

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
Wednesday, 24 July 2019
ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A

Chair:

Mr P.A. Treloar

Members:

Mr D.K.B. Basham
Mr M.E. Brown
Ms P.M. Luethen
Mr P.B. Malinauskas
Mr J.K. Szakacs
Mr J.B. Teague

The committee met at 09:00

Estimates Vote

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT, \$18,018,000
LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, \$5,585,000
HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY, \$7,790,000
JOINT PARLIAMENTARY SERVICES, \$12,823,000
ADMINISTERED ITEMS FOR JOINT PARLIAMENTARY SERVICES, \$2,809,000
STATE GOVERNOR'S ESTABLISHMENT, \$4,152,000

Membership:

Mr Murray substituted for Ms Luethen.

Minister:

Hon. S.S. Marshall, Premier.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr A. Richardson, Auditor-General, Auditor-General's Department.
Mr I. McGlen, Deputy Auditor-General, Auditor-General's Department.
Ms J. Blanche, Manager, Corporate Strategy, Auditor-General's Department.
Mr R. Crump, Clerk, House of Assembly and Secretary, Joint Parliamentary Services.

The CHAIR: As the duly elected Chairman of Estimates Committee A, I welcome you all to the first sitting of the committee. The committee is a relatively informal procedure and, as such, there will be no need to stand to ask or answer questions. I understand that the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition have agreed to an approximate time for the consideration of proposed payments,

which will facilitate a change of departmental advisers. Can the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition confirm that the timetable for today's proceedings, as previously distributed, is accurate?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, sir.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes.

The CHAIR: Changes to committee membership will be notified as they occur. Members should ensure that the Chair is provided with a completed request to be discharged form. If the Premier undertakes to supply information at a later date, it must be submitted to the Clerk Assistant via the answers to questions mailbox no later than Friday 5 September 2019.

I propose to allow the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition to make opening statements of about 10 minutes each should they wish. There will be a flexible approach to giving the call to ask questions based on about three questions per member, alternating each side. Supplementary questions will be the exception rather than the rule.

A member not on the committee may ask a question at the discretion of the Chair. Questions must be based on lines of expenditure in the budget papers and must be identifiable or referenced. Members unable to complete their questions during proceedings may submit them as questions on notice for inclusion in the assembly *Notice Paper*.

There is no formal facility for the tabling of documents before the committee; however, documents can be supplied to the Chair for distribution to the committee. The incorporation of material in *Hansard* is permitted on the same basis as applies in the house, that is, that it is purely statistical and limited to one page in length.

All questions are to be directed to the Premier, not the Premier's advisers. The Premier may refer questions to advisers for a response. The committee's examinations will be broadcast in the same manner as sittings of the house are broadcast, that is, through the IPTV system within Parliament House via the webstream link to the internet and the Parliament of South Australia video-on-demand broadcast system.

I now proceed to open the following lines for examination: the portfolio is the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, the minister appearing is the Premier. I declare the proposed payments open for examination and call on the Premier to make a statement if he wishes and introduce his advisers.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will not be making an introductory statement, but I would like to take this opportunity to introduce the people who are sitting with me today. To my immediate right, your left, I have Andrew Richardson, the state's Auditor-General. To my left, I have Ian McGlen, who is the Deputy Auditor-General. Behind me sits Julie Blanche, who is the Manager, Corporate Strategy from the Auditor-General's Department, and, of course, Rick Crump from Parliament House.

The CHAIR: Thank you, Premier. The Leader of the Opposition has the call. You may wish to make a statement or begin your questions.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thank you. I do not seek to make a statement. I would rather just hop straight into questions. We thank the Premier, the Auditor-General, his deputy and staff for being with us this morning. Premier, does the office of the Auditor-General monitor the requirements for proactive disclosure by relevant agencies and also ministerial offices?

The CHAIR: Before the Premier takes that question, leader, you have jumped to the Auditor-General's—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes.

The CHAIR: —which we have not opened as yet. I have opened the Legislative Council, House of Assembly, Joint Parliamentary Service Committee and Administered Items.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My apologies, Mr Chairman. We have no questions in that area. I understand that we did advise the relevant officers that we were not going to be asking questions of those respective groups.

The CHAIR: My apologies; I did not have that information. Are there any questions from the government side before we close that?

Mr TEAGUE: No.

The CHAIR: If not, there are no further questions, I declare the examination of the proposed payments for the Legislative Council, the House of Assembly, the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee and Administered Items for Joint Parliamentary Services to be completed. The next portfolio and estimate of payments appearing on my schedule is the State Governor's Establishment of \$4,152,000. Do you have any questions on this area?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No.

The CHAIR: If not, any questions from the government side?

Mr TEAGUE: No.

The CHAIR: There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the proposed payments for the State Governor's Establishment to be completed. We are working our way through and come to the Auditor-General's Department. The estimate of payments to the Auditor-General's Department is to the value of \$18,018,000. I declare the proposed payments open for examination. Premier, I am not sure if you have the same advisers, but once again I invite you to make a statement and introduce advisers.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They are precisely the same as we introduced before, less Rick Crump.

The CHAIR: Leader of the Opposition.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Premier, in regard to the Auditor-General, Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, pages 68 to 76, does the Auditor-General monitor requirements for proactive disclosure for agencies and also ministerial offices?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that he does not do that work.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So that I understand, and for the sake of clarity, does the Auditor-General in no way, shape or form have any regard to proactive disclosure requirements or compliance?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that the Auditor-General has not looked at that, but he could look at that if he found it of interest.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has the Auditor-General ever had reason to look at compliance with proactive disclosure?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that to date he has had no interest in this issue, but he has the ability to do so if he does develop an interest in this area—but to date, no

Mr MALINAUSKAS: On the same budget reference, Premier, there was a discussion last year in regard to the Auditor-General looking at the resolution of any confusion that may or may not exist regarding the powers of the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption and the Auditor-General. The Auditor-General told this committee last year: 'I do not think there are going to be any issues about misinterpreting our respective roles.' Mr Richardson went on to state:

We do, naturally, have overlaps, so it is important that we have a process where we can delineate what the situation might be for our respective mandates.

Has that process of interpretation been developed or proceeded with as anticipated?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There is no change. I am advised that there has been no change since last year.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is there now a process consistent with what Mr Richardson told the committee last year about a potential overlap between his respective roles, responsibilities and powers and those of the ICAC?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that there has been no development of any formalised guidelines to clarify the potential overlap since the report was made to this committee last year, but there are plenty of instances where there have been informal discussions to clarify situations. However, the Auditor-General does not believe that this is an issue of concern.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has the Auditor-General changed his opinion since last year? It would be a perfectly legitimate thing to occur. In light of the fact that last year the Auditor-General stated that he thought it was important that we have a process to delineate the two, has the Auditor-General, in light of the experience over the last 12 months, formed the view that it is no longer important to have a process for that delineation?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Auditor-General informs me that he has provided information to the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee regarding this issue. He does not believe that there is a requirement for a formalisation, and he is satisfied with the current informal processes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: On the same budget line, but more specifically on pages 67 and 68, sub-program 1.1, which is described as audits, and sub-program 1.2, titled Special Investigations, does this allocation of resources reflect any reviews of specific issues that were conducted in the 2018-19 financial year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am informed that that is the Coober Pedy investigation. The reason for there not being a budget going forward is that there has been no referral from the government, the parliament or the Treasurer to the Auditor-General for any special investigation over and above the normal audit process that he conducts.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What criteria does the Auditor-General use when contemplating the special projects or special investigations that require additional review?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is the referral process that I just outlined.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Are there any additional investigations or reviews currently being conducted by the Auditor-General?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Not special investigations, but obviously the primary responsibility of the Auditor-General is to conduct audits, and that is within the existing scope and the existing budget. From time to time there will be a special referral or a special investigation that is the subject of a referral, but there is nothing envisaged at the moment, and that is reflected in the budget that is presented.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But is the Auditor-General currently conducting any specific reviews of state government expenditure beyond the ordinary process?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Not that I am aware of. I am informed by the Auditor-General that, although it is not a specific special investigation, there are some performance reviews that he is currently undertaking.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Into whom?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised by the Auditor-General that the performance audits are work that the Auditor-General's office has been doing now for some years. The current audits in progress include a performance audit into Country Health SA hospital sites maintenance, the Darlington Upgrade and Flinders Link projects, the use of credit cards in local government, and a performance audit has just begun into the Building Better Schools program.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is the Auditor-General currently examining the use of government or ministerial credit cards?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sorry, what was that?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Does the Auditor-General intend or is the Auditor-General—does, is, has—intending to examine the use of government credit cards or ministerial credit cards as distinct from local government?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There is nothing specific envisaged there, but of course the Auditor-General's responsibilities and scope include that in the normal course of his activities.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Does the Auditor-General ever examine or compare his analysis of government credit cards with what is publicly disclosed under the proactive disclosure arrangement?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No specific investigation has been made.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Sure, but that was not the question. Does the Auditor-General ever refer to the proactive disclosures that are made under the relevant Premier's circular in relation to his examination of government credit cards?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I refer to my previous answer.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has the Auditor-General ever looked at proactive disclosures that are made?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised no.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is the Auditor-General's agency subject to the across-government requirement of operating efficiencies? If so, what will the impact be—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Could you start that question again?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Certainly. Is the Auditor-General's agency or office subject to the across-government requirement regarding operating efficiencies?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that there has not been a budget savings task requirement requested of the Auditor-General's Department.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has there been any impact on the Auditor-General's budget through savings measures or indeed has there been the requisite growth in the Auditor-General's budget line that he feels necessary to be able to do his job?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think the budget actually shows an increase in the budget allocated to the office of the Auditor-General.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Sure, but does the Auditor-General believe that that is sufficient for him to be able to perform his functions?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is the budget that is presented.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But I am asking—

The CHAIR: Leader, excuse me, can you just confirm you are still on the same budget line when asking questions?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes.

The CHAIR: I might just ask the Premier to speak up a little bit or bring your microphone a little bit closer, please.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The problem is that the microphone is on the entire time, so sometimes when I am discussing, it is actually amplifying around the room.

The CHAIR: Yes, but we need to hear your answers, Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Absolutely; I will be more audible.

The CHAIR: Leader, could you repeat the question please on the same budget line, which is page 68, I think?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The Premier responded by saying that is the budget. I am conscious of that, but does the Auditor-General believe that the budget line is sufficient for him to be able to perform his functions, in his view?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I refer you to my previous answer.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What was that again because I could not hear you either?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is the budget that is provided. This is not a committee to ask personal opinions. The budget is an increase to the Auditor-General's Department, as provided by the previous government.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has the Auditor-General made any representations to you regarding the budget allocation?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Not to me, no.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What procurements have attracted the attention of the Auditor-General during the course of the last financial year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Auditor-General informs me that a huge number of audits are conducted over the course of a 12-month process and all those details will be contained within the Auditor-General's annual report, which will be handed down in October.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I will be more specific then for the benefit of you and the Auditor-General: was the travel services contract awarded to QBT examined or analysed by the Auditor-General?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised no.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: And the KordaMentha contract awarded by SA Health via what I understand to be a direct approach?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not sure what the value is of going through a whole list of things. The Auditor-General hands down his report in October. There are hundreds of individual audits that are conducted—probably thousands—over the course of a 12-month period.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am aware of that. I am just asking about—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The normal course is for those to be not pre-empted but reported in the annual report, which is handed to the parliament in October.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Sure, but I am asking now: was the KordaMentha report—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am just telling you now that the normal course in this parliament is for all of that detail to be tabled in this parliament and published in the October annual report.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So are you willing to answer that question?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not know. You were going to list off a whole number—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No, just two.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sorry, for QBT, we have said that there was no specific audit.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: And in regard to KordaMentha?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that, yes, the contract with KordaMentha is something that the Auditor-General is looking at.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Looking at or has looked at?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is still in progress.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Excellent; that is good. How does the Auditor-General fund the audits of government agencies? Is there a specific levy or charge that is applied to agencies in order to recover the cost of an audit.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There is a charge that is made to individual departments, so that money comes into the Auditor-General's Department. You will see that on the income line, which is on page 69.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My last question is regarding the Auditor-General's component of this timeslot. How does the Auditor-General go about selecting which agencies they will prioritise for audit and which agency might be subject to a far more extensive examination versus others? I am just

trying to understand how those decisions are made or what criteria are applied to exercise that judgement.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Auditor-General informs me that he uses a risk-based methodology for determining what areas he concentrates on. It is ostensibly the same methodology that has been used by the Auditor-General's Department for an extended period of time. There will be some routine audits and other audits that are specific to areas that may have attracted his interest.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The new approach for the approval of government advertising is that it is now approved by a new committee made up of political appointments and the Treasurer, as distinct from the previous PCAG committee, which was made up of independent public servants. Is the Auditor-General satisfied that this change is appropriate and that the current system for approving government advertising is appropriate?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am informed by the Auditor-General that he has not looked at that issue.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: And determined what?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: He has not looked at that issue.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Does the Auditor-General have an opinion about those changes, in terms of the approval of government advertising?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This is not a forum for determining people's personal opinions.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am interested. This is a forum for me to ask questions, and I am asking one. Does the Auditor-General have a view about that?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Auditor-General has not done an investigation. The Auditor-General might look at it in the future, and if he does, then that will be published.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has the Auditor-General expressed a view about the appropriateness of the new arrangement regarding the approval of government advertising?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sorry, what was that again?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has the Auditor-General expressed an opinion or a view about the appropriateness of government advertising being approved by, essentially, political appointees.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: First of all, I do not accept the premise of your question and the assertion that you are making. Let's be quite clear: the PCAG did have political staffers on it as well, which is completely different from what you have just informed this committee. Secondly, I have already answered the—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I said 'a majority'.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sorry?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I used the term 'a majority'.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, there were political staffers on the PCAG and there are new arrangements with regard to the GCAC. As I have made very clear, the Auditor-General has not looked at that, but he is completely open to looking at that process. If he does, that will be reported in the ordinary course of affairs.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I have no further questions regarding the Auditor-General's Department.

The CHAIR: Are there any questions from the government side in relation to the Auditor-General's Department? If not, there being no further questions, I declare the examination of the proposed payments for the Auditor-General's Department to be completed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE PREMIER AND CABINET, \$270,551,000
ADMINISTERED ITEMS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE PREMIER AND CABINET,
\$9,061,000

Minister:

Hon. S.S. Marshall, Premier.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr J. McDowell, Chief Executive, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Mr S. Woolhouse, Executive Director, Communities and Corporate, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Ms E. Balan-Vnuk, Executive Director, ICT and Digital Government, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

The CHAIR: I declare the proposed payments open for examination. Premier, we are examining the estimate of payments in relation to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and also Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. I invite you to introduce your advisers and make a statement if you wish.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. The advisers who join me now are Mr Jim McDowell, who is the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet; Steven Woolhouse, who is the Executive Director, Communities and Corporate; and Eva Balan-Vnuk, who is the Executive Director, ICT and Digital Government.

The CHAIR: Premier, are you happy to take questions now?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, thank you.

The CHAIR: The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My questions start with Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 18, under program 1, and I will stick with that theme for some time. Premier, the system for approving government advertising was previously, as you described, PCAG. It was a committee that had an overall majority of public servants; in fact, my advice is that it had one political appointee. Why was that scrapped in favour of a system where the final decision on a major advertising campaign is now taken by a committee made up of the Treasurer and a majority of political appointees?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We formed the opinion that that was the best methodology to determine what government advertising was going forward. As you would be more than aware, we have a significantly lower budget for government advertising. We have new guidelines that we have put in place, and we are satisfied that we have the appropriate governance structure in place.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Who is on GCAC?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have those details with me, but I am more than happy to provide them.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Are you able to seek advice from your staff present about who is on GCAC, or do they not know either?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is actually an item administered by the Treasurer, not by the Premier. This is a good question for you to ask in the other chamber. As I said, I am happy to ask that question of the Treasurer, but it is not my responsibility.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is DPC responsible for Premier and Cabinet communications?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is DPC responsible for government advertising?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have just outlined that. I could go through it again if you would like. We have a budget line that coordinates government advertising, which is coordinated within DPC, but the governing body, which is the GCAC, is chaired by the Treasurer. It is the Treasurer's responsibility. If you have questions regarding that, it would be good to direct them to him.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So DPC has a budget line that is responsible for government communications, but it has no responsibility for government communications; is that what you are trying to explain?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What I am advised is that DPC has a communications budget that really is a fraction of what it was previously under the previous government's arrangement. Those government communications were centralised within DPC. Under the current arrangements, that is quite different. Although there is a communications budget within DPC, it is mainly used to run DPC's own communications website, and so on and so forth. We do also provide the secretarial services to the GCAC, but that is actually chaired by the Treasurer and he takes responsibility for overall government advertising.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: It sounds a little inconsistent with your previous answer if DPC is providing secretarial services for something that you do not have responsibility for, nevertheless. Has the government conducted any evaluation or research regarding the performance of the state government?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sorry?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has the government, your government, conducted any research regarding the performance of the state government in terms of any opinions of South Australians?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am certainly not aware of any research that has been conducted.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But has any been conducted?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, if I am not aware of it, it is difficult to report it.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Can you avail yourself of that information today?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not aware of any instances where that has occurred. If you have some information, perhaps you could provide it to the committee.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am asking questions; I am hoping that you have the answers to them.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have any information regarding that.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has there been any evaluation of how South Australians have received last month's state budget?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, not that we are aware of.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has the government conducted any polling regarding this year's state budget?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am happy to make an investigation if the department has done any work in that area, but I am certainly not aware of it whatsoever.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Have you done any focus group research regarding this year's state budget?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I just refer you to my previous answer—whether it is a focus group or research, I am not aware of any.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: With respect to DPC providing and overseeing the work of GCAC, would you expect DPC and yourself being aware of what is being approved in GCAC regarding research on the government's performance or, more specifically, this year's state budget?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, the GCAC might have done some research looking at the effectiveness of individual campaigns, but that would be a matter for the Treasurer, not for me.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Why not for you?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is not something that we have done within DPC. We do not have a budget line for it, and it is just not something I am aware about.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So you do not have a budget line for communications and research?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: For DPC, but that is for the overall DPC communication. I presume GCAC will have a methodology for determining the effectiveness of individual advertising campaigns. I would hope that they would, but that is not something that is administered by DPC.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Do you employ Ashton Hurn?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: She is employed within my office, yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Do you employ Paul Armanas?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, he is an employee of my ministerial office.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Do you employ Belinda Heggen?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Are those three people on GCAC?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that information. I could find out. We can find out.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That would be good.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We are just looking at it now. It is on the website.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thank you. As soon as that information comes to light, I would be interested in hearing it.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I find it difficult to understand that you would not have access to that information already.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Well, I am astounded that you do not. They are your employees. I do not employ them: you do. You are surprised that I do not know. In fact, you employ them and you do not know.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Let's be very—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That is extraordinary.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Let's be quite clear—

The CHAIR: Order! The Premier actually has the call at the moment.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Let's be very clear: the GCAC is not my responsibility.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But you employ these people. They are your staff—

The CHAIR: Leader of the Opposition—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: —and you are suggesting that I should know what your staff are doing.

The CHAIR: Leader of the Opposition, order!

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I will let you know what they are having for lunch.

The CHAIR: Leader, order! I would like to keep this process civil.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So would I.

The CHAIR: We ask a question and we receive an answer; that is the way it works. Premier, have you finished your answer to that previous question?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Absolutely.

The CHAIR: Leader of the Opposition.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Well, he has not because he has said that he is going to get the answer for us.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Mr Chairman, I am informed that Belinda Heggen, Paul Armanas, Ashton Hurn, Jihad Ali and Rachel Walsh are on the GCAC.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Who employs Jihad—sorry, I did not catch his last name.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Ali.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: And someone Walsh?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Rachel Walsh.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Who employs both of those people?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This is all generally available information, but Jihad Ali is employed by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and Rachel Walsh is employed within Renewal SA.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So there are five members of GCAC and four out of five are employed by either you or DPC, and you are telling me that GCAC is not the responsibility of DPC.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sorry?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Four out of five people on DPC are either your direct employees or an employee of DPC, and you are telling me that you do not think they are the responsibility of DPC.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We provide the secretarial services. I have been through this and I have nothing further to add.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Are you aware of what those four people, who are your employees, approve on GCAC or get information for?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Again, I just suggest that you actually direct these questions to the Treasurer, who has responsibility for the GCAC.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But why would I ask the Treasurer when the Treasurer does not employ anybody on GCAC?

The CHAIR: Leader of the Opposition, there is a point of order from the member for Heysen.

Mr TEAGUE: Standing order 268, paragraph 2, allows for examination of proposed line items of expenditure. The leader has referred to program 1 on page 18 and he has then proceeded to go down a path. I am starting to struggle with the particular proposed item of spending to which he has referred, particularly in the last run of questions. I would be grateful for some greater level of precision around what line item he has proceeded to.

The CHAIR: I understand the point of order you are making, member for Heysen. However, I am not going to uphold it at this stage because program 1 relates to Premier and Cabinet policy and support, so I think at this stage at least the questions are within that scope.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Indeed.

The CHAIR: But I am going to remind the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier to try to keep this discourse civil.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am keen to.

The CHAIR: Excellent. Your call.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thanks, Mr Chair. Does the Premier receive any reports from GCAC or his department regarding any evaluation or research that is conducted regarding the performance of the state government, more specifically in regard to the state budget?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have not sought or received that information, but the GCAC themselves could do that evaluation. I am informed that evaluation of government campaigns has occurred in the past and is likely to be occurring on all government advertising expenditure.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Just for the sake of clarity, I am going to ask about the focus groups again. Have focus groups been conducted over the past 12 months, or are there plans for focus groups to be conducted over the coming 12 months?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I have said in my previous answers, there is nothing that I am aware of and, if GCAC is doing some, that is a question for the Treasurer.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Are you able to take on notice whether or not focus groups have been conducted by the government over the last 12 months?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have provided an answer. That is something you can direct to the Treasurer. He may have done that via his chairmanship of the GCAC.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But I am directing it to you as the employer, as the agency that I am advised is responsible for GCAC and certainly is indeed the agency that employs four out of five people who are on GCAC.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I refer the Leader of the Opposition to my previous answer on this.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So you are not willing to let us know whether or not focus groups are being conducted?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I refer the Leader of the Opposition to previous answers I have provided.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Okay, so you are not. Did the Premier or his office work with the Liberal Party regarding the coordination or the organisation of the robocalls that South Australians received at 5.30 this morning and other obscure times, inquiring about the direction of the state government?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not sure what you are referring to.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: You are not aware that robocalls went out by the Liberal Party at obscure hours of the morning regarding the performance of the state government?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not sure what that has to do with the office of the Premier. I am not sure what line item you are referring to. If there is a question regarding a Liberal Party or a Labor Party or a Greens matter, that is a matter for those parties, not for me.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: You have nothing to do with that?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have provided my answer to the committee.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has the Premier or his office had any communications with the South Australian Liberal Party regarding the robocalls that went out at obscure hours of the morning asking people about the performance of the state government?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I refer you to my previous answer.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What was that again?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This is a matter for a political party. If they are doing research, it has nothing to do with the office of the Premier.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That is what I am asking you, though. Did you or your office have any communications with the Liberal Party regarding those robocalls?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have certainly had no discussions. As I said, this is a matter for a political party. It is not a matter for me. There is no budget line. I have no idea how you think this would be relevant and within scope for the state budget examination.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Because you are responsible for Department of the Premier and Cabinet communications and communications regarding the government. If there are robocalls going out to the South Australian community at obscure hours of the day asking questions about the performance of the state government, it is entirely reasonable to assume that those questions are being organised in concert with you and your staff.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I just make the very clear point that we do not run the Liberal Party out of the Premier's office, unlike what we have seen recently with the Leader of the Opposition using state taxpayer dollars to fund campaigns that were essentially authorised by the Labor Party in South Australia. That is not something we would do, and I think the questioning really indicates more about the way the opposition operates than the way the government operates.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Again, I ask the question: does anyone in your office—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have provided my answer to the committee.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: You have not answered the question, though.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have provided my answer to the committee.

The CHAIR: Leader and all committee members, when ministers or the Premier are asked a question, they answer it the way they see fit. If you are not able to get the answer you want, then it is probably time to move on.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: It is not so much about the answer I want as distinct from an answer.

The CHAIR: Well, the answer you are looking for—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I will ask a different question then, Chair. Did anyone in the Premier's office view or review or approve the script for the robocalls that were conducted at obscure hours of the day?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This is not a matter for examination here. It is not a matter that is run out of the Premier's office—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That is not for you to determine.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is not a matter that is run out of the Premier's office. If the leader has specific questions regarding individual political parties' research or expenditure in any way, then I suggest the Leader of the Opposition directs those questions to the relevant organisation and not to me during the state budget examination in the South Australian parliament.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Was the decision to undertake the robocalls driven by the results of evaluations carried out on the government's budget, in particular the backlash regarding privatisation or land tax?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have no further comment regarding this current line of questioning. I have made it very clear this is not an issue for examination here within this committee.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I will move on because clearly the Premier knows nothing about anything to do with the Liberal Party.

The CHAIR: Just move on, leader.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I might start with the objectives of your agency outlined on page 12 of Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, where it states:

The Department of the Premier and Cabinet delivers specialist policy advice to the Premier and ministers and supports the Cabinet process.

Premier, when you were leader of the Liberal Party in opposition, you stated that your government would not have a privatisation agenda. When you decided to abandon that position and embrace the privatisation of essential services, such as the trains and the trams, did you seek advice from your agency regarding that?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I completely reject the premise of the question. It is not an issue which is related to expenditure in my area. The issue regarding the train and tram network is a matter for another minister and has nothing to do with me. It has nothing to do with the expenditure that sits within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The largest privatisation that has been embarked upon by this state, by some estimations since the sale of ETSA, has nothing to do with you? Are you not the Premier of the state?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am the Premier of the state. Let's make it very clear: we stand by decisions that have been made in cabinet, but it is not a matter that is discussed within DPC.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has DPC provided any advice to the cabinet or you regarding the privatisation of trains and trams?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The cabinet processes that exist provide that all cabinet decisions are subject to comments by individual departments that are sent to the cabinet for ultimate consideration.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In my experience, DPC does have the capacity to formulate its own opinions, often informed by the advice of other departments, and does indeed formulate strategic advice, as is outlined in the budget paper. Did that occur in regard to what is, I think, undoubtedly a very significant policy decision regarding privatisation?

Mr TEAGUE: For the benefit of the committee—

The CHAIR: Do you have a point of order, member for Heysen?

Mr TEAGUE: For the benefit of the committee—I might be the slowest one in the room—I have heard a reference to page 12, I think, of Budget Paper 4, Volume 4. I cannot see a line item. I am as interested as anyone else on the committee to consider line items in this series of schedules. I would be assisted if the leader might identify the line item and direct with some greater precision a question to that line item.

The CHAIR: Member for Heysen, we are discussing the objectives listed on page 12. The second paragraph of that page suggests:

The department leads the implementation of South Australia's strategic priorities and policy commitments in the areas of economic and social development...

And it goes on. I guess the questions relate in a broad sense to that context. I take your point about individual budget lines. We seem to be having questions about policy rather than expenditure, which ultimately is the role of this committee.

Mr TEAGUE: I am guessing, too. I share your sentiment. I am left guessing, so I maintain the previous point of order.

The CHAIR: Is the point of order relevance? I am putting words in your mouth. Member for Heysen, I appreciate your concern as to the function of this committee, but I am happy with the leader's questions at this stage, bearing in mind that ultimately he will get back to individual expenditure lines, I am sure.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I asked the Premier a question about the strategic advice that DPC provided in regard to its view on the privatisation of trains and trams—as I said, what is universally accepted as a significant policy decision.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I have already provided to the committee, each government agency is afforded the opportunity to have input into all cabinet papers. This is submitted via the Cabinet Office, and that information and advice are made available to all cabinet ministers as they make their deliberations regarding government decisions. However, we will not be talking about individual advice from departments that go through the cabinet process, and I cannot imagine that the Leader of the Opposition, as a former cabinet minister, would think that we would provide that information to this committee.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No, but that is not what I am asking. That was a useful statement of what is well known. What am asking the Premier is: what advice was provided by DPC, an agency for which he is responsible, regarding the very significant strategic policy decision to privatise the trains and trams?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The point that I just made was that that advice, like every other government department's advice, is received by cabinet in confidence.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has DPC provided you advice regarding the privatisation of trains and trams?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, if advice was provided, it was provided to cabinet and it was provided in confidence, in accordance with the practices of the South Australian government.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Did DPC conduct its own analysis outside of the cabinet process for the purposes of providing you, personally, with strategic advice regarding the train and tram privatisation experience, when looking at other jurisdictions globally?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We make cabinet decisions, and that advice would have been provided to cabinet, if there was advice. It would have been exactly the same process for all government departments that would have input into all cabinet decisions.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: On Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 19, regarding the agency's allocation for supplies and services, is that the allocation from which the consultancy fees were paid to Mr Wayne Eagleson?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is most likely. We can check, but we think that is most likely.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Are you happy to take that on notice?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, we will take that on notice.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Did Mr Eagleson provide any advice regarding the privatisation of key public services, such as trains and trams?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Not that I am aware of.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Did Mr Eagleson provide any advice regarding privatising?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, not that I am aware of.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Did Mr Eagleson provide any advice regarding outsourcing?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, not that I am aware of.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Did the Premier seek any advice from the former Victorian premier, Jeff Kennett, regarding the privatisation of trams and trains?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Did DPC conduct or develop any advice, whether it be through Mr Eagleson or through another source, regarding the changes to land tax that have been proposed in this year's state budget?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Not that I am aware of.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Did DPC conduct any analysis at all regarding land tax changes?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Only as per my previous answers. The DPC, like all government departments, has input into cabinet deliberations. Obviously, there was a Budget Cabinet Committee. Like every department, DPC has input, but that is obviously confidential.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How did the Premier formulate his view on the decision regarding land tax?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is a consideration that was made within my role as a member of the Budget Cabinet Committee and as a member of the cabinet. As such, it remains confidential.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I might move on to another line, Mr Chairman, as I am conscious of the time.

The CHAIR: The session is due to go until 10.45, but probably somewhere in that last 10 minutes we will look to read the omnibus questions.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In that context, Mr Chair, I might just skip over a few things. On Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 18, highlights, point 5 in respect of the Economic Advisory Council, which

provides strategic advice on policy designed to stimulate the economy and jobs growth, could the Premier explain his understanding of what the Economic Advisory Council does?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Economic Advisory Council provides confidential advice to me as the Premier on the direction of the state and on various opportunities that come up for our consideration. It has now been operating pretty much since we formed government and I have been very satisfied with the six members we have on that council.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Excellent. Was the Economic Advisory Council's view sought on the proposal to privatise a key public service in regard specifically to trams and trains?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Why not?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, the Economic Advisory Council is mainly focused on economic growth in South Australia, not with the provision of individual government services and whether or not we are getting best taxpayer bang for buck. That is not really within the scope of the Economic Advisory Council.

That said, individual members can feel free to contact me if they have opinions on issues that are outside scope; sometimes that may occur. I cannot think of any specific instances at the moment. Certainly none contacted me on the issue that you raise. They certainly would not be prevented from doing that. That sort of issue or decision of government would seem to me to be outside the scope of the Economic Advisory Council.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Does the Premier think that public transport is actually important in terms of the economy?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Absolutely.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Why would the Premier not seek the advice of the Economic Advisory Council?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I provided an answer to that and I have nothing further to add.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But if public transport can be an important driver in terms of the economy, why would such a very significant decision not necessarily be improved if it had the advice of an esteemed council like the Economic Advisory Council?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have provided an answer. I can provide further detail if the leader requires it. Public transport is important for our economy, but how the service is actually provided is just outside the scope of the Economic Advisory Council.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How often does the Economic Advisory Council meet?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have the exact schedule in front of me, but I think it would probably be around every six weeks.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Are decisions that are being made by the government or being contemplated by the government ever referred to the Economic Advisory Council?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I cannot think of a specific example, but in our confidential discussions I canvass various issues of economic growth with them. As I said, I have been extraordinarily satisfied with the responses that I have received. It is a confidential environment. The members of the Economic Advisory Council do not receive any remuneration for the work they do; there are no board sitting fees paid to these members. It is a six-person group. I have just been advised that it meets between eight and 10 times per year.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thank you. I would like to acknowledge the work that the Economic Advisory Council does on an unremunerated basis. There are some good people on that council.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I would point out, though, that we do give them breakfast at 7 o'clock in the morning, so it is not without some benefits. Sometimes those croissants are quite welcome at 7am.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: On the decision of the government to dramatically accelerate the growth in state debt to unprecedented record levels, was any advice sought or given by the Economic Advisory Council about that long-term economic decision?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There was nothing that was specifically sought.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Why not? Would a group as esteemed as that not be a good place to seek a view about such a significant long-term state decision?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is just a different format from the previous government, where they might have sent a referral to the Economic Advisory Board, and then the Economic Advisory Board would have resources to conduct an investigation or commission research and that would come back via the Economic Development Board to the government. It is just a different make-up, a different scope.

It meets eight to 10 times per year for two hours, seven to nine. I do contact members between meetings, but again it is more advice of a general nature, rather than specific investigations. I must say, though, that I have discussed the budget with the Economic Advisory Council. Certainly, nobody raised with me any concern whatsoever with regard to the increased debt level. I do appreciate that it is an increase.

As I have outlined to the parliament before, I think it is an investment to develop the productive infrastructure and other infrastructure of our state, and we are doing it at a time when we have lowest interest rate environments for an extraordinarily long period of time. We got the most recent debt that the state government signed up for at a cost of 1.66 per cent, and since then I think there has been a 50 basis point reduction, so if there is ever a time to invest in productive infrastructure now is the time.

I note that the rating agencies have looked at this. Their initial feedback to the government has certainly not raised any concerns. Ultimately, they will determine a final position sometime later this year or early next year, but if they do have concerns, often rating agencies will put a rating that they have on watch, and this was not the case after the budget was handed down. Quite frankly, the debt increase that we put in place was pretty much mirrored in most other jurisdictions in Australia for budgets that had been handed down in the last six months.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I remain conscious of time, Mr Chairman, so I may come back to that in due course if time permits. Regarding Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 18, and referring to DPC and the Premier's responsibility for leading the development of Lot Fourteen and associated areas, how much physical space has been set aside at Lot Fourteen for the resoundingly good news that the Australian Space Agency is going to be headquartered in Adelaide?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Australian Space Agency will be incorporated into the McEwin Building redevelopment, I think at level 2. With regard to the exact square metreage, I am happy to take that question on notice and come back. The McEwin Building will also house the SmartSat Cooperative Research Centre, as well as other tenants.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Excellent, thank you for that. When will the Australian Space Agency move in, if they have not already?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Australian Space Agency has been established, and my understanding is that they do have offices now in South Australia and that they are proceeding to recruit key staff. My understanding is that the new premises within the McEwin Building will be ready before the end of this year.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: A media release from December last year states: 'The Australian Space Agency will be located in Adelaide by mid-2019 and is set to employ 20 full-time equivalent staff.' Has that not occurred?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Of course, this is not the responsibility of DPC. This is a federal government agency. As I previously advised, they opened an office in Adelaide, which is currently in Franklin Street. Once the refurbishment of the McEwin Building is complete, which I am advised will be before the end of this year, they will relocate into that new facility. As to how many people are currently employed, I am not sure, but currently the Director, Dr Megan Clark, is in Adelaide on a

very regular basis. My understanding is that the Deputy Director, Anthony Murfett, now lives in Adelaide and that other staff have been recruited.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Have you been advised whether or not the commonwealth still intends to meet its commitment to move or have 20 full-time equivalent staff and the office being headquartered here?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have outlined the position regarding the headquartering; there is no movement in that. As to the existing number of staff, are you asking how many currently exist or whether the budget has been provided for that?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Both.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The budget has certainly been provided; that was in the most recent commonwealth budget. As to how they are going with their recruitment, I am not aware of that situation at the moment.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: When would you expect those people to be employed and based in Adelaide?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I would like them to be employed and based in Adelaide as soon as possible, but it is not really my responsibility, nor that of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. The budget has been allocated. In addition to what I have already reported with regard to the McEwin Building, subsequent to the original announcement that the headquarters would be based in South Australia, we have also been able to secure mission control and the Space Discovery Centre for South Australia. I am informed that in the initial phase, the Space Discovery Centre will also be housed within the McEwin Building on North Terrace.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Will the chief executive, Dr Megan Clark, be based full-time in Adelaide?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not know that. As you can appreciate, despite the fact that the headquarters will be here, there is still a huge amount of work in other jurisdictions. It is not as though the entire space program will be based in South Australia. The headquarters will be based here, but there are very significant nodes in all states, and obviously the minister response is based in Canberra. I have virtually weekly interactions with Dr Clark, but as to where she is ultimately going to be based I am not sure.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Would the CEO not be headquartered at the headquarters?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, I just do not have information on where she will be residing, but she is here on a very regular basis.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Sorry, I am just trying to understand that—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I know that the Leader of the Opposition is trying to look for a negative in South Australia being awarded the headquarters for the Australian Space Agency—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Absolutely not. I am just trying to understand that—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —but if he had been following this issue, he would understand that the space program the federal government has put in place has significant nodes right around the entire country. The entire program is not based in South Australia—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: It is headquartered here.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not know who is answering this question, sir. Usually—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Not you.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —there is some courtesy afforded to the Premier when he is addressing the committee Chair. I would like to proceed without being interrupted, if possible.

The CHAIR: Certainly, Premier. Continue.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have tried to provide very short answers, compared to any of the previous formations of this committee I had to endure over five years, when the premier would

tee off for a 17-minute answer to a simple question. I have tried to provide very short answers to give the Leader of the Opposition the maximum time to ask any questions, but this is actually a really important issue.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I agree.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Winning the ability to host the headquarters in South Australia was extraordinarily important for us in terms of international positioning. We are already seeing some of the benefits, but it does not mean that the entire space operation of the federal government will be located in South Australia. That is understood by everybody who has been following this issue. We will of course be augmenting what the Australian Space Agency does here in South Australia with the continuation of programs offered by Defence SA and SASIC, the South Australian space industry council, as I think it is referred to. I will find out the exact name and correct it if I have it wrong.

We are providing a huge amount of support to augment what the Australian Space Agency is doing in South Australia. As I said, that is already being picked up internationally. On a recent trip overseas, I had the opportunity to meet with people and talk to them about what we are doing in space, and it is garnering so much international interest, which is no doubt going to translate into increased investment in South Australia.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has the Premier ever sought to establish whether or not the Chief Executive of the Australian Space Agency will be headquartered at the headquarters?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sorry, what was the question? I did not hear the question; I was talking to the chief executive.

The CHAIR: Could you repeat the question, please.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Sure. It is a straight-up, simple question. Has the Premier ever established whether or not the Chief Executive of the Australian Space Agency will be based at the headquarters?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, I have not sought that.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That is extraordinary. Let's go on to a separate matter regarding the next budget line in Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 18, program 1, regarding the coordination of cross-government policy. My question relates to DPC's tender No. DPC043234, titled Travel Management Services, released in April 2018, resulting in a change of provider from early 2019.

When asked about the tender in this house on 27 February this year and whether he was aware that Helloworld subsidiary QBT travel had lodged a bid for the contract when the Premier opened the Helloworld conference on 11 May, the Premier said that he 'wasn't aware that there was a link between Helloworld and QBT' and, further, that he was 'not even aware that there was a process underway at that point in time'. Did the Premier meet with QBT and Helloworld's chief executive officer, Mr Andrew Burnes, prior to the 11 May event?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What was the 11 May event, sorry?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am advised that the 11 May event was a conference that the Premier himself attended.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Your question is whether I had ever met Andrew Burnes prior to opening the conference in Adelaide. The answer to that is yes, but I do not recall when.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In your time as Premier?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Again, I do not recall. I just do not recall when.

Mr TEAGUE: Mr Chair, I seek the call. It seems as though the Leader of the Opposition has shifted to a new topic. I wonder whether I might ask a question on the previous topic of communications.

The CHAIR: You have a question. We are still on the Office for Digital Government, so I am sure that is in order. Are you seeking the call now?

Mr TEAGUE: No rush, but it seems that we are perhaps moving to another broad area.

The CHAIR: The portfolio is open, so you are able to ask the question at any time. Do you want to do it now?

Mr TEAGUE: I am happy to.

The CHAIR: Go for it.

Mr TEAGUE: Thank you, Mr Chair. Premier, we have had a number of questions about government communication activities. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, pages 19 and 20, where there is an explanation of significant movements and a note about the decrease in the 2018-19 estimated result. There is a reference to government communication activities and \$10 million, which I understand to be a reduction. How is that possible, and is that sustainable? Does it indicate any change of approach in terms of government spending on communications?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that under the previous government's arrangement an additional \$10 million was provided in the 2017-18 year, which just happened to coincide with the lead-up to the state election. In years prior to that, it was pretty much at reduced levels. We are very satisfied that the budget line we have for this will allow us to deliver on our requirements in this area. We do not see the need for anything like the money that the previous government spent on this area of so-called communications.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I refer back to the line of questions I was taking previously.

The CHAIR: Just for my benefit, can you refer to the page and budget line, please.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 18, program 1.

The CHAIR: Is there a dot point on there somewhere?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Sorry?

The CHAIR: Is there a dot point that you are referring to particularly?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No. I am just talking under the general umbrella of the objective of cross-government policy in respect of specific procurement undertaken by DPC. I referred earlier to the Premier's speaking at an 11 May conference, and the Premier's statement in this place when asked about that conference. Does the Premier recall meeting Mr Burnes on 18 April sometime prior to the conference on 11 May?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not recall that, but I am happy to make inquiries. I am advised, though, that the procurement process was one which was actually underway under the previous government.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Does the Premier recall, though, meeting Mr Burnes prior to the conference?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I have stated previously, I had met him, but I do not recall when. I just do not have those dates available to me at the moment, but I am happy to make an inquiry.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Our FOI documents indicate that the Premier met Mr Burnes on 18 April at 3.45pm and similarly received advice in the lead-up to that meeting. Does that ring any recollection with the Premier?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am certainly not denying it, but you asked me what date I had met him, and I said that I did not recall. However, you already have that information, so I do not think I will ask my department to go and find out what the date was; you already have it.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I was just asking whether you recall it. In another document obtained through freedom of information, dated 9 May 2018, a briefing prepared by the SATC in the lead-up to your speech, or your attendance—and, indeed, my advice is a speech—at an 11 May conference, states, 'I am advised that QBT is a subsidiary of Helloworld.' Did the Premier read and note that briefing?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is quite possible that I did, but I just do not have that information in front of me. To be clear, I get asked to speak at a lot of conferences in Adelaide, a lot of events in Adelaide. Departments present me with comprehensive briefings, as well as speeches. Whilst I do thank the public servants for preparing all that information, I would not like to swear on oath that I read every single paragraph in those comprehensive briefings.

From my recollection, it was an Australia-wide conference of employees and partners of Helloworld. It was a very large group. They came into Adelaide. They were here for two or three days. It had quite an impact upon our local economy—lots of famils—and my understanding or recollection from what I received from SATC is that it was important for me to be there because not only was this group going to make an impact whilst they were here but, of course, we wanted to showcase what we had to offer in South Australia so that, when they went back to their work, they would advocate for their clients to come to South Australia. This is why it was presented to me as something that I should attend. As I said, this is something I do on a pretty regular basis.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I might move on, Mr Chairman, to another set of questions, as I am conscious that I am running out of time. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 18, program 1, under the same heading. Who in DPC monitors compliance with the Premier and Cabinet Circular 35 regarding the proactive disclosure of regularly requested information?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that that monitoring is done by State Records, which sits within the Attorney-General's Department.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: State Records might record that information, but who monitors compliance?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have the circular in front of me. The reference that I have is that this is the responsibility of State Records and it is the Attorney-General's Department.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Are there any audits, regular or otherwise, to ensure that agencies are appropriately complying with proactive disclosure or do you just sort of let agencies monitor that themselves?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not aware of any specific audit that is undertaken.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Does that imply that agencies are largely left to their own devices to ensure compliance with the circular?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not aware of anybody not complying. There is a circular on this matter that was published in November 2016. I am not aware of any noncompliance. I am sure if there were noncompliance it would be reported and, if it was, it would be addressed.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Premier, in a recent FOI disclosure from your agency the table in a document received by the opposition provides totals for all agency budget lines for a particular trip; that was marked 'not for disclosure'. Why would that happen?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: You have not provided enough information. You have not mentioned what the FOI reference was and you have not mentioned what the trip was, so it is difficult to answer the question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That is okay; I will provide a bit of detail. The trip related to travel to the USA by you as the Premier, your chief of staff and an agency representative as part of G'Day USA events. There was a document marked 'not for disclosure' that was subsequently obtained by the opposition through FOI. Why would that be marked 'not for disclosure'?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Again, I just do not have the information in front of me. I am happy to make inquiries, but obviously you have it, so it was disclosed. We take all our reporting responsibilities very seriously and, to the best of my knowledge, we adhere with all the guidelines.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I will move on to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, program 1, page 18, regarding targets. What was the total cost of the Joyce review into international engagement?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will have to take that on notice, but I am very happy to provide it.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thank you. When three FTEs attached to the China strategy transferred from DPC to DTTI, how many of those individuals themselves actually remained in DPC? I am referring to page 14 of Budget Paper 4, Volume 4.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: My understanding is that the three members of that team were transferred to the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment in accordance with the recommendations from Joyce, but it was thought that some capability needed to be retained, and that was retained within intergovernmental affairs within DPC.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My last question in this area: is the French strategy team still part of DPC or has it moved?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, that is also in intergovernmental relations.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Regarding the same budget paper, my question relates to a statement made by the Premier on 31 January this year when he released the SA royal commission report into the implementation of the Murray-Darling Basin plan. Premier, you stated:

I will [also] write to the Prime Minister today to convene a meeting so that we can get the Chief Minister from the ACT, the premiers along the basin and the Prime Minister to consider the content of this report.

Has that meeting yet been held?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Did you get a response from the Prime Minister?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What did it say?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: A meeting has now been scheduled.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: When is it?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: From memory, I think it is 9 August.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is that as part of a general COAG meeting or is that a very specific meeting, as you sought?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, it will not be part of COAG because COAG includes the Northern Territory, Tasmania, and Western Australia, which are not subject to the Murray-Darling Basin Plan.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So we have a meeting in August that is consistent with the request you made of the Prime Minister?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes. I wrote to the Prime Minister, as you would recall, when we received the royal commission report. I then wrote to the Prime Minister again when he was confirmed as the continuing Prime Minister of Australia, I received correspondence back to suggest that the meeting would be convened, and 9 August is the date that it will be held.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Since the release of the royal commission report, have you followed up with any other premiers along the Murray-Darling Basin to discuss the issues contained within that report or are you waiting for the August meeting?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There are conversations that you have with other premiers and the Chief Minister of the ACT, but nothing formal. There have been informal discussions. This is a very important issue, and I am looking forward to the meeting that is going to be held on 9 August.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: On 31 January, you also stated that there was commentary within the report regarding the Murray-Darling Basin Plan and its adequacy and referred to conflicting legal opinions regarding the legality of the plan. Have you taken any steps to resolve that legal question from the perspective of the South Australian government?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We are currently formulating a response to the royal commission report; this will be considered in cabinet and we will be publishing a response to that. Obviously there are multiple departments involved in this: my department, the Department for

Environment and Water, and ultimately the royal commission is a responsibility in the budget line of the Attorney-General. Our response will be a response on behalf of the government, and that will be something considered by cabinet.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Apart from taking the action of writing a letter for a meeting in excess of six months after release of the report, have you done anything following the royal commission's report?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think I just outlined it in my previous answer; that is, at the moment we are formulating a whole-of-government response to the royal commission report. We are also taking into account many of the other reports, or some of the other reports, including the Australian Productivity Commission report and other reports into the Murray-Darling Basin Plan and its performance.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: When do you anticipate we will have the response to the royal commission report?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think that is something that the Cabinet Office is working on at the moment. I can provide an update, but I do not think it will be too long.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Because it has already been pretty long.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, it is a very important issue. It is not something that you just give a response to without careful consideration. This is a very important issue for our state and we will take the time to get the right response. We are looking forward to the meeting of the basin states and the ACT, which will be held on 9 August.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What are you going to advocate for at that meeting?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: First of all, we will be advocating for adherence to the plan. This is something that we have felt very strongly about for an extended period of time. As I have stated in this place, the problem with the original plan is that there was a lot of carrot and not much stick. We have to do everything we can to keep everybody at the table. We have to have everybody working towards delivery against the commitments they have made. I feel confident that we will meet our obligations. We have to make sure that all the other jurisdictions stay at the table.

Mr BROWN: I might read the omnibus questions now, Mr Chairman.

1. For each department and agency reporting to the minister:
 - What is the actual FTE count at 30 June 2019 and the projected actual FTE count for each year of the forward estimates?
 - What is the total employment cost for each year of the forward estimates?
 - What is the notional FTE job reduction target that has been agreed with Treasury for each year of the forward estimates?
 - Does the agency or department expect to meet the target in each year of the forward estimates?
 - How many TVSPs are estimated to be required to meet FTE reductions over the forward estimates?
2. Between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019, will the minister list the job title and total employment cost of each position with a total estimated cost of \$100,000 or more which has either (1) been abolished and (2) which has been created.
3. Will the minister provide a detailed breakdown of expenditure on consultants and contractors above \$10,000 between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019 for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, listing:

- the name of the consultant, contractor or service supplier;
 - cost;
 - work undertaken;
 - reason for engaging the contractor, and
 - method of appointment?
4. For each department and agency for which the minister has responsibility:
- How many FTEs were employed to provide communication and promotion activities in 2018-19 and what was their employment expense?
 - How many FTEs are budgeted to provide communication and promotion activities in 2019-20, 2020-21, 2021-22 and 2022-23 and what is their estimated employment expense?
 - The total cost of government-paid advertising, including campaigns, across all mediums in 2018-19 and budgeted cost for 2019-20.
5. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, please provide a full itemised breakdown of attraction and retention allowances as well as non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contracts between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019.
6. What is the title and total employment cost of each individual staff member in the minister's office as at 30 June 2019, including all departmental employees seconded to ministerial offices?
7. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, could you detail:
- (a) How much was spent on targeted voluntary separation packages in 2018-19?
 - (b) What department funded these TVSPs? (except for DTF Estimates)
 - (c) What number of TVSPs were funded?
 - (d) What is the budget for targeted voluntary separation packages for financial years included in the forward estimates (by year), and how are these packages funded?
 - (e) What is the breakdown per agency/branch of targeted voluntary separation packages for financial years included in the forward estimates (by year) by FTEs?
8. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, how many executive terminations have occurred since 1 July 2018 and what is the value of executive termination payments made?
9. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, what new executive appointments have been made since 1 July 2018, and what is the annual salary, and total employment cost for each position?
10. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, how many employees have been declared excess, how long has each employee been declared excess, and what is the salary of each excess employee?
11. In the 2018-19 financial year, for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, what underspending on operating programs (1) was and (2) was not approved by cabinet for carryover expenditure in 2019-20?
12. In the 2018-19 financial year, for all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, what underspending on investing or capital projects or programs (1) was and (2) was not approved by cabinet for carryover expenditure in 2019-20? How was much sought and how much was approved?
13. For each grant program or fund the minister is responsible for please provide the following information for 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21 and 2021-22 financial years:

- (a) Name of the program or fund;
- (b) The purpose of the program or fund;
- (c) Balance of the grant program or fund;
- (d) Budgeted (or actual) expenditure from the program or fund;
- (e) Budgeted (or actual) payments into the program or fund;
- (f) Carryovers into or from the program or fund; and
- (g) Details, including the value and beneficiary, of any commitments already made to be funded from the program or fund.

14. For the period of 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019, provide a breakdown of all grants paid by the department/agency that report to the minister, including when the payment was made to the recipient, and when the grant agreement was signed by both parties.

15. For each year of the forward estimates, please provide the name and budgeted expenditure across the 2019-20, 2020-21, 2021-22 and 2022-23 financial years for each individual investing expenditure project administered by or on behalf of all departments and agencies reporting to the minister.

16. For each year of the forward estimates, please provide the name and budget for each individual program administered by or on behalf of all departments and agencies reporting to the minister.

17. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, what is the total cost of machinery of government changes since 1 July 2018 and please provide a breakdown of those costs?

18. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, what new sections of your department or agency have been established since 1 July 2018 and what is their purpose?

19. For each department and agency reporting to the minister:
- What savings targets have been set for each year of the forward estimates?
 - What measures are you implementing to meet your savings target?
 - What is the estimated FTE impact of these measures?

The CHAIR: Thank you, member for Playford. For the committee's benefit, the Premier is appearing all day today and, if the Premier is happy, there is no need to read those omnibus questions in the next session or the one after. Are you happy with that, Premier?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, I am happy with that.

The CHAIR: Excellent. We are still within the Office of Digital Government, so if the opposition or the government have one or two further questions I am happy to take those, or we move on to the Productivity Commission or Infrastructure SA.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I would like to use the allocated time we have in this area, if that is alright, Mr Chairman.

The CHAIR: Yes, certainly. You have the call.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I would like to go back to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 18, regarding Lot Fourteen. Premier, the news of MIT is good news, but is there a written agreement with MIT regarding its positioning at Lot Fourteen?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What does that written agreement with MIT reference?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is an MOU that exists between the various stakeholders—the universities, MIT itself, Optus and BankSA. It is an MOU that is commercial in-confidence, but,

as I have publicly stated, the commercial partners have been very generous in providing support to enable MIT to establish the Living Lab in South Australia.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Apart from the MOU, is there anything more substantive at this point with MIT—that is, a lease or any documents or contracts that refer to other issues around IP and so forth—or is it just, at this point in time, an MOU?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that there are provisions in regard to IP in the MOU. I do not recall those specifically, without rereading that document. In regard to a lease, though, that would be something dealt with by Renewal SA. Again, I do not have that information, that Renewal SA report through to the Minister for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Was the company Stone and Chalk appointed by DPC?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, that contract was entered into by the Office of the Chief Entrepreneur, which sits within the Department for Innovation and Skills.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Sticking with Lot Fourteen—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This is one of the reasons why I took the coordination for Lot Fourteen into DPC—because so many different government departments had individual programs and they are funding them separately. It seemed more logical to have the coordination within my department.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In that context, are you able to inform the committee of the number of tenants we currently have at Lot Fourteen?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have some information that somebody prepared.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: While you are looking, I might just add a second component to that question. In terms of any of those leases that have been entered into, are any of them in any way, shape or form subsidised by the state, whether it be through incentives or rent reductions, that are inconsistent with what would be seen as a market rate?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that there are currently 19 tenants at Lot Fourteen. There are another 12 leases that are currently being finalised and there are many dozens more that are currently prospective. I am also advised that all current tenants are paying market rent.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How about incentives and other arrangements associated with those leases?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have any information on that. As I have stated, this is really an issue that sits within Renewal SA. But the advice that I have received, because I asked that question myself, is that all current tenants are paying market rent.

The CHAIR: Leader, I might just interrupt here. You are at liberty to continue, but my timetable suggests that we should close this one off and move to the Productivity Commission and Infrastructure SA.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: There are so many questions, Mr Chair.

The CHAIR: Of course, but we have limited time. One last question?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No, I am happy to move on to the Productivity Commission and Infrastructure SA.

The CHAIR: There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the proposed payments for the Office for Digital Government to be completed.

Membership:

Hon. A. Koutsantonis substituted for Mr Brown.

Hon. Z.L. Bettison substituted for Mr Szakacs.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr J. McDowell, Chief Executive, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Dr M. Butlin, Chair and Chief Executive, Office of the South Australian Productivity Commission.

Ms C. Bierbaum, Deputy Chief Executive, Office of the South Australian Productivity Commission.

Mr J. Conway, Chief Executive, Infrastructure SA.

The CHAIR: Premier, we are examining the Productivity Commission and Infrastructure SA. I invite you to introduce your advisers and make a statement if you wish.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I would like to introduce to the committee Dr Matthew Butlin, who is the Chair and Chief Executive of the South Australian Productivity Commission, and Christine Bierbaum, who is the Deputy Chief Executive. Also joining us here is Jeremy Conway, who is the Chief Executive of Infrastructure SA. Because we have only half an hour for the two, I am happy to move between the two. We do not have to have two discrete lots, if the leader would prefer.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In regard to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 32, I understand that the Productivity Commission has been relocated to DPC since the beginning of this year; is that right?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Can you say that again?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I understand that the responsibility for the Productivity Commission was moved to DPC at the beginning of this year; is that right?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: From the outset, it was established as an attached office to DPC under the Public Sector Act, but there has been no change subsequent to its original formation. It is just the way that it was originally.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How many times has the Premier met with the Productivity Commission?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that information. It has been on a reasonably regular basis, every couple of months, but I can provide specific detail on that.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: You will take that on notice?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Productivity Commissioner has suggested that it is approximately four times.

The CHAIR: Leader, before I give you the call, for the purpose of our records, the member for Playford has been discharged and the member for West Torrens has joined the committee.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Does the Premier meet with the Productivity Commission on a regular basis or is it as required?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is just as required, but I am informed by the Productivity Commissioner that we have another meeting coming up very soon.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Who decided the inquiries that the Productivity Commission is to undertake or, in the case of current or previous inquiries, has undertaken? Who makes that decision? Is it you, or is it the chair of the Productivity Commission? How does that work?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is by negotiation. It is a discussion that is held.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So the Premier quite reasonably seeks to make input into what the Productivity Commission inquires into and what it does not?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I essentially make the decision, but obviously I like to discuss that with the Productivity Commissioner before I make a decision as to what the likely benefit of any inquiry is going to be. An inquiry is an expensive exercise. We are very fortunate in South Australia to have Dr Matthew Butlin as our inaugural Productivity Commissioner. He has extensive experience

with the Australian Productivity Commission, the VCEC and also in his role as the commissioner for red-tape reduction in Victoria.

So, rather than just saying, 'This is what you are going to be investigating or what inquiries you are going to undertake,' we think it is prudent to have that discussion to see what the likely benefits of the inquiry are going to be because we have finite resources. We have increased those resources, but they still remain finite and we want to make sure that we get best value for the taxpayers of South Australia.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I understand the Productivity Commission has launched an inquiry into local government. How much money has been allocated to undertake this inquiry?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not sure the government allocates money to specific inquiries. What we do is provide an overall budget for the year. We were approached by the Productivity Commissioner to look to increase our budget for the SA Productivity Commission over and above what was originally envisaged so that we could undertake more inquiries. After consideration, cabinet agreed with that.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Did you discuss with the Productivity Commission chair your desire for a local government inquiry before you announced it?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Absolutely. In fact, it was something that we had discussed for a long period of time because the local government sector had made representations to me over many years that many of their costs and expenses were related to state government requirements. They assert that a lot of their costs are related to things they are required to do by the state and that many of those requirements consume great resources but do not deliver the requisite benefit, so we thought it was a good idea to take a look at this issue.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In a letter to the chair of the Productivity Commission, dated 13 May this year, you requested an inquiry into local government costs and stated that 'the rising cost of living has put undue pressure on South Australian households and businesses'. When you wrote that, were you aware then that you were going to increase the solid waste levy by 40 per cent?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that information in front of me, but they are two separate issues; they are not related. The inquiry is looking at issues where the local government sector have asserted, over a long period of time, that there is inordinate additional cost pushed onto them in terms of regulation put in place by the state government, not with regard to a specific levy.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But is the solid waste levy not an example of state government pushing something onto local government that has an impact on the cost of living?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is not a regulatory burden; it is actually a levy.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But for South Australians who are concerned about the rising cost of living putting undue pressure on South Australian households and businesses, surely a 40 per cent increase in the solid waste levy is a contributing factor to that?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, it is, but it does not relate to the budget lines that you are talking about. We are here to examine the state budget as it relates the Productivity Commission and Infrastructure SA. I do make the point that we are going to be expending the additional revenue that we receive from the increase of the solid waste levy on very important projects for this state.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes, I am sure the residents of outback South Australia, Whyalla, the South-East, Eyre Peninsula and Yorke Peninsula—

The CHAIR: Leader—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: —are very excited about the prospect of that money being spent on—

The CHAIR: —a question.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: The Premier raised the programs. He talked about them.

The CHAIR: Member for West Torrens, you do not have the call; the Leader of the Opposition has the call and he is about to ask a question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am very conscious, Mr Chair, that your constituents would be very excited about the sand at West Beach. Premier, is it not hypocritical to instruct the Productivity Commission to inquire about local government costs when this budget is actually slugging them with a \$90 million increase in costs?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think I have already answered that question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Premier, regarding the inquiry into the local government's terms of reference, you asked the Productivity Commission to provide recommendations on actions the South Australian government could take to lower government costs. Do you accept that increasing the solid waste levy by 40 per cent certainly does not lower local government costs?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have made my response to this: it does not relate to the Productivity Commission or Infrastructure SA, which is the area of examination the committee is currently supposed to be focused on.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But if the Productivity Commission is currently looking at the costs of local government, and that is a concern that your government has, why then would you impose the solid waste levy increase by 40 per cent?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have provided my response to the committee.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am just looking for consistency in government policy regarding local government, and the Productivity Commission is looking at local government.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: You are quite within your rights to pursue this, but not in this committee. That would be a good question for question time—much better than some of the questions you have been asking in recent performances.

The CHAIR: Leader, we have just 15 minutes left on the Productivity Commission and Infrastructure SA.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I refer to the same budget line on pages 32 and 33 regarding the reasons for an increasing cost in FTEs. Can the Premier detail the increase in resources for the Productivity Commission budgeted for 2019-20?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The increase is not so much an increase in unplanned costs, but a request was made to increase the resources so that we could undertake more inquiries than were originally envisaged. We think that this is a really important reform. It did not receive the support of the parliament, so we have established it in a format that was not our ideal scenario. We wanted to establish it under statute; that was not possible, so we have established it separately.

We have been very happy with the progress of the South Australian Productivity Commission to date. In a difficult budget environment, the Budget Cabinet Committee was persuaded to increase the resources that were originally envisaged for this attached office.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Does the Premier sit on that Budget Cabinet Committee regarding the budget?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, I am a member of the Budget Cabinet Committee. It does not mean that I attend every meeting, but I am a member of the Budget Cabinet Committee.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Would you attend the majority of those meetings?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have the attendance details in front of me.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: To the best of your recollection, would you attend the majority of those meetings?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Obviously, all important decisions are made ultimately by cabinet.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is it possible that you did not attend a majority of those meetings?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not really sure what budget line you are referring to.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am referring to your previous answer, when you referred to the Budget Cabinet Committee meetings.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, I am a member of that. I do not have my attendance records here, and I have nothing further to add.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So it is possible that you did not attend the majority of those meetings.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have provided an answer to the committee.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In relation to the Productivity Commission's inquiry into procurement and practices, will the Premier rule out outsourcing the management of procurement functions that are currently undertaken by state public authorities?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is not something I have contemplated. We have received the report, and I think that we will respond to the report early to mid next month.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has the Premier requested that any further investigations be conducted by the Productivity Commission outside the procurement inquiry and the local government inquiry?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There are two stages to the procurement: there was the original phase and the scope that was put in place in October last year, and that was expanded earlier this year to include capital items. That is a major variation to the original process. I think that we then announced the local government inquiry, and there will be others that we will announce in due course.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has the Productivity Commission provided any advice to the Premier in regard to the government's decision on privatisation of trains and trams?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Not that I am aware of.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Why not?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is outside the scope of what the Productivity Commission's advice to government is.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: If you are increasing the budget of the Productivity Commission and you decide what the Productivity Commission looks into, why would you not use the Productivity Commission to examine the very substantial cost that privatisation of trains and trams is going to have for the South Australian public?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not accept anything like the premise of that question. It is not something that we have asked the Productivity Commission to look at. As I have outlined to the committee before—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What premise do you not accept?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am the one who determines what the Productivity Commission looks at. I think that we have arrived at the right areas of focus where the Productivity Commission can add value.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: For context, the reason I ask the question is that you have the Productivity Commission and the Economic Advisory Council, two sources of independent advice on high-level strategic questions for government policy. If the government is making a decision about the privatisation of trains and trams—a very significant government policy decision—why would the Premier not seek advice from either of those independent sources of advice for such a significant decision for our state?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, cabinet seeks advice and receives advice from various areas before it makes its decision, and I am satisfied that cabinet gave due consideration to all issues that we have considered since coming to government. That advice is received in confidence in cabinet.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Did it ever cross the Premier's mind to ask the Productivity Commission, or for that matter the Economic Advisory Council, about train and tram privatisation?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have already answered the question with regard to the Economic Advisory Council, but with regard to the Productivity Commission, no, it did not cross my mind. I have already said that the major focus for us was starting with procurement and moving to local government. These were things that we had envisaged for some time and were within the resources of the South Australian Productivity Commission.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How many times have you met with Infrastructure SA? This relates to similar questions I was asking earlier. Do you meet with them regularly, or is it the same sort of approach that you use in regard to the Productivity Commission?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is similar. When you say 'meet with Infrastructure SA', there is a chair and there is a board. I have not met with the board. I have met with the chair on occasion, and they are undertaking their work at the moment to come up with their recommendations to government, which I understand will be received early in the new year.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I understand that Infrastructure SA looks at government projects with a budget of over \$50 million. Outside that criterion, does the Premier ever speak to Infrastructure SA about what it may or may not look into? When I say 'may or may not', I am not talking about providing permission. Would you ever say to Infrastructure SA, 'Can you please examine this project'?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think I am entitled to do that, but to date I cannot recall. If I thought that they were looking at projects and there were omissions, I feel that I could speak to the Infrastructure SA personnel, as anybody could, quite frankly. But they ultimately need to make their determination as to what they see as the priorities, and that will be received by the government next year and we will ultimately respond to that.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Have you ever had a conversation with Infrastructure SA regarding GlobeLink?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Not directly, but the government has already commissioned work separate because we wanted to kick this off much earlier than the establishment of Infrastructure SA. You would recall that Infrastructure SA, unlike the Productivity Commission, has been established under an act of this parliament. That took some time to go through, and we did not want to delay consideration of the GlobeLink project.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is the Productivity Commission established as an act under parliament?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is that what you just said?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: You did not support it.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No, that is not right; you withdrew it.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I know that is your interpretation of what occurred, but we were of the opinion that the parliament was not going to put it in a format that would suit the government. We thought that it would be ideal to have it operating under statute, but this was not going to occur.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am not sure on what basis the Premier formed that opinion. He certainly did not inquire that of me or my office. I did not realise that the Premier's expertise extends to mind-reading of the opposition. Regarding Infrastructure SA—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, the—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: —and GlobeLink—

The CHAIR: Order! The minister is going to respond to that comment, I think. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The opposition sought amendments that we did not think would suit the agenda of the government and, whilst those amendments were there, we thought we cannot continue to delay the establishment of the South Australian Productivity Commission. As I stated for

a long period of time whilst we were in opposition, we were really lacking organisations like Infrastructure SA and the Productivity Commission to provide independent advice to the government.

That is why we sought to have both these organisations enshrined under South Australian legislation, but we were not prepared to continually delay with amendments that we thought would not be in the best interests of the government or the state.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I welcome the Premier's recharacterisation of his earlier references both in this place and outside this place that the opposition did not support the legislative establishment of the Productivity Commission; that is simply not accurate. Regarding GlobeLink, I understand that the role of Infrastructure SA is to provide important long-term strategic advice to the state on infrastructure. How on earth does the Premier explain that that organisation would not examine GlobeLink, which is a central piece of his policy regarding infrastructure in this state?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I did not say that.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes, you did. My recollection (and we will get *Hansard* to check) is that you had not engaged Infrastructure SA for advice on GlobeLink.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: You asked whether I had spoken to Infrastructure SA about GlobeLink and I said no. That does not mean that Infrastructure SA is not going to have regard to GlobeLink.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has Infrastructure SA looked at GlobeLink?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that this is going to be considered as part of their strategy.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Okay, so now Infrastructure SA is looking at GlobeLink?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The government has already kicked off a separate investigation, but this will be incorporated into the work that Infrastructure SA provides in its report next year.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is Infrastructure SA doing its own piece of work on GlobeLink?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This will be considered as part of the Infrastructure SA 20-year strategy.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So you have two inquiries ongoing?

The CHAIR: Member for West Torrens—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Obviously, sir, there is—

The CHAIR: Premier, just before you go on, I want to clarify this: the leader has had the call and I am happy for him to continue asking questions. If other committee members want the call, they need to seek it. Member for West Torrens, do you have a question?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The leader has a question, sir.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: No, order! Member for West Torrens and member for Heysen, you will not interject across the chamber. We have 2½ minutes to go and the leader has the call.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I think it has been established that the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing in regard to GlobeLink, let alone the Premier. How about the Portrush and Magill roads project? Has Infrastructure SA provided advice to the government on that project?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Infrastructure SA has been established, and the vast majority of its work at the moment is the development of the 20-year infrastructure plan. It was never envisaged that this would be an organisation that we would send projects off to for a quick, 'What do you think of this?' type of evaluation.

Therefore, because this is a project that has already been announced, we are, as we have previously announced, in this hiatus between the development of the 20-year plan and the continuing

capital works of the government. But where Infrastructure SA will be involved in this project is the post-implementation review. That is a key component of the scope once that 20-year infrastructure plan is developed and delivered.

I know that this is a reform that the previous government opposed for a long period of time. In fact, my understanding is that we were the only jurisdiction in the country without an infrastructure body independent of government. The previous government liked to develop projects with less rigour, let's just say, and they were entitled to do so.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Like GlobeLink.

The CHAIR: Order!

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Like the long list that you are racking up.

The CHAIR: Order! The Premier is responding to the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They were entitled to do that, but we have a different arrangement.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Do you? That is what I am trying to understand.

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There is a period of time when I think any reasonably minded person would understand that to come up with a 20-year infrastructure plan there has to be extensive consultation and analysis. I have actually been very impressed by the time frame that Infrastructure SA has put forward for the development of the 20-year infrastructure plan—well done.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My question, Premier, then is—

The CHAIR: Leader, we will let the Premier finish and then I am going to call this session to a close.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: But there was always envisaged a period, which existed between coming to government and the determination of the plan, when we were not prepared to not push ahead with important infrastructure projects for the state, and that has been incorporated into our first two budgets.

The CHAIR: Having reached the allotted time, I declare the examination of proposed payments for the Productivity Commission and Infrastructure SA to be completed.

Sitting suspended from 11:16 to 11:30.

DEFENCE SA, \$20,249,000

Membership:

Mr Brown substituted for Hon. A. Koutsantonis.

Minister:

Hon. S.S. Marshall, Premier.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr R. Price, Chief Executive, Defence SA.

Mr J. McDowell, Chief Executive, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Mr R. Barnett, Executive Director, Corporate Services, Defence SA.

The CHAIR: Welcome back everybody. The Premier is appearing and the portfolio we are examining between now and 12.30pm is Defence SA. I declare the proposed payments open for examination. Before I call on the Premier, I have been instructed that Hansard is having some difficulty hearing all the questions and answers, so I remind all members to continue to speak into the microphone. Premier, please introduce your advisers and make a statement if you wish.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you, sir. I have great pleasure in introducing to the committee Richard Price, Chief Executive, Defence SA, and Rob Barnett, Executive Director of Corporate Services. I indicate to the committee that there will not be any opening comments.

The CHAIR: Are there any questions for the Premier? The leader has the call.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Regarding Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, page 140 and Defence SA's aim to support the commonwealth strategic defence industry through local industry participation and the budget line on pages 143 and 144, what resources are allocated towards monitoring the impact of the Future Submarine program on the local defence industry?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not sure what you mean about what resources are involved in monitoring. Are you envisaging that there is a unit set up to see what current increases in work there is? I am not quite sure where you are heading.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Clearly the Future Submarine program is an extraordinary opportunity for the state, and I guess I am trying to get a sense of what efforts are being undertaken within government, presumably within Defence SA, to actually assess how that is progressing; that is, how is local industry going when it comes to the benefits of the submarine program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This area of Defence SA is headed up by David Eyre, who is the director of maritime. I think the leader is correct in asserting that this is an incredible opportunity for our state. The Strategic Partnering Agreement was signed between the commonwealth and the Naval Group earlier this year. In fact, it was a great honour to be present when it was being signed; in fact, the French Armed Forces minister, Florence Parly, flew in from France for that signing.

It is still early days. The build-up that the Naval Group has in South Australia is still very much in its infancy, but there are huge opportunities. The areas that we are specifically interested in here in South Australia are around skills and also around making sure that we have the right companies investing here in South Australia who might also participate. We have a large number of SMEs in South Australia and we also have some of the very significant primes. We do not have as many middle-market companies that exist in the supply chain for submarines that might exist in other parts of the world and this is something that we are trying to address.

We do have resources not only here in South Australia but, importantly, also in Europe—probably only in Europe for a few more days, as it turns out, because our resource there is based in England, which I understand is exiting Europe as of the end of October. Currently, our person dedicated to this project is a gentleman by the name of John Rees. He is based in the UK but he also services France.

Mr Rees accompanied me on my visit to Cherbourg last week for the launch of the first of the Barracuda class. He is really well informed about the supply chain that exists for Barracuda, which is not identical but a similar submarine to the one that is being contracted with the Naval Group in Australia. Work is being done here in Australia and work is being done in Europe to make sure that we have the right investors and the right skills in place to maximise the opportunity for our state.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I thank the Premier for that summary, but I am genuinely interested to find out whether there is any specific allocation of resources within Defence SA, whether as a unit or whatever it might be, to monitor how this is going?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Again, I do not know what you mean by monitoring. In terms of whether we have a methodology that is going to go to companies asking them what they are contributing to the project so far, I am not aware of anything in that line at the moment. We are just on the front foot. Last week, when I was in London, I hosted a half-day workshop, which was held at Australia House, where we worked with the Society of Maritime Industries in the UK to provide a briefing on the opportunity that exists.

I think it is too early to be able to report, but if there are some statistics on what contribution there has been to date I am happy to provide them after this committee. But it is still very early in the phase for the submarine program. Of course, there are two programs that precede that. Obviously, we are currently underway with offshore patrol vessels down at Osborne, which is a project being delivered by Luerssen.

We will get the first two of 12 offshore patrol vessels being built here in South Australia and thereafter, of course, we will be producing nine frigates here in South Australia. That project will be delivered by BAE. There is work right across the board in maritime: offshore patrol vessels, frigates and ultimately the Future Submarines. That work will last for decades.

I think it is also important to report to the committee, though, that there is plenty of work even beyond the maritime projects. Edinburgh is now one of two superbases in Australia. There is a huge amount of work going on in and around Edinburgh and Mawson Lakes. There is plenty of work that we do here in South Australia with regard to system integration, with regard to electronic work warfare, with regard to surveillance and with regard to cyber. The defence industry and opportunity in South Australia is absolutely immense.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: You and I both want that opportunity maximised, and as we move along with the project post the signing of the SPA presumably we need to have a method of examining our progress. Presumably we need to have a method to be able to establish whether or not the full utilisation of that opportunity is being realised around the defence industry, around jobs and around local content. I am trying to work out whether or not that is occurring. I accept that that might not necessarily be an immediate need right now, but I think it will be. I am trying to get a sense of whether or not there is going to be an effort to do that. I do not suspect that it would necessarily be easy to implement such an exercise—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The commonwealth has requirements in terms of industry participation, and the Australian content is envisaged in their planning. I am more than happy to ask the chief executive to provide more detail if you think that I am in some way being evasive.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No, I am actually not accusing you of being evasive; I am not doing that.

Mr PRICE: Perhaps to give you some comfort, we actually are using the resources of David Eyre and John Rees, who have built comprehensive supply chain maps of the existing submarine so that we understand their existing suppliers and who we need to connect our industry with. That information is clearly very sensitive, so we do not publicise it, but that is basically how we are using it to target the connections between South Australian companies and the current incumbent suppliers. Once the contracts for those particular items of equipment start falling—none of those have really been awarded yet—we will be able to see where they are falling and whether they are coming to our suppliers or to somebody else's.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Does the Premier have an insight into the time line of what the tenders and expressions of interest will be in terms of the supply of the Future Submarine program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, I do not have that information. That is something that obviously the Naval Group will be developing at the moment. As I said, it is early days. The interaction with the Naval Group and Defence SA, and even with my office, is extraordinarily good. They have executives in Australia from France on a very regular basis. When we have approached them, suggesting that there might be opportunities for a certain company that might have presented themselves to us, they immediately follow it up.

I think that there are going to be extraordinary opportunities for South Australian companies. I also think that there will be extraordinary opportunities for foreign direct investment into the defence industry in South Australia. I do not think that we are going to be in a position for South Australian companies to supply the full input into the Future Submarines. I think the best opportunity for us, during this, is to try to work with like-minded companies from overseas to join in a strategic alliance or merger, or even potentially an acquisition, into the supply chain for submarines.

I believe that there is quite a sophisticated operation within Defence SA, both here and, as I said, based in Europe, to maximise those opportunities. We have already seen, with the

establishment of the Defence Landing Pad at Lot Fourteen, companies that have been in, have gone through that program and made decisions to open facilities here in South Australia. This was a program that was launched at Euronaval in October in Paris last year, and we have already had success with it. I personally believe that we are just seeing the tip of the iceberg with regard to the potential for using the Landing Pad to look at bringing those potential investors and partners into South Australia.

In addition to what we are offering with the Landing Pad here in Adelaide, we offer a version of it in Europe, where prospective companies looking at the South Australian market can either go into our offices in Australia House or dial in via Skype to meet with a number of advisers to get briefings on banking, legal, human resources and accounting and tax advice to help inform whether they see that there is an opportunity for coming to the Landing Pad in South Australia.

As I was saying, at the function I was at last week there would have been probably 50 or 60 people who turned up vitally interested in the exciting opportunities. Many of these companies are not only seeing the opportunity for them within our current Australian maritime programs but are also looking at using South Australia as a potential base for regional operations for their organisation. This will only help to strengthen the defence industry in our state.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Does Defence SA provide some sort of report or regular feedback to you, Premier, or to your office on where we are at in terms of time lines and the value of supply contracts for equipment on the Future Subs program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have very regular contact with Defence SA, with the chief executive and other key members. I am not sure that there is a reporting mechanism for contracts to date, but I will make inquiries whether that has been put in place or whether that could be put in place. I am absolutely satisfied that the work is being done now to ensure that those future contacts will flow.

As you can imagine, both the Naval Group and BAE are still very much in the phase of trying to work out who is going to be in their supply chain. Keep in mind that some of those decisions are in fact not made by the Naval Group or BAE; they are actually made by Navy and the Australian government in regard to different systems that will exist on those platforms. They are still being determined.

I am convinced that all the pre-work is being done not only in the UK, as I have outlined, but here in Australia—opportunities and workshops where BAE bring executives out from the UK to Australia, where Naval Group bring people out from France to provide information to prospective companies that want to look at the supply chain.

Keep in mind that some of the people who will be contributing to these projects are companies outside maritime at the moment, sometimes potentially outside defence completely. They might be companies that have a major focus on mining, agriculture or construction, but they also have an opportunity to contribute into the supply chain.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is the Premier aware of any local procurement requirement that exists within the strategic partnership agreement?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Am I aware of—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Any local procurement requirement that exists in the strategic partnership agreement between Naval and the commonwealth?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Strategic Partnering Agreement has not been published. We are not aware of any specific South Australian component in terms of industry requirement.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How about Australian?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Certainly, my understanding of the information that has been made public is that there is a methodology envisaged within that SPA that looks at how the agreement would go about looking at what capability we have in Australia versus capability that exists elsewhere and the decision-making process and how that works. I would probably need to get a further briefing. That is a commonwealth responsibility. It is one that we are obviously massively

interested in here in South Australia, but we do not have visibility of the SPA itself. I am happy to make inquiries.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But you have not already?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have just outlined the work we are doing in South Australia. As I said, I am very satisfied with the work we are doing, but if you have information to suggest that we are not performing well, feel free to raise it. We are happy to learn from your great expertise in this area.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Premier, I guess my concern, and what I am seeking you to provide information to the state on, is this. We have this extraordinary opportunity that is underpinned contractually thus far through the strategic partnership agreement, which is a high-level document signed between the commonwealth and Naval, which I accept you are not a party to in a strict legal sense.

But you are a premier with a close relationship with the former defence minister and I would have thought that it was pretty elementary that you would have sought advice from minister Pyne at the time or from the commonwealth generally about what within the strategic partnership agreement ensures that Naval has an obligation for local jobs, as distinct from what Naval's objective might reasonably be about trying to achieve an economic return for the capital invested within it. That is what I am trying to establish.

I do not suggest for a moment, in the context of your remarks, that I have information that will enlighten you. What I am hoping is that you enlighten us by giving a sense of confidence to this state that you are fighting every step of the way to maximise a level of local procurement. That is what I am asking.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think that was just a statement. What is the question?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My question is: have you spoken to the commonwealth about the level of local procurement requirement within the strategic partnership agreement?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said to the committee, it is a confidential SPA, but I think that all the answers I have provided so far show that we are vitally interested in and focused on maximising the opportunities for South Australian firms, and that is what—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: If you are vitally interested in it, tell us what confidence can the South Australian public have that the strategic partnership agreement maximises the local procurement requirement on the Naval Group?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Let's be clear, the contracts have been let on three major platforms in South Australia. I know that you are interested in the submarines, but there are three major platforms. One is already underway and one is going to be underway earlier than the other one, so it is interesting that you are only focused on the submarines when there are plenty of other platforms. I am satisfied that the agency we have, Defence SA, is doing everything it possibly can to maximise South Australian content, and I have outlined to you—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How can you be satisfied—

The CHAIR: Leader, the Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying in the evidence that I have provided to the committee so far, our area of focus has been skills development, which we think is going to be vital to maximising the potential that we realise in South Australia, and the second one is making sure that we have the right level of investment in South Australia to provide into the supply chain.

We have obligations in that area, and if we fulfil those obligations then I think that we are going to be able to maximise job creation in our state. We cannot just rely on the fact that there may or may not be incorporated into the SPA some content requirement for South Australia. What we have to do is create every single opportunity and present that to the Naval Group, to BAE and to Luerksen, and quite frankly to a range of prime contractors to the Australian Defence Force, and present our credentials to them because it is a competitive environment.

These are major global companies and they want to deliver their projects on time and on budget. I think that they are both reasonable requirements or objectives, so the ball is in our court to do everything that we can. As I said, I am more than satisfied that Defence SA, its advisory board, its leadership and in fact its entire operation are doing precisely that. I am very happy to assist with that process when and where Defence SA think that I will add value, and we will continue to have a good working relationship with the commonwealth to make sure that we can maximise that work coming to South Australia.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I have confidence in Defence SA. I am trying to understand how you can be satisfied that we are doing everything we can when (a) we do not have an existing monitoring process in place about how local procurement is going on the Future Submarines project, notwithstanding the fact that it is a long way out, and (b) you are not even aware of the local procurement requirements within the strategic partnership agreement. I find that difficult to understand.

I have no doubt that you are satisfied with Defence SA and that the people within it are working incredibly hard, but a separate proposition is about being satisfied that we are maximising the opportunity for the state going forward. Maybe in that context I will ask a specific question: has Defence SA monitored the level of local involvement in what I am advised is the definition and design phase of the Future Submarines program, a contract that I understand to be worth in excess of \$600 million?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will have to get a briefing on that.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So you have not received a briefing on—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We need to keep in mind—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: —a \$600 million contract regarding the design phase of the Future Submarines and what that might mean for local work in South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: My understanding is that the contract you are referring to was envisaged after the signing of the Strategic Partnering Agreement. It is still in the early stages. I think we are at cross-purposes here. Of course there is a huge amount of work to be done, but we are not cutting steel on the subs at the moment, and we will not be for some years, so there are not contracts that are let.

There is no ability for Defence SA to be able to present to this committee, or to me and the government, with, 'Here are the 42 suppliers who have already been pre-approved by the Naval Group to supply these products at this contracted value.' I think we all appreciate that it is a big program, but the submarine has not been designed yet, let alone the procurement underway.

The contracts that have been let for the submarine program relate mainly to the establishment of the new submarine shed, which is going to be built down at Osborne. My understanding is that contract is many hundreds of millions of dollars and will create construction jobs in South Australia.

Clearly, there are going to be enormous opportunities for South Australia. I am happy to ask David Eyre from Defence SA to perhaps provide me with a briefing as to whether or not any contracts have specifically been let; if they have, I am happy to return that information to the committee.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Naturally, I do not receive the volume of advice that you do regarding these matters, but I understand that the Naval Group made public presentations to industry that its top 40 equipment suppliers were going to be selected in the first half of this year. Are you aware if that is the case?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, that has not occurred yet.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Do you understand if the Naval Group at one point did suggest that may be the case?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, I do not have that information, but I would just remind the committee that the Strategic Partnering Agreement was quite significantly delayed. There were two final issues that did delay the filing of the Strategic Partnering Agreement. I am informed that this will

not affect the overall time frame or cost of the project. It was really important that we get that right, but I think—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: 'We' being the commonwealth and you having nothing to do with it.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Say that again, sorry?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: When you say 'we get that right', you mean 'we' being the commonwealth, in terms of the SPA?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: 'We' as Australian citizens. We are all pretty interested in the outcome of this, so I think it is really important that we as a country get this right. It is essentially a relationship that will last for decades and decades. In fact, if you think about it, the captain of the final sub has not even been born yet. It is going to last for a long period of time. It is important to get it right, but I think that we are all aware that there were quite considerable delays in the finalisation of the SPA.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In regard to that top 40 exercise, since it has not been done, is Defence SA monitoring that process in the context of opportunity for local South Australian suppliers?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Absolutely. I am happy to ask David Eyre to give a briefing to you on that—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I would be grateful for that.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and where that opportunity sits at the moment.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thank you. Does the Premier, the government or Defence SA have a view about the level of local content that they hope will be part of the Future Submarines program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Just ask that again, sorry.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Do you or does any agency within your government have a view, target or ambition for the amount of local content that will be part of the Future Submarines program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It depends on how you define 'local content'. Obviously, the headline figure at the moment is that the project will be \$50 billion over its life, but that is broken up between both the original production and the sustainment. Even when you look at components of that, there are certain components that will just have to be imported, for example, combat systems. These are decisions that will be made by the commonwealth.

We do not have a capability in-country, an Australian company, to develop those, but we would like to see many of our local SMEs within the defence industry feeding into the supply chain of those primes. That is what has occurred in the past, especially with the air warfare destroyers. If you look at the air warfare destroyers contract, you could claim that there was certain South Australian content because the assembly was done in South Australia, but there was a fairly substantial procurement of some of the technology from other jurisdictions, so it is very difficult to put an exact number on it.

Obviously, from our perspective, everything we do is trying to maximise our content within that subs program. Some of that will be done within our SME sector. Some will be done within primes that expand their capability in South Australia. As I said, one area that we are definitely focusing on at the moment is further investment from interstate and overseas into the South Australian economy so that we can have input into that supply chain.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Does Defence SA monitor employment levels generally at ASC's shipyard?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Monitor the—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Does Defence SA monitor employment levels at the Osborne shipyard?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: ASC are happy to provide that information to Defence SA, the government or yourself on a regular basis. I am happy to get an exact number for you and provide it.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Does Defence SA proactively try to monitor them?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sure. They have a great working relationship with ASC.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has Defence SA provided you with advice on the number of jobs currently at ASC?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have not asked in recent weeks. Obviously, people are aware that a further reduction was announced last week at ASC of around 50 people. I think we all appreciate that the last 12 months, 18 months or maybe two years down at Osborne have been difficult as we move between the air warfare destroyers and the frigates program. The commonwealth has seen fit to try to alleviate some of that problem with the construction of the first two of the offshore patrol vessels, but that has not been sufficient to bridge that gap.

There was a hiatus in terms of federal government commissioning of ships of six years when the former Labor Party was in government federally. There was not a single ship commissioned in that six-year period, and that flows through to right about now. The Coalition, since it came to government six years ago, has commissioned 57 separate vessels, and so now the forward program is very, very clear.

More than just the program, I think the major change, which was envisaged within the Defence White Paper and the Industry Capability Plan, was that the defence industry going forward would be regarded as a strategic defence capability; this was not previously the case. So when that fundamental policy decision was changed and the defence industry was recognised as a defence industry capability, it then meant that we needed to develop parts of that defence industry here in-country, and a big part of that is, of course, the maritime program.

Now we have a continuous shipbuilding program. This provides certainty to companies that are involved in those programs, and they then respond by investing in terms of personnel development, in terms of infrastructure and in terms of other investments to ensure that they can respond to that continuous shipbuilding.

I do not envisage that we will return to some of the problems that we had with some of the previous platforms where early ships or vessels suffered from very large cost blowouts and time frame blowouts because there is real certainty, and we are not looking to massively ramp up, ramp down, ramp up, ramp down some of the human resources. Having said that, this is definitely a difficult period, but I think going forward that will be eliminated.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Does Defence SA know how many people are currently employed at ASC—I appreciate that you may need to take this on notice—and, if so, what that breakdown is from the AWD program in comparison to the full-cycle docking maintenance of Collins class or the Collins class sustainment work?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, we would know that. We are happy to find that out and provide that information as quickly as possible.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thank you; I appreciate your taking that on notice. Has Defence SA advised the Premier on the possibility of the commonwealth shifting Collins class sustainment work to the Henderson shipyard in WA?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There has obviously been lots of speculation with regard to this for an extended period of time, but I am not in receipt of any information that suggests that that work will be moving to Western Australia. Obviously, the Navy regularly reviews these matters as to where the full-cycle docking will be done.

It is currently being done in South Australia, and I note that it is being done in South Australia extraordinarily cost effectively. There were some issues with regard to this that go back several years, but there have been very significant investments in improving the productivity of that full-cycle docking, which I think is really at a world best practice level here in South Australia at the moment.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I think that speculation rightly has a number of people concerned about the prospect of that move. Has Defence SA, or for that matter any agency within government, allocated resources to lobbying against the transfer of that work to Western Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that Navy are looking at this matter and that this is something that is under active consideration this financial year. I have obviously spoken with the newly installed defence minister and defence industry minister on their most recent visit to South Australia.

There are some general concerns within the Defence Force as to whether or not South Australia will have the personnel capable of delivering on the massive program that is currently underway with offshore patrol vessels, Future Frigates and Future Submarines, as well as the full-cycle docking and the potential Life of Type Extension for the Collins class. I am of the opinion that we are. That is one of the reasons why in our first budget we put \$200 million into skills development—so that we can make sure that we have the requisite technical skills in place.

Moreover, that is one of the reasons why, in the most recent negotiation with the federal government for a Designated Area Migration Agreement, we put occupations into that list that we believe were potential constraints to us fulfilling that massive increase in work. Nevertheless, this probably still remains a concern, and I think that there is still work we must be doing. I certainly will be playing my role in terms of those negotiations.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Have you provided political advocacy to the commonwealth, namely, through the Prime Minister, on retaining that work that is potentially up for movement to WA?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Prime Minister and I speak on a very regular basis and he is more than aware of my position on this issue and, more broadly, on defence work. We want to position ourselves as the defence—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But have you advocated to him directly?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Absolutely. Defence, space and cyber are three critical areas for us, and the Prime Minister is absolutely aware that we want to bring as much work in these areas as possible to South Australia. As I was saying, this is one of the reasons why we were the first state in Australia to sign the Skilling Australians agreement, which is more than \$200 million—\$100 million from state taxpayers and \$100 million from federal taxpayers—towards this program. This is one of the areas that he was very happy to include in the Designated Area Migration Agreement.

As you would be more than aware, we have two DAMAs in South Australia: one covers regional South Australia, but the one that covers metropolitan Adelaide has a list of occupations, and that was developed with issues like maritime in mind after discussing it with the defence sector. I am convinced that we have the facilities in South Australia, we have the available space in South Australia and we have the skills in South Australia, and I am certainly continuing to advocate on that on a very regular basis.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has Defence SA allocated any resources or conducted any analysis of what the economic impact would be of a movement to Western Australia of the Collins class sustainment work?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Certainly, it really all depends, if there was a move, on what it actually involved. Is it Life of Type Extension, which is work that we do not currently have, of course, where there is full-cycle docking, as well as what the timing would actually be? All those things are completely unknown, but I just do not envisage that this is something that is imminent. As I said, there is a negotiation to occur. The Australian Defence Force are looking at this issue. I am advised that they will be making a decision this current financial year, and we will be doing everything we can to keep as much work in South Australia for as long as possible.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Do you think that the Collins class sustainment work currently conducted in South Australia will stay in South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is certainly what I am working towards. There are issues associated with that because the area in which that work is currently done is an area which will be required for the new submarine construction, so there will be issues associated with creating new facilities for the ongoing sustainment work.

This is one of the reasons we are putting a huge amount of effort into this skills development area—to make sure that we not only have the skills but also can demonstrate to the commonwealth that we will be able to have the requisite skills in place as they are required.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Moving on to Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, page 144, under sub-program 1.1, at the bottom of page 144 there is a reference to the implementation of the Defence Industry Employment Program for Ex-Service Personnel. I understand, Premier, that you made an announcement on 26 November last year regarding the agreement between Defence SA and DTC. Why was Veterans SA not included in that process?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think Veterans SA has been included in that process. We have been keeping them informed along the way.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In the November 2018 announcement about the agreement between Defence SA and DTC, obviously Veterans SA was not part of that agreement. I am trying to understand why.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The funding came from within Defence SA, but it is not correct to characterise it that they were not informed. They have been—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I did not say not informed—involved.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, the money is actually coming not from Veterans SA but from Defence SA. I think that is the reason why.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What involvement did Veterans SA have prior to 1 July this year regarding this piece of work? What involvement does it have now post 1 July?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that they were involved in a working group that established the program. Of course, as you would be aware, they have now co-located with Defence SA, so I think this will strengthen relationships between Defence SA and Veterans SA even further.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: On 5 July, you announced the portal or the website. Is that the official launch of the program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The official launch was on Thursday 4 July at the DTC annual dinner, which was an excellent occasion, with I think between 600 and 700 people at the Adelaide Convention Centre. It seems to be getting larger and larger each year—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I was there, yes.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am surprised, then, that you did not recognise my wonderful speech and launch of the portal. What were you doing, sleeping or drinking or something?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Neither. I was having water, to be specific—but, yes, your address was inspirational.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I know you announced that on the night, but I am trying to understand if that is when it was launched. Was that when the program was launched?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes. My understanding is that the portal is now up and running. I think there are eight or 10 companies that are key, signed-up employers to the program already. We are going to have a further launch, which will be more of a public to-the-veterans launch, but at the moment we are populating that portal, that website, with opportunities that exist.

There are great opportunities in this area, and I am not sure this is something that has been envisaged previously. I know that we have kept the commonwealth informed—Darren Chester, Minister for Veterans Affairs, and also Linda Reynolds, Minister for Defence, and Melissa Price, the Minister for Defence Industry—regarding what we are doing here. We think there is a great opportunity to take the serving men and women of the Australian Defence Force who are looking to leave their service and assist, in any way we can, in the transition of these men and women into the defence industry.

There is no doubt that there is a massive increased requirement for personnel in the defence industry. One of the things we know about people who have served in the Defence Force is that they have high-level skills that have been developed over a long period of time. They understand the defence industry better than most people across the overall population. Importantly, they have security clearances in place that could potentially be transitioned directly to defence industry, which would be another advantage of this cohort.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Premier, were concerns raised by Veterans SA regarding the planned launch of this program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I cannot recall anything specific directly to me, no.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: As the minister responsible for the various agencies that would have a connection to this program, were you made aware of any concerns that Veterans SA had with any of the actions of other agencies and the budget impact of any changes to the proposed program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Are we still talking about the employment program?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, I do not recall any specific representation regarding concerns for the employment program. It is a pilot. As I said, it is not something that is being done elsewhere. We will learn from it. It is probably taking a little bit longer to get up and running than originally envisaged, but I am still convinced that this is an important program to put in place.

I should emphasise that this is not a program that would be limited to people who are currently only serving members of the Australian Defence Force, but it will be veterans who would also be able to access this service, which would be good. It is quite possible that this type of program could be extended to other employment sectors beyond defence industry, but there is an obvious logic with regard to the defence industry in the first instance.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am advised that there are concerns that relate to the focus of the employment program being too much on defence industry jobs, as distinct from jobs that might exist outside the defence industry. Do you think that is a problem within the current program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I might have just answered that in the previous answer. As I said, I think there are opportunities beyond the defence industry, but there are very obvious defence industry opportunities, so I think that was a good and logical place to start. Certainly, I will be doing everything I can to find veterans worthwhile employment post their service. We certainly value their service to the country and we want to do everything we can to make sure that they have fulfilling employment and lives post their service.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is DTC best placed to be able to exploit those opportunities outside the defence industry?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I would not think so. The program that we are currently operating, which is funded by Defence SA, which is administered by DTC, is specific to the defence industry, but it does not preclude us from looking at other opportunities down the track with other sectors.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But why are you not doing that now?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think I have answered that: this is a pilot. It is a first that exists.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I accept that. How many jobs are currently online or available through the program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not sure. I am happy to find out and come back to you. As I said, I think there are eight to 10 companies that have decided to be the foundation program partners. We want to lift that number. We want to get jobs placed onto the site and we want to engage the veterans community and ADF members as soon as possible. I think that there is a launch more broadly at the end of this year.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has there been any engagement between Defence SA and the New South Wales government to work in collaboration on the employment program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, I am not aware. I am advised that the chief executive is not aware.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Premier, is there any source of conflict between Defence SA and DTC regarding the program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Any source of—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Conflict.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, I think that DTC is a membership-based organisation. It is extraordinarily good at what it does. It has a huge number of members, and they are a logical partner for us for this program. The success of this program is really going to hinge on whether companies in South Australia provide those opportunities. I have not received any information to suggest that they will not be on board.

I must say that since the launch on 4 July we have been happy with the response and the feedback we have received from the industry. However, I do not want to overspruik this just yet. It is early days, it is a pilot, it is not something we have done previously. We have committed resources to it, and I am happy to report back on progress as that happens.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is the Premier aware that there are email interactions between DTC and Defence SA referring to inappropriate and unprofessional conduct?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Would the Premier like to take the opportunity to seek advice on that from his officials?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: If you have something to outline to the committee, then you should feel free to do so.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: There are FOI documents relating to the funding of the program going back to April this year, documents released some time ago. I am happy to refer specifically to them. For instance, on 2 April there is an email from the then CE of DTC to Mr Richard Price advising that his letter is acknowledged, as well as the direction to stop work on the program. I would like to know the context of those instructions. She goes on to say in this email:

I have advised all subcontractors to stop work effective immediately. This is very disappointing. I am happy to have a conversation before I formally respond...

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It seems to me that you are in receipt of all that correspondence, so I am not sure what your question is. From my perspective, that relates to correspondence that occurred some time ago.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In April this year.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not know whether you have a watch, but it looks like we are in July now. We had a launch of this program—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Premier, do not be flippant. I am trying to ask legitimate questions.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, I am trying to answer. I am answering the question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: You were referring to my watch. That is not an answer to the question. I am trying to ask—

The CHAIR: Leader, you have asked your question and the Premier is now answering it. We have just 2½ minutes left in this session. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What was the question?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The Premier has forgotten—it is habitual. I am asking about the correspondence between Mr Price and the CEO of DTC referring to stopping work on the employment program. There is another email here from Mr Price asking if it is inappropriate and unprofessional to personalise an issue on this matter. I get the sense that the relationship between

DTC and Defence SA on this specific issue has been a little problematic. If that is the case, I am surprised that the Premier has not been advised of it, considering that he is the responsible minister.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am sure it does not surprise the committee that I am not privy to all correspondence that exists within all my agencies' departmental staff and within any related sectors, but what I can advise the committee is that this is an excellent program and—despite the correspondence that the Leader of the Opposition might be referring to, which dates back several months—there was a very successful launch of this program on 4 July at the DTC annual dinner.

DTC have certainly conveyed to me their delight with the program they are offering. They see it as a benefit to their members. I see it as a benefit to the overall state by providing valuable employment to our veterans. As the Minister for Veterans Affairs, I am very pleased about this. I am also very pleased because it provides additional capability to our defence industry. From my perspective, improving the capability and capacity of defence industry personnel in South Australia, an area that we know is going to be under strain, is a massive win for the state, and we are looking at every opportunity to expand that capacity and capability. This is one such area.

As I have conveyed to the committee, it is an area which is a pilot, but I am satisfied that the launch has occurred and we will have success with it. I am happy to provide further updates to this committee down the track.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Mr Price wrote to the CEO of DTC in April this year and at the end of his correspondence he states:

We understand that you have directly approached the Premier's office to arrange a launch event. However, until we have resolved these issues—

which he has outlined above—

to our satisfaction, I will not be recommending to the Premier that this event proceeds.

Were those issues addressed and did the Premier receive advice from Mr Price regarding his launch of the event?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The advice that I received was that we should proceed with the launch because all issues had been resolved. I am delighted to again update the house that that launch took place on Thursday 4 July.

The CHAIR: Having reached the allotted time, I declare the examination of the proposed payments for Defence SA to be completed.

Membership:

Mr Hughes substituted for Hon. Z.L. Bettison.

Hon. L.W.K. Bignell substituted for Mr Brown.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr J. McDowell, Chief Executive, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Ms N. Saunders, Executive Director, Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Mr S. Woolhouse, Executive Director, Communities and Corporate, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

The CHAIR: Premier, you will be changing advisers because the next portfolio open in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet is in relation to Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. Premier, I invite you to introduce your advisers for this session, please.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is with great pleasure that I introduce to the committee this afternoon Nerida Saunders, the Executive Director of the Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation

division. I reintroduce Steve Woolhouse, the Executive Director, Communities and Corporate. I think lurking somewhere behind me is the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Mr Jim McDowell.

The CHAIR: Premier, do you wish to make a statement?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, sir.

The CHAIR: Unless the leader wants to make a statement, I will invite questions.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thank you, Mr Chair. I thank Nerida for being here and the other advisers as well. Premier, I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 24, the first paragraph:

Empower Aboriginal people to have a stronger voice in decision making across...governance arrangements.

Your budget documents use some interesting terminology regarding 'voice' and 'empower'. If this is important to the Premier, why did he scrap the treaty process as one of his first acts as the relevant minister?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not think we can put those two things together. A voice to parliament I do not think we can say is represented by treaty. I think there are other methodologies that we can have as a voice to the government and a voice, ultimately, to parliament. We have already canvassed the issues with regard to the treaty process, but I am happy to go over them again if you would like me to.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I would like the Premier to explain why he decided to scrap the treaty process when, for instance, federal minister Ken Wyatt recently said:

... with respect to Treaty, it's important that states and territory jurisdictions take the lead. When you consider the constitution, they are better placed to undertake that work.... Treaty models are evolving with work undertaken by the Victorian and Northern Territory governments which address the aspirations of Indigenous Australians in those jurisdictions, and it's important that it resides and sits there.

I would like to know whether or not you are aware of those comments. Do you support your federal Liberal colleague and, if you are aware of those comments, will that potentially result in you changing your position of scrapping the treaty process?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We made a decision not to continue with further treaties in South Australia. We made that clear to the people of South Australia before the election. We of course have continued to implement the Buthera Agreement, signed by the previous government in the dying days of that administration. All the information that I have received is that that is progressing well. Certainly, from our perspective, the government is fully engaged with that process. There will be things that we learn from the Buthera Agreement that we can directly pass on to other nations here in South Australia, and when that is obvious, that is what we will be doing.

Considerable resources are allocated to this process. We are taking it extraordinarily seriously. From my perspective, all of the feedback that I have received from the Narungga Nation and other people within that community is that they have been satisfied with the government's commitment to the full implementation of the Buthera Agreement.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: If the Premier believes that is important and constructive, why would the Premier have scrapped the treaty process for the rest of the state?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: For starters, I was not convinced that we had the model right, in terms of engagement. I do not want to specifically canvas it here, but there were and there remain people within that nation who are not supportive of the Buthera Agreement. I think it was a rushed process. It did not produce an optimal outcome.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But you were just singing its praises.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We are doing everything we can to get that process back on track, but it is the subject of quite a lot of stress within that community. If the Leader of the Opposition is not aware of that, I am happy to provide a briefing to him on that.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I would welcome that briefing, thank you.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Any time. With the Aboriginal Affairs Action Plan that we published in December last year, one of the 32 action items on that plan was to develop a new model for engagement. That is something that the Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement, Dr Roger Thomas, has been working on and we hope to be able to finalise that certainly within the time frames that are provided under the action plan.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I want to stick to this theme of treaty. You referred in your previous response to the importance and value of the Buthera Agreement, but you do not think treaty is the best way forward. If that process with the Narungga Nation is seen to be beneficial, is it possible that the Premier will reconsider his position on the treaty process, or has the Premier made a policy decision and, even in the light of evidence or representations from Aboriginal communities and indeed a federal minister, is it the case that, in order to save face, the Premier will not reconsider the treaty decision that he took earlier in the term?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have not had an opportunity to meet with minister Ken Wyatt since he has assumed that role. I certainly congratulate him on taking that role. We had a really good working relationship with him in his previous portfolio. We are really looking forward to working with him in this area, and I hope to be able to catch up with him later this month or early next month.

This is a critical area. It is one of the reasons why I took this portfolio myself. It is one of the reasons why we returned Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation to the Premier's department, as the central agency. It is one of the reasons why we developed a whole-of-government action plan. I am very proud that we are taking a whole-of-government approach to Aboriginal affairs. It is a complex area of public policy. It is not an easy area of public policy, but it is one that is extraordinarily important and one that we have to get right.

As I said, one of the items that we have envisaged in our action plan is the development of a new model for engagement in South Australia. I look forward to receiving the final recommendations from the Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement. I have been very happy with the level of engagement he has undertaken right across South Australia in the development of the model that he wants to present to us. I am very happy to update the parliament once I receive that advice.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Have you received any correspondence from Aboriginal people, or their representatives, asking for the treaty process to be recommenced?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am very aware that there are different views right across South Australia with regard to this issue. Some people are very passionate about treaty. Some people want a whole-of-state treaty, some people want a whole-of-nation treaty, some people want treaties between individual nations and states or individual nations and the commonwealth. Some people do not see it as a priority.

There are very disparate views and I take my responsibilities in this portfolio very seriously. I listen to all those views. At the moment, there are many priorities that this government has for Aboriginal affairs. We are genuinely implementing the Buthera Agreement. This is something in which the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment, Erma Ranieri, has a very big involvement. To the best of my knowledge, all chief executives are genuinely involved with how they can play their role in the Buthera Agreement and the full implementation of that agreement.

Ms BEDFORD: Premier, I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, pages 24 and 25. How many Aboriginal-specific positions are available across all of government at or above ASO8 classification?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will probably need to take that question on notice, but I should be able to get that fairly quickly for you. That is something we monitor on a regular basis, and it is monitored by the Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment. There are a number of Aboriginal people who are employed in the Public Service, but many of them are at the lower levels within the Public Service. This is one of the reasons why, since coming to government, we have pushed ahead with a leadership program for Aboriginal members of the Public Service. I understand that is now in its second iteration.

This is an opportunity whereby people either self-nominate or are hand-selected by their chief executives and identified as people with potential. They participate in a program. It is not a

three-hour workshop; it is a really well-constituted program. I remember speaking to some people who had been through the program and were genuinely saying that they got a lot out of it. I know there was a lot of interest from—I think it was the second cohort—participants who went through, and had that launch earlier this year.

It is still a bit early to say what success it has had in terms of advancement through the Public Service in South Australia, but this is something that I will certainly be monitoring very closely. I am happy to provide the member with an update once I have spoken to the commissioner.

Ms BEDFORD: That would be good. Following on from that, it is the second cohort now. How long do you think it will take to see some real improvement? This is through the Public Service, but more broadly in the community are you able to exert any pressure on similar sorts of programs taking place at corporate levels or beyond?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I cannot think of anything more broadly at the moment, but I can say that one of the things we have asked the Industry Advocate to do is look at ways that Indigenous companies in South Australia can get better access to state government contracts. In a way, that will create employment in the private sector off the back of contracts that are in the public sector. This is something that Ian Nightingale has taken very seriously, to the level that he has come along and spoken to the senior management council in South Australia. I understand that members of the senior management council—the chief executives in South Australia—are taking this opportunity very seriously.

Ms BEDFORD: I have one last question on the same budget paper and line. What steps are being taken to close the gap in Indigenous superannuation where it relates to better uptake of superannuation by Indigenous people, reflecting that that community has a reduced life expectancy?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Super is controlled at the federal level. Obviously, we pay superannuation as taxpayers to public sector employees. I would like to take that question on notice with the other two questions and provide a comprehensive overview. If there is something I can contribute in terms of the super issue, I am more than happy to provide more information.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Going back to treaty, Premier, you referred to looking at the views of Aboriginal people when it comes to your decision to abandon a treaty. Are you aware of the work undertaken by Dr Thomas on consultation with Aboriginal people regarding treaty? It was probably the most comprehensive consultation that has been undertaken by the state government with Aboriginal people.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What do you understand that consultation to have shown?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Keep in mind that consultation was done prior to the government's rollout of their program. We now know what occurred with that program, so there has been further consultation. We formed a position that we would not change our pre-election position with regard to treaty. As I said, we very genuinely entered into the spirit as well as the letter and the financial obligations of the Buthera Agreement. Lessons we learned from that will be applied to other areas.

One of the areas that is difficult with regard to treaty in terms of the negotiation is the area of mandate. Who has the mandate to actually conduct the negotiations? This often is highly problematic within individual nations. Prior to forming our opinion, we spoke to the relevant personnel in New Zealand because they have very effective treaties in New Zealand; they have a small number. It is a different arrangement there. They have very well-defined longstanding organisations that conduct the negotiation and they have that mandate.

I am not somebody to in any way play political games with this issue. I think that all issues within Aboriginal Affairs need to have a degree of sensitivity and focus. We formed an opinion prior to the election. On coming to government, we have far more access to information than we had previously. To date, nothing that we have been presented with would change our position currently.

As I said, one of the 32 items on the action agenda was to ask the Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement to look at this issue of what is the best practice engagement with Aboriginal

communities in South Australia, and my understanding is that he is in the very final stages of that recommendation to government and that we should be receiving that fairly soon.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Do you believe that the Aboriginal people's opinions should inform whether or not we go down the treaty path as a state?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes. As I said in a previous answer, Dr Roger Thomas is conducting this work for us at the moment as part of the Aboriginal Action Plan and he has been speaking to different groups right across the state. My understanding is—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: If the overall majority of Aboriginal people support treaty in this state would you then change your position to have scrapped it because, to the best of my knowledge, the overall majority of Aboriginal people in that original consultation said, 'Yes, we believe treaty is a good idea.' The former government then pursued a process of treaty.

You have come to government and scrapped that process, and I am not aware of any evidence that suggests that the Aboriginal people have changed their mind on the value of treaty, notwithstanding the challenges that may exist of their implementation. So, that being the case, would you be open minded to reversing your position?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Obviously we have a new federal minister, and I am looking forward to having a conversation with him. He has made his comments regarding treaty in recent days. We know that the commonwealth is looking to formalise its response with regard to a voice to parliament following the Uluru Statement from the Heart. I think that in this regard it is early days.

You identify the states that are taking action. I am more than happy to look and listen and seek some reports on what progress is being made. As I said, we are continuing with our implementation of the Buthera Agreement if there is a potential change to what we are doing here in South Australia. The most important thing though—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Why did you make the decision to scrap the treaty process without that information at hand? You came to government. You would have had access to Dr Thomas's consultation. Who was advising you to scrap the treaty process? What Aboriginal people were telling you to scrap the treaty process in light of the fact that you had that information available to you?

The CHAIR: Leader, I might just remind you that you have the call at every opportunity, but I might ask you not to interrupt the Premier when he is answering your previous question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Very well, Mr Chairman.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am just trying to recall. Certainly, on coming to government I had the opportunity to meet with the commissioner, Roger Thomas, who was the treaty commissioner at the time—he is now the Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement here in South Australia—and his office, as I had access to him prior to the election. In his reports to me, I think that he very accurately outlined what he saw as the process that had been put in place under the previous government and the benefits of the Buthera Agreement and also some of the complexities around the negotiation.

I also had the opportunity to meet with people from the Narungga Nation and receive their feedback, and it is fair to say that that feedback was disparate. There were some people who thought the agreement was adequate, there were some people who thought that it was completely inadequate and there were some people who still to this day have very grave concerns regarding that agreement.

We are where we are with regard to that agreement. I do not make any comment regarding the adequacy of the Buthera Agreement because I know that these things are very difficult and complex negotiations. I appreciate from the previous government's perspective that they were looking to finalise that prior to the election, and that is fair enough. I think they took that course of action, which was logical, and we have an agreement now.

As I said, some people are not happy with that agreement, but I think that most of the people I am dealing with believe that we are genuinely implementing the letter and spirit of that agreement,

and we certainly have continued the funding as per the agreement that was signed by the previous government.

The CHAIR: For the committee's information, we will break for lunch at 1.30.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I appreciate the Premier's reiteration of his position in regard to the Buthera Agreement. What I would like to understand—because that information and that explanation, which I think are justified and warranted—is the inconsistency between that position and the decision to stop treaty or scrap treaty everywhere else.

If the Premier is of the view that decisions around treaty going forward should be informed by Aboriginal people, if the majority of Aboriginal people believe treaty to be a good thing and the Buthera Agreement enjoys support by this government, why then the decision to scrap treaty? My specific question, if you want me to drill it down, is: what Aboriginal people advised you in favour of scrapping the treaty process? What Aboriginal people did you engage with prior to making that decision?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have answered that several different ways already. I think it will probably be something that does have a time. I do not think it is resolved yet who that will be between. As I said, there are some people who believe that we should have one treaty for the nation. I note that Ken Wyatt does not think that at the moment. I know that there were very disparate views with regard to even a state-based treaty, whether the states were the logical jurisdiction to sign that agreement and whether or not it should be statewide or individual nations.

The previous government formed an opinion; I respect that. We are implementing that process at the moment. We believe that there are some fundamental building blocks that need to be put into place as soon as possible in terms of a more robust model for Aboriginal engagement in South Australia. Perhaps if they were in place the treaty process the previous government embarked upon would have been more successful.

Currently, in South Australia we have the South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council (SAAAC). I have very fulsome engagement with this organisation. In fact, the SAAAC has met now twice with cabinet. As you would be more than aware, leader, very few organisations ever come to cabinet. We feel this is very significant, where the SAAAC and the South Australian government cabinet can come together on a regular basis to very genuinely work through how we can improve outcomes in South Australia.

Certainly, in our first two meetings we had a good agenda. The first one was mainly focused on the Aboriginal action plan, and in the second one we were very pleased that the SAAAC came to us and said, 'Look, these are the specific areas that we would like to focus on for this meeting.' These meetings will continue into the future, but we are also, as I said, in the midst of finalising a new engagement model for the state going forward. Again, like many things in Aboriginal affairs, there are disparate views on exactly how that should look, who the representatives would be, and whether they would be appointed or whether they would be elected.

Since we came to government, the South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council has had its term extended twice now, if not three times, until June next year, and this is exactly the same Aboriginal advisory council personnel that the previous government put in place. We have not changed the personnel; we have not augmented the personnel. We have kept the people who were put in place by the previous Labor government, and we continue to work with them and take their advice very seriously.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In light of the fact that you have retained the same personnel, has their advice changed? If their advice was in support of treaty and you take their advice seriously, why then abandon the treaty process? If the people are the same, the advice is the same, and you take their advice seriously, why then the change in decision?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We discussed these issues on coming into government and put forward a proposal regarding what we wanted to do going forward, and we have received support from the SAAAC since then. We asked them about the development of the action plan, and we specifically raised the issue that we did not believe we had time to waste to go out for a very long-winded consultation. We asked them to accept a shorter period for consultation where they were

involved, the Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement was involved and state departments were involved to come up with an initial action plan.

We were very keen, in that action plan, to avoid motherhood statements. We really wanted it to be an action-oriented plan where there would be a number of items where we could say they were either achieved or not achieved within a two-year period rather than having long-range aspirations. There are already plenty of those: what we are lacking is progress towards them, so what we decided on was an action plan that we could determine, within time frames, yes or no.

My understanding is that on the most recent update we are on track in more than 30 of the 32 items. I think there might be one that is still outstanding—there you go, there are two that are outstanding I have just been informed, so I was pretty accurate there, and we will be able to take corrective action on those two. There is really good progress, and I would like to commend all my fellow members of cabinet. I have been super impressed by the way they have taken on their responsibilities in this area.

I can also say that one of the reasons we changed the arrangement with regard to Aboriginal affairs and brought it back into the central agency is that I genuinely believe it was always extraordinarily difficult for a minister to look after this portfolio because there is a limited amount of money that goes into Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. There are finite resources within the division itself, and most of the service delivery actually occurs in every other department: it occurs in Health, it occurs in Attorney-General's, it occurs in education, transport, police, and so on and so forth.

That is why rather than leaving one minister with the responsibility of trying to go out and, essentially, cudgel other ministers, who have their own level of concerns in their portfolio areas to try to somehow deliver against their agenda, I thought it was much better practice to try to make it a whole-of-cabinet agenda. I know it is early days, but I think there are some really good green shoots that will support this as being the right approach.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Those gathered at Uluru in 2017 wrote, 'We call for the establishment of a First Nations Voice enshrined in the Constitution.' Do you think that is something worthy of pursuit?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Certainly, this is something that the federal government is envisaging at the moment. I am certainly in support of as much interaction as possible. I really look forward to meeting with the minister in the coming weeks just to see what that process is. My understanding is that, going back probably more than a year now, there was a sort of cross-party working group put together to look to respond to the Uluru Statement from the Heart. With everything else that has been going on with the federal election, I think it would be good to get back to find out what is happening there.

With regard to the state parliament, I certainly believe that we need to have greater interaction with Aboriginal people in South Australia. I am not convinced that the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee is contributing as much now as was originally envisaged in the legislation. From time to time, we can look at the objects of those committees. Maybe there is an opportunity there to do something that will provide a greater level of input into our considerations here in this parliament.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Will you support South Australian Labor's commitment for an SA voice to the South Australian parliament?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not sure what your proposal is, but I am more than happy to hear it and my door is always open. If you have a specific proposal, then I would be more than happy to hear it.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: When people gathered at Uluru in 2017, they wrote:

...the coming together after a struggle. It captures our aspirations for a fair and truthful relationship with the people of Australia and a better future for our children based on justice and self-determination.

We seek a Makarrata Commission to supervise a process of agreement-making between governments and First Nations and truth-telling about our history.

What steps have you taken to investigate such a commission in South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This is a truth-telling commission?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The Makarrata commission, yes.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not think we have taken any steps with regard to that. Keep in mind that this was actually a statement made while the previous Labor government was in power. I am happy to see whether they provided a formal response and took action with regard to that statement, which was made while they were in government.

Mr HUGHES: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 12. Under Objective it states:

The department provides leadership across government policy development on Aboriginal community support, multicultural affairs and the arts.

A lot of emphasis has been put on the Aboriginal Action Plan by the government. Of the 32 items in that action plan, how many have been initiated by the current government?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think it is a combination. I am certainly not one to throw out good programs that were put in place by the previous government. Sometimes we have just kept them exactly as they were by the previous government; sometimes we have augmented them and sometimes we have introduced our own. Quite frankly, I think this is an area where it is not about Labor or Liberal. I think if there is one area of government policy on which we should all be working together in a bipartisan way it is Aboriginal affairs, because I think it is actually one of the most, if not the most, complex areas of public policy.

I think both parties have had their highlights and lowlights in terms of administration in this area. I certainly recognise the previous government's efforts in this area. We are taking a different approach in some areas, but we are certainly not in any way, shape or form being ideological or throwing the baby out with the bathwater. Where we see programs that are working well, we are happy to continue them and then further reinvest in them.

Mr HUGHES: I acknowledge the importance of taking a bipartisan approach, especially in relation to Aboriginal affairs, but, given the importance that the government have put on the action plan—there are 32 items—maybe you could humour us by indicating which of the initiatives are Liberal Party initiatives. I acknowledge that there are a number of initiatives that are hybrid initiatives that were started under Labor that have possibly been built on by the current government, and there are other initiatives that were pure Labor initiatives, if you like. Of the initiatives that are in the action plan, how many have been as a result of actions by the current government?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The action plan is the action plan. I do not have an ability, here at this committee, to go through it line by line to determine—and I do not know the purpose. I really fail to understand this line of questioning. I have already said that there are things that the previous government did that we acknowledged were good. We are not in any way, shape or form saying that we have all the answers.

The commitment I make to this committee today, and to the parliament more broadly, is that if people have suggestions on things that we could do that would improve the action plan, we are all ears. This is an area where we do not want to have a political contest. I certainly do not believe that I have the information to provide a comprehensive answer, nor do I think it would be useful anyway.

Mr HUGHES: Of the elements in the action plan, the various initiatives, how much federal funding has been received for those initiatives? If federal funding has been received, for which initiatives has it been received?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that information with me, but obviously the federal government do have a role to play. Housing is an issue that comes immediately to mind, and it is incorporated into the Aboriginal Affairs Action Plan. I am happy for officers within AARD to look at that question. If they have something to add, I am happy for them to provide that directly to you.

Mr HUGHES: What was the level of consultation in relation to the action plan? I think it has been referred to that the people who were consulted within the Aboriginal community were essentially government-appointed Aboriginal people. SAAAC has been mentioned, and the Aboriginal Lands

Trust. Was there any consultation with Aboriginal communities on a wider basis? If so, with whom, and which communities were consulted?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Again, I am not quite sure of the reason for these questions. If you are asserting that the only people we consulted were government-appointed board members, I have not changed any of the board members since the previous government. They were actually Labor-appointed people who did most of the consultation.

I did acknowledge in one of my previous answers—I am not sure if you were here at the time—that we did go to the SAAAC. We were concerned that some people would say that there was not extensive consultation, but we put it to the SAAAC that we thought that there was a need for action, not more and more consultation. They agreed. They said, 'We have been very well consulted over a long period of time.'

I made the commitment that if, after the action plan was implemented, people said, 'There are other things that we would now like to add,' we would not have to wait until the end of a two-year period for them to be brought on. In the next six or 12 months, I think that we will find ourselves in a situation where some items will be completely delivered. So, if you like, they will come off, and it is quite possible that new items will go on.

We are not a government that says, 'We can only do things which are on our 32-point plan.' If there are other items—and there are plenty of them—where people come to us and say, 'We think that there are some other opportunities for advancement,' we are all ears. This is an area in which not only I am vitally interested but I am genuinely of the opinion that the cabinet, and the government more broadly, is vitally interested in this.

We see very strong support for the action plan from Senior Management Council. In fact, we could not have delivered it in the time frame without the very strong support of members of the Senior Management Council. If there are other items that community members or the SAAAC would like to add, or the Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement, in his discussions with members of the broader Aboriginal community of South Australia, would like to add, we are not eliminating any ideas in this area.

Neither are we saying that everything we have done is right. We are making best endeavours. Often you think something is going to work, but sometimes it does not. If that is the case, we are not going to double-down and be bloody-minded and stick to an issue because we said that we thought it was going to work; we will take corrective action.

Mr HUGHES: Given the importance of the action plan, and I acknowledge that it is a living process, if you like, and that over time it will evolve, would you acknowledge that it is important that there be wider consultation with the Aboriginal community and not just with the peak bodies that are in place?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, and that is why one of the items on the action agenda is to come up with a new model for that ongoing engagement. I think we are only weeks away now from the final report being received from Dr Thomas. He has had extensive consultation on the consultation. He has been out talking to people right across the state, and he is very good at it. I am advised that he is going to give me a report by the end of September/early October. He is doing final consultation on different models; that will be received before the end of the year and we will make that public.

Mr HUGHES: So different models of consultation with the broader Aboriginal community?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes. As you guys would be aware, you were in government for 16 years, there are lots and lots of different representative groups within Aboriginal South Australia—sometimes even within an individual nation there are multiple levels of representation—so this is not an easy process. It is not like the election of a committee at the local basketball club. By the way, that often has its level of political processes. This is really quite a complicated area and we are considering all options, but it is fair to say that this is one area we do not want to rush and get wrong because the consequences of that I think will just further entrench some of the issues we have had in regard to an effective representation to government in the past.

Mr HUGHES: Time permitting, I might come back to the action plan, but I think it is important to raise some questions about remote Aboriginal housing. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 153, Program 1: Accountability for Public Sector Resources, highlights 2018-19, dot point 2. Have you met with minister Ken Wyatt since his appointment, or have you spoken to him by phone?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No.

Mr HUGHES: Do you intend to do so in the near future?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I know that you have only just come to the committee, but we have been in it for 45 minutes and I have actually canvassed this twice. I am happy to do it a third time. We congratulate Mr Ken Wyatt on his appointment. We enjoyed a good working relationship with him in his previous portfolios in relation to ageing. We have, I think, sought a meeting that we hope to have with him by the end of this month or early next month.

Mr HUGHES: In last year's estimates you told us that you had not met with minister Nigel Scullion. However, your colleague Michelle Lensink of the other place told her chamber that you actually had met all together with minister Scullion to discuss remote Aboriginal housing. Do you recall that meeting?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not remember the specific details, but I know that we did have various representations with the federal government in regard to their offer to us in terms of remote Indigenous housing. We were not happy with their initial offers to us; we felt they were unsatisfactory. My understanding is that a satisfactory agreement has now been reached. Not wanting to handball, but this is actually not something that we have dealt with in DPC. We were party to early negotiations, but this is something that would be better canvassed with the Minister for Human Services.

Mr HUGHES: So you are saying that you did not actually meet with the then minister?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think we did meet with him, but I did not conduct the negotiation for the remote Indigenous housing agreement. That was a different department. I think there was a meeting in Adelaide, which probably would go back to last year, but I just do not have the date of that meeting.

Mr HUGHES: Do you recall that at the meeting with minister Scullion before budget estimates last year that minister Scullion made a one-year offer of funding and you readily accepted this offer and the ongoing responsibility without future commonwealth investment; is that your recollection?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No.

Mr HUGHES: What is your recollection?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, I have just outlined it to the committee, but I am happy to do it again. My recollection is that the commonwealth made an offer to the state, which we rejected. In fact, I do not think that there was any agreement until early this year. I think that what they were offering was not acceptable and, rather than just agree for the sake of agreeing with the commonwealth, we held out. I think we ended up with a much better deal than what was originally being pushed by the federal government.

Mr HUGHES: Given the agreements that are in place, how many new houses will be built and in which communities?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Again, this is a very reasonable question, but it is a reasonable question for the Minister for Human Services, not the Premier. I just do not have that information. It is not in my portfolio.

Mr HUGHES: Surely, given your portfolio area of Aboriginal affairs, and given the importance of remote housing and the real challenges that exist in communities such as on the APY lands, I would have thought you would be across it.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I just refer you to my previous answer.

Mr HUGHES: How much has been budgeted for over the next decade when it comes to Aboriginal remote housing?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I just refer you to my previous answer.

Mr HUGHES: Did the funding agreement that was entered into with the commonwealth fall well short of what other states were able to negotiate?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I cannot be any clearer. I am not trying to dodge these questions on behalf of the government. It is just that I do not have any of that information. I am not party to that agreement. I am surprised that the Leader of the Opposition is encouraging you to ask these questions. They are just not relevant to this committee.

The CHAIR: Member for Giles, when you were indicating your budget line you were actually referencing Treasury and Finance. We do not actually have that open at the moment. I understand that your questions are relevant to Aboriginal housing in particular, but I might ask that you come back to Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. The leader has a question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 24 and specifically dot point 3 in reference to the Aboriginal Heritage Act. Premier, which minister is responsible for the administration of the Aboriginal Heritage Act?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am, as the Premier.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How many determinations have been made under that act since you came to government?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that information, but I am happy to determine it and get back to you.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: You are happy to take that on notice?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do have that information, which I am happy to provide to the committee now, if you would prefer it now.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That sounds great.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As you would be aware, under the Aboriginal Heritage Act I have the ability to determine approvals, authorisations and determinations. I am advised that one approval has been made. There have been 11 authorisations, and one determination was considered but rejected.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is that it?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Correct.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What happened with that determination?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That determination was related to the Leigh Creek coalfields area. It was a request by ATLA and it was refused.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Why did you do that?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: In fact, that was something I delegated to the Treasurer. I am happy to provide further detail, but I am not sure that I have it here. I will just check.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Why did you delegate it to the Treasurer when you are the responsible minister?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that ATLA requested for determination to the government which would prevent the Leigh Creek pilot to go ahead, citing that they thought there would be disturbance of the local heritage. An investigation was undertaken and the government formed the opinion that that was not going to be the case, and so the pilot was authorised to proceed.

I am advised that with regard to this issue different representative groups had disparate views. ATLA was of the view that this would form a disturbance; other groups were not of that opinion. Ultimately, the government formed the opinion that we would not be making a determination.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Why did you delegate that determination to the Treasurer?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It was a decision that I made at the time. I think I have delegated authority to the Treasurer on just two occasions. I do not think I have done anything recently.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Why? You are the responsible minister. Why are you delegating to the Treasurer?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: From time to time, we form the opinion that another minister is in a better position to make that determination. In this case, that was the person I decided would do it. It is a difficult situation sometimes, where you have responsibility for economic growth and you have responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. My gut feeling at that time was that he was in a better position to make that decision.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: You are a premier who has taken on the responsibility of the Aboriginal Heritage Act, you feel as though you are conflicted in the administration of that act in the context of your pursuit of economic growth as Premier, so you then hand it to the Treasurer? Does he not have to take into account economic growth? Why is he better placed to make that balanced judgement call than the responsible minister themselves?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, I formed the opinion that he would be better to make that decision in this particular instance.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Why did you form that opinion?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is the decision that I made.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But why?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, I have provided my answer to the committee.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But I am trying to understand the rationale. Did you make that decision just spontaneously, or did you think it through and then come to a view?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I know you ran out of questions quite some time ago, but I have provided my—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: You love that line, don't you? You keep saying it over and over again. I have dozens of questions here to ask you.

The CHAIR: Order!

Mr MALINAUSKAS: It is getting a bit boring. Come up with something new, surely.

The CHAIR: Order! Leader, you have asked your question. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The reality is that there are so many legitimate questions that could be asked for this portfolio. It is a portfolio that we should all be—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But this is the one I am asking you now: why did you make the decision? Why are you delegating that authority? What is the reason you formed that opinion?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sometimes if you ask it louder, you get a different answer. I do not know; that might be what has happened.

The CHAIR: To all committee members, we are down to the last 30 seconds so, Premier, do you have anything further to add to that answer?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, sir.

The CHAIR: I will take one more question, leader.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Premier, how many Aboriginal jobs have been created within the public sector since you took office?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I took a question on that only a few minutes ago from the member for Florey. I have committed to getting that information to her and I am happy to provide it to you as well.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I would like to be provided with a degree of specificity in regard to that exercise for the sake of my personal interest. When you undertake that work, can you please come back with figures in regard to SAPOL?

The CHAIR: I guess that is a supplementary question. The Premier has agreed to do that. Having reached the allotted time, we are going to break for lunch. The committee will reconvene at 2.30. The bells will ring for three minutes prior to that.

Sitting suspended from 13:30 to 14:30.

Membership:

Ms Stinson substituted for Mr Hughes.

Ms Luethen substituted for Mr Murray.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr J. McDowell, Chief Executive, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Mr S. Woolhouse, Executive Director, Communities and Corporate, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Ms J. Layther, Director, Arts SA, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

The CHAIR: Welcome back to committee A. We are this afternoon dealing with Arts SA for the first hour and Veterans SA for half an hour after that. We will have a break at 4 o'clock and, at 4.15, we will examine Multicultural SA for three-quarters of an hour. If the Premier has any new advisers here, I ask him to introduce them, please.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It gives me great pleasure to introduce to the committee this afternoon Jennifer Layther, who is our fabulous Director of Arts South Australia. I reintroduce to the committee Steven Woolhouse, the Executive Director of Communities and Corporate. Behind me is Mr Jim McDowell, Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

The CHAIR: Do you wish to make an opening statement, Premier?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, thank you, sir.

The CHAIR: Leader, do you wish to make an opening statement? If not, I invite questions. The member for Badcoe.

Ms STINSON: Thank you very much, Premier and department executives as well. I will go firstly to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 30. Could you tell me how many unpaid attendances there were at the State Opera in 2017-18?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not sure that we report those. I can make an inquiry of the State Opera, if you like.

Ms STINSON: I refer you to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 30.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I see. In 2017-18, there were 9,000.

Ms STINSON: I was after unpaid attendances.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sorry. It was 1,200.

Ms STINSON: Is it 12,000?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No; 1,200.

Ms STINSON: The budget paper that I have has the State Opera unpaid attendances 2017-18 actual as—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There were a number of errors on that page. My understanding is that the Treasurer has already issued a correction to that page.

Ms STINSON: When was that issued?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have no idea.

Ms STINSON: This is estimates. It would be handy for the opposition to have the correct figures. If a correction has been issued, it certainly has not been brought to the attention of the opposition or the shadow minister for arts.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not sure what the Treasurer's methodology is, but I can tell you now that it is 1,200. It is pretty obvious that it is a typo.

The CHAIR: It is quite obvious to me that that is a typographical error of some sort. Seek clarification by all means, but it is a mistake, by the looks of it.

Ms STINSON: Are there any other errors that the Premier would like to bring to the opposition's attention?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As you can see, in the way that page was originally presented, State Opera appears twice. It is the first reference that is correct, with that typographical error. It is 1,200 in place of whatever that number is. The one underneath it, which says State Opera, is actually the State Theatre Company.

Ms STINSON: Could you take us through that? Obviously, you are apprised of information that we in the opposition are not.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am happy to do it now, but I do not want to chew up all your time, or I can just provide it to you.

Ms STINSON: Well, this is estimates, so I would like to be able to question you about the numbers. I have just been made aware that you have not provided the correct numbers in the official budget papers that are published online.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The online paper has been updated for some time; that is completely—

Ms STINSON: These papers I printed last night were not updated last night when I printed them.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Alright, so what is your question?

Ms STINSON: My question is: what are the true figures?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: For the State Opera?

Ms STINSON: For the State Opera, for the State Theatre and for any other organisation that you have not disclosed the figures for.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is not as though we have not disclosed the figures.

Ms STINSON: You have not disclosed them to the opposition. No-one has called our offices, no-one has made us aware whatsoever that there has been any change to the published figures of the state budget. How are we meant to ask questions about the budget in estimates if we are only now finding out that you have furnished us with the wrong figures on budget day?

The CHAIR: Maybe I could help find a way through this. It is quite obvious to me that 'unpaid attendances' for 2017-18 is a typographical error.

Ms STINSON: I am happy to accept that, sir, but—

The CHAIR: It is not a correct number, so if the Premier can at least ascertain what the correct figure is that should help, should it not?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have just had a look, and the updated one is the one that is online at the moment. I do not know when the correction was made, but it certainly is online at the moment. I do not know whether you are looking at an old version, but I am happy to go through it now in trying to be as helpful as I can to the committee.

Ms STINSON: Thank you.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: For State Opera, paid seats of performances, the 2019-20 target is 19,000, the 2018-19 estimated result is 14,000, the 2018-19 target is 26,000, the actual in 2017-18 is 9,000 now, and then below that are the unpaid attendances. I will not keep reading them out, but for those four reporting periods that are on the page: 4,000, 3,000, 5,000 and 1,200.

Then for State Theatre, paid seats of performances, again using those same four columns working from left to right, the figures are 45,000, 40,450, 44,900 and 41,736. Unpaid attendances are 6,000, 5,740, 5,700 and 7,063.

Ms STINSON: Thank you very much.

Mr TEAGUE: Chair—

The CHAIR: Member for Badcoe, we have just had a look at the online version, and there has been a correction. On the particular figure that I mentioned before, the unpaid attendances now reads 1,200.

Ms STINSON: I accept that, sir, but, as I mentioned earlier, it is not a correction that was brought to the opposition's attention whatsoever, and certainly last night when I reviewed the papers as I had on budget day they were the same as the ones that were in the budget papers that were presented to the parliament on budget day.

I would have thought that, if these things do change and if something is presented to the parliament that is later determined to be incorrect, the opposition, who are obviously going to be asking questions about this in estimates, might be given at least the courtesy of the correct numbers before estimates. Did you have a point of order or shall I go on?

The CHAIR: Actually, member for Badcoe, that is for me to do. There is a point of order from the member for Heysen.

Mr TEAGUE: For the benefit of all members of the estimates committee, I bring to your attention the fact that the online version that we are working from is updated and contains figures in a sensible format. What appears to be the subject of discussion is simply a matter of typographical presentation as opposed to a policy direction or matters of accountability.

The CHAIR: Member for Heysen, I agree with you, and that is the point I have been making. In the printed version, member for Badcoe, it is quite obvious to the casual observer even that it is an incorrect figure. It is not even a real number. Can I suggest that we not waste too much time on this. We only have three-quarters of an hour.

Ms STINSON: I am happy to move on, sir. Premier, could you tell us what the attendance figures are for the Adelaide Festival Centre, as those do not appear to be published in the papers that were tabled in paper to the parliament on budget day.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, I am more than happy to do that. In the 2019-20 target column, the figure for paid seats is 45,000 and the estimated result is 40,450.

Ms STINSON: I am sorry, could you start again?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sorry, I am reading from the wrong line. For the Adelaide Festival Centre, the 2019-20 target is 850,000. The estimated result for 2018-19 is 980,000. The target for last financial year was 820,000 and the actual in 2017-18 was 823,270.

Ms STINSON: Thank you very much. Premier, for the sake of completeness at least, could you tell me if the figure that I have in front of me for the SA Museum for the number of visitors is correct? You will find it in Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 31.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Would you like me to read the numbers out?

Ms STINSON: I am happy to read you what I have in front of me if you would prefer.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have no preference.

Ms STINSON: The number I have in front of me for the number of visitors to the SA Museum in the 2017-18 actual is 82,067; is that what you have?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, 824,067.

Ms STINSON: So that is another error. Are there any other errors on that page, page 31, that have been subsequently corrected on the online version?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Not that I am aware of.

Ms STINSON: Are there any other errors in the arts and culture budget pages that we have not discussed in the last few minutes?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Not that I am aware of, no. Mr Chairman, if I could make an apology to the committee for any inconvenience it has caused. I would have thought, though, at a very cursory glance, that any reader would have recognised immediately the errors. For example, State Opera appears three times with completely separate numbers, so it hardly should be a revelation to anybody today that there was an error in the published papers. I do not know when the online version was changed, but certainly anybody taking a look at that one page would know that there was a very obvious typographical error with the titles.

The CHAIR: Thank you for that, Premier.

Ms BEDFORD: I refer the Premier and minister for the arts to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 15, the shift of the History Trust out of Arts SA and into the Department for Education. How will that affect funding for the Centre of Democracy and would the Centre of Democracy be better placed attached to parliament rather than education?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I thank the member for Florey for her question. She could be quite right and maybe it should be attached to the parliament, but this is not an area that is administered under my jurisdiction anymore. I think it was transferred to the education department as of 1 September last year.

Ms BEDFORD: It was worth a try.

Ms STINSON: Premier, considering those errors that have been detected in the budget papers, do you think you have possibly cut too many staff from Arts SA if they are not able to get the budget papers right?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No. I am advised that the update was made on Friday 21 June and updated online. That is the advice I am just receiving, but please be aware that these figures are not figures that are done by Arts SA: they are figures that are done by Treasury, and from time to time errors are made. I do not think this is the first time there have been typographical errors in something that has been handed down. As I said, I apologise to the committee for any inconvenience, but I think the error is reasonably obvious.

Ms STINSON: I disagree.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: So you think there are three State Opera companies in South Australia?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: For the five years I was a minister we, as ministers, had to go through every line.

The CHAIR: The Premier has apologised and he has informed us that the online version was updated on 21 June. I think we will move to the next question, member for Badcoe.

Ms STINSON: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 29, program summary. What is the current headcount of employees in the arts and culture line of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: For what period?

Ms STINSON: What is the current headcount as of this moment or as of the most recent information you have to hand?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that. What I have are the budget lines in front of me that say the estimated result in 2018-19 was 55 and that the budget for this year is 55.

Ms STINSON: Could you take that question on notice and get back to us later?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not think it has changed.

Ms STINSON: The headcount was my question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Ms STINSON: In the budget papers it says 55, but I am asking for the headcount. Obviously some of those FTEs may be part-time or—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We can take that on notice. I would be more than happy to come back with the result.

Ms STINSON: Thank you very much. I would also be after the headcount as at 30 June 2018, if it is possible to take that on notice as well. Are you able take that on notice as well, Premier?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: If we are able to provide a headcount on that date we will, but certainly the budget provides that the FTEs on that date were 81.7.

Ms STINSON: In last year's budget there was a breakdown of agencies that the FTEs were allocated to. Could you please list which agencies these FTEs are allocated to that are published in this year's budget, and how many FTEs are allocated to each agency?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Can you repeat the question, please?

Ms STINSON: In last year's budget papers there was a breakdown of the agencies that each of the FTEs were allocated to. Could you please list which agencies the FTEs are allocated to this year? That information is not in the budget papers this year.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think that is because last year we were mid a year making an allocation from Arts SA to other agencies, so they were people who were transferred to the education department and the Department for Innovation and Skills. That transfer has been made. We are not making a further transfer to those departments; that was made on 1 September last year. There is no such transfer on an ongoing basis. They are the employees; they were transferred, and they remain those other portfolio's employees.

Ms STINSON: I understand what you are saying there, but when I look at the table that was published last year it splits up the number of FTEs between the four different program areas. They are the State Library, public libraries and community info services, access to art, museum and heritage (which covers the Art Gallery of SA, the SA Museum, Carrick Hill, History SA and Artlab), and the fourth line is arts industry development.

I understand all those are still sitting with you—aside from History SA, and I know how many people are in History SA. I wonder if you could provide the same information that was provided in the budget papers last year, that is, a breakdown of those 55 FTEs across the program lines or, if you prefer, across agencies and programs.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have already dealt with the agency issue. My understanding of the breakdown of the 55 is as follows. Arts SA, as of MOG changes last year, is really now focused on policy advice and grants administration, and there are 13 staff who are involved in those two areas. In addition to that, 13 people sit within DPC more broadly who provide that corporate overhead. So people and roles that were previously undertaken within Arts SA are now in DPC—finance, human resources, some infrastructure management and so on and so forth. They have been transferred out, so there are another 13 there. That means there must be 29 who are in Artlab.

Ms STINSON: So 29 people in Artlab now?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is my understanding.

Ms STINSON: So there are not separate people allocated to the State Library, public libraries, the Art Gallery of SA, the SA Museum anymore?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Those agencies would report their staff separately, but there are no Arts South Australia employees separated out within their numbers. That is the way the 55 is derived; 13 are for policy and grant management, 13 for more corporate overheads that are allocated, if you like, back from the DPC staff to Arts SA, to come up with the 55, and then 29 in Artlab. The 29 in Artlab is really exactly the same. If you go back to the 2017-18 year, there would have been around that number of the 81 who were Artlab employees.

Ms STINSON: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 28, under the heading Arts and Cultural Policy and Support. Does Arts SA still exist, as in is it a brand you still use?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think that it is something still being used from time to time, yes.

Ms STINSON: Can you give me some examples of where it is now being used? It is just that there is no mention of it in the budget.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that it is not as though we have recalled everything and no longer use the brand, but we are not proactively setting up a separate brand for a separate agency Arts South Australia now.

Ms STINSON: I refer to Budget Paper 5, page 78, the national Aboriginal art and cultures gallery. Could you provide the breakdown of state and federal funding by year for the gallery?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: From a state perspective, my understanding is that we included \$60 million in last year's budget, the first of which appeared in 2021. There was \$60 million of state government money, which was provided in two years: the first \$10 million was in 2021 and the second amount, the \$50 million amount, is in the 2021-22 year. In terms of the federal government money, I understand that we have been provided with \$85 million in capital to go towards the gallery, although I think some of the recommendations coming to us now might change the name to 'centre'. In the forwards, my understanding is that \$13 million of that is available out of a total of \$85 million.

Ms STINSON: That is the coming four years of the federal budget you are talking about?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Correct.

Ms STINSON: Was there \$200,000 for a scoping study in the previous financial year, 2018-19?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Ms STINSON: Is there \$500,000 in 2019-20 for a business case?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Correct.

Ms STINSON: My calculation—and maths is always dangerous, of course—is that all that adds up \$145.7 million.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Ms STINSON: Why, then, in the written explanations do the budget papers say that this adds up to \$150 million? Is there other money that I am unaware of?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will take that on notice because that is a Treasury reference and there may be another government department that is allocating some money towards this. We are not 100 per cent sure. It is not DPC money towards that number. To be clear, we are not yet in receipt of the original scoping study final report, although my understanding is that it is imminent. Then we need to get on with the business case. The final budget for the Aboriginal art and cultures centre is yet to be determined.

The good news is that we already have that \$145 million or \$150 million, which is already in the forward estimates. Because the site for this is still under demolition and that work is going to take another 18 months, we still have time to get the overall planning for this right. I thought it was very important to try to get the money locked into the budget and the commitment from the federal

government locked in as part of our City Deal so that it is available. Rather than having a big shock when the final business plan is complete, it is actually provided for.

Ms STINSON: It is rather an important point, how much it is costing. From my understanding, there is \$145.7 million in the budget papers; that is, in your agency and anywhere else, only \$145.7 million has been publicised. However, in your media releases, in all media coverage, in your own comments to the media and indeed in the explanatory paragraphs, it talks about there being \$150 million. Is there somewhere else that that remaining \$350,000-odd is, where we should be looking for it? It would be good to know where that money is, if you are claiming to be spending \$150 million.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think that what you are suggesting is that there is actually \$4.3 million missing. I do not know where the other figures that you have just come up with come from—

Ms STINSON: I am sorry, yes.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —but I will, as I previously answered to the committee, chase up that discrepancy with the Treasurer. As I said, it is quite possible that other departments are making a contribution to that. It is not easily understood just at the moment, but I will definitely follow it up.

Ms STINSON: How is it that you have been telling the community that you are spending \$150 million on a new art gallery but you have not asked previously what makes up that \$150 million and where it is coming from?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think most people appreciate that there is a business plan that is currently underway.

Ms STINSON: Yes, but the money for that is allocated, and we can see that money in the budget papers. It is the remaining—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have provided my explanation.

Ms STINSON: Budget Paper 5, page 78, the same reference, states that the \$500,000 committed in this year's budget is in addition to already announced funding of \$150 million. Does that mean that the total amount is \$150.5 million—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Ms STINSON: —or has that been poorly written, and is that another error?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No. That is new money, the \$500,000 that is in the arts budget.

Ms STINSON: New money on top of maybe \$150 million.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have provided my answer.

Ms STINSON: On Budget Paper 5, page 78, the same reference, why is the estimate of expenditure on the gallery in 2018-19 recorded as nil when last year's budget allocated \$200,000 for the scoping study? Is that because it has not been billed yet? You did say earlier that it was being done but just had not been delivered yet. Does that mean that it just has not fallen against the budget papers yet, or is there some other reason?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It would have been allocated against a different general ledger item.

Ms STINSON: Would you mind explaining that to me?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The \$200,000 was allocated in the first year to the scoping study. We have allocated \$500,000 to the business plan, but the business plan might come out of a different line item that exists within the DPC budget, but it is still money that is going to be expended against that centre.

Ms STINSON: When do you expect to have the PricewaterhouseCoopers scoping study?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have an exact date, but I am happy to provide that. However, I think it must be very soon because we received a reasonably complete draft about four or five weeks ago that was only subject to a few further consultations. My gut feeling is that it would be in the next couple of weeks.

Ms STINSON: Will that be released publicly, or does it need to go to cabinet first?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Most things like this would go to cabinet for noting before a public release, yes.

Ms STINSON: So you are intending to release that scoping study publicly, in full?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, of course.

Ms STINSON: What about the business case; when will that start? Has that already started, or is it dependent upon the completion of the scoping study?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No. Obviously we need to get the scoping study first that will inform the business plan. But, again, I thought that we have to get the money allocated into the budget to go to the next step so that we can get that done and move the project forward.

Ms STINSON: When do you expect the business case to be completed?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am hoping it will be done in this current financial year.

The CHAIR: The leader has the call.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Will the scoping study and then presumably the business case that follows seek to make an assessment about the expected demand, attendance, interest and economic activity as a result of tourism that would be associated with the gallery?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is it possible that that piece of work will come back and say that that level of interest is not to the extent that everyone would collectively hope?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We are confident that it will.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But is it possible?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, we are confident that it will.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How can you be confident?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is the opinion that we have formed. If you have an alternative view, if you think that people are not going to be interested in Aboriginal art and culture, please feel free to make that statement. I am happy to take that on board; however, we feel very confident that this will be very well regarded. Despite the tourism interest, we have one of the most incredible and extensive collections that exists anywhere in the world and I think we have an obligation to make it more publicly available.

I think the current collection, especially the collection in the SA Museum, has really been stored in a completely and utterly inappropriate condition for a long period of time. Few people have been able to access that collection. I think that we as a state have an obligation to share it, and that is precisely what we will be doing.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: If the scoping study and business case is analysing economic activity, interest and demand and it comes back and says, 'We have reservations around the economics of this,' do you still intend to proceed with the project anyway, in light of the fact that you think there is a higher order cause here? Or, does the scoping study and business case actually have an impact on the decision you take? It is a genuine question. Has a decision been made and regardless of what the business case and the project's scoping study says you are going to do this anyway?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have anything further to add to my previous answer.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What do you mean by that?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We are proceeding with this project and we are absolutely confident that this will be a very important centre, not only for cultural reasons but also for strong economic reasons.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So why are you doing the scoping study and the business case? If it is not going to inform any decision, why are you doing it?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It will, but your question was: what if it comes back and raises concerns; will you not be proceeding with it? I just pointed out that we will be proceeding with it.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Even if the business case study says that it does not stack up, the interest is not there or whatever it might be—which no-one is hoping for—if that eventuated, are you telling me that you are just going to proceed with this \$150 million expenditure in any event?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have nothing further to add to my previous answer.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: These are questions about a \$150 million investment of taxpayers' money.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The Wine Centre mark 2.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That is exactly what we want to avoid. I am just trying to understand. Are you just saying, 'I am not going to answer questions; \$150 million, I will spend it as I see fit. Scrutiny can go somewhere else'? Is that the approach we are adopting here?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think it is almost extraordinary that the Leader of the Opposition would characterise our position on this in that way. I think he would be currently offending a huge number of people in South Australia.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am not offending anyone. I am asking you to explain the decision-making process.

The CHAIR: Leader, we have had this discussion before. The Premier is answering your question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I think a lot of people will be offended, Mr Chairman, that the Premier is not willing to answer some pretty basic questions.

The CHAIR: Leader, you have asked your question. The Premier is answering it. Do you have anything further to add, Premier?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, sir.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Can the Premier please explain what this scoping study from PwC, which is presumably costing the taxpayers of South Australia some money—\$200,000—is informing?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We sort of went through this last year. I am very happy to go through it again. We will be publishing the entire document and, once you see that, you will understand that there is some complexity with regard to exactly and precisely what the gallery/centre will be.

As we have said, we have two incredible collections with the Art Gallery and also the South Australian Museum. We also have to interact with other cultural entities, in particular Tandanya in South Australia. We have done a huge amount of consultation with Indigenous groups in South Australia and more broadly around precisely what the scope of the gallery will be. I am quite convinced that what we will end up with in the final report will be of world significance. I think many jurisdictions have talked about a national art and cultures gallery for a long period of time. I think Australia needs something of this calibre and so we are proceeding with it. We have allocated initial moneys in our first two budgets for it.

It does not mean to say that it is not without its complexity, because trying to work out what the governance arrangements will be and what the access arrangements will be are not easy questions to answer, and that is why we decided to work with PwC to develop this scope. Once it is received by cabinet and published, we will then go out to the market to get a business case developed

for this gallery. We think this is the right way to go about it. It is disappointing that it has been characterised differently by the Leader of the Opposition in contrast quite distinctly from—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am sorry, Premier, but that is a really, really absurd characterisation of a question.

The CHAIR: Leader, you are called to order. We have had this discussion. This is the third time. You are asking questions—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: If the Premier misrepresents a question—

The CHAIR: You are asking questions and the Premier is answering them.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: We are asking questions, not making statements.

The CHAIR: And the Premier is answering.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think that our approach is quite different from the previous government's approach. We note that, with regard to a gallery on that site, the government had multiple iterations in a public design competition. In fact, I think there were two where they awarded it and did not have any money in their forward estimates ever to actually deliver, so they took the sector here in South Australia on a merry dance, getting them to do a huge amount of work at huge cost and no gallery.

By contrast, what I think we have demonstrated is putting the money into the budget and then going about the detailed work that is necessary to deliver a world-class centre for us here in South Australia. As I said, I think that the collections we have are extraordinarily precious and significant, and we would like to share those with the world. I think that we will create a tourist attraction of national and international significance and that we will have a very profound effect on increased visitation in Adelaide.

We have seen what has happened in other jurisdictions where they have created galleries. They have seen very significant increased numbers of visitors. We have seen it in South Australia when we have had exhibitions of international standard here that have driven increased visitation to South Australia. I think of *Colours of Impressionism*, which was held at the Art Gallery of South Australia, *Turner from the Tate*, and, of course, *Tarnanthi*—all world-class exhibitions that have driven increased visitation to South Australia. We would like to have something of that scale but on a permanent basis here in South Australia, and I am quite convinced that we have the collections to deliver on that.

One of the things that we are doing to make sure we are ready is putting some money into last year's budget and this year's budget for the more appropriate storage of some of the artefacts in the SA Museum's collection. I am informed that last year we spent \$380,000 on more appropriate storage of our collection at the South Australian Museum's Netley storage facility and that in the next two years we will spend an additional \$2.6 million to do the urgent immediate works that were neglected in times gone by.

I emphasise to the committee that this is only a partial solution to the storage issue, but this will deal with the immediate requirement. The department is also working on medium and longer-term solutions to the overdue storage problems that we have in South Australia.

Ms STINSON: Premier, are you confident that the \$150.5 million will cover the cost of the planning and construction of the gallery?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No; that is why we are doing the business case.

Ms STINSON: So how have you arrived at the \$150.5 million figure?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think that is the minimum amount. As I have already elaborated upon twice in this committee, I think it shows real conviction when a government puts the money into the forward estimates. It really shows that we are going to do this. It is not just, as I described before, taking people on a merry dance and dangling a carrot. The first significant amount of expenditure, which is \$10 million, is in the 2020-21 year and \$50 million is in the year after.

Ms STINSON: If that \$150 million is just a starting figure, are you expecting it to be something more like \$350 million, which was the Sydney gallery, or \$400 million like the Melbourne gallery? Is that actually the figure you think you will arrive at?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No.

Ms STINSON: Do you have a ballpark idea of where you will end up? Is \$150.5 million pretty much what you think you are going to spend, or do you think it is going to be significantly more than that?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We just need to wait and see. If you think about building costs at the moment, for a project of this level, you tend to work on around \$10,000 per square metre, so \$150 million would provide 15,000 square metres or thereabouts. I do not want to be held to the exact \$10,000 per square metre figure; I am just using this as an example of what valuers would use to arrive at a cost estimate. To put it into perspective, 15,000 square metres is much larger than the existing Art Gallery and Museum added together.

Ms STINSON: I refer to Budget Paper 5, part 2, pages 77 and 78. This is relation to the Aboriginal cultural storage collection you mentioned earlier. In your policy documents, you put forward that the new Aboriginal art and cultures gallery would solve the problem of the storage facility at Netley, but it appears from the comments you have just made that the money set aside under this budget measure is only to upgrade the existing facilities at Netley. Have I understood that correctly?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not want to pre-empt the findings of the study that is being done into the medium and long-term storage of the collection at the SA Museum because it is a broader piece. It does not just deal with the SA Museum; I think it also deals with the Art Gallery, the State Library and the History Trust. We were convinced by the SA Museum that urgent work was required to protect the collection from deterioration, so we decided to proceed with that as a matter of urgency.

We do not think that this money will be wasted because much of the \$2.6 million expenditure is spent on putting systems in place regarding bar coding and so on and new facilities to store. Ultimately, they can be transferred to other locations. There is some racking, but the racking can be moved, the packaging can be moved, and the identification will be useful anyway. So, no, I do not think it is wasted expenditure.

Ms STINSON: What I am trying to find out is: will the full contents of the storage facility at Netley at the moment be transferred to the new Aboriginal art gallery, or is the plan now to upgrade the Netley facility and have the items remain at the Netley facility, or is there some other option?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We do not own the Netley facility; I think the previous government sold it some time ago. My understanding is that at the moment the amount of our collection on public display is a couple of per cent. It is really just a fraction of our total collection. Obviously, a larger proportion of that collection will be displayed in the new gallery. I do not think that there is a definite position on whether or not the storage of the entire collection will be incorporated into the new design. I do not think that we are at a position on that.

I note that, in some similar museums, they co-locate the collection with the display. I am thinking particularly of Quai Branly in Paris, where they have the vast majority of their collection actually stored on site. This allows better interrogation of the collection by key stakeholders. Other galleries have separated those things out. In particular, earlier this year I visited the National Museum of the American Indian in Washington, where they had one site dedicated to display and another site dedicated to storage and ongoing research. I do not think that we have formed an opinion on that at this stage.

Ms STINSON: But it is unlikely that the contents of the Netley facility will all end up in the new gallery; is that right? I have been out there myself as well and had a look at it. It is unlikely that you are going to move all of that into the new gallery.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I have just said, I think that is yet to be determined.

Ms STINSON: You also just mentioned that the state does not own the Netley facility. I assume, though, that at least some of this money is for fixing the roof.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think that there have been improvements to the roof. I can get an update on that. We will get an update on the roof situation. It was a longstanding issue we inherited from the previous government, but I have been advised that it may have been rectified already and that this money is really linked more to those three aspects I outlined before: the identification, the packaging and the racking systems. That money would need to be spent whether it was stored at Netley or elsewhere, so I do not consider that to be wasted money if we move the collection.

Ms STINSON: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 28 regarding the arts plan. Have you received the arts plan?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No.

Ms STINSON: You have not received it from the consultants you hired and gave a 30 June deadline?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No. I heard that you made those comments in parliament yesterday. I do not know where that came from. I think that the original—

Ms STINSON: From you. You said that 30 June was the date you were receiving the documents from the consultants. Certainly, the entire arts sector understands that on 30 June you got that.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, no, you informed parliament yesterday that I had received it; now you are saying that I said that I was going to receive it—

Ms STINSON: Well, actually I am asking you if you have received it. Have you received it?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is very hard to finish a sentence here, isn't it, sir?

Ms STINSON: You seem to be confused about the question. I am just trying to help you out. The question is—

The CHAIR: Member for Badcoe, I have taken the Leader of the Opposition to task on this already. I suggest that, after you have asked your question, you wait for the Premier to answer without interjecting.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you, sir. I was just making comment that yesterday the member for Badcoe informed the parliament that in fact we had received it. Now that she is aware that we have not received it, she may have to inform parliament of that error. The original due date was for 30 June, and the authors of the report requested some time ago that there be an extension of a month, which we granted. They did considerably more consultation than was originally envisaged, and we were delighted with the attendance at the consultation. It was well beyond any expectation that we had originally—

Ms STINSON: I went to it.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —so there was a further month that was granted to them.

Ms STINSON: What is the new deadline now?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said in my previous answer, there is a further one-month extension, so that should be received by the government by the end of July, and that will then be something which, of course, cabinet will consider and then publish.

Ms STINSON: Do you expect to publish a full consultants' document?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Ms STINSON: Is that the arts plan in itself, or will you be receiving a report from the consultants and then devising your own arts plan after you receive that?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We are going to be publishing the results of the work that has been done. We will then reflect on that and we will respond accordingly.

Ms STINSON: Will there be any budget allocation for implementing the recommendations of the arts plan?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Say it again, sorry?

Ms STINSON: Will there be any budget allocation to implement the arts plan?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have not seen it yet.

Ms STINSON: Are you envisaging that money will be required to implement the arts plan?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, certainly money will be required to implement the arts plan, but whether or not—

Ms STINSON: But you might not provide it?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Is that a question, or is that a statement?

Ms STINSON: No, it is a question. You just said that money would be required for the arts plan, but you also said that you wanted to see the arts plan before allocating any money. You either think that there will be money required in the arts plan, and you are going to provide that money, or you are not going to provide that money.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: To be clear, I think that we have made it reasonably clear to everybody in the arts sector in South Australia that we want to devise a new arts plan that will inform the way that we spend money going forward.

Some things that we are currently doing will be continuing, some things that we are doing may stop and some things that we might be doing going forward might be new items. We will need to see the arts plan before that is determined, and I think that is a very reasonable position to take. We have been very clear with the arts sector in South Australia that we are not flush with funds at the moment.

The most recent budget has provided a \$2.3 billion writedown in revenue to the state. At the same time, we have not provided further budget savings for the arts sector in the most recent budget. In fact, there is an increase in expenditure, so they know that it is a difficult time at the moment. We would not envisage massive increased expenditure, but we will wait to see what the arts plan provides.

Ms STINSON: Could there be some cuts to some organisations as a result of the arts plan?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Let's just wait to see what the arts plan provides. Everybody has had input. I have been delighted with the feedback that I have received from people within the sector who appreciate the fact that they are going to have an arts plan, an arts direction, in South Australia. It has been quite some time between drinks for an arts plan for South Australia. I think that the early work that I saw was very positive. Feedback from the sector has been very positive, and I think that this document will provide a longer term direction for arts in South Australia.

Ms STINSON: Were the consultants advised not to speak with any organisation or individual during their consultation on the arts plan?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No.

Ms STINSON: So the consultants were not told not to speak with the opposition?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No. All the sessions that were run were public events. There were hundreds of people there.

Ms STINSON: Yes, I attended them. A series of one-on-one interviews were conducted with arts organisations and other individuals in the sector. Can you tell me how many of those were done and, for that matter, if a list is available of which organisations there are I would be pleased to receive that as well.

The CHAIR: Member for Badcoe, this is in relation to the development of the arts plan; is that your query?

Ms STINSON: That is right, sir.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that more than 200 face-to-face meetings were held, with up to 600 individuals in attendance at town hall meetings across metropolitan and regional

settings. In addition, I am informed that 150 written submissions were received (I am not sure whether one of those came from the opposition), and over 1,700 online surveys were completed. I will make inquiries whether the opposition made a submission.

Ms STINSON: I would know if I did. Could you please provide a list of the organisations that had face-to-face meetings and the organisations, or individuals for that matter, that submitted written submissions?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will ask the authors whether they are happy to provide that information.

Ms STINSON: Could we receive their actual submissions as well?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No.

Ms STINSON: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 29, net cost of providing services. Was the savings target of \$4.9 million for Arts SA and arts organisations in last year's budget achieved?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think that it was achieved, but as you would see—

Ms STINSON: You think that it was?

The CHAIR: Member for Badcoe, I think you have precluded the answer by interjecting.

Ms STINSON: That is fine; I can ask another one. Was the savings target of \$4.9 million for Arts SA achieved? Have you been advised that that target has been achieved?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I just gave that answer to the committee.

Ms STINSON: You said you think so, so do you think someone advised you of that, or do you know that someone advised you that the savings targets were met?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have nothing further to add to my previous answer.

Ms STINSON: It is a fairly important question: were the savings targets met for the arts budget?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not sure if I can finish an answer without being interrupted on this occasion, but the reality is that what is provided in the budget is an estimate to the end of the financial year, which has only just concluded. What happens is a reconciliation process over the next couple of months before a final figure is arrived at. I envisage that we will come to a position where we have achieved all our budget savings.

Ms STINSON: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 28. Your Investing in the Arts election policy document stated that you get matched funding from the corporate and philanthropic sector for arts grants. Where is that money in the budget?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sorry, can you repeat the question?

Ms STINSON: Your election policy stated that you will get matching funding from the corporate and philanthropic sector for arts grants. Where is that money in the budget?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think most of the individual organisations are working very diligently to get corporate sponsorship, donations and philanthropy, and I am certainly assisting organisations as much as possible to that end. We have a very generous philanthropic sector in South Australia, and we should be very grateful for that. I know that the arts organisations in South Australia have performed particularly well in this area in recent times.

Ms STINSON: Do you track the philanthropic commitment to arts in this state?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That would be something that would be done at the individual level. For example, the Art Gallery of South Australia would have a measure, Carrick Hill would have a measure and so on and so forth.

Ms STINSON: So how can you be confident that you are meeting that election promise?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, that is exactly what we are working towards.

Ms STINSON: So that is not achieved yet?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have nothing further to add.

Ms STINSON: Your Investing in the Arts policy document also committed to triennial arts funding for arts organisations. Where is that detailed in the budget, and is that a policy that is being applied?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: If you think about what we have done most recently with the Adelaide Festival, we have given them a commitment for three-year funding for their major work. They made the representation to us that this was needed to be able to secure works because many of them actually have quite a long lead time. They cannot just decide in March to have an opera in July—these things sometimes take a year, two years or three years—so we have provided that forward commitment, if you like, to that project, which has a long lead time.

Ms STINSON: Are there any other organisations that are receiving triennial funding aside from the Festival? I am happy to receive a list at some later date if that is easier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We are certainly keen to provide greater certainty to arts organisations. This is one of the issues that I think will be addressed in the arts plan, but I am happy for the department to provide further advice on an individual basis.

Ms STINSON: Thank you very much. You also made an election commitment to establish a commissioner—

The CHAIR: Member for Badcoe, this will be your final question. We need to move on to Veterans SA.

Ms STINSON: Thank you, sir. You made an election commitment to establish a commissioner for cultural development. Has that been done, and where is that in the budget?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, we decided to put that issue on hold pending the arts planning process. That will be something that may or may not be taken up in that process.

The CHAIR: The time has come for us to move from Arts SA to Veterans SA.

Membership:

Hon. A. Piccolo substituted for Ms Stinson.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr R. Price, Chief Executive, Defence SA.

Mr R. Barnett, Executive Director, Corporate Services, Defence SA.

Mr R. Manton, Director, Veterans SA.

Mr J. McDowell, Chief Executive, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Mr S. Woolhouse, Executive Director, Communities and Corporate, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

The CHAIR: The next session we have in Estimates Committee A is Veterans SA. Premier, would you introduce your advisers please?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is my great pleasure to introduce to the committee this afternoon Rob Manton, Director, Veterans Affairs, and reintroduce Richard Price, Chief Executive, Defence SA.

The CHAIR: Do you intend to make an opening statement, Premier?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, sir.

The CHAIR: Then I call for questions.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Just before I begin I would like to put on record the opposition's appreciation for the government and Veterans SA's successful commemoration of World War I over the period 2014 to 2018, including the production of the booklet *Valour and Violets*, which chronicles the impact of the Great War on South Australians who served and on those who waited at home for them to return.

I also acknowledge the major centenary project, the ANZAC Centenary Memorial Garden Walk along Kintore Avenue, which has been well received by the community and by the veterans community in particular. On that note, could the Premier confirm the current status of that project and under whose care and control it is? Also, what was the final budget for that project?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This is the ANZAC commemorative walk?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: That is correct.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will ask the director to provide that information.

Mr MANTON: Thank you for the question. The memorial walk has been transferred to the Adelaide city council. It is the subject of negotiation between the Adelaide city council and the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure for its ongoing maintenance. I am uncertain of the status of those negotiations, but I believe they are ongoing.

The final cost of the project was \$9.3 million, I believe. A total of \$5 million of that was from the federal government, \$3 million from the state government and approximately \$1½ million dollars from the Adelaide city council, who then provided further funding for the resurfacing of Kintore Avenue, taking their contribution to in the order of \$2 million.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I would like to draw the Premier's attention to Budget Paper 5, Defence SA Departmental Efficiency Measures, on page 26. In your capacity as Minister for Veterans Affairs, what benefits do you hope to achieve from the transferring of the Veterans SA program to Defence SA?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I certainly believe that there will be some benefit from working in a larger office where there are opportunities to interact with another agency of government which has an interest allied to their own. I think we have been extraordinarily satisfied with Veterans SA since coming to government. It was an initiative of a former government; in fact, it was an initiative of premier Rann.

We were very happy to support the establishment of Veterans SA, and it basically has been in various government departments in the past. On coming to government, it was moved to the central agency of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and relocated to Wakefield House. It does have a small number of staff of 4.4 people. We just felt that there were some advantages in having them within a larger office, providing cover when people are on leave. As I said, we think that there are some crossovers between the two portfolios.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Does the Premier envisage any administrative or budget savings from the co-location or the merger of Veterans SA into Defence SA?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Nothing specific. Within Defence SA more broadly, there are some efficiency targets that we believe we will be able to deliver. That will be a matter for the chief executive and the director with regard to how some of the overhead work is done within Veterans SA, although I think probably DPC was doing the overhead work. The work that was done in providing support to Veterans SA to deliver on their programs was previously provided by DPC. That will now be done within Defence SA.

As we heard earlier today in reports to this committee, Defence SA is an organisation with full corporate overhead providing finance and HR, which I think is a nice sort of crossover between the two. Sometimes an agency like Veterans SA can, as a small organisation in a big department like DPC with over 550 people, not be as comfortable a fit as Veterans SA sitting within Defence SA, which is more in the order of 20 to 30 people.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Just to make sure I have understood your answer correctly, my understanding is that previously Veterans SA was in DPC—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Correct.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: —and that some of those corporate services provided by DPC will now be provided by Defence SA—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Correct.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: —such as HR, etc., and that, as a result of, you do not anticipate any administrative or budget savings from Veterans SA?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Not that I am aware of, no.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: What is the agency's status now in the 2019-20 financial year? Is it an administrative unit or is it still self-contained? Perhaps you can just clarify the status of the agency as of this year.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is precisely what it was previously; it was just sitting within DPC and is now sitting within Defence SA.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Now that it is part of Defence SA, is Defence SA reviewing the role and activities of Veterans SA?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There are always ongoing reviews, but there is no specific review being undertaken of their programs. They are all continuing in the budget as outlined when we handed down the budget. The work that they do is changing over time. I think you quite rightly pointed out in your opening statement that there was a great focus on commemoration in the lead-up to the centenary of ANZAC between 2014 and 2018. That work was a huge additional workload, but it now shifts to other issues—some more contemporary issues.

Starting this financial year is the early work on the business case, if you like, for the Torrens Parade Ground hub. Currently, that is a facility that has a state government agency and has some ex-service organisations in it. It is an incredibly iconic location in South Australia. We have previously asserted that we think we should look at the possibility of creating a veterans hub on that site, not only with Veterans SA but also with other ESOs. We have also made it very clear to the veterans community that it is not something that we have the money for immediately but that we will commence early work this financial year. We are just trying to shore up the viability of that to inform future budgets.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Whereabouts in the budget is that mentioned? I noticed that the work you will be doing on the hub was mentioned in last year's budget, but the budget papers are silent this year. Now that you have raised that, it might be an opportune time to explain what sort of resource will be made available for that investigation to be progressed.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think that will be funded out of the Premier's contingency. I do not think that Rob Manton has any money for me. He is so tough, that guy.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: What sort of time frame do you anticipate?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This financial year.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: So by the end of this financial year there will be a proposal to do something or not do something, as the case may be?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have yet to go out to the market to determine what that will be like. As soon as we have that information we will be making it public, and I am certainly happy to provide you with a briefing on it.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: In an earlier answer, in terms of the size of Veterans SA, the director mentioned an FTE figure of 4.4. In the budget papers, in Volume 4 on page 14, the workforce summary shows 5.3. Can somebody provide a reconciliation of the difference?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I advise the director to provide that information to the committee.

Mr MANTON: I am not familiar with the page that you are referring to, but the—

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: It is a Defence SA workforce summary for their section that includes Veterans SA.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I can tell the member that that would be the allocation of overhead towards it. Just as we went through with Arts, there is an allocation of 13 DPC people. Clearly, there are direct program people and then there would be an allocation of overhead.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Are you saying that there is actually an FTE figure of 5.3 in that unit?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I advise the director to explain a rather complicated arrangement that we have with regard to an employee of SA Health who is based at the Jamie Larcombe hub.

Mr MANTON: You would recall that the Jamie Larcombe Centre model of care incorporates research, inpatient, outpatient and the Partnerships Hub. The position of the Partnerships Hub Coordinator is a health employee auspiced to Veterans SA for the period governed by a memorandum of administrative agreement with SA Health, and that is the reason for the discrepancy in the numbers.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: In fact, if you describe Veterans SA as the general unit, you only have 4.4 staff.

Mr MANTON: In my office there are 4.4 of us, and the Partnerships Hub is the fifth person.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Mr Price is very generously providing the overheads, free of charge.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Premier, in an earlier response, you indicated that the change for Veterans SA from DPC to Defence SA had some benefits. Can I clarify what direct contact the agency now has with you as minister and what are the actual reporting lines? How does that unit now report to their minister, given that it is under a different management structure?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Really there is just no change whatsoever. I meet with the director on a very regular basis. He tells me when I need to be at different events. We have regular meetings. There is no change whatsoever in terms of the interaction with the minister. The only change is that, instead of the director reporting through to the head of DPC, going forward he is reporting through to the head of Defence SA.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: If there is no practical change of any consequence, and there has not been a review following the move, is there going to be a review imminently of the way that Veterans SA operates? Is there an intended review?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Just to clarify, when you say there have been no changes, the question I was asked by the shadow minister was: is there any change in the interaction with the minister and the answer to that is no. But, as I have subsequently outlined, the reporting has changed but there is certainly no review imminent or underway in regard to the work that Veterans SA is doing. We have only just published the budget, which outlines the budget for this year and the forward estimates and also puts out the highlights that we have achieved and then the targets for subsequent years.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So why the change?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I outlined that only a few minutes ago—literally only a few minutes ago I went through that.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am just trying to understand the logic of the decision to make the move in light of the fact that the veterans community up until this point seems to have been incredibly satisfied with the work that Veterans SA has been undertaking.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have provided an answer. This was not because we were dissatisfied with the work of Veterans SA. For the reasons I outlined before—and I am happy to repeat, sir; I am sure you were listening—we just thought that that differential between four people

sitting in an office of 560 people within DPC was not ideal, and we thought there was a more logical fit within Defence SA. We are very satisfied that we have made the right call.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: On that, given the Productivity Commission's recent final report handed down and their recommendations regarding the relationship between their Veterans SA, which is Department of Veterans' Affairs, and defence, how do you reconcile your position given that commission's recommendations?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have only just received the final report—the Australian Productivity Commission's report I presume you are referring to—and we are working through a response to that at the moment. But please keep in mind that there is a very big difference between the Australian Defence Force and Defence SA. The people who are veterans in South Australia are not former employees of Defence SA, like you are providing the parallel for at the federal level, where you have the defence—

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Actually, that is not the issue the commission has canvassed but, anyway, I am happy to hear your answer.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, perhaps you could clarify your question then. I thought that was what you were—

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: The commission has made it very clear that by bringing the two agencies together you can blur the lines and the veterans component of it can be diminished, and that is their concern. That is why they have actually changed their recommendation, their draft report, to leave the departments separate—to make sure there are clear lines of responsibility.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was just saying in my answer, the veterans were previous employees of the defence department. It is not comparable with Defence SA. Defence SA has veterans working in it. There is no doubt about that. In fact, they have a large number of veterans working within Defence SA, and the chief executive is a veteran himself and so are most of the executives. But the reality is that it is not a former employer-employee relationship; it is quite separate. I understand the distinction at the federal level, but it just does not apply at the state level whatsoever.

The CHAIR: I believe the member for Florey has a question.

Ms BEDFORD: Premier, I am just wondering what is happening as our veterans age, and some of them are retiring from public life and public appearance altogether, and whether any thought has gone into how we might perhaps recognise the contribution of some of the significant extremely aged and frail veterans as they retire or no longer appear at ceremonies?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Do you have anything in mind?

Ms BEDFORD: I do not want to mention anyone, but someone you know—a tall gentleman who was a doctor who played a lot of cricket—has retired recently. He is not coming out anymore and has sort of vanished off the face of the veterans scene. Rather than wait for a funeral, say, we were thinking of maybe having some testimonials for some of our more significant veterans.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is not something that I have received advice on before. We do have a Veterans Advisory Council, which is chaired now by retired Brigadier Laurie Lewis. That is exactly why we have a Veterans Advisory Council. That is exactly the sort of thing that I could put to him, and I would be very happy to do so.

Ms BEDFORD: It was just a thought.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: To close off, in terms of the move of Veterans SA, Premier, what is your understanding regarding the current staff of Veterans SA? Will any of the current staff in Veterans SA be required to reapply for their positions?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, that is not envisaged at all.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I now refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, page 149, Program 3: Veterans' Affairs, grants and subsidies. What grant programs are administered through this program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Which ones—

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: What grant programs are administered through this program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Which grant programs are administered—

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: They are on page 149.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have two funds: one is the ANZAC Day Commemoration Fund and one is our annual allocation. Do you want me to read in—

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: No, what I want to ask is: what were those grants anticipated for? Are they a general core for grants for funding? Are they grants that also include funds for the RSL, for example? What groups are covered by that grant line?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: In terms of the annual allocation of grants, the Premier's allocation, they are basically there to support the education of South Australia about the state's involvement in our nation's military history, including peacekeeping activities, to honour and commemorate the service and sacrifice of South Australian veterans and to assist the education of South Australian veterans' dependants.

There is a catch-all in there that says 'and any other purpose of a like kind determined by the Premier'. They are things like the Australian American Association, which received a grant of \$1,000 to go towards the Battle of the Coral Sea anniversary celebrations. The Army Health Services Historical Research Group received a \$3,000 grant for a publication on SA doctors since World War I.

We are providing money to Operation K9, which is administered by the Royal Society for the Blind, for their Operation K9 assistance dog program, which is \$15,000. It is also the fund I use to provide fairly substantial grants to the RSL state branch. We provide \$100,000 to them from that grant program and then also \$100,000 to the Legacy Club of Adelaide, so it is a range of those two larger ones and then a range of smaller ones, in accordance with those criteria. Then we have the ANZAC Day Commemoration Funds, which have been running for—

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Premier, I do not need them detailed. That is fine. I have enough information for that one, but I will qualify that comment. Does that include a grant for the Partners of Veterans Association of Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that it did in the 2017-18 financial year.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: As a one-off grant?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Correct, but they are more than that. Some organisations might receive almost an annual distribution, some will come when there is a special commemoration and then some will come every now and then when they believe they need support.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Premier, I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, Program 3: Veterans' Affairs, page 149. Under highlights 2018-19, it mentions:

- Established a process for collecting data on the number of veterans and ex-service personnel in South Australia who become homeless, experience mental health problems or are incarcerated.

There are two parts to this question: what progress has been made in that collection of data and can the Premier provide some specific examples on how that has been implemented to benefit individual veterans?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We are doing some work at the state level, and I have also written to the Australian Statistician, Mr David Kalisch, who sits within the Australian Bureau of Statistics, requesting that consideration be given to adding a question to the 2021 national census to identify households where serving or ex-serving members of the Australian Defence Force reside. I have not received any response—sorry, I am getting updated as we speak. This is like a real-time briefing.

I have good news to report to this committee, and you have heard it here first today. There are but two issues that are going to be considered for potential inclusion in the 2021 census, and one of those two is the request that we have made. I think this would be really good because we know that by getting better data we are going to be able to better serve the veterans community here in South Australia more broadly.

With regard to our state government, I think the area we are doing best is within Corrections in South Australia. My understanding is that this has been running for a year or thereabouts. When prisoners are being admitted to prison, they are asked if they have served in the military, if they were deployed overseas and if they are happy for their details to be given to Veterans SA. These names are then given to a veteran who works within Correctional Services and runs the veterans' support group for veterans in custody in South Australian prisons. This previously was not being done. It is a simple methodology that has been put in place, and we think it is adding value.

I think there are other areas we are now looking at. I am advised that we are doing some early work in the collection of data for the homelessness services sector. This is something we will be considering more broadly at the veterans ministerial council when we next meet. Hopefully, I will have more to report on that once we have been able to raise it at the federal level. I think the more we can do in terms of gathering this information and then acting upon it, the better off we are going to be.

The CHAIR: We have time for one more question.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: In the evidence to this committee last year, the Premier and his advisers stressed that the data collection will be, and he just used the term 'real-time' data to enable service delivery providers and veterans groups to respond at that time. I am not sure how using the ABS to collect data will help that real time, when the person actually needs support at that particular time. What progress has been made in that area?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think that you are misinterpreting my comments. In my comments relating to real time, I was informing the committee in real time that we just had a brand-new update regarding this issue. I do not think that anybody is suggesting that the census data will be available in real time. It is only collected once every five years.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Can you perhaps clarify how this real-time data is being used apart from in Corrections? In your evidence to the committee last year, it was used in a whole range of areas. I would like to know what progress has been made. I am not clear from your answer what progress has been made in Health, for example, and not only Corrections but the broader justice system. You have mentioned Corrections, which is great. I understand that process was initiated by the previous corrections minister. What has actually been done? The feedback that I am getting from the ESOs is that not a lot has changed since 12 months ago from their point of view.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Given that this time has finished now, I am happy to ask the director to provide me with an update, which I am happy to forward on. If ESOs or the Labor Party have any suggestions with regard to things that we could be collecting and utilising, then we would be more than happy to do so.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: We already do that. We invite your department to our forums. They are there to hear the ESOs' real-time answers.

The CHAIR: Premier, do you have more to add? I am happy to take a response to that.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, I think I covered that.

Sitting suspended from 16:01 to 16:16.

The CHAIR: While everyone is finding their place for the 45 minutes we are to spend on Multicultural SA, I can inform the committee that the member for Light has been discharged and has been replaced by the member for Reynell. Welcome.

Membership:

Ms Hildyard substituted for Hon. A. Piccolo

Departmental Advisers:

Mr J. McDowell, Chief Executive, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Mr S. Woolhouse, Executive Director, Communities and Corporate, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Ms J. Kennedy, Director, Multicultural Affairs, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

The CHAIR: Premier, the final session of the day is on Multicultural SA. I invite you to introduce your advisers, please.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, sir. In addition to Steve Woolhouse, who I have already introduced in previous committee appearances, and Jim McDowell, who similarly has been introduced on many occasions, it is my great pleasure to introduce to the committee Justine Kennedy, who is the Director of Multicultural Affairs within DPC.

The CHAIR: Thank you. You are not intending to make an opening statement, Premier?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am happy to.

The CHAIR: I just thought I would ask. If you would like to, you are welcome.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have not made any other opening statements, but we do have 45 minutes, although I do not want to chew up any time that is available.

However, can I say to you, sir, and to the committee that this is a very important area of government policy and very important programs. I am very pleased to take on the responsibility, although I must say that I am very much supported in my role by my parliamentary secretary, the Hon. Jing Lee, and also very much supported by all members of this parliament, especially members of the Australian Labor Party who are very active members within multicultural communities, so we are often at functions together.

I think we should all be very grateful for the harmonious multicultural state that we are, and when we look around the world at the moment at different jurisdictions and see some of the consequences of a lack of harmony, I think it really gives us an opportunity to reflect on what we have here. We must never take it for granted and we must continue to work very hard to make sure that we can maintain this very harmonious relationship that we have.

With those opening statements, I am very happy to hand over to the opposition for any questions that they might have.

The CHAIR: Thank you, Premier. The member for Reynell.

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you, Mr Chair, and thank you, Premier, for your opening statement. Your Budget Overview contained in Budget Paper 1 does not specifically mention multiculturalism, nor does the budget speech. Can you tell us how your budget fits with achieving your vision for multiculturalism in South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have a budget and a unit that sits within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet—as I said, the central agency in South Australia. There are currently 14 people who support the government's programs with regard to Multicultural Affairs. We have allocated a budget for this current financial year of \$5.56 million, and that really supports the programs that we are offering.

In addition to that, from time to time there are issues that need to be funded beyond this budget. For example, at the moment there is a program in response to the atrocity that occurred in Christchurch. Our response to that as a state was something where those sorts of issues are dealt with out of a separate budget, but by far and away our grants programs, the policy advice and the administration of SAMEAC are all contained within program 5 in DPC, which is titled Multicultural Affairs.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, how does your vision and your words on page 26 of Budget Paper 4, which state, 'This program supports South Australia's ethnic communities and promotes community capacity and harmony', align with the deal you have struck to pay workers from overseas 10 per cent less than other workers?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: To clarify that situation with regard to the Designated Area Migration Agreement, we would not be paying overseas workers less. In fact, incorporated within the DAMA is an inability to pay an overseas worker less than they are paid in Australia, but the TSMIT, which is set on a national level, is based on conditions right around the country, and often the TSMIT is significantly higher than the payments for workers in that sector, so it does not really reflect the situation in certain circumstances.

It is incorrect to suggest that workers from overseas would be paid less than Australian workers; that is specifically prohibited under the Designated Area Migration Agreements. More than that, we are very keen to see more people come to South Australia. We would like to grow our population. Some migration is a component of that, especially in regional South Australia, where there are very significant capacity constraints to some of those communities and some of those companies. As we fill that capacity requirement, we actually grow the overall productive capacity of that company and that community.

Currently, there are some very significant skills shortages in South Australia. That is why we applied to the federal government to create a Designated Area Migration Agreement specifically for regional South Australia, and that is one of the reasons why we overturned the previous government's decision to levy families who are sending their children to state schools in country areas, which was an enormous burden imposed upon them by the previous government.

I am trying to remember off the top of my head, but I think there was something like a \$10,000 charge levied per child for those migrant families in coming to South Australia. Whilst we have not completely removed it right across South Australia, certainly for regional South Australia that massive additional burden has been removed. This is a massive benefit to those families who are coming to regional South Australia, contributing to the economy and helping us to grow the productive capacity of regional South Australia.

I am told that in many communities they make a very significant economic impact more broadly in the community, and many of them like playing for the local sporting teams. Of course, the single number one issue in many regional communities is that they have not been able to fill all their sporting teams. I am told that in some communities they have been able to recruit some of these migrants to play in their very important sporting teams, further integrating people into regional South Australian life.

Ms HILDYARD: What sectors will be targeted to achieve your increase of 1,000 business migrant nominations each year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have them. There are quite a number, certainly dozens, and I do not have that information here. Migration is actually handled by the Department for Innovation and Skills, not by Multicultural Affairs, so that is a question you could direct to that estimates committee. However, more broadly it is now available on the website; it lists all the occupations that are subject to that DAMA.

Ms HILDYARD: How will progress against that target be reported and also published?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Again, that will be something to direct to the relevant minister.

Ms HILDYARD: You have told us that multiculturalism is important, but last year you cut \$256,000 from your budget and this year you have again cut \$251,000 from your budget and \$196,000 from the estimated spend to multicultural communities to access grants. Can you explain why you have made this cut, and how does this cut fit with your vision and with the statement on page 26 of Budget Paper 4, Volume 4? That reads:

This program...includes grant programs to community organisations that provide services to help families and [communities] improve their quality of life and strengthen the wellbeing of culturally and linguistically diverse communities, as well as support for multicultural events and initiatives.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: For starters, I would like to correct the record for the committee. The budget for Multicultural Affairs, program 5, within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet last financial year was \$4.85 million. The budget this financial year is \$5.56 million, so that is quite a substantial increase—

Ms HILDYARD: Sorry, it is in relation to the grants program.

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell—

Ms HILDYARD: I just wanted to make sure he heard my question; it was about the grants line.

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, listen to me, please. You have asked a question. The Premier is answering and you will hear his answer without interjection. You will have the opportunity to ask another question—

Ms HILDYARD: Sorry; I thought he must have misheard because I am talking specifically about the grants.

The CHAIR: I am sure he did not mishear. Premier, you have the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I was just responding to the comments the shadow minister made, where she asserted there had been budget cuts. I was making the committee very aware that there has been a significant increase in this area. There is an increase from last year's budget of \$4.8 million. The actual expenditure was above budget, at \$5.6 million, and this year the budget increases on the budget that was provided in the 2018-19 year.

In terms of grants and subsidies, there is a reduction that follows on from the review that was done into the way that grants and subsidies are allocated. I am very pleased that what we arrived at was a best practice methodology. The new grants program, which is administered by the unit, centred around four separate programs. People make application and they are assessed. There is a greater degree of transparency regarding the allocation of that money now under grants and subsidies.

We took time to meet with the sector. They expressed some concerns about the lack of information and feedback that were previously provided, and there were concerns about the transparency of the grants process that existed in previous years. We were happy to take all those issues on board, and I can say that we have received very, very positive feedback from the sector for the reforms we have put in place.

Ms HILDYARD: Why has grant funding for communities been cut by \$251,000 while budgeted employee expenses has gone up by \$491,000?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think the work we are doing goes beyond just administering grant programs. There are a large number of programs and projects that the department runs, and I think we are at a time when we need to make sure that we have the very best support for multicultural communities in South Australia. Grants program support is one part of it, but so is support from the unit, and that is what we have decided to do.

Ms HILDYARD: What consultation occurred before that cut—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have excellent consultation. As I said in my previous answer, the feedback we received from the sector was reasonably scathing about the previous government's administration of grants. Sure, there were people who were very happy when they received a grant, but there were many people who were very dissatisfied because it was not a transparent, open process: it was direct funding from the government, rather than an open, competitive grants process. As I said, we have received overwhelmingly positive feedback on the way that the Multicultural Affairs unit has revised the methodology.

Ms HILDYARD: What is the extra \$491,000 allocated to employee expenses specifically for, and what will the three additional FTEs specifically do?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that level of information, but I am happy to provide some further feedback.

Ms HILDYARD: Is any of the \$491,000 being directed to employee severance or entitlement payments?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not aware of that, no.

Ms HILDYARD: What is the rationale for reducing grant funding whilst at the same time increasing funding for internal staffing?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I fully appreciate that you may have run out of questions just a few minutes into this estimates committee, but I have just provided an answer to that twice.

Ms HILDYARD: There are plenty more.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Keep going. We can come back to that other one. I can give that answer again towards the end.

Ms HILDYARD: Was the decision to cut grant funding and increase staffing expenses a recommendation of your review?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have provided a comprehensive overview of this issue with regard to grants. I think that if the member spoke to people in the sector she would receive exactly the same feedback we have received; that is, overwhelmingly, people are very happy with the arrangements we have put in place. They love the open, transparent and competitive way in which grants are administered. It is a significant improvement in terms of the way that they were administered previously.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, in relation to the Budget Measures Statement, can you guarantee that no further cuts from Multicultural Affairs will be made to meet the additional savings target from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have just put down the budget. It is only a few weeks old, so this is the most up-to-date information that we have.

Ms HILDYARD: So you cannot guarantee that there will not be any further funding cuts to Multicultural Affairs?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have only just brought the budget down. This is the most accurate and up-to-date real-time information we have that talks about the budget. As I said, it is a very, very significant increase in terms of the budget over the budget that was provided last year.

Ms HILDYARD: So no guarantee then?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have nothing further to add to my previous answer.

Ms HILDYARD: On page 26, it is stated that the funding review will ensure that an equitable funding structure is in place. How do you define equity?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have been through this several times, but I am—

Ms HILDYARD: But how do you define equity? It is a different question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I can define it by what is not equitable. What is not equitable is a government making decisions with no transparency, with no rationale, hand-picking organisations and a very healthy scepticism from the sector that certain groups were supported because they were particularly prevalent in metropolitan marginal seats. That is not equitable. By way of the alternative, we spoke to the sector at length about what they did not like about the previous administration and what they saw as genuine reforms and improvements, and that is precisely what we have implemented.

Ms HILDYARD: How did the review achieve equity?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I cannot add anything further.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, will further grant funding reviews occur?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Nothing is envisaged at this stage.

Ms HILDYARD: Can you guarantee that, should there be any further funding reviews, they will not also result in further reductions in grant funding?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That question contains a very hypothetical presentation, but the reality is that nothing is envisaged in terms of a further review, so I am not going to start extrapolating on what could happen if a review was done and certain circumstances were arrived at.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, can you outline what conditions are put on organisations in relation to receiving grant funding?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: My understanding, and what I am informed, is that this is covered off in Treasurer's Instruction 15, which is the administration and acquittal of government grant funding.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, has there been any advice whatsoever given to organisations on receipt of funding, or when discussing the allocation of funding, about the involvement of the opposition in events and programs for which they utilise that funding?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, not that I am aware of.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, has the Hon. Jing Lee from the other place provided any advice about the involvement or otherwise of the opposition in events and programs for which communities receive grant funding?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Certainly not, as far as I am aware. We always welcome all parliamentarians, regardless of their political persuasion, to work with us to celebrate diversity and our wonderful multicultural community here in South Australia.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, has the Hon. Jing Lee from the other place, or any other member of the government, ever advised any organisation or group seeking grant funding not to speak with the opposition about their event or to involve them?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have already answered that in the previous question. I have nothing further to contribute.

Ms HILDYARD: What criteria are used to assess which particular events are funded?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We do not have that information readily available here, but it is all on the website, so I direct the member to take a look.

Ms HILDYARD: I did.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There are criteria for each of the grant programs that we provide, and they are reasonably accessible.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, who presents the funds once they are allocated to communities? What meetings with communities are held prior to funding announcements or at the time of funding announcements?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think that is pretty variable. There are a huge number of grants. Some would be presented in person, and that would be the preference—to have a member of the government present it. I know that many multicultural groups appreciate a visit from the Premier or the assistant minister or another cabinet minister or a member of parliament, but of course sometimes it is not possible. That is regrettable. Sometimes there is a presentation before an event, sometimes it has to be after an event and sometimes I think that we probably just transfer the funds because of a timing constraint. A huge number of grants are administered, but where possible we would like the government to be represented to celebrate with our multicultural community.

Ms HILDYARD: As a follow-on question, Premier, are there ever meetings held with particular communities whilst their application for funding for events is being considered in relation to that particular event? Obviously there are general meetings, but I mean in relation to the particular event that is being considered for funding.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: For example, I could attend a meeting of an organisation in my electorate that is applying for a grant. The process is open, it is transparent and it is competitive. I

certainly would not want to issue an instruction that members of the government cannot visit a club while it is under consideration for a grant. I think that a huge proportion of our clubs in South Australia would apply for grants from time to time. I just think it would be quite difficult to administer.

Ms HILDYARD: What is the process when grant applications are being considered? Are there ever meetings with those communities who are in that grant round whilst that grant round is being considered about that grant funding?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Certainly, if I were asked to meet with a group, I would be happy to meet with that group and walk them through the guidelines and emphasise what our ambition is as a government with regard to Multicultural Affairs. It is not like the awarding of a government contract.

We really want to disburse this money each year, but we want to do it in accordance with our objectives as a government and the new guidelines which have been put in place and which recognise an open, transparent and competitive system. It is quite different from the previous arrangements, where the government would essentially meet with an organisation and strike a deal from their budget allocation. We think this is a better methodology.

That does not mean to say that from time to time an organisation might be directly funded, for example, from the Premier's contingency, but this is really few and far between. We would much prefer people to go through the process of making an application for one of the grant programs that we have just announced.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, can you guarantee that no member of your government has met with communities that are in a grant process to direct them about opposition involvement in relation to events, should they be successful?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have answered that question.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, what is your view of multicultural radio?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Multicultural radio? Of course, we are very fortunate in South Australia to have various ethnicities with their own or shared radio. I think this provides a good service to people so that we can preserve language.

Ms HILDYARD: How do you support multicultural radio?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: From time to time I am invited to appear on—not appear, because you cannot really appear on radio, can you?

Ms HILDYARD: Be heard.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am invited to attend and be broadcast on radio and, where possible—I would not like to suggest that I am doing it on a very regular basis—I am happy to go along to participate. In my particular case, this often involves where outside broadcasts are done and so you will find Italian radio or Italian and Greek TV or radio will approach me at an event and then I can issue a greeting or answer some questions and, on occasion, use my very limited language skills to offer a greeting.

Ms HILDYARD: What do you think your support achieves?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, I would like to encourage all members of parliament to engage where they can with radio and other broadcast methodologies to diverse communities in South Australia. I think it is really important that people from the broadest backgrounds in South Australia have access to politicians of all political persuasions as much as possible.

We need to have more people from diverse backgrounds represented in the South Australian parliament. I think it is really good when people get the opportunity to interact. It is not commonplace in many countries around the world where members of the public can interact very freely with members of parliament. In fact, it is something that is very particular to Australia and I think we do it particularly well here in South Australia.

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you, Premier. Given your answer, why has radio 5EBI, which reaches 44 different language groups here in South Australia, lost its annual state government funding of \$22,000?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not sure. I can find out and come back to you. I am not sure where they were funded from previously, whether it was a grant program or something that is administered by the Premier directly. I am happy to make inquiries and come back to you.

Ms HILDYARD: What criteria were used to determine that 5EBI's work no longer merited that funding, given that funding has been provided by successive state governments, uninterrupted, for more than 20 years?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said in my previous answer, I am not familiar where it was being funded from before, whether it was DPC, whether it was multicultural affairs, whether it was human services or whether it was the education department, but I am very happy to make inquiries and come back to you.

Ms HILDYARD: What changed that meant your government provided the \$22,000 of funding last year and not this year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have nothing further to add, sir.

Ms HILDYARD: What consultation about this cut to vital funding for 5EBI was had with their station manager and also their 200 volunteers?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Again, I have made an offer to find out and come back to you. I am happy for you to read in any other questions you would like me to follow up simultaneously. I know you have written all the questions down, but I cannot add any more if I do not know about it.

Ms HILDYARD: Given that you now do know about that cut, what is your message to the listeners of 5EBI and the 200 volunteers, given this cut to funding?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, I am very happy to make inquiries. That is what I will do.

Ms HILDYARD: But what is your message to them? Do you have something that you would convey to those volunteers and to the people who listen?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, I am very happy to make inquiries. This is the first time it has been raised with me.

Ms HILDYARD: So you were not aware that for 20 years this radio station had been funded in that way?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Mr Chairman, I have nothing further to add.

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, I think the Premier has answered that particular line of questioning. He has taken it on notice and will get back to you. We will move on to your next question.

Ms HILDYARD: I will ask two more questions that you might want to take on notice in relation to that. Premier, what is your message about that cut to 5EBI to the 31,000 people who listen to community radio because of the programs? They specifically have identified that they listen because of the programs it provides in languages other than English. Also, what is your message about this cut to the 92,000 people who listen to community radio because there are programs available on it not available anywhere else? I appreciate that you will take those two questions on notice.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, on 15 May this year, the Hon. Tung Ngo from the other place asked the Hon. Jing Lee two questions that were taken on notice. To date, no answer has been provided to either of them, so I ask you those questions now. Firstly, what is the dollar figure for the total grant funding pool for the Multicultural Grants Program 2019-20 that was recently announced?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Can you state that question again?

Ms HILDYARD: What is the dollar figure for the grant funding pool for the Multicultural Grants Program 2019-20 that was recently announced?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will take that question on notice.

Ms HILDYARD: Okay, so it will be taken on notice again?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you.

Ms HILDYARD: You might want to take this other question on notice, a question that has already been taken on notice. What is the dollar figure for each of the four categories of funding—Advance Together, Celebrate Together, Expand Together and Stronger Together—being offered under that grant program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will follow that up, as per the previous answer, but I would just indicate to the committee that I have been informed that there has been no cut to funding for 5EBI. They are still funded until 2020, but we are yet to receive an application for the 2020-21 year.

Ms HILDYARD: That is not what the letter from your government that we have been shown indicates, but I am sure you will follow that up.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: If you have information, I think it is important to share it with the committee. My understanding is that they are funded for the 2019-20 year, but of course there needs to be a further application for 2020-21.

Ms HILDYARD: They have been told their funding will not continue. The successive \$22,000 that they have received for the last 20 years has been cut.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sorry, I thought what you were asserting previously to the committee was quite clear and that was that they were no longer receiving money. However, as I have just pointed out to the committee, the advice I have just received is that their funding is preserved for this year but that they will need to put in a further application for subsequent years.

Ms HILDYARD: So are you guaranteeing their \$22,000 in future grant application processes?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, I am just clarifying the situation because what was asserted was that they were not receiving money, but they have their money for this financial year. I think it is really important that we make sure that the committee is not under the false impression that in fact they are no longer receiving any money. They will need to put in an application for further years. I think that is reasonable. I do not think anyone can have ongoing funding without review, but I think this is reasonably commonplace with most government grants.

The previous government may have provided an assurance that, come what may, you will be funded into the future. They were perfectly entitled to do that, but, as I have said, we had a major review of the way that we allocate money in Multicultural Affairs. I am 100 per cent convinced that it is a far superior model. It is competitive, it is open and it is transparent, but people do need to apply for it.

Membership:

Ms Stinson substituted for Hon. L.W.K. Bignell.

The CHAIR: You have the call, member for Reynell.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, what was expended on the third biennial South Australian Multicultural Festival, and what is budgeted to be expended on the fourth biennial South Australian Multicultural Festival?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think the budget for this year is \$69,000. I am not sure if I have the information on the 2017 event. I am informed that the 2017 biennial South Australian Multicultural Festival was held in Rundle Mall, and this will now move to Victoria Square. I am informed that this will occur on 10 November this year. I am just having a look, but I do not think I

have any information regarding what the cost was in 2017. The budgeted cost for this year is \$69,000. I am informed that it is a reasonably similar amount to the event held two years ago.

Ms HILDYARD: So \$69,000 again? Okay. Premier, what was expended by your government in the previous financial year, across departments, on the provision of translation services? What is budgeted in this financial year for the provision of translation services across departments?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is a very reasonable, important and relevant question, but it would be better directed to the Minister for Human Services, who looks after those programs. They are not programs that are administered under Program 5: Multicultural Affairs within DPC.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, what was expended by your government in the last financial year on the annual Governor's Multicultural Awards, and what is budgeted for it in this financial year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I know that in 2018 we celebrated the 11th year of the awards, and on coming into government one of the first things that His Excellency asked me about was the expansion of the Governor's Multicultural Awards. We agreed with the request to significantly expand the Governor's Multicultural Awards. Last year, my understanding is that more than 800 people attended those awards, which were held within the grounds of Government House, and I am informed that the expenditure in the 2018-19 financial year was \$53,853.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, do you think that 75 people attending six community forums across Adelaide and regional areas represents thorough consultation with community members, who are not linked to organisations, about the review of the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission Act 1980?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think most people were informed that we are undertaking that review, and if other people have submissions we are not preventing them from making submissions to us. I am satisfied that we have spoken to a broad cross-section of people who will be affected. I am advised that six community forums were held in Adelaide and regional areas, and 76 people attended those community forums. A further workshop was also held, and I am informed that 53 people attended this stakeholder workshop.

It goes on: we have subsequently received 14 written submissions, 69 surveys were completed online, and a further 14 hard-copy responses were received. In addition to this, we have put a discussions paper up on the government's portal, the YourSAy website, and we have received further feedback via that process. Most importantly, we are attending a large number of multicultural events across South Australia virtually on an hourly basis and receiving input asking questions regarding that review. I am satisfied that appropriate levels of consultation have occurred.

Ms STINSON: Premier, earlier today when I approached the bench, did you say that I was nasty, that I ask nasty questions or that I was a nasty bitch?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, certainly not.

Ms STINSON: You did not say that I was nasty?

The CHAIR: Premier, I do not want you to answer that at this point. Member for Badcoe, this is a committee to examine the budget lines, and I do not know that that refers to any budget line.

Ms STINSON: You did not say that I was nasty?

The CHAIR: I might ask you to withdraw that question, member for Badcoe. You can talk to the Premier afterwards about that, but not here today. We have five minutes to go.

Ms HILDYARD: It is a very important question about the conduct of the Premier and this estimates process—a really important question.

The CHAIR: Thank you for that advice, member for Reynell, but I am not going to allow the question because in this committee that I am chairing we are dealing with the budget. If there is a question about a budget line, you are free to ask that.

Ms HILDYARD: The comment was made during the course of the committee; is that not relevant?

The CHAIR: I was not aware of that. I did not hear it.

Ms HILDYARD: Well, I guess it has been brought to your attention.

The CHAIR: I invite you to ask a question about the budget.

Ms HILDYARD: It is pretty important.

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, you probably have more budget line questions.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, do you still support the process for the selection of members to the SAMEAC board that you outlined in the 2018 estimates session?

The CHAIR: Premier, I am going to interrupt you. Hold that question for a moment. The secretary has quite rightly advised me that, according to standing orders, any complaints, such as the one raised by the member for Badcoe, need to be raised at the time, and that is stated in—

Ms STINSON: Sir, it was not sitting: it was after the session finished sitting.

The CHAIR: Thank you. That is all I will say on that. There is a standing order that relates to that.

Ms STINSON: I brought it to your attention as soon as I could.

The CHAIR: Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not recall the question precisely.

The CHAIR: Could you ask the question again, please.

Ms HILDYARD: Okay, we are not dealing with this. Premier, do you still support the process for the selection of members to the SAMEAC board that you outlined in the 2018 estimates session?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have those comments at hand, but I am happy to review them and come back to the committee.

Ms HILDYARD: Do you intend to implement a new process for appointing members to SAMEAC?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As to SAMEAC members, as you will recall, we made a fairly significant change on coming to government. Whilst we were very grateful for the contribution that previous members had made to the committee, they were almost there on a semipermanent basis. We thought that there was an opportunity to have greater turnover on that committee, which would provide leadership opportunities for people within the multicultural communities in South Australia.

Ms HILDYARD: In the last estimates session, Premier—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am just finishing that off.

Ms HILDYARD: Sorry, I thought you had finished.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They were appointed for a two-year period, so it is my understanding that they will conclude that term probably towards the middle of next year. I think that there are 11 committee members, 10 new and one person who was on the previous South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission.

Ms HILDYARD: But it was an internal process. You spoke in the last estimates session about yourself and other members of the government talking with people and going through an internal process. Is that the way that you want to continue to appoint SAMEAC members?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have made the appointment. Those people have been appointed for two years. They conclude that term in the middle of next year. I do not think that we have fully determined precisely how the new SAMEAC board will be formed after that. There is obviously going to be a need for some continuity going from this board to the new board, but the precise make-up of that I am not really in a position to inform this committee, but we do have plenty of time with another 12 months to go.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, will you respond to the clear message from the community that the current appointment process for members of the commission needs to be more transparent?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have not had that feedback.

Ms HILDYARD: It is in your consultation document. That is a quote from your consultation survey from your department. It is your survey that you conducted, and that is a quote directly from that survey about what the community has said, word for word.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have not received the consultation report yet; it has not been concluded. If some people feel that way, then that is something we can consider, and if we have to make a change then we are happy to make that change. I think that the overwhelming feedback we have received is that the concept of having a movement on that committee is an advantage. It provides people with opportunities to hold leadership positions and contribute as a voice to government.

It does not mean that some of the people who held roles previously cannot continue to play roles, and it does not mean that people who have held roles cannot come back onto SAMEAC going forward, but we made that change. Governments from time to time can change the way they go about these things, and I think that overall it has been an improvement.

The CHAIR: Having reached the allotted time, I declare the examination of the proposed payments for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and the Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to be completed. Thank you, Premier, thank you to your advisers through the day and thank you to committee members and the secretaries.

At 17:01 the committee adjourned to Thursday 25 July 2019 at 9:00.