

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
Thursday, 27 September 2018
ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

Chair:

Mr S.J. Duluk

Members:

Mr M.E. Brown

Mr M. Cowdrey

Mr F.J. Ellis

Mr L.K. Odenwalder

Mr C.J. Picton

Mr J.B. Teague

The committee met at 09:00

Estimates Vote

SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE, \$833,967,000

ADMINISTERED ITEMS FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE, \$59,000

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE, \$743,934,000

**ADMINISTERED ITEMS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND
INFRASTRUCTURE, \$9,353,000**

Minister:

Hon. C.L. Wingard, Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services,
Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing.

Departmental Advisers:

Cmmr G. Stevens, Commissioner of Police, South Australia Police.

Ms J. TePohe, Acting Chief Executive, Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.

Ms G. O'Neill, General Manager, Road Safety, Department of Planning, Transport and
Infrastructure.

Mr B. Cagialis, Director, Finance and Risk, Department of Planning, Transport and
Infrastructure.

Mr S. Johnke, Director, Business Services, South Australia Police.

Mr M. Hanton, Motor Accident Commission.

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 minister 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 minister and the lead speaker for the opposition confirm that the timetable for today's proceedings as previously distributed is accurate?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, Chair.

Mr ODENWALDER: I assume so. I do not remember being consulted but I assume someone on my side was consulted.

The CHAIR: You do not remember the member for West Torrens consulting you?

Mr ODENWALDER: I have absolute faith in the member for West Torrens.

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 minister undertakes to supply information at a later date, it must be submitted to the committee secretary by no later than Friday 26 October 2018. I propose to allow both the minister and the lead speaker for the opposition to make opening statements of about 10 minutes each, should they wish.

There will be a flexible approach to giving the call for asking questions, based on about three questions per member, alternating each side. Supplementary questions will be the exception rather than the rule. A member who is not part of the committee may ask a question at the discretion of the Chair. Questions must be based on lines of expenditure in the budget papers and must be identifiable or referenced.

Members unable to complete their questions during the proceedings may submit them as questions on notice for inclusion in the assembly *Notice Paper*. There is no formal facility for the tabling of documents before the committee; however, documents can be supplied to the Chair for distribution to the committee. The incorporation of material in *Hansard* is permitted on the same basis as applies in the house; that is, that it is of a purely statistical nature and limited to one page in length. All questions are to be directed to the minister and not the minister's advisers. The minister may refer questions to advisers for a response, back through him and then through the Chair.

The committee's examinations will be broadcast in the same manner as sittings of the house are broadcast, and that is through the IPTV system within Parliament House and via the web stream linked to the internet. I will now proceed to open the following lines of examination, the portfolio being Road Safety. Our minister is the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. I declare the proposed payments open for examination and refer members to the Agency Statements, Volume 4. I call on the minister to introduce his advisers and to make an opening statement if he so wishes.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, I would like to introduce the people alongside me. To my right I have the SAPOL commissioner, Mr Grant Stevens; to my immediate left, Julianne TePohe, Acting Chief Executive of DPTI; and to the very far left down the end of the table, Gabby O'Neill, General Manager, Road Safety, DPTI. Behind me at the second table, Bill Cagialis, Director, Finance and Risk, DPTI; Stephen Johninke, Director, Business Services, SAPOL; and also with us today is Matthew Hanton, Motor Accident Commission.

The CHAIR: Would you like to make an opening statement, minister?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I would like to make a brief opening statement. Thank you, Chair. Road safety in South Australia is tackled in a three-pronged approach. I want to make that clear to this committee and all those present. The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI) is one arm, SAPOL is another and the Motor Accident Commission also plays a role.

As the minister involved with road safety, I am responsible for strategy, policy development, speed management and road safety promotions. The Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government (minister Knoll) is responsible for budget and legislation, and the Treasurer oversees the finances of the Motor Accident Commission. It is, as I said, a three-pronged approach, and that is where the responsibilities lie.

The CHAIR: Thank you, minister. Member for Elizabeth, you may have an opening statement. If not, we will go straight to questions.

Mr ODENWALDER: I will go straight to questions, sir. Could you briefly go over that three-pronged approach again, in terms of ministerial responsibilities?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Absolutely. As I said, there is a three-pronged approach for road safety across the board. It involves the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, for which minister Knoll is responsible; SAPOL, which plays a role in road safety as well; and the Motor Accident Commission, which is responsible to the Treasurer. They are the three elements, and that is the way the responsibilities are distributed.

Mr ODENWALDER: You then are the minister responsible for road safety, and in the DPTI budget lines, it gives you responsibility for road safety. You have said that in the three-pronged approach, minister Knoll was responsible for those lines in DPTI. Can you clarify that for me? Are you responsible for those budget lines?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Along with the Minister for Transport, of course. Just to explain: as I said, I am the minister with responsibilities for road safety, which include strategy, policy development, speed management and road safety promotions. The Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government has responsibility for budget and legislation. Under this government, we have one chief executive reporting to one minister. As the minister responsible for road safety, my role is to drive a strategy and clear vision for the future where deaths on the road become an exception.

The role of Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government is to provide a budget for the realisation of the strategy, including dedicated road safety programs and infrastructure programs. Together, we are working towards driving a safe system to ensure a joined-up approach to road safety with all three elements.

Mr ODENWALDER: Do you know why the words 'road safety'—

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, I do not know where we are. Are we still opening statements or are we getting a question about responsibilities? If we are—

Mr ODENWALDER: Either way. It can go to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3—

The CHAIR: You know the rules better than almost anybody.

Mr ODENWALDER: I have forgotten, sir; it seems so long ago.

The CHAIR: Well, let me remind you. Where are we?

Mr ODENWALDER: Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 162, ministerial responsibilities in DPTI. But it goes to the opening statement anyway. Do you know why the words 'road safety' do not appear in your official designation as commissioned by the Governor? Previous governments have always had a minister for road safety as far as I am aware—certainly as far back as I can remember. Does this reflect a diminished importance of road safety in the eyes of this government?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Absolutely not, no. I think the Premier made it very clear when we came into government that we have streamlined a number of departments and the names. Just to have a hundred portfolios lined up alongside a minister's name—

Mr ODENWALDER: I understand the changes in the departments; I am just wondering why there is no minister for road safety, as there has been for as long as I can remember.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: If I can finish what I was saying. When we came into government, the Premier very clear that the different ministers would have streamlined titles. There was no need to have a hundred different names alongside the different ministers—

Mr ODENWALDER: Oh, okay; I do not remember him saying that, sorry.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —so that was something that he made very, very clear. That title was just absorbed within, as I said, a three-pronged approach amongst the three ministers. I do not see a problem with having three ministers focused on this issue; it is a good approach. We are looking at it from a DPTI perspective, as I have outlined in my previous answer, and also from a SAPOL perspective. The Motor Accident Commission, through Treasury, also plays a role.

Mr ODENWALDER: I think you said you were responsible for strategy in the three-pronged approach?

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, I assume we are still on the same page?

Mr ODENWALDER: We are still on the same line, yes, or the opening statement—whichever you prefer. You are responsible for strategy. Can you outline your vision for road safety in South Australia? What do you hope to achieve?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am just trying to find the budget line you are referring to per se.

Mr ODENWALDER: Well, you are responsible for a road safety strategy under this government; I am just asking you what it is.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, I think it has just rolled over from the previous government's strategy, and that is to head toward zero by 2020. Like you, I hope we are on the same page. We want to reduce the road toll, get it as low as possible—

Mr ODENWALDER: Do you have a target?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes; I can find that for you. Targets are very much our line. They are on the website and readily available, but I will just grab the details for you. Sorry, it is in the budget: it is 84 for fatalities and 600 for serious injuries, or potentially below 600. But the zero target for fatal and serious injuries is what we are heading towards.

Mr ODENWALDER: That is over the next year, is that what you mean?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, I refer you to page 168 of the budget because it is outlined there, but I am happy to repeat it for you.

Mr ODENWALDER: Please do.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The targets are based on the number of fatalities that need to be reduced in order to meet South Australia's road safety targets of less than 80 fatalities and less than 800 serious injuries by the end of 2020. That is what we are shooting for. The number of serious injuries has already fallen below the 2020 target, which is great news. The serious injury targets have not been revised and remain as per the previous year.

You will see from the performance indicators on page 168 of the budget that serious injuries have gone down from 657 in 2016-17 to 622 in 2017-18. The target in 2017-18 was below 600, and it did not quite achieve that. The target for 2018-19 is to get below 600 as well. When the program was put in place to achieve these targets by 2020, 800 was the serious injuries target set. To the credit of people in this caper, and to the credit of the previous government and their work as well, we are down around 600, which is very good.

Mr PICTON: On the same budget line, given that the minister said that essentially this strategy is the same as the previous government's, can the minister confirm that the Road Safety Action Plan 2018-19, released in February this year, is still the policy of the government?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes. That was released this year and it is continuing.

Mr PICTON: Another question on the same budget line, in terms of the responsibilities. In previous governments there was a list of detailed responsibilities between what was the then minister for road safety and the then minister for transport and infrastructure. Is that the arrangement you have in place between yourself and the Minister for Transport? If so, would you be able to table that—perhaps on notice—for the committee?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I would have to check what the arrangement was with the previous government; I am not au fait with that so I would have to get that information first. I can take that on notice, for sure.

Mr PICTON: Obviously I mean for your government, not the previous government.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I thought you asked that given the previous government did X—and I do not know what X is. So I could find out what X is, and then you want to compare that with what we are doing in our government, is that the question?

Mr PICTON: The question is: do you have a detailed list of your responsibilities versus the Minister for Transport's responsibilities? If so, can you table them?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I will take that on notice and bring it back to the committee.

Mr ODENWALDER: On the same line, page 162, is the minister aware of a report recently published by the director of the Centre of Automotive Safety Research, Jeremy Woolley—

The CHAIR: Is this report in the budget?

Mr ODENWALDER: No.

The CHAIR: No? Remember—

Mr ODENWALDER: Oh come on, I know the rules, Chair.

The CHAIR: No; we know the rules.

Mr ODENWALDER: I am allowed to contextualise it—

The CHAIR: The member for Narrunga has a question.

Mr PICTON: Point of order.

The CHAIR: There is no point of order. The member for Narrunga has the call.

Mr PICTON: Point of order, Chair.

The CHAIR: What is the point of order?

Mr PICTON: You are removing the ability—

The CHAIR: Member for Kaurana, what is the point of order?

Mr PICTON: It is completely in order—

The CHAIR: No, what—

Mr PICTON: —for the member to ask a question—

The CHAIR: Of course it is, absolutely it is.

Mr PICTON: —which is in relation to the budget—

The CHAIR: And do you know what? After—

Mr PICTON: What has the minister got to hide about it—

The CHAIR: After—

Mr PICTON: —a question about a report.

The CHAIR: Member for Kaurana, you are out of order.

Mr PICTON: You have allowed many questions in relation to reports.

The CHAIR: Member for Kaurana, do you want to be up here on Tuesday again or not? Otherwise it is going to be a long—

Mr PICTON: You have allowed many questions in relation to reports over these estimates, and you are refusing this.

The CHAIR: Member for Narrunga, you have the call. You will be heard in silence.

Mr ELLIS: Thank you, Chair. I refer to Budget Paper 5, page 106, regarding Kangaroo Island road safety improvements. Can the minister provide some information about the government's election commitment to improve road safety on Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I thank the member for his interest in this area and for the question. I am pleased to provide an update to the committee. As the member has noted, the Marshall government made an election commitment to improve road safety on Kangaroo Island, and this has been done through additional directional road pavement arrows; additional road signage to 'drive on the left', or 'drive on the left in Australia'; and a complementary education campaign.

In 2018-19, a budget allocation of \$20,000 has been made to deliver these much-needed infrastructure improvements. The Kangaroo Island Council has been consulted and supports this initiative. The cost for providing directional arrows is estimated at \$2,000 at each location. The cost for installing each 'drive on the left' sign is estimated at \$500. The ideal time for pavement marking to ensure longevity is between October and March in each year. Implementation dates are currently being discussed with the Kangaroo Island Council.

On 28 June 2018, DPTI met with representatives from the Kangaroo Island Council and SAPOL to better understand the council's views about possible measures for improved community road safety. Meetings were also held with the community road safety group to explore the possibility of engaging with the community about ways of reducing crashes on Kangaroo Island. Assistance is being offered to the Kangaroo Island Road Safety Group to develop a social media communications plan in relation to community road safety, and further communication with Kangaroo Island Council will occur to progress this.

It has been a long held view by locals on the island that when tourists come over, keeping them on the right side of the road, which is the left side of the road, is very important, and that is why this process has been put in place. Again, to see DPTI and SAPOL working well on this road safety initiative is absolutely outstanding, and to be engaged with the Kangaroo Island Council and the Kangaroo Island Road Safety Group is another big positive for all involved. This is a great initiative and another one that shows we are supporting our regions. Again, I am very confident this will help make our roads safer on Kangaroo Island.

The CHAIR: Thank you, minister. Member for Elizabeth may ask a question and, if it is about a report, I am sure he will ask it in a question that is ruled in.

Mr ODENWALDER: Maybe I will save it.

The CHAIR: You might save it.

Mr ODENWALDER: Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 167. Minister, when will the government fulfil its promise to increase speed limits on some rural roads? I am sure you are prepared for that one.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you for that question. It is a good one. This is an election commitment, of course, that is hooked to the election. Again, this is one of those projects on which I am working closely with the Minister for Transport. Just to outline again, the responsibility for speed management and the strategy for that rests with me. The authority to change the speed limits rests with the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. The budget for infrastructure, road safety improvements and road maintenance, again, also rests with the Minister for Transport.

We want to reverse the speed limit reduction—which the previous government did—from 100 km/h back up to 110 km/h on eight country roads. We are evaluating the roads and the safety improvements needed. As you would understand, you need to make sure the roads are up to speed.

Mr ODENWALDER: Why would you not do that before you made the election commitment?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, I was just saying that we will make sure that the roads are improved and the road safety risk is minimised so that we can put them back up. We are working through that. We will deliver that in a timely manner.

Mr ODENWALDER: When?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: There are a number of projects that need to be done to ensure that the conditions of the roads will be up to spec so that we can do that. Road shoulder sealing is one of those things that we are looking to do. A systematic review of speed limits on the rural network under DPTI is underway, and is expected to be finalised towards the end of the calendar year. The current investment programs allocate \$10 million annually to priority shoulder sealing, and we know how important that is if you are going to maintain a road.

Unfortunately, under the previous government, maintenance of roads was very poor, so we want to make sure that is done. During June 2018, complete shoulder sealing was achieved along the final length of the Riddoch Highway. Installation of audio tactile line marking is due for application in the next financial year. This will complete planned works on the Riddoch Highway. So works are

being done, and I am working with the minister to make sure we roll that out in a safe and timely manner.

Mr ODENWALDER: Are you saying, then, that those roads are currently unsafe?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No. We want to make sure that when we put the speed limits back up, the works have been done, and they are in a safe condition to be able to—

Mr ODENWALDER: Did you know they were unsafe? Did you hold this view when you made the election promise that you were going to change the speed limits back?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am not sure where you are going with the question.

Mr ODENWALDER: I am not going anywhere. It is just a question.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: My answer is really clear: we want to make sure we do the work on the roads to make sure that we can put the speed limits back up. That is why am working with the Minister for Transport to make sure that the works are done, so that when the speed limit goes back up, the road is in a condition to accommodate that speed limit and everyone will be kept safe on the roads.

Mr ODENWALDER: Did you discuss this election policy, or have you discussed it since the election, with the RAA or the Motor Accident Commission? Can you table any documents about that?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, the second part of that question was?

Mr ODENWALDER: Can you table or provide the committee with any documents about those submissions?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What I have said, and I have made it abundantly clear—

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, we are quite clear about what can be tabled and what cannot be tabled in committee, as you well and truly know.

Mr ODENWALDER: You are right, sir. Will you provide any information regarding the RAA's submissions, if there are any, or the Motor Accident Commission's, or indeed any submissions the Centre for Automotive Research made regarding rural speed limits?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I outlined in my previous answer, and I will say it again, I am working with the Minister for Transport in that collective around the roles that we have, which I have outlined from the get-go, and we are making sure that we get the roads into the condition that we need to put the speed limits back up, and that work is being done.

Mr PICTON: I have a question on the same budget line.

The CHAIR: Which is?

Mr PICTON: Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 167. Just to clarify: is it the government's position that it is inappropriate to have those roads at 110 km/h without further works required to them?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, what budget line was that?

Mr PICTON: I just said, Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 167. In terms of the eight roads that you have promised in your election commitment to increase back to 110, and criticised when they were reduced to 100 km/h, is it the government's position that that can only be done and that they are currently unsafe to be at 110 km/h without road improvements being applied to them?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What I did say in the previous answer, because it is the same question—I am very happy with that—is we are doing an assessment on those roads. That is what is underway at the moment. Where works need to be done we will do that before we put the speed limit back up. So we will assess the roads, work out what needs to be done and we will put the speed limits back up at that time.

Mr PICTON: But certainly some works would need to occur for them to be safe at 110 km/h; is that what you are saying?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am sure they would, but that is for the experts to say. We will speak with DPTI and DPTI will provide that to the Minister for Transport. I will liaise with him. He is in charge of the infrastructure area, as I have previously outlined in other questions already this morning. He will work on that, I will work on the road safety strategy and together we will implement that policy.

Mr PICTON: Do you have a time frame of when you are expecting to receive advice on that?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Not in front of me, no.

Mr PICTON: I understand there was also a commitment to undertake a review of other speed limits, to potentially increase other speed limits. Is that work underway and do you have a time frame of when you are expecting to receive that report?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I have outlined in a previous answer, and I will just repeat it. You may have missed it, and I apologise. A systematic review of speed limits on the rural network under DPTI control is underway, within its current budget allocation, and is expected to be finalised towards the end of the calendar year.

Mr PICTON: Is that being undertaken within DPTI?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes.

Mr ODENWALDER: Given the time, we will move on, minister. Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 167. You mention there have been improvements for motorcycle safety. That is a target, I think, rather than a highlight. Can you update the committee on what is going on regarding motorcycle safety, given that last year there was quite a comprehensive review handed to the government and work begun on some measures around licensing, etc., for motorcycles? Can you update the committee on what the current government is doing in response to that review?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, for sure. I am advised that the report will be coming shortly, but the information I can give the committee is that motorcycle safety improvements are planned in the Adelaide Hills at a cost of around \$400,000 annually. This is a major destination for motorcyclists, as you would understand. Motorcycling has become increasingly popular for both leisure and commuting. The Australian Transport Safety Bureau figures show that motorcycling is the most dangerous form of land travel in Australia, at almost 30 times the fatality rate recorded by operators of other vehicle types per million kilometres travelled.

Annually, approximately \$400,000 is invested in improving our most popular and challenging motorcycle routes. In 2018-19, the installation of a motorcycle safety barrier, delineation and signage upgrades on Tippet Road and centre-line audio tactile line marking on Gorge Road are planned in the Adelaide Hills. The centre-line audio tactile line marking is the first of its type in the Adelaide Hills, to assist motorbike riders to stay within their travel lane, to reduce the likelihood of head-on collisions with oncoming traffic. These roads are high-speed motorcycle routes with posted speed limits greater than or equal to 70 km/h with a history of motorcycle-related crashes.

Specific motorcycle safety improvements include: motorcycle safety barriers installed below guardrails to provide a more forgiving environment for the rider, reducing the impact of a collision due to the energy-absorbing qualities. They are the barricades that go around the bottom, as you would appreciate and understand.

Mr ODENWALDER: Yes.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Other improvements include post caps on the existing guardrail, which are also very beneficial, as well as vertical post protectors on wire rope safety barriers to provide some cushion on impact. Centre-line and edge line audio tactile line marking, delineation and signage upgrades and road service improvements are all things that add to the safety of motorcyclists, of course.

Mr ODENWALDER: Thank you, minister. I probably should have been more specific. I am talking about the review that was handed to the government regarding graduated licensing and things like curfews. There were a whole lot of recommendations made to government last year. I understand some action was taken in regard to some of those measures. Has the current government continued that work?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes; I am advised that by the end of October I will receive a comprehensive brief to move towards new legislation, which I expect to bring back next year, and which I can bring back to the committee before introducing it to parliament, if that is how it pans out.

Mr ODENWALDER: So you cannot give us any detail now about what work is being done?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I said the work is being done and I am expecting a report by the end of October.

Mr ODENWALDER: What work is being done?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It is being reviewed. I think I made that very clear.

Mr PICTON: So there will be legislation?

Mr ODENWALDER: There will be legislation introduced next year, you say?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I will have a look at the report and, potentially, we will look at what we need to do from there.

Mr ODENWALDER: So you have not decided whether there will be legislation or not: you are just going to look at a review of a review and then make a decision?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry; can you say that again? Repeat the question.

Mr ODENWALDER: You have not decided yet whether there will be any legislation at all to make motorcyclists safer?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No; we will have a look at the report when it comes in and decisions will be made from there.

Mr ODENWALDER: In the time that is left to us then, I will take you to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 167, Targets. I want to ask you about the road safety camera review, and I have a series of questions about that. The section on that page which details fees, fines and penalties, I assume the bulk of this fine revenue is from fixed safety cameras, is that right?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Can I just get you to say the page number again?

Mr ODENWALDER: Yes; 167. Under Income—Fees, fines and penalties. I assume most of that—correct me if I am wrong—comes from fixed safety cameras? Can you confirm that, or indeed how much of that comes from fixed safety cameras?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have just been informed that is not camera revenue: camera revenue is in the police budget.

Mr ODENWALDER: Alright then; no worries. Back to the safety camera review then: can you tell us who is chairing it and how many FTEs are attached to that particular review?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I will give you a briefing on that. As you would be aware, this was—

Mr ODENWALDER: Before you do, given the time, I would appreciate knowing when the report is due, will it be made public and how much it is costing in total.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you, again. The speed camera audit is nearing completion and cost approximately \$40,000, which will be met from within DPTI's existing operational budget.

Mr ODENWALDER: What is that \$40,000 for?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That is for an independent consultant to do the review.

Mr ODENWALDER: And who is that?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Martin Small from Martin Small Consulting.

Mr ODENWALDER: And he is not getting paid anything so much as handed \$40,000 for administrative costs or something?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, he is conducting the review. His consultancy firm is conducting the review.

Mr ODENWALDER: How much is he getting paid to conduct the review—\$40,000?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes. The cost of the review is \$40,000.

Mr ODENWALDER: Okay. Are there any departmental FTEs attached to this, or is this completely an outside independent review?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I could go and get a breakdown of that for you and bring it back to the committee if you would like a bit more detail.

Mr ODENWALDER: Yes.

The CHAIR: Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. Unfortunately, time has expired. I declare the examination of the proposed payments for the portfolio of road safety closed. The estimate of payments for South Australia Police and the administered items for South Australia Police is to be adjourned until later today. The estimate of payments for the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure and administered items for the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure are to be adjourned to committee A.

DEPARTMENT OF THE PREMIER AND CABINET, \$299,804,000

**ADMINISTERED ITEMS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE PREMIER AND CABINET,
\$11,796,000**

**ADMINISTERED ITEMS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY AND FINANCE,
\$1,748,226,000**

Minister:

Hon. C.L. Wingard, Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr C. Beattie, Acting Chief Executive, SAFECOM; Chief Officer, State Emergency Service.

Mr P. Fletcher, Acting Chief Officer, Metropolitan Fire Service.

Mr G. Nettleton, Chief Officer, Country Fire Service.

Ms J. Best, Business Manager, Country Fire Service.

Ms S. Di Ciocco, Business Manager, State Emergency Service.

Ms L. Lew, Business Manager, Metropolitan Fire Service.

The CHAIR: If we could please move to the portfolios of SAFECOM, Emergency Services Levy Fund, Country Fire Service, SA Metropolitan Fire Service and State Emergency Service. Of course, the minister appearing is the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. I declare the proposed payments open for examination and refer members to the Agency Statements, Volume 2. I call on the minister, as the changeover occurs, to introduce his advisers and to make an opening statement.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you, Chair, and thank you to the support team here. I would like to introduce, to my very far left, Mr Greg Nettleton, the Chief Officer of the Country Fire Service. To my immediate left is Mr Chris Beattie, the Acting Chief Executive of SAFECOM and the Chief Officer of the State Emergency Service. To my right is Mr Paul Fletcher, the Acting Chief Officer of the Metropolitan Fire Service. Behind us we also have the business managers from the Metropolitan Fire Service, Country Fire Service and State Emergency Service. I would like to put in

an apology for Ms Iolanda Calabrese, the SAFECOM business manager, who unfortunately is unwell and could not be with us today. She sends her apologies and we wish her well and a speedy recovery.

For my opening statement, I would like to start by putting on the record my thanks and appreciation for the outstanding work of our emergency services sector. Year in, year out, our emergency services organisations—CFS, MFS and SES—respond to over 45,000 calls across the state. That is a lot of calls—45,000 calls. I can confidently say that the emergency services sector continues to demonstrate remarkable skill, expertise and tenacity befitting what South Australians recognise as operating among the world's very best.

As a state, we are fortunate that in times of need, we are able to rely on our men and women in uniform, and I am extremely proud of the sector's efforts. The vital work of Surf Lifesaving SA and our volunteer marine rescue units should also not be forgotten for the significant contribution they make to the safety of South Australians along our coastlines.

I also take the opportunity to thank not just the paid staff but also the volunteers, who are ably supported by the Country Fire Service Volunteers Association and the SA SES Volunteers' Association. I feel it is important to note during a time like budget estimates the fact that our emergency services sector is funded solely and entirely by the emergency services levy.

While all property owners make contributions to the ESL, thankfully very few will count themselves as beneficiaries of the services provided. But even though many households will never call upon our emergency services sector, in the unfortunate event that they need to, the public will remain blind to the badge or the truck or the colour of the uniform. They can safely and reasonably expect the nearest, fastest and most appropriate response at their doorstep.

As part of this year's budget some of the additional measures for our sector include: \$5 million for CFS station upgrades; \$600,000 to the MFS for additional staff to support audits of buildings with aluminium composite panels; funding for the MFS to implement a retained fire station model in Mount Barker; funding of \$190,000 to Surf Life Saving SA to establish a shark spotting drone capability; an ongoing annual grant of \$5,000 to each of the 22 surf lifesaving clubs; \$5 million to fund a replacement for Alert SA; and support for a new and long overdue SES/CFS command centre and headquarters.

All things considered, I am fortunate to have in this portfolio some of the hardest working and most humble individuals. I would like to thank the chief officers and the chief executive for their frank advice and continued efforts. Looking ahead, the sector is in capable hands, and I look forward to continuing to work together to build upon the success that we have achieved.

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, do you have an opening statement? If not, please kick us off.

Mr ODENWALDER: No, thank you, minister and thank you, ladies and gentlemen. I want to go quickly to the opening statement. I note that you introduced—

The CHAIR: Can you just move us to a line item, if you could?

Mr ODENWALDER: No, I am going to the opening statement which—

The CHAIR: No.

Mr ODENWALDER: —if you peruse previous estimates it is—

The CHAIR: Well, fortunately I am in charge of this one and questions are to come from budget line items. You have a chance to make an opening statement and some comments, as the member for Kurna did on Tuesday, which were very insightful, in his opening statement—the way he used those but, please, we are not here to debate opening statements.

Mr PICTON: We gave some good opening statements.

The CHAIR: That is a matter of personal opinion, the member for Kurna.

Mr ODENWALDER: Agency Statements, Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 94, Workforce summary. I note that you refer to Mr Beattie as the acting CE of SAFECOM. Can you explain why that would be the case? I do not for a second disparage Mr Beattie. I know he is a fine man.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am glad you don't. All the gentlemen sitting alongside me do outstanding work. The reason that I referred to Mr Beattie with that title is because the CE of SAFECOM, Mr Malcolm Jackman, is on leave.

Mr ODENWALDER: On leave—has he begun his arrangements of working part time?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, he has.

Mr ODENWALDER: Is he on leave or is it his day off?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, just to be clear: at this point in time Mr Beattie is acting in that role because Malcolm Jackman had holidays booked a while ago.

Mr ODENWALDER: Alright. I will go to the objective on Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 94. I will start with the review which was announced last week in tandem with that announcement about Mr Jackman going part time. When will the terms of reference for this review be released, and what do you expect them to be looking at exactly?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Page 94, you said, and what line, sorry?

Mr ODENWALDER: Just the objective of the agency. You have announced a review into the agency and I want to know when the terms of reference will be released and what do you expect them to be looking at?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I understand where you are going with the question but I cannot quite align it to a budget line. I will give you an answer because I think I can appreciate where your question is coming from. I recently approved a request from Mr Jackman, as you pointed out, the Chief Executive of SAFECOM, to trial a part-time arrangement, working three days a week for six months. On 18 September 2018—

Mr ODENWALDER: Excuse me, minister, for six months?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, it was a trial period for six months.

Mr ODENWALDER: A trial period.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes.

Mr ODENWALDER: First, I want to ask about the trial period: at the end of the trial period you will assess whether that is a satisfactory arrangement and then you will demand that he go full time, if that is necessary.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Maybe I can finish and it may—

Mr ODENWALDER: No, it was a legitimate question.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —give you the answers you want.

Mr ODENWALDER: As long as we get the answer to that question and also I would like to know what days he is having off.

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, the minister is answering this question and I am sure that in the fullness of his answer you will get probably a bit more than you are at the moment because you keep interrupting.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you, Chair, and thank you for allowing me to finish. Again, just to give some more detail to the member: on 18 September 2018, following Mr Jackman's request, I announced that the government would be undertaking a review of SAFECOM. A small team has been established in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, led by Christine Bierbaum, to undertake the review and will work with the emergency services sector and SAFECOM to develop terms of reference, to identify appropriate governance arrangements, budgets and time frames.

A working group will be established to support the review, comprising the chief officers, the chief executive of SAFECOM and senior officials from DPC, Department of Treasury and Finance and SA Police. DPC will examine whether the functions provided by SAFECOM are delivered in the best manner. The review will examine a number of other issues, but that review and those terms of reference are being established as we speak.

Mr ODENWALDER: What do you expect this review to cost the budget? Will extra resources from SAFECOM be allocated to this review?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I just outlined, it will be done by DPC, so there is no cost to the budget. I note, though, that in a review the previous government did they got in EY consultants and it cost over \$95,000. This is not that review; this is just looking at the management of SAFECOM, and I am expecting that it will be done very swiftly.

Mr ODENWALDER: How swiftly?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Very swiftly. The point I make, member for Elizabeth, is that it is not a long, drawn-out process, as has happened previously—we are just looking at that sector, at the SAFECOM management, not the whole sector, just at SAFECOM. As I pointed out in my previous answer, the chief executive went to three days a week, and that went to the head of public sector employment, the commissioner. She agreed to those terms, so we put it in as a trial for six months, as I outlined previously, and that has given us the opportunity then to go, 'Well, let's have a look at the management structure and do a review on that.' I stress the point that that has been done through DPC and not through a big costly exercise.

Mr ODENWALDER: Was it instigated by you?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes.

Mr ODENWALDER: It was. And when did the idea first occur to you? Was it when he came to you asking for three days a week?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, when he went to three days a week I thought, 'Well, hang on, that's probably a good, timely opportunity to have a look at this situation.'

Mr ODENWALDER: You had never seen a need for a review before? This need for a review is precipitated entirely by his going to three days a week?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: When the chief executive went to three days a week and came to me with that plan, it made me think that this is an opportune time to have a look and do a review of the sector, as I said previously, and that is the decision I made.

Mr ODENWALDER: But if you had been looking at the sector, as you presumably have for the last six months at least, why has not this occurred to you before? If SAFECOM suddenly needs reviewing simply because the CE has chosen, for whatever reason (and we will get to that), to go to three days a week, why did it not occur to you before? What has changed? Let me put it another way: before Mr Jackman asked you to go to three days a week, had you received any submissions or had any conversations with anyone within the agencies that SAFECOM needed reviewing, was in need of some sort of shake-up?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: When I came into this role with all my portfolios, I looked at all of the portfolios. For SAFECOM specifically I have made it very clear that I looked at the operations, worked very closely with all the chiefs and acting chiefs, and they have been outstanding people doing wonderful work, engaged with people on the ground and met with the volunteers, the volunteers' association and all the key stakeholders in this industry—can I stress the point, the volunteers specifically, as to the great work they do and how much I think everyone in this place here, in both houses, appreciates what the volunteers do.

I made that decision after Mr Jackman came and said that he wanted to go to three days a week, and that triggered my saying, 'Well, let's do a review, let's have a look at the management of this', and that is exactly what we are doing.

Mr ODENWALDER: When did you first become aware of Mr Jackman's desire to go to three days a week? I am using shorthand here.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: When did I become aware, as in when did he approach me with it?

Mr ODENWALDER: When did he tell you? When did you become aware? Whether he told you or whether—when did you become aware that he wished to—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am trying to think of the date, and I will not take a stab at a date. I can go away and find—

Mr ODENWALDER: Okay; was it a couple of weeks ago when you announced the review, or was it significantly before that? Was it several weeks before that? Was it months before that?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It was before I announced the review that Mr Jackman came to me with this. As I said in my previous answer—

Mr ODENWALDER: I know it was before, but how long before? You can at least differentiate—

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, the minister is I think being pretty fulsome.

Mr ODENWALDER: In his usual manner, sir.

The CHAIR: Patient, is what I encourage you to be.

Mr ODENWALDER: It is not in my nature, sir.

The CHAIR: I disagree. I think you are a wonderful, patient man.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I was saying, Mr Jackman came to me with the proposition of going three days a week. I went to the public sector commissioner and discussed it with her to see if it would work. She came back with the advice that we could go ahead with it for a trial period; that is what we put in place. I made abundantly clear a few moments ago that it is a six-month trial.

At that time, I made the decision that we would do a review of the SAFECOM management—a very quick review, not an over-the-top review as happened previously under the previous government that, as I pointed out, cost \$95,000. This is just one done through DPC to have a look at the structure.

Mr ODENWALDER: I understand that you have started a review; I think that is clear. What I am trying to establish, though, is when Mr Jackman expressed to you that he wanted to go three days a week. Was it two days before you announced the review or was it weeks before?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, it was back in July. I cannot give you an exact date but—

Mr ODENWALDER: In July?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes.

Mr ODENWALDER: So why not announce a review then? If a review is necessary, I do not understand the timing. I do not understand why the two things had to coincide.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am not sure—

Mr ODENWALDER: You had been having conversations since July with Mr Jackman, so that is two or three months. Why did you decide last week to grant him the three days a week and then announce a review, all at the same time, with fire season approaching?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, I am not sure that you understand the time line. I granted Mr Jackman the three day a week offering and then decided to do a review on the back of that on the proviso—

Mr ODENWALDER: I am just wondering why it took three months to grant him the three days. Why wait? If you knew from July that that is what he wanted, and presumably you think it is a good idea, why not grant him that in July?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, as I outlined, I went through that with the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment. We landed on that position. In the wake of that, I made the decision to do the review of SAFECOM. I think that is perfectly good timing and a reasonable thing to do.

Mr ODENWALDER: Would you have instigated the review had Mr Jackman not wanted to go to three days a week? Would this have happened anyway?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That is a very hypothetical question.

Mr ODENWALDER: It is a hypothetical question. This is a fairly relaxed atmosphere, is it not? It is in order?

The CHAIR: We have been allowing hypotheticals all week, rightly or wrongly.

Mr ODENWALDER: Excellent decision. You have set a precedent.

The CHAIR: To hypotheticals, there have been very wide-ranging answers from ministers, and some did not answer them at all because they are hypothetical.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That is fair enough, too. I want to be as cordial and as open as I can with the member for Elizabeth. His question is hypothetical, so would I or would I not? Hypothetically, I do not know because that did not play out. What did play out is exactly what I said; that is, as I outlined a few times to you before, Malcolm went on a three day a week contract for six months, and then I decided to do the review.

Mr ODENWALDER: Let me put it in a way that is not hypothetical. Were you planning to conduct a review into SAFECOM in any case?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Hypothetically?

Mr ODENWALDER: It is not hypothetical. I said 'were you planning'. Were you planning to?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No. That did trigger my decision.

Mr ODENWALDER: It had not occurred to you before?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I was looking through the operations and the way SAFECOM ran. When Malcolm went to three days a week, it gave me the opportunity to say, 'Let's do a review, and let's have a look into this.' I think I have answered that question I was going to say a dozen times but probably more now. I do not think I can be any clearer.

Mr ODENWALDER: You could probably try.

The CHAIR: The member for Heysen has a question.

Mr PICTON: Dixer.

The CHAIR: Sorry, member for Kurna, if you utter that word once more, you will be removed. We do not use the word Dixer in this committee because every member of the committee has an equal opportunity to ask any question as they may sit in the budget line items.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The CHAIR: No, you know I have already ruled on that all week. The member for Heysen has a question from the budget no doubt.

Mr TEAGUE: As a member with responsibility for the Adelaide Hills, this is certainly territory of interest to me. My question relates to Budget Paper 5, page 51, in relation to Alert SA, and also to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 97, regarding the fourth dot point in relation to highlights as well as the fourth dot point in relation to targets 2018-19 regarding the emergency information warning system. Minister, can you provide an update in relation to the status of the replacement Alert SA solution?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you very much, member for Heysen. Being a member in the Hills I can appreciate his interest in this and I appreciate the question. I am very pleased to give this update to the committee. Under the previous Labor government during the period from December 2017 through to January 2018, the Alert SA website and app experienced a number of significant service outages. On 7 January 2018, then minister for emergency services, the member for Kurna, directed the decommissioning of the Alert SA app and website.

Following the decommissioning in January 2018, funding was approved to enable SAFECOM to develop a business case for the replacement Alert SA solution; \$108,000 was expended on engaging expert advice to assist in the development of the business case. In February 2018 SAFECOM was provided funding for \$500,000 to refine the business case, develop detailed specifications for a replacement solution and approach the market. Notably, no money was allocated

to build a new app. A request for information was released to the market in February 2018. This process was followed by an invitation to supply which was issued in an open market approach on 26 March 2018.

In June 2018, an updated business case was established outlining the funding requirements necessary to develop and support a replacement Alert SA solution, user experience and user interface design, and research was undertaken in parallel with this process with the aim of compressing future development time frames. The research conducted also showed that there was a public need for such a high service and that the Alert SA brand was not damaged. The government has announced additional funding in the state budget of \$5.2 million over four years, including \$2.6 million in the 2018-19 budget for the delivery and operation of the new Alert SA website and mobile app.

Focus has been placed on delivering a robust replacement solution and ensuring that the state retains the intellectual property of the new solution to alleviate ongoing dependence on a single contracted supplier. The new Alert SA solution will be delivered in the 2019 calendar year once it has successfully performed against an extensive reliability and load testing regime; 170,000 downloads of the previous Alert SA app were recorded and it is anticipated that the new app will exceed this. It is also noted that the government is looking to recover some costs from the loss of the shutdown, should I say, or the scrapping of the original app, and that recovery equates to just over \$1 million that we are trying to recover from that fiasco.

Mr ODENWALDER: This was \$1 million for the recovery—

The CHAIR: Sorry, where are we in the budget?

Mr ODENWALDER: Sorry, on the same line.

The CHAIR: Which is?

Mr ODENWALDER: Page 94—Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 94, as the member for Heysen made perfectly clear.

The CHAIR: Page 97, to be kind.

Mr ODENWALDER: For the Alert SA replacement? Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 94. How many invitations to supply were received? You said it was updated on 26 March. How many were received and when were they received?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I will take that question on notice. I do not have that detail at hand.

Mr ODENWALDER: Is it in the hundreds or is it one or two? You just do not know.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I just said I would take that question on notice. I do not have the detail at hand.

Mr ODENWALDER: How were the figures of \$2.6 million started up and then \$866,000 going forward over the forward estimates arrived at? Was that based on the previous project?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I think, as I outlined, there was a detailed business case put together and evaluated on the responses that were put forward.

Mr ODENWALDER: I apologise if you have already said this, but I understand from your public statements that a provider has been identified?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes.

Mr ODENWALDER: Can you tell the committee exactly when that decision was made?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No; I do not have the exact date, but I am happy to take that on notice as well.

Mr ODENWALDER: Okay. Who made that decision?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The process is that the evaluation panel made the assessment and then they gave that assessment to the chief executive of SAFECOM, who passed it on to me.

Mr ODENWALDER: Was the evaluation panel within SAFECOM?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, the evaluation panel was from within the organisation.

Mr ODENWALDER: I do not expect you to have this information here, but can you advise the committee who was on that panel?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry?

Mr ODENWALDER: Can you provide the names of the people who were on that panel?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, I can get that for you. I will take that on notice as I do not have those names with me.

Mr ODENWALDER: I understand. Could this project not have been pushed along further? Bushfire season is approaching—when does bushfire season officially start? Gentlemen? Someone must know.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It actually slides along—

Mr ODENWALDER: Yes, I know it slides, but what is the trigger?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The October long weekend. To be more specific: there are nine bushfire management committees, so it starts in different locations at different times. They make the recommendation as to when it starts in each jurisdiction.

Mr ODENWALDER: But you just nominated the October long weekend as kind of a rough estimate?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It is a bit like defining when a season starts. It starts here, but is it going to be hot on 1 December because that is when summer starts? No, it is not. In my mind, as a layperson, they normally think around the October long weekend.

Mr ODENWALDER: You are not a layperson; you are the Minister for Emergency Services.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Laypeople would operate to that, so we draw that common line. The technical answer is: all nine jurisdictions make that assessment and it comes from there.

Mr ODENWALDER: You were obviously aware that the invitations to supply had gone out and that this process was underway, and you are aware that bushfire season is approaching. Did you try to push that project along at any point between March and October? Did you personally involve yourself and say, 'This system needs to get going before we have a bushfire'?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I understand where your question is coming from. I think one thing we need to be really cautious of—as the member for Kaurua would know, it is easy to scrap an app and throw a million dollars out the window. That is really easy to do, but when you are building a brand new app, especially a very important app such as this, you want to make sure you get it right. So—

Mr ODENWALDER: But I assume there is a precedent for this type of app. It is not starting from scratch.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It actually is, because it was previously scrapped. It is not a rebuild, a relaunch or a reload; it is actually starting from new. I have been through the necessary process to get to this point. It is about community safety and we want to get it right, so we will go through that process. We do not want to rush it, and we do not want to get into a situation where it was rushed and had to be scrapped again. We know what happened there.

Mr ODENWALDER: My question was: at any point in the process, did you get involved and ask, 'Can this project be pushed along any faster?' or did you just say, 'Okay, we'll just let it go and let it drift along'?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I stress the point that this is the sort of thing you have to get right. You cannot rush this—

Mr ODENWALDER: I appreciate that. I am not saying 'rush it'; I am saying 'get it done'.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: You cannot rush this. You must do it in the right order at the right time to make sure you deliver a reliable product. We know what happened with the old app and we do not want to have the same situation happen again. It is about making sure we get it right because it is about public safety.

Mr ODENWALDER: Okay. In relation to the million or so dollars you referred to earlier, regarding the legal risk put against the government by the failure of the old app, whereabouts does that figure pop up in the budget?

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, to be completely fair it is for you to find the line item in the budget and to ask the question pertaining to that. That is the purpose of budget estimates—

Mr ODENWALDER: No, that is not true.

The CHAIR: It actually is true. I will allow you to rephrase—

Mr ODENWALDER: The minister mentioned a million-dollar figure which I do not think is in the budget, so I would like the minister to explain where it exists. If it exists that is fine, I stand corrected.

The CHAIR: Does the minister want to answer his question?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: To clarify: it was written off as an expense and there is no contingent liability. We are trying to claw back the loss of—

Mr ODENWALDER: So it is not a cost to the budget?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It has been written off at that price, and there is no contingent liability. It is about trying to get that money back.

Mr PICTON: On the same budget line—

The CHAIR: Member for Kurna, which is?

Mr PICTON: Which is Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, and page 94 comes to mind. From what the minister was saying before—

The CHAIR: Member for Kurna, I like it how you did go to get your budget papers but you have not opened them up. Let us try again for the sake of consistency.

Mr PICTON: Page 95.

The CHAIR: I think you mean 97, because—

Mr ODENWALDER: No, it is here on 95, New projects, Alert SA replacement—

The CHAIR: Well, the member for Kurna is asking the question so he can follow the rules.

Mr PICTON: Page 95. The minister was saying, as has been widely reported, that there was an approach to market in February. He has now said, this new information to me, that, presumably after the election in March, there was a second approach to market. When did that approach to market complete?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Just to clarify it, because I do not want to mislead the committee, I will just go over this so it is clear for everyone. During the period from December 2017 through to January 2018, the Alert SA website and app experienced a number of significant service outages, we know that. On 7 January 2018, the then minister for emergency services directed the decommissioning of Alert SA—you will remember that—and the website as it could no longer be utilised and promoted as a reliable information channel to the community during emergencies.

Following the decommissioning in January 2018 funding was approved to enable the SA Fire and Emergency Services Commission (SAFECOM) to develop a business case for a replacement Alert SA solution, and \$108,000 was expended in engaging expert advice to assist in the development of the business case. In February 2018 SAFECOM was provided funding of half a million dollars to refine the business case, develop detailed specifications for the replacement solution, and approach the market.

A request for information was released to the market in February 2018. This process was followed by an invitation to supply, which was issued in an open market approach on 26 March 2018.

Mr PICTON: My question is: when did that complete, the invitation to supply?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am advised we do not have the date at hand, so I will take that on notice.

Mr PICTON: Okay, if you can take it on notice. On what date was a supplier selected?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have already indicated that I will supply that as a question on notice. I will take it on notice to get you the exact date as well.

Mr PICTON: Okay. Do you know roughly? Was it in the last month or was it three months ago or—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I do not want to mislead the house, so I will take it on notice. If I had a stab in the dark that could be misleading.

Mr PICTON: Who is the supplier?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am advised it is a local company, SRA Information Technology.

Mr PICTON: Have they delivered similar products in the past?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, I am informed they are a local South Australian company that has delivered significant ICT products both nationally and internationally.

Mr PICTON: Is what you have asked them and contracted them to do essentially the same as the previous app in terms of what consumers will see, that there will be an app and a website, or are there changes in terms of what the contract is under this product?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am advised that this company is going to keep the Alert SA brand and name. The research shows that it is still very strong, so that is great. It will have a slightly different look and feel—and we know that technology has advanced so I would imagine there will be some things that are different to the previous app—but deliver the service we require.

Mr PICTON: Is there a particular date by which they have to have delivered a product to you?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I do not have the exact date. I do not have the contract in front of me, but I do stress the point, as I have made to the member for Elizabeth very firmly, that we want to get this right. Again, you know personally yourself what it is like if it is not right. You shut down the previous app. We do not want to do that again. We are working with this company. I am happy to take that on notice and check the contract and see if there is a definitive date. We are hoping for the next calendar year, as I pointed out, and we will want it sooner rather than later but we will not want to push the project to risk another failure like you experienced.

Mr ODENWALDER: Budget Measures Statement, MFS, page 49. I want to talk a little bit about emergency services in Mount Barker. I note the decision to establish a retained fire station in Mount Barker. Can you outline very briefly the reasons why you think there should be a retained fire station at Mount Barker? How was that decision made?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As the member would be aware, there is a large growing population in Mount Barker in the community there, and they need both residential fire protection and bushfire protection. In this budget, we have provided the MFS with additional funding from 2019-20 to implement a retained fire station model in Mount Barker in phase 1. The phase 1 transition is expected to take approximately six months to implement. It is proposed that the standard MFS retained firefighter process will be implemented, targeting to recruit as many personnel as possible from the ranks of the existing Mount Barker CFS brigade.

The MFS will utilise the existing CFS fire station and that money in the forward estimates, as you can see, is there for 2019-20, 2020-21 and 2021-22. As noted in that, it also includes \$1.8 million for appliances. The MFS has been provided additional funding from 2018-19 for an engineer and safety officer in 2018-19 and 2019-20. I apologise—

Mr ODENWALDER: That was the aluminium cladding.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That is the aluminium cladding, which is another commitment that we made. The retained firefighting service in Mount Barker has been very welcomed by the community. I know the local member is very excited and it is a growing population base.

Mr ODENWALDER: I am sure they are. You mentioned you are working on recruiting from the existing CFS. Is that right?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, the option is there for CFS firefighters.

Mr ODENWALDER: What sort of impact do you expect that to have then on the existing CFS? You say the nature of Mount Barker is that there is a growing residential area but also a significant bushfire risk. Have you made some assessment of the impact that developing a retained MFS station will have on the existing CFS volunteer force, considering that you are recruiting from that volunteer force?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have outlined the wonderful work that the volunteers do, in particular through the Adelaide Hills, as the member for Heysen would very much know. I was up there just the other week, speaking with a few of the locals in Mount Barker. One of the great things about that community is that they are very passionate about their community. I will defer and get the names of all the smaller CFS stations around, but I know there is Littlehampton, Nairne, Meadows, Hahndorf—I am putting the chief on the spot here to name them all and not leave anyone out.

Mr ODENWALDER: In alphabetical order, please.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: There are four, and I think there might be a fifth or even a sixth in that localised area, which does show the community spirit of that region and the understanding of what the community needs. I was so impressed that these little communities around the bigger community of Mount Barker have their CFS stations and that they are well supported. We will be working with the CFS. The CFS does a great job all the time of growing their volunteer base and keeping people engaged with the community. I see this as a really good opportunity to have both the CFS and the MFS in that community working together. They are a very passionate bunch. We are always looking for more CFS volunteers.

Mr ODENWALDER: I assume they overlap. I assume that CFS volunteers can also be retained MFS firefighters. Is that the case?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes.

Mr ODENWALDER: Presumably, you envision that there will be quite a lot of crossover in the workforce.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes.

Mr ODENWALDER: Has that happened in other places? Is that the situation in Gawler and places like that?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes. Mount Gambier has a full-time crew and a retained crew as well, so it does happen in other jurisdictions.

Mr ODENWALDER: No, sorry, my question was about sharing between the CFS volunteer force and the MFS retained force. Does that happen a lot on the peri-urban fringes? Is that a standard model or is Mount Barker a special case?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: There are others around the state that have a similar model or different models, depending on the nuances of the localised area. I mentioned Port Lincoln and Mount Gambier, but Mount Barker will be one of the only ones that has this arrangement where they share the shed. We were up there the other day, and I have never seen a neater set-up in my life. I know the acting chief was suitably impressed—the boots were very well polished.

Mr ODENWALDER: That is good to know.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: And the station was very—

Mr ODENWALDER: It is funny that, is it not? It is because you were visiting the station.

The CHAIR: I know that the member for Colton has been waiting very patiently. He has a question.

Mr COWDREY: I have a question that I think the member for Kaurua has a lot of interest in as well. Budget Paper 5, Budget Measures Statement, page 52. Can you provide an update in relation to the new drone capability of surf lifesaving clubs in South Australia?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I thank the member for the question. This is another exciting election commitment. Prior to the election, the government made this commitment to provide unmanned aerial vehicle capability to surf lifesaving clubs in South Australia. A small working committee was subsequently formed by Surf Life Saving South Australia in consultation with Surf Life Saving New South Wales, who had recently undertaken a similar project with significant positive outcomes. Surf Life Saving South Australia subsequently provided recommendations to the government for the establishment of a UAV capability based on the New South Wales service, to be managed centrally through Surf Life Saving South Australia headquarters but to be available to all Surf Life Saving South Australia clubs.

The decision to manage the capability centrally was based on the technical nature of the equipment and significant considerations towards gaining and maintaining current competency as pilots. Currently, four UAVs have been acquired in preparation for the forthcoming season, with further aircraft to be acquired during this financial year. The first pilot training course has also been conducted, with eight pilots successfully completing the course. It is anticipated that further training courses will be conducted during this financial year to extend and maintain the capability and ensure availability to all clubs, commensurate with risk assessments made by Surf Life Saving South Australia.

The provision of UAV capability will enhance Surf Life Saving South Australia's ability to meet marine-related risk in a broad beach safety context, as well as complementing fixed-wing and rotary aerial shark surveillance capabilities. During the 2018-19 financial year, Surf Life Saving South Australia has been provided with a grant of \$190,000 from the Community Emergency Services Fund to establish the capability, including the acquisition of aircraft and training of pilots. This is a very exciting project that will very much add to the safety on our beaches into the future.

Mr ODENWALDER: I want to take the minister now to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 97, talking about the State Emergency Information Call Centre. Firstly, I assume this is the State Control Centre—we are talking about the same thing, are we not? The terminology is the same?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: My apologies; can you provide that page number again?

Mr ODENWALDER: Page 97 of Volume 2. In description and objective—in fact, in the highlights, you say there has been enhanced State Emergency Information Call Centre capability. Can you outline what that is, given I cannot see anything in the budget relating to this?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry; are you asking if it is—you changed your question. Was your question about if it is the headquarters or—

The CHAIR: I think the member for Elizabeth was just clarifying whether the SEICC is the same as—

Mr ODENWALDER: The same as the State Control Centre.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, it is not.

Mr ODENWALDER: Okay. Last year, on 17 January, the then opposition criticised the state government for its, 'Pathetic commitment to look at finding a new home for the State Control Centre, which serves the—

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth.

Mr ODENWALDER: Yes?

The CHAIR: It is not for you to reflect on whether something is pathetic or not.

Mr ODENWALDER: No, this is not me—I beg your pardon—I am quoting from a Liberal press release.

The CHAIR: Well, then that is entirely in order, and continue.

Mr ODENWALDER: Given the Weatherill government's 'pathetic commitment' to finding a new home for South Australia's State Control Centre, can you detail what the current government has done in relation to that?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Do you know who that quote was attributed to? It was a scathing quote about the previous government.

Mr ODENWALDER: Yes: it was the member for Schubert, on 17 January.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The honourable Minister for Transport.

Mr ODENWALDER: Yes, indeed.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What I can tell you is—

Mr ODENWALDER: He was a good shadow minister.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What I can tell you is, successive independent and internal reviews have identified significant operational limitations of current headquarter facilities for SES, CFS and SAFECOM, located at 60 Waymouth Street, Adelaide. A market call seeking accommodation proposals from the private sector closed on 16 February, 2018. Twenty-one submissions were received, of which five were shortlisted in April 2018. This issue had been going on for more than a decade, and that is where the previous government left the situation. As I said, 21 submissions were received, of which five were shortlisted in April 2018.

The government has committed to progressing the initiative, as outlined in the budget measures paper. Final budget impacts across the forward estimates will be determined following commercial negotiations with shortlisted proponents. The Country Fire Service, State Emergency Service and SAFECOM have been in that building. The current lease term expires on 1 November, 2017, with a three year-by-year option negotiated to extend the lease.

The CFS State Coordination Centre and the SES State Control Centre operate from this site. Their functions are primarily associated with supporting command and control coordination and intelligence capabilities to manage large-scale emergencies and disasters. I am aware that the current leased accommodation is severely compromised in terms of building resilience, operational capability—

Mr ODENWALDER: We were aware of this last year, minister.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —access amenities, and parking for staff and volunteers.

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, the minister is—

Mr ODENWALDER: Well—

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, the minister is providing his answer and you are cutting into your own time by interrupting.

Mr ODENWALDER: Sure.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and that successive independent and internal reviews have identified significant operational limitations, but, as I said, nothing had been done. The market call—

Mr ODENWALDER: You have had a shortlist now for five months and nothing has happened since then?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The market call requesting proposals for a private sector was sent out and closed on 16 February. The emergency services sector and the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure are leading commercial negotiations with shortlisted proponents. An improved accommodation solution, when agreed and implemented, will enhance community safety through the provision of enhanced service delivery, increased operational performance—

Mr ODENWALDER: So when will that be?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —enhanced situational awareness, improved effectiveness and much more effective operation of administrative—

Mr TEAGUE: Point of order.

The CHAIR: Yes, member for Heysen?

Mr TEAGUE: Standing order 271: this estimates committee is, so far as practicable, to follow procedures in a committee of the house of parliament. A question has been asked. The minister is in the course of answering the question and I ask you, Mr Chair, to direct the questioner to allow the minister to complete his answer.

The CHAIR: Yes, member for Heysen, I uphold your—

Mr ODENWALDER: Point of clarification: if we are following so closely the procedures of the House of Assembly, then the minister should be providing relevant information and not detouring on all sorts of irrelevant matters.

The CHAIR: Indeed, and if I could quote one of my favourite Speakers, Speaker Atkinson—

Mr ODENWALDER: You and me both, sir.

The CHAIR: —I believe the minister is very germane to his answer. I do uphold the member for Heysen's point of order.

Mr ODENWALDER: I want to know—

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, I just remind you once again, that essentially this is the committee's estimate. The more you choose to interrupt and the more you interject, the more the member for Heysen will make valid points of order and the more I will rule on them and the more time I will take up. Bearing in mind that we only have 10 minutes left in this session, we can continue having a debate about whether the minister is providing a fulsome answer or not, but ultimately that chews into your next question. I think the minister is entirely in line and I am sure he will conclude his answer shortly so that we can get on to the next question.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you, Chair. Absolutely, I will. Where I was going with my response was, what we are doing will resolve a longstanding known risk and vulnerability for the state. The previous government sat on their hands, and it is the Marshall Liberal government that is taking action with this matter. I think in your question the quote from the previous shadow minister was spot on.

Mr ODENWALDER: It was spot on. So what have you done since April? You said there were five shortlisted in April. What has happened since then?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I have outlined, we have progressed this matter. It is in the budget and we are moving forward, unlike what the previous government did.

Mr ODENWALDER: You have progressed the matter how? This is not the radio now. You have to give some detailed answers. You do not just go to the next thing.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I gave you an answer.

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, you have asked your question. The minister will now provide an answer.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have given an answer.

Mr ODENWALDER: What have you done since April?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We have progressed the matter. It is in the budget. We are moving forward with this project.

Mr ODENWALDER: What has happened, though? What have you done?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I have outlined, we are progressing this, as opposed to the previous government, which did nothing for 16 years. I appreciate your interest. What I can also maybe add is that detailed commercial negotiations with shortlisted proponents will be undertaken

by DPTI. Finalisation and approval of a preferred proponent will also be achieved. That will be what is happening. The target is for 2018-19.

Mr ODENWALDER: That will happen. Why did it not happen in April or May or June?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: You guys sat on your hands for 16 years—

Mr ODENWALDER: I did not.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and you want us to do it in six months. It is quite phenomenal. We are progressing.

Mr ODENWALDER: I am just asking you a question. There is no need to be defensive. I am asking you a question.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We are progressing this project after years of neglect.

Mr ODENWALDER: I am just asking you a question.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: And I have answered the question.

Mr PICTON: Same budget line.

The CHAIR: Which is what, member for Kaurua? You should know by now.

Mr PICTON: Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 64, in terms of the Country Fire Service. In terms of the control centre, when does the minister expect that he will have picked one of those five proponents that have been shortlisted since April?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I outlined just a second ago, but am happy to repeat for the member, commercial negotiations with shortlisted proponents will be undertaken by DPTI.

Mr PICTON: Yes. The question was when?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: You will have to ask DPTI. They are working through that. When that has been decided, we will let you know.

Mr PICTON: So you do not have any interest in that as the Minister for Emergency Services?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have answered your question.

Mr PICTON: Have you asked DPTI when that is likely to be?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have answered your question.

Mr PICTON: You do not know?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have answered your question.

Mr PICTON: Wow.

Mr ODENWALDER: I take the minister back to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 94, which goes to the objectives of SAFECOM. What reasons did Mr Jackman give you for requesting a part-time position, as opposed to a full-time position?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have given a number of responses on this and I do not want to be repeating myself, but if I am asked the same questions—

Mr ODENWALDER: No; that would be great.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: If I am asked the same question, I will have to give the same answer, which you would appreciate. Mr Jackman came to me and asked to do this role three days a week, making himself available 24 hours a day seven days a week but on that remuneration, and his package was altered accordingly. I stated that I went to the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment and asked her to have a look over the proposal to see if it would work. The advice came back that it could work and to give it a six months' trial, and that is what we did.

Mr ODENWALDER: I understand that, so thank you for repeating that, but what reasons did Mr Jackman give you for that request?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: He felt that he could do the job in that time frame.

Mr ODENWALDER: So he felt that he could do a full-time job adequately within three days.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That was what was put to me and what I put to the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment.

Mr ODENWALDER: But what did Mr Jackman tell you?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I just answered that.

Mr ODENWALDER: He told you that he could do his job, that he currently does, in three days, rather than five days.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes. As I pointed out, making himself available seven days a week but working—

Mr ODENWALDER: But remunerated only for three days, with the appropriate loadings, or whatever it is. What days then is he expected to be in the office?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That is the flexible work arrangement that he is negotiating.

Mr ODENWALDER: Right, so any equivalent three days over any period. Do you think the job can be done adequately in that time frame? Do you think it is a part-time position; is that your view?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That is a really good question and, do you know what, when I thought about that for a minute I thought, 'We should have a review,' and that is what we are doing.

Mr ODENWALDER: Right. What are the terms of reference for this review?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That is being worked out, as I answered a little while ago now. That is being worked through the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and I can give you—

Mr ODENWALDER: Have any of the other agencies—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —a little more information, if you like. Just as far as the review is concerned, a small team has been established by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, led by Christine Bierbaum, to undertake the review, and will work with the emergency service sector, including—as I have stressed—the volunteers' association and SAFECOM, to develop terms of reference and to identify appropriate governance arrangements, budget and time frames. The working group will be established to support the review, comprising the chief officers, chief executive of SAFECOM and senior officials from DPC, Department of Treasury and Finance and SA Police.

Mr ODENWALDER: When you told Mr Jackman that his decision had precipitated a review, did he express any concerns about that, about the review or the timing?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No.

Mr ODENWALDER: He did not express any concerns to you at all.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No.

Mr ODENWALDER: Okay. Have any of the other agencies or their relevant officers or CEs expressed any reservations about either the review or the timing of the review?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Reservations, no; questions, yes. They asked how long we thought it would go. They were probably—and I think I mentioned this before, and again, I apologise but when the question is the same I have to give the same answer—they thought it might have been the 95,000—

The CHAIR: Minister, to be fair the member for Playford he has not asked a single question all morning, which surprises me, as well. I am also disappointed.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We all are.

Mr BROWN: I am being eliminated by other people's questions, Chair.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you, Chair. It is the elimination that I am responding to, Chair, thank you. The other agencies had questions, yes. I said there were questions because they were concerned that it might have been, as I have said previously, another \$95,000 overarching, huge review. It is not that. It is an internal review being done through DPC that is just looking at the SAFECOM management structure.

Mr ODENWALDER: If I understand you correctly, you are saying that some officers came to you with some concerns and you allayed those concerns by saying that it would be a minimal review. Is that right?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, you did not hear me correctly, so I will repeat the answer again. I apologise, but if he does not hear I have to repeat it.

The CHAIR: Minister, please direct the answer through the Chair.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you, Chair. If he does not hear I have to repeat the answers. No, they did not come with concerns, they came with questions.

Mr ODENWALDER: With questions.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, just clarifying how it was going to work.

Mr ODENWALDER: Who came to you with questions?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: You asked me if any of the chiefs came to me with questions.

Mr ODENWALDER: Yes, which ones? Who came to you with questions?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have to try to think who it was. I am not going to have a stab. I would have to go away and take it on notice and have a think about it, because I cannot remember exactly.

Mr ODENWALDER: And whose decision was it to appoint Christine Bierbaum to lead this review?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That was through the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Mr ODENWALDER: It was not your decision?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No.

Mr ODENWALDER: Did you play any role in that decision?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, I asked the department to do it and they assigned someone to do the job.

Mr PICTON: Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 94, the same line of questioning in terms of SAFECOM and the CEO. Were you concerned in terms of when you approved the six-month appointment part time at three days a week that that might lead to confusion, it might lead to times when there was not somebody in charge of the organisation, which were, I have to say on the record, reasons why I refused a similar request that was made to me when I was the minister for emergency services. I am happy to put that on the record.

The CHAIR: Member for Kaurua, it is not relevant what you did in a previous administration. We are here to look at the budget line items; the minister can answer that broad question accordingly.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, I was not concerned. Again, I spoke with the head of the public sector, the commissioner, and took her advice. I believe very strongly in the capabilities of the three agencies as well. I think the people running those agencies do an outstanding job. As you know, SAFECOM is not an operational arm. The MFS do their job, and a wonderful job; the SES do their job, and a wonderful job; and the CFS do their job, and a wonderful job—more specifically, the CFS and SES, with the volunteers they have. They are truly great people and great South Australians and go relatively unrecognised, I think, in our community, which is something I am working on to make sure that they do get that recognition they deserve. They do an outstanding job.

So no, I was not concerned. I took the advice and, again, I stress the point that SAFECOM is not an operational arm in that the agencies do their work, and with the people in charge I think they do a very good job.

The CHAIR: I declare the examination of the proposed payments for the portfolio SAFECOM, Emergency Services Levy Fund, Country Fire Service, SA Metropolitan Fire Service, State Emergency Service, and the estimate of payments for administered items for the Department of Treasury and Finance completed. The Department of the Premier and Cabinet and administered items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet will remain adjourned until later today.

Sitting suspended from 10:32 to 10:46.

Membership:

Mr Malinauskas substituted for Mr Picton.

Departmental Advisers:

Cmmr G. Stevens, Commissioner of Police, South Australia Police.

Mr S. Johnke, Director, Business Services, South Australia Police.

Mr I. Hartmann, Manager, Financial Management, South Australia Police.

Mr J. Down, Inspector, Staff Officer—Commissioner, South Australia Police.

The CHAIR: Welcome back, everyone. We open up the proposed payments for the portfolio of SAPOL. We of course have the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. I declare the proposed payments open for examination and refer members to the Agency Statements, Volume 4. Minister, please introduce your new advisers and make an opening statement, if you so desire.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I would like to introduce, on my very far left, Mr Ian Hartmann, Manager, Financial Management, SAPOL. Mr Stephen Johnke, Director, Business Services, SAPOL is to my immediate left. To my right is the Commissioner of Police, Mr Grant Stevens, and behind is James Down, Inspector, Staff Officer—Commissioner, SAPOL.

During my short time as minister, I have been nothing but impressed by the commitment and hard work of all members of SAPOL who I have come into contact with. From the Police Academy to Hindley Street, Port Augusta and Mount Gambier, I have been fortunate to experience firsthand just some of the challenges and situations faced by the force every day. I look forward to meeting many more members over the coming months. One thing is clear: the importance of visible front-line policing has never been greater.

The Marshall government has immediately got to work to address our election commitments, including the appointment of the Hon. Kevin Duggan AM QC to conduct a review of police work, an independent audit of traffic cameras, establishment of a counterterrorism action plan, development of a hoon driving hotline capability for the public to report traffic behaviour and offending, funding for a trial of light armoured vests and, in line with community concern, changes to police station opening hours at Henley Beach, Norwood and Glenelg.

One thing is absolutely certain: no changes or decisions made by the new government will have any impacts on front-line policing. We are committed to ensuring that our police force is equipped with the experience, the resources and the tools they need for policing in the 21st century. I also take the opportunity to acknowledge the important work of the Police Association, in particular the president, Mark Carroll, and the secretary, Bernadette Zimmermann, and acknowledge the work they do for their members.

The CHAIR: Thank you, minister. The member for Elizabeth may have an opening statement or a question.

Mr ODENWALDER: I have a brief opening statement. I concur with the minister, of course. I put on the record my extreme admiration for SAPOL as an organisation. I think it is respected across the country. I am particularly proud to have been part of a government which for 16 years invested so heavily in SAPOL, in its resources and its people. I have to say that; I have a former police minister sitting next to me. On that note, I will get straight into questions. Minister, I will go straight to the workforce, referring to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 13. Can you tell me on latest figures how many sworn police officer FTEs there are currently employed? I thought I would start with an easy one, minister.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I can give you numbers on just about everything here, so I will drill down to that one. For 30 June, the projection is 4,673.2 FTEs. That is the total full-time employee count.

Mr ODENWALDER: As at when?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Estimated result 30 June. I am informed as well that as at 30 June 2018 SAPOL had 5,903.7 active FTEs, representing 4,651.8 FTE active police, sworn or community constables; and 193 cadets at the Police Academy who graduate in 2018-19.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That sounds about right. Just to clarify—

The CHAIR: Member for Croydon, you have a question?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Sorry. Thank you, Mr Chair.

The CHAIR: It comes through the Chair, as you should know. Please identify what page and budget line you are referring to.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am talking on the same budget line that was just mentioned by the member for Elizabeth.

The CHAIR: Good. If you had been following how we do things in here, every new questioner has to go back to where we started from.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes, I have noted in proceedings that the format that has been applied by you, Mr Chair, is somewhat different than in committee A.

The CHAIR: Do you have a question, member for Croydon?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes. For the sake of clarity, and putting aside the—

The CHAIR: Sorry, the budget line item?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: On the same one that was mentioned.

The CHAIR: Which is?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 13. In regard to the numbers, putting aside the number of full-time employees or FTEs from SAPOL and just focusing on active sworn police, was I right that you said 4,658 active sworn officers, and that is including community constables, plus 93 cadets?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, sorry. I will go again just to be clear: 4,651.8 FTE active police, sworn or community constables, so both of those.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Sure.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: And 193 cadets at the Police Academy who graduate in 2018-19.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: When do those cadets graduate?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The 193 cadets are staggered over the year, but a proportion of those will go towards the 4,713 who will graduate in January. Good to see you here, by the way; I was expecting to see Katrine.

Mr ODENWALDER: Point of order—

The CHAIR: Let's just get on with the questions.

Mr ODENWALDER: Sure. I hope you will hold the minister to the same standard you hold the rest of us, sir.

The CHAIR: I hold everyone to the same standard—

Mr ODENWALDER: Good, I hope so. Over the course of the afternoon or the morning, I want to get a clear idea of exactly who these people are and where they work. Can you give me the community constable number again?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I think it was 193, but I am just guessing—sorry, that was the number of cadets. I will get the community constable number for you; I should not guess, and I apologise. I will wait to get the exact figure. When you say you want to know all about them, are we talking names? Birthdays? Where are we going here?

Mr ODENWALDER: I want to know how many there are.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: You said you wanted to know everything about them, so I am just checking.

The CHAIR: Minister—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry; I am waiting for the answer, Chair.

The CHAIR: —it is not appropriate to provoke the member for Elizabeth.

Mr ODENWALDER: I do not feel provoked, sir; your protection is not needed. I want to know how many there are and where they are stationed.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The number of FTEs at 30 June 2018—I am advised there are 35.47 community constables. You would like to know where they are placed and stationed?

Mr ODENWALDER: Yes.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Actually, that is probably not true: it cannot be 35.47 community constables; it would have to be 35.47 FTEs. I will just get that other information for you as well.

Mr ODENWALDER: While you are going through that workforce, if you could get the number of police security services personnel as well.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As we track them all down, I can tell you there are 10 positions on the APY lands, two at the Maralinga Tjarutja lands at Yalata—so that is 12 positions—and the remainder would be in the metropolitan and local service areas. Would you like an exact location?

Mr ODENWALDER: No, metro is fine. The number of police security officers, if you can? Just to be clear, they are not counted in the sworn number?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No; that is correct. I am advised that at 30 June, there are 125.4 active.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 13 again. How many active sworn police officers left the force in the 2017-18 financial year?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am advised the number was 188 sworn in 2017-18.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So 188 active sworn police retired or, for whatever reason, left the police force?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Just sworn, yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So a component of those people would have been non-active who have since formally left?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Do you have a projected number for what the equivalent would be for this financial year?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am advised that the budget is for about 160 separations.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: On the same budget line, Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 13. I understand that the target for the number of active sworn FTEs under 313 has largely been realised, that the ultimate number—give or take a handful of course—is 4,713 active sworn FTEs. Is that correct?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am advised yes, but that does include seven cyber positions, positions that were released to get cyber experts in, which was agreed with PASA. That was to bring expertise into the operation that would not otherwise have been there. Also, as I think I said before, the January graduation rounds out that 4,713 when those graduates come through.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Excellent. In my reading of the particular budget item, the new budget provides—and I think it is consistent with the public remarks that have been made by you, minister—for that active sworn FTE figure to be maintained throughout the life of the budget. In other words, the savings measures in the budget, the workforce has been excluded from that, that more or less the funding for the 4,713 or thereabouts has been maintained throughout the budget.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes; the sworn workforce, the 4,713, has been quarantined, it is a front-line service, obviously. So yes that is there and protected, if you like, as it has been with other emergency services. For SAPOL that 4,713 figure is guaranteed.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: On the same budget item, and in regard to the cadet courses, I note that the cadet course has been delayed, which provides for a saving. What are the implications of that regarding the number of police? In other words, if the cadet course is delayed and attrition continues at the rate that has occurred and that is largely forecast to occur, what will that do to the sanctity of that 4,713 number?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am happy for the commissioner to explain the time line on this.

Cmmr STEVENS: The approach that has been accepted is that 4,713 is a target for 30 June each year, so the cadet courses are phased to ensure that we have a full-time active sworn headcount of 4,713 on 30 June.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That has largely been realised for 30 June 2018. In light of the minister's reference to the existing cadets, those who are in the system now, is that likely to be the case for 30 June 2019?

Cmmr STEVENS: Can you—

The CHAIR: Sorry, commissioner. Minister and member, all questions are to come through me and through the minister. If the minister would be happy for the commissioner to—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Well, through you, Chair, the—

The CHAIR: The question can stand, but it is up to the minister. If he would like the commissioner to answer then he needs to indicate, as per previous practice in this committee.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Can you repeat the question?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: As the commissioner has answered, the 4,713 is taken to be met looking at the 30 June figure. Is it the case that 4,713 or thereabouts, give or take the cyber security numbers you referred to, was realised on 30 June 2018 and that you forecast that will be realised on 30 June 2019?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How about 2020-21?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am happy for the commissioner to respond.

Cmmr STEVENS: We program our recruit courses to meet that target of 4,713 each financial year. With the cadets we have in the academy, as the minister has indicated, a proportion of those goes toward fulfilling the 4,713 commitment at the end of January. The other cadets who are in there are scheduled to graduate in accordance with our budget to meet that 4,713 target and that is the way we program recruit training in 2021 as well.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Through you, Chair. Minister, will the saving that is occurring in regard to the cadet course result in there being periods throughout the financial year where the number of active sworn police will fall below the 4,713 number?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So your saving will result in there being less police during a period of the financial year?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am advised that the 4,713, as has been in the past and as it is going forward, is to be at that point at 30 June, as you have pointed out, give or take the cyber crime and whatever else. Throughout the course of the year, there will be fluctuations to that with people retiring or stepping away and new cadets coming on board. So that fluctuates through the course of the year, with a commitment to hit that number at 30 June.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Through you chair: yes, minister, that is a given because clearly you are not in control of when people decide to retire, but the saving associated—which I believe is in the order of \$1.1 million according to the budget paper—with the cadet course and the timing will necessarily mean that there are less police. Albeit that the 30 June target is met, during the course of the year there will be less police than would otherwise be the case if that saving was not the case.

Mr ODENWALDER: And, indeed, fewer police as we approach 30 June.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am advised, and just to be clear—I think I said this in my last answer but I may not have been clear enough so I apologise if that was the case—the financial structure of the recruitment process has not been impacted, so that recruitment process as it has been in the past will continue into the future. As you rightly pointed out, you cannot control when people retire or step away or whatever might happen. As the graduates come on through that process the funding is there, and there is no savings impact that will affect that funding to make sure that at the end of the year we will be at 4,713.

I stress again that fluctuations throughout the course of the year can take place but to have 4,713 on any given day is not really possible. The agreement is to have 4,713 at 30 June, and the budget and the funding is there to ensure that we get to that point, and there are fluctuations along the way.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Chairman, I will refer to a different budget line to provide an additional level of clarity in regard to my question: Budget Paper 5, Part 2, page 136. Minister, I understand and in no way question the veracity of the budget in order to be able to realise the 4,713 number at or on 30 June or thereabouts.

To be fair, I also appreciate that 4,713 is a rather precise number. Clearly, there will be some variation at either side, but the size of that variation, or the amount that 4,713 has departed from, is very much informed by the way that cadet training courses are undertaken, the time in which they are undertaken and the volume in which people are going through.

I want to understand the implications of the \$1.1 million that is saved across 2018-19 and 2019-20. I do not take away the realisation of the 4,713 on 30 June. I just want to understand what the implication of that \$1.1 million saving is.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: From what I am advised, it is again the issue that we have talked about; that is, that the flow of cadets compared to the number of people who are retiring is going to fluctuate, it is going to vary. However, the commitment as at 30 June is that we will have 4,713.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: We have established that, but the number of cadets does not fluctuate because of the number of people retiring. The number of people retiring fluctuates because of the individual decisions that those officers make around the timing of their retirement. What is being asked here is about the flow of cadets.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Whilst they are being delayed slightly for their course, the cadets will still graduate in time to meet the 4,713 target.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: On 30 June?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes. The target will still be met.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Okay. So what is being delayed?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Just the commencement of some of the programs.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So the delay in the commencement of the program means that they still graduate, only later?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: In time to meet the 4,713.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Sure.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Just to clarify: SAPOL's budget includes \$1.1 million savings over two years to be achieved by revising the timing of the December 2018 intake of 22 cadets to be six months later, commencing in June 2019—and they will still graduate in time. In fact—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Had it not been for that delay, would those cadets have commenced earlier?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Just to clarify, member for Croydon: the strategy is very similar to the strategy that I think your government put in place, where you moved the earlier cadet intake to later in the financial year. It is pointed out that the same strategy of 30 per cent of junior cadet intakes was employed, I think, when you may have been minister. I am not 100 per cent sure, but that is what the previous government did as well. So it was just moving the intake—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Chairman, I am seeking an answer to a pretty specific question, namely, the delay in the commencement of the cadet course that the minister referred to. Presumably, had it not been for that delay, those cadets would be concluding their course earlier and becoming active, sworn FTEs earlier than would otherwise be the case.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The argument is: yes, with the ebbs and flows.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We have made it really clear that at no time are we at 4,713 right the way through. The commitment is to have 4,713. So that is what we will be meeting and, as you did in previous budgets, it is the same effect here to move that back so that we still meet the 4,713.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Through you, Chair, I think the minister needs some clarity on this because the previous budget decisions were made to substantially increase the financial budget allocation to SAPOL in order to be able to grow the police force by an extra 313 active sworn FTEs—so it was a growth. A timing of the growth is one thing, but we are not talking about growth. You are not forecasting, through this budget, to grow the size of the police force. What you are seeking to do is maintain the size of the police force on 30 June each year, which is fine and I am not in any way critical of that. What I am asking about is what happens during the course of the financial year because, just to give some context—

The CHAIR: I appreciate, member for Croydon, that you do have some background experience in this, but, of course, it is to ask the minister—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am asking a question. Are there going to be fewer—

The CHAIR: —but with a lot of context. Ask the question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I will ask a very clear question: are there going to be fewer police officers enrolled in SAPOL, say, for instance on—pick a date—1 May each year, as a result of the delayed intake?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I understand your question and there is a relativity to that—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What is the answer?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry; if I could finish—there is a relativity to that in that we talked before about when people will retire and when people step down—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am not talking about that: I am talking about recruitment.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry; if I can finish please, member for Croydon?

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, can I just remind the committee that this is not an opportunity for debate. This is not the committee stage of the second reading of a bill. It is a chance for the members of the committee to ask questions and the minister—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: We understand the rules. We are just asking questions and just looking for answers.

The CHAIR: I do not know if you do. Member for Croydon, I know this is your first estimates participating as a member of the House of Assembly. The minister is providing an answer. He will provide the answer and you will be able to ask subsequent questions. I am being very generous.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I get your question and you are saying, 'On this given date, what will the number be, depending on the graduates'—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No, that is not my question.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Well, please give your question again, then.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I accept that, on the basis of the answers you have given—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry; what is your question?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am getting there—on 30 June each year the 4,713 number will be realised.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am not asking what the number will be on 1 June, I am asking if the number on 1 June, for instance, will be fewer as a result of the delay that you referred to in the cadet course?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The point of the matter is, potentially, yes—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thank you.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry; if I can finish—but if the 160 that retire retire after 1 June but before 30 June, then it will be no. As you said, you cannot predict when those 160 people forecast to retire are going to retire. If they retire after that date, well, no, it probably will not be. If they retire before that date, potentially it could be. The commitment, as we know, is 4,713 on 30 June. That is what we are committed to.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I do not accept that last part, but in regard to—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We are committed to 4,713 on 30 June.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My question is—

The CHAIR: It is completely irrelevant what anyone accepts or does not accept. The minister provided an answer.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I appreciate the answer. It has provided clarity that the \$1.1 million saving will necessarily result in police starting or being delayed than what would otherwise be the case, which means we are at risk of 4,713—

The CHAIR: Member for Croydon, are you asking another question or making a statement? The member for Colton has been waiting very patiently for over half an hour to ask a question. Member for Colton.

Mr COWDREY: Thank you for your timely attention. My question is with regard to Budget Paper 5, Budget Measures Statement, page 137. Minister, can you provide some more information about the development of rapid response capabilities for SAPOL?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I thank the member for Colton for his interest. I am happy to provide the committee with this update. In line with the Marshall government's election commitments,

SAPOL is in the process of developing a model to significantly enhance the ability of police to respond rapidly to high risk incidents, including terrorist incidents. The key driver for this initiative is the nationally consistent security posture mandated by the federal government and is based on the current advice from Australian security agencies.

Terrorist organisations continue to encourage and incite attacks on defence and police personnel. However, the most likely civilian targets for a terrorist attack within Australia are crowded places, passenger transport facilities and critical infrastructure. The nature of attacks and attack planning, both in Australia and in Europe, indicate that people are currently more likely to be targeted than built infrastructure. Locations are more likely to include significant sporting events, public transport, major shopping precincts and symbolic or cultural sites.

The security risk posed by an active armed offender (AAO) event is prevalent in the community's collective consciousness as a result of interstate attacks and the frequency of media reporting of international AAO events in jurisdictions that share our social values. In the current threat context, there is a business requirement for an agile protective response capability focusing on vulnerable areas with a high risk profile. The benefits of this initiative include a layered approach to public safety by providing a scalable security posture that is not impacted by the availability of the state's police tactical groups to resolve high risk domestic and terrorist incidents.

On Sunday 26 August 2018, the state government announced that SAPOL will be able to use up to 48 sworn positions to create new teams in a middle tier between general duties and highly specialised STAR Group officers. This initiative will bring South Australia into line with other states that have already developed such a capability in response to the changed CT environment within Australia, through enhanced support of front-line police to safely manage major events and the capability to rapidly respond to any terror or high risk incidents in South Australia.

The allocation of dedicated trained and equipped resources and the application of risk treatment strategies for AAO have significant broad benefits for front-line policing beyond effective responses to AAO incidents. The benefits of this include enhanced organisational reputation, image and community confidence; scalable security presence in crowded places at times of actual or perceived increased risk without impacting a high risk response capability; overt scalable security posture for corporately significant deployments to planned events; front-line tactical support, increased tactical options available to front-line policing response; members trained and equipped in method of entry capability for emergency entry to premises and for supporting rapid entry to premises for investigations units; and offender control/management for preplanned operations.

Work has commenced and a discussion paper has been developed to help identify the most appropriate model and structures, with a view towards implementation in 2019-20.

The CHAIR: Thank you, minister. The member for Elizabeth.

Mr ODENWALDER: I have a couple of quick questions on that same line, Budget Measures Statement, page 137. With regard to the counterterrorism rapid response—and I think I am on the record as saying this may well be a perfectly reasonable idea—do you envision that members of this group will also conduct normal patrol work and be attached to districts, or would they be a fully stand-alone team?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am happy for the commissioner to answer this one.

Cmmr STEVENS: Thank you, minister. The intention at this point is not entirely clear. We have indicated that we would require six months to fully scope out the way in which this rapid response capability is going to be established. The options are that they are attached to districts in the metropolitan area or that they are connected to a currently stand-alone area, such as our state tactical response team or our highly specialised STAR Group. The intention is that they will remain mobile and available to respond to specific types of incidents, so their full engagement in general patrol duties is not likely to be one of the outcomes of our concept development. The intention is that they will remain free and available to respond.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I refer to the same item, Mr Chair.

The CHAIR: Page 137, thank you.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Whose idea was the rapid response team, minister?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That is something that we worked on consultatively between myself as the minister and the commissioner.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes, I assume that you consulted with him on it but whose idea was it?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I just answered that question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Can you repeat the answer; I did not hear?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It is something that we worked on consultatively between myself and the commissioner.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Did the police commissioner ask you for the rapid response team to be developed?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, the commissioner put that forward as part of our process, and it was a great idea, and we have supported that idea.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So the police commissioner asked for the rapid response team.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The police commissioner is in charge of operations, as you are well and truly aware.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That is his call and that is what he put.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Was it the police commissioner's idea to develop the rapid response team?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The police commissioner is in charge of operations, as I have said a hundred times over.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: He put that idea on the table in discussions that we have fairly regularly.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Did the rapid response team then have nothing to do with an election commitment?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No. The rapid response was not an election commitment, no.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Just in the answer you gave to the member for Colton, you said that this was as a result of—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, no. As a result of our election commitment that has freed up the staff to be free to be a part of the rapid response. There is a second part, as the commissioner points out, which I will go to in a second. What I said in response to the member for Colton was that our election commitment freed up the staff who will be able to be deployed into the rapid response—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What election commitment was?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: By opening the police station opening hours.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How did that free up police—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, if you let me finish—what that has done there is—you have probably seen in the media and would be aware that we are putting civilians into police stations along with sworn police, so that frees up 26 police officers, along with the prosecutors as well, and they go into a quantum of people who will be available for this rapid response capability, so that was because of our election commitment. Remodelling the police stations with that civilianisation gives us that quantum of around 45 people to go into the rapid response capability. That was the election commitment that freed up those people with the solution that came there, and that gave us the quantum for the rapid response.

The other part to the election commitment that dovetails into this is the doubling of police firearms training which can go specifically towards this rapid response team. Those numbers again, just to clarify: 26 sworn police officers coming out of metro stations and 22 civilianised solicitors going in, so that gives us 48 sworn to go into that capability.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: With the police station hours—obviously you will correct me if I am wrong—the election commitment was to extend the operating hours of a few police stations. I think there were three: Glenelg, Henley Beach and Norwood. In delivering that commitment, did you go beyond that and not just facilitate the civilians working in those extended hours but also working throughout the other hours that were otherwise opening, that it freed up—I have not articulated that question very well, sorry.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: If you go again, that is alright.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Prior to the police stations opening up with the additional hours, as per your election commitment—those police stations were staffed by police presumably—you extended the hours. Extending the hours when they were closed would not have freed up police resources, you would have just taken an additional civilian input. I want to understand how extending the hours freed up police.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I think I understand your question. I am just going to make sure that am not going down the wrong path.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Maybe I will put it another way to make it a bit clearer: neither of us believe in magic puddings, right? So extending police station opening hours does not create more police. So how did you make that work?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I apologise, you have not missed the point I made. The question was a bit long-winded; maybe I did not explain myself clearly enough, too, so I will try to clarify—sing out if my answer is like your question. What we have done with the model is gone back to the way it was previously. Under your government it was sworn police officers in every police station, which chewed up a lot of sworn officers. We have gone in and put civilian workers, administrators, back in to do the administrative work in police stations.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Not just in the extended hours but also the other hours?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: In the other stations as well, sorry.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In all the stations?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: In all the metro stations, yes. So that is where that 26 came from. Twenty-six sworn metro officers come out to go into the Rapid Response Unit, along with 22 solicitors and 42 administrative workers or civilians going into the police stations. So we have administrators doing administrative work. There will still be police officers present—we have made this abundantly clear—to supervise. Just to clarify: this is nothing new; I have put all this on the table before. That was the strategy and that is how it plays out.

It gives us those two capabilities: we meet the commitment, open those police station hours and revert back to a model which, I think, was around, potentially, when you were minister—prior to 313 I am informed. That is when that model was in place. It worked wonderfully well. We are going back to that model and it is allowing us to have that capability that I talked about, the 48 sworn for the rapid response.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That makes sense—you have answered the question, thank you. Just to be crystal clear, there will be police officers working at police stations during the extended opening hours?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How many police officers versus civilian staff will be in those extended hours?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Would you like me to verbalise the numbers for you?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes, sure—just in the extended hours I am talking about.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Just the three stations are you talking about?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: For instance, yes.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: For Norwood, for example, in the extended hours they will have one sergeant, four from other ranks and five ASO staff, so a total of 10. Henley Beach will have—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But how many active sworn SAPOL officers will there be versus civilian staff?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I was just saying: one sergeant, four from other ranks—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So five officers?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes. Henley Beach will be the same, and Glenelg will be three. That is across all hours of service delivery and not just the extended hours. That is the staff there to accommodate the service delivery across the roster for when that station is open.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So during the extended hours at Henley Beach, for instance, since the member for Colton probably takes an interest in this, at 10 o'clock at night, how many SAPOL officers will be on site?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I do not have a breakdown of how many will be there at that time, but they are there for supervision purposes. I am happy to take it on notice and get an hourly breakdown for you.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Whose decision was it to put those police officers in those locations during those extended hours?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The commissioner allocates police resources.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: It was the police commissioner's decision?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: He allocates police resources.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So the police commissioner decided to put active sworn SAPOL officers on those sites during those extended hours?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: To extend the hours and have the ASO2 people and/or civilians there, we have to have police officers there overseeing, so yes, they will.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So whose decision was that?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The police commissioner allocates resources to this. That is his role, his responsibility, and what that has done is, when he looks at the overall force, give him that capability now—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I think you have answered the question, so thank you. It was the police commissioner's decision.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: If I can just finish—

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —it gives him that capability now to have those numbers for the rapid response team. So when you look at the overarching capability of the force, it is an expanded capability.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Did the police commissioner ever advise you against the extended police station opening hours?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, the police commissioner allocates police resources. It does not have anything to do with me.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So the extension of the police station opening hours has nothing to do with the election commitment or you or the Premier or the member for Colton?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, what I said was—I think I have answered this question but I will say it one more time—the police commissioner allocates police resources.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Sure, but the allocation of police resources to extend the opening hours, you are saying, has nothing to do with you?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, the police commissioner allocates police resources.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Okay, so it was the police commissioner's idea to extend the police station opening hours?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The police commissioner allocates resources.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes, I know.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I cannot be any clearer. I have said it four times.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Maybe I will add another level. I can comfortably state here on the record that it was the police commissioner's decision to close those stations for those extended hours. I am trying to understand why the police commissioner decided to now open those stations with those SAPOL officers. So the police commissioner decided to close those stations. Now he has made a decision to allocate staff into those stations. I want to understand why.

The CHAIR: Member for Croydon, I have allowed a very open and free debate on this issue all morning which is—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: It is not a debate. I was asking questions.

The CHAIR: A discussion. I am speaking, member for Croydon. Of course, as you know, the police commissioner is not appearing before this committee or is not answerable to the committee.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No, I am asking the minister.

The CHAIR: The minister is and of course the minister is responsible for the fulfilment of the budget as opened in this session. These are very broad statements and concepts and I think the minister can choose to answer these questions how he likes, but it is not the police commissioner who is here to provide answers or his decisions or reasons in front of the committee: it is the minister and, of course, that through the budget.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: All my questions are to the minister.

The CHAIR: I appreciate that. I am just reminding the committee of its roles and obligations. Minister.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you. I think I have been really clear. I will just make one last statement on this. As you know, it was a government decision to extend the police station opening hours. We funded the police commissioner—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Okay, just—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —sorry, if I can finish—we funded the commissioner to free up police to meet the resources that he needs to deliver what he needs to deliver.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What does he need to deliver?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: He needs to deliver the overall police force—that is what he needs to do.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Who is in charge of police stations?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The police commissioner. I will say it one more time and then I am done.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Are police stations considered to be a matter of police operations?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The police commissioner is in charge of police operations. For the eighth time—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I know that, but I am confused. Are police stations considered a part of police operations?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The police commissioner allocates police resources.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I know that. I am not asking about that. I am asking about police stations. Are police stations a matter of police operations?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Okay, so they are not a matter of government responsibility. They are not a matter of government policy. They are a matter of police operations.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I will be abundantly clear.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: See, just before—and we can check *Hansard*. Just before, you said—

The CHAIR: Member for Croydon.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: —police stations—

The CHAIR: Member for Croydon, when I have the call, you will stop speaking. Period.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I—

The CHAIR: No.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I know he needs your protection—

The CHAIR: No, I am not giving you any protection whatsoever. All I am meaning is you asked the question, the minister is answering it. Let him finish answering it.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But you are interrupting.

The CHAIR: The member for Narungga has a question.

Mr ELLIS: Thank you very much, Chair.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: He was answering the question!

The CHAIR: The member for Narungga has a question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That is a disgrace. You are a disgrace, Mr Chairman. We are trying to ask questions during this estimates process.

The CHAIR: Member for Croydon, I will ask you to withdraw that statement. I will give you an opportunity to withdraw that.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I withdraw.

The CHAIR: Member for Narungga.

Mr ELLIS: I will take the minister to Budget Paper 5, in the budget measures, page 135, and ask that the minister explain to this committee the status of the government's election commitment with regard to light armoured vests for front-line police.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I thank the member for his interest in this area and I am pleased to provide an update to the committee. As the member has noted, the Marshall government made a pre-election commitment for a trial of 100 light armoured vests. If successful, this will lead to a rollout of 1,900 vests in total. The reference to light armoured vests is synonymous with the reference to stab proof vests used by the Police Association in advocating for increased protection for their members.

There are numerous types of multipurpose vests commercially available. Other Australian policing jurisdictions, including New South Wales, have recently introduced such vests after conducting testing and procurement processes. Initially, some suggestion was made that SAPOL could piggyback off of the New South Wales process in order to swiftly expedite the acquisition process. This has since been discounted as a viable option. There are concerns that this would not meet procurement rules and that the New South Wales vest might not prove to be the best option for SAPOL.

The state government's commitment to the initiation of a trial within the first 100 days in office has been met. Work commenced in April 2018 and was formalised in May with the establishment of a working party inclusive of procurement and financial experts, together with subject matter experts inclusive of appropriate gender representation. There are significant complexities which need to be addressed, and the concept of trialling and supplying the new vests is not as simple as first anticipated. It is necessary to establish an appropriate level of ballistic protection for the proposed trial vests.

There are currently over 4,000 SAPOL officers who are operational in the sense that they complete an annual incident management and operational safety training course. Of these, between 2,000 and 2,500 are engaged in front-line uniform operational duties. The next step is the finalisation of an audit of the existing tote vests and completion of recommendations to the commissioner for approval of minimum specifications and standards for the proposed vests. This will then enable the completion of a clear and unambiguous business model. The specific work locations at which the 100 trial vests will be assigned and tested has already been determined by the deputy commissioner.

The trial will also be used to inform a final decision on mandatory wearing of the new vests, given the fundamental proposition that any personal protective equipment provided by the employer should be worn in the course of employment; \$156,000 has been provided in 2018-19 to fund the trial of the 100 vests.

The CHAIR: Thank you, minister. Does the member for Playford have any questions?

Mr BROWN: Not at this stage.

The CHAIR: The member for Elizabeth has a question.

Mr ODENWALDER: You are keeping your powder dry. On the same budget line or Budget Measures Statement, page 139, about light armoured vests, you said that the immediate rollout of vests, and I am paraphrasing, was discounted as a viable option. Who discounted it? By whom? Where did that advice come from?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The commissioner.

Mr ODENWALDER: The commissioner? Okay. I did not quite understand what you said about the allocation of the 100 vests that are funded by this trial. Where will that be?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We are in the process of rolling those out. I think what I said, just for the record, is that the specific work locations at which the 100 trial vests will be assigned and tested has already been determined by the deputy commissioner. That is what the deputy commissioner has done in this process.

Just to clarify: the deputy commissioner has found a range of locations across the state, and this has been talked about a lot with these vests. As you can understand and appreciate, South Australia is a big state; what may be needed at Coober Pedy might be different to Mount Gambier or Murray Bridge—as with, I am informed, water operations and mounted operations. It is very important to get the right vest for the right operation, and there is such a diverse climate and range. That is being explored as we speak.

Mr ODENWALDER: Forgive me if I am not reading the budget papers as well as I should, but there is \$4 million allocated for the trial over four years? Is that right?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What page are you on?

Mr ODENWALDER: Budget measures, page 139. No, I am wrong about that; I beg your pardon. My question is: if \$156,000 is provided for a trial in 2018-19, why is there no budget allocation for a rollout should that occur? Presumably, from what you have said, the trial will result in a rollout of some sort of vest for every front-line officer. Is that right? Will the end result be that every front-line officer will have a vest?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: To be clear, what we have said, and what I said in my last answer, is that it is hard to budget for something when you do not know what you will be needing. That is what is being explored as we speak: determining what is needed and what is required. The

funding will then come from there. I can go through my last answer again, if you would like, to just outline—

Mr ODENWALDER: No. So you do not accept the fundamental proposition that every front-line police officer should have a vest? That is not your starting point?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Just to clarify—I may be repeating myself, and I apologise, but the question is being asked again—there are over 4,000 operational SAPOL officers in the sense that they complete the annual incident management and operational safety training course. Of these, over 2,000—and perhaps as many as 2,500—are arguably engaged in front-line uniform operation duties which would reasonably require adequate protection against spontaneous attack with ballistic or bladed weapons.

The required number of new vests to be issued or supplied can only be realistically determined once the proposed trial has been completed and accurate costings have been obtained from prospective suppliers. Any calculation of numbers will need to take into account any view or submission provided by the Police Association and/or the workforce during consultation in setting the criteria for personal issue of MPLBVs—how is that for an acronym. The Police Association has not yet been consulted, but it is to be expected that their position will favour a broader policy for distribution of the new vest. That is being worked through as we speak.

Mr ODENWALDER: Just one more question: the Police Association has not been consulted?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Not in relation to the type of vests. I again apologise if I am repeating myself, but just to be abundantly clear, I think I have outlined the process we are going through—that is, to find what is required.

Mr ODENWALDER: Yes, I am just trying to clarify what you said.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As we are going through and looking at different vests—well, the commissioner is; I am not involved in that, obviously—at the right point, the Police Association will be involved. It is just a matter of drilling down to what vests are right, and that is what the commissioner and the team are doing.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Going back to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, sub-program 1. I refer to police station opening hours. Is there any potential for police station hours or locations to vary into the future?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, could you repeat that?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is there any potential for police station locations or hours to vary into the future?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Not as far as I am aware.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Whose decision is it? Who decides the hours and locations of police stations?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The police commissioner.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Not the government?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No. To clarify and go back a bit: you started on a line that you were saying I had talked about, and I did not think I had. I am happy to check *Hansard*. Just to clarify our election commitment for police station opening hours: as a government, we funded civilian staff to go into police stations, which freed up police for the police commissioner to assign as he sees fit.

While I do not mean to overdo it, I again stress the point that the police commissioner allocates police resources. Our funding commitment was there for the 42 civilian staff to go into the police stations, which I outlined before, thereby freeing up police for the police commissioner.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So the police commissioner determines the location and hours of police stations?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have been advised there have been previous situations where the police commissioner has been advised to build police stations in certain locations. That has happened in the past.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Who decided to amend the hours of the Norwood, Henley Beach and Glenelg police stations, the government or the police commissioner?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, I think I have answered that question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: It is a very simple question: was it the government or the police commissioner?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I will answer it one more time. That was our election commitment and we funded the civilian staff to go in there. The police commissioner then had police staff, which he assigns, freed up. I cannot say any more than that. That is the answer to the question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So in the future, if a political commitment is made by a candidate or a political party or whatever, and they end up forming government and the funding is provided to deliver on that, then the police commissioner should comply with that? I just want to understand the principle here, because in the past the police commissioner decided to change the hours of Henley Beach, Glenelg and Norwood and now that decision has been changed—in your words—because of delivering an election commitment. I am trying to understand the interface between election commitments and government decisions—which are the words you used earlier—and the decisions of the police commissioner.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have answered that question. I can repeat it, it is up to you.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Do you rule out—

Mr TEAGUE: Point of order. I have listened carefully to the member for Croydon and—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What is your point of order?

The CHAIR: No, member for Croydon—

Mr TEAGUE: The point of order goes to standing order 271. The questions before this estimates committee need to relate to a line item—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes; Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, sub-program 1.1.

The CHAIR: Member for Croydon, I will listen to the member for Heysen's point of order in silence.

Mr TEAGUE: —in the budget. The point of order goes to the nature of the inquiry, which is an inquiry as to future policy as opposed to the allocation of budget resources.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No, it is not. I have asked a specific—

The CHAIR: Member for Croydon, I am listening to the member for Heysen's point of order. I will rule on it, and if you want to make deliberations after that you can.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What is your ruling?

The CHAIR: The member for Heysen has not finished.

Mr TEAGUE: The point of order goes to the appropriate direction of a question to a budget item as opposed to an invitation to debate future policy considerations in relation to how policing or other matters may be determined in the future.

The CHAIR: Thank you, member for Heysen. As always you are very wise. I will continue to listen to the member for Croydon; I am sure he has quite a few questions on the budget and will continue to ask questions pertinent to the budget and directly in the budget, and the minister will continue to provide the answers as he sees fit.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So what is the ruling on the point of order?

The CHAIR: The point of order from the member for Heysen is correct. I ask you to ask your next question, member for Croydon. I uphold this point of order.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The question I asked was in regard to police station hours—Norwood, Henley Beach and Glenelg—

The CHAIR: Are you debating the point of order? I am giving you—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am repeating my question.

The CHAIR: Member for Croydon, I am giving you the floor to ask the minister a question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My question is: under the budget—Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, sub-program 1.1—does the minister commit that there will be no variation to police station hours over the life of the budget?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have answered the question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Just remind me, because I got interrupted: what was the answer?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have answered that question a number of times.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What is the answer?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: You can check *Hansard*. I have answered the question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am asking you to repeat the answer. I do not think I have asked that question. I asked it in a particular format and the committee is entitled to an answer.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: You have asked the question over and over. I have given you the answer over and over.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I have not. It is a completely different question.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have answered the question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am not talking about Henley Beach, Norwood and Glenelg; I am talking about other stations. It is a crystal clear question and a non-answer will be a non-commitment to not vary other police station operations hours.

The CHAIR: Not at all, member for Croydon. Member for Elizabeth, do you have a question?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am sorry. What is the government's policy in regard to police station opening hours over the life of this budget?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The police commissioner is in charge of operations. I have given that answer a hundred times over. I cannot give it again.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: You are in charge of opening hours.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: You potentially talked about hypotheticals.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: You said before it was a government decision. The member for Colton is running around telling people that he gets the credit for the decision to extend the hours at Henley Beach.

The CHAIR: Member for Croydon, I hate to disappoint—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The CHAIR: Member for Croydon! I hate to disappoint you but the footage tonight of today's estimates will be from Estimates Committee A, so there is no point in being hysterical.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The CHAIR: There is no point—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The CHAIR: Member for Croydon!

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The CHAIR: Member for Croydon! If you have a question to the minister—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I do. He is not answering.

The CHAIR: He has provided his answer. The reality is, it is the committee's estimates. The minister has been pretty direct in his—the minister believes he has answered the question.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The CHAIR: The minister believes he has answered the question. He is repeating his answer. I am comfortable with the minister's answer.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The CHAIR: We can play this charade for the next 45 minutes, and I also ask you to withdraw that statement as well.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: What statement?

The CHAIR: That I am protecting the minister.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I did not say that.

The CHAIR: What did you say?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I said, 'In your objective opinion.'

The CHAIR: Well, are you saying my opinion is not objective?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am saying it is objective. That is what I just said.

The CHAIR: Very good. Well, if I am objective, I must be right. Member for Elizabeth, do you have a question?

Mr ODENWALDER: Budget Measures Statement, page 140. My question also relates to police station opening hours. This goes to the country policing review. Minister, what correspondence have you had with Peter Gandolfi, the Mayor of Wattle Range Council, regarding the Kalangadoo Police Station?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have had a number of letters and potentially emails as well.

Mr ODENWALDER: Emails as well?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Potentially. I would have to check that. Just so that I am not misleading the committee, I will check and see if he has emailed me. I think Peter might be a letter writer. I think he is probably more of that ilk. I am sure it was a letter, but it could have been an email. I will check.

Mr ODENWALDER: He has written to me as well, just to keep you in the loop there, minister. Have you spoken to Mr Gandolfi at all?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I would have to go back and check my records. I did speak to a mayor in the South-East, or it may have been the acting CEO. I apologise that I cannot recall exactly, but I may have spoken to either the mayor or the CEO. I am not 100 per cent sure but I am heading down to the South-East in October.

Mr ODENWALDER: In a letter to you on 14 May, which I have here—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Is it a letter or an email?

Mr ODENWALDER: It is a letter.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: He is a letter writer.

Mr ODENWALDER: It is certainly on Wattle Range Council letterhead. Mr Gandolfi claims that, in the lead-up to the March election, the Liberal Party made a commitment not to close any station in South Australia, including the Kalangadoo station. Is that true?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I was not shadow minister at the time, so I cannot confirm exactly what was said.

Mr ODENWALDER: You cannot confirm what the commitments were about police stations?

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, the minister is not responsible for what a previous shadow minister may or may not—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: He is responsible for the government's policy, sir.

The CHAIR: Member for Croydon, if you keep interrupting, you will not be participating in this estimates committee anymore.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Recall parliament.

The CHAIR: I am here tomorrow. I am happy to be back. I have no dramas.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Let's see if some of your country brethren would feel the same way.

The CHAIR: If you had some, you would be better off. If you want me to name you, I am happy to do that.

Mr ODENWALDER: It goes to, sir—

The CHAIR: No, I have not finished ruling. A minister is not responsible for a shadow minister's view prior to any general election. As always, I will allow the question to stand but, as always, the minister has the discretion to answer as he chooses.

Mr ODENWALDER: The question is whether Peter Gandolfi's statement is true.

The CHAIR: Whether Mr Gandolfi's statement is correct.

Mr ODENWALDER: Yes. If it is true, not correct.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am probably going to give you the same answer that I gave a few moments ago to the member for Croydon; that is, that the police commissioner makes operational decisions about police. Just to clarify for the member for Croydon—because I gave this answer a few moments ago. Our election commitment was to fund civilians into police stations to extend the police station opening hours. We have delivered on that.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes, the police commissioner has delivered on that. This is where it gets confusing.

The CHAIR: Member for Croydon, are you asking a question?

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! Member for Croydon, if you are asking a question, you know how to ask it. Interruptions are not allowed.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: To be clear, we funded civilians to go into police stations. That was our commitment.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The commitment was to open the police stations.

The CHAIR: Member for Croydon!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, and we funded civilians to be able to do that. The police commissioner then had police resources freed up, which he used at his discretion.

Mr ODENWALDER: Will you be making a similar arrangement with the police commissioner regarding country police stations?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That will be a conversation for the police commissioner. He is doing a—

Mr ODENWALDER: Well, I am asking you.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: He is doing a review of country police stations, and we are awaiting the review.

Mr ODENWALDER: When is that review likely to report?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: This is a comprehensive review. It has no end date. It is a comprehensive review right across the state, looking at policing right across South Australia. I will stand by for that from the commissioner in due course.

Mr ODENWALDER: Sorry, is this the country policing review or is this the Duggan review?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It is the country policing review.

Mr ODENWALDER: Okay. You responded to Mayor Gandolfi's letter by saying:

Thank you for your correspondence regarding police services in...Wattle Range...

The Liberal Government has recently commissioned an independent review of police work. The purpose of this review will be to reduce red tape so that police can streamline their operations...

Is that referring to the country policing review or is that referring to—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, that is referring to the Duggan review.

Mr ODENWALDER: Why is your response to me about country police stations that it is going to be resolved by the end of the country policing review, while your response to Mr Gandolfi was that—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am just informing Mr Gandolfi of the good work being done. That was an election commitment we took to the election, and that will also have some really good understandings and findings on how we can streamline policing and get better outcomes there. We are doing the Duggan review, which I can give you more detail on, if you like, and the police commissioner is doing the country policing review—and I have given the answer to that question.

Mr ODENWALDER: Alright.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Budget Paper 5, Part 2, Operating efficiencies. Has the police band of South Australia been quarantined from the operating efficiencies included in the police budget? This is page 139 of Budget Paper 5.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, there are no initiatives, that I am aware of, that have any reference to the police band.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: No, that was not the question. I was not asking how they are going. I was asking: have they been quarantined from the operating efficiencies included within the police budget?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I have said along the way, the front-line sworn officers are all quarantined, so any members of the police band who are sworn officers will fit into the same catchment.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But they are not sworn officers.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As far as other efficiencies go, it is for the police commissioner to determine what he has, right across the board.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Okay. On the same item, is there a review underway into keeping the police band?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Correct me if I am wrong, because my memory might not be serving me very well, but are members of the police band active, sworn police?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, some are but not all. The majority are, I am informed.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Again, I ask, in regard to the savings measures, has the police band been quarantined from being affected in any way, or is that a matter for the police commissioner?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: To my understanding, I am not aware of any initiatives to target the police band for savings.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So the police band will not be targeted in savings?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No; I just gave the answer.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So what will be? Where is the \$38 million in savings going to come from?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What I can say is that SAPOL's total incremental government recurrent expenditures savings target for 2018-19 is \$21.8 million. That represents \$10.7 million previously approved by the previous Labor government in the budget base and a new efficiency target of \$11.1 million in the 2018-19 state budget. There is also revenue-related initiatives of \$1.3 million in 2018-19. As for all government agencies, SAPOL faces some challenging savings targets. There will be an internal review of service delivery and support functions across the agency to examine more efficient ways of operating and prioritising its functions that will provide savings, including reductions in non-police workforce levels.

Operating efficiency measures being introduced have been applied to back-office activities and, I stress, do not impact on front-line service delivery or the 4,713 full-time equivalent (FTE) active police commitment. The commissioner has the discretion as to how the efficiencies will be achieved, based on the operational needs of SAPOL. SAPOL has both recurrent and interim saving measures identified in 2018-19. SAPOL has set up a budget review process to address the savings task over the forward estimates 2020-21.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Minister, how can you guarantee that front-line operations will not be affected when you do not know where the savings are going to come from? To put it another way: if you are not making the decisions and those decisions are being made by the police commissioner, how can you guarantee that front-line services will not be impacted? They will be impacted. We established earlier that the number of police during the year will diminish, but, 'Hey, on 30 June, everyone will be safe,' but outside of that, how can you guarantee that no front-line service will be impacted when you are not the person making the decisions about the cuts?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I think I made it abundantly clear before. We talked about the fluctuation of staff and the understanding of 4,713 FTEs is that that is the number there on 30 June and there will be fluctuations, depending on when people retire and when people graduate. If I can state the point again: this will not impact on the delivery of the 4,713 full-time equivalent active police commitment, and that is the commitment. I do not think I can be any clearer than that. That is the statement that I have made.

What I do want to point out, though—and I mentioned it in the opening paragraph—is that of the efficiency targets that are in place, it must be really clear that the previous government approved \$10.7 million of efficiency targets and we have put an efficiency target of \$11.1 million this calendar year. If we go back—and this is a little bit cheeky that you talk about this—the previous government had an efficiency target of \$10.7 million in 2018-19, and we had one at \$12.5 million. In 2019-20, that efficiency target of \$20.3 million—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: \$20.3 million?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Ours was \$12.5 million.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is that correct?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, that is correct. For 2021, the previous government had an efficiency target of \$22.1 million, and ours is \$13.8 million. The previous government in the forward estimates had an efficiency target in 2021-22 of \$24.6 million, and ours is \$14.1 million. So it is a bit rich that you talk about where our efficiencies are going to come from with that comparison. I stress the point again: for 2018-19, the previous Labor government's was \$10.7 million, ours is \$12.5 million. In 2019-20, yours was \$20.3 million, and ours is \$12.5 million. In 2020-21, yours was \$22.9 million and ours is \$13.8 million. In 2021-22, yours was \$24.6 million, and ours is \$14.1 million.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is 4,713 active sworn police the number of police that is required to not impact on front-line services?

The CHAIR: You are referring to?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 13, Workforce summary. I will start again. Is 4,713 active sworn police the number that you need to not impact front-line services?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am not sure—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Let me rephrase: is 4,713 active sworn FTE police officers the number you need to be able to deliver services? If it goes below that, presumably it impacts front-line services?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As we have talked about before, give or take cadet academies finishing, people retiring, what time of year they are going to retire, etc.—and, as is pointed out, along with the cyber crime specialists and the like, which of course eat slightly into the 4,713—that is the number of front-line police that we have committed to. Putting more police on the front line is something that we view as very important.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: On the same budget paper item, would you acknowledge that if the number of police falls below 4,713 active sworn FTEs, then that would have an impact on front-line services?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, to clarify: I am not sure where you are going with this, but—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am just asking a simple question; no trick questions.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The cycle means that it is 4,713 on 30 June, and the cycle will mean that during the course of the year—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Is crime higher on 30 June than it is on 1 January?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, this is the commitment that you had as well, as far as I am aware, that you would land 4,713 on 30 June.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That was the target to get to 30 June, but then it would be maintained from there on in.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The target, as far as I am aware, is 4,713 on 30 June. That is what PASA is accepting of, and that is the commitment, to have 4,713. There will be fluctuations throughout the course of the year—I can see that—but 4,713 is the number of police that we have to have on 30 June, and we will be maintaining that.

Can I just say, as far as some of the efficiency targets are concerned as well, I can give you a couple of the measures that are in place to produce those, if you would like. As I am informed, they include the release of uncommitted provisions established from withholding part CPI funding and strategies achieved in advance of targets; redirecting operating capital budget to investing spend and deferring operating capital spend to 2019-20; and cadet efficiencies from rephasing the cadet intakes within the same year, greater youth cadet targets (increased to 30 per cent of total intakes) and 10.6 FTE adjustment to cadet intakes due to more accurate accounting for part-time police employees in the CHRIS21 system versus the replaced HRMS system. There is no impact on the 4,713 FTE active police commitment, as I have pointed out and stressed.

Further measures include unsworn efficiencies of an indicative 24.7 FTE reduction in 2018-19; targeting operating reductions (including fleets, travel and accommodation, general operating and reductions in expenditure areas based on historic trends); and savings as a result of delaying from 2018-19 to 2019-20 the implementation of the MOS extended hours 24/7 roster relating to the districts policing model.

Mr ODENWALDER: I will go back to Budget measures, page 140, and opening hours. I just want to finish off on the country policing review and particularly the issue of Kalangadoo Police Station. Minister, have you had any conversations since the election with the commissioner regarding the Kalangadoo Police Station, and at any point did he convey to you that it was his understanding that keeping Kalangadoo Police Station open was an election commitment of the government which had to be met?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No. I say that with the proviso that the police commissioner did mention to me that his parents-in-law once owned the pub in Kalangadoo, which I thought was

interesting when we were talking about Kalangadoo. That was when he said that he was doing a regional policing review and that is still progressing and he will keep you updated on that as it travels along. I was intrigued to know that his in-laws owned the Kalangadoo Hotel. I am heading that way in October and I might even slip by and have a lemon squash at least, if I am there.

The CHAIR: The member for Heysen has been seeking the call for quite a long time and I will go to him and flick back to the—

Mr ODENWALDER: The minister is doing fine.

The CHAIR: The minister is doing extraordinarily well but, as I ruled previously, I want all my committee members to be able to participate in estimates.

Mr TEAGUE: Thank you, Mr Chairman. This perhaps follows on and expands on the member for Elizabeth's question. I thought it might be an opportunity to ask the minister in relation to Agency Statements, Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, at page 12 and over to 13. Minister, could you please clarify the status of the review of SAPOL police work?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I thank the member for his interest in this area, and I know he is very keen about the role of policing in South Australia. During the 2018 South Australian election, the Marshall government made a commitment to commission a retired judge or senior lawyer to lead a review of all aspects of police work, the intention being to seek identification of time and productivity efficiencies, to streamline operations and reduce administrative burdens on front-line policing.

On 20 June 2018, the Marshall government announced that the Hon. Kevin Duggan AM QC had been appointed to conduct the review. Mr Duggan is a highly esteemed member of the South Australian community with longstanding experience and expertise in criminal justice, having been a justice of the Supreme Court. In addition, a small team has been established at SAPOL to assist Mr Duggan as required, and preliminary discussions have been held on what support will be required.

It is expected that Mr Duggan will commence work on the review at the beginning of October 2018. It is anticipated that Mr Duggan will report back to government by October 2019. Mr Duggan is in the process of finalising how he will undertake the review, including consultation with stakeholders, including the SAPOL support team and the Police Association of South Australia. The terms of reference for the review are:

1. The arrest and charging process used by charging officers.
2. The requirements of officers to supervise suspects and arrestees in stations and throughout transport and any options to use auxiliaries or new initiatives instead.
3. The processes of police prosecutors and officers working on police prosecution, specifically reviewing where efficiencies can be improved.
4. The time spent by officers during court proceedings especially when providing evidence in a matter, and any relationship this may have with major indictable offences reform recently commenced.
5. The processes and requirements of officers in producing evidence for trial and any relationship this may have with major indictable reform recently commenced.
6. Relevant legislative provisions, statutory obligations, accountability requirements and internal protocols aiding red tape and reducing efficiencies in front-line policing.
7. The use of technology-based justice measures like video-enabled justice to reduce red tape and increase efficiencies in policing.
8. Any other measures or policies to improve red tape reduction in front-line policing.
9. Any other matters arising that Mr Duggan considers relevant and that are in line with community expectations.

Mr ODENWALDER: I might just change tack for a second and go to Budget Measures Statement, page 137, which is about the changes to the length of the cadet course. Minister, will

there be any impact on Police Academy staffing due to the policy change to reduce the cadet course from 12 to 11 months?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No impact to the 4,713.

Mr ODENWALDER: No impact to the Police Academy staff?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No.

Mr ODENWALDER: No, okay. Was the shortening of the length of the cadet course a recommendation from SAPOL?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What has happened here with this—and this is an interesting program, and it has been, perhaps, not necessarily misreported but misconstrued by some people—is that it will now be an 11-month course and not a 12-month course. In the past I think it has been six months and nine months. I am not sure how long it was when you went through, member for Elizabeth.

Mr ODENWALDER: Three weeks.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Three weeks—they got you through in three weeks?

Mr ODENWALDER: That is right. I was rushed through.

The CHAIR: They could not get him out quick enough.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We are not shortening it to three weeks. I know when the commissioner went through it was two years; we are not going back there either. It is at 11 months. Jump in any time, commissioner, and correct me if I am wrong, but it was an 18-month probation. This reprofiling means that it will be an 11-month course and a 19-month probation, so that will allow more on-the-job training at the academy, so that balance will be split between the 11 months and the 19 months, as opposed to 12 months and 18 months.

So it is the same amount training; the net effect is the same. The first 11-month cadet program will commence from July 2019, and an 11-month cadet course will result in all cadet intakes from 2019-20 and annually thereafter, now commencing one month later, with no impact on the original graduation dates. Therefore, this budget measure does not impact on the 4,713 FTE active police commitment, which I know the member for Croydon will be very interested in.

Normally the annual cadet intake budget is 144 FTEs to address recruitment and annual attrition, estimated at 140 per annum. The cadet attrition of four FTEs and a reduction in duration of one month's training for 144 cadets equates to approximately a \$1.3 million saving per annum by 2021-22. These savings take into account a one-month lag on the future ranked progression to positions with higher remuneration and associated employee on-costs, penalties and allowances. So no impact on the training of the cadets. As I said, what was a 12-month course and an 18-month probation is now an 11-month course and a 19-month probation. I think that is a good initiative.

Mr ODENWALDER: So a 19-month probation—that means you are transferring some of that training to the probationary phase?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes.

Mr ODENWALDER: That is all very interesting, minister, but my question was: was this a recommendation from SAPOL or was it a decision of government.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It was a recommendation of SAPOL.

Mr ODENWALDER: Okay.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The CHAIR: Member for Croydon, do you have a question?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Oh, come on!

The CHAIR: No, don't 'come on' me! If the member for Croydon has a question, I will allow him to ask it. He is just chewing up your time, member for Elizabeth.

Mr ODENWALDER: Point of order—can I have a point of order? You have been very generous to the member for Heysen. My point of order—

The CHAIR: What number?

Mr ODENWALDER: No, in your opening statement, sir, to these committee meetings, every time we meet you make the point that it is a relaxed atmosphere.

The CHAIR: I do not think it says 'relaxed atmosphere' at all.

Mr ODENWALDER: No, no: so questions can come and go with relative ease. In fact, I will pull you up on another point of order. When the minister directs one of his advisers to answer the—

The CHAIR: I am not sure what the point of order is, because points of order can only be found in this green book here, as you know, and that is certainly the case. You are just chewing up your time, but it does not bother me.

Mr ODENWALDER: I think we should take a more relaxed approach, as previous eminent chairs have.

The CHAIR: I will reflect over the lunch break and you can bring me some chocolate and we will see how we go. Member for Elizabeth, do you have a question—I would ask it.

Mr ODENWALDER: I do. I have lost my page now, sir.

The CHAIR: Sorry for breaking your stride.

Mr ODENWALDER: You absolutely did, sir, but that is alright, that is your job. I will continue talking about cadets. I wanted to clarify a couple of minor points. At what point is a cadet counted as a sworn police officer? Is it at that moment in the graduation ceremony when they are handed the certificate of authority and shake the commissioner's hand and that sort of thing? That is the point where they become full sworn police officers?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It is on swearing in at graduation. I am not sure if it is at that point when they shake hands or when the hat goes in the air.

Mr ODENWALDER: I suspect it is the certificate of authority.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I always like the hat going in the air myself.

Mr ODENWALDER: The commissioner is nodding, for the *Hansard*.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I like the tradition.

Mr ODENWALDER: At what point of the cadet phase or the probationary constable phase is driver training provided? My question is: at what point are they fully qualified to drive urgent duty—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It is provided within cadet training, I am informed.

Mr ODENWALDER: And that will remain in the 11-month course?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, I am informed that is correct.

Mr ODENWALDER: Is it the same with firearms training?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am informed that that is correct.

Mr ODENWALDER: So currently it is provided completely within the cadet phase and that will remain?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes.

Mr ODENWALDER: Who identified, or who will identify, which parts of the curriculum are surplus to requirements in that cadet phase? Has there been any detailed work undertaken, and is it possible to provide any of that to the committee?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am informed that it is likely to be cutting out one week of annual leave, one week of out phase and then cutting out, or moving out, the equivalent of two weeks of scheduled downtime or non-core program time—i.e. info sessions with Legacy or Maxxia.

Mr ODENWALDER: I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 13. Can you give us a quick update of how the fifty-fifty recruitment program is going?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The commissioner can give you an update on this one.

Cmmr STEVENS: Thank you, minister. In terms of our gender parity strategy, which was announced on 1 January 2016 and commenced after that date, the target was for gender parity in each recruit training course at the time of commencement of that course. I am pleased to be able to say that every recruit course that has commenced since that day has met that gender parity target. It goes without saying that, as a result of attrition of some cadets, there is no guarantee that the gender parity target is met at time of graduation; that is subject to cadet performance.

It was of particular concern, as we ramped up to complete 313, that fulfilling the government's commitment to finalising 313 may have had an impact on the SAPOL target of gender parity but, once again, I was very pleased to be able to announce that we exceeded the fifty-fifty gender parity target during the entire recruit phase, in accordance with the effort to deliver on the government target.

Mr ODENWALDER: I understand the problem of achieving gender parity in the police force. Are the attrition rates about the same across the genders, given the difference in starting points?

Cmmr STEVENS: The attrition rates are higher for female sworn police officers.

Mr ODENWALDER: As a percentage.

Cmmr STEVENS: Correct, as a percentage. One of the challenges for us is to ensure that we provide a workplace that recognises the particular needs of all employees. We are doing significant work in the area of flexible working arrangements and access to opportunities to ensure that women are provided every opportunity to retain their employment with SAPOL throughout the course of their work life.

Mr ODENWALDER: Thank you. I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 21, Activity indicators, statistics and so on. Minister, are there any particular movements in recent crime statistics that are of note or that the community should be concerned about? Are there any particular spikes in activity?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have a bit of detail on this and I was trying to abbreviate it but I do not think I can. I will give you all the information.

Mr ODENWALDER: I do not need all the crime stats, I just need to know if there is anything we need to be concerned about.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, I just want to explain the bigger picture here to understand your question which was about crimes to be concerned about—of course, any crime is a concern. Let's work through some of the key content.

Mr ODENWALDER: Let's assume for argument's sake that some crimes are of more concern than others.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Overall in 2017-18, offences against the person increased by 0.7 per cent or 168 offences compared to 2016-17. However, the number of offences in 2017-18 was lower than 2008-09 with 24,291 offences.

Mr ODENWALDER: 2008-09?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, it is lower in 2017-18 than it was back then. Sexual assault and related offences increased by 16.1 per cent or 295 offences; 2,122 at 2017-18; 1,827 in 2016-17. There are increases in all three subgroups, with aggravated sexual assault increasing by 9.1 per cent or 105 offences; non-aggravated sexual assault by 20.6 per cent or 68 offences; and non-assaultive sexual offences by 36.1 per cent or 122 offences. One prolific offender contributed to much of this increase.

Other results were mixed. Common assault increased by 3.4 per cent or 226 offences; 6,927 in 2017-18; 6,701 in 2016-17. Whereas threatening behaviour decreased by 19.3 per cent or 216 offences; 909 in 2017-18; 1,120 in 2016-17. In 2017-18, offences against property increased by 0.1

per cent or 77 offences compared to 2016-17. Theft and related offences increased by 3.6 per cent or 1,579 offences. Within this category, theft from motor vehicles increased by 3.7 per cent or 325 offences. Theft from shops increased by 12 per cent or 985 offences.

Other theft, which includes petrol drive-offs, increased by 0.9 per cent or 192 offences. Receive or handle proceeds of crime increased by 15.9 per cent or 224 offences. Theft from shops has steadily increased over the last five years. Serious criminal trespass offences decreased by 11.9 per cent or 1,627 offences. Within this category, serious criminal trespass (residence) decreased by 10.3 per cent or 906 offences, and serious criminal trespass (non-residence) by 14.8 per cent or 721 offences. They are some of the numbers.

Mr ODENWALDER: Can you tell me, minister, how often this is updated on the SAPOL website? I imagine you would agree with me that pretty timely access to this kind of data is important for a number of reasons, not least of which to make people feel safe, but last time I checked—and I could be wrong—the data has not been updated since May. Can you tell me why that is? Is that a usual turnaround time?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am informed the data is put up monthly but as they get closer to the annual report they hold off on data to make sure that the data aligns with the annual report. That is the information I have been given. I will let the commissioner add a comment.

Cmmr STEVENS: The monthly data may differ to the final results in the annual report on the basis that there is a cleansing process that occurs with all data to remove duplication and incorrect reporting and matters which are withdrawn. So whilst we put the information up to the community so that they have an understanding of the incidence of crime, which can be searched by location as well, we suspend putting that up in the weeks preceding the compilation of the annual report data so that there can be no incorrect correlation of what is on our website and what is produced in the annual report.

Mr ODENWALDER: I understand. So matters that are withdrawn do not appear on the stats at all after the cleansing process? Is that right?

Cmmr STEVENS: I think if there is no offence identified as a result of inquiry, that matter is not included as a reported crime, but that is after a matter has been reported to police. When a police incident report has been recorded on the system and due inquiry finds that no offence was actually committed, that matter is not included.

Mr ODENWALDER: Notwithstanding the level of detail the minister went into earlier, are there any plans to publish more details on these datasets? There has been a lot of discussion over the past few years about separating domestic violence offences, for instance, and we have had ongoing discussions about that. Are there any moves towards making a lot more data open?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I will let the commissioner answer that as well.

Cmmr STEVENS: We are continually examining how we can release as much data to the community as possible. We were one of the first jurisdictions to provide crime data in relation to suburbs. We do examine where there is potential for victims of crime to be identified as a result of the information we release. An example of that may be a sexual assault in a relatively low-populated area where people are likely to know each other. However, we are constantly examining what we can release, ensuring the integrity of the data and also that we do not inadvertently revictimise victims of crime.

Mr ODENWALDER: On the same page, minister, can you tell me the total number of calls to Crime Stoppers in the last financial year and as a percentage of the total calls to the call centre?

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, can you confirm where we are?

Mr ODENWALDER: We are still on the same page: Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, Agency Statements, page 21, Activity indicators.

The CHAIR: Thank you very much.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have just been informed that there were 20,417 Crime Stoppers calls received in 2016-17 and 20,355 in 2017-18, down approximately 80.

Mr ODENWALDER: And what is that as a percentage of the total? As I understand it, they all go to the call centre. What is the percentage of calls to Crime Stoppers in relation to the total number of calls? Can you tease that out?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As a percentage? I would have to take that on notice.

Mr ODENWALDER: If you could also take on notice the total number of calls regarding illicit drugs.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am not sure we would have a breakdown of calls regarding illicit drugs. I am happy to have a look and I will come back to you if there is a figure for that. What I can give you, which may help, is the following information. There were 478,447 calls received on 131 444 in 2016-17 and 485,643 in 2017-18. In relation to call centre police incident reports—which are incident reports taken by the call centre—there were 39,712 in 2016-17 and 42,426 in 2017-18. There were 26,469 call centre traffic complaint reports in 2016-17 and 26,128 in 2017-18. And, as I mentioned, Crime Stoppers received 20,417 calls in 2016-17 and 20,355 calls in 2017-18. I have been informed that the percentage of calls received by Crime Stoppers is 4 per cent. In addition, there were 154,763 calls to 000 in 2016-17 and 154,665 in 2017-18.

Mr ODENWALDER: Why will the government not fund Crime Stoppers to any extent?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am just looking for the budget line. I am not sure that you have one.

Mr ODENWALDER: There is a mention of online reports to Crime Stoppers, so I assume SAPOL—

The CHAIR: Page 21, member for Elizabeth, is about activity indicators.

Mr ODENWALDER: That is right. There is a relationship between SAPOL and Crime Stoppers.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What I can say is that Crime Stoppers SA Incorporated was established in 1996—

Mr ODENWALDER: No, I know the history; I have it written here as well—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Listen—and is a not-for-profit program operating under licence from Crime Stoppers Australia—

Mr ODENWALDER: Sir, this was not the question; we are running out of time.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It is good to get this background. Its activities are governed by the constitution of CSSA Inc and by the Associations Incorporation Act 1985. The program is governed by a board of non-executive directors. The board of Crime Stoppers SA includes an assistant commissioner and a superintendent.

Crime Stoppers plays a critical role in encouraging members of the public to come forward with information to help solve crimes and to be alert—

Mr ODENWALDER: So why do you not fund it?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Let me finish, please—and to be alert and engaged with their community. Crime Stoppers provides a secure way for information about illegal activity and unsolved crimes to be reported to police. Crime Stoppers works with police, business and the public to solve, reduce and prevent crime.

Mr ODENWALDER: Well Chair, now we have established that the question was in order—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Standby. SAPOL maintains the Crime Stoppers section as part of the State Intelligence Branch. The Crime Stoppers section is staffed by one senior sergeant coordinator, one sergeant and one brevet sergeant intelligence officer.

Mr ODENWALDER: We know this.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Hang on. So there is that commitment to Crime Stoppers. Administrative support is provided by the State Intelligence Branch. SAPOL also provides call centre

staffing as they answer the 1800 333 000 telephone calls, triage, and provides information for immediate actioning or to the Crime Stoppers section for value adding in nonurgent matters. Police operational staff than action the incoming information through normal investigative processes, reporting outcomes back to Crime Stoppers.

I have scoured past budget papers, and Crime Stoppers has never had ongoing support or funding from the previous Labor government other than the continued resources I have just mentioned. So for Crime Stoppers it is the same now as it was before, nothing has changed.

Mr ODENWALDER: It is not true that nothing has changed. Has the minister met with or had any direct contact with the CE or anyone from the board of Crime Stoppers since budget day?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Since budget day, me or my office?

Mr ODENWALDER: Yes.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I think my office has spoken to Crime Stoppers a couple of times. I may have a meeting coming up but I would have to check my diary, I do not want to mislead the committee. However my office has been in touch with Crime Stoppers, yes.

Mr ODENWALDER: Is it your intention, is it the government's intention, not to fund Crime Stoppers into the future other than those in-kind ways you mentioned?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I just outlined that I have been through the budget papers, and we will continue to fund Crime Stoppers as it has been in the past with those supports from SAPOL. I have looked through the budget papers, and the previous government did not have ongoing funding support for Crime Stoppers.

Mr ODENWALDER: I understand you are committed to that in-kind support. My question is: are you refusing to fund it into the future, is it your intention not to fund Crime Stoppers in any other way into the future?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: This is how Crime Stoppers has been funded in the past, and I will continue to fund it as it has been funded—

Mr ODENWALDER: Chair, that is not the question.

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, you do know we have opened this financial year's budget papers. I am sure with the next year's financial year's budget papers you can come back and ask the minister a question there.

Mr ODENWALDER: Budget papers go for four years, Chair.

The CHAIR: In terms of activity on page 21, we are looking at—

Mr ODENWALDER: Budget papers go across the four years, so my question—

The CHAIR: The line we have open right now, today, the question you are asking is for 2018-19 projection only.

Mr ODENWALDER: My question goes to the minister's intention.

The CHAIR: And the minister can choose to answer as he sees fit.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you, Chair. To be clear, the previous government did not fund Crime Stoppers.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That is not right.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It is absolutely right.

Mr ODENWALDER: There is \$960,000.

The CHAIR: We are not here to—

Mr ODENWALDER: There is \$960,000—

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, time—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: There was \$960,000—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It was never put in their account; you have never actually given them \$960,000 over the course of a year.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you, the member for Croydon has just come clean and said they have never given Crime Stoppers any money.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That is right, we committed to give them \$960,000.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Unfortunately there have been a lot of commitments you guys made that you have not delivered on in the past. That money was not in the bank. In 16 years of government, the previous government never gave funding to Crime Stoppers. They gave that in-kind support I just outlined, which we are continuing.

Mr ODENWALDER: So the answer is that you are refusing to fund Crime Stoppers into the future.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The answer is we are continuing the same support that was given by the previous government. That is what they gave and that is what we are going to give. Crime Stoppers will keep delivering its outcomes as it always has and I will—

The CHAIR: Order! We are almost in the luncheon adjournment. I have been very generous. I am not going to have this constant debate across the chamber. Member for Elizabeth, you have 1½ minutes to go. Please ask your next question.

Mr ODENWALDER: Budget Paper 4, Volume 4—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I just want to be clear on the response to that answer—

Mr ODENWALDER: No; I had the call. I think the Chair gave me the call.

The CHAIR: Minister, the member has the call.

Mr ODENWALDER: Thank you, sir. Can the minister update the committee on the progress of your sniffer dogs in schools policy? Is this your responsibility?

The CHAIR: Member—

Mr ODENWALDER: I beg your pardon: Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 19, Crime and Criminal Justice Services.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have just been given an update on that. SAPOL is working very closely with Education on that, Education has the lead. We are finalising the methodology on how that is going forward. I note it is a policy supported by the Labor government, and I appreciate the support of the member for Croydon on this policy. He has been out there publicly saying that he believes it is a good policy. We will be delivering on that. As I said, that sits with the Minister for Education, so if you have other questions on that I am happy to direct them to the Minister for Education.

The CHAIR: Unfortunately time has expired, and I declare the examination of the proposed payments for the portfolio SAPOL and the estimated payments for South Australia Police and administered items for South Australia Police completed.

Sitting suspended from 12:45 to 13:45.

DEPARTMENT FOR CORRECTIONAL SERVICES, \$339,527,000

Membership:

Ms Hildyard substituted for Mr Malinauskas.

Mr Gee substituted for Mr Brown.

Minister:

Hon. C.L. Wingard, Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing.

Departmental Advisers:

Mr D. Brown, Chief Executive, Department for Correctional Services.

Mr C. Sexton, Executive Director, People and Business Services, Department for Correctional Services.

Ms B. Daly, Acting Senior Executive Services Consultant, Department for Correctional Services.

Ms N. Boal, Acting Director, Governance and Executive Support, Department for Correctional Services.

The CHAIR: The proposed payments are for the folio of the Department for Correctional Services and we have the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services appearing before us. I declare the proposed payments open for examination and refer members to the Agency Statements Volume 1. Minister, could you please update the committee with your new advisers, and should you wish to make an opening statement you certainly may.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: To my left I have Chris Sexton, Executive Director, People and Business Services; to my right I have David Brown, Chief Executive of DCS; behind me, I have Natalie Boal, Acting Director, Governance and Executive Support; and also Brigid Daly, Acting Senior Executive Services Consultant.

Whether it is in the areas of health, aged care, education, emergency services or law enforcement, this government is committed to providing better public services across the board while also creating better public value across the board. Importantly, this government is committed to better public safety for all. As Minister for Correctional Services, let me say that I am delighted to be leading the Better Prisons program which includes a range of sweeping reforms to South Australia's prison system. The Marshall government is delivering all the elements that this state needs to create a world-leading prison system. We are investing in our public prisons and ensuring that our facilities are run efficiently, in line with industry best standard and practice—more prison capacity, more prison jobs and more prison investment in infrastructure and technology.

The decision to transition the Adelaide Remand Centre to a private provider was made in the public interest, and I make no apologies for that. Accommodating a prisoner at the Remand Centre is expensive, more expensive than it has to be. I have every confidence that DCS staff, particularly those who work in our prisons, will engage fully in the sweeping reforms of the Better Prisons program. The \$200 million investment in the public prison in this year's budget is testament to that, and 310 new high security beds in the Northfield precinct is testament to that.

I am also proud to reiterate this government's bipartisan support to reduce reoffending by 2020. We are building on that and, to be quite frank, in some respects we have been left to do the heavy lifting, because there is one simple fact that cannot be denied: we cannot deliver on rehabilitation if we do not have enough prison beds. Expanding prison capacity across existing prison sites has a multitude of other benefits: jobs for local businesses, jobs for contractors and subcontractors, jobs in the regions where some other businesses are doing it tough. Importantly, expanding our capacity means jobs in corrections.

Already in my time as minister, I have seen dozens of trainee correctional officers graduate into what will be challenging but rewarding careers. Despite the substantial challenges facing our prison system, I am committed to working with DCS to ensure it continues to fulfil its obligations to effectively manage the state's prisoners and offenders. The Better Prisons program is also about exploring new pathways and implementing changes to benefit the system and ultimately the

community. In fact, through the Better Prisons program, this government has made the biggest capital investment in the South Australian prison system in a generation.

The Better Prisons program is going to future-proof our system to meet projected growth. The Better Prisons program is also about improving efficiency and accountability across our entire prison system. We want our prisons to be the best that they can be and we are going to do whatever it takes to make them the best they can be. Again, this is something that I am very proud of as correctional services minister. It is a fairly simple equation: a high performing prison is ultimately going to deliver better rehabilitation outcomes for prisoners, which means improved community safety and ultimately less victims of crime.

Speaking of rehabilitation outcomes, I want to share with you my recent experience at the official launch of the Work Ready, Release Ready program, one of the flagship programs driving the bipartisan strategy to reduce reoffending by 10 per cent by the year 2020. It is an innovative program designed to help prisoners prepare for employment in the lead-up to their release so that, when they do leave the prison gates, they are re-entering society with the right skills, qualifications and training to go straight into a job.

Ultimately, Work Ready, Release Ready is about placing offenders on a different pathway, away from crime and towards sustainable employment. This program involves three key phases: phase 1 is Work Ready, phase 2 is Release Ready and phase 3 is the employment phase that sees offenders provided with targeted employment support, including direct linkages to employers to ensure they can find and maintain a job upon release.

The government I serve is committed to building the economy and growing jobs in our state. It is my expectation that my department and its partners are providing prisoners every opportunity to build their skills to address their offending behaviour and to apply themselves to be work ready by the time they are ready for release. This government is committed to building employment opportunities across the state for everybody, including those who have been in prison. It is great that the Work Ready, Release Ready program is being run in both the regional and metro areas across five sites, namely, Adelaide Pre-Release Centre, Adelaide Women's Prison, Mobilong Prison, Cadell Training Centre and Port Augusta Prison.

It is an undeniable fact that the overwhelming majority of those in custody will one day be released into the community. We want to make sure that, when they do re-enter the community, they are equipped with the skills and training to gain employment and have post-prison support to keep them on the path, away from a life of crime. I firmly believe that important reforms, such as the Better Prisons program, will enable us to not only meet but possibly exceed the 10by20 target set down by the last government.

In closing, I want to take a moment to pay tribute to the men and women of corrections, who work tirelessly behind the scenes 24/7, 365 days per year to make the community in which we live a safer place. Corrections may not be perceived by some as a particularly glamorous line of work, but what I can tell you from firsthand experience, as I have toured our prisons and community correctional centres around the state, is that the pride and professionalism of corrections staff is second to none. It is that pride and professionalism, that dedication to community safety and reducing reoffending, that will drive the Better Prisons program and help to create a world-leading prison system in South Australia.

The CHAIR: Thank you very much, minister. Member for Elizabeth, will you make an opening statement or go straight into questions?

Mr ODENWALDER: I will go straight into questions. I should clarify that the minister is indeed the Minister for Correctional Services.

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, if you have a question, I suggest you ask the question and refer to the budget.

Mr ODENWALDER: I could refer to ministerial responsibilities, sir.

The CHAIR: Do whatever you like, but ask a question.

Mr ODENWALDER: I will continue. Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, page 105, Custodial Services. These questions relate to the escape and subsequent capture of the violent criminal Shane Gauci. I apologise if I have pronounced the name wrong. When were you told that this prisoner had absconded?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have to check on times and dates. Give me a moment.

Mr ODENWALDER: It happened on Monday.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, I know when it happened. I am just trying to work out the time. It was Monday morning when my staff were briefed, and I was briefed after that.

Mr ODENWALDER: Sorry? Say that again, please.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: On Monday morning my staff were briefed, and I was then briefed by them immediately.

Mr ODENWALDER: What action did you take immediately upon receiving this information?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, this is an operational matter, so there is—

Mr ODENWALDER: No, I am asking what you did.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: And I am explaining that this is an operational matter, so I cannot go and catch the guy. That is not what you want me to do, or anyone to do. It is actually for SAPOL to then step in, do the operations, start trying to apprehend the guy and bring him back into custody. I personally am not involved in that operational process. I am not on the front line. That is not my job and not my responsibility. As the correctional services minister, I do not think it is any minister's responsibility to actually get their hands into any operations. As I have said: as it was, once the guy was on the run, it became a SAPOL matter. I will invite the CE of Corrections to give you some more detail on the operations because that is his domain.

Mr BROWN: Thank you, minister. The information that I received was: shortly after 9 o'clock I was advised that we had a prisoner unlawfully at large from a community work program. That prisoner was Shane Gauci and he had absconded from the work van en route to an off-site work location. I was briefed by the responsible executive with respect to that incident and what steps had been taken to secure the remaining prisoners on that work program to ensure that all critical information was available for SAPOL as they deployed their resources to the incident scene and to take steps to apprehend the prisoner. Once those operational matters were in train, we provided the necessary updates to the minister's office.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Just to add to that point: of course, I was told that it happened. I am not involved in the operations, but I was regularly briefed along the way as well.

Mr ODENWALDER: By SAPOL?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: By SAPOL and by Corrections as needed and as warranted.

Mr ODENWALDER: Given that you were regularly briefed and you are the minister for both agencies, what measures were taken by you to inform the affected suburbs that there was a prisoner on the loose?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, it is not my role to meddle in operations. I would advise any minister for police and the future minister for police, if that is their aspiration, that they do not meddle in operations. It is SAPOL that run the operations when it comes to policing and the chief executive looks after that when it comes to Corrections. Operations are done by the people on the ground.

Mr ODENWALDER: When you were informed on Monday morning that Shane Gauci had absconded, did you ask any questions of your agency about the nature of his crimes? Did you ask what sort of person it was that we were dealing with on the loose?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am trying to think if I asked or if I was told. I may—

Mr ODENWALDER: Did you ask for a briefing about him particularly and what he had done?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, to make a couple of points, I was informed and information was given to me. The key to this is—and I am really trying to stress this point because there is potentially a misconception out there that I get involved in operations and that I have something to do with operations—I have to be really, really clear that SAPOL do policing and that is their role. I am not here to tell the police commissioner how to do his job. I back the police to do their job and they do their job very, very well in South Australia. Whilst I am briefed and updated on what is going on and any information, I cannot get involved in the operation to try to catch someone. That is very much a SAPOL operation.

Mr ODENWALDER: I promise I am not going to harp on about this. I am just trying to establish the level of interest you took initially. You hear that a prisoner escapes: do you immediately ask for the information about this prisoner?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I think I made that very clear that I got the information first thing Monday morning. I am presuming the time line here, but as soon as the chief executive was aware, he let my office know, who let me know. That was the exact time line—it could not have been any swifter and I appreciate that great correspondence.

Mr ODENWALDER: So both you and the chief executive knew on Monday morning of Shane Gauci's rap sheet, to use the colloquial? You knew the nature of his crimes and what he was locked up for?

Mr TEAGUE: Point of order: I have listened carefully to the member for Elizabeth and I have started to wonder whether this might be a topical case study in relation to a line item. This is not an occasion to have a general discussion—

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth.

Mr TEAGUE: —with the minister about the portfolio area generally and how operational matters are responded to. I ask that the member direct the committee to the relevant line item and otherwise stick to the question.

The CHAIR: Member for Heysen, I am listening intently. All week, I have been quite broad in my allowing of debate and broad-natured questions, and, as always, ask for the minister to choose to respond how he sees fit. At this stage, I am prepared to rule that the question is in order.

Mr ODENWALDER: Thank you, sir. I hasten to add that I am not suggesting that the minister should be involved in operational matters. What I am suggesting is that he should take an interest. My questions are to what sort of interest he took in the proceedings. My question, before I was interrupted by the member for Heysen, was: on the Monday morning, both the CE and the minister were aware of this person's crimes, his criminal history. Did the minister have any discussions with the CE before he went on to the radio the next morning to discuss it?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No. What I can tell you is I was—

Mr ODENWALDER: You did not have any discussions with your CE before he went on the radio on Tuesday morning?

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, you asked your question and the minister is certainly answering.

Mr ODENWALDER: I am just clarifying. So no, the answer is no.

The CHAIR: No need to—

Mr ODENWALDER: Okay, the answer is no.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: My office and I had contact with the CE at 9.13 on Monday morning, when it first became apparent, and then again at 11.47, and dialogue continued throughout the course of the day around this issue. We did have conversations throughout the course of the day, and I was made aware of the criminal history of this person, yes.

Mr ODENWALDER: Okay.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: But again, I stress the point not to meddle in operations.

Mr ODENWALDER: Indeed, okay.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: SAPOL are the people who run that, and SAPOL are the best people to handle that.

Mr ODENWALDER: Can I just clarify, there are currently two inquiries then? There is an internal Corrections inquiry and a SAPOL inquiry into what happened? I do not want to pre-empt anything about these inquiries, but I would like to know the general areas they are looking at.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Corrections has an internal inquiry, or a review, into what went on from their perspective.

Mr ODENWALDER: Into the escape?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes. SAPOL is investigating the offence; that is what they do. They were here a few moments ago. I could have asked them about that then. They investigate the offence, and Corrections will—

Mr ODENWALDER: The offence is escaping from custody, or something? Is that what you meant? Is that what you mean by 'the offence'—escaping lawful custody or something?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The actual offence would be determined by the prosecution, but I think the line you are going down is here. We are on the same page. I will not be held or quoted on the actual term of the offence, but yes.

Mr ODENWALDER: I understand.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Corrections are doing their review as well.

Ms BEDFORD: I was going to use all my questions for other things, but—

The CHAIR: We can always go to the member for Heysen, who I know is very keen to—

Ms BEDFORD: —following on from that, because it has been very broad, I heard on the radio that—

The CHAIR: Sorry, member for Florey, which budget paper?

Ms BEDFORD: It is the same broad one he had—

The CHAIR: Which is? I have been consistent all day. If you cannot name it, you do not get the question.

Ms BEDFORD: Alright. It is the same one, Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, whatever page Lee was on.

The CHAIR: I will just go to the member for Heysen, who I think has been waiting intently all day.

Ms BEDFORD: This follows on directly from what we were just asking—

The CHAIR: No, I have been consistent all day and all week. The member for Heysen has the call. Member for Florey, you of all people should know how these committees run.

Ms BEDFORD: This follows on from the responding.

The CHAIR: The member for Heysen has the call.

Mr TEAGUE: Thank you, Chair. Through you, could the minister inform the house about the department's strategies to detect and prevent the introduction of contraband into the prison system? I refer to Agency Statements, Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, where it is addressed at pages 105 and 106.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you very much, member for Heysen. I thank him for his question. This government went into the election with a clear mandate in relation to crime, justice and the law, and as Minister for Correctional Services, I am committed to delivering outcomes across

the criminal justice system that improve service delivery, increase efficiency and provide better public safety for all.

The department has been tasked with implementing the Marshall Liberal government's election commitments to pilot a program at a regional prison to block the use of contraband mobile phones, with a view to rolling it out across the prison network. We are also going to work to do what it takes to stamp out drugs in prisons.

All correctional jurisdictions are challenged by prohibited items entering the prison system. Contraband, especially drugs, poses significant risks to the safety and security of staff, prisoners and the prison system as a whole. The department continues to be vigilant to detect and intercept contraband entering the state prisons. The department already has a range of powerful contraband prevention strategies and works very closely with SAPOL in terms of information and intelligence sharing.

In fact, earlier this month, there was an interception of contraband at Port Augusta in prison by Corrections and SAPOL. A visitor was found to have passed 73 Suboxone strips and a mobile phone onto a prisoner, and Suboxone was found in the visitor's car. This was a significant find, and my understanding is that the prisoner has been charged and the visitor has been banned from the prison and faces the very real possibility of finding themselves on the other side of the prison bars. I can tell you that right now it is harder than it has ever been to introduce drugs into the prison system but, in line with the government's election commitment to a zero tolerance stance on drugs in prisons, we are going to make it even harder.

Let me touch on some of the strategies that we have committed to putting in place. We are introducing workplace drug and alcohol testing for correctional officers, staff and contractors for alcohol and illegal drugs. We are legislating to ban members of outlaw motorcycle gang members and their associates from visiting prisons. Mobile phones are, of course, already prohibited items in our prisons and there are penalties for the possession of prohibited items within the correctional institutions. We are investing \$950,000 in 2019-20 for a mobile phone jamming trial that will stop prisoners from committing further crimes within prison and facilitating the flow of drugs and other contraband.

Importantly, this government is also committing \$9 million over the forward estimates to upgrade security systems from analogue to digital electronic security systems at the Northfield precinct which, of course, encapsulates Yatala Labour Prison, Adelaide Women's Prison and the Pre-Release Centre.

This government's Better Prisons reform program also includes funding for key infrastructure at the Northfield precinct to improve security. The new infrastructure includes new high-security visit centres at both the Yatala Labour Prison and the Adelaide Women's Prison. These visit centres will allow for additional non-contact visits and provide improved CCTV so that prison staff are enabled to more closely monitor all visits.

The budget includes a new admissions building at the Yatala Labour Prison which will result in better screening for everyone entering the site. At the Adelaide Women's Prison we have also committed to the development of a new gatehouse that will strengthen and modernise the site's access control.

In terms of legislation, the Correctional Services (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2018 was introduced to parliament on 6 June 2018 to help us achieve these commitments. I am pleased to say that the bill passed the House of Assembly, with amendment, on budget day, 4 September 2018, the day we also announced the sweeping Better Prisons program reforms, including the largest capital investment in the system in decades at the Northfield precinct.

New technology is all very well and the legislation is important to drive reform but ultimately it is the people, the staff on the ground, who work vigilantly and tirelessly 24/7, 365 days a year. They are ultimately our strongest asset in fighting the war on drugs in our prisons.

The CHAIR: Member for Florey.

Ms BEDFORD: Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, page 105, Program 2. When are we expecting the construction of the new health centre at the women's prison to be completed? Will the facility be

funded to operate 24/7, as it is in the Yatala Prison for male prisoners, as opposed to the current arrangement? Will there be a mother and baby facility included as part of this upgrade?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I thank the member for Florey. The Adelaide Women's Prison is the only specialist women's prison in the state. The additional high-security beds are required to meet future demand. It is important to also note that existing buildings and services at AWP are considered to be in poor condition. The additional accommodation provides DCS with the capacity to manage the high-risk and highest-needs prisoners under the full range of conditions expected to be experienced, from secure care through to independent living to release.

Stronger Together—Safe Children and Stronger Families 2017-2020 was launched in March 2018 and it brings a focus to the needs of incarcerated mothers and children that interface within the correctional system. The primary caregiver status of women offenders requires consideration in relation to service delivery and to contribute to the rehabilitation of women offenders and ultimate reduction in reoffending. The Stronger Together framework is underpinned by practices and programs that are relational and promote healthy connection to children, family and significant others.

The front entrance and reception at the Adelaide Women's Prison and Adelaide Pre-Release Centre is under review with assistance from renowned architect Sarah Paddick, with a view to improving visitor processing and making the front reception more family and child friendly. The findings will contribute into the design principles for the new gatehouse and visitor centre at the Adelaide Women's Prison and Pre-Release Centre, which funding has been provided by this year's budget process for an additional 40 beds and critical supporting infrastructure.

The DCS external internet home page now provides links for families about the operations of correctional services, especially prison and the impact on families and children. Pamphlets also have been developed to provide additional information for incarcerated women with children. The Adelaide Women's Prison and the Adelaide Pre-Release Centre have expanded visiting opportunities for women in custody with young babies, as well as streamlining and expanding opportunities for supervised Department for Child Protection visits.

Partnerships and interagency activity has commenced to improve collaborative practice for high-risk families, and for women entering custody pregnant. This includes updated procedures for pregnant women in custody to ensure both mother and infant are supported and protected in a targeted and shared care approach.

A high proportion of women enter custody as a recent victim of domestic and family violence. Children who witness domestic violence are also victims of the abusive behaviour. DCS has procured a program for women offenders in custody and the community that will seek to address women offenders' victimisation, and will educate them on the impact of domestic violence on their children.

With the expansion of the department's home detention program, more primary care givers are eligible to complete their sentence in the community. This enables suitable prisoners to be released earlier in their sentence and spend longer on home detention at home with their families. Sixty-two women commenced the post-prison home detention from 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018.

DCS currently does not have a mother and baby unit operating at the Adelaide Women's Prison. Data indicates there are very few women who would be eligible to access such a facility, and resources are better directed to programs that reach a wider number of prisoners. There is a commitment, however, to undertake a business case for a multipurpose family unit to consider the most effective way of enabling women in custody to maintain family ties and ultimately connect and reunify with their children with confidence and skills.

In addition, a new health facility at the Adelaide Women's Prison, to answer the member's question, will be delivered in 2019. A short-stay, live-in section will be included in the facility, with the potential to accommodate the very small number of women who give birth in custody each year and are eligible to maintain the care of that newborn infant. Over the short-stay period, mother and infant bonding and attachment would be a primary focus and provide greater opportunities for breastfeeding. The other thing I would say to the member is that Health has carriage of the health centre, but DCS will lead the carriage of the mother and babies.

Ms BEDFORD: So I need to ask someone in Health whether you are funded to operate it 24/7; is that what you are saying?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The capital budget and operating budget for this financial year is in the budget this year, and then operating budget will be determined between Corrections and Health going forward from there. In our budget it is only the DCS component, I am informed, and the health budget is separate for their allocation.

Membership:

Mr Malinauskas substituted for Mr Gee.

The CHAIR: Before we continue, unfortunately the member for Taylor has requested to be discharged and replaced with the member for Croydon, who I believe may have a question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, Agency Statements, page 100. There is a reference there to key agency outputs, particularly reducing offender recidivism. The former government had a policy of reducing reoffending by 10 per cent by the year 2020, which I note you have mentioned on more than one occasion. Does the new government intend to carry on with that policy? Believe it or not, this is not a trick question. I am just trying to understand what—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, I apologise. You were not here, but I did outline a lot of that in my opening statement and I am happy to revisit it for you, so thank you for giving me the opportunity. What I will say is the government confirmed its commitment to the bipartisan strategy for reducing reoffending: 10by20. The 10by20 strategy includes the following flagship initiatives—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thank you, so my question—

The CHAIR: Member for Croydon!

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The minister has answered my question.

The CHAIR: No, member for Croydon, you asked your question and I think the minister is legitimately answering that question.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —Work Ready, Release Ready; New Foundations; tailored rehabilitation for Aboriginal offenders; and rehabilitation programs. In January 2018, the previous government published the first progress report detailing the work underway to address the six 10by20 strategies. During 2017-18, the following progress has been achieved on a number of 10by20 initiatives, including Work Ready, Release Ready.

I did point out a little bit earlier that I was there to launch that at the Northfield site just recently. It was great to have so many businesses there eagerly involved and willing to be a part of this program. In fact, that was on Wednesday 29 August at the pre-release centre. The event was attended by approximately 60 people from across various areas of the community, including local businesses, local council representatives, community organisations, Indigenous organisations and Workskil Australia. The launch showcased the \$9.2 million program, which has already equipped more than 185 prisoners with the qualifications and training to find and maintain employment upon their release.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thank you, minister. My next question goes to Budget Paper 5, Budget Measures Statement, page 26. With the operating savings, there is a line there regarding the New Foundations trial realising substantial savings, which add up to just over \$18 million. I understand from previous information that you have provided in the parliament, minister, that those savings are largely a function of New Foundations not being delivered in the way it had been anticipated.

My question is: rather than realising the savings, why has the government or the department not decided to reinvest that money in an alternative method of trying to achieve that objective? The New Foundations program was aimed at ensuring that a key element that is necessary to achieve reducing reoffending could take place—i.e. access to housing for released offenders who might not otherwise get access to housing. Why has that been realised as a saving rather than reinvested in a more effective program that could achieve the same objective?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you for that question. I think it is longer than the previous sitting we had. In 2017-18, DCS only used \$200,000 of the \$2 million that was budgeted in funding for that project. Lessons learnt from the procurement process and market feedback will underpin the next step strategy to pilot the program and build an evidence base going forward. So it was a good idea that did not get executed to the level that was needed. We are going to keep working on the idea and keep driving ahead with the pilot. The government remains committed to the New Foundations initiative—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: By cutting it by \$18 million?

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and supports piloting the program to build the non-government sector's capacity and experience in providing accommodation and support services to offenders transitioning from prison. The procurement process will be undertaken for the pilot program in 2018-19. The department will seek to form a partnership with a non-government organisation to co-design the program model based on best practice and available evidence.

The budget has been reduced to \$1 million per annum across the forward estimates in 2018-19. Unfortunately, the market was not mature enough and it did not eventuate. As I said, good idea, poor execution at the time, but we will continue with the pilot program. I know your government previously had a rack 'em, stack 'em and pack 'em policy.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That is not true, minister.

The CHAIR: Order!

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The former government actively departed from that policy.

The CHAIR: Member for Croydon, it is not for you to infer what is true or not true. The minister is providing his answer. I know the member for Florey is desperate to ask a question and I am prepared to give her one if—

Ms BEDFORD: Do not drag me into this.

The CHAIR: I will drag you in.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: And to finish, again, I stress the point that we have money there to support the pilot. We will go to the market and work to try to deliver on the outcomes needed.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The same budget line item: you are going to have a trial. Is the trial forecast under your stewardship to last for four years?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, we have the budget in there—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: For \$1 million per annum.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —to go and do the trial.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So when will the trial conclude?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: If I just go back to my previous answer, under your stewardship it may have been, but \$200,000 was spent and the program was not taken up.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So when will the trial conclude?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It did not work under your government. We will get to work and we will work with the industry—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So when do you forecast the trial to conclude?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We will go to market. We will run the pilot. We have allocated funds to do that. I stress the point that it was not delivered previously but we will get to work in delivering it.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: But when—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That is what we have committed money for in the budget.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am sorry, I am going to ask the same question until I get an answer. The budget forecast that New Foundations was turning from a program to a trial. You have articulated the reasons why that is necessary. What I would like to know is: how long will the trial last?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have just been advised that it will be in place this financial year and run for three years.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: A three-year trial.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am told that aligns with the Report on Government Services recidivism measures.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The Report on Government Services provides an annual update on the rate of recidivism or reoffending. That happens annually from the Productivity Commission year in, year out. What does that have to do with the length of the trial?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am told that will be built into the evaluation plan.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: So the trial is going to last for three years?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That is what I said.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That is a very long trial.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, previously it did not work. When you were in the chair, I presume, is about when it started, and it did not work. This is the process we are going down. We are going to work with the market and get a mature market. The market was not ready for this. They did not come to the table, so we are going to do the trial.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: You are going to test the market through the trial? How are you going to test the market? Is that what you are going to do during the course of the trial?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I will get the CE to give you a little bit more information.

Mr BROWN: The key for us with working up a pilot with the market is to understand what elements of the procurement process and the model that we took to the market last time did not work for the NGO sector and the housing sector. Through doing that piece of market sounding and design work with the market, we will then need to review the invitation to supply that we put out to the market for the New Foundations program. One of the areas that we identified through the evaluation and feedback of the failed market process was that the market was concerned about the volume, the number of participants we were trying to bring into the program over a three-year or four-year period.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Too many?

Mr BROWN: They were worried about finding sufficient accommodation and/or being able to bring online sufficient accommodation to support that area. Really the key for us to work on with the market is the accommodation side of the program. We already have quite a lot of experience and understanding around the wraparound support and rehabilitation services.

The final point I would make about measuring the impact is that to look at someone who joins a trial or a pilot of a program, (1) we need to balance the market's ability to take the volume and (2) to have sufficient numbers to do a proper evaluation of the pilot. Furthermore, if the ultimate goal is to reduce reoffending, the measure for any individual who engages on that program is two years from the date that they commenced the program to make a proper evaluation. As chief executive of the department, I am very committed to the objectives of the New Foundations program. I think it is something we should continue to pursue with the government, but we need to do more work with the NGO sector to design the next approach to market.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thank you. Chairman, through you, I refer to the same budget line and subject. If the trial takes three years, it will conclude before the forward estimates under this budget. If the trial concludes and is deemed to be successful, and a program is developed in a way that the market is capable of delivering and is consistent with its intent (i.e., to meet the requisite number of offenders going through the program in order to realise the 10by20 target), where will the money come from?

The CHAIR: That is an extremely hypothetical question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: It is not, because—

The CHAIR: It is like saying, 'Should Port Power win another flag, who is going to print the T-shirts?'

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That is a pithy attempt at an analogy. What I am asking is—

The CHAIR: It is a very hypothetical question—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: —if the government is not planning a trial—

The CHAIR: —and I am sure the minister will give a very hypothetical answer if he so chooses.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: It is not hypothetical, because the government themselves are committed to—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It is an extremely hypothetical—

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Well, if what Sam says goes, maybe he should be the minister.

The CHAIR: Member for Croydon, you can withdraw that.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Happy to withdraw. I am trying to understand the trial. If, as one would hope, the trial is put together with the intent to succeed, presumably the forward estimates should contain a commitment on delivering the program at the end of that trial. That is clearly absent. This speaks of more than an intent to trial on the back of market failure; it speaks of a rudimentary cut to rehabilitation. I am trying to establish whether, if the trial is successful, there is committed funding in the budget to roll out the program and achieve the 10by20 target. Everyone in this room wants to see the government achieve the 10by20 target.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I thank the member for the question. It was another longwinded, very hypothetical question. The Chair read my mind when he made that comment to the member. You are saying, 'If it is successful, if that happens, or if something else happens, what are you going to do then?' That makes the question incredibly hypothetical. We are having a trial, we will work through that trial, and we will address it when we get to that point.

As it stands at the moment, we do not know. I will say that you had the program there and it did not succeed. That was a shame. We will say, 'This is the methodology we are going to use,' we will have a pilot, we are going to work the pilot and we hope it succeeds. We will address that when we get to that point. Ifs, buts, candy nuts—it does not really matter.

The CHAIR: The member for Florey has been seeking the call for some time. Member for Florey.

Ms BEDFORD: Thank you, sir. I refer to the Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, page 108, Program 3: Community Based Services. In relation to the second dot point under highlights 2017-18, what proportion of the contract funding for the Home Detention Integrated Support Services Program is allocated to the intensive support program for female offenders?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you for the question. I am advised we do not have that information at hand but I will take it on notice and get back to the member with the details.

Ms BEDFORD: My last questions refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, page 104. Will there be any increase in funding for education in prisons and the Adelaide Remand Centre? Also, what ratio proportion is the female take-up for those education programs?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am told there is no gender breakdown in that, so I will take that part on notice and get an answer for the member. However, I am also told that whenever there is new infrastructure put into the budget there is also additional funding for education and rehabilitation programs, which I think the member will be pleased to know. As far as that gender breakdown is concerned, again, I will take that on notice and get back to the member.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Back to Agency Statements, Budget Paper 4, Volume 1, page 100, Key agency outputs. Regarding the 10by20 target, without the reduction in reoffending that was forecast to be achieved through the New Foundations program, is the ability of the department to reach the 10by20 target compromised?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: My advice is that it is too early to say. There are a number of projects and programs that make up the 10by20 target, and New Foundations was one. It has now been rescoped, bearing in mind the position it was in, but there are other projects: Work Ready, Release Ready; Home Detention Integrated Support Services Program; The Arches Bail Accommodation Support Program, the Aboriginal Strategic Framework rehabilitation programs. The list goes on. It is how they collectively come together. Another report will be handed down in January, I am told.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I appreciate that. What my question goes to—and I want to say this with the utmost sincerity, which the minister might find hard to believe—is that I cannot speak highly enough about how happy I was to see, in the budget papers, that there was the retention of the sort of funding you referred to for the programs you talked about. They are vital to achieve this important public policy objective and I am glad that the government has said on the record, and that you have reiterated today, that it is a worthwhile objective in terms of reducing reoffending by 10 per cent by 2020.

What concerns me though—and I am sure you can understand this—is that without the \$18 million that was going to New Foundations, that money goes off into the ether. It will get swallowed up by Treasury, the hard-fought-for funds that we really had to hustle to obtain to put towards this important policy area will disappear. What I am looking for is a sense from you, minister, that that \$18 million has not just disappeared but has instead been reallocated to other additional areas to achieve the public policy objective.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I appreciate your question. We know this is a complex and overarching portfolio area. When I came to this job one of the first things that was put before me was that there was the potential, that the mapping and the planning—which I know you respect and appreciate—had us on a collision course for 2020 of having more prisoners than beds.

When I asked what measures were put in place and what were we going to do to combat this, I was told there was nothing in place. When we looked at the graph of where the growth—and the tract graph that I think you are on record as appreciating as being well scrutinised and well worked through, we realised that by 2020 we were going to have more prisoners than prison beds. So we went about committing to putting into place 310 additional beds on the Northfield site, 40 in the women's prison and 270 high-security beds in the Yatala prison.

I mentioned in my opening statement—and I know you were not here; I apologise, I will repeat it so that you have it—that to do rehabilitation programs as well, you need to have the right prison environment and the right prison system, so reinvesting that will help with rehabilitation programs as well. That has been very much our point, our intention. We want a better prison system. We put a Better Prisons plan in place to make sure that we have a better prison system for South Australia, hinged around the 310 extra beds at the Northfield site that I just mentioned, a \$200 million investment into the public prison system. Of course, the other parts of that are the outsourcing of the management of the Adelaide Remand Centre, which has been well and truly canvassed, and also flexible a workforce and benchmarking.

We see great opportunities and, if we can deliver this program in full, I would aspire to have the best prison system in the world. I think we should be shooting that high. A big part of having a good prison system is having a good rehabilitation system. So we are committed to the 10by20 but we are also committed to our Better Prisons program to make sure that we have enough beds to meet projected prison capacity. That is what we are going about doing and, as I said in my opening statement, I am very proud of that. I think it is going to be very good for South Australia.

Mr ODENWALDER: Budget Measures Statement, page 27. Minister, can you provide any independent reports which clearly outline a case for privatising the Adelaide Remand Centre?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I just outlined that plan as part of our Better Prisons program.

Mr ODENWALDER: No, can you provide an independent report which outlines the case?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I just outlined our plan for the Better Prisons program, which includes outsourcing the Remand Centre. I do note that we do have one outsourced prison in South Australia, which is at Mount Gambier.

Mr ODENWALDER: Chair, we are running out of time today. I think it is fair to ask the minister to come to the—it is a yes or no.

The CHAIR: The minister is answering the question. I cannot direct the minister to answer the question—

Mr ODENWALDER: Well, you can direct him to answer the question.

The CHAIR: —nor can I direct you in how you ask your question. I wish I could.

Mr ODENWALDER: How would you have rephrased it? Minister?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I will cut it short for you then and say no.

Mr ODENWALDER: No independent report.

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth.

Mr ODENWALDER: Thank you. Same line. Do you stand by your assertion on the radio that it was your idea to privatise the Adelaide Remand Centre?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Absolutely. I took the idea to cabinet. Many ideas go to cabinet. It was one we agreed to as part of the budget measures. It is part of our Better Prisons program and it will deliver great outcomes for South Australia.

Mr ODENWALDER: So it was put to you: you think on your own volition, nobody came to you and said, 'Here is a problem', you think on your volition, 'I reckon we could save some money by outsourcing', you send this off to Treasury and they come back with figures saying, 'Yes, minister, you are right.'

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, what I said was—

Mr ODENWALDER: No, that is what the journalist said to you, and you said yes.

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, you are quoting from?

Mr ODENWALDER: I am quoting from a radio interview with David Bevan and you said yes to that. David Bevan said, 'Is any of that wrong?' and you said no. So was it your idea?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, I take full responsibility for this program—

Mr ODENWALDER: And he pressed you for it? Was it your idea?

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth. Minister.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: And I said, 'No, I take full responsibility for this plan and this program. I am very proud of this plan and this program.' I took it to cabinet, cabinet ratified it, we are doing it, it is in the budget papers, and you are probably looking at the budget papers right now. It is really clear and really concise. We have been up-front with what we are doing, and we have made it abundantly clear that it was a budget decision, a cabinet decision. It was put in the budget papers.

Mr ODENWALDER: But was it based on advice from the department, or did you just come up with the idea?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, what you do in this role is similar to what the previous minister would have done when he was looking at his New Foundations program. He would have been bouncing it around: he would have taken it to cabinet and he would have had it approved by cabinet, and that would be his project, if you like, or his plan.

Mr ODENWALDER: The Treasurer said, in his estimates meeting:

The simple reality is that we took advice from the CEO of Corrections and his senior officers, together with discussions with Treasury, and his advice was in relation to achieving a budget savings task that confronted them...was that the Adelaide Remand Centre made good sense.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, can you repeat that quote?

Mr ODENWALDER: Sure. It was from the Treasurer, last Friday:

The simple reality is that we took advice from the CEO of Corrections...and his advice was in relation to achieving a budget savings task that confronted them...was that the Adelaide Remand Centre made good sense.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: So again I say—

Mr ODENWALDER: All am asking you to do is confirm whether it was your idea or an idea that was brought to you and you then brought to cabinet.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am not going to debate whose idea it was, or whether it was claiming an idea or stealing an idea. The process—

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The CHAIR: Member for Elizabeth, the minister is answering the question.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The process is this: as the minister I take proposals to cabinet. Cabinet ratifies them and then they are actioned. That is how it appeared in the budget. I took it to cabinet and cabinet processed it and agreed with it. It was in the budget, and here we are.

Mr ODENWALDER: Okay. Why then was the Adelaide Remand Centre chosen?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That is a very good question. There are a couple of key points to this. A big part of it is its stand-alone functionality. It is a slightly different unit to the other prison systems, if you like. Its size is 274 beds, and there are 150 correctional staff who work there. One of the things that I was really conscious of, with this decision in working through this process, was to make sure that every person who works at the Adelaide Remand Centre could, if they so choose, stay within the public corrections system.

Mr ODENWALDER: Okay, so 150—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Let me finish. That was 150 workers, and I was intent on making sure that they could stay in the public system in metropolitan Adelaide. On the day of the budget, I actually went to the Adelaide Remand Centre and spoke to them all and made that abundantly clear at every opportunity I had. I will take this opportunity as well to make it really clear that every person who works at the Adelaide Remand Centre can stay working in the department of corrections, in the public system, if they so choose. The options that were put to them were that they could—

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The CHAIR: The minister is completely in line.

Mr ODENWALDER: He is answering a different question.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, let me finish, please. What they could do was—

Mr ODENWALDER: I have three minutes left.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I need to finish this question and you are wasting my time.

The CHAIR: You are wasting time by interrupting.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you, Chair. What they could do was be guaranteed their job in the public corrections system, either at the new Northfield precinct where the 310 extra beds are going, which I have already discussed, or, if they chose, they could go into the regions. They might want to work in Port Lincoln or Murray Bridge or somewhere else in the regions, such as Port Augusta. They also had the option, if they so chose, to apply for a job at the Adelaide Remand Centre, with a new provider, or go into community corrections. The department has been doing a great job in working with those people right the way through, and will continue to do so, to take them on that journey.

That was a big part of the reason that I chose the Remand Centre. The Remand Centre was chosen because I specifically was very keen to make sure that we had a quantum and a size that we could absorb back into the public corrections system so that their jobs were guaranteed and they could stay working in the public corrections system.

Mr ODENWALDER: Given that you are acting on advice from the department—I think we have established that and that it was not your idea—can you categorically rule out privatising any other prisons or any other aspect of the corrections system?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We will not need to with our Better Prisons project. That is exactly why we—

Mr ODENWALDER: So you are ruling it out.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That is exactly why we—

Mr ODENWALDER: You are ruling it out.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: If I can finish, please. That is why we are delivering the Better Prisons program. Also, the start of your question was comment and probably a little bit over the top. I have talked about our Better Prisons project and the elements of that.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: If I can finish, again.

The CHAIR: Member for Croydon, there is no need to interrupt the minister. This was not your question.

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, you have been so well behaved for the last hour. I would hate for you to start off the next hour on a bad foot.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I was saying before I was interrupted, there will be no need to. Our Better Prisons program will deliver outstanding prisons for South Australia when we deliver on all the elements that we have before us, and they are the outsourcing of the management of the Adelaide Remand Centre; the 310 new beds at the Northfield site, which will invest \$200 million back into the public prison system; benchmarking; and also the flexible workforce. If we deliver that Better Prisons project, we will not need to.

The CHAIR: Alas, time has expired and I declare the examination of the proposed payments for the portfolio Correctional Services and the estimate of payments for the Department for Correctional Services completed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE PREMIER AND CABINET, \$299,804,000

ADMINISTERED ITEMS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE PREMIER AND CABINET, \$11,796,000

Membership:

Mr Gee substituted for Mr Malinauskas.

Minister:

Hon. C.L. Wingard, Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing.

Departmental Advisers:

Ms K. Taylor, Chief Executive, Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing.

Mr T. Nicholas, Acting Senior Manager, Strategy and Investment, Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing.

The CHAIR: We now move on to the portfolio for the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing. We have the minister appearing in his capacity as the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. I declare the proposed payments open for examination and refer members to the Agency Statements, Volume 4.

Ms HILDYARD: Mr Chair, just while we are getting settled, we could do the omnibus questions in the last minute or two, or should I do it now while they are getting settled?

The CHAIR: We can do them now. I have declared them open.

Ms HILDYARD: I will read the omnibus questions into *Hansard*.

1. Will the minister provide a detailed breakdown of expenditure on consultants and contractors with a total estimated cost above \$10,000, engaged between 17 March 2018 and 30 June 2018 by all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, listing the name of the consultant, contractor or service supplier, the estimated total cost of the work, the work undertaken and the method of appointment?

2. Will the minister provide a detailed breakdown of the forecast expenditure on consultants and contractors with a total estimated cost above \$10,000 for the 2018-19 financial year to be engaged by all departments and agencies reporting to the minister, listing the name of the consultant, contractor or service supplier, cost, work undertaken and method of appointment?

3. For each department and agency for which the minister has responsibility:

- (a) How many FTEs were employed to provide communication and promotion activities in 2017-18 and what was their employment expense?
- (b) How many FTEs are budgeted to provide communication and promotion activities in 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21 and 2021-22, and what is their estimated employment expense?
- (c) The total cost of government-paid advertising, including campaigns, across all mediums in 2017-18 and budgeted cost for 2018-19.

4. For each grant program or fund the minister is responsible for please provide the following information for the 2017-18, 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21 and 2021-22 financial years:

- (a) The name of the program or fund;
- (b) The purpose of the program or fund;
- (c) Balance of the grant program or fund;
- (d) Budgeted (or actual) expenditure from the program or fund;
- (e) Budgeted (or actual) payments into the program or fund;
- (f) Carryovers into or from the program or fund;
- (g) Details, including the value and beneficiary, of any commitments already made to be funded from the program or fund; and
- (h) Whether the grant was subject to a grant agreement as required by Treasurer's Instructions 15.

5. For the period of 17 March 2018 and 30 June 2018, 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.

6. For each department and agency reporting to the minister:

- (a) The total number of FTEs in that department or agency;

- (b) The number of FTEs by division and/or business unit within the department or agency; and
 - (c) The number of FTEs by classification in each division and/or business unit within the department or agency.
7. For each department and agency reporting to the minister, could you detail:
- (a) How much is allocated to be spent on targeted voluntary separation packages in 2018-19?
 - (b) How many of the TVSPs are estimated to be funded?
 - (c) What is the budget for TVSPs for financial years included in the forward estimates (by year), and how are these packages to be funded?
8. For each department or agency reporting to the minister in 2018-19 please provide the number of public servants broken down into headcount and FTE's that are (1) tenured and (2) on contract and, for each category, provide a breakdown of the number of (1) executives and (2) non-executives.
9. Between 30 June 2017 and 17 March 2018, will the minister list the job title and total employment cost of SA executive positions—(1) which has been abolished and (2) which has been created?
10. Between 17 March 2018 and 30 June 2018, will the minister list the job title and total employment cost of SA executive positions—(1) which has been abolished and (2) which has been created?
11. 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.
12. For each year of the forward estimates, please provide the name and budgeted expenditure across the 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21, 2021-22 financial years for each individual investing expenditure project administered by or on behalf of all departments and agencies reporting to the minister.
13. For each department or agency reporting to the minister how many surplus employees are there at 30 June 2018 and for each surplus employee, what is the title or classification of employee and the total cost of the employee?

The CHAIR: Minister, if you could introduce your advisers and make an opening statement, please?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I certainly can. Can I start by saying that if the member for Reynell ever leaves this place—and I do not see her doing that soon—she will be a race caller extraordinaire. Terry McAuliffe, eat your heart out. And they say that I can speak fast. That was fantastic. I would like to welcome to this committee hearing, on my left Kylie Taylor, Chief Executive, Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing, and on my right Tim Nicholas, Acting Senior Manager, Strategy and Investment.

Members in this place would be aware of the work the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing does within each of our electorates, including athletes and organisations that are working with the office, improving their club through STARCLUB, training at elite levels with SASI or applying for funding for everything from new equipment to a new facility through one of the grant programs.

The Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing administers eight separate ongoing grant programs, ensuring all processes are at best practice with good governance. In 2018-19, the office will be allocating \$21.3 million in grant funding across eight ongoing programs and one new program. The 2018-19 budget outlined our plan for better community services by supporting the following projects: \$9.8 million for upgrades to the Adelaide Super-Drome; \$19 million for the home of football at State Sports Park; \$2.05 million for upgrades to the SA Athletics Stadium; \$1.3 million to allow for

the completion of the Sam Willoughby International BMX track; and \$8 million for upgrades to the Women's Memorial Playing Fields.

These, along with many other new infrastructure initiatives in the 2018-19 budget, confirm the Marshall government's commitment to build our economy, create more jobs and deliver better community services. These initiatives alone will create in the vicinity of 165 full-time equivalent jobs in construction.

I was proud to announce our new grassroots football, netball and cricket program. The Marshall government will allocate \$12 million over the next two years, which includes \$1 million from Cricket Australia and SACA and \$1 million from AFL and SANFL. A further \$5 million is to be considered for a third year if the program is deemed successful. Funding will be allocated to support female and family-friendly facilities for local football, netball and cricket clubs and beyond.

It is anticipated that this program will fund \$24 million of facility upgrades at community sporting grounds over the next two years, with an additional \$10 million should the program be extended for a third year. In recognition of this significant program, other existing recreation and sport program grants will be prioritised towards other sports over that period that are eligible.

I am delighted that as a government we have committed to a revised sports voucher program, where families will be able to access a \$100 voucher (up from \$50) per child per calendar year towards the cost of membership or registration fees. We have also expanded eligibility to cover a wider variety of active recreational pursuits, including dance. The abolition of the \$59.40 fee for volunteer screening checks for people working with children and vulnerable people is another policy initiative that I am very proud of. Sport and recreation is dependent on volunteers, and this fee was a significant barrier to participation for volunteers, and indeed participants, when these costs were passed on.

The Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing is committed to addressing inequality across participation, leadership, sponsorship, remuneration and media coverage. As the chair of the national Meeting of Sport and Recreation Ministers, I am personally committed to driving this agenda, as is the chief executive of the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing, who is also currently the chair of the Committee of Australian Sport and Recreation Officials (CASRO) and is leading the working group on women in sport.

More importantly, the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing and I are focused on changing the culture of sport to allow women and girls to access the same opportunities as men and boys both on and off the field. I believe increasing female participation in sport is not dependent solely on funding, but rather changing the culture of sporting clubs so that families are welcome and encouraged to participate in multiple ways.

The office is also currently seeking input from state sporting organisations and grassroots participants through a survey process to inform future direction for women and girls in sport. Work engaging the sport and recreation sector through initiatives such as 40:40:20 is ongoing, with state sporting organisations continuing to be assisted to reach gender balance on their board. Finally, the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing provides the resources to engage with the racing industry and be the first point of contact between the government and industry.

Since corporatisation of the racing industry in 2000, the state government has not sought to interfere in the day-to-day management of the racing industry. Government's dealings with the racing industry since then have revolved around major policy issues of local and national significance. The Marshall government acknowledges the importance of the South Australian racing industry and its economic and social contributions to South Australia. Renaming the office for recreation and sport to include racing is an important step in recognising this.

The government is committed to working with the racing codes to ensure their viability and sustainability into the future. The government recently announced that it would provide the industry with a one-off grant of \$4.85 million to offset the losses incurred by the industry in relation to the point of consumption tax. The government has also committed to provide a \$5 million loan to assist with the completion of the Murray Bridge Racecourse development. The development located at Gifford Hill on the outskirts of Murray Bridge is a joint venture agreement between Thoroughbred Racing SA, the Murray Bridge Racing Club and developers, Burke Urban.

A new racecourse and equine precinct will continue to raise the profile and encourage further investment in the local thoroughbred racing industry which supports thousands of jobs and is an important contributor to the state's economy, in particular in regional areas. The government will continue to develop positive and constructive relationships with the state's peak racing industry bodies as well as represent the interests of South Australia's racing industry at the Australasian racing ministers' conferences.

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, are you going to make an opening statement or go straight into questions?

Ms HILDYARD: Straight into questions, thank you, Mr Chair. Minister, at page 18 of the budget overview, it is stated that the government 'is committed to delivering improved community services and is supporting investment in upgrading community infrastructure and unlocking more outdoor spaces'. Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 43, shows a cut to sport, recreation and racing of over \$22 million. How does that cut assist in achieving your vision in the budget overview and also the vision you have just outlined? How will that \$22 million cut in any way assist in achieving that vision?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I want to be really clear on this so that you understand the position. What you are talking about is a year-on-year comparison, and if we look over the forward estimates what we are actually seeing under our government is that we are investing \$40 million more in sport with capital investments. You are comparing year on year and, yes, we have put new plans in place and new projects in place and the year-on-year figure has that differential, but if you look over the forward estimates, from what the previous government had planned, they had two projects at \$20 million and that was it. There was no capital investment in the budget for the office for recreation and sport, as it was known then, committed from the previous government.

However, as you rightly point out, we have put all of the capital for these projects into the budget: \$24 million for the grassroots football, netball and cricket program, which I am happy to talk about later; \$19 million for the State Sports Park (not in the ORSR budget under the previous government); \$9.8 million for Super-Drome upgrades (not in the ORSR budget from the previous government); \$8 million for the Women's Memorial Playing Fields, we have committed that (not in the ORSR budget under the previous government); support for community sporting clubs, \$7.7 million for a number of clubs across the board; SA Athlete Stadium upgrade, \$2.1 million; and the Sam Willoughby International BMX Track, \$1.3 million.

When you look at it in isolation, yes; when you look at it across the forward estimates, there is an extra \$40 million of capital investment that the previous government did not have in place. I am very proud of that. These projects are great projects and we have a very strong and clear focus on growing participation in sport. With a lot of the clubs I go to, facilities have deteriorated and dropped off, and we have programs in place now that I think will be very well patronised and engaged. We will be able to grow programs and engage community sport and get the facilities that are needed for young people to get involved.

What I did not mention as well was the \$29 million we put in the budget. Again, the previous government's budget had no money for this at all. We are doing \$100 sports vouchers now for primary school-aged children who want to play competitive and club sport. The previous government had ended their project and did not have any money in the forward estimates for this project. So we are delivering the full \$100—

Ms HILDYARD: Chair, I think we are moving away from the \$22 million cut.

The CHAIR: Just to be fair, member for Reynell, your opening statement, obviously referring to Budget Paper 1, as you did, allowed broad scope. Had you kept on page 43, you may have been okay. Your next question, member for Reynell.

Ms HILDYARD: What consultation was done before the decision was made to cut \$22 million from the budget as per line 11 on page 43, Volume 4, Budget Paper 4? Was any consultation done?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That is the same question, and I will give you a similar answer, just to be clear, as I may have not been clear enough.

Ms HILDYARD: Well, it is not clear, because it is clearly a cut.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: So let me be clear. Your government had \$22 million—or the figure you are giving—in one year. We have put an extra \$40 million on top of that over the forward estimates.

Ms HILDYARD: That is so not true.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Your government had no money in the ORSR forward estimates for any other projects.

Ms HILDYARD: It is just not true.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It is absolutely true.

Ms HILDYARD: Can we just move on, Mr Chair?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The office for rec and sport had no money in the forward estimates for those projects. I am glad you pointed them out, because football in particular is over the moon with the \$19 million it has; \$9.8 million for the Super-Drome is outstanding as well; the Women's Memorial Playing Fields, \$8 million, is exceptional; SA Athletics Stadium also; and the Sam Willoughby International BMX Track. There are some really exciting projects there.

We have made that long-term commitment and, when you look at that capital investment, which you may have overlooked—and I am happy to take you through that a bit further—I want to be really clear that we have an extra \$40 million in capital investment in the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing budget that was not there under the previous government.

Ms HILDYARD: That is just not true, and people do not believe it, minister. What plans does the government have to support the Roger Rasheed development in Christie Downs—page 45, Volume 4, Budget Paper 4, in relation to sporting complexes.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have had some conversations with Roger, but I will get Kylie to outline where it is.

Ms TAYLOR: Roger Rasheed has come with a proposal that is seeking some money to upgrade the Morton Road facility at Christie Downs. In consultation with the minister, we have asked the Roger Rasheed Foundation to go back and provide us with their evaluation material from the two projects they have delivered already at Oaklands Park and out at Playford. They have provided us with some material, and we have also asked them to work with us and with Flinders University, so we are in conversations right now—the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing, the Roger Rasheed Foundation and the Flinders University—in terms of an evaluation framework that would sit alongside that project that can then be considered by the government. So it is about what is the rigor that sits around it so that it can be considered.

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you. Can you confirm, minister, that this development will go ahead with some funds from state government?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I think the CE just gave a very good update—

Ms HILDYARD: It was a great answer, but I am asking you whether you can confirm whether or not it is going ahead—yes or no?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The CE just gave a great update of where that is at. We will do the evaluation. It would be wrong to go and throw money at someone without doing that evaluation and knowing where you are going, so we will do that evaluation and we will make sure that, where we invest the money, we are getting good value for money for the South Australian taxpayer.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, can you confirm progress on the skate park at Park 25?

The CHAIR: Sorry, where are you, member for Reynell?

Ms HILDYARD: Sorry, Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 45, sporting complexes.

The CHAIR: Thank you. I have been like this most of the day, by the way.

Ms HILDYARD: I will keep going on this particular page.

The CHAIR: Thank you, member for Reynell.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am informed that no-one involved with the skate park has spoken with the office for rec and sport in my time here. No-one from the skate park has spoken to the office for rec and sport about that project.

Ms HILDYARD: Well, there is not a skate park yet. Minister, is the Liberal government committed to a skate park in the city?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: A bit like the last answer—

Ms HILDYARD: Yes or no?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —if someone has a project, they are welcome to bring that proposal to the table and it can be evaluated. This is something where lots of people might have ideas, and I am sure they are good ideas, but you must do the rigour and you must evaluate them to be able to deliver on them.

Ms HILDYARD: So, minister, have you had any conversations with the skating community whatsoever?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I said a few moments ago, no-one involved in a project at the skate park has approached the office for rec and sport or me. They may have been having some dealings with DPTI, but I do not want to mislead the—

Ms HILDYARD: Are you saying there have been no conversations with the office for recreation and sport—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, if I can finish—

Ms HILDYARD: —about a skate park in the city?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That is what I am informed.

Ms HILDYARD: Okay, thank you. Minister, there was \$2 million in the Mid-Year Budget Review for Aldinga Soccer Club, but council has now been told that that money will not be made available. Why was this decision made?

Mr Teague interjecting:

The CHAIR: Member for Heysen, page 45. The member for Reynell indicated she would be on this page for—

Ms HILDYARD: Yes, I will let you know when I switch.

The CHAIR: It would help the committee, member for Reynell, to perhaps just say you are keeping on page 45.

Ms HILDYARD: Sure, thank you.

Mr TEAGUE: My query is: where on page 45?

Ms HILDYARD: That is actually my question, because there was a commitment and page 45 is about sporting complexes and there is nothing there—that is my point.

The CHAIR: Conversation across the chamber is completely and utterly disorderly and out of line. I encourage you to both desist, member for Heysen and member for Reynell.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am informed that that project actually had, again, no business case around it. There was talk of it being co-located with the super school that was potentially going into the area, and there was no location done for that super school. Again, it was another one of those projects that did not have a business case and did not have any planning in place. When they go away and get that, we are happy to sit down and talk them through that project.

Ms HILDYARD: On the same page, when was the soccer club notified that the project would not be going ahead?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The project was a commitment of the previous government. It was never a commitment of ours, so we were never progressing with that project.

Ms HILDYARD: Have you spoken with the soccer club?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I just said—

Ms HILDYARD: Have you spoken with the soccer club, yes or no?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I just said—

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, you have an opportunity to ask questions. The minister has an opportunity to answer the questions. It is not appropriate for you to direct the minister how to answer the question. It is for me to rule if the answers are in order or not.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I said, that was not an election commitment of ours. It may have been the previous government's, but they did not deliver it in their 16 years most notably. I am also advised that the chief executive of the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing has had a conversation with the Onkaparinga council about the greater precinct.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, as you have mentioned, in the budget overview there is funding outlined for football at the State Sports Park, Adelaide Super-Drome upgrades, Women's Memorial Playing Fields, SA Athletics Stadium and the Sam Willoughby International BMX Track. Do you think it is honest to re-announce funding as if it were on your government's initiative, given that funding had already been committed by the former Labor government?

The CHAIR: Once again, member for Reynell, I am just going to give you a chance to re-ask that question. Are you inferring that the minister is being dishonest which is most unparliamentary?

Ms HILDYARD: I am asking—

The CHAIR: No, it is most unparliamentary.

Ms HILDYARD: Okay, I will reframe the question.

The CHAIR: Please do.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, why are you outlining funding that had already been budgeted for and announced by the former Labor government?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, I have answered this question before but I will have another go to try to be a little bit clearer. When I got into this role as the minister, I went to the office and said, 'Right. What is in the budget? What money do we have in the office for recreation and sport for these projects?' The very short answer, and it was a really short answer, was none. The previous government—

Ms HILDYARD: That's not true.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —did not have money—

Ms HILDYARD: It's just not true.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —in the bank account—

Ms HILDYARD: It's not true.

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, please allow the—

Ms HILDYARD: I'm sorry, Mr Chair. I just get incensed.

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, I appreciate this is your first time in front of me this week and I am very excited that you are here. But if we just let the minister answer the question, he is completely in order and then you will be able to ask your next probing question.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: So I need to be clear: when I got into this job, I said to the chief executive, 'What money do we have in our bank account to deliver these projects?' The answer was none. The money was not there. It was a pie in the sky commitment without the funds being put into

the account of the office. At the budget just gone I sought a commitment through cabinet to get the funds committed for those projects—and I can run through them with you again—

Ms HILDYARD: No, thank you.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and they were delivered. I am very proud of that. I am very excited to be delivering those projects and when I go to the CE now and say, 'Have we got the money in the bank account for those projects?' She says yes. So the difference was, no, we did not have the money. Now the difference is, yes, we do have the money. The difference was under the former Labor government, no.

Ms HILDYARD: I think you have made your point.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Under the current Liberal government, yes, we do have the money. So it is good news—

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —for those projects going forward and—

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you, minister.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —I think all the young people are very excited and—

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, I just don't need you to talk over me, please.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, the government announced that it was giving—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Please let me finish and don't talk over me. That is a little bit rude.

The CHAIR: Order!

Ms HILDYARD: Perhaps you could make a new point.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am making the same point—

Ms HILDYARD: Yes, you are.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —because I need to be clear because you keep asking the same question, which is fine, and I will say it again. The money was not in the account and it is in the account now. So we look forward to delivering those projects, and I know you will be excited about those projects as well.

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you, minister. Minister, there was one—

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, you have a question?

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you, Mr Chair. On the same page: why is there \$1.5 million less in your package in relation to the Super-Drome than what was committed by the previous Labor government?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you again for the question. The previous amount committed by the government was zero and we have committed—

Ms HILDYARD: I understand the AIS money but I am interested in your funding.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Just to explain, the difference is it comes from the federal government; the \$1.5 million comes from the federal government. The 7.7 comes from the state government.

Ms HILDYARD: It still does not add up to the same amount. Can you confirm, minister, whether the wind tunnel will be going ahead as part of that development?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What I can confirm from what you are saying is, firstly, on the wind tunnel, yes. Secondly, on the Mid-Year Budget Review, the only items that were committed

funding were the Goodwood Oval and the South Australian Women in Sport Taskforce. There was no commitment to any of these other projects—

Ms HILDYARD: It is just not true.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —in the rec and sport budget.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, in relation to statements on page 70 of Volume 4, Budget Paper 4 in relation to page 18 of the Budget Overview and also in reference to your opening statement, how do you personally, minister, define gender equality?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I think I covered that in my opening statement, my position on this.

Ms HILDYARD: You didn't. You didn't mention it. What is your definition of gender equality, minister?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, I think I have covered that in my opening statement.

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, I am looking at page 70, and I am just—

Ms HILDYARD: It is in three different places.

The CHAIR: I am sure it is. If you could just tell me which dot point it comes under on page 70.

Ms HILDYARD: It is in the budget overview on page 18, which talks about female facilities and the need to ensure that women can equally participate in all aspects of sport. It is also referenced on page 70 of Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, and in the minister's opening statement. I would have thought, in any case, that any minister should and could answer a question in relation to their definition of gender equality.

The CHAIR: Once again, if the minister wishes to answer this question, he can; however, I would argue that the minister is not responsible. The portfolio under examination is not gender equality—

Ms HILDYARD: I think all ministers are responsible for gender equality, actually.

The CHAIR: —but if the minister is happy to answer—

Ms HILDYARD: Respectfully, Mr Chair, I think all ministers, including this one, are responsible for gender equality in South Australia.

The CHAIR: I would like to think all of Her Majesty's ministers are responsible for equality.

Ms HILDYARD: So perhaps we can answer the question.

The CHAIR: Thank you, minister.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: My definition is not a budget item. I made my position very clear in the opening statement and I do not think it can be any clearer.

Ms HILDYARD: So you cannot define it here today?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, the definition you are asking for is not a budget item.

Ms HILDYARD: So you are not going to answer that question?

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell.

Ms HILDYARD: Very interesting. Minister, in relation to the same references, how will the government achieve gender equality in sport? What is your vision to achieve gender equality in sport? What is your definition?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Currently, across the board, participation in sport by women and girls is not equal to that of men and boys. In South Australia, across nearly all metrics of sport— participation, leadership, sponsorship, remuneration and media coverage—the engagement of women and girls is far from equal to that of men and boys. There is a significant commitment nationally and locally to address this imbalance.

As I said in my opening statement, I am personally committed, as Chair of the national Meeting of Sport and Recreation Ministers, to drive this agenda. The Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing is also currently chair of the Committee of Australian Sport and Recreation Officials (CASRO) and has led the working group on women in sport—a big commitment there.

When I became minister, I asked the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing to conduct a review of the SA Women in Sport Taskforce to determine the direction and action plan for their future. The review incorporated wide-ranging consultation and analysis, in conjunction with task force members and the industry, to provide valuable insight into what is required from government and relevant stakeholders. I have listened.

Survey responses closed on 14 September, and the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing is still analysing the results, but the initial findings are quite enlightening. For state sporting associations, the three priority areas they are currently addressing are access to quality coaching, cultural change, and building participation and competition structures. Access to playing surfaces and the provision of appropriate facilities were listed as lower priorities for action on average.

In terms of what sport can do to achieve gender equality, state sporting associations identified leadership, culture and facilities as their role. Participants felt that equality of access was the most important priority for state associations. Disappointingly, over half (54 per cent) of the participant respondents indicated that they had experienced unfairness through sport. Respondents provided examples relating to payment, quality of coaching, and men and boys getting access to the best facilities and times.

Clearly, facilities have been identified as an issue and the government will continue to fund redevelopments through the Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program and the new grassroots football, netball and cricket program. What came through strongly for me was the importance of culture—how women and girls are welcomed into the club environment and how they are treated. Our clubs are in many cases the centre of our community, and my aspiration is that clubs provide a safe, welcoming and inclusive environment for all in our community.

Over the coming months we will deliver our new grants program creating spaces that are welcoming and family friendly across the three highest female participation or growth sports of AFL, cricket and netball, and will develop strategies to respond to the information gathered through the review. I think, in fact, you were invited to fill in the survey; I am not sure whether we got your response or not, I hope we did. Did we get your response?

Ms HILDYARD: I think I am asking you the questions, minister.

The CHAIR: It would not be appropriate, minister, as to whether the member for Reynell has or has not—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry; it was just an informal follow up. What I will say from the responses is that one anecdotal example given was around a facility built for women but only the elite women at that club got to use it, and when they were not using it was used by the men and the boys. They are serious issues I think we need to address.

Other things that came back is that people were looking at funds to assist with facilities to suit both male and female participants, to help build better facilities to cater for both males and females, that all new facilities be for both genders equally, and grants for building unisex facilities for trainers and players. That is some of the feedback we got.

This process has been really enlightening. We have listened to what the community has had to say. This is an exciting time, and I actually look forward to working with the member for Reynell and delivering really great outcomes for our sporting—

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you, minister. Minister—

The CHAIR: Thank you, minister. Member for Reynell, I have the call; I am the Chair. The member for Heysen has been patiently waiting for more than half an hour for a question, and I know he is eager to ask that question.

Ms HILDYARD: Maybe he can define gender equality.

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, order.

Mr TEAGUE: Thank you, Chair. Can the minister update the committee on the progress of the government's election commitment to expand the Sports Voucher program and continue it for a further four years? I refer to Agency Statements, Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 70, perhaps with particular reference to the first dot point under Targets 2018-19.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I thank the member for his question; I know he is very passionate about his community and, in particular, about the young people in his community we want to engage with and whose participation we want to grow. We know that the cost of living is an inhibitor to people who have to pay to play sport, so this is a really great program.

The Sports Vouchers program commenced in 2015. It currently provides a discount of up to \$50 for all primary-school-aged children towards the cost of sports club fees or memberships. Our election commitment was not only to continue this valuable program but also to double the discount, meaning that from 1 January 2019 each primary-school-aged child in South Australia can claim up to \$100 discount. Further, this government appreciates that dance has not been an eligible activity in the past, so we are also making all forms of dance an eligible activity. Dance organisations need to register as a voucher provider to ensure that from 1 January 2019 they can offer a sports voucher discount.

We will be communicating these exciting updates of the expanded program to some 1,500 registered sports voucher providers in the coming weeks. The Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing has responsibility for the administration of this program and will be managing the promotion and communication around this to ensure that all providers are ready to offer up to \$100 discount in 2019.

According to the latest Australian Sports Commission 2017 AusPlay data, 63 per cent of children participate in organised physical activity outside of school hours at least once per week. The Active Healthy Kids Australia 2016 Report Card on Physical Activity for Children and Young People reports that while two-thirds of Australian children participate in organised out-of-school sport, fewer than 20 per cent meet daily physical activity recommendations, and that is key. These statistics show that as a nation, whilst we are continuing to see children participate, there is still room to improve. By doubling the discount and providing sports vouchers of up to \$100, we are helping families manage the cost of one of the barriers to participation.

The Sports Vouchers program continues to be embraced by the whole community: parents, grassroots clubs, and private sport providers alike. I am delighted to advise the committee that to date more than 194,000 vouchers have been redeemed worth over \$9.5 million since the program's inception. Aussie rules football continues to be the most popular sport with children using sports vouchers. From the 55,515 vouchers redeemed in 2017, some 20,480 vouchers were for Aussie Rules alone, and we know the uptake of young girls in particular playing football has been a big reason in that rise which is outstanding.

The other most popular sports rounding out the top five during 2017 were netball, 9,717 vouchers; football (soccer), 6,936 vouchers; gymnastics, 4,441 vouchers; and basketball, 2,517 vouchers. With double the discount being offered from 1 January 2019, I encourage all clubs and parents to continue to embrace this valuable program. I look forward to reporting on future figures on sports vouchers and seeing the difference the \$100 voucher is making to our community and our state.

Ms HILDYARD: On the same page, why is the \$100—

The CHAIR: Which page?

Ms HILDYARD: Page 71. Why is the \$100 sports voucher not available for private swimming lessons?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Just so we are clear, nothing has changed from the previous way this was done.

Ms HILDYARD: That is not my question.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Sorry, if I can just finish. Nothing has changed from the previous way this was done. The provider has to be affiliated with a state association, so that means they can be accountable and it can be accounted for. So if someone is affiliated with a state association, they can claim the voucher, and that is the way that the program has worked in the past and will continue to work in the future.

Ms HILDYARD: Will the grant submission from Recreation SA to conduct research into why primary school students are not able to access water safety lessons be granted by the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am told that grant submission has just been resubmitted, and is in the process of being considered at the moment.

Ms HILDYARD: Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 70, and page 18 of the Budget Overview. How does the Female Facilities Program cut, the \$24 million program cut, and the \$10 million cut from the last fully funded round assist in achieving gender equality in sport? Clearly the \$5 million per year, which is absolutely contingent on council and club funding, is nowhere near the \$24 million, and nor does it compensate for the \$10 million that was cut. How does that cut assist in your vision to achieve gender equality?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, I need to clarify some numbers because they have been a bit misconstrued. We are not continuing with the \$10 million that was in the process—

Ms HILDYARD: Nor the \$24 million—

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —sorry—the \$10 million in the process for the Female Facilities Program that the previous government had. We have gone with a new project, which I am delighted to talk about. We have gone with the grassroots football, netball and cricket program, which has a huge growth rate: netball, 35,000 participants; cricket, 62 per cent of new people starting cricket are female; and football, you know all too well has gone from 2,000 to 4,000 to 6,000 female participants in the last three years. The growth of females playing those sports has been exceptionally big so we have gone with that new program.

To clarify the numbers, so it is on the record: as a new government we have not rolled out the \$10 million that was in the female facilities. We have gone with this new project and, in fact, we have put an extra \$5 million in. So we took the \$10 million and we added an extra \$5 million, so it is \$5 million, \$5 million and \$5 million over the next three years.

We have engaged with the SANFL and AFL, as well as Cricket Australia and SACA, as a group. Along with Netball SA, they were so keen on the project that the football and cricket components contributed \$1 million each to this project. We are unapologetic in saying that doing the co-funded projects with council is the right way to go. I stand to be corrected on this figure—and I will correct it for the committee if I am wrong—but over 70 per cent of community sports clubs are built on council property. So I think it is really exciting to have council be a stakeholder in this program.

I think it is a really good project to partner with those organisations and have them put skin in the game in high-growth areas that are really focused around women and girls. We need to be clear that the \$14 million that the government put into this project—

Ms HILDYARD: Twenty-four.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —in its 16 years—

Ms HILDYARD: Twenty-four.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Hang on, \$14 million is what the previous government spent on this project.

Ms HILDYARD: Twenty-four was committed—fully funded and budgeted.

The CHAIR: Order! The minister is answering the question. Let him answer in silence, please.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: So \$14 million was expended by the previous government, and we as the new government have taken the last \$10 million and put it into our own project. We have

actually added that \$10 million and put in an extra \$5 million. So our \$15 million plus the \$2 million from cricket and football makes it \$17 million. It is a joint funded project, so there is \$24 million, with another \$10 million in the wings, so potentially \$34 million. That is an exciting project and we are very keen to deliver that for South Australia. It is a really good project and I think people are excited by it. I look forward to delivering it over the time.

When I came into this job, I asked about the women's facilities program. I can go over old ground, but I have spoken about the work we did when we surveyed the community, the state sporting organisations and people involved in the Women in Sport Taskforce and got some really great feedback. I looked at the women's facilities program—it is one of the first things I did—and I said, 'Great concept. How are we going? There is \$14 million that has been allocated to this. How much has actually been delivered in projects on the ground?' and it was less than \$0.5 million that had actually been delivered in that time. The government had been in for 16 years at that stage and had done the program over the last few years of their term. I think the figure was less than \$0.5 million—again, I will correct that if I am wrong.

Ms HILDYARD: My budget paper states something else.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The other projects had not actually been delivered, so I have made a concerted effort to work with the office and make sure that we get these projects delivered. A lot of that money was just sitting in bank accounts and not being put into facilities on the ground, and that is what is important. Our focus with our grassroots community sports project is very much about getting facilities on the ground.

There is a lot of talk about change rooms, etc., but the other thing that has come to me—and I have talked about culture as part of the survey—is that we need to have a club, and a club environment, and community areas. I think it is really important that people congregate and meet for health benefits, etc., but we must have a club environment that is welcoming to women, and to everyone, so that they feel empowered to be able to be the best they can be and do the best they can do.

Ms HILDYARD: Mr Chair, I think we are going over old ground. We really are.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We need to make sure that we deliver that, and that is what I am focused on delivering. When you say \$24 million of cuts, that is actually wrong. There has been \$14 million invested by the previous government in their program. We have taken the \$10 million and we have turned it into what I believe is a better program for all of South Australia to get better facilities—

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you, minister.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —better culture—

Ms HILDYARD: Mr Chair, we have heard this before.

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, the minister is concluding his answer.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and community clubs—

Ms HILDYARD: It is repetition.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —for all of the community, and I am very proud of that.

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, I hope you have a different question or a different line item.

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you, Mr Chair. No, it is on the same budget paper.

The CHAIR: Another repetition.

Ms HILDYARD: What is your message to the volunteers who spent countless hours applying for the final \$10 million round of the \$24 million program? Particularly, what is your message to those codes in rugby, basketball, soccer and hockey, all of those other codes that cannot ever now apply for any funds? What is your message to them? They are pretty angry with you, let me tell

you. Some of them cannot apply, so I am really interested to know about those in the codes that are now excluded. I am sure all the members would like to know about that.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you very much. I have just been advised, and I am very well aware, that the department rang every one of those people who made an application and we understand and appreciate the work that went in.

Ms HILDYARD: Yes, what is your message, minister?

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, you have had an opportunity to ask your question. The minister is answering the question. He has consulted with his adviser, which is consistent with every other minister who has ever, ever appeared before any other estimates committee. This one is no different. Minister, please continue.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you, Chair. They have all been rung and spoken to. The office has offered to work with them and facilitate them across to one of the new programs. For those who do not fit into the new program, the grassroots community football, netball or cricket program, they can go across to the Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program and be worked across there.

I would be very surprised, on advice, if they could not all be reprogrammed into one of those other programs, such as the Active Club Program, etc. The department has been working very closely with everyone who applied. As you know, when there are applications, there are more applications than can be granted anyway, which is always disappointing. But, everyone has been contacted. The department has offered to work closely and reprofile all of those applications across to a new program that would suit them. On advice, I do not think there are many, if any, that would not fit into one of the other programs, be they other sports you mentioned liked rugby, basketball and so on. There are programs there for everyone and we are willing to work through that with all of them.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, do you think they are all happy with that response?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I said, we have put our programs in place. We are excited by these programs and we think they are going to deliver very, very good outcomes. We are very outcome focused. I mentioned before the previous program. When I got into government there was, arguably, \$12 million or \$13 million—maybe more—sitting in the pockets of clubs, not in facilities. We are very focused on engaging with councils, working with councils and getting this money into the community to deliver what they need, be it a facility or be it lighting.

One of the other pieces of feedback that I received from this that you would be interested in, I think, member for Reynell, was about lighting. At this club, women said, 'We want lighting to allow us to walk safely to our car.' So it was not even the change rooms that they were worried about. They wanted lighting so that they felt safe walking to the car. They are the sorts of things coming from the communities that we all know and live in, and I know you do too. We want to listen to them and we want to assist them where we can to have those facilities that are community based, community minded and have men, women, boys, girls—everyone in the community—involved, engaged and part of a community sporting club. That is what we are really focused on delivering and excited about delivering.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, have you spoken—

The CHAIR: Member for Narungga.

Ms HILDYARD: Seriously?

The CHAIR: Sorry; what does 'seriously' mean, member for Reynell?

Ms HILDYARD: With seven minutes to go.

The CHAIR: I do not know what that means. Do you have a point of order or are you questioning my ruling?

Ms HILDYARD: I will withdraw that.

The CHAIR: Thank you, member for Reynell.

Ms HILDYARD: Seven minutes.

The CHAIR: Sorry, member for Reynell.

Ms HILDYARD: I was just looking at my clock.

The CHAIR: I am thoroughly looking forward to writing the report for this Estimates Committee B, which, of course, started at 9am last Friday. I would say that government members of the committee—not that I see them as government members, I see them as members of the committee—members of the committee who sit on my right have probably in total asked about 22 questions across five days of estimates, and I would say that members who sit on my left have probably asked in the order of maybe close to 1,000 questions, or 600 or 700 at least, I would have thought. So I will be very keen for that wrap-up. If you seriously think that is an issue, member for Reynell, I take great umbrage at that, but I am glad you withdrew that statement. Member for Narungga.

Mr ELLIS: Thank you. I have a serious question.

The CHAIR: The 23rd question from the government in a week.

Mr ELLIS: I would like to take the minister to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 71. Can the minister provide some information about the successful applicants under the latest round of the Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program and tell us if there might be a particular focus on regional funding that was awarded?

The CHAIR: No doubt the minister will be brief in his question to allow one or two final questions from the member for Reynell.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you very much. I thank the member for the question. I am pleased to provide an update to the committee, with a bit of information about this grant program as well. The Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program is another one of those that I think most clubs or groups across the state should fit into. Again, I commend the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing to the committee for the work that they do to help facilitate this for clubs and groups that are looking to apply for this grant.

The Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program helps eligible organisations establish or improve active recreation and sports facilities to meet the needs of the community in South Australia. Eligible applicants can apply under the following categories: minor facility development (requests between \$25,000 and \$200,000); and major facility development (requests between \$200,000 and \$1 million). The budget for the 2018-19 year is \$4.28 million. A total of 29 applications were approved under the 2018-19 round, with six metropolitan projects totalling \$763,300, five greater metropolitan projects at \$379,800, and 18 regional projects totalling \$3.136 million.

I am pleased to provide the committee with the following details about some of the successful regional applications. The electorate of Chaffey received \$135,000 for the Renmark Tintra Lawn Tennis Club and \$45,700 for the Renmark Table Tennis Association. The electorate of Flinders received \$135,000 to upgrade the Ceduna Sailing Club, \$190,000 to assist the redevelopment of the Port Lincoln Leisure Centre, \$630,000 to construct the Cleve multifunction community sports centre, and \$368,000 to construct the integrated recreation and sport activity zone in Wudinna.

The electorate of Hammond received \$197,500 for the community centre at Callington, \$168,500 to develop stage 2 of the Murray Coorong Trail, \$416,500 to construct a swimming pool in Karoonda, \$200,000 for a six-kilometre shared use walking trail in Kinchina Conservation Park, and \$171,700 for a multidiscipline shooting complex and clubhouse at Tungkillio. I know quite a bit went to the electorate of Narungga too, if I am—

Mr ELLIS: Not enough.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Not enough. I know the electorate of Narungga did very well also. The electorate of Wright also received \$500,000 for a community facility at Bridgestone Reserve in Brahma Lodge. It is great to see the metropolitan and the regional electorates—

The CHAIR: Anything in Waite?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: For that, I would have to go back and double-check. I do not have all the successful applicants there.

The CHAIR: I am disappointed.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I will take that on notice, Chair, and the department can let you know.

The CHAIR: Minister, could I ask you to conclude, so we can allow the member for Reynell one or two more quick questions.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Absolutely. I am pleased to let the committee know that applications for the 2019-20 round of the Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program are anticipated to open in early February and close in April 2019. Successful clubs can expect to be notified in late July 2019. I do commend that program to the committee.

The CHAIR: The member for Reynell.

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you, Mr Chair. In relation to Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 70, where is the Female Participation Grant program?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The grant you are talking about, just to be clear, is the Female Participation Grant, which was part of a one-off payment to the office that went through a number of different projects. It was not an ongoing fund or commitment or anything like that; it was a one-off payment.

Ms HILDYARD: So it has been cut.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That was a \$300,000 commitment through the Mid-Year Budget Review. It was just a one-off payment and it was just a one-off round of grants. Again, when I came into the position I do not think all of that had been expended, so it was with great pleasure that we found a lot of other projects around women's sport that we were able to support and fund.

An assertion that the female participation grant has been cut or axed is totally untrue. It was a one-off payment, as I stressed, through the Mid-Year Budget Review last year, and the female participation grant was one element of that piece of funding. When you look in the budget, you will not find it because it was not an ongoing program. I just have to be very—

Ms HILDYARD: I just have one question, thank you, Mr Chair.

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, I will have it known that we are over 3.45 but I am the most generous chair ever know to estimates and—

Ms HILDYARD: Absolutely.

The CHAIR: —this better be a quick question.

Ms HILDYARD: It is a very quick question. Thank you, Mr Chair. Minister, in relation to the same page, where is the funding committed in last year's budget to ensure equal prize money for men and women at South Australia's iconic Bay Sheffield?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am informed that did not come through the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing.

Ms HILDYARD: So where is it? It is one of the most iconic sporting events in South Australia, so where is it in the budget?

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, if it is not a payment administered under this portfolio then unfortunately the minister is not responsible for that.

Ms HILDYARD: Disappeared.

The CHAIR: I suggest it may sit with the Treasurer. Alas, there being no further time for questions I declare the examination of the proposed payments for the portfolio Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing and the estimate for payments for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and the administrative items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet completed. I lay before the committee a draft report.

Mr TEAGUE: I move:

That the draft report be the report of the committee.

Motion carried.

The CHAIR: Wonderful. Before I formally close the committee, could I thank all the staff of the house for their forbearance over the last week.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Can I indulge for 30 seconds and thank all my staff and all the people involved. It is a very long process for all the agencies and all the departments that I work with. I would like to pass on my great thanks to them and, as I said, in particular my staff who do a mountain of work—a big thank you to them as well.

The CHAIR: Thank you. I am sure the member for Reynell on behalf of the opposition concurs with that.

Ms HILDYARD: I absolutely concur with that. Thank you very much.

At 15:47 the committee concluded.