

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**Tuesday, 8 June 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***SUPPLY BILL 2021***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—ICT vulnerability management in South Australia Public Sector Entities, Report No. 10 of 2021

By the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas)—

ElectricSuper—Board Summary Report as at 30 June 2020.

ElectricSuper—Report to the Board on the Actuarial Investigation as at 30 June 2020

Fee Notices under Acts—

Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988

Administration and Probate Act 1919

Associations Incorporation Act 1985

Authorised Betting Operations Act 2000

Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1996

Building Work Contractors Act 1995

Burial and Cremation Act 2013

Conveyancers Act 1994

Co-operatives National Law (South Australia) Act 2013

Coroners Act 2003

Criminal Law (Clamping, Impounding and Forfeiture of Vehicles) Act 2007

Dangerous Substances Act 1979

Dangerous Substances Act 1979—Dangerous Goods Transport

District Court Act 1991

Employment Agents Registration Act 1993

Environment, Resources and Development Court Act 1993

Evidence Act 1929

Explosives Act 1936

Fair Work Act 1994

Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act 2017

Fisheries Management Act 2007

Freedom of Information Act 1991

Gaming Machines Act 1992

Guardianship and Administration Act 1993

Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013

Labour Hire Licensing Act 2017

Land Agents Act 1994
Land Tax Act 1936
Liquor Licensing Act 1997
Lottery and Gaming Act 1936
Magistrates Court Act 1991
Mining Act 1971
Motor Vehicles Act 1959—Accident Towing Roster Scheme
Opal Mining Act 1995
Partnership Act 1891
Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Act 2000
Petroleum Products Regulation Act 1995
Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016
Plumbers, Gas Fitters and Electricians Act 1995
Public Trustee Act 1995
Relationships Register Act 2016
Second-hand Vehicle Dealers Act 1995
Security and Investigation Industry Act 1995
Sheriff's Act 1978
South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2013
State Records Act 1997
Summary Offences Act 1953
Supreme Court Act 1935
Work Health and Safety Act 2012
Youth Court Act 1993

Regulations under Acts—

Criminal Assets Confiscation Act 2005—General
Expiation of Offences Act 1996—Fees
Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act 2017—Prescribed Amounts
Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia) Act 2013—Expiation Fees
Mining Act 1971—Rental Fees
Motor Vehicles Act 1959—Expiation Fees
Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016
 Accredited Professionals—Fees Notice
 General—Fee Notices
 Fees, Charges and Contributions—Miscellaneous
Private Parking Areas Act 1986—Expiation Fees
Road Traffic Act 1961
 Miscellaneous—
 Expiation Fees
 Fees
Roads (Opening and Closing) Act 1991—General
Surveillance Devices Act 2016—Corresponding Laws
Terrorism (Police Powers) Act 2005—Police Powers
Victims of Crime Act 2001—Fund and Levy

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

Fee Notices under Acts—

Adoption Act 1988
Animal Welfare Act 1985
Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium Act 1978
Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016
Crown Land Management Act 2009
Disability Inclusion Act 2018
Heritage Places Act 1993
Historic Shipwrecks Act 1981
Housing Improvement Act 2016
Landscape South Australia Act 2019

Marine Parks Act 2007
National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972—
 Hunting
 Lease Fees
 Protected Animals—Marine Animals
Native Vegetation Act 1991
Radiation Protection and Control Act 1982
Supported Residential Facilities Act 1992
Water Industry Act 2012
Regulations under Acts—
 Environment Protection Act 1993—Fees

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

Fee Notices under Acts—
 Controlled Substances Act 1984
 Education and Children's Services Act 2019
 Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005
 Firearms Act 2015
 Food Act 2001
 Hydroponics Industry Control Act 2009
 Police Act 1998
 Retirement Villages Act 2016
 SACE Board of South Australia Act 1983
 South Australian Public Health Act 2011
 Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products Act 1997
Regulations under Acts—
 Correctional Services Act 1982—Miscellaneous

ANSWERS TABLED

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

LANGFORD, MR B.

The PRESIDENT (14:25): Before calling on questions without notice, I would like to indicate that today is the 60th birthday of Mr Basil Langford. Most of us know Basil as a long-serving member of the catering division, I think for about 20 years. Basil is celebrating his 60th birthday today, but he has been unwell for several weeks and away from the building. On behalf of members, I extend Basil every best birthday wish and for his speedy recovery.

Question Time

COVID-19 QUARANTINE FACILITIES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding COVID facilities.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: When questioned about advice surrounding purpose-built quarantine facilities in this place on 27 May, the minister said, 'I have not sought any such advice.' The Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet spoke yesterday about purpose-built quarantine facilities, and he said, 'I haven't been aware of any new conversations around a new facility'. The Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet further described quarantine facilities as 'a responsibility for Health'.

This comes after the Victorian government signed a memorandum of understanding with the commonwealth for purpose-built facilities. It also comes after the Prime Minister announced criteria

for federal funding for purpose-built facilities, and all of this comes after calls from WA, Queensland, Victoria and New South Wales to develop purpose-built facilities. My question to the minister is: why isn't the minister even discussing the possibility of purpose-built quarantine facilities when the commonwealth and other states and territories are doing exactly that?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:27): The Marshall Liberal government has been extremely innovative in ensuring that our quarantine facilities are fit for purpose. I think it's important to stress that our medi-hotels are only one part of our quarantine network. In particular, I would highlight to honourable members the success of the Paringa facility, which has helped provide seasonal workers who have supported particularly our industries in the Riverland. Also, the government is actively pursuing Parafield Airport as a potential site for international students and, as I said, we are continuing to use medi-hotels.

I think it is important to appreciate the discussions that are going on between the commonwealth and Victoria. I am not a member of national cabinet, but my understanding is that the commonwealth offer is to make co-contributions to facilities where those facilities would increase the quarantine capacity—to be more specific, to increase the capacity to quarantine international travellers. My understanding is that Victoria is not talking about decommissioning medi-hotel facilities. My understanding is that Victoria is talking in the order of 500 beds in their facilities. Our medi-hotel network has 1½ thousand beds.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: You wait and see.

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: They will close down their hotels. Why aren't you on the front foot with this, Stephen?

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter has the ability to ask a supplementary question and will be quiet.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: On this point, the Premier and the Hon. Ian Hunter are—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —not on the same page. The Premier has made it clear that we are not interested in increasing our international traveller quarantine. If the Hon. Ian Hunter wants us to invest in an additional facility to increase the capacity for international travellers then he should be clear about that.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: And Labor should say where they would put this facility—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —and how many more do they think we should take.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I believe that this state—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, on both sides!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I believe that this state is carrying its weight on international—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —traveller quarantine, and I and the Premier do not believe it should be expanded.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary, the Leader of the Opposition.

COVID-19 QUARANTINE FACILITIES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): Regarding the Parafield Airport facility that the minister spoke of, is there any advice about whether that is more or less safe than the medi-hotel system in relation to the possibility of COVID escaping?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:30): I think it's important to appreciate that everything we do in relation to the COVID response is based on public health advice. The Parafield facility, the Paringa facility and the medi-hotel facilities are constantly being monitored by our—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: First of all they get established on the basis of public health advice and their continued operation is—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —continually supervised by our public health team.

The Hon. E.S. Bourke interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Ms Bourke!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: One of the key factors in relation to the safe operation of these facilities is what I would call cohorts. The risk of COVID-19 amongst Pacific Island workers who are based in the Riverland is fundamentally different from international travellers returning from—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —India. We will continue to operate not on the basis of Labor's—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —press releases but we're going to act on the basis of public health advice.

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

COVID-19 QUARANTINE FACILITIES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): At the Parafield Airport facility, which the minister mentioned, are any overseas students who would be potentially housed there over and above the returned traveller numbers that South Australia would be accepting?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:31): Firstly, this element of the program, in terms of the coordination of the international students return program, is being handled by the Premier and a separate minister. My understanding is that the commonwealth has been quite clear: international students will not be part of the international traveller cap.

COVID-19 QUARANTINE FACILITIES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): Final supplementary question: just to be very clear, is it the minister's understanding that international students would be in addition to and in excess of returning traveller numbers to South Australia?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:32): I have already answered that.

BUSINESS AND JOBS SUPPORT FUND

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:32): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer a question regarding funding.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: As part of the 2020-21 budget, the Treasurer announced additional funding would be allocated to the Business and Jobs Support Fund, bringing the total funding for that program to \$530 million. The priority for the fund as stated by the Marshall Liberal government was to ensure the ongoing survival of entities and to minimise job losses. The DTF website currently states that as a result of funding decisions already taken there is limited remaining capacity in the fund.

My question is: has the entire \$530 million been allocated towards ensuring the survival of entities and minimising job losses and, if not, how much is remaining in the fund and how many businesses or entities that applied for a grant have been rejected?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:33): The detail of that will be outlined in the budget speech in just over two weeks, but there is a very small component—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Deputy Leader has asked a question and the Treasurer is trying to answer it, and I can't hear either.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The details of the answer to the honourable member's question will be outlined in greater detail in the budget speech in two weeks, so stay tuned.

The PRESIDENT: The Deputy Leader has a supplementary.

BUSINESS AND JOBS SUPPORT FUND

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:33): Why can't the Treasurer answer a question about how much is remaining in a fund, the expansion of which was announced in last year's budget?

The PRESIDENT: It's very hard to draw that from the original answer but the Treasurer can respond if he wishes.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:34): I have nothing further to add to the answer to the first question.

BUSINESS AND JOBS SUPPORT FUND

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:34): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: A leak to the opposition has advised that there are significant funds still unallocated in the business and support fund, and a decision has been made to allocate that funding towards additional capital grants for non-government schools. My questions to the Treasurer are: can the Treasurer confirm that funding from the business and support fund is being reallocated towards additional capital grants for non-government schools? If so, why has the Treasurer decided to reallocate the funding, despite the COVID-19 pandemic still having an impact on South Australian businesses and South Australian jobs?

The PRESIDENT: Before I call the Treasurer, there was a fair bit of opinion in that explanation, but I will go to the Treasurer.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:35): The details of funding application submissions and decisions that the government has taken—I will just point out to the honourable member that there are two COVID-related support funds. One was Business and Jobs Support and one was Community and Jobs Support, and I suspect that there may well be some confusion in the honourable member's mind in relation to those.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Not denying it.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Not denying it at all.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is out of order.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The details—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Confirming by the silence that this is—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Why are people leaking against you so much?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The details of any decisions we have taken will be outlined in great detail in just over two weeks.

BUSINESS AND JOBS SUPPORT FUND

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:35): Supplementary arising, just to help with my confusion: is the Treasurer saying that there will be funds going towards non-government schools from this fund?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:36): There is always funding from the government towards non-government schools.

BUSINESS CONFIDENCE

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:36): My question is to the Treasurer. Treasurer, can you indicate what the latest NAB survey shows about business conditions and confidence here in South Australia?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:36): As I have indicated on a number of occasions previously, one of the critical elements nationally, but also in South Australia, to economic recovery post COVID is obviously business conditions but also business confidence. So the continued monitoring of how business confidence tracks is an important element of how our state emerges in terms of creating jobs and economic recovery. There are a number of surveys that look at business conditions and business confidence, the latest of which have been Business SA's Survey of Business Expectations and also the NAB Monthly Business Survey, which has only just been released in the last 24 hours, I think it was.

Importantly, in relation to monthly business survey conditions—that is, what small and medium-sized businesses believe the conditions that apply to their business are at the moment—it is important to note that for businesses in South Australia their understanding of their business conditions rose in May 2021 to be close to the record high level recorded back in December 2020. I think importantly for national economic recovery conditions, business conditions also rose in May to be at a record high level in seasonally adjusted terms—so not just in South Australia but, importantly, nationally there has been a rise.

That also mirrors the recent Business SA Survey of Business Expectations, which saw a significant rise in the March quarter in terms of business conditions; that is, the last time the March quarter index had reached such a high was over 13 years ago, in the December quarter of 2007 at the back end of the pre-GFC boom. So I think business conditions are an important indicator.

In relation to business confidence, the NAB monthly survey actually shows a slight dip in business confidence nationally, across all states, in the last month compared to the previous month, and that was also mirrored in seasonally adjusted terms in South Australia as well. So, from an economic recovery viewpoint, anything that leaders in the community—parliamentary leaders, government leaders and community leaders—can do that assists in the building of business confidence is an important element of economic recovery, because if business leaders are not confident in their future they (a) won't invest in the future, and (b) won't start creating jobs for South Australians.

I think the recent ABS figures, in terms of investment, at least demonstrated that on the first element in South Australia there had been a significant increase in private sector capital investment over the last 12 months, I think, at record levels of just over 20 per cent. That is an important indicator that businesses are still investing, assisted, no doubt, by commonwealth government policies in relation to instant tax write-offs. That is an important element of business investment in their future.

There is a slight dip in business confidence in the NAB survey in all states, and nationally as well, a slight dip in South Australia as well, but it is something that we all collectively need to work on in terms of trying to encourage business confidence in the state's future. Whatever our political persuasion might be, our collective best interests as a state are served by businesses being confident enough to invest and to help create jobs.

BUSINESS CONFIDENCE

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:40): Supplementary: that same report shows that retail confidence is actually the lowest across all industry sectors in the state, and also that labour costs, aka wages, are at record lows.

The PRESIDENT: Question.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: Does the Treasurer make any link between people's failure to have wage growth and not being able to spend anything at the shop?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:40): No, I don't make that same link, but there is no doubting that—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —the Reserve Bank governor has indicated that nationally the relatively low level of wage growth is an important indicator in terms of national economic recovery and that historically, for the last few years, there has been a low level of wage growth, which has been a product of a number of issues in terms of both low interest growth and inflation right across the board.

I note, as I have previously, that this state government, unlike some other governments, has actually continued to provide reasonable and sensible salary increases for its employees, public servants. We have averaged pay increases of somewhere between 1.5 and 2 per cent. The Hon. Mr Hanson will know that some other governments, Labor and Liberal, have frozen public sector wages over the last 12 months. I am sure the Hon. Mr Hanson would warmly endorse the policies of the current Liberal government in terms of the contrary approach—

The Hon. J.E. Hanson interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Hanson!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —adopted by some other governments, both Labor and Liberal, I note, to freeze wages growth. To the extent—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —that the state government can influence wages policy in terms of its more than 100,000 employees, we are if not the biggest certainly one of the couple of biggest—

we would be the biggest, I would imagine—employers in this state to accept that we can influence wages policy.

The Hon. J.E. Hanson interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am sure the Hon. Mr Hanson would warmly endorse the current policies of not only the government but—I was going to say me as Treasurer, but I won't extend it that far, just the current government. If I can use a royal 'we' very, very humbly, the royal 'we', we the government have been relatively generous in terms of our wages policy, but we think sensible in terms of what is a sensible increase for our employees.

SKYCITY ADELAIDE

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:43): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Treasurer on the topic of SkyCity Adelaide.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Yesterday, it came to light that Australia's financial regulator, AUSTRAC, had launched an investigation into potential serious noncompliance by SkyCity Adelaide with anti-money laundering and counterterror financial rules. Seven years ago, SkyCity Adelaide signed an agreement with the state government to vary the approved licensing agreement to allow for the massive expansion of its operations that we currently see, which included a requirement to make an up-front payment of \$20 million to the SA government when the agreement became binding.

My question to the Treasurer is: in light of the potential serious noncompliance of SkyCity Adelaide with anti-money laundering and counterterror financing rules, is the government concerned about the source of the \$20 million up-front payment that was made seven years ago?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:44): That question is probably more appropriately addressed to the Leader of the Opposition in the Labor Party because, as I'm sure the member knows, sadly, seven years ago we were languishing in opposition—a long history of 16 years of being in opposition.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Mr Hunter, the Hon. Mr Maher and former treasurers would be people who subscribed to those particular arrangements with the Casino, so I think the question is probably best directed to them in relation to the detail of that particular arrangement or deal to which the honourable member refers.

In relation to the overriding important aspect to the member's question, that is, that there have clearly been serious claims made—not claims, I should say—there is now an indication that AUSTRAC, which is the appropriate agency with responsibility for investigating anti-money laundering and counterterrorism financing breaches, is conducting an investigation into aspects of SkyCity's operations, and I know that other honourable members have raised this issue before.

Certainly, from the state's viewpoint, the commissioner for business and consumer affairs has made it clear that he has now put his review on hold after discussions with AUSTRAC on the basis that they are the appropriate agency with the appropriate capacity, because these are obviously quite complex investigations that AUSTRAC has the capacity to monitor.

The commissioner's view is that they are the appropriate agency to continue and finalise those investigations and then, ultimately, to report on them. Until the commissioner sees a final report, he has decided, after discussion with AUSTRAC, to put his review on hold until AUSTRAC have completed their negotiations.

Coming back to the issue of that deal seven years ago, I can't offer any more detail because I had no direct knowledge of the discussions.

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

SKYCITY ADELAIDE

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:46): Noting the Treasurer's response, will the Treasurer be making inquiries to satisfy this parliament that the relevant rules were complied with by SkyCity Adelaide and, in particular, to ensure that no laundered money was involved with that payment?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:47): I can certainly seek advice from those who were around seven years ago—those who had the responsibility for monitoring whatever arrangement was entered into. That would obviously be the commissioner, potentially. I will seek advice and bring back any answer that they might be able to provide.

In relation to the source of any money that was paid under the former Labor government, as to whether that was laundered money or not, I'm not sure. I'm sure the commissioner is not in a position to be able to answer that. I think what he's saying is that the appropriate agency to continue the investigation into this is AUSTRAC. They have the capacity to do it. I think they have listed two specific time periods. I think one of them was under the former government and one might have been in the first year of the current government that they were investigating in relation to SkyCity's operations.

I don't think the time periods they referred to go back seven years; that is, the nature of their investigation. I don't know whether that's because they have looked at it and don't believe there were issues of concern at that particular time, which might be possible, or whether there is some other restriction. I can certainly seek to ascertain as to whether there is any restriction on what AUSTRAC can do.

My broad understanding is there is not; that is, if they had concerns about a period of seven years ago when this deal was done with the former Labor government, I don't believe they are restricted from investigating that, but I can certainly take advice on that. Maybe the Hon. Mr Hunter or the Hon. Mr Maher might be able to throw some light on the arrangements that occurred at that particular time.

SKYCITY ADELAIDE

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:48): Supplementary: my question is to the Treasurer. Has the government been in talks with SkyCity about the AUSTRAC investigation? Why hasn't the commissioner for business and consumer affairs been able to detect any of the concerns by AUSTRAC or any other irregularities that could raise an alarm in his office's own inspections?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:49): The advice from the commissioner is that AUSTRAC is the appropriate agency to investigate anti-money laundering and counterterrorism financing breaches. They have the capacity to do so. He has, as I indicated earlier, indicated he will put his review on hold until they have concluded theirs.

The commissioner obviously has ongoing responsibilities in terms of their operations—that is, the Casino's operations—in terms of gambling regulation, which is controlled by the state. The ongoing responsibilities of the commissioner, as outlined by this parliament through legislation and other government arrangements, continues, so that will continue. But in relation to money laundering and counterterrorism financing breaches, the appropriate agency is not the commissioner, it's actually AUSTRAC.

GAMBLING REGULATION

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:50): Does the Treasurer now concede it was a mistake to dismantle the office of the independent gambling regulator when so many probity issues have since arisen with Australian casino operations?

The PRESIDENT: I am not sure whether that arises from the original answer. The Treasurer, if you wish.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:50): No, I don't, Mr President.

ADELAIDE CONVENTION CENTRE GALA DINNER

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:50): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Assistant Minister to the Premier regarding multicultural affairs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Information provided to the opposition shows that the assistant—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Members on my right will remain silent. The Hon. Mr Wortley has the call.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Information provided to the opposition shows that the assistant minister recently hosted a fundraising dinner at the Adelaide Convention Centre in honour of the assistant minister. We have been advised that 900 people attended and tickets were sold for \$180. My questions to the assistant minister are:

1. Exactly what taxpayer-funded resources, if any, did the assistant minister use to organise an event in honour of herself?
2. What was the total revenue from the event?
3. Where did the money raised from this huge gala event go?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:51): I thank the honourable member for his question. None of those questions he asked are actually of interest to the public in terms of multicultural affairs, so I therefore am not required to answer those questions.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Jing Lee has the call and will be heard in silence.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:52): The question I ask is of public interest. My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding safety for people with disabilities. Can the minister please provide an update to the council about how the Marshall Liberal government's new easy to use safeguarding app will help ensure the wellbeing and safety of South Australians with a disability?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:52): I thank the honourable member for her question. It is a great honour to be able to talk about our proposal for a new safeguarding app for people with disability. We have contacted the Australian government. Both the new minister for NDIS, the Hon. Linda Reynolds, and the NDIS Quality and Safeguards Commission have indicated their support for this particular initiative. The state government has committed \$500,000 for the creation of a smart phone app and, as I said, we have endorsement from the federal government.

We are intending that the app will be able to assist people with disability to do a number of things. During the COVID period, the Community Visitor Scheme, when it wasn't able to visit people in their homes, was conducting a number of its visits by audiovisual means. So we believe that audiovisual means will be a really useful way of people with disability being able to connect with a community visitor, to have a check-in with them—not a formal health check but a wellbeing check, I should say—and also to contact a range of different services that they may need through a range of functionalities through the app.

Clearly, there would be emergency services available. We are anticipating that we would also have contact available, as I have said, through the virtual Community Visitor Scheme; potentially through advocacy bodies; the Adult Safeguarding Unit, which was extended last year to people with disabilities; the Quality and Safeguards Commission; the Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner; and also to have all the hotline numbers that people may need to contact through that.

Our next steps will be to consult with people with disability to see what sort of features they are interested in and the form which it should take. Clearly, we would want to have things in easy English and use the particular accessible functionality, which I think is known by the acronym WCAG, which means that it's able to be accessed by a range of people who might be sight impaired, hearing impaired and the like.

So we look forward to hearing from anybody who has any suggestions about how this app might—what particular features and functionalities they would be interested in, and we intend that it may well be a pilot that can be rolled out across Australia in due course.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:56): Supplementary: in terms of the app that the minister talked about, how would that have helped Annie Smith in her case, where she had all technological equipment withdrawn from her for months?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:56): I'm not sure where the honourable member has that particular information from, and I think we still do need to be careful about the specifics of the case she raised. Indeed, in terms of hypotheticals I just think this is an area, particularly because it is still under investigation by the Quality and Safeguards Commission—so I just say that in relation to that specific case I think we set that aside.

In general terms, clearly technology is something that is being increasingly useful for people with disability. We see that in a range of settings, such as SDA properties. If anybody has been to the Uniting Communities facility in the city, U City, there is a range of technology that people use, for people who may be physically less mobile. They can turn on lights and do a range of things which enables their independence.

So there is a range of ways in which we are not just improving inclusion for people with disability, which is a very important part of the safeguarding going forward, but certainly improving functionality is something I think we need to look at across the spectrum. There are various means in which we need to be doing a whole range of things to improve inclusion for people with disability as well as safeguarding.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:57): Further supplementary: how will this app assist those who have intellectual disability or cognitive incapacity in terms of downloading an app? What benefit will it be for them?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:58): I thank the honourable member for her supplementary question. I did mention easy English, which is a way of assisting people who may have some sort of cognitive impairment to access information in those terms. Certainly, people themselves can nominate. We have a lot of projects involved with increasing the capacity of people with intellectual disability to be their own advocates.

I'm not sure what the intent of the honourable member's question is. I'm hoping that she is not falling into the trap that some people in the community do which is to not assume that people who have capacity are able to advocate for themselves. I am sure she is not going to that space. But I think we are very much in the space where we are continuing to provide tools for people so that they can make their own decisions.

This is in that space. People will be able to either make those decisions themselves and access it themselves directly, or they may ask a family or a guardian to assist them or indeed a staff member. I think there is a range of elements to it, and if the honourable member has some particular conceptual design issues that she would like to provide to us, then we would certainly welcome that.

RETIREMENT VILLAGES

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (14:59): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer a question concerning reimbursement of residents of retirement villages who were overcharged for services due to past inconsistent practices of the Valuer-General.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: Since asking a question in this chamber on 6 May, I have received additional advice from the Office of the Valuer-General on 19 May that 15,506 independent living units in 384 retirement villages are affected, requiring changes to their valuation configuration, contrary to the figure of 12,000 units provided by the Treasurer today in respect of my question on 6 May.

The Joint Committee on Retirement Villages reversed the Valuer-General's reckless decision of July 2015 to create a separate assessment policy for each living unit, which resulted in significant rises in service charges. For 2½ years from the commencement of the joint committee until 1 July this year, these residents have been subject to unfair billing, and dating back a further 2½ years prior to the joint committee's establishment to 1 July 2015.

SA Water notes on its website, 'We are changing the way we assess and bill retirement villages to ensure fairer billing.' SA Water is to be commended for acknowledging the need for fairer billing, but the amount collected over the five-year period needs to be reimbursed, consistent with practices we expect in other industries where charges are found to be inappropriate. Similarly, the emergency services levy and sewerage charges should be examined.

My question to the Treasurer is: I am again asking whether the 15,506 independent living occupiers in the 384 retirement villages will be reimbursed the amount in excess of \$20 million, that they paid in good faith, arising from a reckless and inequitable policy of the Valuer-General?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:02): With great respect to the honourable member, the answer is the same as the first time he asked the question: the answer is no. I do point out that the Valuer-General in 2015 was a different Valuer-General to the current Valuer-General.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary, the Hon. Mr Darley.

RETIREMENT VILLAGES

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:02): Does the Treasurer seriously intend to go to the next election with some \$1,500 owing to elderly South Australians who are occupiers of 15,506 independent living units in retirement villages and who were ripped off by these changes?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:03): I am not sure that I can add anything more to the answer I gave to the first question and the answer I gave previously, and that is that these decisions were taken by the former government, the former Valuer-General, back in I think 2015, and we are not in a position to correct all of the sins and errors of former administrations.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:03): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing about health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: Yesterday, at 1pm, a major incident internal disaster was declared at the Royal Adelaide Hospital due to extreme levels of overcrowding. My question to the minister is: why hasn't the minister spoken to his chief executive officer about the internal disaster unfolding at the RAH?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:04): I have.

The PRESIDENT: It is very hard to get a supplementary out of that. I call the Hon. Mr Stephens.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:04): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding COVID-19. With the announcement this week that the Pfizer vaccine would be made available to aged-care workers, will the minister update the council on other work being done to support the vaccination of other priority cohorts?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:04): I thank the honourable member for his question. The COVID-19 vaccination rollout is the largest peacetime operation in

South Australia's history. The Marshall Liberal government is working hard, in partnership with the commonwealth and a range of stakeholders, to give all South Australians the opportunity to be vaccinated against COVID-19 and to do their bit to protect their loved ones and the wider community.

The clinical advisory group ATAGI has designated priority cohorts based on their clinical evaluation of the risk of contracting COVID or their vulnerability to COVID if contracted. One of these priority cohorts is Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander South Australians. Local health networks are developing bespoke strategies to engage their ATSI communities. For example, in the north and north-east of Adelaide, the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network has established a dedicated Aboriginal health hub for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.

Located within the larger Elizabeth mass vaccination hub, the clinic provides tailored and culturally appropriate care. The vaccination team consists of two clinical nurses, an Aboriginal health practitioner and a primary healthcare worker, all of whom specialise in delivering health services to Aboriginal people. Consumers are met at the entrance and directed through to the clinic, with administrative assistance and further information provided. Assistance with bookings and transport arrangements can be obtained through a dedicated number run by Aboriginal staff.

The NALHN Aboriginal Health service is contacting Watto Purrinna clients to make sure they are aware of the service. An outreach service is also in place to make contact with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who are sleeping rough in the metro area or the northern Parklands. SA Health has been working more broadly with Aboriginal leaders and elders to assist in the distribution of regular bulletins and vaccine information and promoting the availability of the specialised service in Elizabeth. The provision of this culturally sensitive service to a vulnerable cohort in the South Australian community is another example of the Marshall Liberal government stepping up to assist with the vaccine rollout in response to the ongoing pandemic.

I want to thank the teams within SA Health who are working hard to provide access to COVID-19 vaccines for South Australians and, in particular, the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network team, who include the following: Kurt Towers, the Executive Director of Aboriginal Health; Tinarra Toohey, the senior Aboriginal health practitioner; Tim Fawcett, the clinical practice nursing director; Toni Shearing, the manager for strategic partnerships and research translation. I thank them for their creativity and innovation in developing a service for their consumers, and I wish them all the best in the weeks and months ahead.

SKYCITY ADELAIDE

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:07): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer a question regarding SkyCity Casino.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: As we heard yesterday, SkyCity Casino issued a statement that it was being investigated by AUSTRAC after the financial crimes watchdog identified potential serious noncompliance issues between 2015 and 2019. The company said AUSTRAC's concerns were raised as part of a compliance assessment commenced in September 2019 focusing on the Casino's 'management of customers identified as high risk and politically exposed persons'. My questions to the Treasurer are:

1. Has the Treasurer or anyone else sought advice on what type of person would be defined as 'politically exposed'?
2. Did SkyCity Entertainment Group advise the government of the AUSTRAC investigations prior to the ASX announcement yesterday and, if so, when?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:08): I was intrigued by the use of the phrase 'politically exposed persons' because I am not sure that there is a legal definition of that, so I do not know the answer to the question of what AUSTRAC meant by that phrase. In relation to the second or third question, my understanding is that SkyCity advised I am not sure exactly who—it might have been the commissioner or the Attorney-General; I think it might have been the Commissioner for Consumer and Business Services—sometime prior to the ASX announcement that they were going to make an announcement to the ASX at the opening of business.

My understanding is that it would have been around about the last 24 hours before that, but if I have that time period wrong I will correct the record. As with market sensitive information, companies are obviously at varying stages—when they make a judgement that there is something that they need to advise the market of they need to do so within the broad guidelines that apply to them. I think they did that at the opening of business on the Monday, I guess it would have been.

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

SKYCITY ADELAIDE

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:10): A politically exposed person is one who has been entrusted with a prominent public—

The PRESIDENT: I need a question.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Yes, it is. In relation to the response from the Treasurer about a politically exposed person, who is someone entrusted with a prominent public function, will the Treasurer, or the Attorney-General, now have discussions with ICAC?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:10): The honourable member has his version of what that particular phrase means. That is of interest but whether that's the view of AUSTRAC and others who are more intimately involved in this process I guess is the more important issue. The honourable member is aware of issues in relation to ICAC and the acts that govern that and I am sure that he is aware of the quite strict provisions that relate to public discussion about those issues. I'm sure he is mindful of that.

Certainly, I can't add anything further to the fact that the responsible officer in this case, the Commissioner for Consumer and Business Services, has had discussions with AUSTRAC, so I am advised, and has put on hold their review of the current operations pending AUSTRAC completing their investigations. As I said earlier, it is their view—and I think everyone would accept that AUSTRAC is the appropriate body under the legislation to look at allegations of money laundering and related issues, and they also have the expertise and responsibility for undertaking any such investigation of allegations.

SUNRISE ELECTRONIC MEDICAL RECORD

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:12): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: The opposition has received information to suggest that the government's electronic records glitch which saw medications prescribed at 1,000 per cent of the right dosage in fact extended even further than that. We have been informed that in March this year the Flinders Medical Centre had a number of outpatient referrals wiped from the system, with staff indeed still trying to track down the missing documents. My questions to the minister are:

1. Can the minister confirm whether or not the outpatient referrals were lost and, if so, when he was actually first advised of that situation?
2. Can the minister confirm whether or not the original dosing situation has now been identified and remedied?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:13): There were two separate sets of Sunrise issues: one was in relation to medication management and the other in relation to what I'm told was the work list manager EMR issue. As the honourable member is suggesting it does not relate to medication, I presume it relates to the second issue. I'm told that SA Health was made aware of occasions where the documentation of administered medications was not recorded as complete within Sunrise EMR, and there were medication management issues which related to intermittent dosage being changed at data entry. I don't recall being advised of impacts on outpatient appointments but I will certainly make inquiries as to whether that has been the case.

SUNRISE ELECTRONIC MEDICAL RECORD

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:14): Supplementary: can he confirm whether or not the situation has now been identified and remedied?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:14): I am happy to include that in my response.

HOMESTART

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (15:14): My question is to the Treasurer. Is the Treasurer able to indicate whether either the former Labor government or the current government considered and undertook any investigation into the privatisation of HomeStart?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:15): My interest was certainly piqued when I understand that, in the last 24 hours or so, the issue of the possible privatisation of HomeStart was raised in a public forum. I thought to myself, 'Well, hello. I seem to recall that, a number of years ago, the former Labor government were in it up to their armpits.' So I have sought some advice in relation to the potential privatisation of HomeStart.

The Hon. E.S. Bourke: So the worst ramping in history, and you're spending your time looking after—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: As we know, under the former government, whilst they were running rampant, privatising anything that would move—

The Hon. E.S. Bourke interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —the Motor Accident Commission, the lands titles office, the Royal Adelaide Hospital—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Hunter!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. E.S. Bourke interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Ms Bourke!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Labor benches are squealing like stuck pigs at the moment.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: This is a very sensitive issue—a very sensitive issue—because the Hon. Mr Hunter of course was a member of the cabinet that was actively engaged in approving all of these—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

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

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: He was in it up to his armpits.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The opposition is wasting its time. Provoking the Treasurer might mean that you will lose more question time. The Treasurer has the call.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The issue in relation to HomeStart, I am advised that the former Treasurer—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The former Treasurer, Mr Koutsantonis—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —back in the period of 2016-17—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —as I said, whilst he was considering the privatisation—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —of everything else—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Hunter will cease.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —he commissioned taxpayer funds to investigate—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —the privatisation of HomeStart.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: He looked at a range of privatisation options—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —of HomeStart, right through from the complete sale to the potential sale of the HomeStart loan book—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —to private bank operators.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

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

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, you are going to lose a question for your side if you do not cease now.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: So the range of options the former government and the former Treasurer investigated were right through from the potential complete sale of HomeStart through to various other options in relation to, in essence, selling off the loan book—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —selling off the loan book of HomeStart, a range of those particular options.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: At the time, the former government was investigating the potential privatisation of SA Water as well.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: At that particular time, the government decided, because this was leading up to the 2018 election, not to proceed with the HomeStart privatisation because their privatisation—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

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

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Because they, frankly, didn't have room for any more privatisations in the short amount of time left before the election—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —so they had to save a few for if they were elected in 2018, what they might be able to privatise after 2018. So the decision was taken prior to 2018—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —not to proceed with the privatisation of HomeStart, but thank goodness the Labor government wasn't re-elected because who knows what would have happened—

The PRESIDENT: The Treasurer should bring his answer to a conclusion.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —in 2018 if they had been re-elected.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: They may well have privatised HomeStart. They may well have privatised SA Water and any other government asset that was left.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am going to go to the Hon. Ms Franks.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Point of order.

The PRESIDENT: Point of order. What is your point of order?

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: During the contribution of the Hon. Mr Lucas, which I was quite intently listening to with great interest, he referred to me as a stuffed pig. That is totally inappropriate. A nice contented cat or something or other but not a stuffed pig.

The PRESIDENT: I will ask the Treasurer to withdraw.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Mr President, I never referred to the Hon. Mr Wortley because he wasn't interjecting. It was the Hon. Mr Hunter and other members.

The PRESIDENT: No, I will ask you to withdraw.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am not withdrawing, Mr President. I said the honourable members were squealing like stuck pigs. They were squealing like stuck pigs. I am not withdrawing that.

The PRESIDENT: I didn't hear the reference. If it says squealing pigs, there were a number of people squealing.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I said squealing like stuck pigs. I didn't call them stuck pigs.

The PRESIDENT: Okay, I am going to move on. The Hon. Ms Franks.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Franks.

ABORIGINAL HEALTH

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:21): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing on the provision of the health essentials to Aboriginal communities under the COVID pandemic.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Last year, as we know, 12 Aboriginal communities were subject to restrictions on their movement under the Biosecurity (Human Biosecurity Emergency) (Human Coronavirus with Pandemic Potential) (Emergency Requirements for Remote Communities) Determination 2020 that was applicable to the Davenport Aboriginal community just outside Port Augusta.

While it was implemented on 29 March and repealed in July 2020, during the time it was applied members of that community were heavily restricted, unable to go to their local shops, in terms of the Davenport community to the Port Augusta local services, and consequently the South Australian government afforded them the provision of some of the COVID pandemic health essentials and basics.

My understanding is that, as a result of that restriction on their movements and indeed the challenge of the pandemic, health basics such as toilet paper, hand sanitiser, cleaning products and the like were made available to the Davenport Aboriginal community via the generosity of the Marshall government.

My question to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing is: how many of the residents of the Davenport Aboriginal community were actually able to access those health basics, such as toilet paper and hand sanitiser, that were made available to that particular community?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:22): I thank the honourable member for her question. As I know, she appreciates that the biosecurity arrangements are under a commonwealth piece of legislation. They were both imposed and lifted by the commonwealth. It would be fair to say that they were very challenging for communities. The honourable member talks about in terms of obtaining essential supplies; it was also very disruptive in terms of their engagement with the broader community, engagement with education and the like.

In relation to the South Australian government's support for that community as they were coping with both the pandemic and the biosecurity restrictions, my understanding is that there were supplies made available to the community. They weren't made available, as I understand it, through SA Health, but rather through the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and specifically the Aboriginal affairs and reconciliation division.

I will certainly seek an answer through the Premier, who is the responsible minister for that division and that department, and bring back a response for the honourable member.

COVID-19 QUARANTINE FACILITIES

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (15:24): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding health security.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS: In November last year, the Leader of the Opposition called for an end to the medi-hotel system and instead looked to dedicated quarantine facilities. The Premier responded by saying that it was 'pushing fear and division'. My questions to the minister are:

1. Based on what we know today, does the minister stand by the Premier's previous comments that the purpose-built quarantine facilities for returning Australians are pushing fear and division, and why?

2. Is the possibility of dedicated quarantine facilities being considered at all by the Marshall government?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:25): Could I start with the second question first: is the government looking at dedicated quarantine facilities? Well, that's exactly what we have at Tom's Court. We have one of the best quarantine networks in Australia and a key part of that has been the early adoption of a dedicated COVID facility.

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: The question was about purpose-built.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The minister is answering the question.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: In relation to the honourable member's comment in relation to Labor's continual pushing of fear and division in relation to the pandemic, I agree with the Premier.

DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE SAFETY HUBS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (15:25): My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding women's safety. Can the minister please provide an update to the council on the rollout of domestic violence safety hubs in regional South Australia?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:26): I thank the honourable member for her question and for her interest in this important area. Last Friday, the Assistant Minister for Domestic and Family Violence Prevention, Carolyn Power, and myself were in Mount Gambier to officially launch The Haven, which is our fourth Women's Information Service-modelled domestic and family violence hub and the sixth hub in the state, located at the Mount Gambier Library.

The hub has been operating since May and, once again, is a model where we put out a call to ask volunteers to be part of this program. They have certainly answered the call and we are very grateful to a number of people who have stepped forward and who have gone through the very comprehensive training put on through the Office for Women and the Women's Information Service so that they can assist people who may be experiencing domestic and family violence.

The model of the hub is at the community library. Once again, there is a safe space there that has been set aside, which has a lot of information and provides discretion for people if they need to take some time to have a discrete conversation or indeed they may need some assistance and support. We are very grateful for the support of the local community. Ms Lynette Martin OAM, who is the Mayor of the City of Mount Gambier, was also there, along with a number of service providers and quite a large contingent from SAPOL.

As far as Mount Gambier is concerned, due credit should be provided to that community. They have participated in a number of White Ribbon events over the years. They are a very close community and a number of people have stepped up. I would particularly also like to acknowledge Ms Susie Smith, who works for Centacare and runs the local domestic and family violence crisis services, and Ms Sonya Mezinac, who I first met as a member of the local Zonta Club when she organised a domestic and family violence conference in Mount Gambier some time ago. She was

the project officer who was involved in recruiting approximately 20 volunteers to be involved in this service.

We look forward to people who are experiencing domestic and family violence connecting into services and being provided with more support into the future. This is an important community service that will certainly assist with the aim of moving domestic violence experiences upstream so that people can get support earlier when they need it.

Bills

HEALTH CARE (GOVERNANCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

Consideration in committee of message No. 120 from the House of Assembly.

(Continued from 27 May 2021.)

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I move:

That the House of Assembly's amendment be agreed to.

The government's bill contains a last resort dispute resolution provision to the effect that if the Department for Health and Wellbeing and a local health network cannot agree on a term or variation to the service agreement, the minister may make a decision about the term or variation and must advise both parties in writing. The amendment, which passed in the other place and which we are considering today, was moved by the member for Waite and was also supported by the government in that place.

The amendment inserts a new requirement, through a new section 28C(5) of the Health Care Act 2008, that where the minister makes a decision about a term or variation of a service agreement, he must advise the parties in writing and he must also cause a copy of the ministerial decision to be tabled in each house of parliament within seven sitting days after the service agreement to which the decision relates is entered into or varied.

Whilst I do not intend to exercise ministerial intervention in the service agreement negotiations between the department and the local health networks as a matter of course, the government supports the principle of public transparency and is therefore fully supportive of the amendment we are considering today.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will be extremely brief and say that we will be supporting the changes that have occurred and the amendment from the other place. It would be remiss not to note that this has taken many months. Off the top of my head, this has been bubbling around and going on for probably close to 12 months. I do not think it brings much glory to the government that it has been allowed to go on for this long.

Motion carried.

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

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 27 May 2021.)

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:33): In a briefing a couple of weeks ago, it was indicated that a major review of the legislation was scheduled in the next several months. It is suggested that the proposals in this bill could easily be picked up at this time. The complexity of the issues addressed in the act is acknowledged, and a number of the provisions proposed seem good, but foster carers have raised concerns about the lack of consultation. Clearly, the interests of the children are paramount, but the alienation that foster carers feel cannot be in the best interests of the child and the operation of an effective child protection system.

Foster carers are needed, and they need to feel included and supported by the system wherever possible to limit the use of residential care. If the Legislative Council was to proceed to consider opposition and Greens amendments to the bill, it would add to this alienation. Rather, the

government should withdraw the bill and consider these amendments and the views of the foster carers in their more comprehensive review of the legislation.

I would suggest further matters the government could consider in the review of the legislation. The CEO of the Department for Child Protection is the guardian. This function could be shifted to a separate statutory position, if the lack of confidence by foster carers is irredeemable and the system as presently structured is broken. For example, the potential elevation of the position and role of the Guardian for Children and Young People in care to that of decision-maker could be considered.

At present, the position has a limited role. The guardian is appointed to advocate for and promote the rights and best interests of children and young people under the guardianship of the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection. The Children's Guardian in New South Wales does seem to have extra teeth but may not actually take on the role either. Further research is needed.

In addition, foster carers have raised a number of concerns that they consider need to be urgently addressed in the legislation; namely, one, that sufficient remuneration be provided to foster carers rather than depending on their goodwill to ensure care above the poverty line is provided to children in their care; two, that the department has an obligation to seek damages where children are harmed in state care; and, three, that there is timeliness of decisions and actions by the department to ensure attachment trauma is not added to the trauma already experienced by the child. I reserve my position on this bill.

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

RETAIL TRADING BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 May 2021.)

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:37): I remain unconvinced about the need to change our existing shopping hours. It does affect businesses and their cost structures. If the trading hours are changed holus-bolus, businesses will need to extend their trading hours to match their competitors, and that will impact on their costs and change the existing balance in the marketplace. With penalty rates having been changed in recent years, it will mean that some workers will work hours that do not suit their lifestyle without receiving sufficient monetary compensation.

Fair-minded South Australians do not want businesses placed under further financial stress or workers' work-life balance worsened just so shoppers can have a 24/7 shopping experience, particularly after everyone has experienced the shock and dislocation of a global pandemic. Fair-minded South Australians want their government to focus on quality of life, fairness and support for those individuals and businesses adversely affected by events outside their control.

Accordingly, I will not be supporting the wholesale changes to shopping hours being proposed by the government. I am prepared to consider, with appropriate industry and worker feedback, minor changes such as the extension to 9am from 11am for Sunday supermarket trading.

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

REFERENDUM (RETAIL TRADING) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 May 2021.)

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:38): Having not supported the government's proposal to deregulate shopping hours based on the fair-mindedness of South Australians and their concern about business cost structures and workers' lifestyle balance, I believe South Australians would not welcome an unnecessary referendum. Accordingly, I will not be supporting the referendum on shopping hours.

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

UNEXPLAINED WEALTH (COMMONWEALTH POWERS) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

Second Reading

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:42): I move:

That this bill been now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Mr President, I am pleased to introduce the Unexplained Wealth (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2021. The Bill makes a limited text referral of power to the Commonwealth to facilitate South Australia joining the National Cooperative Scheme on Unexplained Wealth (the National Scheme).

The National Scheme comprises measures, including a limited, text-based referral of powers and provisions to support enhanced operational coordination, greater information sharing and renewed arrangements for the equitable sharing of seized criminal assets in unexplained wealth matters.

The National Scheme is designed to be complementary to, and sit alongside, existing State and Territory unexplained wealth regimes.

The Bill also contains a referral of power ('the amendment reference') to allow the Commonwealth to make limited amendments to its unexplained wealth legislation without requiring further legislative amendment in South Australia.

Providing an amendment reference is standard practice when undertaking a referral of power, otherwise the Commonwealth would be unable to amend their legislation at all, including minor or technical amendments, without having to get the participating States to complete a new referral.

Mr President, joining the National Scheme will benefit South Australia by granting an equal share of seized assets to participating States that contribute to confiscation actions under the equitable sharing arrangements.

The National Scheme also encourages greater cooperation in proceeds matters by requiring participants to inform one another of operations or legislative changes that may impact on other jurisdictions, and it also creates Commonwealth commitments to further improve information-sharing.

The Scheme will also enhance the operation of State unexplained wealth laws by granting new information-gathering powers which will allow State law enforcement to compel the production of relevant information or documents anywhere in Australia through production orders and notices to financial institutions.

It also allows for the use of lawfully intercepted information in unexplained wealth matters, which will be invaluable in identifying assets and persons of interest when traditional investigative techniques prove inadequate.

The design of the National Scheme ensures the preservation of the concurrent operation of State laws through provisions which will allow State laws to operate concurrently and permit the States to roll back amendments made to Commonwealth laws as they apply in their jurisdiction.

An Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) underpins the operation of the National Scheme, which is signed by all participating jurisdictions.

Importantly, the IGA sets out the equitable sharing arrangements that form part of the National Scheme. The equitable sharing arrangements set out how the proceeds are shared between jurisdictions following successful confiscation orders.

In each matter where there are 'shareable proceeds', the Cooperating Jurisdiction Committee is formed in order to divide the proceeds between the jurisdictions who have contributed to the joint investigation.

The equitable sharing arrangements, aside from being outlined in the IGA, are inserted into the *Criminal Assets Confiscation Act 2005*, as well as being referenced in the *Serious and Organised Crime (Unexplained Wealth) Act 2009*. This was a requirement of the IGA, and having the related amendments to these Acts set out the equitable sharing arrangement ensures that the statutory basis for dealing with shareable proceeds that fall within the ambit of the National Scheme are clear.

Mr President, I commend the Bill to the Members and table the Explanation of Clauses.

Explanation of Clauses

1—Short title

The short title is Unexplained Wealth (Commonwealth Powers) Act 2021.

2—Commencement

Commencement will be by proclamation and section 7(5) of the *Acts Interpretation Act 1915* does not apply.

3—Interpretation

This clause provides defined terms for the purposes of the measure.

4—Adoption of National Unexplained Wealth Laws

This clause adopts certain Commonwealth laws for this State as provided for under section 51(xxxvii) of the *Constitution of the Commonwealth*. The adopted laws are laws under *Proceeds of Crime Act 2002* of the Commonwealth within the meaning of section 14C of that Act as that section is in force immediately before this Act is assented to by the Governor.

The adoption begins at the commencement of the clause, ending at the end of the day fixed under clause 9 or 10 as the day on which the adoption is to terminate.

5—Reference of matters

This clause refers certain matters to the Commonwealth for the purposes of the Commonwealth making laws with respect to those matters by making express amendments of the *Proceeds of Crime Act 2002* of the Commonwealth. The matters referred are matters relating to unexplained wealth and information gathering.

Excluded from the referral are certain amendments of the Commonwealth Act requiring a person to pay an amount otherwise than by order of a court or requiring or permitting property to be restrained, forfeited or seized otherwise than by order of a court.

The reference has effect only for the period commencing at the commencement of the clause and ending at the beginning of the day fixed under the measure as the day on which the reference is to terminate.

6—Amendment of Commonwealth law

This clause makes it clear that the *Proceeds of Crime Act 2002* of the Commonwealth may be amended on account of Commonwealth laws or instruments enacted or made on the basis of powers vested in the Commonwealth apart from any reference or adoption.

7—Rollback of particular express amendments

This clause gives the Governor the power to declare that certain express amendments to the *Proceeds of Crime Act 2002* of the Commonwealth will not apply in respect of certain proceedings or in specified circumstances contemplated under sections 14G and 14J of the Commonwealth Act.

8—Relevant offences

This clause specifies, for the purposes of the *Proceeds of Crime Act 2002* of the Commonwealth, the State offences that will, under the Commonwealth Act, be relevant offences of this State thereby attracting the application of the Commonwealth Act. Those offences are:

- (a) an indictable offence against a law of the State;
- (b) an offence against section 68(3) of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*;
- (c) an offence against section 52, 53, 72 or 74 of the *Fisheries Management Act 2007*;
- (d) an offence against section 99 of the *Liquor Licensing Act 1997*;
- (e) an offence against a provision of the *Lottery and Gaming Act 1936*;
- (f) an offence against section 47, 48, 48A, 51 or 60 of the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972*;
- (g) an offence against section 28(1)(a) or 41 of the *Summary Offences Act 1953*.

9—Termination of adoption and amendment reference

This clause provides for the termination of the adoption of Commonwealth laws and the amendment reference by the Governor by proclamation at anytime.

10—Termination in particular circumstances

This clause provides specific circumstances in which the Governor may terminate adoption 1 and the amendment reference by proclamation. Those circumstances are—

- (a) if the Commonwealth Parliament enacts an express amendment of the *Proceeds of Crime Act 2002* of the Commonwealth that, in the opinion of the Governor, is inconsistent with the fundamental attributes of the unexplained wealth provisions;
- (b) if the Commonwealth Parliament enacts an express amendment of section 14G or 14J (about rollback), or Division 2 of Part 4-3 (about sharing proceeds), of the *Proceeds of Crime Act 2002* of the Commonwealth.

11—Effect of termination of amendment reference before termination of adoption 1

This clause makes it clear that the separate termination of the period of the amendment reference does not affect laws already in place. Accordingly, the amendment reference continues to have effect to support those laws unless the adoption is also terminated.

12—Regulations

This clause provides that the Governor may make regulations for or with respect to any matter that by the measure is required or permitted to be prescribed or that is necessary or convenient to be prescribed for carrying out or giving effect to the measure.

Schedule 1—Related amendments

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Amendment provisions

This clause provides that in this Schedule, a provision under a heading referring to the amendment of a specified Act amends the Act so specified.

Part 2—Amendment of Criminal Assets Confiscation Act 2005

2—Amendment of section 209—Credits to Victims of Crime Fund

This clause amends section 209 to make payment into the Victims of Crime Fund subject to the sharing of proceeds under the National Cooperative Scheme on Unexplained Wealth established by the Intergovernmental Agreement on the National Cooperative Scheme on Unexplained Wealth.

3—Amendment of section 209A—Credits to Justice Rehabilitation Fund

This clause amends section 209A to make payment into the Justice Rehabilitation Fund subject to the sharing of proceeds under the National Cooperative Scheme on Unexplained Wealth established by the Intergovernmental Agreement on the National Cooperative Scheme on Unexplained Wealth.

4—Insertion of Part 7 Division 3A

This clause inserts new Division 3A into Part 7 providing for the sharing of forfeiture proceeds with other jurisdictions in accordance with the National Cooperative Scheme on Unexplained Wealth established by the Intergovernmental Agreement on the National Cooperative Scheme on Unexplained Wealth.

Forfeiture proceeds are proceeds arising from a confiscation, forfeiture or payment under the *Criminal Assets Confiscation Act 2005*, section 9 of the *Serious and Organised Crime (Unexplained Wealth) Act 2009* or a prescribed law.

Forfeiture proceeds are shared with other jurisdictions that have made a contribution (within the meaning of the Intergovernmental Agreement on the National Cooperative Scheme on Unexplained Wealth) to the forfeiture of the proceeds. Proceeds are shared in equal proportions unless the CJC subcommittee makes a unanimous decision that other specified proportions are to apply. Proceeds may also be shared with non-participating jurisdictions and foreign jurisdictions. The balance of forfeited proceeds that remain after payment is made to other contributing jurisdictions is to be paid into the Victims of Crime Fund or the Justice Rehabilitation Fund (for forfeiture proceeds of a prescribed drug offender).

Part 3—Amendment of Serious and Organised Crime (Unexplained Wealth) Act 2009

5—Amendment of section 45—Credits to Victims of Crime Fund

This clause amends section 45 to make payment into the Victims of Crime Fund subject to the sharing of proceeds under the National Cooperative Scheme on Unexplained Wealth established by the Intergovernmental Agreement on the National Cooperative Scheme on Unexplained Wealth.

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

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (OVERSIGHT AND ADVOCACY BODIES) (COMMISSIONER FOR ABORIGINAL CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE) AMENDMENT BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

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

CORPORATIONS (COMMONWEALTH POWERS) (TERMINATION DAY) AMENDMENT BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (COVID-19 PERMANENT MEASURES) BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 27 May 2021.)

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (15:44): I rise to make some comments in relation to the Statutes Amendment (COVID-19 Permanent Measures) Bill 2021. As members would recall, I had the great honour and privilege of being a member of cabinet when we first confronted the COVID-19 issues. We had a number of discussions around the table as to how we could deal with it and how we could best protect the people of South Australia. Clearly, we had the legislation in place for a State Coordinator, but then there was discussion over some length of time about how we could actually deal with all the potential issues that may arise.

We know that there were a number of predictions of how much we would be impacted by COVID-19: the hundreds or thousands of people who could be hospitalised and ill; the many hundreds who potentially could die, given what had happened in other parts of the world. Thankfully, our health authorities globally have learnt much over the last 18 months about the treatment of this particular disease, but we were confronted with a particularly unique set of circumstances, something none of us have seen in our lifetimes.

I know some experts say we need to be prepared for pandemics into the future. When finally we as a species and as a world are on top of this, clearly we are going to have to continue to have the provision to be able to implement measures if we see things get out of control. I know some members think that we should not be imposing some permanent measures, although I think some permanent measures are important.

As we know, we have a state election coming up in March next year. We have the optional sitting week in early December, so the parliament will not be sitting for some months, and of course we often do not come straight back on the Monday or Tuesday after an election. It is usually some weeks and, in the very unfortunate set of circumstances that there was a change of government, then it might be some months after the election that we come back.

So these measures that we are discussing today I think are important. We do not know what is around the corner. I think we have done an excellent job, and I would like to thank all the people involved, right from Commissioner Grant Stevens and our Chief Medical Officer down to the local police officers on the beat and all of our frontline health professionals, as well as everybody who has done the right thing in this state. Our use of the QR code is exemplary with the number of people who are doing it and are willing to do it to keep our community safe.

I think one of the issues that has confronted the Victorian government has been the inconsistencies across the QR code in that state. I think that is why New South Wales, once they were able to get on top of the *Ruby Princess* cruise ship issue, has done a pretty fair job. You have to look at what has been happening around the nation, and the measures that we have put in place by and large have been successful. I know they do create some turmoil for business. I know my colleague the Hon. Mr Stephens will probably touch on the interruption to the Hotels Association.

Members would recall that when I was first elected I owned a farm on the South Australian-Victorian border until about 2006. I still have a vast number of family and friends who are farming and in business there. Certainly, with the hard border and the lockdown, that did pose some

significant disruption to business, with simple things like shearers getting spare parts for equipment, but most people managed to cope with it. There would be some spare parts delivered to the no-man's-land on the South Australian-Victorian border with your name written on it, and if you were a Victorian farmer you could come over and pick up that bit of equipment.

I know people who bought motor vehicles in Bordertown, South Australia, but who lived in Victoria, and when their cars were due to be serviced there was a way to manage that. It did present some problems early on and some confusion and some annoyance, but it certainly proved that you could work your way through it.

There were other issues. I am reminded that initially shearers could travel across the border to shear. They could sleep in some digs in Mundulla, about 20 kilometres from the border, drive into Victoria and do their shearing and the police at the roadblocks were very happy to allow that to happen. I am aware of one shearer whose residential address on his driver's licence was Kingston. They would look at his driver's licence and say, 'Actually, you have come from Kingston and that's outside the 50-kilometre zone, or 70-kilometre zone, you can't come in.'

So there was a little bit of an education process for everybody to go through but in the end the community was able to deal with it. There were even some people in Victoria who were receiving specialist oncology treatment, cancer treatment and chemotherapy in South Australia that prior to that the authorities were made aware and those people were able to be catered for. I think it is very important that this was a measure put in place to keep the community safe, that did not leave people isolated where they were unable to access health care.

There were also a number of school students who live in Victoria but come into South Australia who were provided with laptops. These measures were seen by some as being a bit draconian but I think we have the great fortune to live in one of the greatest countries in the world and we certainly have been able to combat this pandemic better than most. South Australia is one of the states that has done the very best and has had a great result.

Our community, as most of us would appreciate, has been almost unaffected, other than some business interruptions last year, and the lockdown for sure, but now we continue on in our community and with our lives: footy at Adelaide Oval, community footy, all of the things that we love about South Australia, including having nice food and wine. All of the things that we hold dear, such as being able to see our family and friends at functions, weddings, funerals, etc., everything is pretty much back to normal. It is not 100 per cent back to normal, but it is certainly very close to that.

I know my friend the Hon. Terry Stephens will raise some issues around perhaps inconsistencies across the nation when it comes to hotels, but as my hardworking colleague the Hon. Stephen Wade, the Minister for Health, and the Premier—as I said, I had the great fortune to be part of cabinet and from day one we said we would rely on the advice of the health professionals. They are the experts who have the network of people nationally and globally to work out what the best responses are and what are the best tools to combat COVID-19.

As we progress, hopefully we will get more and more of our community vaccinated. I think most of my cohort of friends and people I know have now had a vaccination and are waiting to have their second one in the AstraZeneca sense, and some of my younger friends in the regions have now had their Pfizer vaccination.

I know there has been some media hype around blood clots from AstraZeneca but I think several doctors and surgeons I know have all been very happy to have had AstraZeneca because they know that the best way for us as a community to come out of this is to get the whole population vaccinated. I did some rough calculations and I was 100 times more likely to die in a car accident when I drove to the dentist and back today than I am to die of a blood clot.

An honourable member: Especially the way you drive!

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: No, I was driving sensibly and within the speed limit—as my friends interject—but to put it into context, there are a lot of other things we do, other medications we take, that pose a greater risk, and the greatest risk to our community is for us not to be vaccinated. With these few words, I encourage anybody who has a life that is so dull that they actually want to read my contribution and I hope it sparks them to be vaccinated because that is the important thing.

Until we are at that point we do not know what is around the corner and we do need to make sure that our professionals—and I include Commissioner Grant Stevens and Professor Nicola Spurrier and the team they work with—have all the tools at their disposal, especially if we go through this period when parliament is not sitting as we roll through to the next election. Without going into the specifics of the nearly 20 pieces of legislation that are amended by the bill, it is a wideranging but very important tool to keep our community safe. With those few words, I support the passage of the bill.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (15:55): I rise today to speak on the Statutes Amendment (COVID-19 Permanent Measures) Bill 2021. Since the onset of the COVID-19 outbreak in 2020, the state government's focus has been on keeping the South Australian community safe. It has been a challenging undertaking, but measures implemented by this government have reduced the spread of COVID-19 throughout the state, saving many lives.

On 22 March 2020, a major emergency was declared in South Australia, due to the outbreak. The declaration provided the authorising context for the State Coordinator to implement important public health measures, such as social distancing requirements. The declaration was originally for 14 days and has since been extended, now expiring on 7 September 2021.

The government has learned lessons from the many unforeseen challenges caused by the outbreak. The Statutes Amendment (COVID-19 Permanent Measures) Bill 2021 seeks to make permanent and enact some provisions of the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act. The provisions included in this bill have been essential in assisting the government to manage the COVID-19 emergency response.

The bill proposes to make these provisions permanent going forward, so that they are available to assist with potential emergencies in the future. The bill also seeks to modernise some practices, which are now accepted as reasonable, given the advancements in and adoption of information technology.

I wish to identify some of the provisions that this bill proposes to make permanent. Clauses 4 and 15 of the bill seek to amend the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee Act 2003 and the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. The amendment would allow for parliamentary standing committees to meet via AVL or audio means.

I welcome this change, as it improves the availability of regional members to contribute to standing committees. This therefore improves the efficiency of the parliament and prevents forcing members, particularly those from the regions, to travel vast distances to partake in standing committees. COVID-19 has shown us as a community that videoconferencing is a useful tool to facilitate meetings. I believe clauses 4 and 15 of the bill ensure that contributions to standing committees are equally accessible for both regional and metropolitan members of parliament.

Clause 5 of the bill seeks to amend the Acts Interpretation Act 1915. With the proposed increased availability of remote meetings, this clause seeks to provide some clarification. New section 53(1) clarifies that if an act requires two or more persons to be physically present at a meeting, or that some other transactions take place that require two or more persons to be physically present, this can be satisfied remotely using audiovisual or audio communication.

New section 53(2) in clause 5 states that subsection (1) does not apply to a requirement that a person is physically present to witness the signing, execution, certification or stamping of a document or take an oath, affirmation or declaration concerning a document. This clause provides important clarification, as remote meetings are important to improving accessibility and efficiency but are not always appropriate.

Part 4 of the bill seeks to amend the Emergency Management Act 2004. The proposed permanent provisions aim to assist the State Coordinator and authorised officers to exercise their function and powers. Under part 4, clause 6 clarifies that authorising officers are to be issued with their identity cards as soon as practicable. The clause also clarifies that an authorised officer may utilise other proof of appointment documentation when performing duties until their identity card arrives.

Clause 7 seeks to insert new section 26B into the Emergency Management Act. This section outlines that there is no obligation to maintain secrecy or other restrictions on the disclosure of information if the State Coordinator requires the information. This clause allows for the exemption of maintaining the identity of an informant secret. Clause 8 seeks to insert expiation fees of \$1,000 for a natural person or \$5,000 for a body corporate that fails to comply with the directions of the State Coordinator.

In emergencies such as this one, difficult decisions need to be made in challenging circumstances. Appropriate decisions need to be made without the fear of liability arising in the future. Clause 9 protects from liability for Crown or any persons acting in good faith relating to acts or omissions regarding the COVID act, South Australian Public Health Act or other prescribed act.

We have learnt a great deal about the practicalities of managing an emergency over months rather than weeks. Clauses 6, 7, 8 and 9 of this bill have assisted us in the current emergency declaration and should be available to assist our state if we face another emergency in the future. These are just a few of the important changes that the government believes will assist with future emergencies. I certainly hope that we do not see any further emergencies like we have done in the last 16 to 18 months, but on the chance that we do we will have this legislation in place to ensure that we respond swiftly, if needed.

As COVID-19 has spread across the globe, almost every country has been left to grapple with extraordinary circumstances and challenges. Borders have been slammed shut, economies have ground to a halt, health system capacities have been tested, and unfortunately lives have been lost. Australia has not been immune to the challenges and tragedies of COVID-19. South Australia itself has recorded 767 cases to date, with four deaths, and does encounter the prospect that these numbers could continue to rise.

Since the first Australian COVID-19 cases were detected in late January 2020, the lives of South Australians have dramatically changed. As a government, we have fought COVID-19 on two fronts. Firstly and most importantly, the health and safety of South Australians has been the primary concern of the state government. Restrictions of different kinds have been in place for months to ensure we protect the South Australian community.

The second part of the battle against COVID-19 is how to best support jobs, workers, businesses and the economy. The restrictions have undoubtedly been tough on employees and employers, and that is why the state and federal Liberal governments have unlocked record economic stimulus, infrastructure projects and tax cuts. These measures have been designed to support employment opportunities for South Australians and to provide relief to their hip pockets.

When observing the terrible tragedies occurring overseas, I am proud of each and every South Australian for playing their part in keeping our state safe. I am also proud of our government's collaborative approach with the federal government, SA Health and SA Police to manage the COVID-19 outbreak. Difficult times may still lie ahead of us, but we have shown that South Australia can cope with the complex challenges involved with COVID-19. I would like to thank members of the South Australian community for their cooperation and consideration during this time. With that, I commend this bill to the house.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (16:06): I rise to support the bill and speak on the Statutes Amendment (COVID-19 Permanent Measures) Bill 2021. This bill builds on the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020, following the declaration of the major emergency in place since 22 March 2020; however, the COVID act will expire on 7 September 2021. This bill will permanently enact specific measures from the COVID act, so they do not require extending again.

In summary, clauses of this bill impact legislation that has the effect of removing regulated burden and barriers, improving flexibility and modernising business practices, maintaining control and promoting social distancing. The provisions proposed provide for other potential emergencies in the future, which, as we have heard with previous speakers, is most important.

I will now reflect on specific clauses of the bill and initiatives that impact on various alternate acts of parliament. Clause 4, referencing the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee Act 2003, and clause 15, referencing the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, provide for the

conduct of meetings of committees utilising audiovisual or audio technology. This does already occur to some extent and aligns with contemporary meeting facilities.

Clause 5, referencing the Acts Interpretation Act 1915, also provides for meetings to use similar technology, but regulations can be made to exclude specific types of meetings where it may be required for a person to be physically present to witness the execution of a document or to take an oath or similar declaration.

I am on a number of committees, including the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee, which I have the privilege of chairing at the moment. The ability to have somebody appear as a witness, or indeed for a member to appear via technology or participate via technology, has been a really important tool to allow us to continue with the good running and good governance that we are providing at the moment.

I know that a number of members have taken advantage of the ability to attend a meeting using technology, and of course their attendance at said meetings is always very much valued. I am sure that at different times it has enabled us to have a quorum under reasonably difficult circumstances. That is not to say that there is not a level of patience required in those meetings, because at different times the technology lets us down to a small degree, but I think we have always managed to soldier on and get the job done. I am very grateful that we have been able to adapt to what are most unusual circumstances.

Clauses 6, 7, 8 and 9 amend the Emergency Management Act 2004 to support the State Coordinator in the delivery of their powers. In summary, the delegation of powers in a declared major emergency to non-police authorised officers is expedited and proven by other means even though identity cards might not have been issued conferring those powers, and access to information required by the State Coordinator is not restricted other than the identity of the informant.

Failure to comply with directions may give rise to the issue of an expiation notice; however, no liability attaches to the Crown nor civil or criminal liability attaches to any person acting in good faith. The purpose of the latter provision is to ensure decisions can be made to manage the pandemic or other emergencies without anxiety of any liability arising in the future.

While we are talking about this clause I would like to take the opportunity to commend the police commissioner for the outstanding job that he has undertaken under extremely difficult circumstances. I am sure that over his journey in policing he would have encountered many and varied challenges, but I wonder whether he would ever have dreamt that he would be in a situation where he was basically totally responsible for making decisions that have kept all the people of South Australia safe. I certainly commend him for his effort. I know that he has worked tirelessly throughout this whole episode and continues to do so.

Clause 10 of the bill references the Environment Protection Act 1993 whereby the annual roundtable conference can be undertaken at times determined by the Environment Protection Authority and flexibility is provided on how community and stakeholder engagement is undertaken in lieu of face-to-face conferences. Again, this is a most important adaptation to the set of circumstances we are dealt with. We continue to soldier on and try to provide good government, and these sorts of measures only assist us in doing that.

Clauses 12 to 14 reference the Mental Health Act 2009. These provide for inspections by the Chief Psychiatrist and community visitors via audiovisual technology. I will touch on these particular clauses. I have recently spoken to a health professional, who very kindly passed on some of his wisdom to me in regard to the issue of mental health. Through this pandemic, I have asked him the question as to what he has seen with regard to how South Australians have dealt with, and been affected by, mental health. Fortunately for me, given that I am obviously not a medical professional, he basically said, 'What you have to understand is we all carry stress. Under normal circumstances stress levels can be reasonably low, then we have to deal with other issues and of course those stress levels rise.'

What people have failed to understand or do not acknowledge is that, during the pandemic, with people having concerns about jobs, family and health and all the other things that have gone with this, the actual starting point with a person's stress levels is much higher than it would normally be. So when individuals are then faced with a number of the stressful issues that come about through

everyday life and some of the challenges we all face, they are starting from a much higher base, so the actual stress level is much higher than it would be under a normal set of circumstances. It is something that we all need to be extremely mindful of.

Clauses 16 and 17 reference the Real Property Act 1886. Essentially, these amendments propose greater flexibility, improved technology and efficiency in electronic execution of documents. The South Australian Public Health Act 2011 is to be amended to extend time frames for written confirmations of directions delivered orally, authorise the appropriate disclosure of information by the Chief Public Health Officer as required, and also to provide for the Chief Public Health Officer to issue an order to detain a person suspected of having a notifiable disease and to apprehend or restrain a person who fails to comply.

The latter is absolutely only a safeguard, as community compliance thus far has been extremely high. I commend all South Australians for the way they have absolutely embraced and complied with directions given by the police commissioner and the senior health advisers. Just on that, I would like to take the opportunity to commend Professor Nicola Spurrier for the work she has done. She has often been the public face delivering sometimes not popular announcements, but again I commend all South Australians because we have been extremely respectful, I believe, and have taken in good faith the advice that has been given.

Ask yourself the question: where else in the world would you rather be right now? We have seen early in the piece shocking stories coming out of countries that I have been fortunate enough to visit, like the United Kingdom, Italy and the United States. To see hospitals that have been overwhelmed; it is beyond our comprehension in this country to think we could have a situation where, with an illness that puts your life at risk, you could not have access to the equipment necessary to keep you alive.

We have seen health professionals in other countries having to make dreadful decisions as to who would live and, basically, who would die. I am sure the mental scars that those people will carry for the rest of their lives are quite horrendous, and the loss that families have had to endure in some of those countries, again, will stay with them for the rest of their lives.

At this point, I would like to commend Minister Wade for the exceptional job he did very early in the piece ensuring that we had capacity, because if you all remember in the early stages of this pandemic, again seeing images of what had happened overseas and how this disease had got away in other countries, the very real threat of states and in particular our state not having the capacity to provide the type of health care that would save lives was most concerning.

All credit to Minister Wade, who ensured with his team that we very quickly and rapidly built enormous capacity. Fortunately, we have not had to use that capacity, but I take great comfort out of knowing that it is available, that we could act quickly if necessary. I certainly hope that we never have to go down that path, but it was really encouraging to see Minister Wade and his team making sure that we had access to the best facilities, if they were necessary.

I pay particular tribute to the frontline workers. While we as a state have rolled along pretty well and most of us have been able to go about our lives in a normal way after the initial period when we were in semilockdowns or asked not to travel, we have done an extremely good job. But, again, it is about capacity, and for those frontline health workers, the rank and file police officers, the security guards in hotels, the general nursing staff all over the place, the reality is that they would have absolutely felt like they were at risk while providing that frontline service to all of us. Our gratitude really cannot be measured, because it is just enormous.

My own personal experience with regard to COVID testing: I had to attend, after travelling interstate, the COVID testing station in Victoria Park. It is a drive-up facility. Each time I was there (and it was earlier this year) the weather was pretty warm, and there I was in my air-conditioned car, waiting to be COVID tested. Apart from the selfish impatience you feel because you should be doing something else, but you know you have to have this particular job done, when I got to the point where I was having my COVID test, I saw the reality and enormity of the work that those nurses in particular were doing. I was in a short-sleeved shirt, maybe shorts or light slacks, in an air-conditioned car, and there they were, on a really hot day, with all the protective equipment on.

Their demeanour was really quite amazing. They did their job extremely professionally. I was in awe of the work they were doing. I hope all South Australians are the same. I could not say thank you enough for the work they were doing and the conditions they were working under, without complaining and with a smile. I was really pleased when I gave them thanks, and told them how much I appreciated the work they were doing, to see the look of satisfaction on their face because they knew that they were doing incredibly good work.

Moving on to vaccinations, obviously we are encouraging everybody to be vaccinated. With regard to vaccinations and the excellent QR code uptake, I must admit that, when the police commissioner came out and said that he was going to be a little more aggressive in encouraging people to use QR codes, I was a bit interested in how that was going to work. Again, South Australian people have responded amazingly well. I applaud all South Australians. It is not a hard thing. I think that our QR code system, from what I am told, is as good as anywhere in Australia, and in fact is world class. It will be the key to enabling us to lead as normal a life as possible under these circumstances.

I recently heard in a public forum the chief executive officer of the Hotels Association speaking on behalf of hospitality. I know that it goes for the retail sector as well, in that we have improved our restrictions on venues, both small and large, but I do think personally that it is time we went to 100 per cent capacity. What people need to remember and understand is that very few venues, whether they be small bars in the city or large hotels, have the opportunity to fill all the time. However, there are peak times that make up for the really slow times.

Those venues often have to carry staff and would be running at a loss, or at best break even, in the quieter times. But then, especially in the CBD, we come to those peak times—maybe Friday or Saturday nights, maybe there is a football game at Adelaide Oval or the test cricket is on—and it is an opportunity for those venues to recoup some of the losses they have made. They only get a few chances to do that, to operate at capacity. I know that hospitality venues and retail venues in particular are putting in enormous efforts to make it easy for people to use QR codes. It is the key to opening up.

The police commissioner has done a fabulously good job in getting us to use QR codes and encouraging us to keep doing it, but there needs to be a sweetener on the end of it as well—not just public health, but the jobs that go with retail and hospitality. We must protect those jobs. We have to give those businesses the opportunity to maximise full capacity. With the amount of work they are putting in to make sure people have QR codes, perhaps they should not have the same onerous problems making sure that they are only operating at three-quarter capacity.

I heard some things from Mr Horne that are on the public record. I believe Queensland and South Australia are the only states where you cannot have a salad bar in a hospitality venue or you cannot have a buffet breakfast in a major hotel, which adds an enormous cost with regard to providing those services. We are desperately trying to have people use those hospitality venues. The tourism vouchers that the state government has put out have been enormously popular, but there are some simple things that we should be able to adopt because they are working in other states, and this state has done an amazing job with regard to keeping the number of COVID cases to an absolute minimum.

Another thing I would really like the Transition Committee to consider is that we are a large state by area. I am sure there will be outbreaks in the future, and I am sure we will work incredibly hard and that our health team will work incredibly hard to ensure that those outbreaks are absolutely kept to a minimum, and QR codes are so important to work with that. Given that, if we are going to have any restrictions, we should keep them to small areas.

I have said before to anybody who will listen to me that I see no sense in closing hospitality and retail venues in Ceduna, Streaky Bay, Port Lincoln, Whyalla, Port Pirie, Port Augusta, throughout the South-East and throughout the Riverland if there is a small problem in Adelaide. I can tell you that people in those regions scratch their heads and go, 'Yes, there's a small problem in Adelaide and you will get on top of it, but we are 700 kilometres away; why do we have to shut?' There are jobs in those regional communities that we can support and keep going.

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: So why did your government do it then?

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: To me, that is incredibly important. Remember that it is not the government of the day that is making these rules, it is the police commissioner, who is doing an outstanding job, with health advice. What I am doing is I am putting on the record my encouragement to look at some of those issues, and I think they should be looked at sooner rather than later.

I think the Premier has risen to the challenge. He has done an outstanding job, especially when people were feeling very uneasy about life, certainly in the early stages of the pandemic when we really did not know what was going to hit us. As I said, we had these overseas images and we were extremely concerned that that was going to be our country. Who would have thought that was possible? For once, I think the tyranny of distance and us being so far away from Europe and being an island nation has worked in our favour. From the Prime Minister down, with every state Premier and every territory leader, everybody has acted most responsibly in trying to keep the people of Australia safe, and I believe that generally they have done an outstanding job.

Sadly, we have lost people, and I offer my condolences to those families. Whilst as a country we have done very well statistically, the loss of a person is too much, and my heartfelt sympathy goes out to those people. Sadly, we have lost four people in South Australia. Whilst the rest of us are trying to get on with our lives and live under the best possible circumstances, for the families of those four people this will always be a terrible tragedy that they will remember. With those few words, I commend the bill and wish its speedy passage.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (16:29): I rise to support the bill. After the sterling contribution of my colleague the Hon. Mr Stephens, I am not sure how I follow such a speech.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. Scriven interjecting:

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: No, it was a good speech, I meant that sincerely, and I enjoyed it, and I think—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I look forward to the Hon. Mr Hood's presentation.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Thank you, sir, I will ignore the interjections, which are out of order.

The Hon. C.M. Scriven interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: I meant that quite sincerely. What I heard from the Hon. Mr Stephens was a speech that was from the heart and his personal experience in this matter, and I think all of us have tales to tell. This pandemic has touched all of us. It has touched all of us deeply. Some people have paid a higher price than others and of course some, sadly, have paid the ultimate price. That makes it absolutely clear just how very serious this pandemic is.

Whilst we are so fortunate to live in South Australia where the pandemic has been, for many people, almost—I will not say a side issue because that would be underplaying it but certainly not the issue that it has been in other parts of the world anyway; it has not had anything like the impact it has had in other parts of the world, and we are indeed privileged to be in that circumstance. I should make it absolutely crystal clear that we have lost four South Australians to this terrible virus and that is tragic and I send my heartfelt condolences to their families, as I am sure all members would wish to express.

It has been quite astonishing, when you look at the TV or wherever you get your news from, whether it be the paper, the radio, on the internet I guess increasingly these days, to see and read about and hear of the tragic loss of life that we have seen right around the world. I think all of us, as Australians, and especially as South Australians, are absolutely privileged.

Even the way that our parliament has handled this matter, and I say parliament as opposed to government. Obviously, government must take the lead on these things and I am proud of the Marshal Liberal government's efforts on this matter, but I think the parliament has played a significant

role in that it has largely been a bipartisan agreement on these issues. The various legislation that has gone through this parliament has been largely—I think exclusively, without any sort of silly business, if I can put it that way—reasonable amendments put forward by the opposition and the crossbench which the government has accommodated where possible. In fact, it may be in every case we have accommodated them, I am not sure, but it would be very close to that.

I guess the point I am trying to make is that we have seen the parliament work at its best through these very difficult circumstances. As someone who has been here—I am now in my 16th year in this place—I have seen this place operate at its worst sometimes, so I am very pleased to see it operate at its best, I think for the benefit of all South Australians.

One of the privileges of living in this great state, and indeed in Australia, has been the—it has been criticised but what I would call the controlled and careful rollout of the vaccination program. I state for the record that I am actually booked in to have my first injection tomorrow, the AstraZeneca one, because unfortunately I am over 50. It would be nice if I was not over 50, but I am. My wife, who is not over 50, is going to have the Pfizer jab in a few days as well. I would encourage all South Australians to roll up their sleeves, as our Chief Public Health Officer Nicola Spurrier has, and get the injection. It will allow us to transition back to that normal life—near normal, I guess, or hopefully completely normal life in the not-too-distant future—that we all remember so well.

I make those opening remarks, if you like, as a way of highlighting just how fortunate we have been to be in a place that is largely protected from the devastation that this disease has caused right around the world. Most recently in India we have seen horrendous numbers of people, thousands of people a day, dying from this virus. I think that says very clearly to us that we cannot take it for granted. We cannot ignore the reality that this virus has caused a global pandemic, and we have not seen anything like it for 100 years.

The Spanish flu is often touted as a similar experience, and it was, but the death rate was higher then, of course, because the understanding of these viruses was not at the same level that it is today, and we know how to deal with them so much better than they did back then. It is interesting to me that it was almost exactly a hundred years ago that the Spanish flu swept through the world. I have seen footage, as I am sure other members would have seen, of people walking the streets of Adelaide then, and the streets of Sydney also, covering their faces, wearing face masks and being told to socially distance. It is extraordinary to think that here we are, almost exactly a hundred years later, experiencing a very similar thing.

Unfortunately, it is almost certainly true that we will experience something similar in the future as well, but hopefully it is more than a hundred years from now that the world experiences another pandemic like this. I hope that the preparation, the experience we have had through this period of the COVID-19 virus, has enabled us to prepare for whatever may lie ahead.

I guess the important thing to be clear about in all of that is that this pandemic is not over. We can get that impression because we live in a very fortunate part of the world in South Australia and in Australia and we have largely been protected from this virus, but I think it is very important for us to acknowledge that this pandemic is not over. People are still dying from this virus overseas. We have been fortunate in Australia in that we have had far fewer deaths, but overseas people are still dying from this pandemic. It is absolutely not over.

It concerns me when I hear flippant comments that suggest the pandemic may be over or that we are post COVID. I have heard those expressions and expressions like, 'Back when we had COVID'. Well, unfortunately, the virus is still alive and well and we will be dealing with it for a long time yet, and that is why the vaccination program is so critically important.

I take the opportunity to thank Grant Stevens, who I think has performed admirably in very difficult circumstances. No-one would have foreseen what we are dealing with today, yet he has handled himself absolutely with aplomb, if I can use that word. I think he has been circumspect and very clear in his communication on almost every occasion. I think the amount of stress that he as an individual has borne through this is really something that very few of us will experience.

He has been leading decisions that have required the shutdown of a whole state of 1.7 million people (the capital city of Adelaide having 1.3 million of those people) and has determined, through his role as State Coordinator, which civil liberties of those people would and would not be infringed.

I think he has done it as well as anyone could possibly be expected to do it. He has weighed up the various competing considerations, if you like, extraordinarily well.

Essentially, the pandemic is fundamentally a health problem but, as a result of the impact on people's health so broadly and the restrictions that have had to be introduced, it also becomes a very significant economic problem. We have discussed that in this place in previous bills, and I think one of the things that would have weighed on State Coordinator Grant Stevens' shoulders in this whole debate would have been: where is that line drawn? What is a reasonable restriction and what is too much? To be absolutely frank, I do not think any of us would envy that position. The criticism would be immense, pretty much no matter what decision that individual came to, yet I have no doubt he is doing a tremendous job and deserves significant credit for it.

I would also like to extend my personal thanks and congratulations to Nicola Spurrier, our Chief Public Health Officer. I say this respectfully, but she has become almost somewhat of a celebrity in South Australia. I think she is admired by all. Again, her passionate pursuit of an improvement in the living circumstances of South Australians through combating this virus has been nothing short of exemplary.

I am grateful, and I am very pleased that we have someone of her calibre providing advice to the State Coordinator, the Premier and the Transition Committee. As we have progressed through this virus it has been hard to imagine how she could have done a better job. Everyone is going to make the odd slip-up in these things from time to time, and there are a couple of examples of that possibly, but I offer no criticism at all of her. In fact, on the contrary, I give her 10 out of 10, if I can put it that way.

She has been, I think, in the finest tradition of public servants; she has been one who has genuinely drawn the admiration of the public. We are in a situation where, when we first heard about this virus, none of us understood it. I knew nothing about it. I am sure that is true for almost everyone, and yet she has provided calm, controlled, thoughtful guidance and leadership, which has been very sorely required in these very difficult circumstances. My sincere thanks and congratulations to her as well.

I do not wish to politicise this, but I would also like to congratulate the Premier and Minister Wade on their outstanding leadership and—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Yes, I will not respond to those out of order interjections, sir, but I say it sincerely. I do not mean to politicise it, but I think anyone who happens to be Premier or health minister at the time of a global pandemic is clearly going to have very difficult circumstances to deal with, and they will be criticised no matter what they do. I do not criticise them at all. These are two men that I think the state can be proud of. They have done extraordinary work and I commend them both.

It has been trying for all of us. We have all had our civil liberties curtailed. In some circumstances the word 'curtailed' does not go far enough, because it has been more than that. We all remember, no doubt, one period when we were not allowed to leave our house at all except for a medical emergency or for shopping to get the necessary supplies to get us through to the end of the period.

If you had said to any of us just a year or two ago that they would be circumstances that we would be living through, we would have thought that was ridiculous, and unfathomable actually. Who would have thought that you would regularly see almost everyone wearing masks as they were walking around, as we did for a period, that when they went to the supermarket everyone would wear a mask and that they would sanitise their hands before they went in. These are things that we regard as absolutely normal now, because we are used to them, but before just over a year ago they would have been regarded as unthinkable.

This is one thing that strikes me as falling into that category: just last week we saw some football players returning from an interstate game on a plane and a couple of them, I think, were not

wearing their masks correctly, and as a result of that there was quite a bit of media attention and criticism. In fact, the AFL, the governing body of the competition imposed a large fine on that football club. That is probably appropriate in the current circumstances, but if you had said a little over a year ago that they would be the circumstances we would be facing I think you would have been laughed at, frankly. It would have been hard to fathom, but these are exactly the circumstances we find ourselves in.

Apart from the tragedy, obviously, of the loss of life and the genuine suffering of many and their families, which will always be the most prominent thought as we reflect on this, I think the main thing that people will remember from this pandemic in terms of the impact on most individuals in South Australia will be the issue of the curtailment of liberty. We have seen extraordinary changes in our lifestyle, which would have been completely unfathomable just over a year ago.

Who would have imagined the sorts of things that we have seen in the last little while? Who would have imagined that things like professional football games would be conducted without any audience or any crowd at all? Who would have imagined that we would have had restrictions on, and even completely closed down, restaurants, for example? Who would have imagined that even at this stage of the pandemic hotels, as my colleague the Hon. Mr Stephens outlined, would still be under the restriction of only being allowed 75 per cent capacity?

These are extraordinary restrictions on individuals' liberties in a society where we pride ourselves on freedom and it has been, I think, the most memorable aspect for most of us, other than of course the suffering and unfortunate deaths that have occurred. The real world impact on individuals has come down to the fact that they cannot go to the football, they cannot go to a restaurant, they cannot do this, they cannot do that. Those things are necessary, so I do not criticise them. As I have said, I have supported those decisions along the way, but they have been, I think, the most extraordinary things.

The impact on cinemas, restaurants, airlines, hospitality, tourism and live music—the economic cost to all of these various industries, outside of the health costs of this pandemic—has been unprecedented. When have we ever seen the skies completely empty of air travel? When have we ever seen cinemas and restaurants close completely and live music suspended for months and months? These are things that I think all of us would hope that we never experience again. Certainly, it is my strong hope that we never experience them again.

I raise this issue to highlight that these industries will still need assistance in many cases. These have been unprecedented times for them. When your only income is from serving food and you are prevented from serving food, it does not take long before bills start to mount up and revenue becomes a real problem, so I commend the federal government and the state government on their various programs that have been initiated.

The most significant federal program, the JobKeeper program, provided the opportunity for these businesses to survive in the most extraordinarily difficult time. It is a little controversial, but who would have thought a Liberal government would seek to intervene economically so significantly? I am proud that we did so at a federal level because it provided opportunities for these businesses to continue to exist and to eventually come out the other end, as we all hope we are now doing.

That leads me to my next point, which is just how extraordinary the recovery phase is looking like it is going to be. The economy is coming back very strongly. I think all of us are surprised at just how strongly it has come back. It was not that long ago when we were hearing predictions of 15 per cent unemployment—15 per cent. South Australia's unemployment rate is now 5.7 per cent. We were hearing from well-informed experts some time ago that 15 per cent was going to be the unemployment rate.

I am now reliably informed that there are more people employed in Australia as a whole than there were prior to the pandemic breaking out just over a year ago, 15, 16, 17 months or whatever it was. There are now more people in work in Australia than there were before the pandemic, so the economy is well and truly bouncing back. As I said, I think all of us are surprised at just how quickly and how positively it is coming back.

There are so many things I could point to, but I will not, in the interests of time. So many predictions that were made have proven to be false. There were dire predictions for house prices, if

members recall. I remember it was touted—I will not name these people as I do not want to embarrass them, but they were almost household names in financial circles at least—that house prices would fall by 10 or 20 per cent across the board in the next 12 months. What has actually happened is they have gone up by figures of that order. These things are all signs of confidence.

We have seen the share market roar back. In fact, the share market has now hit record levels in Australia. It has never been higher. We are living in an economy that is bounding ahead, and all of these things demonstrate improved signs of confidence in our nation and in our state, which I think all of us can be pleased with and proud of. When the economy is going strong, more people have food in their belly, more people have a roof over their head and more people have meaningful work to do, which is the source of social satisfaction. It is a social good overall and it is something that we can all be proud of.

There are so many things that have come out of this pandemic that have been a positive on the social side as well. When you reflect on it, these are things we probably would not have expected. As I said, the economy is roaring back, which is fantastic. On the financial or economic side there have been positives as we exit this pandemic, but on the social side there are also some positives that I think can be pointed to.

One of the things that I think makes a lot of sense but was actually a little surprising when I first became aware of it is that rates of flu are actually down substantially as well. I think what has happened, as has been explained to us by those who work in the health sector and know these things, is people are now used to sanitising. They are washing their hands more. They are sneezing into their elbow and not into their hand and then offering to shake it with somebody.

These practices, if you like, that have been learned almost or become habit through the pandemic are things that will benefit us as we go on. I expect that those rates of flu infection will continue to be at a lower level for some time to come. That is one of the positives that has come out of this pandemic in a social sense.

Also, we have all heard accounts of families having the opportunity to reconnect through this period. We have all been at various levels of lockdown across Australia—fortunately in South Australia we have not had to suffer too long in lockdown—but the truth is we are actually in a circumstance now where we have all heard reports of families having the opportunity to reconnect. They could actually sit around the dinner table together because they were not rushing the kids off to netball, hockey or whatever it was in the evening, or mum or dad were not heading out to another meeting. There are social positives out of this as well.

In my own case I have had the opportunity to reconnect with old friends and people I had not seen for some time, and I am sure that is true of many of us because when you have more time on your hands you are able to do these things. I have reintroduced myself to my guitar, some people in this room will be happy to know.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Yes, shame! I am going to put on the public record that I have learnt the *Hotel California* solo.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: It is something I very much enjoy. The point there is people have had the opportunity to go back to hobbies they have not enjoyed for quite some time.

I want to take this opportunity to commend South Australians for their commitment to ensuring that we have endured this pandemic in the best possible way. I heard the Premier say that we did not just want to survive this pandemic, we wanted to thrive as we came out the other end. I believe South Australia is in the perfect position to do that. We will thrive at the other end of this pandemic. I urge everyone to get vaccinated. Again, I thank all those who have led us through these most difficult of times.

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

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:52): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce the South Australian Multicultural Bill 2020. Implemented under the Tonkin Liberal government, the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission Act 1980, commonly known as the SAMEAC Act, is the sole piece of state legislation on multicultural affairs. It was reformist for its time by establishing the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission and setting out the commission's functions and operations. Indeed, in 1989, amendments to the act defined multiculturalism in legislation for the first time in Australia.

Since then, the cultural, linguistic and religious make-up of South Australia has changed and so have the opportunities and challenges for many of our communities. The nature of our diversity has also changed, along with the ways in which we perceive and value it. In the immediate postwar years, almost all migrants to South Australia were European-born. Today, while European migrants still comprise about half of our migrant population, there has been a substantial increase in the share of migrants from other parts of the world.

South Australia is now home to people from more than 200 culturally, linguistically and religiously diverse backgrounds, and it is important that we have a modernised legislation which reflects and accommodates our established as well as the newer and emerging communities. Over time, the language which we use to describe multiculturalism, diversity and linguistically diverse communities has also shifted. The very concept of cultural identity has evolved beyond simplistic links to one's country of origin, race or primary language. Despite these changes, the SAMEAC Act has not undergone a major review in 30 years.

Early government initiatives under the SAMEAC Act aimed to assist individual groups to integrate into our state and address barriers to their participation. While this focus is still important, and the SAMEAC Act served our state well, it is time to produce an updated act that reflects the needs of our multicultural state today and sets a broad foundation for modern policy directions.

In light of this, in 2019 the government conducted a legislative review of the act to help shape new legislation. The consultation phase of the review featured six community forums, a stakeholder workshop, written submissions, an online forum and an online survey via YourSAy. Key themes from the review consultation included that:

- the concept of multiculturalism should be modernised to reflect changes in thinking and practice;
- the commission's functions and appointment of members should be updated and more transparent;
- the language in the act should be contemporised; and
- multicultural principles should be included in the legislation.

These themes and other feedback from the consultation phase are captured in the final consultation report, which is published on the government's YourSAy website, and I encourage members to peruse it.

The government is pleased to introduce the South Australian Multicultural Bill, which will replace the SAMEAC Act and reflects the feedback received during consultation. This fulfils the review's aim to develop fresh legislation and, by setting a foundation for new multicultural policy directions, affirms the government's ongoing commitment to building stronger and vibrant multicultural communities.

The bill's language has been refreshed and modernised, with the main changes being the removal of the term 'ethnic' and the introduction of the concept of interculturalism. In the consultations, the term 'ethnic' was widely acknowledged as being outdated and potentially divisive. In line with this modernising of language, the bill changes the commission's name from the South

Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission to the South Australian Multicultural Commission.

The consultation also called for us to expand our thinking on multiculturalism. Many suggested that the concept of interculturalism be incorporated into the legislation as being inclusive, contemporary and encouraging the exchange of ideas between communities. This is reflected in the bill, helping foster policies and practices that promote acceptance, understanding and respect, as well as a dynamic and inclusive interaction between diverse sections of our community.

Also of significance, the bill requires that a South Australian multicultural charter be prepared and maintained. The charter will be informed by consultation and reflect a set of clear foundational principles defining what multiculturalism means to South Australia. It will be expressed in inclusive and positive language, be aspirational in nature and lay a foundation for the development of future government policies and better services for our community.

Importantly, I note that the bill requires that the charter contain provisions recognising the First Nations peoples of South Australia and their role in the diversity of the people of South Australia. This provision directly responds to feedback from the 2019 review. The bill also modernises and realigns the functions of the multicultural commission to reflect the way they have evolved since 1980, as well as related changes in the sector. These are not significant changes. Many of the new commission's functions in the bill are based on those in the current act, just in updated language.

Significantly, however, the bill includes two new multicultural commission functions, which will further expand the new commission's engagement with communities. These functions are, firstly, to raise awareness and promote understanding of interculturalism and, secondly, to promote the South Australian multicultural charter and the advantages of a multicultural society. As the lead statutory advisory body on multiculturalism in the state, the renamed multicultural commission will be well placed to lead a shift in our thinking about multiculturalism and interculturalism.

The commission's expanded role to promote the charter further cements its ongoing leadership in multicultural affairs in our state. The bill retains most of the provisions of the SAMEAC Act in relation to the multicultural commission's constitution, conditions of membership, terms of office, number of members, remuneration and procedures, but modernises these provisions to ensure consistency with the policy and guidelines for South Australian government boards and committees. The bill makes other changes to the commission's operational powers, but these will have little impact on the commission's day-to-day operations and how it carries out its core functions.

Some minor amendments to the bill have been made since its introduction to the House of Assembly. The first of these amendments is to clause 4—Parliamentary declaration, which has been reframed to more strongly set the tone for the principles of multiculturalism that will underpin the South Australian multicultural charter when that is developed following the passage of the legislation. The amended parliamentary declaration is also more comprehensive and explicit about the parliament's commitment and intent regarding multiculturalism.

Most of the other amendments, which are all minor in nature, relate to the South Australian Multicultural Commission. A new clause 5A—Resources of Multicultural Commission, has been inserted to ensure the commission is appropriately resourced to carry out its functions under the act.

Directly in response to feedback received during the review consultation, there is an additional clause, 6(1a), which provides for the minister to call for expressions of interest before appointing a member to the multicultural commission. I am pleased to inform you that the government implemented a public call for expressions of interest for the recruitment of the new commission members, who will commence their terms on 1 July 2021.

An amendment to clause 6(2) has seen the inclusion of 'backgrounds, gender, lived experiences, age and geographic location' as requiring consideration in appointing members to the commission. Clause 6(3) has been amended to ensure that membership on the commission clearly reflects gender equity.

In terms of the functions of the commission, which are set out in clause 10 of the bill, we have seen the reinstatement of two functions of SAMEAC (ab and ba), which have been slightly reworded to reflect current need. These functions charge the commission, through the minister, with

working with state government departments to ensure there is a coordinated approach to multicultural affairs in this state, and to advise on the extent to which services and facilities meet the needs of diverse communities of our state.

Also, in clause 10 of the bill we have seen the inclusion of the word 'multiculturalism' in the function at 10(e) and the word 'intercultural' in the function at 10(f). Clause 12, which enables the commission to establish committees with the approval of the minister to either advise it or carry out functions on its behalf, has been amended to provide for membership of any such committee to be in line with the characteristics sought of commission members.

There is one amendment to the provisions around the South Australian Multicultural Charter. In clause 18(4)(a), the minister must consult with the Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement in preparing, varying or substituting the charter.

Finally, a transitional clause has been inserted in schedule 1, part 3(1a), to provide for the commission members who were appointed on 1 July 2021 to transfer to the South Australian Multicultural Commission when the new legislation comes into effect.

On behalf of the South Australian government, I thank all those who contributed to the review consultations for your passion and for your interest in modernising our state's multicultural laws. I also thank the current chair, Mr Norman Schueler OAM, and members of the commission for their ongoing contributions to multiculturalism in South Australia.

I extend particular gratitude to our well-known, well-respected and very capable assistant minister, the Hon. Jing Lee MLC, for her hard work and dedication in this area. Assistant Minister Jing Lee is the face of the Liberal government for multicultural affairs, and her commitment to the multicultural community and the South Australian community at large does not go unnoticed. South Australia has been a leader in multicultural affairs legislation for a long time.

As a state with a proud and justified reputation in this area, it is vital that we continue to underpin policies, programs and activities with contemporary legislation. This bill is an important reaffirmation of the importance of multiculturalism to South Australia. It reasserts our government's commitment to continue to serve and deliver for the contemporary South Australian multicultural community.

I commend the bill to members and I seek leave to insert the detailed explanation of clauses in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

3—Interpretation

This clause defines key terms used in this proposed Act.

Part 2—Parliamentary declaration

4—Parliamentary declaration

This clause sets out a series of statements reflecting the wishes of the Parliament in respect of this measure.

Part 3—South Australian Multicultural Commission

5—South Australian Multicultural Commission

This clause establishes the South Australian Multicultural Commission as a body corporate, and provides that the SAMC is subject to the direction and control of the Minister in all but the formulation of advice and reports.

6—Constitution of Multicultural Commission

This clause sets out the composition of the SAMC, and the terms and conditions on which members of the SAMC hold office.

7—Presiding member and deputy presiding member

This clause requires the Minister to appoint a presiding member of the SAMC, and allows the Minister to appoint a deputy presiding member if so desired.

8—Meetings of Multicultural Commission etc

This clause sets out provisions relating to how the SAMC conducts its meetings.

9—Remuneration

This clause provides that members of the SAMC are entitled to remuneration, allowances and expenses, with the Minister to determine such matters.

10—Functions

This clause sets out the functions of the SAMC under the proposed Act.

11—Delegation

This clause is a standard power of delegation.

12—Committees

This clause allows the SAMC to establish committees.

13—Conflict of interest under Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act

This clause clarifies that certain common interests of members of the SAMC will not constitute a conflict of interest under the *Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act 1995*.

14—Annual reporting

This clause requires the SAMC to report annually to the Minister.

15—Use of staff etc of Public Service

This clause enables the SAMC to use the staff etc of administrative units pursuant to an agreement with the Chief Executive of that administrative unit.

16—Principles guiding consultation under Act

This clause sets out how consultation under the proposed Act is to be conducted by the SAMC.

17—Multicultural Commission to provide report to Minister etc

This clause enables the Minister to require the SAMC to prepare and provide a report to the Minister in relation to the performance of the SAMC's functions, or on other specified matters.

Part 4—South Australian Multicultural Charter

18—South Australian Multicultural Charter

This clause requires the Minister, in consultation with the SAMC, to prepare the South Australian Multicultural Charter, and sets out how the charter is to be prepared and published.

19—Statutory duty of State authorities in respect of Charter

This clause provides that each State authority, as defined, must, in carrying out its functions or exercising its powers, have regard to, and seek to give effect to, the South Australian Multicultural Charter.

Part 5—Miscellaneous

20—Regulations

This clause is a standard regulation making power.

Schedule 1—Repeal and transitional provisions etc

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

Part 2—Repeal of South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission Act 1980

2—Repeal of South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission Act 1980

This clause repeals the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission Act 1980.

Part 3—Transitional and savings etc provisions

3—South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission dissolved

This clause dissolves the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission on the commencement of clause 2 of this Schedule, and transfers all assets, rights and liabilities of the Commission to the Minister. The clause also extends the appointments of current members of the SAMEAC as initial members of the new Commission.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. R.P. Wortley.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (COVID-19 PERMANENT MEASURES) BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:03): I rise to speak in support of the Statutes Amendment (COVID-19 Permanent Measures) Bill 2021. I would have thought, just over a year ago, when we first started grappling with this pandemic, that we would not have had such emergency management measures in place for well over a year, as we have seen, but this pandemic has turned our worlds upside down and provided for a prism to re-examine the way we live.

The bill has some very practical measures that will be ongoing and become permanent measures, as much as we have permanency in these pandemic times. Indeed, the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee Act is amended to ensure that members may join by audiovisual means. I note that the Presiding Member of that committee reflected on the ease with which this has assisted members of that committee to participate in the work of the committee but the technology perhaps being a little lacking at times, and I concur with that.

I point out that, while we were given information in the briefing that that was to support regional members, for those of us who for example have had other requirements and are not regional, whether it is waiting for a COVID test or not being able to be physically in this building, the changes that have been brought about by the pandemic, with the ability to meet remotely through audiovisual measures, have meant that democracy has continued under the pandemic in a way that has given it a real shake up. Certainly, this building and the institution in which we sit sometimes does need such a shake up.

The Acts Interpretation Act, the Emergency Management Act, the Environment Protection Act, the Mental Health Act and many more are all subject to some of these permanent and very practical measures that have become part of our world of living differently under COVID. We have lived now under this pandemic for a little over a year, and it has been a very challenging time and South Australia has certainly risen to the challenge.

I echo the commendation that other members of this council have acknowledged today for Professor Nicola Spurrier, our Chief Public Health Officer, and for Commissioner Grant Stevens, our State Coordinator. They have faced quite testing times, and I think we have been in very safe hands with those two at the helm. I note that we are technically in a police state, however, and the Greens certainly do not find comfort in being in a police state. I would rather we were in a public health state.

I note that other jurisdictions around the country do not necessarily have the police commissioner as their state coordinator or equivalent position. Indeed, the very specific nature of whatever emergency they face then determines who is the lead agency and person in charge. Certainly, from the Greens, in terms of debating the Emergency Management Act well over a decade ago now, if we could turn the clock back, should it be a public health emergency perhaps it should be the Chief Public Health Officer in charge ongoing. For example, if it was a fire emergency, the head of the fire services should be in charge ongoing, etc.

This pandemic has challenged us all. We have been told to stay at home to stay safe. What that has absolutely made crystal clear is that not everyone is safe at home and not everyone has a home. For those who live with family and domestic violence, their homes were not safe, yet we were forcing them to stay there with very little supports, with increased isolation and often with increased coercion.

I have been quite critical of the lack of proactive response. Over the period of time that we have had some of the emergency declarations, there has been a lack in understanding of the

complexity of domestic and family violence, but I am pleased to say that that is improving as the voices have been heard of those who represent particularly the women's sector and the DV and family violence sectors in those emergency declarations.

Of course, under the pandemic, just over a year ago we saw the Premier declare that no-one need be homeless in this city. Indeed, we cleared the streets of those who were homeless and living rough just before this time last year, with the coming of winter as well as the onslaught of the pandemic, and we housed people in hotels or homes. We found them a roof to put over their heads and we found them the supports that they needed. We showed that it can be done and we showed that the world can change overnight if we simply reprioritise what we think is important. In that case, we thought it was important to have good public health for the entire community, so we supported the most vulnerable in our community.

At a commonwealth level we saw people on welfare payments lifted out of poverty, abject poverty, for the first time in many generations, and that has now been lost. Should we, like Victoria, face a lockdown situation again, I do fear what will happen now with that lack of support to housing, that lack of a welfare system that has put people above the poverty line rather than plunge them into poverty, and should we need to again be telling people, 'Stay at home to stay safe,' whether or not they will be safe, whether or not they will be secure and whether or not they will even have a home.

This pandemic is an opportunity to build back better. The Greens have said that in our campaigning work across the country but we have shown that political choices are made as to whether people have homes, as to whether people live in poverty, as to whether people have good access to public health. It has laid bare one of the tenets of the public health mantra, if you like, that there are social determinants to health and, in this case, those social determinants have very much exposed what I would call cracks in our social fabric.

Building back better should not mean that we paper over the cracks. We actually have to rebuild and ensure that those cracks that have now been exposed are properly fixed, that people are housed, that people are able to live good and healthy lives and are able to afford food, rent, power, utilities, medicine should they need it, and education should they need it. I have to say that unfortunately I think we are heading back into the error of our old ways.

While the measures in the bill today are good, practical measures, there is no vision coming from the Marshall government about ensuring that people are not plunged into poverty and are not put into homelessness yet again. We are seeing rough sleepers on our streets increase at a rapid rate—in fact, at a rate higher than I have seen in my adult lifetime of living in the city—and I find that to our shame.

I note that NRAS expires soon and I think there is another cliff of increased rents that are about to hit that somewhat private rental market that was supported by the Rudd era reforms that increased the ability of people to pay an affordable rent under that scheme. That is something where we have not seen redress coming from the state government and I think that is, again, to our shame as a parliament.

The real pandemic is coming; that is, we have faced the public health crisis of the coronavirus, we have seen our worlds turned upside down, we have seen shortages of toilet paper in the supermarkets, a twist on who really is an essential worker in this day and age, the fascination with things like TikTok and watching *Tiger King*, and they all have their place in the stories that we tell of our woes of the pandemic. I have to say that I will here declare that I did not bake a single loaf of sourdough in the pandemic. I did eat quite a few.

The Hon. R.A. Simms: Neither did I.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The Hon. Rob Simms interjects that neither did he. I have tasted his cooking and I think that is a very fine thing. What we have seen through the shared trauma, though, is the importance of community and the importance of connection, and the reason people have resorted to those things which I put in a somewhat humorous and trite way is that as a community we are stronger together but we have been forced quite often into isolation, and the most vulnerable of us have suffered the most.

I look on the pandemic as an earthquake that has shaken the very foundations of our social fabric, but what is the tsunami to come? The Hon. Terry Stephens raised this. The tsunami to come post the pandemic earthquake is, of course, a mental health crisis. I am often fond of saying that it is not whether your glass is half empty, it is not whether your glass is half full that affects your mental health, it is how long you have been made to hold that glass. No-one can hold a half full or a half empty glass forever.

The longer we make people struggle to pay the rent, afford medicines and be able to feed themselves, and the harder we make their lives and the more trauma we expose them to, the less likely they are to be able to meet the challenges to come as we transition from this public health pandemic. The mental health crisis to come is what needs our most urgent attention and all our efforts. However, the pandemic, as I say, is an opportunity to build back better: build more houses, build public infrastructure and ensure that we have food and water security in this state to get right the basics of a good social system and healthy welfare state that will create a healthy population, both physically and mentally.

I, for one, look forward to a recognition, as we have seen at various levels of government, of the importance of our public institutions, the importance of public investment and the importance of ensuring that all share in what is in Australia, this developed and very wealthy nation. With those few words, I commend the bill and look forward to the committee debate.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:15): I welcome the opportunity to talk about the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on South Australia. It really goes without saying that we have been very lucky in our state when it comes to the impact of COVID-19. I think a lot of us reflect on that when we see what is happening over in Victoria at the moment and the regrettable situation that they face there. We are very lucky in that sense. However, whilst many of us have been lucky, this has not been a lucky time for everybody in our community. In fact, COVID-19 has exposed the growing pandemic of inequality that has been sweeping the globe over the last few decades. Really, this pandemic has shone a light on that.

In particular, I want to talk a little bit about the impact on some of the most vulnerable people in our community. As my honourable colleague Tammy Franks has stated, we saw the government take action to support people who are homeless, in terms of connecting them with short-term accommodation during the pandemic. That was a welcome thing, but unfortunately we have not seen the follow-through. We have not seen the government then ensure that those people are provided long-term accommodation.

I really fear that there are people sleeping on our streets—I know there are people sleeping on our streets in the middle of this harsh winter—and that is simply not good enough for a state like South Australia. It is simply not acceptable that we have people sleeping on the street when we have so many resources at our disposal. Where is the leadership from this government to deal with the housing and homelessness crisis?

We also know, and this has been reported extensively over the last few months, that if you are somebody who is renting and you are trying to live on JobSeeker—and I say 'trying to live' because you cannot live on JobSeeker; it is woefully inadequate—you cannot find a single place that is affordable for you to rent in South Australia. If you are a single person, there is not one single property that is affordable for you to rent. I think that is an outrage.

I really would like to see some leadership from the government to deal with the rental crisis. What are they doing in terms of building more social housing? What are they doing in terms of building more public housing? What are they doing in terms of building more affordable housing? This is not something we can just push off into the never-never; it is integral to the response to this pandemic and the economic crisis that has followed. Just today, I noted a news report on the ABC, referring to homelessness services in Port Lincoln. I quote:

A homeless support service in South Australia's Port Lincoln is reluctantly calling for locals to donate tents, sleeping bags and old swags, following an increase in people seeking support in the...region.

It comes as reports of rental shortages across...SA emerge...

What on earth is happening when we have vulnerable people being forced to sleep in tents because we do not have enough accommodation available in our state and in our regional centres? That is a

disgrace. That is an absolute disgrace, and we need leadership from this government to address that.

As I said before, COVID-19 has really exposed that ongoing crisis of inequality in South Australia, and it has really highlighted the potential for government to take action that changes people's lives for the better. What we need from this government is for them to embrace this opportunity to actually take the leadership that is necessary to deal with the public health crisis and also the growing crisis of inequality in South Australia, recognising that every South Australian deserves a roof over their head and a place to call home, and that that is the right of every citizen in our community, not just the wealthy few.

Whilst I support this bill and commend this bill, I call on the Marshall government to go further in terms of advocating for vulnerable South Australians and in terms of investing in the infrastructure that we need to ensure that people are not plunged into poverty as a result of this economic crisis. I note that the government has called a Code Blue to support people during the extreme weather that we are facing over the next few days, but they are announcing that measure—and of course the Greens welcome that—at a time when they have initiated brutal cuts to the homelessness sector in South Australia. We have seen cuts to Street to Home, cuts to Catherine House, cuts to the Hutt St Centre; again, a failure of leadership at a time when leadership is so desperately needed.

In terms of concluding my remarks, I make a few comments about the rollout of the vaccine to people who are homeless. You may recall that I asked the health minister in question time during our previous sitting period what the government's plan was to ensure that the vaccine was made available to people who are homeless.

He provided an explanation and stated that he was going to be dealing with support services to get the vaccine out through food trucks that already provide support to people who are homeless. It is great that something is being looked at, but we need to have more detail on that. The minister's response really threw open more questions than it did answers.

We need to know whether or not more resources are being allocated to these organisations so that they can roll out the vaccine. Are these the sorts of organisations that have been impacted by the Liberals' brutal cuts to homelessness support services? Are these organisations going to be able to ensure that a follow-up vaccine is provided to people who are homeless? What measures are in place to ensure that we can keep track of these people and ensure that they receive the second vaccine that they so desperately need?

All of these are questions that the government has failed to answer. When I asked the minister about this I received, might I say, a fairly churlish response correcting me about the size of the health department. That is not good enough. We need to see leadership from the government on these questions, and we need to see answers to these questions, so that vulnerable South Australians know that they are getting the support they desperately need during this economic crisis. I commend the bill, but I call on the government to show the leadership that we need to ensure that no South Australian is left behind.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I. Pnevmatikos.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (DRIVING AT EXTREME SPEED) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (LOCAL GOVERNMENT REVIEW) BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to amendments Nos 1 to 14 and 17 to 26 made by the Legislative Council without any amendment; disagreed to amendments Nos 15 and 16; and made alternative amendments as indicated in the following schedule in lieu thereof:

No. 15. Clause 129, page 68, after line 38 [clause 129, inserted section 262F(3)]—After paragraph (c) insert:

and

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

No. 16. Clause 129, page 69, line 26 [clause 129, inserted section 262G(3)]—Delete 'unless the LGA consents to the making of the recommendation.' and substitute:

unless—

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

House of Assembly's Amendments in lieu thereof

Clause 129, page 69, after line 10 [clause 129, inserted section 262F(5)]—After paragraph (c) insert:

- (ca) industrial relations;

Clause 129, page 69, after line 12 [clause 129, inserted section 262F]—After subsection (5) insert:

- (6) In addition, before nominating a person for appointment as a member of the Panel, the Minister (in the case of the presiding member or the member nominated by the Minister) or the LGA (in the case of the member nominated by the LGA) must ensure that a registered industrial association that represents the interests of employees of councils specified by the Minister by notice in the Gazette is consulted on the proposed nomination.

Clause 129, page 73, after line 41 [clause 129, inserted section 262S]—After subsection (1) insert:

- (1a) If the person primarily affected by the behaviour the subject of a complaint is an employee of a council, the Panel must, before refusing to deal with, or determining to take no further action on, the complaint, consider any submissions received from a registered industrial association representing the employee.

Clause 129, page 74, after line 14 [clause 129, inserted section 262T]—After subsection (2) insert:

- (3) In addition, the Panel must ensure that, during an inquiry relating to a complaint where the person primarily affected by the behaviour the subject of the complaint is an employee of a council, any registered industrial association representing the employee in the matter is given a reasonable opportunity to make submissions relating to the inquiry.

Clause 129, page 76, after line 5 [clause 129, inserted section 262W]—After subsection (1) insert:

- (1a) If the person primarily affected by the behaviour the subject of a complaint referred to the Panel under this Subdivision is an employee of a council, the Panel must, before determining whether or not to take action under this section, ensure that any registered industrial association representing the employee is given a reasonable opportunity to make submissions on the matter.

Clause 129, page 76, after line 40 [clause 129, inserted section 262X]—After subsection (2) insert:

- (2a) If a report under subsection (1) relates to a complaint where the person primarily affected by the behaviour the subject of the complaint is an employee of a council, the Panel must provide the report to any registered industrial association representing the employee.
- (2b) The Panel may, in providing a report to a registered industrial association under subsection (2a), require the registered industrial association to ensure that the whole or a specified part of the report is not disclosed to any other person or otherwise published.
- (2c) A registered industrial association that contravenes or fails to comply with a requirement under subsection (2b) is guilty of an offence.

Maximum penalty: \$10,000.

At 17:25 the council adjourned until Wednesday 9 June 2021 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES**

In reply to **the Hon. J.E. HANSON** (5 May 2021).

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services): I have been advised:

Over a period of 18 months, extensive consultation occurred with a number of organisations and agencies which provide homelessness and mental health services.

Consultations ranged from workshops with providers and people with lived experience, written submissions, and various meetings with sector and government stakeholders.

The following organisations with mental health expertise were involved:

- AnglicareSA
- Centacare Catholic Country SA
- Centacare Catholic Family Services
- Drug and Alcohol Services South Australia
- Eastern Community Mental Health Service
- Exceptional Needs Unit, Department of Human Services
- Life Without Barriers
- Mind Australia
- Mission Australia
- Neami National
- Prevention and Population Health Branch, Wellbeing SA
- SA Health
- Uniting Communities
- Uniting Country SA
- Uniting SA
- Western Community Mental Health Service

RETIREMENT VILLAGES

In reply to **the Hon. J.A. DARLEY** (6 May 2021).

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

1. Approximately 12,000 residences within retirement villages will benefit from the policy to value all retirement villages as a single village rather than as multiple independent living units within that village.

2. It is not intended to reimburse residents for state government charges incurred from July 2015 as a result of the previous valuation practices.

3. Backdating of state government fees and charges fees to July 2015 (for example SA Water bills) would be a significant and costly exercise requiring billing system changes and difficulties in identifying the occupant of the independent living unit at that time.

4. It is expected that overall water bills for those migrating to single value villages will be lower as SA Water's annual fixed water supply charge of \$271.40 will now be apportioned amongst units within a village, rather than each unit having to pay the full amount.

LAND SERVICES COMMERCIALISATION PROJECT

In reply to **the Hon. J.A. DARLEY** (13 May 2021).

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

The Office of the Registrar-General and the Office of the Valuer-General have provided the Attorney-General with a detailed update, which details the actions taken since 2018 to address the relevant recommendations from the Report of the Auditor-General—Report 12 of 2018—*Land services commercialisation project*. As such the Attorney-General is satisfied that each recommendation has been adequately addressed.