

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
Wednesday, 28 July 2021
ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A

Chair:

Mr P.A. Treloar

Members:

Hon. A. Koutsantonis

Mr. S.K. Knoll

Ms P.M. Luethen

Mr P.B. Malinauskas

Mr. J.K. Szakacs

Mr. T.J. Whetstone

The committee met at 09:00

Estimates Vote

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, \$5,803,000

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY, \$8,094,000

JOINT PARLIAMENTARY SERVICES, \$13,013,000

ADMINISTERED ITEMS FOR JOINT PARLIAMENTARY SERVICES, \$3,324,000

STATE GOVERNOR'S ESTABLISHMENT, \$4,118,000

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT, \$18,616,000

DEPARTMENT OF THE PREMIER AND CABINET, \$351,203,000

**ADMINISTERED ITEMS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE PREMIER AND CABINET,
\$9,185,000**

PREMIER, OTHER ITEMS, \$5,562,000

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 M. Stint, Manager, Finance, Auditor-General's Department.

Mr R. Crump, Clerk, House of Assembly, and Secretary, Joint Parliamentary Services.

The CHAIR: Welcome, everybody, to the first day of estimates. I am going to give an instruction now that when people are asking or answering questions they are able to relieve themselves of their masks but must have them in place at any other time. The first thing I need to do is call on the member for King.

Ms LUETHEN: Thank you, Chair. I move:

That the Chair write to the Speaker to request the following changes to the timetable agreed in the house on 20 July, pursuant to standing order 268, paragraph 6: that the Department for Child Protection be examined on Thursday 29 July, the Department for Energy and Mining be examined on Friday 30 July, and that the committee meet at 9.30am on Thursday 29 July.

Motion carried.

The CHAIR: The estimates committees are a relatively informal procedure and, as such, there is no need to stand to ask or answer questions. I understand that the Premier and the lead speaker for the opposition have agreed an approximate time for the consideration of proposed payments, which will facilitate a change of departmental advisers. Can the Premier and Leader of the Opposition confirm that the timetable for today's proceedings previously distributed is accurate?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes.

The CHAIR: Changes to committee membership will be notified as they occur. Members should ensure 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 24 September 2021.

I propose to allow both 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 asking questions. A member who is not on the committee may ask a question at the discretion of the Chair.

All questions are to be directed to the Premier, not the Premier's advisers. The Premier may refer questions to advisers for a response. 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 the proceedings may submit them as questions on notice for inclusion in the assembly *Notice Paper*.

I remind members that the rules of debate in the House of Assembly apply in committee. Consistent with the rules of the house, photography by members on the chamber floor is not permitted while the committee is sitting. Ministers and members may not table documents before the committee; however, documents can be supplied to the Chair for distribution. The incorporation of material in *Hansard* is permitted on the same basis as it applies in the house, that is, that it is purely statistical and limited to one page in length.

The committee's examinations will be broadcast in the same manner sittings of the house are broadcast 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 for consideration is the Legislative Council, House of Assembly and Joint Parliamentary Services. The minister appearing is the Premier. I declare the proposed payments open for examination.

Membership:

Ms Bettison substituted for Mr Szakacs.

The CHAIR: I call on the Premier to make a statement, if the Premier wishes, and introduce his advisers.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will make a very brief statement. Firstly, I thank the staff here at Parliament House and all members, including the opposition, for accommodating the changes that were necessary due to the seven-day lockdown in South Australia. I am very grateful to all the people who have made accommodation for this change so that we can get estimates through in a timely manner.

I introduce Mr Rick Crump, who is of course the Clerk of the House of Assembly and also the Secretary of the Joint Parliamentary Services, who will be working with me on the first line of questioning regarding Parliament House.

The CHAIR: Leader of the Opposition, do you wish to make a statement?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes, I do. Again, it will be relatively brief. Over the last seven days we have seen an extraordinary set of events here in South Australia with the advent of the seven-day lockdown. I want to put on the record that this was an extraordinary event but absolutely the right thing to do. The South Australian Labor Party and I provide total bipartisan support to the actions the Marshall Liberal government took, on the advice of Grant Stevens and Nicola Spurrier, to put the state into lockdown in order to deal with the cases that we had from the emerging cluster in and around the north-eastern suburbs and other areas.

There were extraordinary sacrifices paid by a number of South Australians during the course of the lockdown, not least of which are those small business operators who had to close their doors, workers who had to give up their labour and people who put in an extraordinary amount of effort at testing stations and the like. They deserve a lot of credit, but I think every last South Australian deserves credit for the way that we approached the lockdown in a united, considered and thoughtful way, with generosity of spirit in our hearts.

We ultimately achieved the best possible result, which was our emerging from that seven-day lockdown without any extension to it, notwithstanding the restrictions that are currently in place, which also enjoy the support of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. I want to put on the record my thanks to all those people who were involved from government, from the Premier right through all the agencies, the bureaucracy and the people on the ground who were delivering critical services. They deserve an extraordinary amount of credit, along with every other South Australian.

Of course, the lockdown only concluded as of midnight last night, which was fantastic news; I say that as a father of a six year old trying to get homeschooled. I was very relieved yesterday when I saw the Premier announcing that children were going back to school. My wife and I were high-fiving, to say the least. However, we did only emerge from the lockdown yesterday evening and we have come straight into estimates.

As the Premier would be aware, I wrote to the Premier as we were going into lockdown, in light of the fact that we had estimates originally scheduled for last week, making it clear that the opposition was more than happy to amend the estimates schedule accordingly, which of course the government elected to do, as made sense considering we were going into lockdown.

Given that there is still a significant imposition of restrictions in place, given that the threat of the virus in South Australia has not completely abated, given the nature of the Delta strain in particular, I want to put on the record that the opposition remains more than willing to facilitate a delay in estimates.

I am very conscious that the chairman of the Transition Committee joins us here today. Other key Public Service agency heads will have to expend a large amount of their time and resources committing their efforts to estimates during the course of this week. I am also very conscious of the fact that the Premier has an extraordinary amount on his desk at the moment no doubt, with the focus on dealing with the circumstances around the virus. I simply would again reiterate that we would be more than willing to accommodate a delay in estimates.

The work of estimates is critical. It is an incredibly important function of the parliament. It is clearly an important opportunity for the opposition to perform its role, in terms of the scrutiny of taxpayers' dollars and how they are expended, but it can wait. It could easily wait a week or wait two weeks.

I am concerned that we do not want to put an unfair or inappropriate imposition on such important functions of government through having estimates hastily held this week. I simply make the offer that we would be happy to delay it, but if the Premier and the government wish to proceed, as is currently planned for today, the opposition clearly is ready, willing and able to do so and we will proceed with estimates as is custom and practice.

The CHAIR: Thank you, leader, and thank you, Premier. I invite questions from members.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: We have a couple of questions regarding parliamentary services generally, but we will be able to go through these relatively quickly, which I am sure the Clerk is deeply disappointed about. My first question goes to the fact that in early 2020 there was a series of members of parliament who had claimed the country members' allowance and then were required to make reimbursements. My question is: did any members of parliament make any reimbursements to the parliament in financial year 2021?

The CHAIR: So, leader, just for the record, we are referring to Budget Paper 3—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: It is Budget Paper 3, Appendix C, table C.2, on page 160.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that the issues the leader is referring to are not this financial year and not last financial year but the financial year before. These are issues to do with claims that were made up to and including 30 June 2020. I am advised that, yes, there have been some reimbursements of those and some of them track back into financial years for the previous decade. That is in line with what I presented at last year's estimates, where there was, in addition to the ones that were canvassed very broadly in the media, one member who had one day, another member who had another day and another member who had two days. As I said, those went back over an extended period of time.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Which members were those?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think I am permitted to state these: the member for MacKillop with one day, the member for Hammond with one day and the member for Flinders with two days. All the others have been very publicly canvassed, as you would be more than aware.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Just to be clear, and to go back to my original question, were there any members of parliament who made any reimbursements for the most recent financial year, that is, the 2020-21 financial year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, not for the 2020-21 financial year. Which financial year are we talking about?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: 2020-21.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is the financial year that has just completed?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Are you asking, 'Did anybody make a reimbursement for an incorrect claim in that year?' The answer to that is no. 'Did some of them'—and I have just outlined to you—'make payments for things that might have occurred a decade earlier?' The answer to that is yes. Some of those have been very publicly canvassed, but the ones that are the minor adjustments I did refer to in last year's estimates. Do not forget that last year's estimates actually were held not in the normal part of the year but much later in the year and so, in fact, we have had two estimates in a sort of eight-month period.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Notwithstanding the fact that the reimbursements that were made in the last financial year, the 2020-21 financial year, were not in regard to claims from that financial year but from prior periods, will the Premier commit to publicly disclosing all details of each member: the amount and date of any reimbursements made following a country member's allowance claim?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think most of those have been made through the media, quite frankly, but if they have not, I am happy to look at that matter.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So you are happy to commit that there will be a full disclosure?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have just given my answer to that. The Clerk advises me that there is potentially one member who could have gone into that next financial year. He will make an inquiry with regard to that and, if we have something to update you with, we will provide that for you.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Which member is that?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Again, let's just find out whether it is actually the case before we provide that information, because we do not have it at the moment. We do not know whether it is in the next financial year and if it is, we will let you know.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: You have been advised that there currently is a member of parliament who currently has a claim under investigation, but you will not disclose which member of parliament that is.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised by the Clerk that there was a reimbursement made last financial year, but for what exact period it related to and whether some of it was for last financial year is yet to be determined and we will determine that. The Clerk advises that this is a member who is making a series of payments, paying back amounts, but they relate to a number of different time periods. Some of that could have been indeed last financial year, but that work has not been done yet. The Clerk is happy to do that work.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Which member is that?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is the member for Mount Gambier.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Again, this will be my last question in this area. Why won't the Premier just commit that all elements of the country members' allowance—both claims and disclosing of reimbursements—will not be released publicly?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That would really be a question for the Speaker. I do not direct the Speaker; it is a matter for the parliament. Publication of those details is under the control of the Speaker, as you would know. We have changed the arrangements here in Parliament House so that it is the Speaker who publishes the reconciliation, I think now on a monthly basis—a very different situation from when we came to government which was just published on an annual basis. So it is now published on a monthly basis and that publication is really a matter for the Speaker.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I appreciate that, except to say that you are the Premier and you were elected with a majority. The idea that the Premier can divorce himself from the functions of the parliament is a little naive in light of the fact that you have been elected Premier. We have a Speaker from your party. 'This is the parliament; it has nothing to do with me,' I think is a little cheeky. Has the House of Assembly been cooperating with the ICAC investigation in regard to the member for Narungga? To be more specific, have all documents requested from the ICAC been provided to the ICAC from the House of Assembly?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is a little bit like reheating last week's dinner. These are the same questions you asked last year and my answer is exactly the same. I just refer you to *Hansard* from last year. It is not for me to interfere in an ICAC inquiry and it is not for me to inquire as to whether or not documents have been provided. It would be completely inappropriate and I think the member appreciates that.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: This is an opportunity, Premier, for us to ask questions regarding the parliament with the Clerk present, so it is not an opportunity for us to scrutinise your lack of answers in the parliament during question time. This is a different process. This is a different opportunity. So I again ask with the Clerk present, regarding any documents that have been requested from the ICAC, has the house provided them to the ICAC? It is a simple yes or no proposition.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I refer you to my previous answers—this year and last year. I remind the committee what we are talking about with these budget lines and I am sure the Chair would appreciate this—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: If you would like to be elected chair, put your hand up. Otherwise, we will move on to the next question.

The CHAIR: Leader, the Premier is answering your question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think it is important to determine what these questions are about. As the Leader of the Opposition should be aware, the Premier does not direct the parliament. Parliament is sovereign to itself. We provide a budget to the parliament. We provide a budget to the House of Assembly, to the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee and, of course, to the Legislative

Council. But as for matters that are the domain of the parliament and the Speaker, they are matters that the Leader of the Opposition has plenty of opportunities to take up in different fora from this. We are here to answer questions with regard to the budget, not the operation of the parliament.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Same budget line: has the parliament engaged counsel to give it advice regarding the ICAC investigation?

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Has the parliament engaged counsel or sought legal advice in regard to the ICAC investigation?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Again, that would be a matter for the Speaker. It is not a matter that we—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is a matter of expenditure and, if the parliament has expended money hiring counsel, we would like to know. The Clerk is there. Could you ask him please?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have any information to suggest—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, ask the Clerk.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that that would be the case. I have no information to suggest that that would be the case.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Has the parliament claimed privilege over any documents sought by the ICAC?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I just refer you to my answer provided to the committee last year on that matter.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What was that?

The CHAIR: Member for West Torrens, that is not a question that relates to the budget.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I disagree with you, sir.

The CHAIR: No, do not disagree with me.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, I am sorry. I am about to.

The CHAIR: My ruling is that your question was about whether privilege had been claimed.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

The CHAIR: Now that is not to do with the budget, as I understand it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is, sir. The parliament functions on a budget and, if the parliament exercises privilege over documents, it does so because it has the resources. I would like to know from the Premier, through the Clerk, if the parliament has claimed privilege over any documents sought by the ICAC investigating former Liberal MPs.

The CHAIR: I am going to let the Premier answer that if he wishes but I am still concerned—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I bet you he does not want to answer it.

The CHAIR: Member for West Torrens, I am still concerned that that is not a specific budget question. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is the same line of questioning that the member for West Torrens went down last year. He is very itchy when it comes to matters about the ICAC—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am. Many of your members are before it.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and he seems to know how it operates extraordinarily well from personal experience, but the reality is my answer to this question this year is exactly the same as my answer to the question last year—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What was that?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and that is—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What was it?

The CHAIR: Order, member for West Torrens!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that this is not a matter at all—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You can't remember?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —for an estimates committee.

The CHAIR: Can I interrupt for a moment, Premier, please. I am interrupting the committee now. We are going over old ground here, but my point is that any member of the committee is able to ask a question, provided that I rule it in order, and the Premier is able to answer. And while he is answering, the member, having asked the question, will listen to the answer.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is very clear to me that the Leader of the Opposition and the opposition generally have run out of questions about 25 minutes in. We got a pretty good indication of that right at the outset when the Leader of the Opposition made quite a long and lengthy introduction telling us about his children, and their going back to school, rather than getting down to questions. They have had an extra week to prepare questions and so far all they have done is go to questions that were asked last year. Answers were provided last year and they are not going to change this year.

The CHAIR: So your response to the question?

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

The CHAIR: Thank you.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How many FTEs were employed by the parliament in 2021 compared with 2019-20? I am happy for this to be taken on notice. Can a breakdown be provided between permanent and casual, how many employees were stood down without pay during any period in 2019-20 and 2020-21, and what was the total expenditure in wages in 2020-21 compared with 2019-20? Again, I am happy for that to be taken on notice.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There are 114 FTEs fully funded within the current budget. A breakdown for those: for the 2020-21 financial year, we had an average of 13.6 in catering, 23.2 in reporting, 13.7 in Joint Services, 10.9 in the library, 26.6 in the House of Assembly, and 17.9 in the Legislative Council. You want a split between full time and part time. We might take that question on notice. What was the other part of your question?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: If you are taking it on notice, then you can just refer to the *Hansard*. I will move on to the Auditor-General's Department.

The CHAIR: There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the proposed payments for the Legislative Council, House of Assembly, Joint Parliamentary Services and Administered Items for Joint Parliamentary Services complete. The next line of questioning relates to the State Governor's Establishment. Do you have any questions on that at all, leader?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No.

The CHAIR: If not, I declare the examination of the proposed payments for the State Governor's Establishment complete. We move now to the Auditor-General's Department. I declare the proposed payments open for examination. Premier, have you had a change of advisers?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I would like to advise the committee that Andrew Richardson, the Auditor-General, and Ian McGlen, the Deputy Auditor-General, join me now.

The CHAIR: Are there any opening statements on this issue?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No.

The CHAIR: Otherwise we will go to straight to questions.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, page 70, Program 1: Auditing Services. Will the Auditor-General be conducting or is the Auditor-General considering an audit into the effectiveness of the state government's debt management and its ability to pay down debt and deliver surpluses, given reports that the GST deal signed by this government will leave South Australia worse off?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Auditor-General advises me that there is no specific separate inquiry into the matters raised by the leader. However, he will be looking at the state budget, as he does every year, and providing a state finance report at around about the same time as he presents his other reports. I remind the committee that we do have, in addition to the Auditor-General looking at our budget, the various ratings agencies that look at our position.

I note that when we came to government South Australia's budget was rated the lowest of any state in Australia. In fact, it was rated below Tasmania, which is extraordinary. I note that we have recently very significantly improved our standing, moving to AA+ with Standard and Poor's. Moody's released their report on us only last week, which is Aa1, which is I think equal with other states, such as New South Wales.

We were not put on a watch. In fact, we were very pleased with the response we had from the independent umpires, if you like—the ratings agencies. They were very impressed with the way that our targeted response was not encumbering future budgets in South Australia and that we did also plan to return to a surplus situation. They also recognised that there was a need, as we were advised by the Governor of the Reserve Bank of Australia and Dr Kennedy, who is the department's secretary in Canberra, to have stimulus and support packages for our economy during this particularly difficult period but that they needed to be targeted and they needed to be short term, and that is precisely what we have provided.

I note that the Commonwealth Parliament Offices did an analysis of the various state responses in our budgets—the fiscal stimulus and support we provided—and that South Australia was, in fact, rated the second most generous of all the states, just slightly behind New South Wales.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I noted the Premier's very lengthy answer. Clearly, he wants to avoid all the questions we have prepared, notwithstanding his earlier remarks, in his very lengthy—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Anytime the leader likes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: We will take you up on that, Premier, so thank you.

The CHAIR: Leader, ask your questions. There is no need to provide extra commentary.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I would simply note that the Premier did not go into any detail whatsoever regarding the main tenet of the question, which was the fact that he has signed South Australia up to a long-term deal that will diminish South Australia's GST return in the long term, which is a dereliction of his responsibility to future generations of this state. My next question is: is the Auditor-General conducting or considering any audits into government advertising expenditure?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has the Auditor-General looked into or will the Auditor-General look into the cost-benefit analysis, if there is one, for the new basketball stadium?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, but it would not be outside a normal scope of an audit, should that be made available.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I refer the Premier to Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, page 71, Sub-program 1.2: Special Investigations. Has the Auditor-General given consideration if he will investigate the probity of the process of appointing directors to Racing SA? I understand that the Hon. Frank Pangallo from the other place has written to the Auditor-General regarding this.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is under consideration.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So the Auditor-General is considering investigating the probity of the process. Very well.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, he has not responded to the correspondence yet. He is still considering it.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: When does the Auditor-General expect to have completed that consideration?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Within the next week or so.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has the Auditor-General been requested to conduct or is he currently considering or conducting any other special investigations?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Auditor-General advises that, no, there are no further special investigations that are being considered and that they are reasonably non-discretionary anyway. The only instances where a special investigation can be put in place is if the Auditor-General is requested by the parliament, the Treasurer, a minister or the Independent Commission Against Corruption.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thank you. Sir, the opposition has concluded its questions of the Auditor-General.

The CHAIR: There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the proposed payments for the Auditor-General's Department complete.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As it turned out, sir, I was not wasting anybody's time. There were only six minutes of questions, way less than the allotted time.

The CHAIR: Thank you, Premier.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr N. Reade, Chief Executive, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

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

Ms D. Dixon, State Project Lead, Lot Fourteen Project, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

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

The CHAIR: The next portfolio for examination is the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, the Office for Digital Government and the Adelaide Convention Bureau. The minister appearing is the Premier. I invite the Premier to introduce his advisers and make a statement if he wishes.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you, sir. Joining me this morning are Nick Reade, chief executive. I also have Steve Woolhouse, who is the Executive Director of Communities and Corporate, and Di Dixon, who is looking after the project associated with Lot Fourteen. She is the state project lead. There is also Eva Balan-Vnuk, who is the Executive Director of ICT and Digital Government. I have no opening statement.

The CHAIR: Leader, do you wish to make a statement? Questions, then.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I refer to Budget Paper 3, Appendix C, table C.2 on page 160 regarding the Agent General. Was there any selection committee or selection process for appointing the Agent General?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As the leader would be aware, this is an appointment that is made by the Premier. We did speak to one person who provided some input from an HR and recruitment perspective. Ultimately, we considered a number of people for this important role for South Australia.

I suppose there were two different considerations: to appoint (1) somebody who was based in the UK who might have a lesser knowledge of the offerings here in South Australia, or (2) somebody based in South Australia who might have a lesser knowledge of what was going on in the UK. We ultimately formed an opinion—there were some interviews conducted—to appoint the Hon. David Ridgway.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Who were the other candidates?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think that would be inappropriate. I think that there is a level of privacy that needs to be shown to people who apply—well, not necessarily apply but who were approached for this position.

Can I just say that there was one other particularly good person who was considered. This is a person who was based in the UK but who was originally born in South Australia, and although they had maintained a very good interest in South Australia they just did not have the depth of knowledge and experience of businesses in this state.

We are very keen to very significantly expand our activities and results in the UK, especially with the new UK free trade agreement being signed fairly soon. I know that there has been a high level of negotiations, and most matters have been resolved. In fact, it could have been signed by now, but my last information was that it had not been signed.

However, regardless of that, I think that there are great opportunities for further export of South Australian goods and services and investment attraction into South Australia, as well as ultimately, when the borders lift, great opportunity for tourism from the UK into South Australia. As I said, we took all these things into consideration and I formed the opinion that David Ridgway would be the best person to promote our interests in the UK.

I can advise the committee that the scope of the UK operation will be diminished going forward, because, of course, they previously also looked after Europe. Subsequent to Brexit, we formed the opinion that what we should do was to set up a separate European office. We have already announced and included in the budget lines with regard to this, and we will be setting up an office in France.

I do not have anything to advise on an appointment there yet, but it is something we are considering at the moment. The UK office, which previously also looked after Europe, will now be concentrated on the UK, and I think that there are great opportunities there.

Can I also take this opportunity to thank Bill Muirhead for his long and meritorious service to the people of South Australia. He did an outstanding job. I note recently that he has accepted a position on the council of the University of South Australia. I note that he intends to be spending more time back here in South Australia, and I think that presents us with unique opportunities to tap into his great love of this state and also his incredible contacts in the UK.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Who was the HR advice from?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Again, I do not think that is relevant to provide to this committee.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No, sorry, Mr Chairman—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We sought external advice.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am just answering the question, Mr Chairman.

The CHAIR: The leader has asked a question and the Premier is answering it.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Okay. So—

The CHAIR: No. The Premier is answering.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not think it is relevant. We seek advice from various HR consultancies in South Australia. There is a list the leader is more than happy to have a look at that outlines the panel of people who provide services to South Australia. We did not ultimately move

forward with a full contract for this person, to do an extensive recruitment project. That is my understanding. However, we did seek some preliminary advice. But, as I said, for the reasons outlined before we formed the opinion that we would appoint the Hon. David Ridgway to this important post for South Australia.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The HR advice that you received with respect to the Agent General appointment you referred to earlier, did you get that for free? Was it just free HR advice, or was money expended for that? Because if money was expended for that, I think that the people of South Australia are entitled to know who provided it.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, there was no expenditure. I am advised by the chief executive that we did consider whether or not we would go out for advertised recruitment. There was some discussion with a member of the panel. That was not proceeded with. We did not incur any expenditure. I think that we have made an excellent appointment.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So there was a panel. Who was on the panel?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not sure what you mean by 'the panel'.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: You just referred to the panel.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, if you were paying attention to my—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am paying attention to every word you say.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: If you were paying attention to my answers, you would see from *Hansard* that there is a panel of people who provide HR advice to the government. We did not go and find a new person to provide that initial discussion. There is a panel of people who are approved, just like there are for many services to government. It was not that long ago that you were in government; I would have thought you would have understood how that panel operated.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Was there any discussion between you and David Ridgway about his vacancy?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not sure what you mean. Of course there was discussion regarding the vacancy. We did not just appoint him without consultation.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The vacancy he creates in the Legislative Council?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, that was not my consideration at all.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So you never discussed with David Ridgway the vacancy that he would create in the Legislative Council at any point?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It was pretty obvious there would be a vacancy but that was not part of our consideration at all.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: When did you make the decision to appoint David Ridgway to the position of Agent General?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think we had multiple extensions—I do not have them with me at the moment—to the time that Bill Muirhead had served. He was originally appointed, I think, by the Hon. Mike Rann as the Agent General for South Australia. I think he was subsequently extended by the Hon. Jay Weatherill and he was extended two or three times, I think, by me. His term completed at 30 June. The time frame was something that we had to resolve by 30 June and I think we got in just in time. We had to ultimately appoint an acting Agent General, James Mraz, to take over that role until David Ridgway could assume that role. I think that takes place some time in August.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What will be the total salary package for David Ridgway? Will he be paid more or less than the previous Agent General?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: My understanding is it is exactly the same as the previous arrangement with Bill Muirhead. There was no change to that arrangement.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What other benefits will David Ridgway be entitled to—car, driver, expense account, staff, flights? Can the Premier provide a detailed breakdown of this? Again, I am happy for this to be taken on notice.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, it is exactly the same as what is provided. There is an overall budget that is provided to the Agent General and that is, I think, documented. There is no change whatsoever to the terms, the conditions, the expense accounts that the Leader of the Opposition refers to compared with what was already in place.

As I said, we expect to do very well in this market but the scope of the operation there has been diminished by no longer looking after the UK, so we did not see any need to further expand that position. It is a part-time position, as the leader would be aware, not a full-time position. The remuneration for the Hon. David Ridgway will be exactly the same as for Bill Muirhead, who preceded him.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How is it that David Ridgway, in your opinion, is the best possible candidate that we can find as a state for the Agent General position, but he was not fit to be the tourism minister?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not sure how this is a budget-related question, but I am more than happy to soak up the leader's time on this and give him the reasons for the appointment.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The reason why it is pertinent, Premier, is that it is an important role. It is paid for out of the expenditure of taxpayer dollars and so the appointment is utterly material to this process. Again, I make the point that this is a minister who resigned in rather poor circumstances because he was not up to the job of being the tourism minister. You took the portfolio off him for presumably a reason or two and then he gets appointed to this incredibly important role. How is it that David Ridgway is the best possible person that South Australia can find to represent us in this role?

The CHAIR: Before I call on the Premier to answer that, not so much in relation to that question, leader, but in relation to previous questions about salary packages, etc., it actually comes under the auspices of the Minister for Trade and Investment. So the Premier appoints in general and then the Department for Trade and Investment is responsible for administration and salary packages. There will be an opportunity to ask that question in Estimates Committee B on Thursday.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: We have moved on anyway.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: On that, it is a slightly complicated situation inasmuch as I do actually pay for the Agent General but transfer the money, would you believe, to another department just to administer the payroll. I am happy to answer any questions on this, but it is a slightly quirky one with regard to the Agent General.

The Leader of the Opposition has a number of matters slightly confused. David Ridgway did not resign as the Minister for Tourism. After the devastating bushfires, I spoke to David Ridgway and I said that I wanted to take on this part of his portfolio. Obviously he was disappointed because he very much enjoyed that portfolio, but I had formed the opinion that a huge part of the recovery from the bushfires would be based on regional tourism in South Australia and that, like Will Hodgman in Tasmania who took on the role as Minister for Tourism, I would do the same thing here in South Australia. I have enjoyed that portfolio. It has been an extraordinarily challenging time.

That was in January 2020. David Ridgway did not actually resign from the cabinet until much later in the year. There were two other resignations from the cabinet at that time, and he had said to me for quite some time that he would be resigning from the cabinet at the first reshuffle. We were all envisaging that that could have been some time later but it was not, so he took the opportunity to resign from the cabinet at the time. I wanted to correct the record because there were some completely incorrect assertions made by the Leader of the Opposition with regard to the resignation of the Hon. David Ridgway.

The second part of the question was really about why I formed the opinion that he was the right person for the job. Sir, as you would be aware, we have a Growth State agenda in South Australia, with nine separate areas that we think our government should be focused upon. This work was actually overseen by David Ridgway as the Minister for Trade and Investment in South Australia.

He did the work, along with Steven Joyce, who was the finance minister in New Zealand, who came in to do a review.

They identified nine areas that we really wanted to focus on in terms of trade and investment. He has an intimate understanding of those nine areas. He has an intimate understanding of all our capabilities in these nine target areas in South Australia. I do not think there is any person who would have a closer understanding of what they would be, and these are the areas that we want to be focused on not just in the UK but in all our overseas offices.

For those reasons, and because of his close family links in the UK, we thought that he would be the ideal person. It is very difficult to find somebody with a comprehensive skill set in this way. Usually you find somebody who has an excellent set of connections in the UK or an excellent understanding of the situation here in South Australia. David Ridgway performs well on both those counts, and that is the reason that we decided to back him in to this very important position.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My next question goes to a different budget line. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 17, Highlights 2020-21, dot point 1 where it states:

Supported the Premier's leadership of the management and recovery from COVID-19 through National Cabinet.

My first question on this topic to the Premier is: given the delayed vaccine rollout and the outbreaks that we have seen with Delta in South Australia, New South Wales and Victoria, notwithstanding South Australia and Victoria coming out of lockdown last night, and obviously the increasingly difficult situation around the world, how long do you expect hotel quarantine arrangements to continue?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Nobody knows the answer to that question. As the leader would be aware, the Doherty Institute has recently completed some information, which will be provided to national cabinet this coming Friday. The Prime Minister has said that we may not make a final decision at this national cabinet meeting coming up on Friday but hopefully fairly soon to really chart that pathway out where we move away from lockdowns.

People have been speculating about different thresholds in terms of vaccination, but what we know is that vaccination rates are increasing around the world. Until recently, we have had a green zone with New Zealand. In South Australia, we will be trialling a home-based quarantine for South Australians, or Australians maybe, who have been vaccinated in Australia, travelled overseas and come back. This is potentially a great opportunity to reduce our reliance on quarantine hotels, but nobody has a crystal ball, so at the moment we continue to use those quarantine hotels.

I do note that we have very significantly reduced the number of international arrivals coming back into South Australia per week. Recently, we moved from 530 per week down to 265 and again this week we had an even lower number because we had no international arrivals on either Monday or Tuesday. This was a request that I made to the Prime Minister last week, in light of the lockdown situation and the increased pathology requirements here in our state.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How much taxpayers' money has been spent on medi-hotels since they began?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is not a matter I preside over. This is the quarantine hotel?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think that would be a matter to address in the SA Health estimates, which I think is next week.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Do you have any idea how much this is costing the state, even a ballpark figure, as the Premier?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Treasurer referred to this in his statement to the house only a few weeks ago when he outlined that there had been an increased expenditure related to that. I refer the leader to the Treasurer's speech in the house, but otherwise I refer him to the health estimates, which will be held next week.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How much money has been allocated over the forward estimates to the operation of medi-hotels?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Again, that would be a matter for the health estimates. This is not—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Do you have any idea?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is not any idea. That is not what estimates are about. We are examining certain aspects of the budget. The questions that you ask do not relate to the lines that are open for investigation at the moment.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How many breaches from quarantine have been detected in the last financial year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that. Again, that would be a very useful question for you to ask either via the select committee on this matter—I think there are members of the Australian Labor Party—or Health. There are a range that have already been canvassed. Some of those are very minor and some of them are more significant, but overall our quarantine hotel arrangements have served South Australia extraordinarily well.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: They are questions that we can ask in those other forums and we will, but my question is: have you asked how many quarantine breaches have been made?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What budget line are you referring to at the moment?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Have you asked how many quarantine breaches have occurred in medi-hotels?

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

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has the state government put forward a proposal or requested the commonwealth to set up a standalone quarantine facility in South Australia for returned travellers and—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Have I?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has the state government put forward a proposal or requested the commonwealth to set up a standalone quarantine facility in South Australia for returned travellers?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We are back to reheating. These are questions you have asked already in question time and the answer is going to be the same, but I am more than happy to help the Leader of the Opposition out with a lengthy answer if he requests because he clearly—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Just a yes or no would be fine.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —has no other questions.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Just a yes or no is fine. It is a pretty straightforward question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have looked at a range of options to accommodate the returning Australian citizens who are stranded overseas as well as particular target groups. I think these have been well canvassed in the media, but I am happy to go through them again. We wanted to bring back seasonal workers to South Australia, so we did set up a separate standalone facility in the Riverland. I think more than a thousand international arrivals were accommodated in that facility.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Why not do that for returning Australians?

The CHAIR: Order! The leader has asked his question and the Premier is answering. There will be no interjections.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you, sir. We did set that up and that has worked extraordinarily well. I think it is now no longer in operation. The second area that is being contemplated and worked through at the moment is for the return of international students and a pilot in South Australia. We hope to be the first in the country. We know that South Australia has been very fortunate to have an increasing number of international students under the current government. That has made a very significant positive impact in the first two years of our government.

Unfortunately, with the border controls, the number of international students has significantly declined, so we would like to get them back. We do not propose to use the current quarantine hotels

for that and so a separate standalone site has been considered for that. We are doing our fair share in terms of repatriating stranded Australian citizens. In fact, the last time I looked at the figure, which admittedly was several weeks ago, we had brought back around 8 per cent of all returning stranded Australian citizens, so more than our fair share in terms of population or our percentage of the overall economy.

The federal government has an offer on the table for those states that want to increase their capacity for bringing back international students. I think there was a deal that he put together for Queensland and a further deal he was considering for Western Australia. In South Australia, we are not proposing to increase over and above the caps that have been set at the moment. As I said, we have taken back more than our fair share, but we will still look for alternatives for bringing back our seasonal workers and our international students in a safe way because we want to do everything we can to support our economy.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Why have special quarantine arrangements for overseas workers and international students but not for returning Australians?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, they are a completely different cohort. What we do, and it has been a hallmark of our arrangements since day one here in South Australia, is listen to the experts. It is very well for the Leader of the Opposition and the Australian Labor Party to go out on a daily basis and say, 'We are offering bipartisan support,' but then go out and put in alternative suggestions, helpful or otherwise, on pretty much a daily basis that do undermine the public confidence with regard to the way we are managing the COVID-19 pandemic here in South Australia. So far, the Australian—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Premier, I understand that you want to exercise a bit of political bravado in estimates, but that is pretty unfair. I think that is unfair. Not on any occasion has anyone in my team done anything to undermine public confidence in the health advice: we have done the exact opposite. Just on that, Premier, you have been out there day after day saying that I want to bring in—

The CHAIR: Leader, I am going to interrupt. I am going to ask the leader and the Premier both to cut the commentary.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I agree, sir. All I want is an answer to the question.

The CHAIR: Thank you, so you will come back to the question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: All I want is an answer to the question. Do you have one?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, that was not a question; that was just like a statement, wasn't it? I have no idea what it actually was. It was a sort of whingey, whiney statement, like somebody was not paying attention to you for five minutes. What was it?

The CHAIR: I have asked you both, the Premier and the leader, to cut the commentary.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This is what we are used to, sir—

The CHAIR: I understand that.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —no questions.

The CHAIR: Questions and—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: There was a question and I am wanting an answer—

The CHAIR: Order! The leader and the Premier will come to order. Questions and answers are going to be directed through the Chair.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My question—

The CHAIR: No, I have not finished yet, leader. There will be no conversations across the floor. Perhaps, leader, you would like to come back to the question you asked a little while ago now.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am still waiting for the answer, yes.

The CHAIR: Let's repeat it for my benefit.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Why would we be providing a particular form of quarantine that arguably brings with it greater amenity for one cohort of people—international students returning, for instance—but a very different form of quarantine with arguably less amenity associated with it for returning Australians?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying before, these are completely different cohorts and we listen to the international experts in this area. We listen to the state-based experts in regard to the risk and we adjust accordingly. What we have heard from the Australian Labor Party is that they would establish a standalone quarantine facility. We do not know how much it is going to cost to build, where they are actually going to put it.

The entire time they are undermining the public confidence that we have in our quarantine hotel situation in South Australia. When is the Australian Labor Party going to tell us how much, where and how long it is going to take to actually build? They are great at going out and undermining the great work of SA Health and the great work that our entire state is doing in this area, but the reality is that they are not doing anything to advance this cause whatsoever.

The CHAIR: Order, Premier! Thank you. You have concluded your answer.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am happy to answer the Premier's questions. We know that \$200 million can provide a substantial number of beds, as we are seeing in Victoria.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Is this a question or what is this?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: It is an answer to your question, so if you were paying attention to—

The CHAIR: Order!

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The public confidence in hotel quarantine—

The CHAIR: Leader, you are addressing this to me, not to the Premier.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Sir, the public confidence in hotel quarantine is not undermined by anyone in the Australian Labor Party. It is undermined by repeated medi-hotel breaches that have resulted in statewide lockdowns.

The CHAIR: I have asked you both—

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The CHAIR: No, Premier. I have asked the Premier and the leader both to cease the general commentary. Estimates is an opportunity to ask specific questions about specific budget lines. Before I call the leader, I will remind everybody that Health is appearing on Thursday afternoon in committee B.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I do note that Professor Nicola Spurrier, I understand and am advised, has noted on the record that the biggest risk of outbreaks in South Australia in the past have been from the virus within medi-hotels. We know that Victoria went into a statewide lockdown as a result of a medi-hotel breach in South Australia. So given that, does the Premier have any intention to request of the commonwealth a standalone quarantine facility, not to provide additional quarantine on top of medi-hotels but instead of medi-hotels?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Here we go again: the Leader of the Opposition deliberately undermining the great work of SA Health. They have run quarantine hotels extraordinarily well. For some reason, the Leader of the Opposition thinks that by changing the postcode of where we put the quarantine hotel somehow magically the risk completely and utterly diminishes. Well, it does not.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I have never said that, sir.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We are listening to the experts. We will continue to listen to the experts. They have advised us extraordinarily well—since day one. The commonwealth has been very clear that they will provide more money for quarantine facilities if we increase our numbers that we are bringing back. But we have done our fair share. We have absolutely done our fair share in South Australia. The Australian Labor Party can be out there saying that they want to build new quarantine facilities and bring more people back. They can put their policies—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: We have never said that.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to the people of the state at the next election, but we will stick to the position that I think has served our state extraordinarily well since the advent of this coronavirus. We will not be taking money from the commonwealth government to increase the numbers that we are bringing back—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: And that was not the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —into South Australia. We are satisfied with our share of the national repatriation of stranded Australian citizens. We want to take our share, but we do also know that the Delta variant is particularly problematic. What we constantly do, though, is look at the way that we operate our quarantine facilities in South Australia. I am very proud of the continuous improvement that we have made right from day one. You would note, sir, that last year we were independently audited or assessed, if you like, by Jane Halton, who did that assessment of all the jurisdictions in Australia, and South Australia did extraordinarily well.

But there are still learnings from different jurisdictions, and we have put them into place. We now have in South Australia a dedicated COVID-positive site, the Tom's Court Hotel. I think there are currently 25 people within that site. That is going very well because it separates those people at higher risk from other people who remain at that lower risk.

We will constantly look at ways to improve the quarantine situation, but we will not be so naive to think that by moving it somewhere else somehow the risk completely diminishes or is extinguished. That is not the case. We certainly will not be looking to take any more than we need to in South Australia, and we will not be undermining the great work of SA Health, who give us the advice with regard to the way we run our quarantine hotel.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Again I make the point that no-one is undermining advice. We are asking questions in estimates, as much as the Premier wishes that we would do that, I might add. I refer the Premier to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 18, targets 2021-22, dot point 1:

Continue to support effective and coordinated decision making within the executive government throughout emergency events including the ongoing management of COVID-19.

How often does the Transition Committee meet?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As needed.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So it does not meet on a weekly basis and then more often if needed or anything like that?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition has been paying attention, but the way it works is that the Transition Committee deals with removing restrictions, and so those restrictions are not put in place on a regular basis; they are put in place in response to a risk. So at the moment you could imagine that the Transition Committee is meeting on a pretty regular basis. That makes sense because some very heavy restrictions were put in place last Monday, and they were further escalated on Tuesday at 6 o'clock last week. Now the Transition Committee has the task of removing those restrictions in a very risk-oriented way.

There are periods of time when the police commissioner, as the State Coordinator during this major emergency declaration, has made it clear that this is going to be situation normal for an extended period of time, so you might not have a Transition Committee meeting for weeks, maybe even longer than that.

We have made it clear that the Transition Committee will meet on an as-needs basis just as the national cabinet meets on an as-needs basis, just as we have had to pivot organisations and institutions like our own cabinet in South Australia, or Executive Council here in South Australia, to respond, to pivot, to be flexible to the changed environment, and that will continue.

I am very grateful to all the people who serve on the Transition Committee. We will obviously have a review of the Emergency Management Act after this overall incident is concluded. We do that after each of the incidents that trigger the Emergency Management Act, and it is quite possible that

there may need to be some legislative changes, but we will not be making that at this point in time. The Transition Committee continues to meet on an as-needs basis.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Have you attended transition committees?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Why not?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not a member of the Transition Committee. I think I can remember the make-up of it off the top of my head, but it is chaired by the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. Sitting on it also are representatives of Health. In particular, I know that Professor Nicola Spurrier or her delegate is there; also Dr Chris McGowan, who is the Chief Executive of the Department for Health and Wellbeing; the Under Treasurer; and the Chief Executive of the Department for Trade and Investment. There may be some other people who are called in from time to time.

We charge the Transition Committee with the responsibility of removing the restrictions in a way that considers three particular elements: health, economy and wellbeing. It is not an easy task. There are plenty of people who want to give advice to this committee. Some people think they have gone too hard; some people think they have gone too soft. We have to take all these matters into consideration. They ultimately provide the final advice with the removal of these restrictions, and they ultimately get incorporated into a direction, which of course is put in place, and the only person who can put a direction into place is the State Coordinator, who is the police commissioner in South Australia.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Do any of your staff attend Transition Committee meetings?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I suppose Nick Reade is a member of my staff. He is the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No—any of the Premier's office staff?

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

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Regarding the directions committee, as distinct from the Transition Committee?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Directions are not a committee. The directions are put in place by the State Coordinator during a major emergency declaration, and that is the police commissioner, Grant Stevens.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So there is no directions committee per se?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No. There are people who are involved with the drafting of the directions. Sometimes, we can give a verbal direction, but ultimately they will all be followed up with a direction that is put in writing and there are people who are involved in that direction.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Given that you are not on the Transition Committee and given that the directions are made by the State Coordinator under the Emergency Management Act, when you publicly say 'we' at press conferences, as you have this week—'We have decided,' 'We have discussed,'—you do not really mean you, do you, because you obviously are not party to the decision?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not really sure what you are getting at. I would speak to all the players involved in this on a daily basis, if not an hourly basis.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Sure.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: If the Leader of the Opposition is trying to assert that somehow I have nothing to do with the management of this, I think he really does not understand the way that we have worked very closely as a team. Within that team, we all have our designated roles: the police commissioner has his roles, Nicola Spurrier has hers, and so do the chief executive, the minister and I, of course.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: At last month's Budget and Finance Committee hearing, your chief executive told the committee that you have no direct input or are not briefed before Transition Committee meetings. Why are you not briefed or consulted about the agenda or topics for Transition Committee meetings?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Why am I not?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Let's be clear: I think we are pretty sure what is going to be discussed each week. I have already outlined to this estimates committee, and I am happy to do it again, that the directions are put in place by the police commissioner. They are directions which do create restrictions, whether they be restrictions regarding density, caps on public activities or the wearing of masks.

In the most recent direction, which will ultimately be noted by the cabinet, there are a huge number of matters canvassed. They are canvassed pretty broadly in the broader media and the population here in South Australia, so I do not need to be presented with an agenda for what is being considered at the Transition Committee when it is held. I am more than aware of what is on that agenda. I am really not sure what this actually has to do with the budget. I am not sure what budget line the Leader of the Opposition is referring to, and I am really not sure where he is going with this line of questioning.

The CHAIR: In answer to that question, Premier, the leader identified page 8, dot point 1, and I am deeming the question relevant.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thank you, sir. Given you are not in the Transition Committee meetings and not a member of the Transition Committee, you do not provide input to the Transition Committee meetings, how is the outcome of a Transition Committee meeting communicated to you? The Transition Committee meeting happens, presumably somewhere in State Admin or elsewhere—I am not sure—and what happens then? Does the State Coordinator then call you and say, 'This is what we have decided,' or do you just get briefed or an email? How does it actually work?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There could be a number of people who would call me. It could be the chief executive. It is often the police commissioner. It could be the Chief Executive of the Department for Health and Wellbeing. There are a number of people who would be able to convey the outcomes of that Transition Committee meeting. Often they are held at the same time as cabinet, and so the chief executive splits his time between those two committees.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So the decision will be communicated to you and then presumably, if it is of significant public notoriety, or it is deemed that the information needs to be communicated publicly, then either the State Coordinator would do that or the Chief Public Health Officer would do that, or in some instances you would do that?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Nearly always, after the Transition Committee we meet in my office; especially over the last week, when we have had lockdown, we have had meetings prior to press each day. We want to make sure we all have the most up-to-date information. There is information coming in in real time with regard to the lockdown, as you can imagine.

We have been very keen to get not only the test results but also the number of tests, the testing sites, the number of people in a directed quarantine situation, the various tiers of those directions, and the sites we are particularly focused on. I find getting people together around the table—often 10 or more, who will sit in my office adjacent to the cabinet room—means we can all get onto the same page quickly.

One of the hallmarks of the way we have conducted ourselves as a state really goes back to day one. I remember very distinctly the presentation that was given in cabinet by Dr Chris McGowan on this matter. It was the very early days, and he said that the number one thing we had to do was to suppress the peak of what was coming and push it out to the future as much as possible, that the number two thing was to stand up as much critical care capacity in the state as we possibly could, and the number three thing was to really educate the people of South Australia about the pandemic—

in fact, I am not even sure it was called a pandemic in the very early days—about this disease, because we needed to take the public with us here in South Australia.

That is why, since day one, you would see a lot of our press conferences—especially when we found ourselves in a situation where we had to explain complex matters—have a perspective from me as the Premier of South Australia, from Professor Nicola Spurrier as the Chief Public Health Officer, and, of course, the police commissioner as the State Coordinator. Then we have other people who come in as well: people like Stephen Wade, the Minister for Health and Wellbeing; Dr Tom Dodd, the clinical lead for SA Pathology; and we might have somebody like Dr Louise Flood, who is head of the Communicable Disease Control Branch. We will bring in those subject matter experts to educate the people of South Australia.

That has put us in a very good position here in South Australia, and I think that the average understanding in this state is extraordinarily good about how this disease is contracted, how it is transmitted and the types of activities individuals can take to protect themselves against it. The primary one, of course, is vaccination.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I will simply respond by saying that I thank the Premier for his answers: they are insightful, and I think they are incredibly important. Again, I want to take this opportunity to put on the record my genuine gratitude and thanks to the people who are making the decisions that have stood our state in such great stead.

I agree wholeheartedly with the Premier that the model has worked of having Grant Stevens and the Transition Committee and others making all these huge judgement calls—with significant pressures and a lot to balance in terms of competing objectives to try to get that balance right. They have done it exceedingly well and, again, I put on the record my thanks for that.

I note that the model has stood us in good stead, and for as long as that model is maintained we can have confidence that will continue to be the case, regardless of who the Premier is—because, of course, the Premier is not party to the decisions themselves. I will move on to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 18, targets 2021-22, dot point 1:

Continue to support effective and coordinated decision making within the executive government throughout emergency events including the ongoing management of COVID-19.

In February, Premier, when you were asked if everybody in South Australia who wants to be vaccinated will be vaccinated this year, you told Adelaide radio—and I quote—'Absolutely.' My question is: will everybody who wants to be vaccinated in South Australia be able to get vaccinated this year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is my expectation. Obviously we are very much constrained by the availability of the vaccination doses. Originally, as a country we considered five separate vaccination opportunities or offers. We have narrowed it down to two that we kicked off with, the AstraZeneca and then the Pfizer. We started with the Pfizer. In fact, I was one of the first people in the state. We were asked to kick off and have leaders around the country vaccinated at the time, and so I kicked off with the Pfizer. I think we offered it also to the Leader of the Opposition. He took a little bit longer to have his vaccination.

Ultimately, we then were the first in the country to kick off the AstraZeneca. Now, there has been changed advice with regard to the suitability of the AstraZeneca vaccine. That has been provided by the Australian Technical Advisory Group on Immunisation (ATAGI), so that has thrown a bit of a curve ball at us here in Australia, but we do have very significant increases in doses available coming to Australia at the end of next month. Then we have the Moderna vaccine, which is available and which comes online in September.

At the moment in South Australia, we are above the national rate in terms of doses administered per head of population, but we cannot be complacent, and my strong advice to the people of South Australia is that, when they are eligible, please book in and have your vaccination. It is very, very important for our state, and we are going to see a very significant increase in the supply, so we will need to also look at the opportunities to open up to further cohorts down the track as these new vaccines come online.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The Premier referred to my getting vaccinated. For the record, I booked my vaccination the moment that 40 year olds—I am 40—became eligible to be vaccinated. I booked my vaccination immediately at the first available opportunity.

The CHAIR: The member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I take this opportunity to take up the Premier's very generous offer of moving an extension. I move:

That there be an extension of the examination of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet for a further hour, concluding at 11.30am.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, sir, I do not support that at all. The question was with regard to the assertion by the Leader of the Opposition that I was fudging an answer to the Auditor-General's examination. As it turned out, he ran out of questions about three minutes later.

The CHAIR: Premier, you do not need to respond to this. I will deal with this as Chair. The member for West Torrens has moved a motion for an extension of time?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: To 11.30, sir, taking up the Premier's very generous offer.

The CHAIR: Regardless of that—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: He said, 'I'm happy to extend—

The CHAIR: No. Regardless of what the Premier may or may not have said, the member for West Torrens has moved the motion and that has been seconded, as I understand, by the member for Ramsay. You have signed that, member for Ramsay?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Yes.

The CHAIR: Do you wish to speak for the motion?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Just to say that I thank the Premier for his very generous offer.

The CHAIR: Is there anyone who wishes to speak against the motion? The member for Schubert.

Mr KNOLL: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think that the motion is a little bit cheeky on behalf of the Manager of Opposition Business. He well knows that he has been in discussion with the Manager of Government Business for months on this, and to try to spring this on at the last minute I think is ridiculous, and so I think, and potentially on behalf of people sitting on this side of the committee, it is not something we are going to support.

The CHAIR: There are three members supporting the motion, and three members opposed to the motion. The vote is tied. As Chair, I have a casting vote, and I vote against the motion.

Motion negatived.

The CHAIR: Continue, leader.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That says a lot about the Premier's sincerity when he says he is willing to have an extension of time. I am not too sure what that means in terms of the veracity of all the Premier's other comments that have been made today.

The CHAIR: I do not know, leader, whether the rules—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So, moving on—

The CHAIR: Leader! I do not know whether the rules about reflecting on a vote of the house would apply in committee but, regardless of that, you may ask a question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I was reflecting on the Premier's offer and then withdrawal of the offer, or not willing for it to be supported. Regarding the vaccine rollout, does the Premier still believe that the vaccine rollout in South Australia is excellent?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We are working very well in South Australia. As I said before, we are above the national distribution rate per capita. We did offer for the Leader of the Opposition to have his jab earlier. He has just outlined to the house that he booked in at the first available opportunity. I am reliably informed by my office that in fact we offered it very early on to the Leader of the Opposition. That was not taken up. He did want to be included in a publicity shot, but that was not appropriate at the time. We did offer him a speedy Pfizer vaccine, but he did not take it up. He did get to his first shot recently and we are grateful for that.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My second.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There has been some hesitancy. Maybe the Leader of the Opposition was feeling a bit hesitant about having that shot—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not 100 per cent sure—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: You are a disgrace, you know that? You talk about undermining public health advice. You are an absolute disgrace.

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Why didn't you have it?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The second one I had a couple of weeks ago—last week.

The CHAIR: Leader, order! Member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Premier has just impugned the Leader of the Opposition, claiming he has some sort of vaccine hesitancy. I have to say that is pretty low. Grow up, child.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order, member for Chaffey! I have said to this committee a couple of times already this morning that we need to cease the commentary. I am going to say that I have had my first AstraZeneca and am about to have my second. Leader, your question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: To be honest, I think it is more of a reflection on the Premier than on anyone else.

The CHAIR: No, just ask a question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: We have lots of questions to ask, sir.

The CHAIR: And 14 minutes to go.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The CHAIR: Member for Chaffey, order!

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is the Premier aware that South Australia has the lowest percentage in the nation of over 70 year olds fully vaccinated?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have all that data sitting in front of me. As I was saying to the committee before, we do have a dosage administration above the national average. We have worked very quickly to establish mass vaccination clinics both in the country and in the city. We have an offer that all people in country SA over the age of 16 can be vaccinated. There are spaces available at the moment.

There has been some hesitancy, and that is natural, but I think the overwhelming experience that people have after they go along to a vaccination clinic or they go and see their GP is that they have been very pleased with the process, the information that has been provided and the supervision in terms of post-vaccination observance. Overwhelmingly, people are very positive.

We have an abundance of AstraZeneca here in the state. Again, I reiterate that my office did offer to the Leader of the Opposition to have his vaccination much earlier than he ultimately decided to. I thought it was fair and reasonable. We did not include him in the photo shoot. Maybe he was

upset about that, but certainly I have confirmation from my office that he was offered that Pfizer vaccination weeks and weeks earlier.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Are you kidding me? Are you absolutely kidding me?

The CHAIR: Order! The Premier has completed his answer.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The offer was made from me to you, Premier. I am moving on to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 18, program summary, expenses. Given the time, I will go straight to this question: what has been the total cost of the Building What Matters advertising campaign so far? Will there be another phase of the Building What Matters campaign rolled out this financial year, and how much has been budgeted for that?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think the total expenditure in terms of the Building What Matters expenditure in South Australia is around \$16.7 billion over the forward estimates. Of course, with the most recent budget, that increases further. I do not know whether there will be a further round of advertising. I think the money associated with that is part of our overall advertising campaign, but I have been told that it has been broken down—\$1.195 million was expended on that campaign.

In total, we see that the expenditure of the government in terms of advertising communications does bounce around a little bit based upon the issues that are circling at the time. For example, we have had a very extensive campaign with regard to fruit fly, which the member for Chaffey is very pleased with, because we are facing a real issue here in our state. We have enjoyed some very good results in terms of being a pest-free area in South Australia for a long period of time. We know that the situation is very concerning there, so we have been able to put more money into that type of advertising, and of course the very extensive campaign around the COVID management in South Australia.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is the Building What Matters campaign concluded, or is there another round of advertising expected to come?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have not been advised of another round, but the leader does raise a very good point: it is very important to continually let the people of our state know that the government is injecting money, on behalf of the taxpayers, into important programs that are going to create jobs in South Australia. We see the response of this positive messaging in South Australia. It actually results in the highest level of consumer, business and investor confidence that we have seen in the state for a very, very long period of time.

However, we do put all our expenditures like this through a process, and it is a process that I think serves the taxpayers extraordinarily well. When I compare our expenditure with that of the previous government, I am very satisfied with the way we are progressing in terms of our public communication and the prudent way we spend the taxpayers' dollars. I do not rule out further expenditure in terms of the massive, massive infrastructure build that is currently underway in South Australia. I think it is really important to let people know about the schools, the hospitals, the roads and the bridges that we are building, replumbing the entire state.

The interest rates are low at the moment. The nature of the questions that came earlier from the opposition was really about the debt level. It is clear that they would not be potentially spending the same amount of money that we are, but we have made a public policy decision. As I referred to earlier, it has been independently assessed by the commonwealth parliamentary office as the second highest—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: We have other questions.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —stimulus and support package in the entire country, second only to New South Wales.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I just want the Premier to be crystal clear about something. The Premier said he has not received advice on a further phase of the Building What Matters campaign. I appreciate the Premier has not ruled out another round of advertising, which is within the government's remit, but does the Premier rule out being aware of any second phase of the Building What Matters campaign due to start shortly?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, I certainly would not rule it out because I think—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But are you aware of any?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that it is really important to—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: You said that, but are you aware of—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Not personally, no.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In terms of future expenditure, is the department aware of any budgeted future expenditure for a further Building What Matters campaign? The chief executive is right next to you; maybe he knows.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, I have not been advised, but I certainly would not rule it out.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Can you seek advice right now?

The CHAIR: No, leader, that is not how it works.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The Premier can ask the chief executive a question.

The CHAIR: What happens here is that the leader asks the Premier a question and the Premier either answers it himself or chooses to refer it to the chief executive.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Certainly, I hope that we are going to continue to stimulate confidence in South Australia. I would be surprised if we were not going to continue to promote the great work that is happening. Businesses around South Australia are really loving the fact that there are more jobs being supported by this taxpayer expenditure, and of course it is delivering great results.

I will take that question on notice from the Leader of the Opposition. If I can get a response before we conclude estimates today, I am very happy to put it on the record. We are not ashamed of our advertising and communications plan whatsoever. I think it is very prudent expenditure and I think the results speak for themselves. We have very high levels of employment in South Australia. I think the unemployment rate at the moment is 5.3 per cent, which seems to me—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The worst in the nation.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to be extraordinarily low. Whilst the opposition wants to talk that down—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: It is the worst in the nation.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —we only need to—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Okay, it is the best in the nation. Is that a lie?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —look at the last four years that they were in power where—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Where it was not the worst in the nation.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —the average figure was up by 6.8 per cent. It is down at 5.3 and they still want to complain. They want to complain on a daily basis. We do not want to complain. We want to get on with delivering jobs for the people of South Australia, and if that includes promoting the great work that is being done in South Australia with the Building What Matters program—\$17.9 billion—then I am very happy to do that every day of the week.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I would simply say that this is an estimates process, and I would ask the Premier: is the Premier willing to turn to his immediate right and ask the CEO of DPC, who is a highly credentialled individual, whether or not he is aware of any bookings that have been made or plans to restart the Building What Matters campaign? If the Premier is not willing to do that—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That goes through GCAC and I have already committed to coming back to you before the end of estimates today. I do not know why you find that so difficult that you need to have something this second. It will happen today. Do not get so stressed about it, calm down.

The CHAIR: As we all should.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I was just asking whether you could ask him. My next question goes to the international students program. When does the Premier foresee the international student trial to commence?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am hopeful that it will start next month, but of course my focus has been very much on the current cluster we have had in South Australia—the outbreak, the lockdown and then coming out of the lockdown—but a lot of work has already been done on preparing that site and making sure that it is suitable for bringing back some of our international students.

We know that they make an enormous contribution to our economy. We know that for every three or four international students who come into South Australia it creates a full-time job in South Australia. We also know that they mainly but not exclusively reside in the CBD, and this is one of the areas here in South Australia that has been disproportionately hit, so we are very keen to get them back to support our universities, to support our economy and to support jobs in South Australia.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: When the Premier says 'next month', I do not know if he means August or September, but let's assume it is either of those. Is the Premier aware of where the students will be coming from?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that detail, but I am more than happy to follow that up.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: 'Follow that up' as in provide a response before the end of estimates today?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not know that that would come today because, do not forget, that is a slightly complicated arrangement with regard to talking with the universities—the students of the three South Australian universities, as well as Carnegie Mellon. I do not know what has been determined for the pilot, but obviously we will be doing everything we can to reduce any risk with people who are coming back into South Australia. I will find out a response to that and we respond in the normal process.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Have you asked at any point where the students would be coming from? If the trial is starting in a month, all things being equal, presumably that takes a lot of preparedness. You have to have people come here, and people just do not get on a plane easily these days; it obviously takes time. Have you asked at any point where those students are coming from?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes. We have had briefings that have come to cabinet on this matter but, as I said, there has been a lot of water under the bridge over the last 10 days. I am happy to get an update. We have direct flights that are still coming into South Australia from countries like Singapore, where we know we have a lot of students, especially medical students at the University of Adelaide, who are keen to get back. With regard to what that pilot and the countries that they are coming from specifically looks like as of today, I do not have that, but I am very happy to commit to getting that information and coming back to the Leader of the Opposition in a timely manner.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Regarding the international student program, will that be operating on a full cost recovery basis?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is my understanding, yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So there will be no expenditure of taxpayers' dollars in this regard at all?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There probably will be some incidental costs associated with this, but my understanding is that the vast majority of all costs will be borne by the people who are coming back and the university sector.

Having said all that, I really do want people to understand that this is an extraordinarily important sector for our economy. It creates dollars from overseas coming into our economy, and it creates jobs here in South Australia, so we are looking to support it. The advice I have received is

that the vast majority of all costs will be borne by the student returning and the university. There are bound to be some incidental costs associated with it borne by the taxpayers of South Australia, but this is an investment in growing our economy in South Australia, bringing these students back and creating more jobs, especially in the CBD.

The CHAIR: You can have one more.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The Premier might give a concise answer and we will have time for two, sir. Premier, given the events transpiring in regard to the Delta strain in New South Wales, and certainly given the continuous extensions that have been announced to lockdowns in New South Wales because of the Delta strain, one would reasonably presume that our border will remain closed with New South Wales for potentially some time to come. Your government's press release dated 18 June states:

One of the Commonwealth's pre-conditions for when students arrive is that the state border must be open for domestic travel, noting the potential need for localised closures related to jurisdictionally defined COVID-19 hotspots.

How could the international student trial be going ahead potentially in a month's time if we have our border closed with New South Wales?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The leader raises a good point. That was one of the original considerations by the commonwealth, but it was a very different situation back at that time. We do have a commonwealth-declared hotspot in New South Wales. There are multiple commonwealth-declared hotspots; in fact it may even be the entire state, although I do not think it is at the moment, and that is the situation that exists. We will work through that issue with the commonwealth, we have a good working relationship with the commonwealth, and we will consider that matter. I think our time for this level of examination is complete.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Can I put on the record my thanks to the public officials here today and the work that goes into preparing estimates. I know it takes a lot of effort and time, so thank you.

The CHAIR: Thank you, leader, and thank you, Premier. I would remind the opposition that if they have any omnibus questions that, as long as they are in by the end of the day, that is fine. Having reached the allotted time—and, might I say, the previously agreed time—for this examination, I declare the examination of the proposed payments for the portfolio programs Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Office for Digital Government and Adelaide Convention Bureau complete.

Sitting suspended from 10:47 to 11:30.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM COMMISSION, \$66,288,000

Minister:

Hon. S.S. Marshall, Premier.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr R. Harrex, Chief Executive, South Australian Tourism Commission.

Ms S. Rozokos, Chief Financial Officer, South Australian Tourism Commission.

Mr A. Kirchner, Chief Executive, Adelaide Venue Management.

Ms M. Hannaford, Chief Financial Officer, Adelaide Venue Management.

Ms H. Rasheed, Executive Director, Events South Australia.

The CHAIR: The portfolio to be examined is the South Australian Tourism Commission, Adelaide Venue Management Authority. The minister appearing is the Premier. I declare the proposed payments open for examination and advise members that the proposed payments for the

Department of the Premier and Cabinet and other items remain open for examination. I call on the Premier to make a statement if he wishes and introduce his advisers

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. Joining me with the examination of the South Australian Tourism Commission is the Chief Executive, Mr Rodney Harrex, and also Ms Hitaf Rasheed, Executive Director, Events South Australia. We also have with us today Stephanie Rozokos, who is the Chief Financial Officer of the South Australian Tourism Commission.

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, thank you.

The CHAIR: Leader of the Opposition, do you wish to make a statement?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No, thank you.

The CHAIR: If not, I invite questions.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I refer the Premier to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 101, explanation of significant movements. It states:

The difference in income and expenditure in the 2021-22 Budget compared to the 2020-21 Budget and 2019-20 Actual is primarily due to...the cessation of the Superloop Adelaide 500 and the varied Santos Festival of Cycling...

My question is: has the agreement been reached with Supercars to exit the contract early?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: For the Adelaide 500?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has any compensation been paid to Supercars for cancelling the contract early?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think there has been a small payment, yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How much?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is commercial-in-confidence, but I can assure the taxpayers of South Australia it was a fair and reasonable sum that was paid, but it was not significant.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: If it was fair and reasonable, why not outline a ballpark figure?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that that amount was commercial-in-confidence and I am sure the Leader of the Opposition would, from his time in government, recognise that in some negotiations the settlement is commercial-in-confidence. This was one such negotiation which occurred. That is an amount which ultimately will be paid for out of the SATC budget.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The South Australian Tourism Commission is taking South Australian taxpayers' dollars and handing it over to Supercars for an event that we are not going to have?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We also have other Supercars events in South Australia and the leader would be more than aware that last year in fact I think we had two additional Supercars events which were part of that negotiation and a further continuation of the Supercars in South Australia going forward. When he says for events that do not occur, I have just pointed to three Supercars events which were part of that overall negotiation where we did not have the Adelaide 500 continuing.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Regarding your negotiations with Supercars around the cancellation of the Adelaide 500 contract for which we have expended dollars, you are telling me that those negotiations encompassed negotiations regarding The Bend and their Supercars events. They are part of the same contract negotiations, are they?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What I am saying is that we have a relationship with—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No, I did not think so.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What I am saying is that we have a relationship with Supercars. Last year, there were not events, to my understanding, that were scheduled for The Bend. As part of the cancellation with the Adelaide 500, I think we were able to negotiate two additional races at The Bend and I think motorsport fans were very pleased to see those events going there. My understanding is that we have now concluded a further negotiation for ongoing events at The Bend. It is a great facility at The Bend. It is a facility that is amongst the very best in the world, not just for vehicles but also for motorbikes.

I think there has also been some good news that has been able to be negotiated there. Part of the problem with international events at the moment is getting drivers or riders in and out of the country, so some of the things which we are hopeful for for the future have had to be put on ice because we are in an extraordinary situation at the moment. I think most appreciate how difficult that is.

But we still have a good working relationship with the Supercars. We have enjoyed having the Supercars here in South Australia but, as the Leader of the Opposition would be more than aware, we formed the opinion that the continuation of the street race, the Adelaide 500, was not in the best interests of the taxpayers of South Australia. That was a recommendation which came to the government from the SATC board.

It was a unanimous decision. It was not one of these 5-4 type decisions. It was a unanimous decision that there was just not a desire to continue with that expenditure and that there were better things we could do with that money, and that money could be better applied to creating more jobs in South Australia, so the government took the position to support the unanimous recommendation of the SATC board.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am aware, Premier, that you just take directions from everybody else and let them make the decisions. You used to answer questions once. My follow-up question to the Premier is: given that we have paid Supercars taxpayers' dollars for cancelling the contract early, have there been any other claims for compensation due to the Adelaide 500 being cancelled—any other contractors, sponsors, anything else?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, there are a small number of other contractors who were significantly disadvantaged. Some of those, of course, are enjoying some good work at the moment with other events that have already occurred or plan to be occurring into the future, so we are continuing to work with them. I think the vast majority of them have already been concluded last financial year, but there could be some remaining ones and that is something that the SATC is working through.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So given we now have multiple compensation payouts, notwithstanding the Premier's unwillingness to disclose the amount to Supercars, can the Premier give a global figure for the total amount of taxpayers' dollars that have been expended in cancelling the Adelaide 500?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No. I think I have made it clear that the matters you are referring to are commercial-in-confidence—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But if you give a total figure—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and it does not matter how many different ways you ask the same question, it is not going to be something that we would disclose. But what you can see in the budget papers, of course, is the overall budget for the SATC and, last financial year where the bulk of those payments that you just referred to were incorporated, they have been incorporated into those budget variances which you can see in front of you.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: We will get to the cuts that you have made to the SATC in due course rest assured but I guess my point is that you are saying to the people of South Australia that it was good value to them to cancel the Adelaide 500. I am grateful the member for King is present because I know she is a big supporter of cancelling the Adelaide 500 and she is on the record as such and we welcome her honesty about being so keen to cut the Adelaide 500, or you do not support cutting the Adelaide 500. The member for King may be changing her position.

The CHAIR: We will get to the question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But the question is: given the Premier is telling the people of South Australia, and the member for King ably supporting that effort, that it is good value to cut the Adelaide 500 for taxpayers, surely the Premier must be able to disclose how much of the SATC budget has been spent on cancelling that event in total?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What I find extraordinary is the year 9 debating tactics employed by the Leader of the Opposition verballing other people who are in here and putting—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Not at all.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —assertions forward which just do not make any sense. The reality is we cancelled the ongoing Adelaide 500 with regret. It was a great event for South Australia—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Why cancel it?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and we acknowledge that. But it did not offer a good return on investment compared with alternatives that we can have in South Australia going forward. This was not the decision of the government. It was the recommendation of a group of people who are very representative of the industry here in South Australia.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So, Premier, if that was their recommendation, whose decision is it? Whose decision was it?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am just continuing my answer.

The CHAIR: Order, leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Leader of the Opposition, four minutes in, is getting very hot under the collar. He has seen what is happening with Jack Snelling and he has seen what has happened with Tom Kenyon and he is getting very snaky today. I will not be taken off course, though; I am going to stay focused on what is in front of me.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That is embarrassing. That is actually embarrassing.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying, of course it was with great regret that we cancelled the Adelaide 500, which had been an excellent event for South Australia over a long period of time, but what we saw with this event was a number of things converging which provided the SATC board with the information that they required to provide a recommendation via their CE to us.

Now, ultimately it was their decision; they control that budget, and out of respect for the government, who ultimately provides the funding for the SATC, we were consulted, and we backed that decision. We backed that decision because our ultimate goal is to see more people employed in the tourism sector in South Australia.

We have released our tourism sector plan right through to 2030. We want to significantly grow the size of this sector and we are on track to do that, notwithstanding the very significant situation that we have had with the coronavirus. We will get back onto that trajectory, and we will achieve our goals in terms of 2030. We will make sure that we do that. It is a very important sector for our economy, and it is one of the reasons why I took on this portfolio myself.

The Adelaide 500 event was consuming more and more of the SATC budget and it was giving a lower and lower level return for the people of our state. We need to see a return in terms of jobs, in terms of interstate and overseas visitation to South Australia, in terms of bed nights, in terms of the number of people who are employed in our cafes and our restaurants, and the add-on trips into regional South Australia. That is what we need to see, and that is what we charge the SATC board with the responsibility to deliver.

The Adelaide 500 was seeing decreasing numbers. In some years there was extraordinary expenditure with regard to the music event that accompanied it, which did provide some increased numbers of people attending, but what we had seen over time was a diminution of the people attending.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, standing order 98: this is debate, sir. The question was very specific.

The CHAIR: I think the Premier was actually couching his answer in relation to the Adelaide 500 and the situation around that, so I am happy for him to continue.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you, sir. It was a very broad question and it made a number of assertions.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: It was very specific.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Leader of the Opposition is not asking specific questions today. He is asking—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How much did it cost to cancel the Adelaide 500? It is very specific.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That was not the question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes, it was—a global figure.

The CHAIR: I remind the committee that the same rules—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: If you do not want to answer it, just do not answer it; we will move on. I have lots of questions.

The CHAIR: Order, leader! I am speaking. The rules in the committee that are applied are the same as those in the house, and that is that when a minister is asked a question they can answer and respond to that question in whatever way they see fit.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, sir. It was a very broad question. The Leader of the Opposition has narrowed it down now, but I am answering the original question which made some assertions with regard to our motivation for cancelling the Adelaide 500, and I am outlining them to the house. If the leader does not want me to outline them to the house, then I am more than happy to stop and move on to the next question, but I think it is relevant to the committee and to the people of South Australia. I am outlining the reasons why we formed the opinion that we would no longer be proceeding with supporting this event.

With the second part of the question, if that is the only part that we want answered, I have already answered that. I answered it at the previous question where I said that we would not be divulging that information. They were commercial-in-confidence negotiations. The Leader of the Opposition would be more than aware of how commercial-in-confidence negotiations and settlements work, and we will not be providing that information today.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Very well. Let the record show clearly that the Premier is not willing to disclose how taxpayers' dollars are being expended on cancelling events. My next question to the Premier is: was SATC in possession of any Adelaide 500 merchandise after the event was cancelled last year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is possible, yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What was the estimated value of the merchandise left over?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that information. I am happy to make an inquiry and come back to you.

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, that is what that means.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I just want to be clear. If you are taking it on notice, that is good that you will come back to us.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Just ask a question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What type of merchandise was it, and can you provide a breakdown of the merchandise?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, I do not have the details of that, but it is very likely that there would be merchandise associated with that event. Again, we reluctantly made that decision, but we made that decision in the best interests of the taxpayers of South Australia and put

that money that was originally allocated to that Adelaide 500 event into a range of events that we want to run right throughout the year to provide a greater level of employment, a greater level of visitation into South Australia. That was a decision of the SATC and it is one that I, as the minister, backed 100 per cent.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Good, excellent. Regarding all that merchandise, I have a suite of questions in this area if you are willing to take them on notice: what has happened to that merchandise? Was the merchandise destroyed or sold? If it was destroyed, why did you not try to sell the merchandise? Why did you not donate it to charity? These are questions I would invite the Premier to take on notice.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Ask them now and we will take them on notice.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I just did.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Oh, sorry.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So you are willing to take them on notice?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sure.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thank you.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is what we do.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Who made the decision to sell off Adelaide 500 infrastructure? Did you direct that the infrastructure be sold off before the next election?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No. I think the Leader of the Opposition appreciates, like most members of the South Australian parliament, that they are a separate, standalone statutory authority. They make their own decisions with regard to their balance sheet.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So who made the decision? The SATC made the decision to sell them off?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, the board would have made a decision. The reality is we are not continuing—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has the infrastructure been sold yet?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —with the Adelaide 500, and so there is no point whatsoever in sitting on—and a cost associated with the storage of facilities that we are no longer going to be using. I am quite sure the SATC board formed the opinion that the best thing they could do would be to reduce their ongoing operating costs associated with the storage of facilities they no longer needed.

There were some elements of the facilities that they had, which they said that there was some value in their using for other functions and events going forward, and they have been able to do that. But there were things that were surplus to their requirements, and they have looked for a home for them. Some of those things I think have found their way to The Bend, supporting motorsport in South Australia, and some will ultimately be sold.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has all the infrastructure been sold yet?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, I do not think that all the infrastructure has been sold. As I just outlined in my previous answer, some of it is being kept for future events. We run a very extensive events program in South Australia; it is one of the things we feel very strongly about. We are a very good state to run events that attract people from interstate and ultimately from overseas, and some of those facilities were very useful and can be repurposed.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Can the Premier provide a breakdown on what has been sold and what has not been sold?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will take that question on notice, and if I can get some information I will come back to you.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thank you. I refer the Premier to the same budget reference that states that the difference in income and expenditure in the 2021-22 budget compared with the 2019-20 actual is primarily due to the cessation of the Adelaide 500 and the varied form of the Santos Festival of Cycling. I gather the sale of goods and services going from \$11.8 million in 2019-20 to just \$980,000 is mainly due to the cancellation of the Adelaide 500; would that be correct?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, that is my understanding.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So you cancelled an event that generated almost \$10 million in ticket sales and sponsorship?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, it cost significantly more than that. You can look at one side of the equation. You have to look at the costs associated with running that event. Ultimately, that is the very detailed work that the SATC board did over an extended period of time and gave the unanimous recommendation to the government.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I refer the Premier to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 100, Program 2: Tourism Events:

Redirected funding from the former Adelaide 500 (net funding of approximately \$14 million per annum) to the Leisure Events Bid Fund.

The government announced the Illuminate festival in August 2020, which has obviously unfortunately been interrupted through no fault of anybody. You announced the cancellation of the Adelaide 500 in October 2020, so Illuminate was done and dusted well before the decision to cancel the Adelaide 500. Can the Premier name a single event that has been announced since the cancellation of the Adelaide 500?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Which ones?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, for example, the NRL State of Origin match, which—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Sorry, my mistake, Premier. I got my question wrong; my apologies. Can the Premier inform the house if there has been one single new event that has been announced since the cancellation of the Adelaide 500?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That was certainly not envisaged previously. I think the Leader of the Opposition might be getting confused with the NRL State of Origin first round match that was held last year versus the one we have now secured going forward. We have also had other events we have secured going forward. I am quite happy to get a list of those for him.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: New events, not the Masters Games and so forth, which was already committed to, but new events—great new initiatives like the ones you promised on the news of the cancellation of the Adelaide 500.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I hope to be able to read this in uninterrupted, although I pretty much doubt it, given the leader's lack of sleep last night following the terrible, terrible information that came out yesterday. The first new event we have had since we came to government, of course, was the new Adelaide International. Before the Leader of the Opposition jumps in and says that was announced beforehand, we have secured a 10-year commitment to this since that decision was made, a 10-year commitment to bringing international tennis to South Australia, something we as a government feel very—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is disconcerting, the cynicism of the opposition, when we secure an international event to South Australia and all the shadow minister can do is say we have already announced that. Actually, that is not correct; that is just not correct. Yes, we did have an original event, but we have now secured a 10-year agreement because of the investment we made in Memorial Drive and into this fantastic event.

Wasn't it great the first time it was held? Of course we were interrupted earlier this year, and that is why we had A Day at the Drive, which was another new event that was not on the calendar

before, one we feel very positive about here in South Australia and one that was announced after the decision was made with the Adelaide 500.

Sir, with your indulgence I am happy to read some of these other new events since we came to government into the consideration—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Not since you came to government: since the cancellation of the Adelaide 500.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, a 10-year extension to the Adelaide International at Memorial Drive. Do we accept that is subsequent to that—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No, I do not. Keep going.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Why do you not accept that?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Because what you promised—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Don't you know how the calendar works? I can give you a copy and a walk-through of the Gregorian calendar. It is not complicated. There are 12 months, and every month has a—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What you promised people were great new events—

The CHAIR: Order!

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The extension of existing events is not a new event. We are still waiting for the list—keep going.

The CHAIR: Order! Leader, you have asked your question. You have made it quite clear what you are asking the Premier. The Premier—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The CHAIR: The member for West Torrens is called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Just one!

The CHAIR: The member for West Torrens is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will read a list of new events since we came to government—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Let's do it, Premier—and you will be heard uninterrupted.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The CHAIR: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There was a 10-year extension to the Adelaide International at Memorial Drive announced in November last year. The year 2021 is the Year of South Australian Wine which, by the way, I must say is going extraordinarily well. South Australia has significantly outperformed the rest of the nation in terms of export of wine, and that is something we are very proud of.

At A Day at the Drive we saw six of the best players in the world, with an amazing global media audience for what was occurring right here in South Australia. There was the Australian Baseball League at the Adelaide hub down at West Beach and, of course, we have now announced the 2023 Australian Masters Games, which will be an eight-day—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: In fact, that is not correct. That was only announced in March this year, and with even with your basic understanding of how the calendar works—

The CHAIR: Premier!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —you would know that is subsequent to the announcement regarding the Adelaide 500—

The CHAIR: Premier, continue on and we will not respond to interjections.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you, sir. The eight-day sporting festival to be held in October 2023 will attract approximately 9,000 athletes to compete in 45 sports in 70 venues across the state. Of course, there is the NRL 2023 State of Origin, which we announced in March this year—so that is subsequent to the Adelaide 500 announcement. In April this year, we also announced Moving Portraits by Robert Wilson at the Art Gallery of South Australia.

We know that those events are events that can be held over an extended period of time, so any restrictions or lockdowns that are held would not necessarily affect so comprehensively a one or two-day event. Of course, subsequent to the cancellation last year we have had the announcement of the Women's World Cup coming to South Australia in 2023, where we put in an excellent compelling and competitive bid to bring games to South Australia, and part of that, of course, was our massive upgrade to Coopers Stadium at Hindmarsh.

We announced in May this year the 2021 Australian Masters Rowing Championships and the World Cup 3 Replica Regatta. I would say that, since we have been here sitting in this very important estimates meeting, Australian rowers have won two gold, a silver and a bronze over at the Tokyo Olympics, and we hope to see a lot of fantastic Masters rowing taking place here in South Australia when that is going to be held, which will be absolutely fantastic.

Obviously, the Leader of the Opposition has already referred to the Illuminate South Australia program, but the announcement—since the cancellation of the Adelaide 500—of course was taking it regionally. We love to support our regions in South Australia. It has already been down to Mount Gambier, and I heard from the member for Mount Gambier that there were lots of delighted smiles on the faces of people down in that area.

It will travel up to the fabulous Riverland area. In fact, I think it is going to Renmark on the beautiful shores of the Murray, and of course it is also going over to Eyre Peninsula, in your electorate, sir, near your hometown of Edillilie. It is going to Tumby Bay, so the mayor of Tumby Bay should be pleased with that. We have also announced very recently the extension of Tasting Australia. This has been extraordinarily—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That does not count as new events. The question was about new events. Extensions do not count as new events, sir. The question was about new events.

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, it is a new event.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Extensions of what the former Labor government did is not an example of new initiatives that you promised people as a result of the cancellation of the Adelaide 500.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much for that practical lesson from the Leader of the Opposition—desperate for relevance today. It is a tough 24 hours for him. As I was saying, yes, Tasting Australia has been in place for a long period of time. In fact, I think Tasting Australia goes right back to 1997. Last time I remembered the Labor Party was not the government of the day at that point in time. I think that might have been a Liberal government. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition will take the first opportunity to correct the record where he completely incorrectly asserted that it was a Labor Party initiative.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am happy to, sir.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Of course, it was a Liberal initiative. What we were emphasising, leader, was not a new event but a new component to this event, which is a winter series to support our restaurants and our food sector in South Australia, two sectors that are going to be very important. We have also put up a lot of additional money into regional events. I cannot tell you exactly which ones they are, but we put a further \$1 million into regional events. This will be composed of both existing events and new events. There will be some that are expanded as a combination of expanded and new event.

I do not have all the new events to provide to you today, but I do want to thank the Events team at SATC. This has been an extraordinarily tough time for anybody involved in events anywhere in the country, anywhere in the world. It must be heartbreaking for Rachael Azzopardi, Lee

Cumberlidge and Ian Scobie from Illuminate Adelaide, who have put their heart and soul into developing a fabulous program, just as it would be heartbreaking for event organisers interstate and overseas who have had to cancel at the last moment.

I think that flexibility is the order of the day when it comes to event organising in South Australia, and I do want to thank our fabulous team at Events SA.

The CHAIR: Thank you, Premier, for that very comprehensive list. I would like to inform the committee that the leader has indicated that he will correct the record.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes, of course, sir. I welcome the opportunity, Mr Chairman, to acknowledge the fact that I wrongly accredited Tasting Australia as being an initiative of the former Labor government: clearly, it was John Olsen. I welcome the opportunity to correct the record and acknowledge the fact that the Premier now is so desperate to point to new events that he has reached back as far as 1997, the last millennium.

The CHAIR: An event, of course, that is still running.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I might invite my office to go back and check VCR records to try to find footage of John Olsen making that announcement that the Premier is now claiming credit for.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They have not been asking any decent questions.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The Premier committed that all the money from the Adelaide 500 would be expended on this extraordinary new suite of events. I know the member for King's constituents would be bursting at the seams to get down and enjoy the Masters rowing and witness that in all its glory. I love watching the rowing—it is good during the Olympics—but I do not think that Masters rowing is going to replace the Adelaide 500. My question is: in terms of that \$14 million, how much of that has been expended thus far on securing events like Masters rowing?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Can I just say that the \$14 million is not for events that have already occurred. It is on an ongoing basis and we have ring-fenced that. Some of those events have been announced and I have just announced some of them.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes, comprehensive.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: You would imagine that some of that money has gone towards that and some of it is for new events that we are still yet to announce.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How much of that \$14 million has been allocated thus far?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not know. We are one month into the financial year—in fact, we have not finished the first calendar month of a 12-month period. It is an extraordinary question. They would not have even finished the end of month arrangements. We are one month—in fact, we are not even one month—into the calendar year and the hard-hitting question from the Leader of the Opposition, who has been up all night worrying his socks off, is: how much have you expended so far? I will take that question on notice.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How much of that \$14 million? Of course, the Adelaide 500 was cancelled in the former financial year, not the current financial year. I appreciate the Premier's drama and commentary and that he is desperate to look like he has strength of leadership. I am going to the quick. The decisions you are making—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: You are the one under pressure, my friend. You are in a world of trouble and the member for West Torrens is part of that cabal. Bring him in, bring Bernie Finnigan back, bring Atko back. What a disaster. How embarrassing.

The CHAIR: Enough, Premier. In fact, I am the one under pressure here, trying to run this committee. Although members of this committee—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Chairman, I enjoy it when the Premier starts behaving like this because it gives South Australians an opportunity to see the Premier with the peacock feathers fully displayed and get a bit of a sense of our—

The CHAIR: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My question simply is: given the Adelaide 500 was cancelled in the last financial year, not the current one, notwithstanding your dramatic former answer, how much of the money has been spent thus far on acquiring new events? I am more than happy for you to take that on notice in terms of the last financial year.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not sure what you mean by 'acquiring new events'. Is the leader referring to whether or not we have paid any fees to bring an event to South Australia or whether we have committed funds for future periods? Of course, I have announced some commitments, but the expenditure associated with those would not occur immediately but would occur in the financial period for which they are actually planned. Could the leader perhaps provide some clarity to his question? It does not seem to make a lot of sense.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am simply saying that the government's position has consistently been that all the moneys not expended on the Adelaide 500 would be expended on new events. I have asked how much is being expended this financial year and you said you will take that on notice. In terms of the former financial year, I was wondering if you could take that on notice too.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We are happy to take that on notice.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thank you. What is the new music festival that you are set to announce in the very near future?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sorry?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: A new music festival.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We are considering a large number of events. Can I just say a massive thank you to the people of South Australia as well as the Events Advisory Group and members of the board of the SATC, who have all been considering a large number of events. In fact, I think the number of events that we might have considered and the SATC team have looked at might have topped 100 different events. Whilst many people have advocated for different opportunities, we will announce the final arrangements when they are ready.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Can the Premier confirm that there is a new music festival on the horizon that you are set to announce?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No. That final program is being determined at the moment. All I can say is that we want to have a breadth of events right throughout the entire year. We want to have events that people come along to as spectators, like events that the Leader of the Opposition was referring to a moment ago when he was in a pretty childish sort of way asking who is going to go along and watch the Masters Games. Actually, there will be a huge number of people who will go along and watch the Masters rowing.

They may not be members of the general public, but what are we trying to achieve here? We are trying to increase our interstate and overseas visitation in South Australia to support our tourism operators in this state with bed nights; with expenditure in our restaurants, our pubs, our clubs, our cafes; with extensions to holidays.

We know for a fact that when people come in for these Masters Games they do have very strong expenditure in our state. The vast majority of them are coming from interstate. We also know that their length of stay is extraordinary. They compete in the event, they bring their supporters and then they go on for a holiday, often in regional South Australia, which I must say is experiencing boom times at the moment.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Which is why the Adelaide 500 was so successful, and it begs the question: why possibly cancel it? When was the last time the Events Advisory Group met?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that detail. Essentially, the Events Advisory Group was formed really as a representative of a number of sectors that could provide some advice into the SATC, but ultimately it was always the SATC's responsibility to allocate their \$14 million on a range

of events which would maximise employment and interstate visitation. That has always been the major focus.

Of course, we have to remain flexible and we have to remain nimble because we know that there are some borders that are in place. We know that there are very likely going to be state borders that are going to be in place on again and off again during this period of time, so obviously at the moment we are trying to pivot to things that are going to create keeping people here in South Australia. If you think about what we are trying to do, there are two major things: one is to bring more people in from interstate and overseas and the other is to actually stop the leakage of people out of South Australia interstate or overseas.

Those two things, when they are netted off against each other, is the equation that we are focused on in South Australia. At the moment, a major focus for the SATC is to stop that leakage out and get people spending their money in South Australia. That has been very successful, and I want to commend the SATC board, the chief executive and the team at the SATC. Many people were used to spending money interstate and overseas. They are not doing that at the moment because I think the product offering in South Australia is excellent and I hope there is a permanent pivot.

I was over in your electorate, sir, the electorate of Flinders, earlier in the year and I was stopped in the street by people who were over in beautiful Port Lincoln. I said, 'Do you come here often?' They said, 'I have never been here before.' I thought to myself, 'Are you joking? You've never been to Port Lincoln?' I must have been there 20 times. I love that place, but there are plenty of people who have not been to Port Lincoln or they have not been to Coffin Bay, the Flinders Ranges, Kangaroo Island, down to the South-East, up to the beautiful Riverland or maybe our fabulous Barossa Valley, although I think most people have been there.

The great thing with this situation is that people who have gone to Port Lincoln for the very first time are booking in again for next year and they are telling their friends. When the international borders are removed, I think people are going to think twice about heading overseas with their money. I think they are going to want to spend it in their own backyard.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Let's hope so. I have a final question on this topic. We are now eight, nine, if not 10 months past the decision to cancel the Adelaide 500. It's a significant period of time, to say the least. The Premier committed that we were going to have all these fantastic new events and you have listed off a bunch of old ones and a couple that are maybe a little bit new.

When I asked you about the \$14 million, the committee meeting and whether there a music festival, you said, 'Look, there's a whole bunch of things under consideration. We're still working through it.' That is fine, except this, Premier: why cancel the Adelaide 500, even for this year, if it is going to take 10, 12 months—I do not know how many more—for you to start announcing the events that are going to replace it? Would you not have done that work before you cancelled the Adelaide 500?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think that is a reasonable question, but I would point out to the leader that what we are seeing now are these very large events, which big expenditure goes into, having to unfortunately be cancelled. I think we just had an announcement today from Victoria that their version of our Royal Adelaide Show has had to be cancelled.

We have seen some very strong restrictions put in place for large events where you have large numbers of people randomly wandering around. There was zero chance that we could hold the Adelaide 500 like we have held it before. As I said, it was a great event for our state in the past, but there was no chance that that was going to be plausible. Putting all our eggs into one basket—a huge expenditure over a four-day period with a very high chance that it could not go ahead in its normal format—was not a useful expenditure for South Australia or a useful risk for us to carry going forward.

What we are going to have instead is a spread. They will not be events of the same size and magnitude, but they will also not be events of the same risk. We do want to have motorsport in South Australia. We have a great heritage and history of motorsport in South Australia. The Leader of the Opposition, only a few moments ago, was castigating me for going back to 1997 to basically set my events schedule. I would point out that the Adelaide 500, the one that he supports at the moment,

was actually an Olsen event from the previous millennium. That was not a Labor Party initiative either, so that is an old event as well.

We have to move with the times and we have to recognise that the world is currently operating in a global pandemic declared by the World Health Organization. We have to appreciate that and I think the SATC has provided expert advice—prudent advice—to the government and we have accepted it.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I refer to Budget Paper 3, page 26, table 2.6. Why is there a \$24 million cut for the SATC in the forward estimates?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think we went through this last year. There is very lumpy expenditure associated with tourism budgets and some items, which were previously in the SATC budget, now exist in different budgets. Unless there is any specific amount that you would like me to reconcile or anything that you would particularly like to draw to our attention, we did go through this last year. It is one of the most peculiar budgets because you do not have exactly the same lines running year after year, as you would see in maybe some other budgets. You have to be opportunistic. You have to say, 'Here is an opportunity to put some money into a certain event or bring a certain opportunity to South Australia,' and we have taken them in the past.

One component, which was previously in the SATC budget, has now been transferred—I think it is \$5 million a year—to another budget here in South Australia and that is the convention bid fund. These are the reasons, but we can go through it in more detail if you wish or if you have any specific area that you would like me to reconcile for you.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Premier, my biggest concern is what message you are sending to our tourism operators, travel agents, accommodation providers and the hospitality sector with these severe cuts to SATC, given that our visitor economy has almost halved. At a high, it was \$8.1 billion and now we are down to \$4.4 billion. What kind of message are you giving with these cuts in the future?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Wow, that is quite extraordinary. Let's be clear: since we came to government we have put a major focus on developing the tourism sector in South Australia and, in fact, it rose to \$8.1 billion. When the Labor government was in power—

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: We are talking about this budget.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —I think it was sitting at \$7.6 billion. In case the shadow minister for tourism has not heard about it yet, there is this global pandemic on at the moment. It is called the coronavirus. It is really affecting tourism operators. Perhaps I now understand why the Leader of the Opposition took up the first 45 minutes questioning in this area and did not let the shadow minister ask a question when her first question is really a pretty—

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: It is about cuts to the forward budget.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, sorry, but the shadow minister made it really clear that there had been this dramatic cut in revenue and operation in the sector. This is driven by the coronavirus. If the shadow minister and the Labor Party do not appreciate that and the extraordinary work that our tourism operators in South Australia have done to address and respond and pivot to this, well, it beggars belief. Since this has occurred, we have worked with—

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: This is entirely about your budget and the cuts to the future.

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Maybe they are all upset on that side of the chamber today.

The CHAIR: I will come back to you, member for Ramsay.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: We have 15 minutes left, there is a lot to go through and the Premier is embarking on a lot of commentary, seeking to patronise the shadow minister, and making all sorts of commentary about the opposition. I just really invite the Premier to answer the questions.

The CHAIR: To be honest, leader, through the morning there has been commentary from both sides, from both the Premier and the opposition benches. We have set that scene. The shadow minister has asked her first question. The Premier is probably drawing his answer to a close.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Right, sir. It has been a tough day for the Labor right. They have just lost two of their strongest members historically in the last 24 hours, but I will address the question.

The CHAIR: Thank you.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The shadow minister asserted that, of course, there had been a very big reduction in tourism activity in South Australia. Well, yes, we acknowledge that—

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I am talking about operating expenses going forward.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and what we have done since that has occurred is put money into areas which we think are going to support the sector through this period. Obviously, there are some components that have been very, very disproportionately hit—for example, international tourist numbers coming into South Australia. They have virtually dried up—and of course we have seen a very significant reduction in interstate visitors. People make plans but unfortunately, because of border restrictions and changed arrangements, they have had to cancel those plans. It has created a reluctance for that interstate traveller to come into South Australia.

We are still going to focus on those areas and try to optimise our performance in those areas. I really would like to commend the people at the SATC for the great work that they have done to keep international partners informed about what we are doing, creating that bubble with New Zealand and international travellers, but the major focus has to be on supporting people during this period.

We have now had four rounds of the Great State Voucher, which was really pioneered here in South Australia. It has worked fabulously well. I am often stopped in the street by people who have said that they are using their voucher. They have come down from the country, or maybe they have been in suburban Adelaide and just come in to enjoy the delights of the CBD. This is a voucher that has operated both in the CBD and in the country.

One of the other things we have done is to really support our regional tourism operators during this period of time with the Tourism Infrastructure Development Fund. This is a \$20 million new initiative to support those operators to bring forward capital projects to enhance their operations, their facilities, their offer and their experience to keep people spending money in South Australia. In the first financial year, I think we almost expended the full \$10 million, and there is another \$10 million this year, and that has delivered a huge investment in infrastructure right across regional South Australia.

The shadow minister talks about the forward estimates, four years, and she puts forward a number. As I said, part of that is the fact that we have transferred money for the convention bid fund out of the SATC budget and into another budget that sits, I think, under the control of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, so there is movement there. We have also seen a major investment across government, as I alluded to earlier in my time as the tourism minister—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Point of order.

The CHAIR: Premier, there is a point of order.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Standing order 98, sir; we have a lot of other questions to get to and the Premier is moving beyond the—

The CHAIR: I realise you probably do have a lot of other questions. However, the member for Ramsay's question was particularly broad and the Premier has obviously provided a broad-ranging response. I have been listening carefully, and I believe his response thus far has been relevant to the question but, with that in mind, Premier, we might bring this particular response to a close.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Happy to, sir. I was just going to very briefly say that we do have an across-government expenditure in this area—for example, the great work SATC has been doing with the Department for Environment and Water to get more nature-based tourism, very

significant expenditure by the government. Yes, it does not appear in these numbers but, quite frankly, the tourism sector does not really care about which budget line it comes in. They want to see the overall sector growing, and that is precisely what is going to happen. Yes, there has been a hiatus because of the coronavirus, but we are investing in this sector and we are investing hard.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Can I just thank the SATC for their work and move on to the Adelaide Venue Management questions? I thank the SATC for their preparation of estimates. I know it takes a lot of effort and time, so thank you.

The CHAIR: Thanks, leader.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: While that is happening, I thank the SATC and the Premier for taking up our tourism vouchers idea that we advocated for from early last year, so thank you.

The CHAIR: Leader, it throws to me now. There being no further questions, I declare the examination of the proposed payments for the South Australian Tourism Commission complete. We are going on to Adelaide Venue Management, and you have had a change of advisers, Premier.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Budget Paper 5, page 86, Riverbank arena—and we have a lot to get through, so we will move expeditiously. Has the business case for the new basketball stadium been completed and, if so, when will it be released publicly?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: First of all, I do not know why the Leader of the Opposition constantly refers to this as a basketball stadium. Is he referring to the new state-based basketball facility that we are talking about at Wayville? Is he getting confused with netball and the money we are putting into the netball stadium? He seems to constantly be referring to a basketball stadium. Perhaps he could clarify what he is talking about.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The basketball stadium that you announced as your centrepiece election policy on the front page of *The Advertiser* a few months ago.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, the major announcement that we have made with regard to basketball recently has been the statewide basketball facility that we have entered into an agreement with to develop at Wayville showgrounds. I am looking forward to what that is going to be. We also continue to work with the Adelaide 36ers at the Adelaide Entertainment Centre which may be what the Leader of the Opposition is referring to. But if he is referring to—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No, like I said—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Why don't you grow up and start referring to it by what it is actually called—the Riverbank arena?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Riverbank arena.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Okay, the Riverbank arena basketball stadium, when will you release the business case, or has it been completed, and when will you release it publicly?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This is a project that we have been looking at for an extended period of time. As the Leader of the Opposition would know, there have been a lot of considerations for this new arena. I think South Australia has known for a long period of time that the Adelaide Entertainment Centre, as much loved as it is, is tired and needs significant investment. It is too small and it is in the wrong place.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Have you completed a business case and when will you release it? It is a really specific question. We have eight minutes. I just invite the Premier to answer it.

The CHAIR: I am sure, leader, the Premier has your question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am just giving some background. This is an important project for South Australia and it is not one that we have taken lightly and there have been multiple iterations of the work that has been done on this to date. This is something that has gone off to Infrastructure SA, so it has gone through the independent umpire. Infrastructure SA is chaired by Tony Shepherd. It has an excellent board. They have told us in government that it is ready for

investment, so yes that work has been done and I think there is going to be a consolidated business plan which will be delivered in the coming months.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So no business case has been completed and there is no commitment to when that will be released. Before the COVID-19 pandemic—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I note that the previous government, I am reliably informed, did work on a business case for exactly the same facility. I do not think they actually released the business case for that. By contrast, what we will do—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: We did not commit to it as a central policy.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What we will be doing—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Before the COVID-19 pandemic, in 2018-19 how many times did the Adelaide Entertainment Centre sell out without discounting tickets or fire sale tickets?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that information, but what I do have is the fact that—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Can you take that on notice?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, I am just finishing my answer. I know it has been a tough time, but you will get through this. There are plenty of examples where we do not have a situation in South Australia where artists are even coming to South Australia. Again, going back to my previous evidence to this committee, what that does is provide a leakage out of South Australia where people travel interstate for events and concerts. We have to stop that; we want to go back the other way.

We want to keep everybody in South Australia and bring more people in, and that is one of the reasons why we need to expand the capacity of the existing Adelaide Entertainment Centre footprint. It is under capacity. In its current format, my understanding is that it services an audience of about 8,300. The new facility will be closer to 15,000 which significantly improves the viability for acts coming to South Australia and, therefore, the range of product that we will be able to offer.

Most importantly, it is about moving into a logical place where, when events finish, people do not scurry home. They actually spend some time in the city, in the CBD, spending money in our pubs, our clubs, our cafes, our restaurants, and enlivening the CBD, and that is one of our major areas of focus.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Just to be clear, before the COVID-19 pandemic—let's take for instance the financial year of 2018-19—can the Premier take on notice how many times the Adelaide Entertainment Centre sold out without any discounting of tickets or tickets being given away?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not even sure what you are referring to. I am quite sure there are discounts given on virtually every concert. There are a range of discounts that are probably provided, complimentary tickets that are provided. Can I just say that a minute ago it was a basketball stadium; now it is a concert stadium. We will also at some point hopefully get onto the fact that this is going to be a massive, massive, massive expansion of our convention footprint in South Australia, but at the heart of this project it is all about creating sustainable long-term jobs in South Australia. That is what this is about. It is a very good investment, it has been through Infrastructure SA and it is a pity the Leader of the Opposition will not get on board.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I believe there are other priorities that should be higher up the list. This is my last attempt at this before I move on. Is the Premier willing to take on notice how many times during the 2018-19 financial year the Adelaide Entertainment sold out?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have already answered that question twice. I am not going to continue answering the same question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: You have not answered it. It is somewhat extraordinary that we are committing \$660-odd million of taxpayers' money to a new Riverbank arena, basketball stadium, convention facility, whatever you would like to call it, to replace the Adelaide Entertainment Centre (your words not mine) without you willing to take on notice how many times that facility sold out in the previous financial year, but we will move on to the next question.

The CHAIR: Premier, I am just going to make a point here. We are dealing with the 2020-21 budget, of course, and the out years from that. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It just does not make any sense to me because this is not something that we have done on a whim. It has gone through extraordinary passes at the moment.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Well, you should know the answer to these questions then. Where is the business case?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said earlier, we will be releasing an abridged version of that business case, but we have to be careful as there are commercial-in-confidence aspects to that as well. What we need to do in South Australia is appreciate that this is an investment that has gone through the independent umpire. The previous government did not have the Infrastructure SA board in place providing advice to the government with regard to the spending of public capital. We have put that in place, and they said that this is ready for investment.

It will create a return for the people of South Australia. We will actually get a return each and every year over and above depreciation, over and above interest on this project. It will enliven our CBD, it will expand our convention footprint and it will expand our concert footprint. This is a project that is going to create jobs in South Australia and the Labor opposition want to talk about discounts on tickets two years ago. It is extraordinary.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Given we are talking about convention centres, I refer the Premier to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 173, Adelaide Venue Management. Did the Convention Centre grant your assistant minister, Jing Lee, any discounts when she booked that event and could you please explain to me why FOI documents released by your office revealed that Ms Coralie Cheney, who is the General Manager, Functions and Business Events at the Convention Centre was sitting at your table at that Liberal Party fundraiser?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, I cannot give any advice as to the seating plan. I am involved in lots of things in the state, but certainly the seating plan at a private function I attended is not something I have control over. My understanding is that no state government money went into that project whatsoever.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I asked if Ms Jing Lee received a discount from the venue for the function.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have no idea.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Could you take that on notice?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is certainly not something that I deal with.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Could you take it on notice and ask the venue management board if they could take it on notice for me, please? Why will you not take it on notice, Premier? What are you afraid they might find?

The CHAIR: Member for West Torrens, give the Premier the opportunity to answer.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, no taxpayer dollars were involved in this whatsoever.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is not the question I asked.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This is a public facility and it is for hire. I know that they were very grateful for the work because, as most people in this room would appreciate, it has been a pretty tough time for activities, especially activities with a large number of people.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Did Jing Lee get a discount?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I just do not know that information.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Could you take it on notice, please?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, it has nothing to do with me.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The CE is right next to you.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Ask the CE; he is sitting next to you.

The CHAIR: No, member for West Torrens—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Did you give one of your colleagues a discount?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have already been through this. Why don't you listen?

The CHAIR: Member for West Torrens and the leader, I have already ruled on this. The questions are directed to the Premier or the ministers, and—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am. I am asking the Premier to ask the CE.

The CHAIR: No, that is not how it works. The Premier can choose to ask the CE—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Premier, choose to ask your CE a question.

The CHAIR: —or an adviser, if he wishes. Otherwise, he is able to answer in the way he sees fit.

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

The CHAIR: Leader, do you have a question?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes.

The CHAIR: The last one for this portfolio.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My question is to the Premier. Why will the Premier not ask his chief executive—who is in his immediate presence and who has taken the time from his pretty hectic schedule at a difficult time to come here to aid the committee with information—if he is aware whether the Jing Lee fundraising event, which a lot of people attended with little knowledge of the fact that it was indeed a Liberal Party fundraiser, received any form of discount from Adelaide Venue Management?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I cannot be any clearer. This is an event that did not receive any taxpayer funding whatsoever. I attended it.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But that was not the question, Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The commercial arrangements between this statutory authority and any client—I am quite sure they provide discounts to all sorts of people. I have no idea whether they provided it in this particular instance. What I do know is that we are trying to create jobs in South Australia, and when you do hold a large event you do employ a lot of people. I think that people should be proud of that. I am not going to go into things which I am not responsible for, and I am certainly not responsible for this area at all.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But you are responsible for Adelaide Venue Management.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I would be if there were state taxpayer dollars going into it, and I have confirmed, I think thrice now, that that has not been the case.

The CHAIR: I am going to conclude this session. Having reached the allotted time, I declare the examination of the proposed payments for the South Australian Tourism Commission and Adelaide Venue Management Authority to be complete.

DEFENCE SA, \$11,180,000

Minister:

Hon. S.S. Marshall, Premier.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr R. Price, Chief Executive, Defence SA.

Mr P. Murdock, Manager, Finance, Defence SA.

The CHAIR: We now move to Defence SA. I remind the committee that we have an hour in which to ask questions relevant to Defence SA. Premier, if you wish to make an opening statement and please introduce your advisers.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, sir. Anthony Kirchner has left the building, so has Marie Hannaford and those two people are replaced by Richard Price, who is the Chief Executive of Defence SA, and Peter Murdock, who is the Manager of Finance for Defence SA.

The CHAIR: No opening statement?

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

The CHAIR: Leader, do you wish to make an opening statement?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No.

The CHAIR: In that case, we will go straight to questions.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I refer the Premier to Budget Paper 3, page 26, operating expenses—selected agencies, Defence SA. Why is the Defence SA budget being cut over the next three financial years to eventually be cut in half from \$22 million in 2021-22 to just \$11 million in 2024-25?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There are probably a range of issues where some projects are reaching a conclusion and other new projects are coming on. Is there a specific line that the leader is particularly interested in?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I just want to understand from the Premier what the impacts of that cut will be in the first instance? Why has he made a decision to cut the budget almost in half?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not sure I would characterise it as cutting the budget. We need to spend money in this area in accordance with the issues we are presented with at the time. There has been increased expenditure on projects in the past, platforms we have been bidding for that have come to fruition. We have a budget going forward that supports the operations of Defence SA, making sure we can bid for and win as much work in South Australia as possible.

This is a really important sector. As the Premier, I have taken responsibility not just for defence but also for space, which is also incorporated into this area. This is a very important area and one we will always remain focused on.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Not only do I completely concur with the Premier that this is an important area but I would go so far as to say it will become increasingly important into the future. What was expended on previously that will not be expended on in the future?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: One project, for example, that had a sum of money that Defence SA bid for in a central pool was money to support jobs at Boeing. That was for a defined period. Those jobs still remain but the subsidy, on an ongoing basis, does not remain. That is what I mean.

In some ways it is a little bit like tourism, where it can be a little bit lumpy, but the core activities of Defence SA are all about bidding for and winning new work. From time to time, though, they will bid for—in our government, under the Jobs and Economic Growth Fund—and will receive that money, and it will be there for a period of time to bring that work into South Australia, but then it will be concluded.

So I do not think it is a fair assertion to suggest that there has been a cut. There are just some subsidies and programs, some of which existed under the previous government, that are no longer being funded going forward—and that were never envisaged to be funded going forward. That does not mean Defence SA will not make bids for work coming to South Australia on an ongoing basis.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Given that the budget has been halved, does that mean—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is just not a fair characterisation again. It is like being a little kid in a debate in year 9 at school; it is just not reflecting what has occurred. For example, at the moment Defence SA is very involved in putting in various bids to the federal government with regard to the Modern Manufacturing Initiative. They are working with the Department for Trade and Investment, and it is very possible that some of the money out of the \$200 million jobs fund we announced in the budget will go into projects that will ultimately come into the Defence SA budget.

That is the way this thing works. If you are going to characterise this as cuts you just do not understand the basic element of the way we run Defence SA in South Australia. You have been the shadow minister for an extended period of time and we have offered you every level of support and briefing you could possibly want; it has been a bipartisan portfolio for a long period of time—in fact, since the portfolio was constructed under the Labor government. It is infantile to suggest that there have been massive cuts to defence.

This is a very important sector. Why would the Leader of the Opposition, who says he works in a bipartisan way on these very important portfolios like defence and space and cyber—which will go over decades and decades and decades—want to undermine the confidence that investors have in South Australia by suggesting there have been cuts to the Defence SA budget? That is just simply not the case.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I thank the Premier for his patronising commentary; it is becoming a bit of a routine—and good luck to him. Does the Premier not understand how this is a perfectly pertinent and legitimate question, given the numbers that are outlined in his own budget papers?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, because, as we have said, we have constantly offered briefings to the Leader of the Opposition. He should be familiar with this situation. This portfolio is one where we do not have argy-bargy, and what he is doing at the moment undermines confidence that investors have in South Australia.

The defence industry will take a very, very dim view of the Leader of the Opposition putting on the record spurious claims that investment in this sector is being cut. That is simply not the case. If he had done the work as the shadow minister he would know exactly and precisely our commitment to this sector. We would also know that some of those programs are coming to a conclusion. Some of those programs that were signed up under the previous government—which we have, of course, honoured—are coming to fruition at the moment. There will be other programs that come online. That is the nature of this portfolio. He has been the shadow minister for at least 3½ years; he should know better.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I do not know how to respond to that.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: With an apology to the sector.

The CHAIR: In fact, leader, you do not have to respond. You can simply move on to the next question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The Premier talks about behaving in a way that is silly or incongruous with the bipartisan spirit of this portfolio, which I remain committed to. I am simply doing my job, which is asking the Premier questions about his budget and the numbers that exist within it. If the Premier wants to be particularly defensive about that by being aggressive or patronising, then I would simply submit to the Premier that that would be disconcerting to those people who are paying attention.

The numbers I refer to are there within the budget papers, but I am happy to go on to a separate line of questioning given that the Premier is clearly—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What is very pertinent for the committee to understand is the number of times that the Leader of the Opposition, as the shadow minister in this extraordinarily important portfolio in South Australia, sought a briefing from Defence SA over the last 12 months. Perhaps he would like to convey that to the committee. Perhaps he would like to show how important this sector is, rather than asking questions that were always—always—available to him if he had picked up the phone and asked.

The CHAIR: You have made your point, Premier. The leader just needs to—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: It is just extraordinary. I refer the Premier specifically to Budget Paper 3—I do not know whether the Premier has it available; he does by the looks of it—page 26, regarding operating expenses, selected agencies, Defence SA. Does the Premier have that?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: You need to ask the question, not my availability of the papers.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My question is: does the Premier have those papers available?

The CHAIR: Budget papers?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes, Budget Paper 3, page 26.

The CHAIR: My understanding, leader, is that that is the line we have been on the entire time.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That is right. The Premier is trying to infer that I am being mischievous in some way, but one sees these numbers and sees the operating expenditure decline quite dramatically over the course of the forward estimates. It is not like a marginal reduction. It is a very substantial reduction.

I would have the Premier know that people from the sector have expressed the view and expect the opposition to be asking what is the rationale and the reason for this. I suspect they might be paying attention as we speak, and thus far all I have heard is you going on the attack and having a bit of a rant, and so forth.

People point this out to me and they expect me to ask questions on their behalf, and I think they are legitimate questions. If the Premier just wants to cool his jets, could he just explain to me and those people who have inquired about this reduction what would be happening in the 2020-21 financial year (this year) where the estimated result, according to the budget papers, is \$23 million, that would see it in the 2022-23 financial year—which is, of course, less than two years away—go from \$23 million to \$14 million.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This is the same question you asked about 10 minutes ago.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes. And as I pointed out, we provide all those briefings, mainly in confidence to the Leader of the Opposition. If people are tuning in I can confirm that, in the last 12 months, there has been no approach to Defence SA from the Leader of the Opposition whatsoever for a detailed briefing regarding any of these matters.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But this is the first time we have been able to ask questions of the Premier—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There were budget papers last year and the year before as well. The reality is, as I pointed out in my previous answer, there are some very lumpy movements with regard to our operating expenses because there are programs which were committed under the previous government and which are coming up to completion.

One of those, which I can talk about publicly, of course, is the Boeing deal where there was a sum of money provided over an extended period of time to that company. They have significantly increased their footprint in South Australia. It was a prudent investment on behalf of the people of South Australia, but that expenditure comes to an end so it drops out. You do not automatically put it in.

However, I have also said, and I would be happy to provide further confidential briefings to the Leader of the Opposition, that we are working on a range of other programs to bring other platforms to South Australia. Some of them do require expenditure, but the vast majority of them are coming to South Australia because, over an extended period of time, we have worked in a bipartisan way and put the best foot forward of this sector to attract as much work into South Australia as possible.

There is an amazing amount of work coming to South Australia going forward. The most notable, of course, are the surface ships and the submarine programs that are currently underway in South Australia. The work that is currently being done out at Osborne is very high profile.

In addition to that, you would have to appreciate that there is a large amount of work that maybe goes under the radar (pardon the pun) for the average person in South Australia—the extraordinary work being done at the moment out at Edinburgh, now one of two superbases in Australia. This was previously a base that was slated to be closed. It is now massively expanding and has extraordinary capability in terms of electronic warfare, systems integration, surveillance and reconnaissance work, and intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance work. Of course, we have a massive footprint for the DST Group in South Australia.

We have a fantastic industry sector in South Australia. It is one we want to support and grow and make sure they have the skills in place for the future. These are areas on which we are continuing to increase our expenditure here in South Australia. One of the major areas of expenditure at the moment is the expanded traineeship and apprenticeship program in South Australia. Of course, those numbers do not appear in these budget lines.

When we speak to people in the sector, one of the critical areas for them is making sure they have the requisite skills in place to deliver on these extraordinary platforms and opportunities that are coming to South Australia. You would note that we have a massive expansion in the number of people who are being recruited into apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia, school leavers and people who are re-entering the workforce and, in fact, school students at the moment.

We are supporting the industry through that skills development. It is one of the very important areas. In terms of providing a full reconciliation between years, it is going to be lumpy. We provide that opportunity and invitation for the Leader of the Opposition to sit down with Defence SA at his leisure.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I move on to Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, Program 1: Defence Industry Development, page 158, targets for 2021-22. What advice has the Premier received about the impact on businesses involved in the supply chain of our state's major shipbuilding projects by the delays in the media?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Can you just repeat that question?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Let me put it another way: has the Premier received recent advice about the impacts of major shipbuilding project delays that have been reported in the media? The Premier would be aware that there have been reports in the media about delays with the Future Submarine project and there have been reports in the media regarding delays with the frigate program. I note there have also been reports to the contrary too, but nonetheless there have been reports about delays. Has the Premier received any advice from Defence SA about the impacts of those delays on our local supply chain?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What I do know is that last year BAE Systems Australia got to their 1,000th employee. They had a recruitment drive for a further 1,000 employees in their platforms down at Osborne for this year. I have not had a recent update. I have seen some media speculation with regard to potential future delays in that frigate program, but that is essentially media speculation. There has been nothing that has come to me that specifically talks about a delay in the recruitment for those 1,000 people.

There could be a delay in getting that first ship into the water, which I think has now been speculated at six months, but I do not expect that to very significantly change the number of people we are going to require in delivering on those platforms. They are very important platforms for Australia—nine Future Frigates, which are based upon the type 26 from BAE, which is currently being produced at the Govan shipyard in Scotland. We know that there was a lot of competition, mainly from Fincantieri and the Spanish shipbuilding group Navantia, which of course built the air warfare destroyers in South Australia. Ultimately, a decision was made through a competitive evaluation that they would go with BAE.

Work is underway, and I have been down there to view it. The shed for the completion of the frigates project alone was a major investment in South Australia and we thank the people at Australian Naval Infrastructure for their extraordinary investment in South Australia. It is the most advanced shipyard and submarine yard anywhere in the world. There is no doubt about that. We are very grateful for that.

With regard to the specific question the Leader of the Opposition asked, 'Have I had any specific advice from Defence SA with regard to the delays in that program?', the answer to that is no. I have read the speculation in the media. I have seen that there could be a six-month delay in getting that first frigate into the water, but I do not think that is materially going to change the skills that we require. So we are full steam ahead to make sure that we can get those skills in place for BAE.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That is BAE. I am very conscious of the ramp-up that BAE have engaged in in terms of employment, which of course is only good, but in terms of delays with the Future Subs project, which I think are clearer than is the case with the Future Frigates program, have you received any advice in respect to what is happening for the supply chain? My question does not go so much to Naval as it does to the non-majors and what impact it is having on them in terms of their workforce and their planning going forward.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: To?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I accept what you are saying about the Future Frigates, but in regard to the Future Submarine program, which I acknowledge is far less advanced in the first instance, but the delays there are clearer to see. Have you received any advice from Defence SA making you aware or the government aware of any long-term complications as a result of those delays or impacts on the sector as a result of those delays?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The answer to that is that I am in constant contact with the department with regard to all the platforms in South Australia. The Leader of the Opposition is speaking today about the submarine program, and that is a very important program, but it was never slated to have a very significant workforce this year or next year. It is ramping up. There are hundreds of people down at Port Adelaide, but it is certainly not in the thousands like we are seeing at ASC, BAE and of course out at Edinburgh.

We do know that there have been some fairly high-profile discussions between France and Australia. We know that our Prime Minister spoke with the French Prime Minister recently with regard to that project. The Strategic Partnering Agreement has been signed. In fact, I witnessed the signature in Canberra. Subsequent to that, we are working through the various elements of that design phase. However, the construction has never been slated for being immediate, so there is still some time off on that.

I am happy to seek a further update, but one thing I have learnt about this program, like many defence programs, is that there is an incredible amount of speculation in the media with regard to these platforms. All I can point to is the incredible increase in employment in South Australia. I would like to take this very brief opportunity, if I am permitted, to highlight that it is not just the work that is being done in sustainment down at Osborne and the work of course on the Future Frigates but also the offshore patrol vessels, which are being built as a combined effort between Luerksen and the ASC.

We were successful in winning the first two of those offshore patrol vessels. I did inspect them some months ago and they look absolutely fantastic. Of course, that is where the sector comes in. Yes, the hull is constructed by ASC with Luerksen, but there many, many South Australian suppliers, large and small, primes, as well as mid-sized companies and some of our SME sector that will be getting componentry onto those offshore patrol vessels, like they will with the Future Frigates and exactly and precisely like they were with the air warfare destroyers. I do not see a massive reduction against the forecast yet, but we will continue to monitor this situation extraordinarily closely.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is there any contingency or support planning being undertaken by Defence SA to support those in the supply chain in the event that delays start to have an impact on them? In this case I am specifically referring to the frigates. I used the words 'contingency planning' or 'support planning', but I am happy for it to be in any other form. Has anything been done by Defence SA in that regard?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not aware of anything specific that has been put in terms of a monetary contingency, but one thing I do know about this sector is that this sector understands the stop-start nature of production better than just about any other sector in the world.

One of the things that has happened since the Coalition was re-elected in 2013 is that we have moved to develop—well, I think two major changes that have been made. One is that we are increasing defence spending to 2 per cent of GDP and the second thing is that we are acknowledging the defence industry as a strategic defence capability for our nation. Those two decisions are going to smooth out the stop-start nature or the on-again off-again stance that has characterised the defence industry over a long period of time.

Notwithstanding that, there are always going to be some delays to these major platforms—supplies and building contingencies. I have not been made aware of any significant delays with regard to the BAE-produced frigates at this stage, but I am happy to make that inquiry and come back to the opposition if there is something to report.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What role does the government perform in terms of tracking the contribution made by Naval to South Australia in accordance with the local content commitments that have been signed off by the commonwealth earlier this year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that the commonwealth have now decided to track this and report this as part of their overall supervision. If you keep in mind that the contracts with Naval—or the Naval Group as they want to call themselves, which is the old DCNS—are ultimately with the federal government, you might ask the question: what are we responsible for here in South Australia? Primarily, it is trying to win work to South Australia and make sure that we have the skill availability in place and also the infrastructure investment.

That was historically all South Australia because we owned the precinct at Osborne that was sold by the previous government to the commonwealth because it seemed a more logical orientation. They were controlling the projects and they wanted to own the precinct, so that decision was taken. There are other infrastructure components that we are still focused on, but the major area with regard to these projects is to make sure that we have the right skill availability.

Another area that is very important to the defence primes and the SME sector in South Australia is that we are linked up in terms of research and development. You would have seen, with regard to the Future Frigates program, a very major investment from the taxpayers in South Australia into Line Zero, which is at the old Mitsubishi site at Tonsley. That is an investment we have made along with Flinders University and also BAE themselves. It is, if you like, a factory of the future. That is a role for state governments—to create opportunities for the SME sector to come in and interact with BAE on different methodologies, as well as products and services that might become part of that overall long-term frigate build and sustainment program in South Australia.

I was down there recently and visited the site with Sheryl Lutz, who is the program manager for maritime within the federal government. I think that Senator Simon Birmingham was with me on that day as well. They were very interested in it. It is a great opportunity for businesses in South Australia. As I said, these are the things that state governments should be focused on—winning platforms into South Australia, making sure that we have the requisite infrastructure in place and the skill availability and ultimately making sure that our universities, our primes, our contracts and our SME sector are all joined up, and that is what the focus of Defence SA is on.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I appreciate that the commonwealth undertakes an exercise now, as I understand it, to track that spending, and we have traversed this in estimates in previous years on this subject. I will ask my question in a different form: given the commonwealth is tracking local expenditure, is there anything that Defence SA does to track South Australian expenditure and South Australian investment?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that we do not do that work in South Australia. The commonwealth is now tracking that Australian industry content. Obviously—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I do not mean to interrupt, but do they by any chance break it down state by state, or do they just look across the country?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will make that inquiry and come back to you. But the reality is anecdotally we know that it is still very early days for both the frigates program and the Future Submarines program.

There are examples where people have been selected to work with these suppliers. I am more than happy to, on a confidential basis, find out from BAE the SMEs who have been working with them at Line Zero—Factory of the Future down at Tonsley. Every time I am down there it is a hive of activity. Some of these are microbusinesses that could have groundbreaking opportunities to work with researchers and these large primes and get their products, their services or their technical expertise on one of the most advanced pieces of manufacturing kit anywhere in the world. Of course, there are great technology transfer opportunities from the defence sector working on these large platforms over to other manufacturing opportunities.

I am very happy to get a list from BAE in confidence, if they are happy to provide that, and provide to you the type of companies that I think are going to be hopeful of winning work on that, but ultimately the federal government through their AIC requirements with the Naval Group and with BAE will be tracking that and I will find out from the leader whether or not that is broken down by state.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What is the latest advice that you have received from the commonwealth regarding the FCD work?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Obviously, this is a decision of the National Security Committee, which sits under the federal cabinet. They have not made a decision with regard to the full cycle docking, but the Prime Minister said the last time he was in Adelaide that the work that was being done at Osborne was done at a very, very high level.

We know that there were issues associated with that work going back many years ago. I think a huge effort was put into turning around that operation. Some of it was done by the former chief executive, Steve Ludlam. There is now an excellent chief executive down there at the moment in Stuart Whiley. They are continuing to do fantastic work and I have every expectation that that will continue into the future.

We know that there are very significant skill shortages in other jurisdictions around Australia. We do not have that situation in South Australia. We are working very closely to make sure that we have that skill availability to continue that full cycle docking work here in South Australia as well as the Future Submarine program, the Attack class submarine that is going to be delivered by the Naval Group.

In addition to that, I have every expectation that South Australia is in an extraordinarily good position to win the life-of-type extension of the Collins class submarine. There has been quite a lot of media speculation about this as well. No final decision has been made. There are multiple programs and platforms that we are working on at the moment. The full cycle docking is one of those. We do note that there was a decision on this which could have been made back almost 18 months ago. I am glad the decision was not made back then. I do not know that we would have fared too well with regard to this program.

I am increasingly confident that the full cycle docking will remain in South Australia. We have done an excellent job, I believe, in delivering real availability of the Collins class submarine. This was a real problem when you go back five, 10 or 15 years ago. We had very few of the boats in the water. Many of them were actually up with some extraordinary and very expensive maintenance work being done.

The work of the men and the women of the ASC in delivering the full cycle docking has been extraordinary in recent years. This is not work which can easily be transferred from one place to another. The skills associated with this work are extraordinarily technical and extraordinarily rare. There are more Kockums experts in Adelaide than there are in Sweden at the moment. That is something that South Australia can be very proud of—that there is more expertise here than there is in Sweden at the moment in relation to the Collins class submarine originally from Kockums. It would be, I think, dangerous to transfer that work to another place where those skills do not exist.

For the reasons that the leader was outlining before, there are huge contracts coming to South Australia. It does not work to say that we are going to transfer the work and so therefore all the technical skills are going to move immediately. There are other options for those skilled people to stay where they have put down their roots here in South Australia.

So I do not have a minute-by-minute update. I do speak to the Prime Minister about this on a regular basis. He is fully aware of my interest in this project. The last time he was in Adelaide he said the National Security Committee had not made a decision but he was very happy with the work of the ASC.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I thank the Premier for his answer. No-one would want the commonwealth to make a decision to move the FCD work and I understand the tenet of the Premier's position—that is, an earlier decision may have been the wrong one. But nonetheless, there is a consequence of delay of the decision as well. We have heard directly from people in the supply chain that delay of the FCD work has been at the expense of forward planning, if not direct immediate active employment.

So it depends which way you look at it. An early no of FCDs would have been bad, but similarly a late yes ends up having consequences as well. The commonwealth, of course, made a commitment that they were going to make a decision on this finally before December 2019, so that is two Christmases ago, and we are here now more than 18 months since that time line has passed. Has the Premier, when he has spoken to the Prime Minister, made it clear to the Prime Minister that we condemn the delay in the decision on FCDs?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is extraordinary that the Leader of the Opposition would ask a question like this.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Why?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We retained the FCD work in South Australia. The federal Coalition government has put an extraordinary expenditure into the commissioning of new vessels, the lion's share of which has come to South Australia. Under the previous government, all we had were promises and postponements and cancellations of platforms. Since the Coalition has been elected in 2013, they have commissioned 53 separate vessels—a very changed situation—and the great beneficiary of that is South Australia.

So this concept that I would condemn somebody I think harks back to the previous Labor government when they engaged in these fake fights with Canberra and, quite frankly, it did South Australia no good whatsoever. The biggest purchaser of defence industry in the country by far and away is the commonwealth government. I think what we have displayed since we have come to government is a more grown-up, nuanced and sophisticated approach to winning work for South Australia.

I appreciate that for some people not knowing whether or not the full cycle docking is staying in South Australia would be a moment for anxiety for them, but I think they should have some comfort in the comments made by the Prime Minister when he was here recently. He did say that the NSC had plenty of other things on their plate at the moment and he did not feel that this was a decision he needed to rush. He did comment and commend the ASC and its workforce for the great work they had done in terms of the full cycle docking.

Far from condemning the federal government, I am engaged with them at the moment because I would like to see life-of-type extension work come to South Australia for the extension of the life of the Collins class submarine. I think we are in a very good position to do that work. I think that that in itself will create billions and billions of dollars worth of new work to South Australia.

This is something which is also under active consideration by the federal government. We have seen that reported in the media. We have seen statements that have been made by the former minister and the current minister. I have had a meeting with the Minister for Defence, the Hon. Peter Dutton, where I laid out the case for the great workforce we have here in South Australia and the great capability that we have here in South Australia. We would love to continue to win new work for this state. We are the defence state; there is no doubt about that. We are the defence state. We have the capacity, we have the runs on the board and I expect that work to continue flowing to South Australia.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The Premier refers to their sophisticated, more nuanced approach that has delivered us a reduction in GST revenue into the long-term for future generations, and us being sold out on the River Murray in regard to the water that we are all signed up and entitled to. I point

out, since the Premier referred to it, that the former government undertook a fight with Canberra to ensure that the Future Submarine work did indeed come to South Australia and not end up in Japan, which, of course, was the former Coalition government's plan to do.

I think there are times for nuanced negotiation but I also think there are times to stand up for our state and expect our leaders to honour the commitments they have made. Prime Minister Morrison committed that a decision would be made before Christmas 2019. In the meantime, we have seen no action, not even so much as a rational and reasonable explanation as to why there is such a long delay, and we still do not even have a renewed timeline of when we will eventually find out. There are employers out there who are trying to make very substantial investment decisions and employment decisions who are unable to do so—

Mr KNOLL: Mr Chairman—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am getting to my question—because—

Mr KNOLL: Point of order: I was trying to give the member a reasonable degree of latitude, but he is offending standing order 97 rather greatly.

The CHAIR: Rather greatly. We have had some—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My question is—

The CHAIR: I will come back to that, member for Schubert.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: —in order to understand the impact of the delay, is there a latest figure or an updated figure from Defence SA about what the total economic impact is of us having the full cycle docking work in our state? A secondary component of that is: should South Australia be successful—which, of course, I think everybody hopes, and we are on a unity ticket in this regard—that any future life-of-type extension works were to be delivered to South Australia, what would the economic impact of that be?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There has been plenty of work done on both the continuation of the full cycle docking and the life-of-type extension opportunities, as well as the work on the Future Frigates, the offshore patrol vessels, the various platforms out at Edinburgh and, of course, the Future Submarines, but there are a lot of moving parts. These are very complex programs and there is not one simple answer to the question that the Leader of the Opposition asks because it really does all depend on timing.

The reality is that we do not have a timing for the life-of-type extension. We do know that the Collins class is coming to the end of its useful life. A decision will need to be made, but I am very happy to follow up, and if we can get some information from the federal government of the likely time frame for their decision, then that would give us a further input into determining what that skill requirement is going to be and therefore what the likely flow-on effect to industry in South Australia is going to be.

In many ways, this will be easier to model than perhaps the Future Frigates or the Future Submarines because the Collins class submarine is something that we have been sustaining in South Australia over an extended period of time. There are a huge number of South Australian companies involved in the full cycle docking which, of course, is done here in South Australia. Some of these companies go right back to the original construction of the Collins class submarine here at Osborne.

I will take that question and I will consult with the federal government with regard to their likely timing for a life-of-type extension decision. Certainly, that would enable Defence SA to do some much clearer modelling of the likely jobs impact and work impact generally flowing through to the SME sector in our state.

The CHAIR: Before I go to the leader, I will come back to the point of order raised by the member for Schubert. He raised a point of order in relation to standing order 97. Standing order 97 reads:

In putting any such question, a Member may not offer argument or opinion, nor may a Member offer any facts except by leave of the House and only so far as is necessary to explain the question.

Ordinarily, the standing orders would apply through the committee stage; however, I am prepared to give some latitude. This is a committee of the house; it is the budget estimates committee. I will just go back a bit. There has been commentary from both the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition today. They have chosen to do that. It is not ideal. I have warned them about that. However, I am prepared to give some latitude at least and remind members again that they need to relate their questions specifically to a budget line.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thank you, Chair. I am mindful that we have only 15 minutes left, and also I am trying to work out when we are going to slot in our omnibus questions. We might do it here.

The CHAIR: It is up to you, leader.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I will move on quickly to Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, Program 1: Defence Industry Development, page 158, and the last two dot points for 2020-21. The marketing campaigns Make Your Move and Find Your Place were launched in a period when many people were unable to leave places where they were locked down, obviously, because of COVID and what have you. What consideration did you give to the impact of COVID on these campaigns? Was an honest assessment able to be done about the value of those campaigns, given the unfortunate impact of COVID on them?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What I can say is that these were campaigns that were really informed by industry. One of the things we are very keen to do in South Australia is not just have firms looking to recruit additional numbers from within South Australia. Often, what that means is somebody from one prime will take somebody from another prime, then that person has to go out and take somebody and actually we are not having any additionality to our state.

Very early on, I got as many of the chief executives and HR professionals as I could from the different companies and said, 'What can we do to grow the overall size of the pie?' They came up with a number of very useful suggestions that we followed up, one of which was a coordinated advertising campaign in which we would use social media to generate leads for these companies for people to come to South Australia.

The leader quite rightly points out that there have been some very significant interstate border restrictions that have probably hampered some of this movement. What I would say about recruitment in this area is it quite often takes a long time. One of the reasons for this is the security clearances that are needed to work on some of these platforms. They are not simple; in fact, some of them take a long period of time.

I do not think for one second that we have wasted a cent on this project. In fact, I think it has been very well regarded by the industry, but of course some of the actual job outcomes will take some time. To give you an idea, some of the security clearances may be simple and some of them can take years to effect, and this is another issue which was raised when we had the workshops with the sector, and we have been working through that with the federal government.

I am informed that the Find Your Place campaign was really focused on people here in South Australia—in particular, those who were at school, finishing university or maybe looking to re-enter the workplace—whereas Make Your Move was really far more focused on people from interstate. I think we did two advertisements. They were a little bit gender oriented: one was focused on female recruits and one was focused on male recruits, and we used social media targeting to go directly to them.

I am told that this was hugely successful and, again, was something the industry brought to us. We were very keen to address it because, as I said, one of the major areas of focus for us in Defence SA is the development of the workforce going forward. In many ways, it has been a sector that has been less attractive to graduates because of the on-again off-again nature of the workload, whereas other sectors might be able to offer greater continuity.

I spoke recently at a scholarship event where I think we were presenting a further 15 or 20 scholarships to university graduates to work with industry. I spoke to them about the great decision they had made to focus on the defence sector because it is a great opportunity now, and there are jobs in South Australia for decades and decades to come. This is something that did not exist before. Many people would get involved in it—it is a really exciting platform that they would deliver—but on

the day the platform was delivered they were out of work. In South Australia, that is just not the case. When people finish work, going forward there will be other platforms for them to transfer to, and that makes this a very attractive sector.

Another thing I find really attractive about this sector is the way they develop their personnel. At the moment, we do have a focus on people at school doing school-based apprenticeships, but that does not mean that ultimately they do not go to university, do not rise through the ranks right through to potentially becoming the chief executive or managing director, going forward.

This is a sector that does invest in its people. It loves to have long-term employees it can develop over a period of time. This is one sector that really does provide those opportunities to university graduates to go into a sector, work on a platform but then transition to another platform within that company or maybe into other parts of the sector overall.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Regarding the Defence Teaming Centre, Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, Program 1: Defence Industry Development, page 158, targets 2021-22, does the state government still have a financial relationship or otherwise with the DTC?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What is the total amount in terms of that support? Is it just a general grant, or is there a specific set of KPIs? How does that work in the upcoming financial year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that the current funding agreement is a \$360,000 payment in the 2020-21 year, increasing to \$368,000 in the current financial year. In addition to that, there was money made available to the DTC for the defence industry employment program. This was something we have previously spoken about here, but that has now been transferred for delivery by another part of government.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Which one?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This was the program we originally wanted to get the Defence Teaming Centre to—it was a \$400,000 commitment over a couple of years to deliver people going from the defence force into the defence industry sector. By negotiation, it was decided that would be better delivered by Veterans SA.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In terms of that DTC funding, when does that current funding agreement expire?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: At the end of this financial year.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Across the forwards, is there a budget for that to continue?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Not yet, but there have been a series of negotiations. I am just having a look at it at the moment: the 2008 deed was a four-year deed, then there was a 2012. So there has been funding for the DTC going back to 2008, and it has been various dollar amounts. The current deed is a two-year deed, which I understand was negotiated in 2019 or 2020 and goes through to 2022.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: We might slot in the omnibus questions and if we have time we will come back.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The omnibus questions are:

1. For each department and agency reporting to the minister:
 - What is the actual FTE count at 30 June 2021 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; and

- How many TVSPs are estimated to be required to meet FTE reductions over the forward estimates?
2. For each department and agency reporting to the minister:
- How much is budgeted to be spent on goods and services for 2021-22, and for each of the years of the forward estimates period;
 - The top 10 providers of goods and services by value to each agency reporting to the minister for 2020-21;
 - A description of the goods and/or services provided by each of these top 10 providers, and the cost to the agency for these goods and/or services; and
 - The value of the goods and services that was supplied to the agency by South Australian suppliers?
3. Between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021, 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 (1) been abolished and (2) which has been created?
4. Will the minister provide a detailed breakdown of expenditure on consultants and contractors above \$10,000 between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021 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?
5. For each department and agency for which the minister has responsibility:
- How many FTEs were employed to provide communication and promotion activities in 2020-21 and what was their employment expense;
 - How many FTEs are budgeted to provide communication and promotion activities in 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24, 2024-25 and what is their estimated employment expense;
 - The total cost of government-paid advertising, including campaigns, across all mediums in 2020-21 and budgeted cost for 2021-22?
6. 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 contractors between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021.
7. What is the title and total employment cost of each individual staff member in the minister's office as at 30 June 2021, including all departmental employees seconded to ministerial offices?
8. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, could you detail:
- How much was spent on targeted voluntary separation packages in 2020-21;
 - What department funded these TVSPs (except for DTF estimates);
 - What number of TVSPs were funded;
 - 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; and

- What is the breakdown per agency/branch of targeted voluntary separation packages for financial years included in the forward estimates (by year) by FTEs?

9. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, how many executive terminations have occurred since 1 July 2020 and what is the value of executive termination payments made?

10. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, what new executive appointments have been made since 1 July 2020, what is the annual salary and total employment cost for each position?

11. 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?

12. In the 2020-21 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 2021-22?

13. In the 2020-21 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 2021-22? How was much sought and how much was approved?

14. For each grant program or fund the minister is responsible for please provide the following information for 2020-21, 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24 and 2024-25 financial years:

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

15. For the period of 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021, 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.

16. For each year of the forward estimates, please provide the name and budgeted expenditure across the 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24 and 2024-25 financial years for each individual investing expenditure project administered by or on behalf of all departments and agencies reporting to the minister.

17. 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.

18. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, what is the total cost of machinery of government changes since 1 July 2020 and please provide a breakdown of those costs?

19. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, what new sections of your department or agency have been established since 1 July 2020 and what is their purpose?

20. 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; and
- What is the estimated FTE impact of these measures?

The CHAIR: Given that we have reached the allotted time, I declare the examination of Defence SA to be complete.

Membership:

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

Departmental Advisers:

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

Mr J. Conway, Chief Executive, Infrastructure SA.

The CHAIR: The next portfolio to be examined is the South Australian Productivity Commission and Infrastructure SA. The minister appearing is the Premier. I advise members that the proposed payments for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and Premier—Other Items remain open for the examination. Premier, would you like to introduce your advisers, please, and make a statement if you wish.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No opening statement, but I would like to say that Richard Price and Peter Murdock from Defence SA have departed. They have been replaced by Christine Bierbaum, who is the Acting Chief Executive of the South Australian Productivity Commission. Also somewhere near here is Jeremy Conway, who is the Chief Executive of Infrastructure SA. I will not be delivering any opening statement, sir.

The CHAIR: I ask for questions. Member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I refer the Premier to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 31, Program 6: South Australian Productivity Commission. During last year's estimates, Premier, you told the committee that cabinet were considering some further topics for the Productivity Commission to inquire into. Can you advise the committee, over the last 12 months or since that last estimates committee, how many inquiries have the cabinet referred to the Productivity Commission?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Just to be clear, it is not the cabinet that refers matters. I am sorry if I said that at last year's meeting. It is really me referring those. In addition to the work that the Productivity Commission has already completed—for example, into government procurement, local government, R&D, medical research, fuel pricing and the extractives supply chain—which would have all been in place at the time of last year's estimates, the new areas that I have discussed with the former Productivity Commission commissioner, Dr Matthew Butlin, and the areas that he is looking at are South Australia's regulatory framework, development referrals and the final one is tourism regulation.

These are all projects that have occurred subsequent to that last year. In fact, I am informed that the South Australian regulatory framework was kicked off in January of this year, the development referrals in March of this year and the tourism regulation also in March this year. We are hopeful that all three of those bodies of work can be completed later this year.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Were they all referrals from you, Premier?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, that is my understanding. Often it is a discussion. We were really hampered in terms of the face-to-face meetings that I could have with Dr Matthew Butlin and so we sort of decided to continue a regular meeting arrangement with Dr Butlin via Zoom. Often, we would discuss opportunities. He obviously has huge expertise. He was a former commissioner with the Australian Productivity Commission. He also worked with the VCEC and most recently was the Red Tape Commissioner for Victoria. He has a huge background in economics. Often these

areas that we looked at were by discussion rather than me just sending a piece of paper to the commission. We would raise them in our regular meetings and then decide on a course of action.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Did you consider asking the Productivity Commission to do a body of work on the most recent GST agreement that you agreed to with the commonwealth government?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Could you explain to the committee why?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Productivity Commission is really about how we improve the overall productivity as our state. I see that as a matter between the commonwealth and the various states. It was part of a national agreement that was signed. It is more of a fiscal matter rather than a productivity matter. I am not sure what the Productivity Commission could bring.

I am very pleased with the way that the South Australian Productivity Commission has been established. We sought originally to do this through the South Australian parliamentary process. We were not able to get to a suitable end point in terms of the legislation so we have established it separately. Since that time I have been very pleased with the work that they have provided to the government.

I am also very pleased with the breadth and the calibre of people who have been appointed as commissioners, some of them on a part-time basis and some of them on a very part-time basis, essentially to do one particular body of work. In answer to your question, no, that was not something that was even considered.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: In 2019, they submitted their final report into government procurement to you, and you said that you accepted all 60 recommendations. Have you implemented all those recommendations in full?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that there were two stages to that procurement review, stage 1 and stage 2. Stage 1, the final report, came to government in May 2019, and stage 2 came to us in November 2019. There were 30 recommendations in the stage 1 report, and I am told that we have supported 29 of those and we supported one in principle. With regard to stage 2, 56 of the 60 recommendations were supported and four were supported in principle or partially supported but not in total.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: How many have been implemented?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that information with me at the moment because, as you would be more than aware, these are the responsibility of the individual line ministers. It is not the responsibility of the Productivity Commission to implement this. This is the whole of government, so it is a report to the cabinet. If you went through the 60 recommendations, there would be some that would be the responsibility, for example, of the Treasurer, of the Minister for Local Government or of the individual line managers. So there would be a range of areas of responsibility.

It is not the Productivity Commission's responsibility for the total implementation, so that would be a matter that would have to be reconciled. Certainly, I would invite you in estimates—today is only the first day of the opposition's estimates committee—to put those questions to the individual ministers. From my perspective, I am more than happy to do a reconciliation of those 90 recommendations and to come back to you with regard to my area.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Your government has allocated \$11 million to the Productivity Commission since 2018. Do you think it has delivered any benefits to South Australia and, if you have, could you please outline them to the committee?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is interesting that that question is asked. I have to say that there were some people who were sceptical about the type of work that the Productivity Commission would do. I for one am very grateful and in fact delighted by the work that they have done. I think that government procurement is always an area where we need to go out and look for ways to improve those procurement practices. As the member has already outlined, there were 90 separate recommendations in this area, the vast majority of which were accepted. This is ultimately under the carriage of the Treasurer in South Australia, but I think some very valuable reforms were made.

The recommendations that were made to us from the local government review have been very well accepted. In fact, the Local Government Review Bill has recently been in the parliament. My understanding is that it has been agreed to. Some important reforms that were part of that were canvassed. Not every member of the local government sector agreed with every single one of the reforms that were put forward, but every single person had the opportunity to put their case to the Productivity Commission. Independent commissioners were appointed as part of that process and, as I said, there was a very good turnaround that was instigated on 13 May and completed on 22 November 2019. To the best of my knowledge, that legislation has already passed the parliament.

An area that we are really concerned about is R&D, which threw up some interesting results. It is an area where we do want to improve our performance, in particular with regard to health and medical research. Of course, we received that final report at the end of last year, but since then it has been a very busy period, if you like, so I cannot give an update on the specific benefits of that program to date. I know that Professor Cornish, who was involved in the production of the report, was very satisfied and I have had good feedback from all the participants.

With regard to fuel pricing, this was an area that did create a lot of opinion. We were concerned that we needed to make the right decision in this area and so we had, I think, a very quick turnaround from the Productivity Commission to give us their recommendations, which have now been put into place of course. In fact, they turned it around in just 91 days from the referral to the final report to government, so for that I am very grateful.

As part of that process, we always make sure that we can put our terms of reference out to as many people as possible to have as much input, but ultimately they have made their decision and recommendation. I think that lower fuel prices are already flowing through and we have had commendations from various people with regard to that.

Obviously, we have also had the extractives supply chain report. This is not an area of government that I am particularly involved in, but it is a very important area for government. I am happy to seek some feedback from the Minister for Mining and Energy in South Australia and come back to the member to provide some feedback. What I will say, though, is that I believe it is an investment the people of South Australia have made, but it is also an investment that is delivering a return. Probably the most high-profile, easily understood project is the project with regard to fuel pricing.

The current projects that are underway are important projects for our state. We know that tourism and regulation around tourism are sometimes a handbrake on development and that means a handbrake on jobs in South Australia. We have the Tourism Industry Development Fund—\$20 million over a two-year period. It is highlighting some issues with regard to getting projects through in some council areas. We want to work with our friends in the local government sector to make sure that we can look at those types of approval processes, as well as other regulatory environments, and if there are ways that we can improve it we will.

I am not sure when we will receive the first report from the tourism regulation project. What we tend to do is have an interim report, which we circulate so that people can have their input. We have met all of the commitments that we made in the negotiation for the establishment of the Productivity Commission, which as I said did not pass the parliament, but we basically stayed true to what we committed to in that piece of draft legislation, in terms of being able to get that out to the people of South Australia to have their final input before a final report and then a response from government is received in a timely manner.

In summary, I think it has been good. Have we done a specific arithmetic cost-benefit analysis on it? I think it is still too early. I think we are basically at the two-year point at the moment, but I have certainly been filled with confidence. The cabinet has been filled with confidence and we now make the transition from our first commissioner to our second commissioner in South Australia, who has just been appointed as chair of the commission.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Premier, you just said that the Productivity Commission had made recommendations or gave you recommendations on fuel pricing. What were they?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have those with me, but it is all published. It is actually on the web. One of the things that we have wanted to have from day one is a very transparent advice that comes not only to government but to the people of South Australia. We think it is only right that it is the government that directs the Productivity Commission. There were some models put forward in the negotiation for the draft legislation which had all sorts of referring bodies. We thought that that could be very expensive and not produce a response that we needed. Some states do not have anything like this. We were convinced in opposition that this would be useful and that is why we put it forward.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Productivity Commission received no instruction from government not to make recommendations on their investigation into fuel price watching?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, of course not.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Can we move onto Infrastructure South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes. Can I just say that I was just informed that with regard to the fuel pricing, the specific referral, the terms of reference that went to the South Australian Productivity Commission asked for options associated with fuel pricing and a full explanation. Ultimately, the decision with regard to that was the decision of government.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: In your previous answer, you said that you received recommendations and you implemented those recommendations; is that wrong?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am just clarifying it now.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What were you waxing lyrical about before then? Did you not know that you instructed the Productivity Commission not to make recommendations, yet you sat there and told this committee that they had? Are you on top of your brief, or are you just turning up here? Seriously!

The CHAIR: Member for West Torrens, the Premier is clarifying the situation.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am happy to clarify, sir. There have been a large number, which I think I have provided a pretty comprehensive summary of to this committee, and the vast majority of them have made specific recommendations to the government, and some of those I have actually outlined—how many have been accepted in full—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Except for the one you talked about.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and how many in principle and how many partially. With regard to the fuel pricing, the question is what were the recommendations. What the acting chief executive made me aware of is that the terms of reference asked for the various options that were under consideration from various people—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: And made no recommendations.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to present it to the government, and that is what we have received.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is not what you told the parliament.

The CHAIR: Order, member for West Torrens!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think the people of South Australia are very pleased with the result, and that is why I thank the Productivity Commission for the diligence in the way they went about looking at those various options, presenting it to the government.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Lucky she was here to tell us what actually happened. Can we move onto Infrastructure South Australia. I just remind the Premier of his obligations to tell the parliament the truth.

I refer the Premier to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 32, Program 7: Infrastructure SA. Can the Premier tell the committee how the decision to include the basketball stadium in the March 2021 Capital Intentions Statement came about. Was it referred to Infrastructure South

Australia by the Premier or by a department, or was it an independent decision of Infrastructure South Australia to evaluate the need for a new stadium or arena?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not know what you are referring to when you refer to the basketball stadium. Can you provide greater clarity, please. I have already had to address this with the—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sure. One year out from the election you made a keynote speech at the Property Council where you announced you were building a brand-new basketball stadium. You used those words.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I cannot recall that. There was no way that I talked about building a brand-new basketball stadium. I did provide information—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You just told me a few minutes ago that the Productivity Commission made recommendations and then you had to be corrected again. Are you sure you did not say a basketball stadium?

The CHAIR: Member for West Torrens, you have been here a long time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have.

The CHAIR: You know the rules.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will see him come and go.

The CHAIR: You have asked your question, the Premier is about to answer and there is no need, nor are you allowed, in fact, under the standing orders to interject.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The point that I was seeking clarification on was which project we are talking about. The member for West Torrens said that it was the project that I announced at a Property Council lunch or event earlier in the year. This was not a basketball stadium; this was the Riverbank arena. It is a very important project for South Australia. It is a project which will have the capacity to host sporting events, but the major area of focus is making sure that we can expand the footprint of our convention space in South Australia and also make sure that we can bring and hold expanded events in South Australia. This is essentially going to replace and enhance the offer that we have at—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: standing order 98. I did not ask the Premier to give me the benefits of his brand-new basketball stadium. I was asking how it got to Infrastructure South Australia. Was it referred to them? Was it something of their own initiative? That is what I am interested in, sir.

The CHAIR: Yes, you did indeed ask that question, member for West Torrens.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes. Adelaide Venue Management, which only appeared before this committee a few moments ago—and I am not sure whether there were any related questions like this to them—were the ones who referred the business casework that they had done to Infrastructure SA.

When we were in opposition, we were pretty critical of the previous government. We said they picked pet projects around marginal seats and electoral cycles, and what we said by contrast was that every other state in the country had established an infrastructure body—every other state in the country. So we made a commitment at the 2014 election and again at the 2018 election to establish an independent infrastructure body. That has been established. Unlike the Productivity Commission, that was established as an act of the South Australian parliament. It has been constituted. It has now been operational for several years.

The chief executive is sitting next to me. It is chaired by Tony Shepherd. It has board members coming from the private sector as well as members from the Public Service. I think, quite frankly, it has served the people of South Australia well. Most importantly, it looks at projects independently of the government and provides advice to the government whether or not they are investable or not and that was the advice that we received from the Productivity Commission earlier this year—sorry, from Infrastructure SA earlier this year.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, they are different bodies. If the Premier could please take on notice, or he could answer it now if he likes, when the Adelaide Venue Management board referred it first to Infrastructure South Australia and how long the evaluation by Infrastructure SA took. Did they outsource or get any external assistance for the evaluation? Did they present the government with a final business case and a cost-benefit ratio for every investment we make into this brand-new arena that would be a basketball stadium?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What was the question? Whether I would take all of these things on notice?

The CHAIR: The question was: could you take them on notice or answer them now if you are able.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What was the first question? I will answer that now.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Could the Premier please tell us when Adelaide Venue Management first referred the new arena/basketball stadium to Infrastructure South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: While the Chief Executive of Infrastructure SA is looking for that approximate date, what I can say is that Adelaide Venue Management has been raising this for an extended period of time directly with the government. In fact, I think as I pointed out in my previous evidence to this committee, the previous government was looking at an arena project for the CBD, presumably for the same reasons that we had been looking at it.

That is, the existing Adelaide Entertainment Centre is tired and requires a massive capital investment at the moment and probably was not the same requirement as it was years previously. But for all those reasons, they looked at multiple iterations but, ultimately, it was referred off to Infrastructure SA. I am advised that this was first looked at by Infrastructure SA in financial year 2019-20 but then again in January 2021.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Did they provide the government with the business case?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, they provided Infrastructure SA with their business case but then further work was done. This is the way Infrastructure SA works. You had another question about whether any external consultants were provided.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: From time to time, we do get external people in to do work and we also get independent people in to evaluate those projects, but I will seek that answer for you now.

I am advised that there was a panel of three independent experts that was formed to look at the business case from Adelaide Venue Management and then form an opinion as to what recommendation—whether it is investible or not—they would give to the government, which of course was provided and has now been the subject of our media statements, that that was the case. They did suggest that it was investible, and it has been included in the most recent state budget.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So your evidence to this committee is that Adelaide Venue Management got external consultants to create a business case. My question was: did Infrastructure South Australia engage external consultants? Did they conduct their own business case to verify what Adelaide Venue Management had done?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I just think I provided that advice, that there were three people put onto a panel to evaluate that work; is that the question?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, you told the committee just now that Adelaide Venue Management had formed that three-person panel.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, that was Infrastructure SA.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That was Infrastructure South Australia—excellent. Who were those three people?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We do not have that information here.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Can you take it on notice?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: If it is appropriate, then we will provide that information.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What would be inappropriate about telling us who conducted the business case?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not know. As I said, I will make an investigation.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What did those three external consultants cost?

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Will you take that on notice?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is included within the Infrastructure SA budget. We have, I think, a generous budget for Infrastructure SA. It is probably larger than the previous government had because they seemed to do everything on the back of an envelope, and envelopes do not cost a lot of money as it turns out.

We got independent expert advice because it is important I think to get expert advice when you are spending the taxpayers' dollars, and they said that this does provide a benefit to the people of South Australia. It provides a return to the people of South Australia. It is not going to have an ongoing cost; it is actually going to have an ongoing benefit. After all the interest payments are made and the depreciation costs are incurred, this provides a return to the people of South Australia, and that is why it was a recommendation.

I think it is a very good process and rigour for a government to have external review of its projects. Of course, the previous government need to advise why they did not choose to have that external scrutiny. We have put that external scrutiny in place, and I am very pleased with the calibre of people who are serving on that board and continue to serve on that board.

It is a huge amount of work, but I think what we now have is a long-range productive infrastructure plan for South Australia. We have the Capital Intention Statements, which are being prepared on a very regular basis. We have independent verification that when we spend a cent of taxpayers' dollars they are going to get a return on that, and that is something that hitherto was not available to the taxpayers.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Given the Premier is adamant and confident that this will deliver a return, even once the cost of the capital is calculated and so forth, presumably the Premier knows what the revenue forecasts are of the stadium or Riverbank arena, or however you want to characterise it. What do you forecast to be the revenue in the first year of the stadium?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that information, but I think I indicated in earlier evidence to this committee that we would be publishing an abridged business case with relevant information the leader might find interesting to read.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: When will that happen?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have the final date for it, but I am happy to follow up on the date and come back to you.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Again regarding the arena/basketball stadium, Infrastructure South Australia came to a conclusion that a new stadium would, and I quote, 'generate a sharp increase in event demand in its opening year followed by a steady increase over time'. That is also assuming that in the intervening time it is used as a basketball arena. What discussions were held with the Adelaide 36ers during the evaluation of the business plan about housing Adelaide's basketball team at the new arena?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What I can say about that is that the Adelaide 36ers have only recently been returning to matches at the Adelaide Entertainment Centre. This has been really well regarded by fans and I think it has been a great development. We have also seen some matches with the Thunderbirds—not enough—and I think there is a great opportunity with the Adelaide Entertainment Centre to host Adelaide 36ers matches as well as Thunderbirds matches.

What we are really keen to see with regard to the new Riverbank arena is opportunities for sport to continue on both sides of the river. We have seen a very significant improvement to the

amenity at Adelaide Oval, courtesy of the former government, and we have seen a very significant commitment by the current government to upgrading Memorial Drive. The primary focus of this new Riverbank arena is certainly going to be on an enhanced convention and exhibition space, bringing major entertainment events to South Australia which previously weren't coming to South Australia—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: standing order 98.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and we will also be having sporting events—

The CHAIR: Premier, there is a point of order from the member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Premier is debating the answer. My question was whether or not Infrastructure SA had had discussions with the Adelaide 36ers about playing their games at the new arena the Premier is proposing to build, not about any other matter.

The CHAIR: I will give the Premier 30 seconds. Given that we have reached the allotted time, would you like to wrap up your answer?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes. Specifically to this, I am advised that AVM had extensive discussions with the Adelaide 36ers as well as other sporting opportunities. Of course, they are already clients of the Adelaide Entertainment Centre, so there were extensive discussions. As part of the overall assurance process through Infrastructure SA, I am advised that there was an interview with the Adelaide 36ers as part of this program to verify some of the things that were included in AVM's case that they presented to Infrastructure SA.

The CHAIR: Having reached the allotted time, I declare the examination of the proposed payments for the portfolio programs Productivity Commission and Infrastructure SA complete.

Sitting suspended from 14:01 to 14:30.

Membership:

Dr Close substituted for Mr Gee.

Mr Szakacs substituted for Hon. A. Koutsantonis.

Departmental Advisers:

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.

Ms R. Ambler, Executive Director, Cabinet Office, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

The CHAIR: I advise members that the proposed payments for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Defence SA and Premier—Other Items remain open for examination. We are scheduled from 2.30 until 3.30 to examine Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. Premier, please introduce your advisers and make a statement if you wish.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am delighted to introduce to the committee Nerida Saunders, the Executive Director of Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, a long-term and highly accomplished public servant in this area. I think I am her ninth minister. There is also Steven Woolhouse, the Executive Director of Communities and Corporate, and Ruth Ambler, the executive director of the Cabinet Office. She is also overseeing Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation for me in the Premier's department.

The CHAIR: Do you wish to make an opening statement?

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

The CHAIR: Leader, do you wish to make an opening statement?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No, apart from thanking the staff who have diligently prepared for estimates.

The CHAIR: I invite questions.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Kicking off with Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 23, and the specific reference in the second paragraph under description/objective, which states, 'Provide whole of government policy advice and leadership,' my first question is: exactly what leadership or policy advice did you, Premier, or any agency provide regarding the new APY policing model that, I understand, aims to save approximately \$400,000 per year and which will see individual police officers spending less time in communities?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As the leader would be aware, that is a matter for the police minister and the police commissioner, but I was certainly consulted about it. He is quite right: we do try to provide a whole-of-government approach to this portfolio. It is not a particularly easy portfolio; in fact, it is one of the toughest areas of public policy.

One of the changes we have made since coming into government is to move Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation back into the central agency, and I have taken responsibility for the portfolio myself. We have tried to have a whole-of-government approach to Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, and that has culminated in the production of two separate action plans. Certainly the police minister and the police commissioner have been fully involved in those.

I do understand that there has been a proposed change to the policing model on the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara (APY) lands. I was not aware that there was any budget saving in it. Certainly it was not presented as a budget-saving measure: it was presented to me as just a recognition of the difficulty in having people permanently located on the APY lands. So a new model was presented. It was one which was, I think, widely canvassed.

In an ideal world, you would have police officers stationed up there permanently, but you very significantly reduce the pool of people who can do this work if they are stationed up there for a long period of time away from their family, and so this new model was suggested. I think it provides the best policing coverage on the APY lands, so I was happy to back this plan, but it was ultimately not a decision by me as the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation but ultimately a decision by the police commissioner.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My advice is that your government's own budget papers suggested that a move of this nature could save a lot of money—indeed, up to \$1 million per year. The consequence of this, as the Premier understands, is that, notwithstanding that the police presence on the lands potentially stays the same, there is a value for individual officers having a longer period of time on the ground by virtue of the relationships they develop and the knowledge they develop of the complexity of the area. Does the Premier understand why there is so little support within the community for this new model?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, this is not a budget-saving measure: it is a reflection of the complexity of policing on the APY lands. If there were plenty of people who were looking to go up there and relocate for periods of time, then they would have persisted with that model. This was becoming increasingly difficult. That is how it was presented to me.

Again, I just invite you to pursue this matter in the police, corrections and emergency services estimates committee. I have, I think, faithfully and frankly recounted my involvement in the presentation that I received on this matter. It is a really difficult area of policing. There are some wins and there are some challenges that still exist.

I have to say that the command for the APY lands still is based in Port Augusta, and there is a difficulty in both recruiting and retaining community constables, as well as the people who are relocating up there. I am more than happy for you to have a full exploration of that when the police commissioner and the police minister attend the estimates for their lines in the budget.

However, from my perspective there is no line in my budget provided for policing on the APY lands, and this is one of the reasons why we made the change in the way that we would manage Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. I attended these estimates committee meetings as the shadow

minister for Aboriginal affairs and reconciliation for a very long period of time. I am just trying to remember how long, but I think probably five or eight years, maybe—certainly five years.

It was always difficult for the minister, because the minister has a very small budget for AARD, but the service delivery actually occurs through virtually every other department, whether it be corrections, whether it be housing, whether it be employment, whether it be education, whether it be health and so on and so forth. That is why on coming to government I said that we needed to change that model, because the minister otherwise is basically with a small budget being questioned about, 'Why have you got poor outcomes in terms of education,' or, 'Why have you not achieved what you need to in terms of health?' So we thought, 'Well, let's have a whole-of-cabinet approach.' I am the chair of cabinet and so ultimately took responsibility.

As I have conveyed to this committee today, I have conveyed faithfully my recollection of the discussion on this matter. I cannot add anything further, but I am quite sure that the police commissioner or the police minister will be able to in another committee session.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Let me understand this. I get the inherent logic of the Premier taking on the portfolio as the chair of cabinet and having a whole-of-cabinet approach to avoid a situation where the Aboriginal Affairs minister cannot answer questions about other portfolios that are engaged in service delivery. The Premier makes the change, he is the chair of cabinet and there is a whole-of-government process to avoid the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs being unable to answer questions regarding service delivery.

Here we are. I am asking you a question about service delivery on the APY lands, in this case specifically in regard to policing on the APY lands. It is fair to say, as we all know, that police perform a particularly important role on the APY lands—a disproportionately important role in comparison, arguably, to in other parts of our state.

Given the importance of policing, given the Premier is committed to taking responsibility in this area of policy, given the budget line talks about whole-of-government policy, did the Premier just receive a briefing on this and say, 'No worries, good luck to you, thanks very much,' or did the Premier seek to engage with communities on the ground on the APY lands about what their views would be in terms of changing to this model? It is clear that community sentiment on the ground is fundamentally opposed to the change in model. What is the Premier doing about it apart from just accepting the briefing and moving on?

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

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Does that then suggest that the change of model you have articulated the merits of—I have to say that I think there is logic in your being the chair of cabinet and accepting responsibility—has not really made a material difference in respect of the estimates process? You said you were frustrated in opposition with estimates—a sentiment I sympathise with—with people not being able to answer questions, yet here we are and you are referring to your previous answer, which was, 'Go and ask in estimates on police.'

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, that is not the way I would characterise it at all. I think anybody reading *Hansard* would see that I have provided two comprehensive answers providing a faithful and frank recount of my knowledge of this subject area. Whilst I say I chair the cabinet, and therefore chair the coordinated response in terms of this complex and vitally important area of public policy, I cannot have an intimate knowledge of every single aspect of it.

I think quite reasonably I have suggested that if you do require further detail the person who will provide that is indeed the police commissioner. If you find that unreasonable, I apologise, but the reality is that it is very clear to me that the answer you are seeking could be provided pretty easily by somebody else. I have provided all the information I have on this to this committee.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I will move on then. Using the same budget line, Premier, what advice or leadership did you provide in the decision to slash 75 per cent of funding to the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service operating on the APY lands?

The CHAIR: Leader, while the Premier is seeking advice, can you please direct me to your budget line? I am assuming it is page 23, is it?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes, where it says 'description/objective', the first sentence in the second paragraph.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that that program is continuing and that the health minister has already made an announcement with regard to that. This is the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service that operates out of Amata. That is a line in the health and wellbeing budget, and the minister has already made an announcement with regard to continued funding for that service.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The opposition has confirmed as recently as this morning that the two clinicians who were permanently based on the APY lands up until the end of last financial year are now working in Adelaide and fly in periodically; is the Premier aware of this?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have the details as to where people are located. There is a lot of movement on and off the lands. Some of that had to be put on hold when they were put into the biosecurity pause, if you like—essentially the biosecurity lockdown—which did change the model of service delivery onto the APY lands. As people know, this is a particularly vulnerable cohort. There are a few thousand people on the APY lands, which is a massive area.

Everybody was very concerned about having people going on and off the lands. This has changed the model of care in some aspects of government service delivery because people who were providing those services, once they were there, if they came off, when they went back in they had to do two weeks of quarantine. This worked for some people. In particular, I would like to acknowledge the great work of many people on the APY lands who were prepared to do that.

I have spoken to several teachers who had to do that work. They would come out for the school holidays, but of course when they went back they had to submit themselves to 14 days' quarantine. This was not workable for some people who did work there on a shorter term basis and moved in and out of Adelaide. I am happy to take that question on notice and find out more detail with regard to that CAMHS service, which may be one of those services that had that change.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: If the CAMHS service was permanently based on the APY lands and now it is flying in and flying out, am I missing something? Does the fly-in fly-out model not create more risk than a permanently being based on the lands model?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I suppose the point I was making was that last year, when we were in that biosecurity lockdown essentially, the model of care changed and some reverted back to where they were and some actually stayed as fly-in fly-out. That was the decision that was made. I do not have a specific answer on that particular service, but I am happy to take that question on notice and come back with an answer.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My advice is that for the last decade CAMHS services have been full time on the lands in both Fregon and Ernabella and they have now been told that they are only allowed up once every so often.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have already said a couple of times now that I am happy to get a full detailed briefing on that. As I said, a number of the services that are provided on the lands changed the model of care last year. That may have been one of them. As I said, the Minister for Health and Wellbeing made a statement recently regarding continued funding for Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services on the APY lands.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Would the Premier accept that a service that was up on the lands full time is diminished if it becomes a fly-in fly-out service?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not a practitioner. I would defer to the experts in this area. They would form an opinion as to what the appropriate model of care is, and over time those models of care do change.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I would respectfully submit to you, Premier, that a full-time service on the lands is very different from once a school term, which I am advised is what the change is to, which is four times a year.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, I am more than happy to find out all the details and come back to the leader.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I appreciate that, although the whole idea of your being the minister is to have a whole-of-government coordinated approach, and now we have police and CAMHS, two A1 critical services to people on the lands, where the whole-of-government approach has not furnished the relevant minister, being yourself, with the appropriate information. Regarding nursing on the lands, I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 23, where it says under targets 2021-22: 'Coordinate, monitor and report against actions under the National Agreement on Closing the Gap'. What is target No. 1 under the National Agreement on Closing the Gap?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not 100 per cent sure that I have a copy of the national agreement with me. As the member would be aware, following the apology we established the national Closing the Gap framework. That operated for a period of time and then there was a refresh that was announced by the current government. That refresh work involved for the first time far greater consultation with Aboriginal people. It was a committee that was jointly chaired by the Hon. Ken Wyatt and Pat Turner. We had representatives of South Australia on there, and it was basically a co-design of that refresh around four key principle areas.

In South Australia, we set up a group to help us respond to that report from a state government perspective. We set up four committees across the South Australian Public Service. Each of those committees was co-chaired by an Aboriginal public servant and also one of our chief executives, so they are looking at all of those. That work is currently being completed, and we will be going to the national meeting, which is going to be held on 6 August. I will not be attending that meeting, but I think there are elements of that meeting we will be attending virtually.

You would have noticed in our most recent budget that we have fully funded SAACCON to work on the refresh, as well as funding work from within the Public Service in ongoing delivery against that Closing the Gap refresh. Some of those items will be dealt with from existing budgets and some will be subject to further budget bids as part of the overall budget cabinet committee work.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My advice is that target No. 1 is all about closing the gap in terms of life expectancy, which speaks to health. How much extra funding has been provided to address the requirements of Gayle's Law?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have been provided with some further information. First of all, in the 2021 year, \$433,000 in funding has been provided to SAACCON with regard to Closing the Gap, and the total allocated over four years to support the Closing the Gap agreement is \$3.3 million.

On your specific question about the additional state government costs with regard to our response to Gayle's Law, I am advised that the provision of health services on the APY lands is predominantly provided by Nganampa Health, which is of course a federally funded body, so there would be, as far as I am aware, no specific additional cost, or certainly not one that I am aware of, for the response to Gayle's Law on the APY lands. The government is considering exactly what we will do with regard to that in other parts of the state.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has the Premier responded to the urgent written request from Nganampa Health sent to your government five weeks ago that sought additional resourcing?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What was that relating to? Is that relating to the vaccination program or—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No, just generally. Let me give the Premier some more context. Is the Premier aware that Nganampa Health could cease operating on the APY lands if its urgent resourcing issues are not fixed?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, Nganampa Health is federally funded. It is not funded by the state government. We work very closely with Nganampa Health. In fact, we had many meetings with Nganampa Health during the early days of COVID-19 to put plans in place to respond to the potential for an infection on the APY lands.

We have to be very careful with regard to funding responsibilities with regard to health care. We have a huge set of responsibilities on the APY lands and so does the federal government. It is

certainly something which is a partnership. As I said, I think they have been doing a great job. I am informed that our health minister, the Hon. Stephen Wade, has been discussing resourcing issues with Nganampa Health, but I have not been advised of anything which has been finally resolved with regard to that issue.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Now we have policing, CAMHS and Nganampa Health on which the responsible minister is across the details. These are three critical areas of service delivery in an incredibly complicated community and we are asking questions of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs about these issues and apparently he is not briefed or aware and referring it off elsewhere.

If Nganampa Health is in funding trouble or in trouble in terms of its resources, would the Premier contemplate providing Nganampa Health with additional resources from the state? I understand that principally it is a commonwealth-funded service, but would the Premier contemplate giving Nganampa Health state government resources in order for it to be able to continue its, what we all agree upon, critical work?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying before, we do work in partnership with the federal government, but Nganampa Health are the primary provider of healthcare services. We do work in partnership with Purple House in the provision of dialysis services on the APY lands, most recently with the federal government providing four chairs and the state government providing operating budget on a fee-for-service basis with Purple House for dialysis in Pukatja, historically referred to as Ernabella. There are examples from a state government perspective, but as I provided in my previous answer, with regard to that correspondence I am advised that the Minister for Health is in discussions to better understand those needs and to try to see what can be done to address issues that they have raised.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I move on to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 23. Have you met with the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service workers in the APY lands this year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No. I had planned to be on the APY lands but, unfortunately, because of circumstances that has had to be postponed. In fact, I was hoping with a rescheduled meeting to be up there fairly soon again to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Land Rights Act, which passed this parliament 40 years ago this year, which was a piece of legislation in the Tonkin government. Unfortunately, that has been postponed until April of next year. However, I think that is a really important opportunity for us to remember that groundbreaking piece of legislation.

So I have not been up onto the APY lands this entire year. But prior to this year, I think I have made an annual trip up there for at least the past 10 years and I am still hopeful that I might get up there this year, but it has been somewhat complicated by this lockdown and the postponement of that very important event.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: On your visits to the APY lands, a reporter from *The Australian* newspaper who accompanied you on a 2018 PR visit to the APY lands wrote, and I quote:

Marshall appears preoccupied with art centres. He does not visit health clinics or other services linked to child protection or domestic violence.

In the years that you have been the Premier and the minister, how many health clinics or other services linked to child protection or domestic violence have you actually visited on the APY lands?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that detail at hand. As I said, it has been a visit every year for 10 years, but nearly always what happens when I am there, and certainly last year, is that various members from across the community—people who are working for APY themselves or people who are working for NGOs or people who are working in a range of state government roles—usually come together.

The most recent one of those was held at Amata, which would have been probably about this time last year. I was hosted there by APY Executive as part of that visit. I am trying to remember the exact schedule of that visit but I certainly visited communities. I certainly remember on that trip visiting Mimili, Fregon and Indulkana. I visited those communities.

There are a range of issues. Every time you visit there are a range of issues on the APY lands that need to be addressed. It is a very remote part of our state. It is a very special part of our state. Often when we are in Adelaide, we hear people acknowledging country and it just trips off the tongue. They acknowledge country and they talk about the spiritual relationship with the Aboriginal people and their land, and sometimes it is difficult for people in Adelaide, from Adelaide, to recognise what that relationship is.

It is really clear and evident when you go to a place like the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara lands that those people are definitely at one, like all Aboriginal people are, but it is really easy to see because you can see the land. We have not built all over the top of it. It is a very precious part of our state. It is also a very complex part of our state. It is a very remote part of our state. The federal government and the state government work together with the NGO sector and APY Executive to try to deliver services and opportunities to people on the lands.

The leader was right to acknowledge that I have had a special focus on the arts centres. They do bring in considerable non-welfare money to the APY. But more than that, more than employment, what the art centres offer is an opportunity for the Anangu to tell their stories and songlines and to promote the wonderful stories and songlines of the APY lands to people who might purchase works or see works online or in person anywhere in the world.

It is not just the APY lands. When I was in in Ceduna recently, I saw the fabulous artwork which is there. We are now working to see whether there is an opportunity to do something more around Coober Pedy. Are there other parts of the state where we can look at the opportunities to create sustainable employment which also celebrates the oldest living civilisation on this earth.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That is a good segue into questions I have regarding Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 15, specifically the dot point 'Provide funding support programs to South Australian professional artists and arts organisations.' Premier, under the current funding arrangements, will the APY Art Centre Collective's Adelaide gallery be shutting down?

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

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Under the current funding arrangements, will the APY Art Centre Collective's Adelaide gallery be shutting down?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Under the current—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: —funding arrangement.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The government only provides a very small contribution to the APY art centre. They are an art centre which prides itself on bringing in revenue from the sale of its artworks. It is actually in another portfolio, not this portfolio. I think the funding comes from Arts South Australia and I think it is in the order of about a \$50,000 contribution to the studio and gallery on that site.

Separate from that, under the longstanding commitment that the government has to provide services and support on the APY lands for the last couple of years, we have provided money to not just the APY Art Centre Collective's art centres but also the Ku Arts arts centres, to a range of projects which range from fixing leaking roofs through to building new and expanded facilities, or maybe even accommodation for the arts centres' workers. The commitment to the APY Art Centre Collective gallery in Adelaide is I think small and modest, but if you add up the opportunities and the funding for the last two years to the APY Art Centre Collective's arts centres on the APY lands and the Ku Arts centres, it is significantly higher.

In addition to that, I do recall, again through the Arts portfolio, that the government has provided money to take the Kulata Tjuta exhibition from Adelaide to France. Originally it was an exhibition which was going to Rennes in our sister region of Brittany. I sort of virtually attended that event and unfortunately that occurred at a time when France was in a very difficult situation and I am not sure how long that exhibition stayed in place. But that collection—the Kulata Tjuta exhibition—is still in France and I am informed that it is now on display in Normandy in Le Havre. That may or may not be pronounced correctly but that was money that went to taking the collection of work by the APY Art Centre Collective and taking it internationally.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I appreciate the Premier's extensive knowledge about APY Aboriginal art being displayed in France and the lack of familiarity with information regarding policing services, CAMHS and health services on the lands. The APY Art Centre Collective's Adelaide gallery, which I understand is in Light Square, are they to be kicked out of their current premises?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The South Australian government is not the landlord. That is a private arrangement they have with the University of South Australia.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Have you had any representations from the Aboriginal arts community, or anyone at all for that matter, regarding the APY Art Centre Collective potentially being moved out of their Adelaide gallery site in Light Square?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes. For some time now we have been concerned that they do need to find a new site here in Adelaide. They were looking for a site for a very long period of time. When we came to government, we were delighted when they secured this site and made a contribution to their ongoing rent at that site.

I understand that various people across government and the private sector and the NGO sector have been working with members of the APY Art Centre Collective to look for an alternative site. It would be fantastic to keep that facility going in Adelaide but they were not renting premises from the South Australian government; they were in the private rental market, and I understand that lease is coming to an end.

Dr CLOSE: Premier, I would like to turn to the future of Tauondi College. Obviously, it is not run by you, except as Premier, nor by your department, but what engagement have you had in the question of the future of Tauondi and funding and what is likely to happen to it?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have been very involved in this matter because Tauondi College has been operating in South Australia for an extended period of time. In recent years, though, it has not been providing very many hours in terms of providing that education in accordance with its objects. The state government has been working with Tauondi to transition to a new funding arrangement with the government. It is not funded from DPC; it is funded through the Department for Innovation and Skills (David Pisoni).

I would note that maybe years ago many Aboriginal people would want to go to Tauondi for their education. What we have seen in recent years under our government is a very significant increase in the number of Aboriginal trainees and apprentices commencing their contract of training—a very substantial increase in the double digits. We are very grateful for that, and I think we are at record levels at the moment in terms of hours in training, which is great. The problem is that most of that is not at Tauondi. Tauondi is offering, and in recent years has offered, a narrower and narrower number of courses as the private sector and TAFE have picked up a broader and broader number of Aboriginal courses.

Of course, we find Aboriginal people are very interested in getting qualifications in diverse areas, such as plumbing and construction and all these areas which (1) are not courses that are offered at Tauondi and (2) they are courses that are adequately provided. Some of them are through Aboriginal-controlled private training organisations. The numbers have gone up in the private sector, but the courses and the numbers have massively diminished.

Tauondi had previously been provided with what is commonly referred to as 'block funding'. This is just a sum of money irrespective of how many hours you teach. We have put Tauondi on notice for quite some time that this is unacceptable. We need to see a return for the taxpayers in terms of the outcomes for Aboriginal people. Our focus is on an increased number of training hours for Aboriginal people. Jobs outcomes and skills outcomes are what it is all about. Tauondi have not been able to deliver that.

We have looked to create some other opportunities for Tauondi to provide services to individual government departments. I have personally set up and chaired meetings to try to get individual chief executives to look at what they could potentially be using Tauondi for, and I think some progress has been made in this area. Tauondi have been on notice for a long period of time that the block funding they receive cannot continue into the future.

In addition to the block funding, they have had the use of the site at Port Adelaide and they have essentially had that on a very favourable arrangement in terms of the cost to them, not only in terms of the lease—which I think is just a peppercorn lease—but also in terms of the state government picking up the cost of depreciation and the cost of maintenance of that site. I note recently that the Australian Labor Party said that it is worth about \$4 million. They would give that to Tauondi. The problem with that is one most recent valuation is more than double that—not that that is the issue, but it is just the ongoing costs associated with managing a site like that.

Tauondi have the use of that site, not only at no cost to them but actually with the state taxpayer picking up a very large six-figure sum every year for the maintenance of it. If the Australian Labor Party's position is to transfer the asset to them, they would also have to put a fairly large operating budget in place to support Tauondi to manage that site, an important site for South Australia.

Dr CLOSE: What representations have you received from Aboriginal leaders and, in particular, leaders of the Tauondi organisation but, more broadly, community leaders about the future of Tauondi?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Obviously, I have met with their chair, various board members and their chief executive over an extended period of time. Peter Buckskin is one who has made various representations to me, so have Clinton Wanganeen as the director and Doug Milera as the chief executive. There have been extensive discussions with them and with Doug's team, including his finance chief executive.

We have not been without consultation, and I have had some representations from other people across the sector. At every one of those meetings, though, I have emphasised that the concept of just providing block funding without a very significant increase in the hours of training that are provided cannot continue into the future. It is not like this has come along without fairly extensive conversations since we came to government. I do not have the statistics in front of me, but the problem is that we are talking about a very small number of courses and a very large annual outlay for that site.

I am happy to provide further detail to the member, if she would like, that would really just show the comparison in cost per hour training provided there—even if you leave the site cost out of it—compared with the private sector operators like Carey Training, which have a huge number of Aboriginal trainees they are not only training but also have in full-time employment with their apprentice or traineeship provider.

It is a changed situation. We need to honour the history of Tauondi, which I think has played an extraordinarily important role in South Australia. As I have said, we want to help them transition to a new model, but the days of a large amount of block funding going forward are not something we will continue. Again, this is an area under the control of the Minister for Innovation and Skills but, that said, it is one I am particularly aware of and, hopefully, would like to find a solution to.

Dr CLOSE: I appreciate there will be questions for Minister Pisoni, but I am interested in your role having responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs and whether there has been any Aboriginal leadership, any elders in the Kaurna community in particular but across the state, who have endorsed your view that Tauondi should no longer receive block funding and should either sink or swim on the training per capita it is able to provide.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, as I was saying before, I think the vast amount of representations I have received are from people who are advocating for the continued block funding of Tauondi. However, as I point out to them, my responsibility to Aboriginal people in South Australia is to increase the skills their people are developing. That is not working with Tauondi. What we have seen are very rapidly declining enrolments at Tauondi.

What we have seen overall in South Australia, something my government is very proud of, is that at the moment we are showing a 10 per cent increase year on year of Aboriginal apprentices and trainees. That has to be the focus of the government: making sure we can put our resources into those programs that are delivering outcomes for Aboriginal people. That is just not the case with Tauondi. I wish it were different, but it is not.

I have encouraged the board and I have encouraged the chief executive to look at alternatives, but the member might like to take a look at the breadth of courses offered there at the moment. They are extraordinarily narrow. In fact, at one stage—and this is going back a year and a half ago—I think there were only one or two programs even being offered at Tauondi, so very few hours of training whatsoever.

Admittedly, it has been a tough period for vocational education training, but that is against a massive increase across the rest of the sector. South Australia had a 10 per cent increase in Aboriginal trainees and apprentices, a massive increase in the number of hours being provided—

Dr CLOSE: Chair, I am just finding this slightly repetitive. I do not recall the number for the point of order, but we have such little time. I am aware of the 10 per cent increase and so on—is it 98?

The CHAIR: Yes, I am sure the Premier is concluding his remarks.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am happy to move on, sorry.

Dr CLOSE: Thank you, Premier. My last question on the subject of Tauondi is whether the Premier has been informed, either by his minister or by Aboriginal leadership, that the college will close? If so, what is the time period before that occurs?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, I have not received information from the board with regard to that.

Dr CLOSE: I would like to turn to the question of remote Aboriginal housing. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 184, where there is a reference to remote Indigenous housing programs, although I think in South Australia we prefer the term 'Aboriginal'. My first question is: what is the rate of overcrowded housing in remote Aboriginal communities at present?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, I do not have that figure, but I am happy to take that on notice and come back to you.

Dr CLOSE: For Indigenous Community Housing, has the Productivity Commission reported that South Australia has had the highest rate of overcrowding in Australia every year since the election?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, I do not have that report in front of me, but again I am happy to have a look at that and come back to you.

Dr CLOSE: My next question relates to how much federal funding your government has been able to secure for remote housing. I note that, under the national partnerships for remote Indigenous housing during the Labor government, there was more than \$290 million in housing in remote communities. Is it possible for you to tell us what you have managed to secure since you have been Premier and the minister responsible?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that information at hand, but I am happy to follow it up. However, part of that negotiation the member refers to was the culmination and the conclusion of federal government funding for remote Indigenous housing. Since that deal was done by the former Labor government—which basically did increase the funding for a short period of time but then cut out and transferred all responsibility to the state government; I think it is important for people reading *Hansard* to understand that—there has been a further extension of federal government money into remote Aboriginal housing. I am happy to provide that information if the member is not familiar with that and provide it to her.

Dr CLOSE: Thank you, and if that could be translated into how many new houses might have been built or upgrades of existing, that would be useful. I would like to turn now to the Aboriginal Affairs Action Plan. It is in the same budget paper and volume, obviously. At page 23, there is a dot point under highlights that states:

- Implement actions from the current South Australian Aboriginal Action Plan [2019-20], and develop a new plan...

How many items in the 2019-20 Aboriginal Action Plan were initiatives that were started under the previous government?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Say it again, sorry? How many were started?

Dr CLOSE: How many of the items that were listed in the 2019-20 Aboriginal Action Plan were initiatives? What proportion of them—would be a useful way to explain it—were initiatives that were started under the previous Labor government?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that information, but I have always been happy to acknowledge that there are a range of projects and programs that the previous Labor government started that we are very happy to continue.

This has historically been an area where we have tried to work together. I know for a fact that one of the projects that was initiated under the previous Labor government was the student accommodation in the centre of the city, which I think responded to a need where many young people who had accommodation had members of their community come down and stay with them, which really distracted them from their study. Tika Tirka was an initiative of the previous government, and I acknowledged that when it was opened.

There would be a combination of issues and programs that always continue under a transition from one government to the next. The alternative is what some petty governments do—just terminate all of a previous government's work. I think in an area like Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation we need to be building on the successes and trying to work together to improve the outcomes and the lot of Aboriginal people in our state.

Dr CLOSE: There was a particular service, the Aboriginal Interpreter Service, that I understand was allocated money under the previous government. It was included in the 2019-20 action plan but is not yet operating; can you just explain why that is the case?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This is an area we have had some real issues with. We have been getting services from the Northern Territory, and in fact a couple of independent and non-South Australian government services. We have tried to look for ways in which we can increase the number of people with language skills in South Australia.

The current providers of Aboriginal language interpreting services in South Australia include the Northern Territory Aboriginal Interpreter Service and ABC Multilingua, which is a private provider, and a number of Aboriginal sole traders who are known to government agencies and the Illawarra Aboriginal Corporation.

Following consultations across government and with key Aboriginal stakeholders, a new model for Aboriginal languages and interpreting services is being developed. The proposed model involves the state government's Interpreting and Translating Centre. The ITC is offering an Aboriginal languages service. The ITC is located in the Department of Human Services under Michelle Lensink and Lois Boswell.

The ITC provides interpreting services in more than 110 languages and its expertise in delivering these services will benefit the development of the new Aboriginal languages interpretive service. The ITC is working closely with TAFE and key Aboriginal language stakeholders to significantly expand the number of Pitjantjatjara interpreters in South Australia. Providing an expanded pool of quality Aboriginal interpreters in South Australia is the highest priority of that particular project that sits there.

I think it goes without saying that we have been disappointed with the progress that has been made in this area. We still do have interpreting services that are being provided in South Australia, but it is fair to say that we would like to move ahead with that. There is still money obviously within the budget via DHS that is provided for that ongoing work.

Mr SZAKACS: Premier, in answers to questions from members of this place previously, you have indicated that matters regarding parliament's participation in NAIDOC Week and Reconciliation Week were a matter for the Speaker and the President of the Legislative Council. What formal representations or requests have you made as minister to joint presiding officers regarding the parliament's participation or contribution to both NAIDOC Week and Reconciliation Week?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have spoken to the Speaker on many occasions about Aboriginal representations in this parliament. Some of that goes back to previous Speakers as well.

I think this will be the first NAIDOC Week that we have commemorated in South Australia when we have had the Aboriginal and the Torres Strait Islander flags flying in our chamber. I think that is a major movement forward, just as it was when the parliament decided many years ago now to fly the Aboriginal flag aloft Parliament House and when this house decided to acknowledge country, first of all just on the first day of every sitting week and most recently—I do not know exactly when—every day the parliament sits here, though I cannot speak for the Legislative Council.

NAIDOC is an important commemoration. Of course, it started out as the national Aboriginal and Islander day of celebration. It is now more than a day—it is more than a week—and it was an important week this year when we celebrated the incredible contribution that Aboriginal people have made. I think that we should always look for ways to commemorate and acknowledge the great contribution that Aboriginal people make to South Australia.

One of the things that I was very keen to see with the redevelopment of the Balcony Room was that the very first hang in that space be one of Indigenous art. I have had so many very positive comments about how that looks and how it looks in our parliament. This is something that I am going to continue to champion.

Of course NAIDOC Week, Reconciliation Week and Sorry Day are all important commemorations, but it is important that all of us look for every opportunity to advance Aboriginal reconciliation. I was very pleased last year when our Commissioner for Aboriginal Engagement actually came onto the floor of our parliament to deliver his report. That is not something that had occurred before. We did it in South Australia without pomp, without ceremony and without a national press call telling people to look at what we are doing here in South Australia. We just did it as a natural course, a logical way of operating. It was great when Dr Roger Thomas delivered that report and I felt very proud.

The next phase for us is the establishment of the voice to our parliament, the voice to our government, which will in itself be another act of reconciliation. It will not be something that is incorporated into NAIDOC Week or Reconciliation Week; again, it will be a permanent position. We hope to introduce that legislation in the coming months.

Mr SZAKACS: Notwithstanding the fact that you made no formal representations to joint presiding officers, were you disappointed by the contribution and participation of the parliament during NAIDOC Week and Reconciliation Week this year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: On the contrary. I attended the lunch that was held for NAIDOC Week and I saw lots of representatives of the South Australian parliament. Do not forget that lots of things happen in this building and that we actually represent 47 electorates as members of the House of Assembly and the hardworking members of the Legislative Council represent the entire state. I do not think there would be a member in this place who was not aware of Reconciliation Week or various NAIDOC activities in their electorate.

For us here in South Australia, we have a very active committee, which is chaired by Joyleen Thomas. She keeps telling me she does not want to continue on with it into the future, but I have told her that I am going to talk her into it again. She did a great job. She has had a hardworking committee who worked on events.

We tried this year to have an opportunity to bring together the Premier's NAIDOC Awards with the community awards, which we did at the beginning of the week. This gave it a full week of celebration of those people who were given those awards, then the Adelaide City Council had its commemoration as well.

I am delighted by the increasing interest that all members in this place have of activities around Reconciliation Week and NAIDOC Week. Whilst the parliament has some role, I do not think the parliament was actually sitting during NAIDOC Week this year. Maybe if it were a sitting week it would be a slightly different situation but, as I said, there was very good interest across all members, across all parties and across upper house and lower house in the increasingly interesting and varied program that was put together for NAIDOC Week and Reconciliation Week.

Mr SZAKACS: I appreciate you may take this on notice, but will you come back to us with how many events you attended during NAIDOC Week this year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sure. I am always keen to talk about where I attend events with regard to this portfolio. It is a very important portfolio for me.

The CHAIR: Having reached the allotted time, I declare the examination of Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation to be complete. We will move next to Arts SA.

Membership:

Ms Hildyard substituted for Mr Malinauskas.

Departmental Advisers:

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

Ms D. Dixon, State Project Lead, Lot Fourteen, Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

The CHAIR: As we move into the arts portfolio, Premier, I see that we have had a slight change in advisers or shifting of the deck chairs.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I advise that Nerida Saunders and Ruth Ambler have left and we are now joined by Steven Woolhouse, who is the Executive Director, Communities and Corporate; and Diane Dixon, who is the State Project Lead for Lot Fourteen. I can also report to the committee that Jennifer Layther, known to many in the sector as J.Lay, who is the Director of Arts South Australia, will not be with us because she is in directed quarantine at the moment, or certainly in isolation anyway. So it is with regret that she will not join us today, but we will do our very best to answer all the questions that are put forward today.

The CHAIR: You do not wish to make any more of an opening statement?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No.

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, you are the lead for this. Do you wish to make a statement?

Ms HILDYARD: No, thank you, Mr Chair.

The CHAIR: You will go straight into questions. You have the call.

Ms HILDYARD: Firstly, I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 28, particularly to the decrease in total expenditure through the arts budget of approximately \$10 million from the 2019-20 budget to the 2021-22 budget, given the 2020-21 Arts Recovery Fund line item. Premier, from where specifically will the \$10 million cut be made?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I thank the member for her question, although I do not thank her for her characterisation of it as a cut because, as she would be aware, there was a specific increase in the previous year of \$10.2 million, which was really to support artists and more broadly the arts sector in South Australia flowing on from COVID-19. This was a sector that was disproportionately hit and it was a sector that we wanted to get out and support as quickly as possible.

We consulted the sector very carefully and thoroughly with regard to the types of programs that they wanted to see supported by the state government and we reflected those in the Arts Recovery Fund. They were a combination of small grants that got out as quickly as possible as well as some larger collaborative grants that developed product and practice right through what was a very difficult year, particularly for our performing artists but also for our visual artists and our other artists here in South Australia. That has been a focus of the Arts Recovery Fund. I would not characterise it as a cut. I would characterise last year as a one-off increase in response to COVID-19.

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you, Premier, and I do appreciate and understand the \$10.2 million injection into the Arts Recovery Fund in the last financial year. What I would like an answer to is why in 2019-20 there were total expenses of \$148,000, as per the budget line item, and then of course that same line item is increased, as per the dot point, to allow for the injection of funds through the

Arts Recovery Fund; however, in this year's budget, it does not revert to the 2019-20 total expenses but, rather, there is a decrease of around \$10 million from those 2019-20 figures. I am interested in the reduction from 2019-20 to the current projected figure in this budget.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that this reconciliation is provided for the member on page 28 under those dot points, which really do outline what those additional funding lines were for the 2020-21 budget. The Arts Recovery Fund, which I have spoken about at length, is \$10.2 million. There was a further one-off amount for regional theatre upgrades, which was \$2.3 million. There was funding to the Art Gallery of South Australia from BHP Billiton for Tarnanthi, which came through the state government, of \$1.9 million, and there was support for the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust while their car park was closed to offset the income they received for that.

The \$10.2 million is the area that people often look to because that is the money that went specifically to artists, but the overall uplift in the previous budget was closer to \$20 million when you add it all up—certainly \$16 million or so.

Again, there is some lumpiness with regard to the arts budget because it is an area where from time to time there have to be some larger payments. Some of those come to an end after a period of time, some of them are just one-off and some of them have a diminishing amount over a period of time. It is also an area of government where from time to time there are amounts of money that are pushed into this sector, and that can again create some lumpiness with comparison year on year.

Ms HILDYARD: Again to the same budget paper, the same page and the same area, what is the budget for expenditure through the state Arts Organisations grant program, the main avenue for government to fund small and medium organisations through Arts SA?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Just the first part again?

Ms HILDYARD: Specifically, what is the budget for expenditure to the state Arts Organisations grant program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: You are asking what the annual grants program money is?

Ms HILDYARD: No, specifically for the state Arts Organisations grant program—within the expenditure line item, how much? What is the budget specifically for expenditure on the state Arts Organisations grant program? I ask this because it is the main avenue for government to fund small and medium-sized arts organisations. That is what I want to understand.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I cannot listen to both of you at the same time. You have asked your question.

Ms HILDYARD: I am trying to clarify.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is probably better, without Jen Layther here, to take that question on notice. There is some complexity to that, but I am very happy to provide it.

Ms HILDYARD: If you are to take that on notice, could you please perhaps also take on notice whether there is any plan to expand or increase funding in that particular program, the program that is directed to the small and medium-sized arts organisations. What is it currently and is there a plan to increase it?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is certainly an important part of our sector. When we came to government, the very first thing we did in this portfolio was to put an additional million dollars into those grassroots organisations in South Australia. We felt that this was an area that was neglected by the previous government. There was money going into the arts portfolio under the previous government—in fact, quite a lot in just the last year of the previous government; there seemed to be a spike just before the election. It was not really directed to the grassroots of the sector, so in our first year we made an extra million dollars available, and that has continued.

With regard to your specific question, I am happy to follow that up. This is an area of real focus for our government. We have some great small and medium organisations in South Australia. We have some great larger organisations, some great institutions in South Australia, but you are not going to have the whole ecosystem filled out if it becomes lopsided, so a major focus for us has been on that SME sector, and that has flowed through with that additional million dollars in grants.

As part of our overall COVID recovery plan, that was very much weighted towards those SME and sole practitioners we wanted to get money out to. Also, the money that went to the larger organisations, we made that almost completely dependent upon their working in collaboration with other artists here in South Australia. As I said, that has been a request that has come from the industry and one that we are happy to take up.

Ms HILDYARD: On the same budget paper, same page and specifically the first dot point in relation to the Arts Recovery Fund, given the difficulties the arts and events sector currently faces, will you commit to funding another specific Arts Recovery Fund for this financial year and beyond, as the arts sector is calling for?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We are always looking at ways to support the arts sector. We do have some good grants programs in South Australia. They are all peer assessed. We know that the arts sector in South Australia has been through an extraordinarily difficult time. We also know that we are looking for ways to work with South Australian artists on the development of new products. Some of that is product that we want to work across multiple different portfolios in government, in particular with a greater focus on tourism and the arts sector working together to create more opportunities for sustainable long-term employment.

We will look to the future for supporting those sectors that are disproportionately affected by COVID. Arts is certainly one of them, but there are other sectors. I do not have anything specific to address today or to announce today. Obviously, only last week we announced our business support grants, which went out to both small businesses and sole proprietors. It is quite different from our first round of COVID cash grants which really only went to businesses that had a wages bill up to \$4 million. This goes up to \$10 million.

Also, in our first rounds last year, we did not include sole proprietors and we have in this round. That is also coupled with a program that we are jointly running with the federal government for microbusinesses that might not have a payroll of up to \$75,000 per year. Where eligible and people can demonstrate that there has been a loss of more than 30 per cent in their revenue for the last week, we are working with the government to provide a statewide wages offset of \$600 for those people who have lost between more than 20 hours for last week and for those who are between eight and 19 hours getting a subsidy of \$375.

In metropolitan Adelaide and Gawler and the Adelaide Hills, that is paid for by the federal government. In the rest of South Australia, that is paid for by the state government. It is administered by the federal government, so it is the same application process, but ultimately they will make the payment but we will carry the can because they will send us a bill a bit later.

But, as I said, in addition to that, we are always looking for ways to support our sector. It has been a particularly difficult time. The very best thing that we can do to support our sector, though, is to get people back attending theatre, attending galleries and commissioning works. That is a major focus for our government.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, as the arts sector is calling for, how have you directly advocated for a lowering of the \$75,000 threshold for commonwealth assistance for sole traders and microbusinesses to enable more artists to access the support you just outlined?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think I just answered that in the previous answer, but I am happy to go through it again. That program you are talking about is a state government program for sole proprietors. People would have to demonstrate that they had lost more than 30 per cent of their income from last week.

If they do turn over less than \$75,000 per year, they would be available to apply as a microbusiness to the federal government-administered program which would be paid for by either the federal government or the state government. But let's be clear. That is a program which predisposes that people lost more than 30 per cent of their income for last week. It is not a general support package. It is a support package which relates to people who can demonstrate that they lost money.

The most important things we can be doing is getting our economy back to where it should be and providing as many employment opportunities as possible, administering the grants programs

that we have, getting Illuminate Adelaide back up and running, introducing new events with the money from the Adelaide 500 which will support artists in the arts sector in South Australia and having the arts sector working with SATC in South Australia and our Department of Primary Industries and Regions in South Australia. There are a large number of things we are doing across government to support artists during this particularly difficult time.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, will there be any additional payment or support mechanisms for artists beyond that general disaster payment for the week of lockdown?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Again, I have answered that, not in the last question but in the question before that, when I said that is something we are considering. We always want to support those areas which are disproportionately hit and, as I answered two questions ago, the arts sector is one of those sectors which is disproportionately hit.

We had a seven-day lockdown and we know that people took a hit, especially those people who were associated with Illuminate Adelaide, and that is why our primary focus is to get that up and running as quickly as possible. The Treasurer has already done media today saying that we will look at these opportunities, but we do not have anything to announce immediately here, as it turns out, at this estimates committee.

Ms HILDYARD: The New South Wales government have announced that they are funding a microbusiness support program for artists, particularly for microbusinesses that earn less than \$75,000. Will you commit to a similar program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Again, I do not know whether you have been paying attention but, as it turns out, New South Wales will be in a minimum of eight weeks lockdown. We had one week in South Australia. If people can demonstrate that they have had that loss of more than 30 per cent, there are two avenues available to them whether or not they turn over more than \$75,000 or less than \$75,000 in terms of revenue into their organisation. As I have also said a couple of times now, we are looking at those opportunities, but South Australia finds itself in a different position from that of New South Wales, and we have to be careful of comparing apples to oranges in these circumstances.

The arts sector in New South Wales has been devastated, with very frightening scenes there after already more than four weeks of lockdown and today an announcement of a further four weeks of lockdown. We have not had that situation in South Australia. In fact, the full Adelaide Festival program was delivered, the full program with regard to the Adelaide Fringe was delivered, the full Adelaide Cabaret Festival was delivered.

There have been some interruptions in the last week, most notably the Adelaide Guitar Festival, which was doing extraordinarily well when it was interrupted. We have also had an interruption to Illuminate Adelaide, and numerous other individual concerts and events have of course had to be postponed or completely cancelled because some of those involved artists from interstate are just simply not able to come into South Australia at the moment.

We will look at all of that situation. We are only coming out of the lockdown today. We have committed to looking at it. We have a good working relationship with the arts sector in South Australia. I think we have built goodwill with them with our response to the COVID-19 recovery package last year, which did specifically focus on a lot of those grants, and we will continue to do that in the future.

Ms HILDYARD: How many sole traders are there in the arts sector in South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, I do not have that information, but it is quite possible that the Arts Industry Council of South Australia does gather that information. I am happy to make an inquiry and get back to you.

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you. Premier, can you tell me what the future of the Live Music Venues Grant Program is?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: My understanding is that the Live Music Venues Grant Program is administered through the Department for Innovation and Skills not through Arts SA, but I am happy to make a specific inquiry and come back to you.

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you. Turning to page 27, and specifically the final dot point under the subtitle Targets 2021-22, a target of your department is to create employment for professional practising artists. What are you doing to support the employment of those professionals who enable artists to do their work—for example, set, costume designers, etc.?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: A range of programs are offered in South Australia within various areas. If the member wants to outline which one she was specifically interested in, I am happy to make inquiries. Obviously Adelaide TAFE has a range of programs which are offered. Some of those are specific to the arts sector, but some of them are more general in nature. Many people find their way into the arts sector directly, some through a more circuitous route with other skills they acquire and then end up in the arts sector. If there is an area you are particularly interested in, I am more than happy to make some inquiries and come back to you.

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you. How will closing the Adelaide Festival Centre scenery workshop support the creation of employment for professional South Australian artists?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Again, that is an area which I am happy to get some information on. I am not aware that the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust has made a decision with regard to that, but I am happy to make an inquiry with regard to that.

There was some talk, about four or five years ago I remember, of having some consolidation between various entities in South Australia. I cannot remember offhand who they were. I think it might have been—and I am guessing a little bit here—the State Theatre Company, the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust and potentially the South Australian Film Corporation, but I do not have any update to provide today. However, I am more than happy to make an inquiry and come back to you.

Ms HILDYARD: I had several questions in relation to the closure of the Adelaide Festival Centre Scenery Workshop, so perhaps I can ask those for you to take on notice also.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, I am happy to take any questions that you have on notice.

Ms HILDYARD: The Adelaide Festival Centre Scenery Workshop is the country's leading commercial set builder, so it would be good to understand why it is being closed. The workshop handles 65 per cent of all theatrical scenery work in Australia. Will this work now be moved interstate or overseas? Given that many of the workshop staff are employed on a casual basis, what support will your government provide to these workers both prior to and following the workshop closure? What exactly is the redundancy package, and what is the quantum of the total fund for redundancies that are being offered to employees?

The Adelaide Festival Centre has suggested that a downturn in business is to blame for closing the workshop. Why is your government not supporting these workers and industry leaders through the recovery? Many of the current workshop employees are working up to 60 hours per week building the set for *Moulin Rouge! The Musical*. Would you consider that a downturn in business? If the scenery workshop not returning a profit is justification for its closure, why then privatise or outsource BASS, which does return a profit to the Adelaide Festival Centre? What additional Adelaide Festival Centre services or resources are at risk of being cut? They are all the questions. I do not know if there are any that you want to take now.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Obviously, the announcement by the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust on the BASS ticketing system is public. I read the press release yesterday and have a reasonably good knowledge of that. As you would be aware, the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust is a statutory authority. It is independent of the government. It has an independent chair and independent board of directors. I get to appoint one or two members. In fact, they are Governor's appointments, but ultimately it is a separate, standalone statutory authority. They have formed the opinion that the ongoing costs associated with the massive capital requirement to bring the BASS ticketing up to spec was not a good investment for the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust.

It has been a very good ticketing system for South Australia. It was originally started back in 1977, but the rest of the world has caught up and overtaken the system, and there are very good national and global platforms that we can tap into at a much reduced cost without the ongoing capital requirement to upgrade that system. So we are at that point of having to spend a very large seven

or eight-figure sum, I think, to upgrade that ticketing system, and it just did not represent a good return on investment.

Also, I know that one of the elements of the art and culture sectors' plan, which we are working through at the moment, was looking at whether or not there should be a more up-to-date ticketing platform offered. They have made their analysis. We were not involved in that decision. Obviously, I do not come from an arts administration background, but that analysis was done by the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust.

I was kept informed about that decision. I met from time to time with the chair of the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. The chief executive would keep me up to date with that process. They formed the opinion that it was time to move over to a new platform. My understanding is that all the existing full-time employees, public servants in South Australia, will be offered ongoing employment. They may choose to take that, they may choose not to take that and they might stay in the South Australian Public Service. That is something that would be for them to decide.

Ms HILDYARD: Just to be clear, has nobody notified you of the Adelaide Festival Centre Scenery Workshop closure?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have just spoken with Steven Woolhouse and, again, it is unfortunate that Jen Layther is not here today. As I said, I do recall some discussion about it, but I thought that was several years ago with regard to a combination of different workshops. However, I am happy to take that on notice and come back to you.

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you. The opposition is aware of a Liberal Party fundraiser to be held on 24 August at Her Majesty's Theatre, with the event being billed as a special event with you that will include a tour and 'a peek behind the curtain by taking the same walk artists will through the back of house'. Is the Liberal Party paying full price to hire Her Majesty's Theatre for that fundraising event?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Obviously I am not personally organising that event. I am sure political parties from time to time hire venues that are not their own, and that they pay for that on a commercial basis. I know that the Australian Labor Party holds events at various establishments across the city and I am quite sure they would have held them in government-owned facilities in the past but, like the Liberal Party, they would have paid for that facility. However, I am happy to make a specific inquiry with regard to that event. I was not aware of it.

Ms HILDYARD: Can anyone hire Her Majesty's Theatre for a political fundraiser that would include that back of house tour?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That would be a matter for the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. I do not know who they hire out to. I have seen plenty of people hire it out; I have been to many events there since that fantastic refurbishment has been completed. It is quite an extraordinary addition to the theatre spaces in Australia, and we are very fortunate to have it here in South Australia.

Ms HILDYARD: Are you aware of whether a hire agreement has been signed for the event?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No.

Ms HILDYARD: Moving back to BASS, given the department's stated objective of ensuring the state capitalises on the artistic, cultural and economic opportunities arising from our arts sector, why has your government privatised the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust's ticketing agency, BASS?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think I have already given a comprehensive answer. Was there a part of that you would particularly like to go over again?

Ms HILDYARD: A spokesperson for your government has said that privatising BASS was all about finding the best ticket price for South Australians. Can you guarantee that the new private company will deliver the best ticket prices?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: When you say 'a spokesperson' for our government, who made that comment?

Ms HILDYARD: It was in the media and it was named as a spokesperson.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am just not familiar with that.

Ms HILDYARD: How will you guarantee that the best ticket price will be delivered? Is it part of the agreement with Ticketek?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Again, I have provided quite a comprehensive detailed overview of what I know about that. The Adelaide Festival Centre Trust is an independent statutory authority, and they have formed that opinion. They have given their reasons for that in the media.

I am happy to provide further information, but I would need to find out the exact details of that. It is not a contract I signed, and it is not a contract I perused prior to it being signed by the AFCT. I think that would have been inappropriate. However, for the reasons I have already outlined, it was seen as a far better outcome for the AFCT and patrons in South Australia to move over to the new platform.

Ms HILDYARD: Will the new provider have access to the BASS customer database?

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

Ms HILDYARD: Are you able take that on notice?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sure.

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you. Has every BASS worker secured ongoing employment with the new private provider?

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

Ms HILDYARD: What does being a 'pool worker' with Ticketek mean? Will it mean that a particular worker has access to the same hours, the same conditions, the same pay?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that information, but people will be given a choice. If they are permanent employees of the Public Service they have protections under that arrangement. They may choose to move over to the new employers; that would be a decision for them. Of course, if they do not they will stay with the South Australian Public Service.

Ms HILDYARD: Are the wages and conditions at the new private provider commensurate with the wages and conditions at BASS?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Again, that would not be something I would be privy to. It would be something that would be offered to people who are within that area at the moment. Those permanent South Australian public servants would have to form their own opinion as to whether it was in their best interests to stay with the South Australian Public Service or move over to the new entity.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, are you aware that all BASS ticket sale profits were directly reinvested into supporting cultural and community projects through the Adelaide Festival Centre?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What I do know is that a very, very large sum of money was required to bring that ticketing system up to spec commensurate with programs and platforms that are just commonplace. One of the other big advantages of moving over to a national platform is the ability to reach interstate and potentially international audiences that are already on its database. This is an area of great focus for us.

As I outlined in previous evidence to this committee, we are looking to bring as many people from interstate and overseas as possible—when we are permitted—and so we are very keen to promote our shows here in South Australia, and I think we will get a much better chance to do that with a much larger platform, like Ticketek, rather than the BASS, which was a South Australian product. As I said, in its time it was a very good product, but these platforms now are commonplace. They are much larger, and the ongoing cost of upgrading the environment just did not make sense to the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, so they formed that opinion and have taken this action.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, can you guarantee that ticket sale profits will continue to be reinvested into the Adelaide Festival Centre's cultural and community projects?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What I can say is that this is a decision of the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. I presume they have made it in their own best financial interests, which will only be spent on their programs. They do not return money to the state government. We invest in them, so any advantage that they gain through this will of course be reinvested into their programs. We are not seeking in any way, shape or form to take a dividend from this transaction into Treasury.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, as you would be aware many South Australians, especially elderly South Australians and South Australians living with a disability rely on the face-to-face service provided at BASS at the Festival Centre. Can you guarantee that the new provider will maintain that necessary service?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am happy to take that question on notice. As I have said several times now, the AFCT is an independent statutory authority. They run that organisation. They are privy to all of the details of that contract. Any questions that you have, we are happy to take on notice and put them to the AFCT.

Ms HILDYARD: One more that might be good to take on notice is how South Australians without internet access will be able to access tickets and, in doing so, access the arts.

Again, I refer to page 27, but particularly in relation to the Aboriginal Art and Cultures Centre at Lot Fourteen. Premier, when exactly will construction of the new Aboriginal Art and Cultures Centre at Lot Fourteen commence, noting that 'later in 2021' has previously been stated?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am still hopeful that we will begin the site works this year. There is still very considerable remediation occurring on that site. It is a changing landscape for the CBD. It was a functioning hospital only three or four years ago, and there has been a very extensive demolition and remediation of that site.

We have used that time to consult widely with regard to the development of the Aboriginal Art and Cultures Centre. That is a really important—and I think ultimately globally significant—piece of art and culture infrastructure and we want to get it right. We have stated from day one that this is not a project that we want to rush. That said, the money is in the budget so everybody can be assured that this is a project which the government is committed to.

From opposition I think we committed to \$150 million going into this project. Not in this year's budget but in last year's budget that increased to \$200 million, so a further \$50 million going into that project to make sure that we deliver something that is absolutely fantastic.

In answer to your question, I am hopeful that the site works will begin by the end of this calendar year, and then, of course, we will continue construction through 2022-23, and ultimately with completion towards the end of 2024. There is then a commissioning process. We are hopeful that this new Aboriginal Art and Cultures Centre will be open to the public in early 2025.

Ms HILDYARD: Is the business case detailing final costs, as was promised in your 2020-21 budget, now complete and publicly available?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think we are still working through some of the final details with regard to the design, but nothing we have seen so far would demonstrate to us that we have not provided the right capital budget. Of course, we are still working through all the finer details with regard to the ongoing operational budget. This is going to be a very large centre, I think in the order of 12,000 square metres. To put that into perspective, it is about the size of the Art Gallery and the Museum added together in terms of that floor space, so it is going to be a very significant undertaking by the state government.

We have a very important responsibility to preserve and, where appropriate, exhibit and share the stories and songlines of Australia's oldest civilisation. If you like, the project that works in concert with this new Aboriginal Art and Cultures Centre is the new storage facility. Again, not in this budget but in the budget before, we committed in the order of \$86½ million to the establishment of a really state-of-the-art, purpose-built storage facility, a facility the arts sector in South Australia have been requesting for a very long period of time. Their requests fell on deaf ears for a long period of time when other projects were preferred.

We have by contrast listened to the sector, who said, 'We've got some incredible collections, priceless collections, in South Australia, much of them held on behalf of benefactors and communities. We've got a moral obligation to make sure that those collections are housed in an appropriate way,' so last year's budget provided \$86½ million to establish that. My understanding is that there has been significant development, and I am hoping that will be a project that will be delivered and be in place for a very long period of time.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, are the enabling works completed?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: For the Aboriginal Art and Cultures Centre?

Ms HILDYARD: Yes.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The enabling works? What are you referring to specifically?

Ms HILDYARD: That is a term straight from your paper about the construction and development of the centre.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The site works I referred to earlier or—

Ms HILDYARD: No, in your paper about the Aboriginal Art and Cultures Centre you refer to 'enabling works'.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying a couple of questions ago, that refers to the issue that we have with a very significant site demolition occurring at the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site, as well as the remediation of that site and the site preparation. It is not as though we have been given a greenfield site where we can just start. There is a huge amount of work.

Anybody who has driven along North Terrace is becoming increasingly excited about what is happening at Lot Fourteen. The previous government decided to sell it off for 1,300 apartments to a private land developer. Of course, we stopped that transaction and we have secured that seven-hectare site for a range of activities. The one I am most excited about, of course, is the Aboriginal Art and Cultures Centre, which I think will really complement the other work on Lot Fourteen with regard to some pretty exciting emerging future industries in our state.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, has the Aboriginal Economic Participation Strategy in relation to the centre been developed and implemented?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is a project of the federal government, rather than a project of the state government. It does form part of the City Deal we have with the federal government. I am just trying to remember off the top of my head the amount of money that has been put into that. I think it is in the order of \$3 million or \$3½ million. I visited there recently. I am not sure whether it has opened yet, but I am pretty excited about this opportunity. We were hoping that this would have been opened last year.

Let me just check if it has been opened yet. I am advised that this is going to open in August and that a site has been secured in the Eleanor Harrald Building. This is going to be a great project, and 50 businesses have already registered to be involved.

This is an area within the Lot Fourteen precinct that is going to promote Aboriginal startups and scale-ups. It is going to be an area that is a co-working space, an area where different startups can come to meet. There is a yarnning circle there. There are rooms that people can use for video conferences that they might not have themselves. There is also a range of programs. This is all part of the City Deal program that has been negotiated between the state government and the federal government subsequent to our government being elected in March 2018.

Ms HILDYARD: Exactly what financial support is currently being provided to the governance group overseeing the progress of the Aboriginal Art and Cultures Centre development?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will take that question on notice. I am very grateful for the work that goes into providing that advice to us in government. Our ambassador for that is David Rathman AM, who has a great background as a senior public servant in South Australia. I first met him in his role on the South Australian Museum Board. In fact, he invited me to go down and have a look at their storage facility at Netley.

He spoke to me passionately about the need for a new storage facility, so that has now been agreed to from a budget perspective. He also spoke to me about the repatriation of Aboriginal remains that needed to be dealt with. That is another program the state government has put into action since we came to government. There is still a huge amount of work to do, but he is supported by other people on that Aboriginal reference group and governance group. I will provide further details on the financial support for that group in an answer to a question on notice.

Ms HILDYARD: What is the total quantum of funding being made available to public libraries in South Australia, and can you explain whether there is an overall reduction?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: My understanding was that the money they were previously receiving has been rolled over for a further three years. Whilst there has not been an increase in the funding, my understanding is that that funding level has been kept. I am advised that I made an announcement in the budget that the line for the State Library would be maintained and that they would enter into an agreement with the local government sector.

Ms HILDYARD: Can you confirm whether the funding for council libraries will be annually indexed?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, I think my statements on this have been reasonably clear, and that is that, whilst we will not be cutting back their money, there will not be further indexation going forward. We are looking for some budget savings across the overall budget in South Australia. The library service in South Australia has been supported I think very significantly by the state government over many years, but the lion's share of all the money into our public libraries comes from the local government sector.

I might have the numbers slightly wrong, but I think the total amount of funding going into libraries in South Australia is in the order of \$100 million, of which about \$20 million is provided by the state government. That money will continue but it will not be indexed, but the vast majority of all the money to public libraries in South Australia comes from the local government sector itself.

Ms HILDYARD: Will there be an overall reduction in funding when that lack of indexation is taken into account?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not really know what you mean by that question. As I said, the quantum of the money continues. There is no further indexation that is envisaged, but people came to me and said they were very concerned. They recognised that local government makes up the vast majority of the funding for this. Relatively, the state government provides a smaller proportion, about 20 per cent, of all the funding that goes into public libraries.

We have our own library services that we need to provide in South Australia, and I have to say that in South Australia the relationship between the local government-controlled public libraries and the State Library is a very close one. There is a good working relationship between the two. Certainly, from our perspective, people said they wanted to see that funding maintained. Of course, they would also like to have seen it grown. I get lots of representations in my office on a daily basis from areas that require further investment in South Australia. Unfortunately, we cannot agree to all of them.

Our budget is under enormous pressure at the moment. We are in a deficit situation. The Leader of the Opposition has been in here castigating me today with regard to debt levels in South Australia. We do not want to do anything that is going to put further pressure on that, and I think he would agree. Our public libraries are extraordinarily important in South Australia, and that is why we have asked the State Library to agree to ongoing funding at the same level they are at at the moment.

Ms HILDYARD: So, Premier, what was the rationale for your decision not to annually index funding support to South Australian libraries?

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

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, given it is estimated that that lack of indexation will result in an approximately \$4 million loss in funding, what jobs and services do you anticipate will be lost from libraries?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What indexation rate were you working on?

Ms HILDYARD: Can you answer the question, please?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, I just do not know how you get to \$4 million. That would be quite an extraordinary indexation rate.

Ms HILDYARD: What do you estimate the overall reduction would be from the failure to continue to provide indexation?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It would be a function of what the increased costs associated with running libraries would be. I do not think there is a specific libraries indexation rate, but we are not cutting funding; we are maintaining funding. I do not know how you would possibly get to that figure.

Ms HILDYARD: It is the impact of a lack of indexation over the four-year forward estimates. Can you guarantee that no jobs or services will be lost from libraries as a result of that lack of indexation?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not know how you get to \$4 million over four years on a \$20 million budget. That would be an indexation rate of something like 5 per cent in the first year. If that is what the Labor Party thinks the indexation rate should be, goodness gracious. I do not know where you would get that from. If we look at the inflation rate at the moment, you are talking about an indexation rate that is three, four or five times what the inflation rate is at the moment. I do not know how you arrived at that.

Ms HILDYARD: Can you guarantee that no jobs or services will be lost from libraries as a result of the discontinuation by your government of indexation to library funding?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not know how many times I can say it: we are maintaining that funding. I think it is generous funding, given the circumstances we are in at the moment. We were asked to maintain the funding. We have maintained the funding. I fully appreciate that there are plenty of people who want us to increase funding. There is no shortage of people who come to me on a daily basis—Mr Woolhouse knows this only too well—asking for increased funding. We have a responsibility to work back towards a balanced budget.

We have been backed by the independent ratings agencies, who think that we have taken a fiscally responsible course to provide stimulus and support that is time limited and commensurate with the situation we face but does not burden successive budgets. We have done that. We have massively increased the rating we get from the independent umpires, both Standard and Poor's and Moody's, who have basically moved us from being the lowest ranked state in Australia to equal top, so we are very pleased with that. That does not happen without some fiscal discipline. We are very happy to maintain this level of funding going forward for our public libraries.

Ms HILDYARD: Can you confirm whether the funding for council libraries will be indexed annually going forward?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I just refer you to all of my previous answers. I am very sorry that I was boring you and you fell asleep during most of that.

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, there is just five minutes to go. It is up to you whether you want to pursue this line of questioning, but the opportunity is there for another five minutes.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, can you guarantee that no jobs or services will be lost from libraries as a result of your government's discontinuation of indexation?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have outlined at length to this estimates committee in the evidence that I have provided that we in fact provide a very small proportion of overall public library funding.

Ms HILDYARD: I understand.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We provide approximately 20 per cent of the funding and 80 per cent is provided by the local government sector themselves, so how can I possibly provide a guarantee regarding the overall funding envelope for public libraries in South Australia when we

make up a small part? What I can confirm to this committee is that we will be continuing the funding that we have historically provided. It will not be indexed, but we will be providing that amount.

Ultimately, the local government sector will have to respond with what their funding envelope is going to be. I presume that there is going to be quite a variance. There will be some councils that will say, 'You know what? We are going to invest more money in public libraries.' There will be some councils that will say, 'We don't see this as a priority for our communities.' That is the great thing about having local government: they make decisions in the best interests of their constituents.

What I can say is that we have been very generous with the local government sector in South Australia with our COVID response. In fact, we have had very good feedback from the local government sector in the way that we have poured, I think, \$106 million into the local government sector for a range of projects, and some of them are very grateful. They were never, ever counting on that 50 per cent subsidy for those projects.

We have been able to very significantly relieve the budgets of a great number of councils. In fact, every single council that submitted an application as part of that project—and some of them actually presented and submitted many applications—got a grant via that project and that added up to \$106 million, which will be sitting in the local government sector's bank account.

We work very cooperatively with the local government sector and we will continue to work very cooperatively with the local government sector. It is a very important area of government in this state and in this nation.

Ms HILDYARD: Premier, will you commit to funding a library-led digital strategy?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will speak with Geoff Stempel about that. Certainly the member raises a very good point because digital literacy and the digital economy are areas which are going to become more and more important in South Australia. Our library services, I think, are evolving. Years ago, people would go in and borrow a book and take it away for two, four or six weeks. Some people took them away and never brought them back—I was not one of them.

Now, increasingly, people are going into public libraries to work, to reference digital assets while they are in there, to access the internet and to often get other services online. I think the member raises a good point. This is an area that we are very focused on. It is an area that is included within DPC to have a much greater area of digital communication with our citizens in South Australia. It is an area that we take really seriously. It is an area that the new chief executive, Nick Reade, is working on at the moment and it is an area which the state budget provided further money for.

With regard to the library digital strategy, I am very sure that this is something which Geoff Stempel, the Director of the State Library, and his excellent team are very much considering and I will get a briefing from him. I planned to get to the State Library every three months and then this thing called COVID came along. I have to say every visit that I have had since I have been the minister responsible for this area has been very enjoyable and I really want to commend and thank the people who work in the State Library in South Australia; it is a great South Australian institution.

Ms HILDYARD: With reference to the process and criteria, could you please explain why the Hopgood Theatre was not selected to be the recipient of some of the \$2.3 million of funding to Country Arts SA in the 2020-21 budget for upgrades to regional theatres and when will the Hopgood Theatre's ongoing funding be restored and funding for improvements be committed and expended?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will take that question on notice and speak to Country Arts SA. I think they do an excellent job. You would have noticed in the last financial year that we committed a further \$2.3 million to upgrading the theatres that we are responsible for in country SA. I think the Hopgood Theatre is a very important institution in South Australia. For some reason, I seem to recall that it is not an asset of Country Arts SA but it is a TAFE asset, so it is not on the balance sheet of Country Arts SA. I am happy to still get Arts SA to do some work on that for me and come back to the member.

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

Sitting suspended from 16:30 to 16:45.

Membership:

Mr Boyer substituted for Mr Szakacs.

Mr Piccolo substituted for Dr Close.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr R. Price, Chief Executive, Defence SA.

Ms C. Walsh, Director, Veterans SA.

Mr P. Murdock, Manager, Finance, Defence SA.

The CHAIR: For the next half an hour, we will be investigating the Veterans SA budget lines. Premier, you have new advisers.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Indeed, I do. I would like to introduce and welcome back to this committee Richard Price, who is the Chief Executive of Defence SA, and also Catherine Walsh, who is the Director of Veterans SA, and welcome back Peter Murdock, who is the Manager, Finance, for Defence SA, which incorporates the work of Veterans SA.

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

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

The CHAIR: Do you wish to make an opening statement, member for Wright? If not, I invite questions.

Mr BOYER: Premier, if I could take you to Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, page 164, the program summary. In the supplies and services line for 2020-21, there was a budget of \$431,000 but in 2021-22 the budget is \$140,000—a drop of about \$290,000. Could you explain why the difference?

The CHAIR: I would like to remind committee members that, in relation to masks, I advised the committee earlier this morning that we should be wearing them, other than when we are asking a question or speaking.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We do not have that information here. We are happy to take that question on notice and come back as quickly as possible.

Mr BOYER: Same budget line: is that not due to possibly the abandonment of the veterans employment program, which I believe was announced in estimates last year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We do not think it would be that. Rather than guessing, we will come back with an accurate answer as quickly as possible.

Mr BOYER: On page 163 of Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, in reference to the veterans employment program, which I understand is not running anymore, what has been put there in place of that program in terms of helping veterans to find employment?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: One of the things that we have done recently is to launch the mentoring program. This was a program that partially offset the commitment that we made to getting more veterans transitioning from the Australian Defence Force into the defence industry. This program identifies a number of mentors and a number of mentees who will work on specific programs. The launch was recently held at the Adelaide Zoo after a workshop had been held between the mentors and the mentees, and that will be a facilitated program. This is a pilot and we are hoping to further expand that once we see the results of the first round.

This is a program which will help to provide some support for the mentees. It will also provide an opportunity for mentees to promote the opportunity for veterans' employment here in South Australia. This is an area that we are very focused on at the moment. I am very pleased with the number of organisations—some of them very significantly large organisations in South Australia—

that want to provide mentors for this program, and I want to thank all those mentors for coming forward.

At the launch, I specifically spoke about the opportunity for more veterans' employment in South Australia and the ability for those large firms to think about taking on more veterans as they leave the Australian Defence Force, and for some who have left for some time, to re-enter the workforce.

Mr BOYER: On the same budget line and in reference to that pilot program, how many mentees are there or how many veterans are involved in the pilot?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think there are 20 mentees and 20 mentors, but I must say I was overwhelmed by the number of applications of mentors for those roles. I am advised that the budget for this program is \$700,000 over a four-year program. That was the original budget that was provided so some of that will be expended on this project, but then obviously at the end of this project we will look at how we might continue to roll out that opportunity to support our veterans into the future.

Mr BOYER: Premier, on the same budget line and the same program again, have all 20 mentee positions been filled as well as the 20 mentor positions?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is my understanding, yes.

Mr BOYER: On the same page and same budget line again, now that the veterans employment program has ceased—and I think what you are saying is that it has been replaced by this pilot—how much of the money that was going to be spent on the veterans employment program has been shifted across to this pilot program instead?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that full answer for you today because originally the budget was \$700,000. There is some money put into this pilot program and we need to evaluate this pilot program. But as I provided in terms of evidence to this committee earlier today, there are other programs that we are looking at to try to get people into the defence industry in South Australia and one of those areas, one of those targets for us in getting people into the defence industry are people who are leaving the Australian Defence Force.

One of the things we know is that our men and women who serve in the Australian Defence Force get some incredible skills while they are in those roles, and we want to help them transition into jobs in the defence industry. We have two programs which are run by the agency. With the Find Your Place program, which is run by the agency, that is specifically targeted at people in South Australia. That can be men and women who are working within the Australian Defence Force to find work in the defence industry in South Australia. We really had hoped that this program would be delivered in its original form. That has not been the case.

We have tried to pivot to create more job opportunities for our veterans cohort in South Australia. The mental program is one and the Find Your Place is another, but we will continue to look for opportunities to get the very highly credentialed men and women who have served in the Australian Defence Force, our veterans, into full-time, sustainable and enjoyable employment here in South Australia.

Mr BOYER: On the same budget line, what is the cost of the pilot program?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that here. Part of that program will be just the workshop and the workshops that are being held. There is also a program, Rank to Grade, which is a program trying to get greater movement from people in the Australian Defence Force into the Public Service—if you like, mapping where their rank in the Australian Defence Force correlates with their position in the South Australian Public Service. We would like to get more of that to be better understood on how people can translate their skills.

With specific regard to how much is being committed so far, I will provide that information. Again, it is a pilot program and we are obviously hopeful. But I will be quite honest: we had some false starts with regard to this program in the past.

Mr BOYER: If I could check that you are happy to take on notice how much is going into that pilot?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Mr BOYER: Staying on page 163 and the description/objective, I think it is fair to say there has been some consternation from the veterans community over a number of years about what services are available to veterans in the north. Is there any plan or any discussion being had by you or your departmental people about perhaps a hub in the north or more services in the north?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is a possibility. What we have to recognise is what is the role of the state government versus what is the role of the federal government. Obviously, the vast majority of all services are provided by the federal government. The former Labor government in South Australia established the Department of Veterans' Affairs in South Australia, and we were very supportive of this initiative; in fact, I think it was the first in Australia at that state level. If we look at the objects of the state agency versus DVA at the federal agency, they are quite different entities.

One of the things that we do here in South Australia is administer a grants program so that we can appropriately commemorate some of the important observances of our veterans community in South Australia, and I think that is something that we do particularly well. Of course, of high profile is ANZAC Day and other important days when we mark events on that overall calendar, so this is important work of Veterans SA.

More broadly, though, virtually every single department in the state government interacts with veterans on a daily basis, whether it be employment, health, education, vocational education and training, Corrections, the justice system in South Australia or the skills sector in South Australia. We are working to develop a whole-of-government approach to supporting our veterans in South Australia. We are at the early stages of this.

We have seen some benefit of an approach like this in terms of our overall coordination of services to the Aboriginal communities in South Australia, and we say to ourselves, 'Why can't we also do this for the veterans community in South Australia?' Again, it is the early days of this project, and we will look to expand our response to the veterans community, but ultimately it is DVA at the federal level that provides the vast majority of a very significant federal government budget.

In recent times, we have established a hub at the Repat site, and I have already had some really good feedback on that. We are developing services at the Torrens depot, often referred to as Torrens Parade Ground, the building that sits alongside the Torrens Parade Ground. Then you quite rightly point out that people in the north are saying, 'Hang on. What about us out here?' Whilst there are some general services out there, there are a lot of veterans who are saying, 'This is a logical place for a hub.'

We do not have any position on this at the moment. We will continue to work with the finalisation of the new facility at the Repat site and then obviously the consolidation of services, ESOs, on the Torrens site in the CBD. However, you are quite right that this could be an element we look at further to support those veterans who are based in the north.

Mr BOYER: Staying on page 163 but moving to the targets, and in fact the royal commission, obviously there will be some kind of involvement required from South Australia in that federal royal commission. Are we making a contribution in some way? If so, what will that be, and will it be an ongoing commitment for the duration of the royal commission?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Obviously we are supportive of the federal government's position to establish a royal commission. State government responses to royal commissions are generally looked after by the Attorney-General's Department, which has specific resources dedicated to this.

We know that in May this year Veterans Affairs and the Attorney-General's Department led a public consultation process to inform the terms of reference for this royal commission. Those terms of reference were delivered only last month, in June. They are out now. We will continue to work with the Attorney-General's Department and the sector more broadly, the Veterans Advisory Council here in South Australia, to have a government response.

Obviously we will fully cooperate with the royal commission. We understand this is a royal commission that is not going to be concluded in the next six months or 12 months; in fact, we are advised that it could take up to 18 months to two years to conclude its work. We will certainly be doing everything we can to cooperate with this. We want to have better outcomes for our veterans, and we want to make sure we shine a light on this issue of veteran suicide.

On coming into government, I established a Premier's Council on Suicide Prevention in South Australia, and we have a veteran representative on that body. I think it has done some good and useful work. Obviously we are very supportive of this royal commission, as we are of the continuing work of the federal government to look at and address issues associated with the elevated risk and prevalence of veteran suicide in Australia.

Mr BOYER: Moving back to page 164, I have a few questions about perpetual leases on war graves. I see that in the 2018-19 budget \$1.2 million was allocated over four years, and I think we now see a small note under the program summary that says the increase in expenditure between 2021-22 and the estimated result for 2020-21 relates to the timing of that funding for perpetual leases. How much was allocated for 2020-21 and how much is there across the forward estimates for these perpetual lease grants?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: My understanding is that it is \$300,000 per year for each of those four years, which totals \$1.2 million. So it is from 2018-19 through to 2021-22.

Mr BOYER: On the same budget reference, how much of that \$1.2 million has been spent so far? I accept your answer that the profile is \$300,000 per year, but how much of that \$1.2 million has been spent to date?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will take that question on notice, but I envisage it would be \$900,000 of the \$1.2 million. No, I am advised it is \$565,000 on the perpetual leases project that is budgeted in the 2021-22 year.

Mr BOYER: Could I ask a quick question about the Torrens Parade Ground. I do not have a specific budget reference for you, but the question, if you are happy to take it—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, of course.

Mr BOYER: I am sure it is not news to you that the veterans community is not particularly fond of having the parade ground itself activated, to use the words that we are all fond of, for public events. I accept that has happened over successive years with governments. Is there any consultation or dialogue that occurs with the veterans community before events such as the Winter Wonderland that was there recently on the parade ground?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I did have a meeting with various representatives of the veterans community recently here at Parliament House, and some veterans representatives said we have to be very careful about what happens in that sacred space. Some were not happy with projects like Winter Wonderland being there; others were more nonchalant about it and recognised that one of the reasons why we have very low lease costs in that building is that they are offset by income derived from hiring out that space.

I think that we need to get the balance right, and I think we need to recognise that it is an important area. One of the things I committed to doing was working out whether or not it might be something that we consider in the future—the types of activities that could occur in front of that fabulous building and also, if we are going to have things like Winter Wonderland, whether some discounts might be offered to veterans to take their families along.

We do not want it to be an area where children are not attending. We do not want it to be an area that is closed off and only preserved for veterans. One of the things that most of the veterans at that meeting said was that they wanted to be able to better integrate and commune with the broader population, and in fact out of that meeting came some excellent suggestions on ways we could better connect with the broader community here in South Australia.

One idea that came out of that meeting was to have projections onto that building around very important dates, where people might be able to come and be in that car park area, the parade ground area of the Torrens depot, around important events. We have committed to looking at that

and to continuing to talk with the Veterans' Advisory Council on things that we should be doing down on that site.

Our focus at the moment is trying to get Legacy onto that site. Legacy has sold its asset in the centre of the city. It has an extended period of time until it needs to vacate that site, but we are really keen to get all the ESOs onto the one site and make sure that we can have all those ESOs working together to support our veterans communities in South Australia, and it is part of an overall development of that site.

There is money committed in the current budget for upgrading some of the facilities down there, but they are mainly to do with toilets, kitchens, some of the drainage issues there, as well as putting some dividers in to make more functional spaces so that it is not one big drill hall that can be hired out. We might be able to put that into areas where one part can be, if you like, leased out and we get a return on that when the other half is being dedicated and used for veterans services. That has not been really easy in the past.

There is a bit of money committed into the budget. We are also going to continue to work on the overall master plan for that building. We are going to work with the veterans communities to see what sorts of programs can be put into that important space for South Australia.

Mr BOYER: Premier, could I finish off with questions about ANZAC Day, and I refer to page 164 and the program summary. I know that you have given some detail publicly about this already, but were there any RSLs that approached either your office or perhaps Veterans SA for funding assistance for holding an ANZAC Day service this year which they did not receive, or were all those RSLs that made a request provided with some kind of funding?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, I have looked at this previously. My understanding is that there were a range of responses to the COVID restrictions around this year's ANZAC Day. This is our most solemn day of commemoration as a nation. Last year was very severely impacted, although we did have a very small service at the National War Memorial on North Terrace, which was attended by His Excellency the Governor and representatives of the veterans community.

This year was larger and there were a larger number of people at that National War Memorial on North Terrace. Some of the sub-branches decided to again just promote the Light Up the Dawn initiative, where members would potentially attend their sub-branch but their supporters would stay at home and light up the dawn at the end of their street or at the end of their driveway. Others decided to push ahead.

Some did that within their own resources, some did it in consultation with their local government and some came to us. I am advised that we provided support to the tune of \$85,000, which was really for a range of activities—some of them very small activities that might need the hire of some equipment, loudspeakers or barriers, and others that were more extensive.

There were a range of grants that went to the 10 clubs that sought and received money from South Australia, ranging from the Brighton RSL sub-branch of \$29,000, which I understand was a contribution towards joint activities held with Holdfast Bay council, through to a much more modest amount for the Blackwood RSL sub-branch.

We recognise that many of our sub-branches do not have the resources for crowd control, for COVID marshals, for all the things that are necessary in this changed time. We did not put any pressure on RSL sub-branches to hold events and I know the RSL themselves did not put any pressure on them. Every sub-branch dealt with it in a slightly different way and this was very much supported by Cheryl Cates, who is the President of RSL here in SA and the NT, but we were happy to provide that support that we offered.

I think going forward we are going to see continued very strong interest in the ANZAC Day dawn services, but I think there is going to be a recognition that part of that is going to be the Light Up the Dawn initiative, which was originally billed just to be a once-off. I think it has actually gone extraordinarily well and I think this will be a part of what we do going forward, because for many families with very young children who want to recognise our most solemn and sacred day it can be far better for them to do that at the end of their driveway. Other people are going to want to go to

their local sub-branch or to the National War Memorial on North Terrace. I think there is going to be a mixture of results.

What I was pleased about this year was that we did proceed with a modified ANZAC Day march in Adelaide. There were not as many people marching. We did, as I said, modify that this year. We did not have the bands marching but had them playing and we amplified that music. I am reliably informed by Cheryl Cates that she is going to make every effort going forward to restore the bands for ANZAC Day 2022.

Mr BOYER: Thank you, Premier. I think I have time for another question here. On page 164, under program summary, I think we can see there has been a decrease in the FTE number for Veterans SA from 5.4 to 4.4. What is the reason for that?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think that was part of the movement from the agency before it was linked to Defence SA. My understanding is that there is a very strong working relationship with Defence SA. They worked together very well and some of the services that may have been previously provided are worked through Defence SA personnel, especially around things like events and communications. That is my understanding.

I am advised, via a fairly complex web of information that has been provided to me, that a former employee who was employed to manage the Jamie Larcombe Centre is now going to be contracted via a different employment. Why don't you answer the question because it is above my pay grade.

Mr PRICE: The head coordinator of the Jamie Larcombe Centre used to be a full-time public servant and has now resigned and has been replaced by somebody on contract until the end of 2022, until the end of the financial year.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That makes a lot more sense than I was going to offer. Sorry about that.

The CHAIR: I can inform the committee that we have reached the allotted time once again. We will conclude the examination of the Veterans SA portfolio.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: While we are on veterans, this is a really important area and it has been a bipartisan portfolio for a long period of time. If the opposition require any information with regard to this portfolio, please do not hesitate to let me know. I do not think there needs to be a particularly formal process with regard to this. We actually see each other at a lot of functions, because there are a lot of very important veterans' functions in South Australia, so if there is anything that the opposition needs to know or any clarification with regard to any of my answers today, please do not hesitate to let me know.

The CHAIR: We will conclude there. The next examination will be in relation to Multicultural Affairs.

Membership:

Mr Szakacs substituted for Ms Hildyard.

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

Departmental Advisers:

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

Ms J. Kennedy, Director, Multicultural Affairs.

The CHAIR: We come to the last examination of the day. Premier, would you care to introduce your advisers.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I would, and I would like to thank Richard Price, Catherine Walsh and Peter Murdock for being with us today. As we bid them farewell, we now welcome Justine Kennedy, the excellent Director of Multicultural Affairs in South Australia, and we welcome back Steven Woolhouse, who is perpetually sitting behind me today. He is a powerhouse in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. This is Mr Woolhouse's day of days. He knows every number and, if he does not, he finds out for me straightaway, so we are very grateful for the excellent public servants that we have in South Australia who support us in government. They are my team for the last examination of the day, multicultural affairs.

The CHAIR: Do you wish to make an opening statement?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: In this instance—and this is the only time I have done it all day—I do really genuinely want to say a heartfelt thank you to the community leaders within the multicultural community in South Australia. I have to say, we have faced some very tough times in the last 18 months in South Australia and we have stood shoulder to shoulder with our leaders in the multicultural communities.

Many communities have been anxious about the situation that existed with regard to the coronavirus, and that is perfectly natural as everybody has, but people who are from culturally and linguistically diverse communities often need extra special support and that came from Multicultural Affairs very quickly pivoting to support those communities but most importantly from the community leaders themselves.

I could put forward many examples, but I will not because I will leave somebody out, but suffice to say I am very grateful to our multicultural leaders in South Australia for the way they have supported their communities, and because they have supported their communities they have supported our overall state. I think it is a hallmark of South Australia.

This year is the 40th anniversary of South Australia being the leader in introducing the first multicultural legislation in the country, and I think that is something that every South Australian should know and be proud of. We enjoy extraordinarily harmonious, diverse and enriching multicultural activities in South Australia, but we should never, ever take this for granted. As a state, we should always recognise this and work hard to promote harmony, respect and diversity and I know that is a sentiment that is shared right across this parliament.

I am very fortunate to be invited to a very large number of multicultural events each year. Not all of them I can attend, but every one that I attend is also attended by members from right across the political spectrum. I want to acknowledge the shadow minister in this area, who is very committed to her portfolio. While I am doing that, I want to acknowledge the Hon. Jing Lee, who is the assistant minister to me. She is a great champion for multicultural affairs here in South Australia. There would not be a day that goes by when she is not advocating for a multicultural community in South Australia.

While I am at it, I would also like to acknowledge the member for King and the member for Chaffey, who are in the chamber at the moment, who have both been strong advocates for multicultural communities in their electorate. That is the first time I have made an opening statement, but I really do love this portfolio. It is an important portfolio for South Australia and I feel very strongly that we need to thank our leaders in this very, very tough time.

The CHAIR: Member for Ramsay, do you wish to make a statement?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I have no statement and will go straight to questions. Referring to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4 in Agency Statements, page 25, looking at program 4 targets, specifically talking about the rollout, is there still a multicultural liaison officer from your department at SA Health? I understand that previously there was someone based at the State Control Centre Health.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: In the very tough days of the COVID impact, obviously we were very cognisant of the issues associated with culturally and linguistically diverse communities, so we put a senior officer from Multicultural Affairs into that state control centre. I think Robert Bria did the vast majority of that work. I am informed that he is still based there. I think that we have really benefited from his extraordinary expertise in multicultural affairs in that state control centre. Although it takes him away from his other important work within the agency, I think at the moment there is

probably nothing more important than making sure that we keep a very good handle on it and support our sector.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Premier, you mentioned previously how important it is for us to engage with our multicultural community. Why are the steps to check in with the QR codes not in languages other than English?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Right from day one we have been trying to provide as much information to multicultural communities as possible. My understanding is that the various communications that have been provided by SA Health have been provided in a language and a format that responds to the requirements of the community.

I do not have any specific information with regard to the QR code, but it is a question that I can ask. If there has been a problem there, then I am certain we can rectify it very quickly. It certainly has not been brought to my attention.

As I said, a lot of the information has been provided by leaders in the community. A lot of them have been pivots from moneys and grants previously provided to communities for other purposes that had to be cancelled or postponed for one reason or another and different communities found different ways to spend that money to support their communities during this period of time, and a lot of it was about just getting out the key health messages, staying in contact with people who felt isolated, frustrated and anxious with regard to the restrictions that were in place.

Of course, we have not got that 100 per cent right; nobody ever does. We can see the consequences in other parts of the world and in other parts of the country when this is not done well. I think by and large we have done it well, but if there are any areas the opposition would like to highlight and would like us to look at, I am very happy to do that, and I certainly will take a look at the issue of the QR code. This is a very important frontline defence for South Australia.

A lot of people were probably a little bit concerned about the QR codes in the early days because they were thinking, 'Why is that so interesting?' I think we can all now see with the Modbury cluster exactly and precisely how important that QR code check-in actually is. The professionals, the health professionals from the Communicable Disease Control Branch, were very quickly able to identify when people were in certain locations. Going forward, I expect that perhaps the complacency in South Australia around QR codes prior to the Modbury cluster will be completely evaporating and that the QR code check-ins will be very high going forward.

I also expect that lots of businesses in South Australia will be very keen to make sure that there is high-level compliance in this area. As I said, I am very happy to look into the specific information, and if there is a campaign that we can run around this I think that is a really good opportunity for Multicultural SA to work with SA Health on that, and it might be something that we can follow up with Robert Bria.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Thank you for taking that on notice. Do you have a breakdown of vaccination rates by cultural background, enabling better targeting of vaccine marketing?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not think that data is collected, but I will make an inquiry. I certainly receive a lot of information with regard to our vaccination program, but I certainly have not seen that. We do receive some geographic information, which potentially could be overlaid with multicultural community connections. That is where we have tried to provide additional services into those areas where we have been able to work with the federal government to put more GPs in those areas, where we have been able to identify pharmacies that might be able to work or, indeed, some of the pop-up Health SA booths that help people who may be struggling with booking in online to access that. But I do not have any specific vaccination rate by 'ethnicity', which I think is the word you used. Is that what you were using?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Different rates of cultural background.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Cultural backgrounds. Yes, I will follow that up and if that does exist then I am happy to provide it.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Premier, thank you for taking that on notice. Why have you not done more direct campaigns—for example, on community radio, like 5EBI or Italian radio and different newsletters? Why have there not been campaigns in those newsletters and radio?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I think there has been quite considerable focus on that, and I am happy to get some further information and provide it to you, but a lot of it has been direct, by the community themselves. We asked people who had received grants for events that did not go ahead, 'What is the best and highest use of this for your community?' and some of them said, 'Well, it is for a campaign or a program or something that is going to support the community.'

Again, if individual communities think that there is an opportunity we have missed, then we are happy to address that, but by and large the feedback we have received is that there is a very good understanding. The state government from time to time does some research in this area. This is cabinet-in-confidence, but we do think it is important to monitor, like every state government does, the understanding of the various restrictions across different groups and the issues associated with that. I cannot recall any issue being highlighted in the research that we have done and I think that is a testament to the great work that the agency has done but, most importantly, the community leaders.

From time to time, we have held meetings with community leaders. Some of them have been one on one and some of them have been the Zoom meetings where we have provided information to leaders who have gone back and then provided that to their community members. There is a level of anxiety; there is no doubt about that. But I believe we have been working very closely with those communities.

What I can say is that, on behalf of SA Health, Multicultural Affairs has sent out 14 comprehensive messages and updates about the vaccine to their distribution lists of more than 1,500 multicultural organisations. In turn, many of those organisations are using those community radio channels, social media, emails and text messages to share the information with their members. As you have pointed out, we do have that liaison officer, Robert Bria, who is based within SA Health who is monitoring and looking for ways that we can provide further support.

On 15 March this year, I can advise the committee that SA Health hosted an online information session for community leaders to discuss the rollout of the vaccine and to seek input on community issues of concern. Speakers to that included His Excellency the Hon. Hieu Van Le AC, Governor of South Australia; the Hon. Stephen Wade MLC, Minister for Health and Wellbeing; the Hon. Jing Lee MLC, Assistant Minister to me, the Premier; and Dr Emily Kirkpatrick, Deputy Chief Public Health Officer in South Australia.

On 31 May this year, SA Health hosted an online faith leaders forum to provide updates on the South Australian COVID-19 vaccination rollout. Presenters were the Hon. Stephen Wade; Professor Nicola Spurrier, Chief Public Health Officer; Dr Chris Lease, one of our Deputy Chief Public Health Officers; and the Chief Medical Officer in South Australia. That was an opportunity for those faith leaders to ask questions of the people who are leading the health response to COVID-19.

We get a lot of feedback from those fora and that provides information on the barriers in specific communities to taking the vaccine. It gives us information that allows us to make a more tailored response in the future. But again, if there are any suggestions that the opposition or in fact anybody has with regard to ways that we could better tailor our message, then we would be very happy to have those suggestions.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Premier, can you articulate what the budget has been on these promotions and this direct advertising?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have that with me at the moment, but I am happy to take that question on notice. As I said, it would be a combination of direct expenditure and expenditure that would go via those communities themselves. So it might be slightly difficult to fully calculate without going back to every single community and saying, 'What have you expended?'

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: No, I am keen to understand what your government has spent.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, that would be a good question for SA Health, but of course we are in the multicultural affairs area, so the only area I can really respond to is the money that is

being spent directly and indirectly via Multicultural Affairs. But the SA Health estimates are on next week or maybe later this week—

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I am only interested in the multicultural.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not meaning to be difficult, but you keep changing the question. I was answering, saying I would be able to get you the direct and potentially some indirect Multicultural Affairs expenditure. You then switched to, 'I am interested in what the government spends.'

The vast majority of the expenditure from the government comes from SA Health, and I am trying to helpfully point out that that would be a question for SA Health. I am not trying to be difficult but, of course, I am not responsible for that budget. I am very happy to answer for Multicultural Affairs because I can direct somebody sitting next to me to do that work and provide that to you.

But that will be a very small proportion, a tiny proportion, compared to what SA Health spends because that is the agency with control of this. I would suggest that you ask that question in that estimates hearing or, if you do not find time in that estimates hearing to ask that question, I would be happy to follow it up if you do not get an answer there.

I can also point to the committee that there is a further forum being held tonight at 6 o'clock which will be providing further information to multicultural communities with regards to the restrictions in place as we come out of the lockdown situation, but also to really get further information from the multicultural communities in South Australia as to the effects that people have experienced during a pretty tough seven days for our state.

I know a lot of people feel very relieved at the moment. The vast majority of people are getting on with their lives, but a percentage of people have been very significantly adversely affected by essentially being locked up and often isolated. We want to hear from those multicultural communities about the effects of this and whether there are things that we can do, but, most importantly, provide them with further information with regard to how we come out of the restrictions that have been in place.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: A new line of questioning but on the same page, was the 10th anniversary 'welcome back' gala dinner hosted by assistant minister Jing Lee, held on 29 May 2021, considered a multicultural event or an initiative by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Why was your office asked to write speech notes for this event?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: My office writes speech notes for every single event I attend. I am the Premier of South Australia and consequently I think it is very important that I am informed on every single event that I attend, so I think that is pretty commonplace.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Does your staff usually write you speeches for Liberal fundraisers?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, every single event that I attend, whether it is a fundraiser for the Royal Flying Doctor Society, whether it is the opening of a bridge, the Premier needs to be informed about people who would be attending those events and specific issues that we need to address to the audience at those events.

That event was, of course, attended by a large number of people from the multicultural community. It was very important to be able to highlight key issues for that community and also recognise people who were in attendance that night that I as the Premier would need to speak to and acknowledge and thank. Some of that was done via the speech but, most importantly, in staying as long as I could at that event to thank the multicultural community for the great work that they have done throughout the year.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Let me clarify, Premier: it was appropriate for you to use government resources to write a speech for a Liberal fundraising dinner?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, as I said, as the Premier of South Australia—and regardless of whether they are Liberal, Labor, or whatever they are—I need to have information provided to me with regard to every single event that I attend, regardless of what it might be, so I think that is something which is—

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: So for a political party fundraiser you think it is appropriate for a government person to spend time to write that speech, to spend government resources?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No departmental staff or resources were used in that, but my office is a political office, just as the previous Premier of South Australia, the Hon. Jay Weatherill—or Mike Rann before him—had political staffers and they would, of course, prepare notes for him with regard to every single event that he attended.

Quite frankly I think this is commonplace across every single event that any political leader would attend, and I am not really sure what you are getting at with regard to this. We have made it clear that no departmental resources were used for this event, and they should not be, but with regards to the Premier attending any event there has to be a basic background and briefing provided for the Premier.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Why did some attendees believe that the dinner was held by government?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have any knowledge of that and I find that difficult to understand. It could not have been clearer that it was an event to celebrate Jing Lee's time in that role, and I think a lot of people turned up and a lot of people were very happy to support that because they can see the great contribution that she has made to multicultural affairs here in South Australia. We regard her very highly in that role.

We were very disappointed, of course, when the Australian Labor Party thought that they could get some short-term political gain by undermining her elevation to the presidency of the Legislative Council. I found that one of the more disgraceful acts in this parliament over an extended period of time. For some reason the Labor Party, which loves to talk about diversity and loves to talk about gender equality, did not see fit to support the Hon. Jing Lee to that elevation. It is unorthodox for the government of the day—

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order, member for Light!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There is a lot of chatter over there. It has been a tough day for the Labor Party, especially for the right. I am not sure which faction the member for Light is in at the moment. He has moved around a little in the past, but certainly the right has had a tough day. I think that is the faction he is in at the moment—I am not 100 per cent sure.

As I was saying, we very much honour the work that the Hon. Jing Lee has done and particularly as the assistant minister to me. I was very keen to see her elevated to that role. That was the nomination that the Legislative Council party room endorsed. The Labor Party in South Australia broke that convention where the government of the day's nomination would normally be supported.

The CHAIR: Premier, I might bring you back to the question.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Premier, just moving on, there were some attendees who went to that dinner who did not realise it was a fundraiser because, if it was a fundraiser, you should have had an authorisation on the invitation. Why was that not there?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, it was not an event that I organised. As I pointed out before, it was an event that I attended and I was very pleased to attend it, and there were lots of people who were very pleased. Maybe the member was a little bit annoyed that she was not there. I am sure she would have had a lot of friends who were there. There were lots of happy people at that event. It was an excellent event, but I am not sure—

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: It was a 'welcome back' event. People thought it was a government event.

The CHAIR: Order, member for Ramsay!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —why the member is asking me questions and how it relates to my portfolio. It does not relate to a budget line because, as I have pointed out repeatedly, no departmental resources were used with regard to this, so I cannot see how we can continue to have a focus on something that I have already ruled out using government departmental resources on.

The CHAIR: Just to refresh us all, member for Ramsay, the budget line you have you been referring to is on page 25?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Yes, that is correct.

The CHAIR: Which line is it?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Program 4, which states: 'This program supports South Australia's ethnic communities and promotes community capacity and harmony.'

The CHAIR: Yes, I have that.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Obviously, the reason for my question—and I had many phone calls about this—is that people believed that this was a welcome back dinner because of the difficult time that we had during COVID. That is why they attended: because it had been a difficult time, as you have acknowledged. What I want to know is if those attendees are going to be refunded—those who were unaware that the dinner was a fundraiser?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Certainly, nobody has put that to me. Can I just make it really clear that this was not a government event, and no government resources were used for this, and so it is really not appropriate for me to continue to keep answering questions on a line which does not exist in the budget. This is the opposition's opportunity once a year in estimates to ask detailed questions with regard to an agency, and I have repeatedly said now—I think on four or five occasions—that there were no departmental resources allocated to this event.

It was an event that I attended. I was very happy to attend it. There were a large number of people there. It was an incredible show of faith in Jing Lee for the excellent work that she has done in multicultural affairs—something which the Leader of the Opposition is now laughing about, which I find extraordinary. It was a disgraceful situation that they did not support her elevation to the presidency of the Legislative Council. They talk about gender diversity, they talk about diversity more generally but, when they are put to the test, they are found wanting. But, as I said, no departmental funds were allocated to this particular event.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Why were SAMEAC board members told the attendance at the event was compulsory?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not have any information and, as I said, it does not relate to a budget line that we are examining at the moment.

The CHAIR: We are going to the member for Cheltenham.

Mr SZAKACS: Thank you, Chair. Before the conclusion of today's proceedings, whilst we are still in the Department for the Premier and Cabinet, I note this morning the Premier took on notice a matter that the Leader of the Opposition put to him regarding some future or locked-in advertising. I quote that the Premier undertook to this estimates committee that he would, before the conclusion of today, come back to the committee. Could I ask if the Premier can do so now before the conclusion of today's proceedings?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I can confirm that there is work which is being done on the issue of a further campaign regarding Building What Matters. We think that this is an important campaign. We thought we got an excellent return for the expenditure in the first round in highlighting the incredible \$16.7 billion build that was in South Australia.

The current budget provides \$17.9 billion, and I am very happy to be promoting that because what it means is jobs and, it means business confidence, consumer confidence, and ultimately investor confidence in South Australia. When we look at those metrics in response to the positive messaging we are putting out, what we are seeing is that those metrics are at decade highs; sometimes they are at the highest level they have been in the history of South Australia.

We have government expenditure on a range of advertising matters. Some of them are budget-related and are designed to build confidence across the private sector, the public sector, here in South Australia. Some of them are public notices with regard to COVID, some of them are important public notices with regard to areas like fruit fly in South Australia.

However, Building What Matters is an important program for South Australia and it is one that is under active consideration by the government. I do not have a specific time frame, but I am happy to find out further details on that and come back to you.

Mr SZAKACS: In confirming that the Building What Matters campaign will be reinvigorated, you have also undertaken to come back on notice when that will start. Can you provide—

Mr KNOLL: Point of order: can I ask the member to identify what budget line he is referring to?

Mr SZAKACS: I am happy to: Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 18, for the former minister and soon to be former member for Schubert. Premier, in confirming that—

Mr KNOLL: Sorry, Chair, can I just confirm that that is actually an open line for consideration at the moment?

The CHAIR: Page 18, is that what you said? It is Premier and Cabinet? Yes, it is still open. It has been open all day.

Mr SZAKACS: Thank you, Chair; I will continue. Premier, in confirming that the Building What Matters campaign will be reinvigorated in respect to advertising being started again, and you have also undertaken to come back to us on when that will start again, can you provide the amount that will be spent on that reinvigorated Building What Matters campaign?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The new one? No, because that has not been finalised. I did say this morning that I would try to get some further information and I am glad you brought it up, although we are in Multicultural Affairs at the moment. However, I am more than happy to answer this question because it is important that when people experience quite significant delays with, for example, roadworks that are on at the moment, they understand that this is part of an overall project, an overall package of works that are being undertaken in South Australia. They experience that when we are doing works around schools as well, and families get that disruption. I think it is important for them to note that.

I do not have any final details on when that campaign will start, but it is under active consideration at the moment based upon the success and response we had to the Building What Matters program in last year's budget. I think this year's budget is even more generous in terms of our ongoing investment into these critical areas; \$17.9 billion is a record. It has been independently assessed by the parliament, the commonwealth Parliamentary Budget Office, which assesses our fiscal stimulus and support packages, as second highest in the entire country second only to New South Wales.

I do not have anything further to report, but I am advised that some internal work has been done regarding a further round of Building What Matters. It has not proceeded to the GCAC yet, but I am advised that should occur soon, subject to some internal review as to whether it is warranted or not. However, as I have outlined to the committee so far, I think the people of South Australia deserve to know how their taxpayer dollars are being spent, and I think the results from the first round speak for themselves.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Looking at Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, Agency Statements, page 25 again, in regard to the Multicultural Grants Program, is the Multicultural Priorities Fund part of the Multicultural Grants Program?

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

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: How is it funded?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is not part of the grants program. There are four streams that are identified in our Multicultural Grants Program. This is a separate program, the priorities program. As you would be aware, there are four elements of the Multicultural Grants Program that we offer:

Advance Together, which are grants to assist multicultural organisations to improve their governance and strengthen their capacity in building skills; Celebrate Together, which are grants to assist multicultural organisations to host festival events to celebrate cultural diversity; Expand Together, which are grants to assist multicultural organisations to expand their capacity by upgrading community facilities or purchasing equipment to meet the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse communities; and Stronger Together, which are grants to assist multicultural organisations to develop and deliver projects that strengthen families and communities and improve their access to better social and economic opportunities.

I am advised that in the 2020-21 year the Multicultural Grants Program budget was \$1.965 million to support our multicultural communities. In the current financial year, the Multicultural Grants Program is \$2.85 million. This has been due to additional funding allocated as a once-off through the 2021-22 state budget for the Expand Together grants. These are the ones that assist multicultural organisations to expand their capacity by upgrading community facilities or purchasing equipment to meet the needs of their community.

There is also \$250,000 in funding from the 2020-21 Celebrate Together grants budget being redirected to support the creation of a new Multicultural Emergency COVID-19 Outreach Projects Fund. It is for that one financial year only because of the reasons I outlined in previous answers and also because the Advance Together grants were not offered in 2020-21 due to the COVID-19 pandemic, with funding being redirected to support community outreach projects.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Premier, I am still not clear. What exactly is the Multicultural Priorities Fund?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that the Multicultural Priorities Fund is a small discretionary fund that we use to support projects that are immediate in nature and, most importantly at this point in time, are COVID related, but they can be for a range of issues or opportunities that present themselves within the multicultural community.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: How much funding is there in 2021-22 for this discretionary fund?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There is no specific budget for that, but what I can say is that the total committed grants expenditure from the Multicultural Priorities Fund in 2020-21 was \$633,415 and that money was used to support 36 organisations to deliver community projects and initiatives. This was slightly elevated because there were some unspent moneys that could be redirected and some of those moneys were actually returned to elevate that last year. Some of that was returned and some if it was just repurposed within those organisations in consultation with the agency.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Premier, will you be able to perhaps provide on notice the list of the recipients of that fund?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will take that on notice. That will give us some time to compile that list, but I am advised 36 separate organisations with that \$633,000 for those priority fund initiatives.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Of course, these are separate to the COVID-19 Outreach Projects Fund for 2021? These are in addition to that?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, that is correct. That was a small fund, so this actually supplemented it. As I said, I think about \$180,000 came back into the budget from organisations that said, 'You've given us a grant. We don't have an acceptable project to convert that money over to,' so they were happy to return that money. Of course, that organisation can be making applications via those four streams going forward.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: How do people actually apply for the discretionary fund? How do organisations apply for it?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Obviously, we have an agency that is in very close contact with multicultural communities in South Australia, so they would raise issues directly with the

agencies and then they are brought to me and to my assistant minister. They are dealt with on a case-by-case basis.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Still on the same page in response to targets, obviously you have been doing some reform with the new multicultural bill. At the same time, you put out expressions of interest for what I assume you intend to be a new South Australian multicultural commission, but at the moment it still remains as SAMEAC. There was a process that was taken. Did you refuse any of the applications made through this process that were proposed by the panel to be on the commission?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that the panel worked through the recommendations for committee members and made recommendations. They were individually assessed against the criteria and a recommendation was given for approval. It was a slightly different process for the chair, where there were a large number of people who came forward. The panel did not make a recommendation. They narrowed it down and then ultimately that was a decision for government.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: So there was a short list provided to you. Why are the new chair and multiple appointees members of the Liberal Party?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I do not know what you are referring to. I think the current chair was the former Labor candidate for a seat. I am pretty sure that she ran for the Labor Party in an election going back about 10 years ago, so I do not think you could be accusing us of bias there.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Oh, please!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Again, here we have the cynicism from the shadow minister, who is out there talking about working in a bipartisan way and then rolling her eyes and saying 'Please!' I would love the shadow minister to outline the process that was arrived at for all the appointments made by the previous government. I think here we went out to an expressions of interest and we set up a panel to actually assess them against the criteria. Obviously, the government will have a say in that, but my understanding is that the panel's recommendations regarding people on the SAMEAC board were supported.

With regard to the chair, ultimately there was a short list that was provided to government and the government made a decision. I do not think there is anything unusual about that whatsoever and I certainly do not think it is an opportunity to roll one's eyes.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Have you received any correspondence?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: To be really clear, the previous government actually appointed a former Labor minister as the chair of SAMEAC, Grace Portolesi. Is somebody from the opposition going to suggest that there was some independent process and there was no issue there?

As I said, we are very happy with the members of SAMEAC. Since coming to government, we have said that we needed to see a rotation of leaders through that committee. We held people in place in that committee for a year longer than we envisaged we would, but we were very pleased to do that and I think we have ended up with a very balanced, diverse and representative group and nothing but compliments have been provided to me.

The CHAIR: I will allow one last question. The question will be brief, as will the response.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Premier, have you received correspondence from people who are aggrieved at not being appointed to the commission?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: People are always aggrieved or not aggrieved with regard to appointments I make, but we have a process and we put it in place. I think we have excellent representatives, and there will be opportunities for other appointments.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: So that is a yes, that you have received correspondence?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, I receive lots of correspondence about nearly every decision—

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I am only asking about SAMEAC.

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that I make, but I certainly will not be outlining any grievances that people have.

The CHAIR: I am going to inform the committee that we have reached the allotted time and I declare the examination of the proposed payments complete. They are the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Premier—Other Items, and Defence SA. I would like to thank the Premier for his work today and also his advisers and committee members for the way we have managed to get through the day.

I advise members that the Speaker has agreed to vary the estimates timetable in accordance with the committee's resolution of this morning. The committee will resume tomorrow at 9.30am to examine the proposed payments for the Department for Child Protection.

At 18:01 the committee adjourned to Thursday 29 July 2021 at 09:30.