevent a child, their parents and the siblings' views possibly from being considered. In summary, these amendments, which cover a number of sections of the bill, are largely focused on ensuring children and families affected by the act have a voice and are properly engaged in decision-making processes. They respond to issues raised by a range of stakeholders, including from Aboriginal to multicultural groups. This includes:

- ensuring that the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander families and communities are enabled to more deeply engage in all aspects of child protection, not just placement, and to lead processes and solutions;
- providing procedural fairness to foster and kinship care in relation to departmental processes and interactions;
- the proposed new two-tiered adoption process;
- bringing the best interests principles to life;
- the extent of powers afforded to the CEO; and
- ensuring that children, families and communities from diverse cultural backgrounds are properly considered.

Unfortunately, none of these amendments were accepted by the government in the other place, including those in relation to the adoption and care amendments. The government cannot explain why they want to establish a two-tiered system of adoption in South Australia—one for children in state care and one for the remainder of the population—nor why any changes to the adoption regime in South Australia could not be achieved via the Adoption Act. Nor can they explain why they did not consult with the two adoption peak bodies: Adoptee Rights Australia and Post Adoption Support Services.

I am also concerned that this bill, which was introduced in November last year, was left to gather dust for so long, particularly given the number of ongoing issues impacting the child protection system. Ministers are at the decision-making table to be a voice for South Australians—they have been sworn in to protect. Ministers are there to ensure that stakeholders are properly consulted when policy is designed. However, the stakeholders impacted by this bill rightfully feel overlooked by the minister, and they feel they have been totally ignored by the minister.

Many of the amendments put forward by Labor directly address issues raised by Aboriginal individuals and communities, who are deeply concerned that one in every 11 Aboriginal people in South Australia are in state care. This review process has been dragged out for so long that it is now

likely to be superseded to a much broader and in-depth review of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017, which is scheduled to be debated in October of this year.

As I was saying earlier, there are many times that mistakes can happen—and mistakes can happen—but when you find out that two children have become pregnant in state care, and find this out through the media, not once but twice, if not more times, and on the second time of finding this out, instead of going into your ministerial office to ask how this happened and questioning the department about how you were not advised and how this could happen to a child in state care, go out into your local community to attend an event, to take happy snaps at a citizenship ceremony or to go doorknocking the next day in your electorate, is nothing but disappointing and not what a minister should be doing. Not only has she put her own self-interest first in that case, but she is looking at not even consulting with the relevant stakeholders when it comes to the significance of this bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.J. Stephens.

LEGISLATION INTERPRETATION BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 May 2021.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (16:26): I rise to speak on this bill and to outline a couple of concerns with elements of the bill, but indicate that we agree with what the government has said. It is largely uncontroversial. As outlined by the Treasurer, he is now introducing bills into this chamber that change the legal system, so his reliance on the phrase that he is not a lawyer and cannot possibly know what is going on in legal bills will be wearing a bit thin.

As outlined by the Treasurer when he introduced this bill for the first time in this parliament to the Legislative Council, the bulk of this bill essentially repeals and replaces the Acts Interpretation Act. Some language is modernised and definitions are added. The large bulk of this bill appears to be what is already in the Acts Interpretation Act in some way and will disappear in this new act, and a lot of the updating makes a lot of sense.

We do need to be careful when we are changing an act like this that directs courts how to interpret our legislation because any changes we make have the potential to impact on all legislation that comes before the courts. As I have said, this bill appears for the most part to be a restatement of the old Acts Interpretation Act to codify current practice and interpretations that may not have existed—I think in 1915—when the Acts Interpretation Act was introduced and when subsequent amendments were made over time.

There is one part of this bill that is not merely an update or codifying practice, and that is clause 18. Clause 18 changes current practices where headings within legislation are simply administrative. This clause will make—and retrospectively make in acts that are already on the statute books—these headings part of the act. In practice, what it means is that the court will be able to use headings when interpreting legislation and what the parliament meant by that legislation.

These headings at the moment can be added or omitted by the Commissioner for Legislation Revision and Publication. This means that someone can put, knowingly or otherwise, material into an act without the consideration of parliament, which could now have a real impact on how a court may interpret the legislation that the parliament has turned its mind to.

I thank the Attorney-General's office for providing a briefing last week about this bill and particularly about why this change was being put forward. We were told in the briefing that we were the only jurisdiction in Australia that did not include headings as something that could be interpreted by courts as part of legislative interpretation. It is disappointing that it turns out that this was not the case, that we were not the only jurisdiction in Australia that did not allow for headings to be included in what could be interpreted by courts, but it appears that it is very far from that.

In further information, upon questioning this from the briefing we received, we have now been advised it is only the commonwealth that includes all headings as items that can be interpreted.

Tasmania and Western Australia do not include headings at all, New South Wales does in some circumstances and what we are now informed is that Victoria, Queensland, the Northern Territory and the ACT only include headings if the act was enacted or the heading was inserted or amended after the change in their interpreting legislation. The interpreting legislation for all those I mentioned occurred between 1991 and 2006.

It appears, from the change in views we have had between a briefing last week and further emails in the last couple of days, if we are to rely on the most recent views put forward, that we are not the only jurisdiction that does not have headings included in what can be interpreted; in fact, it would appear we are to become the very first jurisdiction that retrospectively has headings included in what can be interpreted.

In effect, when the chambers of parliament sit down and debate legislation and the nature and effect of the words in the legislation, we have never given consideration to what a heading might say or what it might mean in relation to the legislation because that has never been included in the Acts Interpretation Act as something that is open for courts to interpret as part of the act. What this is going to do, as has been explained in the briefing and in the second reading explanation given by the government, is that all legislation that has had headings put in or retrospectively inserted will now form part of what can be interpreted.

Regardless of what may have been meant by the parliament when we have debated things, the heading as put in, perhaps without parliament turning its mind to it, can now be interpreted as part of that act. We have some difficulties with that, and there will be a lot more questions asked about this when we get to the committee stage, but if it is the case that we are to become the only jurisdiction that will retrospectively allow headings, regardless of the fact that parliament had not intended them to form part of the way the bill might be interpreted, then I think that would be a difficulty in relation to which we will need the government to explain why we are the only jurisdiction to do that.

With that being said, clause 18 I think will need some very significant explanation and there are a number of other sections whose operation we might need to consider. We reserve our right on the bill and what happens to the bill once it further progresses through the chamber.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.J. Stephens.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (COVID-19 PERMANENT MEASURES) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

At 16:35 the council adjourned until Wednesday 26 May 2021 at 14:15.