

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 1 December 2020

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.B. Teague)** took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

**The SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I respectfully acknowledge the traditional owners of this land upon which the parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.

### *Parliamentary Committees*

#### LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (11:01):** By leave, I move:

That the committee have leave to sit during the sitting of the house today.

Motion carried.

### *Bills*

#### APPROPRIATION BILL 2020

### *Estimates Committees*

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:02):** I bring up the report of Estimates Committee A and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

**Mr TRELOAR:** I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee A and move:

That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the Votes and Proceedings.

Motion carried.

**Mr COWDREY (Colton) (11:02):** I bring up the report of Estimates Committee B and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

**Mr COWDREY:** I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee B and move:

That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the Votes and Proceedings.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (11:03):** I move:

That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (11:03):** Thank you for the opportunity to make a further contribution on the Appropriation Bill. I guess colloquially we would refer to these as the 'summing-up speeches' from the estimates process.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee might indicate if he is the lead speaker.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, I am the lead speaker, much to all of your disappointment. No-one will be surprised to hear me refer to the unusual nature of this year's estimates, interrupted part way through as they were on the first day, with both the Premier and the Treasurer and their hearings being halted due to the unfolding—

**Mr Pederick:** Pause.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:**—pause. It was not called a pause or a lockdown—

**The Hon. S.S. Marshall:** 'Circuit-breaker'. We used both.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Circuit-breaker, yes—the electrician's response to the management of the pandemic because we would not want to use the term 'lockdown', would we?

**The Hon. S.S. Marshall:** 'Stay at home order' often was used as well.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** The Premier has got further advice. I will not peeve him off; otherwise, I might be called similar names to the worker at the Woodville pizza house, and we would not want to be cast with those same aspersions.

**The Hon. S.S. Marshall:** Don't say anything false and misleading.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Are there two speakers in the house or just one? I am confused.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee has the call.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Thank you for the call, sir. I understood I had it; I do not know if the Premier did. I commenced my questioning—it is a laughing matter for the Premier—of the Treasurer focusing in on the economic stimulus payments that the Premier had spruiked as being so generous, particularly in a national context, and that the government continues to claim meet the needs of the community, the community that has been so hard hit, not necessarily just those people who have been directly affected not only by the actual virus itself, by the pandemic, but by the collateral impact of that—that is, the restrictions on the community.

I asked the Treasurer whether there would be further support to what had already been announced by the government. It is important, I think, that we spend a little bit of time focusing in on this issue. The opposition has supported and continues to support the health response to the coronavirus pandemic here in South Australia. We have offered bipartisan support—unfettered bipartisan support—to the government, and along the way, where there are opportunities for the government to respond in ways which would assist the community deal with the impacts of the health response to the coronavirus pandemic, we have made those suggestions.

I in particular have consistently called on the government to be quicker and more generous with the financial support it has been willing to provide the community. The Premier liked to claim that he was the first Premier in the nation to announce an economic stimulus package, in mid-March of this year. He claimed there would be \$350 million of economic stimulus money on the table to help people adapt and adjust to the impacts of the restrictions.

Of course, it quickly came out that the vast majority of that funding was existing funding committed for other purposes, worthy purposes of course, but not related at all to helping the community specifically respond to the impacts of the coronavirus restrictions, such as rebuilding Flinders Chase or getting on with the job of ordering medical equipment in country hospitals. This was all money already budgeted and set aside but incorrectly called economic stimulus by this government.

When it became clear that \$350 million of pre-existing money was manifestly inadequate to respond to the impacts of the coronavirus pandemic, the government made a further commitment of \$650 million, some of which actually was economic stimulus funding, including small business grants, and we welcome that. What we did not welcome was the tardiness with which those grants were being rolled out into the community.

Those \$10,000 small business grants were desperately needed by the community as transitional support, particularly for those businesses that were applying for and reasonably expecting to receive the first iteration of the JobKeeper payments from the federal government. They were not able to trade either completely or in any way which could sustain their normal operations or continue paying their employees, let alone somehow maintain their livelihoods until they received that JobKeeper payment.

The payment of those small business grants was absolutely necessary to get them through that period. Unfortunately, those small business grants largely started being received by businesses after JobKeeper became available. Just at the time when state government support was needed, it was not able to be actually provided out into the community, and that was a shortcoming.

Fast-forward, of course, and we have had the recent state budget and the announcement of further economic stimulus measures which, for those people who will be in line to receive them, I am sure will be most welcome. What has also been occurring is a continuing change in the number of and the types of restrictions being imposed on the community, in particular on South Australian small business owners.

As I said, the opposition continues to support the government and SA Health's response to the coronavirus pandemic and continues to lend its support for the imposition of restrictions onto the community. But what we also do is call on the government to recognise the impact that those restrictions are having, particularly on the business community and, if those restrictions are to be maintained, recognise that the state government must do more to assist those businesses which are prevented from operating either in total or in a way which means that they are viable, let alone profitable.

The prime example, which we are discussing at the moment, is the continuation of the one person per four square metre rule in hospitality venues across South Australia. Liquor licences usually are allocated on the basis of a venue's square metreage, and the number of people who can be in that premises is usually one person per square metre, not one person per two square metres, let alone one person per four square metres. In that context, you can understand how a business seeks and then receives a liquor licence, which allows them to operate viably, based on having one person per one square metre.

When that is reduced to one person per two square metres, that is a 50 per cent reduction in the number of people who can frequent that premises. Then, when it is a reduction to one person per four square metres, that is a maximum capacity of those venues of 25 per cent. When there are further restrictions imposed on these venues, for example, having a maximum capacity across the venue regardless of size of 100 people in addition to the one person per four square metres, and when you are a venue which was previously licensed for many hundreds of people across several different areas, whether it is different restaurants or different bar facilities and so on, you can understand why they are unable to operate viably. You can also understand why they are unable to support their regular cohort of employees.

When we went into the snap lockdown a few weeks ago on that first day of estimates, from midnight of that Wednesday night, it was widely regarded that, at the end of that, South Australian businesses hoped to re-emerge with at least a return to the one or two square metres. They thought they were going to go back to what they had previously. South Australia in this regard has the toughest restrictions in the country, and that means we have the toughest business conditions in the country. If the government is going to maintain those restrictions based on the health advice in an effort to keep South Australians safe, that is fine, but it also has to be accompanied by additional financial support.

The government set up three funds. The first fund was established as a business grants fund or business loans and grants fund called the Economic and Business Growth Fund and it had \$100 million placed into it over four years, \$25 million per year. In addition, in response to the pandemic, two other funds—the Business and Jobs Support Fund and the Community and Jobs Support Fund—have also been established.

According to the budget papers themselves, there is at least \$140 million of unallocated funds sitting across those three funds. I asked the Treasurer at the outset that Wednesday, knowing how tough venues are doing it across South Australia, whether there would be any support. He said, 'We have an extra round of small business grants,' both the continuation of the \$10,000 and, if you are a sole trader, a glaring oversight by the first scheme, you are able to access a \$3,000 grant.

Bear in mind that there were \$186 million worth of grants, or over 18,000 grants, paid out in the first round and in the second round there is only \$78 million worth of grants, and that \$78 million is to be split between the \$10,000 and the \$3,000. That means that what we will continue to see is many thousands of South Australian businesses continue to fall between the cracks of government assistance programs. That includes JobKeeper for those many businesses that are not eligible for JobKeeper or no longer eligible for JobKeeper and it also includes those other businesses that have not been able to meet state government requirements.

It has been put to me repeatedly by many businesses that they cannot continue under this current regime without further support from the government. As I have said to this place before on a number of occasions, I take my hat off to Josh Frydenberg for being willing to put in a wage subsidy scheme like JobKeeper. It has staved off the absolute worst impacts of what the pandemic would have done to the South Australian economy and to all the businesses whose activity constitutes that economy.

But that scheme is being wound down and it will come to an end early next year. We have businesses in South Australia under the harshest restrictions in the country that have lost access to JobKeeper because, when restrictions eased, particularly on those hospitality industries, for that five-week period where they had both the one and two square metre rules and the capacity to allow people to drink standing up—or in the euphemistic tones of the government, 'vertical consumption'—that enabled a bump in their sales and their operations. That bump unfortunately means they are not able to demonstrate that they are 30 per cent down on equivalent periods in other years. They might only be 20 or 25 per cent down, hence they are no longer eligible for JobKeeper.

I make the call again on behalf of all those thousands of struggling small businesses to the Marshall Liberal government: please do more to support the South Australian business community, which is labouring under the toughest restrictions in the country. We are prepared to support the restrictions and the efforts that come with that. Venues are more than happy to have QR code facilities to ensure that they can continue trading, but that is not enough while they labour under the toughest restrictions in the country.

There is an opportunity for the state government to respond in a way which has been occurring in other states around the nation where more support is being provided than to South Australian businesses. It is becoming glaringly obvious to people with a close interest in these matters that the Premier, the Treasurer and the government are failing the business community and failing the community at large as a result of inadequately supporting South Australians through this pandemic.

We have also learnt that the government continues to maintain secrecy and a lack of transparency over some of the payments it has been making to particular businesses. There was much song and dance made by the Premier when the announcement was made that Accenture would be coming to South Australia, one of the largest professional service providers globally. It was sold to us as a choice by this company to come to South Australia, such was the attractive business environment, operating environment and access to staff that would be available for them to establish their operations and gear up their operations.

The claim was made that up to 2,000 South Australians would be employed by Accenture on their arrival in South Australia. What we were not told, of course, was that they were paid money to come here and participate in that announcement with the Premier. How much money were they paid? We do not know because the government refuses to make that information clear.

If you are a struggling venue operator in South Australia, I think it is pretty dispiriting when you learn that millions of dollars are being paid to businesses that currently have no presence here in South Australia to come and set up an operation while you are just trying to keep your head above water and continue employing staff and keep contributing to our state's economy, and there is little assistance available for you.

Speaking of assistance, we do know who is getting some assistance from the government—yet another round of assistance—and that is the Stadium Management Authority. Not only have they managed to squeeze a concessional \$42 million loan out of the government for the Adelaide Oval Hotel but in the early stages of the pandemic they were also given a \$4 million free kick by not having to pay some of those required payments under the terms of the Adelaide Oval Redevelopment and Management Act, including contributions to the sinking fund and to community sport grants. They have had a further round of that and the amount of financial support that has gone to the Stadium Management Authority now totals over \$7 million in less than a year.

Imagine that you are the proprietor of a restaurant, a cafe, a small bar or a pub, not necessarily here in Adelaide's CBD but perhaps out in regional South Australia, and you have been ordered to close and then permitted to reopen with only one in four square metres, that you are not

entitled to any of the small business assistance that has been made available to select businesses and that you are just expected to struggle your way through and to rely on the goodwill of your customers to try to support you through these very, very difficult times.

Then imagine how you feel not getting any assistance from the state government and learning that the Stadium Management Authority is receiving \$7 million worth of assistance. That is extraordinary and a double standard that should not be allowed to continue. If the state government can find it within themselves to provide a \$42 million loan, in addition to \$7 million of further financial relief—a nearly \$50 million package that has gone to the Stadium Management Authority—then surely they could be making some of this unallocated \$140 million available they have sitting in these funds yet to be allocated, let alone yet to be spent, in the community. It is just remarkable that the government would allow this to continue.

One thing we called on the state government to do was to initiate a tourism grants scheme, similar to what happened in the Northern Territory and Tasmania: a \$200 voucher South Australians could use to go and spend across South Australia in order to try to get people out of the house again—when we are able to—to go and stimulate South Australian tourism and hospitality businesses.

That was met with a scheme by the government of \$100 if you are going to spend it in the marginal electorate of Adelaide, in order to try to protect the political fortunes of the member for Adelaide and Minister for Child Protection, or \$50 if you wanted to travel further abroad than the CBD and North Adelaide. So it was \$100 if you wanted a tourism experience in the city or \$50 if you wanted to go to the West Coast, Eyre Peninsula, Flinders Ranges, Mid North, Yorke Peninsula, Barossa, Limestone Coast and around the South-East.

Does that sound reasonable? No, of course not and, unsurprisingly, relatively few of these grants were taken up. Today, we see an announcement from the government where the unspent balance of the funds they had set aside for the original voucher scheme is having to be repurposed into round 2 of the scheme. If they had got it right the first time, perhaps the initiative would have had the desired impact for the hospitality and tourism industries, rather than trying to rehash it again because they did not target it in the way that (a) other states had successfully rolled it out and (b) they were called on by the industry and the Labor opposition to do in the first place. That was very disappointing.

Of course, we also recognise that, aside from the additional spending in this budget on economic stimulus, the budget seems to be spiralling out of control under the Premier and the Treasurer. It is remarkable that before the coronavirus pandemic hit South Australia the state government had somehow managed to increase the state's debt burden, doubling it almost to nearly \$24 billion by the end of the forward estimates.

That would be one thing if there was a lot to show for it. The problem is that you look around South Australia and there is very little to show for it. Now we are being asked to accept the fact that \$33 billion of debt will be accrued by the end of the now forward estimates period and that this is a reasonable level of debt.

Under the current circumstances, with interest rates at genuine historic lows and the cost of borrowing correspondingly cheaper, yes, that debt can be accommodated more easily within the budget, but I would like to think, and we would all hope, that there will be an economic recovery in Australia, that there will be an economic recovery in South Australia, that economic growth will return to normal levels—maybe even grow stronger than trend—and that at some point in time that will be reflected in the fact that interest rates will increase to more normal levels, the sorts of levels that we have seen at least over the last five to 10 years.

If and when that occurs, the government's interest burden will escalate, and escalate dramatically. The budget papers make it clear that if interest rates were to increase by one percentage point, in the general government sector alone that would constitute an extra \$248 million, I think it is, by the end of the forward estimates. That is \$248 million that is not available for other areas of expenditure across government, that is not available for spending on health or in our schools or on our police force or out on our roads.

In an environment where last financial year SA Health exceeded its budget by \$547 million, with barely over \$50 million of that coronavirus-related expenditure, that should ring alarm bells to South Australians. This government has removed a fiscal target specifically about debt. There is no debt target anymore. There was a debt target under the previous Labor government, and that target was 35 per cent of revenues. There is now no target. There is a vague allusion to a sustainable level of debt.

Each year, I have asked the Treasurer what he believes a sustainable level of debt is, and he cannot answer that question. There does not seem to be any conception by the Treasurer or by this government about what a sustainable level of debt is. If there is no limit on this debt, it permits poor budget management, the escalation of debt and the running of structural deficits within the budget, with little to show for it at the end of it except a very significant debt burden.

That will not trouble the Treasurer, of course, because he is not here for too much longer, but it will trouble subsequent treasurers, whether it be one from this side of the house or from the other side of the house, and that is greatly troubling to me as the shadow treasurer. That should be greatly troubling to anyone who is interested in management of the state's finances in the future.

It is also troubling, of course, because we know not even half of the funding that is required for the north-south corridor upgrade is included within that \$33 billion. That is remarkable. The federal government tells us it has set aside \$2.5 billion for this project; none of that is inside the forward estimates. The budget papers themselves tell us that something in the order of \$2 billion from the state is allocated within the forward estimates. That means that several billion dollars more debt needs to be accrued by the state government in order to meet its funding obligations to deliver this \$8.9 billion project.

Likewise, for the Women's and Children's Hospital only \$685 million, out of what we understand to be at least a \$1.9 billion hospital project, is provided for across the forward estimates. If the state is to fully fund this hospital, which we all expect, then more debt will need to be accrued. This means that, if you think the state's finances are not in a great shape already, they will only get worse in coming years. What happens in coming years? At the moment, between now and 2026, the state government is party to a revised GST deal—a GST deal that means that our GST allocations are allocated on not the fiscally strongest state but on one of either New South Wales or Victoria.

This was specifically advised against by Treasury in signing up to this deal. Freedom of information determinations have released briefing papers to us where Treasury specifically recommended that the Treasurer not sign up to this deal; this was not a good deal for the state. Why? Because the original GST deal with the unfettered application of genuine HFE principles meant that we would get our fair share of the GST allocation based on need, not some artificial allocation based on propping up federal Liberal seats in Western Australia, which is what the new GST deal does.

There is a bridging guarantee from the federal government that no state will be worse off under this new deal that South Australia has been signed up to by the Premier and by the Treasurer. There is a guarantee until 2026 that South Australia will not be worse off. After 2026, that guarantee runs out. To demonstrate what that means, the federal government has recognised the dire situation that states face in terms of GST entitlements, and they have had to top up the pool to make sure that states can continue delivering those basic services to the standard that Australians expect.

So we have escalating debt and now we have a structural change to the level of GST receipts that we can expect to receive in the future. There will be more debt to service and less revenue coming in in only a handful of years' time, after 2026. What a dreadful legacy this government has left us when it comes to budget management.

We have also had to see other projects increase in cost as well. As projects have been delayed, of course costs increase. There is an escalation factor well understood across Australia for the cost of civil works and civil construction projects. That escalation factor will vary depending on the economic conditions of the day, but something in the order of 3 to 7 per cent has been experienced in the last 10 years. We see The Queen Elizabeth Hospital upgrade delayed by nearly three years by this government. Despite all the funding necessary for it being allocated by the former Labor government across the budget, they have had to kick in an extra \$50 million and do that while reducing the scope of the upgrade.

We have seen other projects like the Springbank Road/Daws Road/Goodwood Road project blow out in cost from \$26 million to over \$60 million. We have seen the Port Wakefield overpass project, committed to by those opposite for \$24 million. They even had former head of the transport department Rod Hook come out and swear black and blue on radio it would only cost \$24 million. It would cost the same amount of money as the overpass at McLaren Vale over that portion of the Victor Harbor Road. Now it is costing somewhere in the order of \$80 million more than that.

What is happening is this government is accruing debt obligations for these projects. It is delaying the projects so that the projects themselves continue to cost more. Right now, I am sure there are hundreds if not thousands of civil construction workers who would like to be gainfully employed on the next stage of the north-south corridor upgrade, or on the intersection upgrades that have been delayed, or on the Main South Road duplication project that has been delayed or even on the Victor Harbor Road duplication project that has been delayed. Not only are those people non-employed and those projects delayed but their costs are escalating as a result of those delays.

Of course, the budget metrics themselves over the forward estimates are based on what can only be described as absolutely heroic assumptions buried within the budget. We have the state's economic forecasts in the budget papers outlining that South Australia is expected to grow beyond the national average of economic growth during some periods over the forward estimates. That is a rare event indeed and has not been achieved for many years here in South Australia, including GSP growth forecast at 4.25 per cent, which would be absolutely heroic.

The revenue estimates, which are baked into the budget to explain how the government can try to demonstrate a path back to surplus, are heroic as well. There are huge increases year on year in the amount of state-owned source revenues coming in, including stamp duty and payroll tax. We already recognise that we are not going to get there because only a few days ago we had the Australian Bureau of Statistics release their annual national accounts data, which shows how each state and territory, as well as the nation as a whole, has performed over the most recent financial year. The national accounts data showed that in the last financial year, the 2019-20 financial year, South Australia recorded the worst economic performance in the nation of minus 1.4 per cent—significantly below the next lowest state and territory.

If that is where we are up to with our economic growth under this government, then you can expect that the forward estimates certainly will not be delivering on those forecasts contained within the budget. There is no rationale that the government can hide behind for that economic performance. It is not like South Australia was COVID-affected and the rest of the nation was not. This is significantly worse economic performance than Victoria's, which was locked down for more than 100 days; so there is little excuse for the government here.

We also expect from the budget figures that there will be no new spending across the next four years and that a surplus will be delivered in the last of the years in the forward estimates on the basis that no further spending is announced between now and the state election, let alone now and the end of the forward estimates. Do we honestly think that that is likely to be the case? Do we honestly think that Health is suddenly going to start meeting its budget?

Maybe it will now that it is not having to compensate the corporate liquidators who are unable to fly in from Victoria to send more bills out, such as the remarkable effort in savings they claim they are achieving for SA Health—just extraordinary. And, of course, we see very significant increases in fees and charges and the government sale of goods and services going forward again, just as we did from last year's budget when there was an extraordinary increase in those costs as well.

I did ask the Treasurer about one area of public spending that is always of interest to the community—and it has always been an area that he has been interested in, in particular—and that is government spending on government advertising. This was something long criticised by the Treasurer, saying that it was a waste of money. You do not need to look too far back into Media Monitoring or to his press releases or into *Hansard* to find repeated references about this. The current Treasurer hated it so much that, upon getting into government, he put himself in charge of government advertising and unleashed the greatest spend the state has ever seen on government advertising—some of it complete rubbish.

Who could forget the 'old mate' campaign, authorised by the Government Communications Advisory Committee? When this humiliating statewide campaign was drawn to his attention, he came out and said, 'It's been axed now. I didn't know about this and, as soon as it was brought to my attention, I told them to axe it.' Remember, there were two 'old mate' advertisements. The claim was made after the airing of the first one, and then of course we were subjected to the second 'old mate' campaign, where old mate and his contemporaries were wandering through the Adelaide Airport.

Maybe a reason for that is that in last year's estimates, when the Treasurer was waxing lyrical about how tough he was being on teachers and holding back their demands for a pay increase, it came to light that his media adviser had in fact been awarded a 6 per cent salary increase without any process whatsoever. There had been no work value assessment and there had been no determination of extra productivity or extra duties, until, of course, the Treasurer said, 'No, no, there are extra duties. I have made the assessment myself. She is my delegate on the Government Communications Advisory Committee, and that's why she is being paid the extra 6 per cent that she is receiving.'

Part of the responsibility of that committee is to publish monthly reports, not only outlining how much money is being spent on campaigns but evaluating the effectiveness of the campaigns. As we have seen this extraordinary increase in government advertising under the current Treasurer, those reports have not been published. You can imagine my confusion.

I thought, 'Well, someone specifically has been singled out for an extraordinary pay increase of 6 per cent to be performing these duties, and the duties aren't being performed. Surely there must be some sort of disciplinary action or perhaps even a wage reduction that's being imposed on this.' But the Treasurer said, 'No, no, it's not her fault. It's not anyone's fault but mine,' of course making it clear that there is no recourse for the community and the media, let alone for anyone else, to get access to that information. How convenient.

Then we moved to other areas particularly under the Treasurer's superintendence, including SafeWork SA and ReturnToWorkSA. ReturnToWorkSA has lost \$450 million over the last two years. Perhaps you might excuse some of that over the course of the last financial year with regard to investment returns. Investment returns for any investment schemes, of course, have been down. Most superannuation funds, for example, have recorded minor investment losses. That might excuse part of it for the most recent financial year, but it does not excuse the performance in the financial year before that: losses of \$150 million in the 2018-19 year and over \$300 million in the 2019-20 financial year.

This raised significant questions about the management of the scheme: is the scheme viable? Its capital adequacy ratio has reduced from 112 per cent to 102 per cent. If that continues this financial year and falls below 100 per cent, what does that mean for employers? Will their ReturnToWork levies have to increase to subsidise the performance of this organisation? SafeWork are not quite so affected; indeed, they have been quite constrained in recent times, not being able to do some of their regular onsite inspections and so on, but the concern over the ReturnToWork scheme needs to be flagged and recognised by the house.

It was of interest, when we resumed the following week after the break that had been imposed on all of us by the snap lockdown—the interruption to those proceedings—to discuss some of the issues that have come out of some of the Treasury agencies that the Treasurer is responsible for: the South Australian Government Financing Authority and its insurance arm, the state fleet, Funds SA, Super SA and the CTP regulator.

The South Australian government's financing agency are responsible for managing loans and grants to businesses, not only making them and doing the paperwork but also making sure those businesses are meeting their obligations. They are also responsible for raising the large amounts of debt that will need to be placed into the market over the coming four years.

They are also responsible for managing the governance relationship with the Stadium Management Authority at Adelaide Oval. I have already spoken about the additional \$3 million of financial support they are receiving but, once again, it goes to show how tenuous this concept was from the Stadium Management Authority: to pursue a hotel and to choose to do it not using their own available private commercial bankers but trying to seek a concessional loan arrangement from the



government. At the first sign of trouble, here we are with the state government a further \$7 million in the hole following that \$42 million loan.

Perhaps we will get to it this week, but there are significant changes mooted by the government with regard to superannuation and funds management. Standing orders perhaps preclude me from talking about that discussion on choice of fund, although—

*The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** The Attorney says we may be getting to it at some point, but I was surprised to learn that in an environment where public servants may or may not have the choice to place their superannuation contributions elsewhere rather than in the state public sector scheme, Super SA will be recruiting an extra—

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Point of order: again, the member knows full well he cannot canvass the substance of the matter in a bill. This bill is the next matter before the parliament and he can, of course, address those issues during that debate. It is not relevant to this matter. Also, it is in the bill before the house, which I think he already knows.

**The SPEAKER:** I note the point of order. The member for Lee has the call.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I was not seeking to canvass the merits or otherwise of fund choice. What I was seeking to canvass was what came out during the estimates hearings, and that is that Super SA, despite pursuing that, is seeking to increase its staffing levels by 45 per cent. That is remarkable. If you are doing less, why would you recruit more staff?

Coincidentally, Funds SA are doing the same thing—not by 45 per cent though. They are seeking to increase their staffing levels by 60 per cent over the next four years. Together, that is an extra 100 FTEs proposed to be recruited between Super SA and Funds SA over the next four years. I thought that was astounding.

At the same time, Super SA has also announced, via its website, that fees will go up for existing members. That is remarkable. There is also, unfortunately for members of both Super SA and Funds SA, no identified increase in investment performance. There may be a change by insourcing some of the investment management facilities, which is what we are told Funds SA is pursuing. Rather than farming out more of the funds to external investment managers, they will seek to directly place investments with some of these additional staff. That is fine, but what is in it for the people who are having their funds managed? Are they to expect a more bespoke or tailored service?

The answer to that, we were told, is in some regard, but it is remarkable to learn that where there will be fewer funds under management in the future they are gearing up to recruit an extra 100 staff. One part of the South Australian Government Financing Authority's (SAFA) duties that I did not make reference to was that they also manage the state government's fleet. This is of interest in the context of the current budget because we are being told that at some point in the future there may be some legislation coming forward to introduce a new type of motor vehicle tax here in South Australia—an electric vehicle-specific tax.

We were told by the Minister for Energy that Fleet SA will be showing the way. They will be using their \$80 million of purchasing power to change the state fleet into the future. There are 6,742 fleet vehicles at the moment and 0.1 per cent of them are electric vehicles—six or maybe 6.7 or maybe it is 7; it would be somewhere between six and seven if it is 0.1 per cent. This is remarkable really. I am not quite sure what the estimate will be of that \$80 million and how is it going to revolutionise the composition of the state fleet, but suffice to say there were no estimates forthcoming in that regard from that discussion. I found that very strange.

When it comes to the employment of executives, you would think the Department of Treasury and Finance would be amongst the most prudent in government. It was a surprise to learn that not only is there a significant increase in the number of staff in those two areas—Super SA and Funds SA—but there is also a very significant increase to the remuneration of those staff. Last financial year, there was a 26 per cent increase in employee expenses, the total cost of employing people in Funds SA. Further, there was a 36 per cent increase in the number of executives employed at a cost of \$150,000 a year or more.

Before these additional staff are recruited to Funds SA, executives are being paid 55 per cent of the total remuneration costs of Funds SA—nice work if you can get it, no question about that. In Super SA, not only that but there has been a predilection in the last two financial years for spending on consultants. It has massively increased in the financial years from only three years ago. I think it was \$40,000 to over \$900,000 in the 2019-20 financial year, and that was just the expenditure to date as well—truly a remarkable performance.

When we turn to RevenueSA, we once again asked the question on behalf of those thousands of landowners who are being stung for the first time by the \$85 million increase in land tax by virtue of the aggregation arrangements—or perhaps not \$85 million, but perhaps more like \$70 million to \$75 million now. We will not actually ever know because the government refuses to tell us how many more people are impacted by the aggregation arrangements after the land tax census, which was undertaken by RevenueSA in order to finally try to get some accurate information about the impacts of the land tax aggregation bill.

The Treasurer maintains that there will be a little over 4,000 individuals, I think, who will pay more and a bit over 2,000 companies that will pay more, so 6,000 or 7,000 landowners who will be stung with higher land tax bills, paying in excess of \$70 million of higher land tax bills. That is a significant hit and, while there has been some relief in terms of being able to defer land tax bills or apply for an actual bill reduction if you are facing land tax aggregation for the first time, that relief is temporary.

There has been a very low take-up of the land tax relief that had been set aside for landlords, who presumably were to pass it on to their tenants. It just goes to show that, rather than the government advertising how good they think they are as a government, it would be helpful if they would advertise the availability of financial support to South Australians to help get them through this pandemic. Of course, there is very little—perhaps no—government advertising alerting landowners to the relief arrangements in this regard.

Finally, we looked at Renewal SA and HomeStart. We asked whether Renewal SA had any involvement representing any interests that the government might have in 88 O'Connell Street. We were told that the government retains no interest in that, that it was merely an initiative under the former Labor government to help the Adelaide City Council purchase that site. You can imagine the frustration of residents in North Adelaide. Here we are, three years on from that initiative, and we have seen a sign go up, we have seen some bollards go up and some temporary car parking arrangements and no activity on site.

We were told a year ago by the Adelaide City Council that they were in negotiations with one preferred proponent to develop that site, and here we are a year later with no progress on it. Imagine if we did know who the developer was, the developer was required to get on with the job and start building there and employing hundreds, if not thousands, of South Australians in building whatever development was agreed to by the council. Would it not be good for the state's economy? Would it not be good for O'Connell Street as a strip? Of course it would.

We saw that the government had little explanation as to why a former director of Renewal SA, Georgina Vasilevski, was, to use the words of the current Chief Executive of Renewal SA, 'terminated from her employment' while she was on leave, coincidentally the day before she had a court appearance for a matter referred to prosecutors after an ICAC investigation. There was no explanation about the timing of this, no explanation about why her role had been replaced with up to four different staff.

It makes the concept of a role being redundant in itself, does it not, if the role that you performed has to be performed by a number of other people. We were told that it was okay, that there was a whole bunch of people, that it was part of a bigger restructure that was made, but they were not coincidentally terminated the day before Ms Vasilevski's court appearance. I do not think anyone needs to think too hard to guess what is going on there. That is disappointing.

We also see that Renewal SA has now taken a particular role in the new properties that have been purchased both at the former Le Cornu site on Anzac Highway and down off Churchill Road, not too far from Regency Park at Prospect. We do not have any idea, though, what might happen on

that site, although we do know that that purchase was made with the current planning arrangements in mind that might see development of up to eight storeys on that site.

I will conclude my remarks there. Estimates tends to be a period of time when departments and their staff put an enormous amount of effort into preparing information and briefings for their particular minister so that that information can be made available to the community. One thing I will commend the Treasurer for is that this year was the first time he did not take a Dorothy Dixer during estimates.

I was told by a former treasurer that you can always tell a minister who believes they are across their brief and has some confidence in their management of their own portfolio when they eschew making an opening statement and taking a Dorothy Dixer. While I will not say that the Treasurer is managing his portfolio well, I will at least grant him some due respect for not wasting the time of Estimates Committee B by taking Dorothy Dixers. Although, of course, I understand in that regard he was virtually alone amongst his ministerial colleagues.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the member for Hurtle Vale, I refer to the point of order raised by the Deputy Premier earlier. I refer honourable members to standing order 184. I do not uphold the point of order and note there the reference to a motion and the prohibition against an attempt to anticipate debate has been interpreted to include debate generally, which might be regarded as a series of motions. As I say, I do not uphold the point of order.

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (12:00):** It is a good point to pick up on, following on from where the member for Lee was talking, with respect to the estimates process. It is my pleasure to make a contribution from Estimates Committee B, which I participated in last week, predominantly questioning the Minister for Human Services across five different parts of her portfolio, of which she has six, the sixth being under our spokesperson for women, the member for Reynell.

I agree completely with the member for Lee and his comments in regard to feeling that the minister is over their brief when they just allow the estimates process to flow and the questions to come from opposition members in relation to the portfolio. This is the third estimates process that I have been involved in as an opposition spokesperson, and I was also involved in three as a government backbencher. My recollection of participating as a backbencher was of asking very few government questions—or Dorothy Dixers, whichever you would like to refer to—and the committees I was in did not have lengthy introductory remarks either.

Sadly, Estimates Committee B for human services, as it is broken up into five different sections (and the one for the member for Reynell, for women, obviously) offered me the great pleasure of sitting and listening to five introductory statements, several of which took close to the maximum allowable time of 10 minutes. In a couple of these sections, there were then government questions asked, which had lengthy prepared and well-structured answers made up by the department advisers. They are the same as is offered up as government questions in question time.

An example of this was in housing, which all members will agree in our current climate is topical. One of the most important, fundamental human rights is having safe, secure, ongoing shelter. The sad thing about estimates for housing and the Housing Authority within human services is that it allowed only 45 minutes of questions. We had nearly 10 minutes of an introductory statement and then my recollection is that there were at least two government questions that had lengthy responses already manufactured and read off the page.

I am here to tell you no-one is watching. Nobody is sitting at home and tuning in from TV land saying, 'This is fascinating. Let's listen to the government questions and the pre-prepared speeches.' No-one is listening. The punters who are listening at home are probably working from home and are part of the department. They are either celebrating the speech they have written, or their friends or work colleagues have written, from the suburbs under the current work from home directives.

We had, from memory, nearly 25 minutes of housing estimates taken up by government statements and Dorothy Dixers that could be asked as part of question time. God forbid the Legislative Council sits beyond 5.30 or 5 o'clock and has a longer question time because more government statements or ministerial statements are made before question time commences. I am

sure we would encourage that if it meant we were then given extra time within our allotted 45 feeble minutes to ask questions on and inquire into the fundamental human right to housing.

Instead, we had 25 minutes, to be generous, to ask questions on what I would have thought would be a cornerstone of policy. Instead, it was a \$500 million pre-Christmas 'slip it out on a Sunday' announcement called a housing strategy, which contained some vision for providing building and investment opportunities for affordable housing. I think they are clearly missing the boat on this.

We have seen in the women's pilot program, for example, nine women's houses put up for sale. These were targeted affordable opportunities for women who have experienced terrible situations of domestic violence. These women have had interruptions of work life, so their superannuation is down and they are unable to accrue enough money to be able to purchase properties.

These nine properties were released on the market, and while there were around 50 inquiries in the past year about these affordable properties, which were preferably but not essentially targeting older women—it was preferable because it then just goes to market and anyone can buy them—we then saw 20 women qualify for them but we have only seen three of these houses go to the target market. If that is indicative of what is going to happen in their plan for 1,000 affordable homes, by ratio, we are going to be celebrating and popping the cork on around 30 or a couple of dozen people moving into houses.

I have no confidence at all that this affordable housing program is going to hit its mark. I am very grateful to the member for Enfield. We are working together and talking at length about opportunities to make policies like this work and to actually make products fit. I was given the opportunity to attend the Treasurer's estimates committee on HomeStart. I acknowledge the Treasurer did not have an introductory statement. The Treasurer was not asked a government question; we just got on with it.

As I said before, no-one is listening at home, so I am pretty much talking to myself, but in relation to HomeStart products for people on low incomes we specifically asked about the government's target and process to get people from public housing—social housing—into home ownership. When we asked how many people actually applied and were successful, I think the response was around 13 people in public housing, which is less than 1 per cent of HomeStart loans.

If the plan of this government is to move people through the continuum, we have a failure at the product end, we have a lack of conversion at the price point end and, in between that, today we have the confirmation that South Australia is the least affordable city to rent on this whole mainland of Australia.

Given that we are in the middle of an economic flux, so to speak, and the wise owls have decided that it is time to pull the cord on some of the products that are out there to support incomes like JobKeeper and such, I think this is alarming, because we have this failure at the product end, we have this failure at the price point end and we have this pile of people in the middle who are paying more than a quarter of their income every week on rent, so they do not have disposable income to spend on other things.

They certainly do not have the money to go safely into home ownership, even though there is the \$10,000 grant that we know. That is not a lot when you are looking at products on the affordable market being \$300,000 to \$400,000. This whole thing is a bit of a catastrophe. We did not have time to predicate these questions further in the housing estimates because there were very long government speeches and Dorothy Dix questions and no time.

Frankly, in the middle of it all as well, as soon as questions get a little bit tough—and this happens not just in estimates but in regular question time—it is, 'The opposition is just making it all up. The root of the questioning is all a fable.' Suddenly it is, 'Oh, the member has a vivid imagination.' Well, go and tell my teachers, because I am very structured. I follow the science. I do not have a very good imagination; I would be the world's worst author. I can barely follow a movie because I cannot anticipate what is going to happen next, so to be accused of making up some pretty wild accusations, I tell you: someone has done a brain transplant—because that is not me, that is not what I am there for.

I was there asking questions based on—and no exaggeration—the hundreds of reports we have had over the last couple of years from punters in the community who have been aggrieved, people's family members who have felt aggrieved, people who have worked in the departments who are aggrieved, people who might still work in the departments who are currently aggrieved and have brought very legitimate concerns to us. Guess what? Estimates Committee B is where it could happen, where you could open up and ask those questions, but either we did not have time or we had time taken up with government introductions and we had government questions.

I will give the Minister for Human Services her due. She was not as bad as the committee I sat in later in the day, and that involved the Minister for Child Protection, who, I am sorry, I think barely answered one question by herself. It was over to the CEO or over to the deputy CEO for every question. The poor people at home who are struggling to pay their rent on an average household income in Adelaide of about \$60,000-odd—if there were actually real people at home tuned into Facebook land watching estimates—would say, 'My goodness, that person earns over \$350,000 a year and they can't answer a question.' I think they would be horrified.

I will give the Minister for Human Services her due: she answered a couple of questions off her own back; it was much better than the effort later in the day. Mind you, by that time of night I had completely lost the will to live and was ready to call it a day. It is a very long day in estimates. My main issue with the process is sucking up the time and accusing people of making stuff up. It does not happen. People come to you. You do a lot of work to validate the origin of such allegations, otherwise you would not actually raise them, because that would just be stupid.

In terms of the full picture, we got some information. We managed to ask some questions about important portfolios that represent people with vulnerability, young people and people who volunteer, who often have vulnerabilities themselves. Volunteering is a great way to be able to connect them to supports, communities and employment opportunities. We managed to get some clarification around some of that.

We also got some information about youth justice, which has been an excellent journey over decades now to change the way we as a community advocate for support for and education of young people who have found themselves on the wrong end of the rules. Of course, the member for Ramsay, who is in the chamber with us now, was responsible for the portfolio of youth justice under the Labor government and made some fantastic reforms. We continue to speak now about how we can continue to move forward but, again, credit where it is due, the reforms that were already happening have continued with their momentum.

We see an inordinate reduction now in the number of young people who are part of the Adelaide Youth Training Centre system. I did congratulate the team who were behind that. I was grateful to have that opportunity; you do not get that opportunity to talk to people who are heading up teams. In fact, that gives me the chance to raise another point. I have asked to have a briefing from the chair of the Housing Authority board in relation to governance, processes and policy. I know he is quite happy to do so, but that has been refused. Another reason we go into estimates is that people have to front up and answer questions.

While it was disappointing in some ways that we did not get enough time to ask questions, do not worry: you will be getting them all on notice. Of course, in this house it will be the Attorney-General who will receive those on behalf of the minister in the other chamber. I am sure she will take that big thwack of paper with absolute joy, pleasure and glee and have a look at it and see all the questions that could not be answered but will now be answered through the notice stage.

There were more questions than answers in some of the responses. Of course, the parliamentary process, while it can be stymied to some degree, will give us the opportunity to ask many more questions as we move on, particularly, as I have said, in relation to housing. Housing is a human right that I will continue to ask questions about, hold the government to account for and actually in some areas shame the government on in terms of their lack of investment in public and social housing.

They are on a unity ticket with the federal Liberal government and should be embarrassed at the numbers coming out of states such as Queensland, New South Wales and Tasmania. A state like Tasmania has announced a \$3.1 billion public housing package—\$3.1 billion. I am not sure what

their state annual budget is. I would have guessed it was somewhere around \$10 billion, thinking about the size of the state, but that is an enormous commitment over the next few years.

Then we go to Victoria. Victoria have done it tough. They have acknowledged and recognised there is an issue with how some of their public housing tenancies are structured and they have announced a \$5 billion package; I think it is \$5.3 billion, if my memory serves correctly. That is an enormous commitment. It shows that they acknowledge that there is an issue, that it needs addressing and that it needs real investment. We have the federal Liberal government asleep at the wheel when it comes to public housing.

We have seen in answers to questions we have been provided from the Budget and Finance Committee and other committees that, in spite of all the huff and puff by this state Liberal government about public housing, and the 'you were terrible' and 'we are amazing', I am sorry, you say that you are going to stop the reduction but you are not. The answer provided in the Budget and Finance Committee by the South Australian Housing Authority was clear: over the next three or four years social housing will go down by 600 properties. Given that we have seen release after release and lines in the media to the contrary, that is pretty embarrassing.

We will continue to ask questions. I know the current Treasurer is proud of the ice in his veins. He wants to spend like Paris Hilton, but I do not think he wants to spend money on public housing. I do not believe that will happen. I urge the government to do something about it as soon as Rob gets on with his holiday plans, retires and goes off into the sunset with our best wishes, because I do not believe that it is going to happen under the current Treasurer. I look forward to another estimates session next year and questions in the meantime. Thank you for the opportunity to contribute.

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (12:21):** I rise today to talk both about Estimates Committee A and Estimates Committee B. First, I would like to acknowledge that, unfortunately, I was unable to participate in person due to my quarantine. I had the absolute pleasure to attend Thomas More College on 12 November, but subsequently I got caught up in the Parafield cluster. It was a wonderful bonding family experience, but we are also happy to be free and active now. Can I just acknowledge both the leader and the deputy leader, who stepped in for me for these estimates sessions. Obviously, a lot of work is done in preparation, and I would like to thank them for their ability to step in on my behalf.

I would like to talk about Estimates Committee A first, in which the Premier talked about tourism. We know that this has been an incredibly challenging year for people involved in tourism. We know that there are more than 4,500 South Australians who are employed in this industry. It is very diverse, and it is driven by many different businesses, many of them micro and small and family, but we also have large providers as well.

When we are talking about tourism, we are talking about people like travel agents, who make bookings, tourist coach operators, business and leisure events, accommodation providers, festivals and events staff and outdoor tourism. Of course, the list goes on, and there are lots of different occupations—hotel managers, CEOs, cooks, cleaners, travel agents, as I have said—so the impact has been quite significant.

There has been a lot for us to ask the Premier in estimates, but the key topic we wanted to talk a bit more about was the shock decision to cancel the Adelaide 500. This event brought enormous economic benefit to the state. We know that 15,000 people came from interstate to stay in our CBD to see this event. For many years—I think it is more than 20—it had bipartisan support. Our questions to the Premier were: how was this decision made? When was this decision made? How much is it going to cost us now that you have made this decision? I have to say that his answers provided no clarity around that.

While I now know the decision went to cabinet and the decision was made on a recommendation of the SATC, it was the Premier who made this decision. He made the decision to cut this event. Not only was it a shock that he cut the event but it was a shock that he did not know how much that decision would cost. How much is Supercars going to ask us for because we ripped up a contract? Who makes a decision before knowing how much it is going to cost?

This is a seven-year agreement. We were at the last of our years in 2021, but we should ask these questions about how much it would be. There was an understanding that more than \$2½ million had been in previous motorsports contracts, but the Premier would not confirm that that is the cost, nor would he confirm how much it costs to hold the Adelaide 500 as a managed event. I find it quite curious that he said that. He came out at one point and said it was north of \$10 million but would not say in this house how much it would cost because it is commercial-in-confidence.

At the same time, the Premier has made the decision that he is going to ring-fence the money saved from running the Adelaide 500 to put into leisure events. If you are going to ring-fence a certain amount of money, obviously South Australian taxpayers deserve to know how much that is. The questions that have come after this shock decision remain unanswered. It is unbelievable that South Australian taxpayers cannot be told and do not know how much it is going to cost us to cancel this event and how much we are going to take from this event to put into other events.

We asked the Premier about the events advisory committee. I have spoken before about my concerns that this shock decision was made with absolutely no plan whatsoever regarding the events that are going to replace that event. In 2019, \$45 million came in for that event. That is a lot of money. And we now know that the Tour Down Under is not going to be in the same form it was. So we are talking about almost \$100 million not coming into our economy over the summer this year.

The plan is to have the events advisory committee, and there has been some commentary about who is actually on it and the process to appoint people to it, but it is after the horse has bolted. The decision has been made, and now this committee is coming together to come up with innovative ideas to fill the calendar throughout the year. I believe that the people on this committee will have the best intentions—I am sure they will come up with ideas—but it takes time for an event to be successful. It takes time to build the audience and the loyalty to an event.

I am very concerned that this rash decision, this shock decision, leaves us with a very empty calendar going forward—and what will be the outcome? Jobs. We know that in 2019, 400 FTEs were employed for the Adelaide 500 and when we asked questions in Estimates Committee A about how those jobs are going to be replaced there was no response, because there is no plan.

We also asked the Premier about the travel vouchers—the idea that we had back in July. We have heard today that there is going to be a second round of travel vouchers. I am really pleased to hear that some of our constructive thoughts about the travel vouchers have been taken on board. The travel vouchers that were put out initially were only for accommodation providers who had 10 or more rooms, and I was very concerned about that limitation.

In fact, for the \$4 million in travel vouchers, only 3 per cent of the sector registered on southaustralia.com were even eligible. It is the narrowest travel voucher scheme that we have seen anyone provide—incredibly different from that in the NT and Tasmania. We also know that only 20,000 of the 50,000 were actually used. Now we have round 2. In this round 2 are accommodation providers with five or more rooms, and I welcome that. I welcome the fact that the Premier, when we are being constructive, occasionally listens.

One of the other key issues very concerning to me about tourism is that departmental efficiencies are still there for tourism. They were absolutely gutted this year by bushfires, COVID, border closures and no international tourists: 'But, by the way, do you think you can find \$2.5 million each year for the next four years?' I say to the Premier: waive these efficiencies; tourism has had enough to deal with. In fact, you have just told them that they have to come up with a whole calendar of events and start them new while cutting out \$10 million over the next four years. Give them a break.

Our borders shut and, for anyone involved in international tourism, overnight no-one came by—all the blood, sweat and tears to build up your business and your reputation, and it ended. I welcome the fact that the Victorian border is down today, as that is our main source of domestic tourism, and this is good news, and we have also seen South Australians go back to the regions, and this is good news. But nothing can replace the fact that we have been fundamentally impacted. Before, we saw \$8.1 billion and it is already down to \$6.5 billion. We know that they have been impacted, so why on earth do you persist with these departmental efficiencies?

I would like to turn now to Estimates Committee B, trade and investment. This is the first time the Minister for Trade and Investment, a new minister, has participated in estimates. I once was a new minister, so I know the preparation that goes in so that you are ready to go. But I have to say, given that our state faces one of the biggest trade shocks in recent history, I was incredibly disappointed by the response from the minister. By all accounts, he is a lovely person and he is a dedicated person. What I did not see was urgency, what I did not see was attention and I did not see a minister who sees that we have a trade sanction before us and that we need to respond. It just was not there.

I am very concerned about that because, when I said to him, 'How many jobs are supported by exports in South Australia?' he did not know. I said, 'How many direct clients does this department support?' and he did not know. What is our plan to deal with this pending crisis? We do not have one. We heard over the weekend that things got far worse than we ever imagined for our wine sector because of an up to 212 per cent tariff. Our premium wines that we export from South Australia and that are much loved in China have been punished. My concern about this is that we had already seen activity against beef, barley, timber and lobster. We knew that this was pending when they were looking at the fact that China believed we were dumping. This was pending, but there is no action and no activity.

When this news came out on Friday, the Labor leader and I called for an urgent task force for those people in wine exports, but we have seen no announcement here. I am really not surprised, given the types of answers and commentary we heard during estimates. Two former ministers were sitting in that estimates committee: the member for Chaffey and the member for Schubert. Frankly, I think they were surprised. While there was information about programs and things they had done, there was no detail about the brief and the pending issues that face us in trade. I think they were surprised at the lack of detail.

The minister said he has had some conversations with the consul and he has written a letter. What we need is urgency, being proactive. What is it that our wine exporters need from us? Do we need to make sure that every South Australian family has a bottle of South Australian wine on the table at Christmas? Do we need to make sure that the storage challenges for these exporters are supported? Do you even know what their needs are right now? I got none of that clarity, none of that information, from estimates.

We talked about the International Freight Assistance Mechanism. We did some good work here—it was started when our rock lobster industry was impacted back in January—and we welcome that assistance to get the airfreight moving, but we have questions. Will this continue? Has the federal government committed to continuing that mechanism or are they going to ask us, as a state, to step up and contribute?

The other area I asked questions about was trade offices. This was a very fundamental, core policy of the Marshall Liberal government when they came to government in 2018. These trade offices, a little smaller than intended, have rolled out: we have five more this year. However, what is the point of a trade office if we do not actually have a plan, a strategy, for engagement in that country? The minister was asked, in estimates, what trade strategy documents we had.

Previously we had a very, very thorough China strategy and an India strategy, to name just two. They were formed with the involvement of many people in South Australia who were interested in these areas. I would almost go as far as to say they were bipartisan documents, those trade strategies; however, because of the vendetta they were ripped up. Now it seems that our only trade strategy is the opening of a trade office. I say to members that the opening of a trade office is not a strategy: it is an office, mostly with Austrade. More work needs to be done to make sure we are truly engaging in those regions.

This was the first time the minister was here. I have to say, I somewhat missed the former minister from the other place, the Hon. Mr Ridgway, because if there is one thing I know about him it is that he is a straight shooter. It was actually his data earlier this year in July that told us that 79,000 South Australians were employed in export. That is about 11 per cent of the state's workforce, which means that 11 per cent of the state's workforce is at risk because we do not have a plan about how we are going to deal with these trade sanctions going forward.



It is a huge part of our economy. Just the other week the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership was signed. This is a fundamental time in Australia's history, to sign this agreement with 15 different nations. We signed this agreement, yet here in South Australia we do not have a plan to deal with that new economic partnership. You have to do the work, and you have to be clear about how we are going to benefit from that new opportunity.

What I took from both Estimates Committee A with the Premier, focusing on tourism, and Estimates Committee B with the Minister for Trade and Investment, is that it seems this government, the Marshall Liberal government, has run out of steam. I know it is a tough time and there is a global pandemic, but there is a lack of urgency and a lack of attention and decisions are being made without a plan. It is simply not good enough. Let's remind ourselves that the tourism industry employs more than 40,000 South Australians and that the trade industry employs more than 79,000 South Australians. We need urgent action to make sure we save these jobs.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (12:40):** I thank all members, small numbers as they are, who have made a contribution to this debate. I thank the parliament, particularly those who chaired the estimates committees, and the support staff for providing the opportunity for members to scrutinise the budget initiatives and all budget matters that have been published.

I would also like to thank each of the members of the departments who prepared material for the ministers and also a number of staff who attended here. Even with COVID restrictions, they were able to sit a metre and a half or two metres apart and provide the information to the parliament, which we greatly appreciate. Having been one of those ministers at estimates, it was doubly valuable to be able to have that. With that, I commend the bill to the house.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I move:

That the remainder of the bill be agreed to.

Motion carried.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (12:42):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**SPENT CONVICTIONS (DECRIMINALISED OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 November 2020.)

**Ms MICHAELS:** Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (12:46):** It is a bit of a surprise that this bill has been called on, but I am very happy to discuss this important issue of spent convictions. Those of us who have been following the workings of this parliament for some time would know that this an issue that has been raised repeatedly.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Kaurna might indicate—

**Mr PICTON:** I am the lead speaker for the opposition. This has been raised repeatedly by particularly the former member for Fisher, the Hon. Bob Such, who brought this issue to the parliament a number of times. In fact, he brought legislation to this place and introduced bills for spent convictions many times: in 2004, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009. It is clearly part of the very proud legacy of the late Hon. Bob Such that the Spent Convictions Act was passed in 2009 under the

previous former Labor government, and no doubt because of the hard work and perseverance of Dr Such it was successful and our first system of spent convictions was established.

Under this system, minor offences were automatically spent after 10 years for adults and five years for juveniles. The benefit of the spent convictions system was subject to a person not being found guilty of other offending during the five or 10-year period. If they did not reoffend during the period, the clock was reset. The benefits of a conviction being spent are many: it is not taken into account for a person's criminal history, the person is not required to disclose the offence to any other person, the conviction is not taken to affect a person's character or fitness, and the conviction can no longer be grounds to dismiss a person from a role or revoke any appointment status or privilege.

The opposition's view is that these provisions were both reasonable and necessary. Prior to the legislation coming into effect, some people would not apply for employment or volunteering because they were embarrassed about a single day in their distant past being shared with many other people. Some of the examples of offences in particular that were offences at the time and clearly against the standards of the day were shocking.

There were issues such as constituents raising with their MPs about being fined a few pounds for playing a game of poker in the 1960s. I am sure a number of members of parliament would have to admit to playing a game of poker now, but that was on people's criminal history list. Offences such as this were brought up decades later when they volunteered to help in a nursing home where their friends lived, or volunteer in a community service.

The previous system also created perverse incentives for employers and volunteer organisations. If information was disclosed to them on a police check, there was no clear guidance about what they should consider or how they should consider it. In some cases, out of an abundance of caution, anybody with anything on their criminal history was rejected from working or volunteering. Many smaller organisations did not have the legal or historic knowledge to understand whether an historic charge, even with decades of no further offending, was serious or not.

The first Spent Convictions Act assisted with these situations while also establishing a number of sensible exclusions. A spent conviction does not mean that all records are destroyed or that they can never be accessed. If a person was being considered for work in security agencies, the police, corrections or the judiciary, then a full record of offending could be disclosed, regardless of how old or how minor the offence was.

Under the former Labor government, amendments were then passed in 2012 and 2013, including the capacity for certain other offences to be spent. These changes allowed people to apply to a magistrate for other offences to be spent if they met specific eligibility conditions in addition to a period of no offending. The new bill seeks to expand on the work that was undertaken in 2012 and 2013 and focuses specifically on historic sex offences.

The government's proposed additions to the Spent Convictions Act focus on actions that are no longer considered crimes, and rightfully so. These include certain provisions and offences that existed under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 and prior to 1972 and between 1972 and 1975. This was the period prior to the partial and then complete decriminalisation of homosexuality in South Australia. The bill also deals specifically with acts of public indecency. The bill adds a new definition of 'prescribed public decency offence', being an offence against public decency or morality by which homosexual behaviour could be punished.

The public decency elements are intended to capture low-level public decency offences, such as public displays of affection, but not overtly sexual activity, between men. In addition to the new offences, the bill also expands the list of parties that may apply to the court for a conviction to be spent and also allows for applications on behalf of deceased persons. This is an important provision, noting that many people who were affected by the laws 50, 60 or 70 years ago are now elderly or have passed away. The bill allows people, such as a partner, child or any person approved by a magistrate, to make an application on behalf of their loved one.

Finally, the bill amends existing section 8A regarding spent conviction for an eligible sex offence. This change means that a judge must, rather than may, make an order for a spent conviction if an application meets the relevant criteria. The opposition clearly supports these provisions in terms

of updating the Spent Convictions Act. These offences were previously offences in our state. They were previously offences that our forebears, members of parliament in this house, believed were offences that so gravely offended the state and offended decency that they should be treated as criminal matters. They were wrong. They were wrong.

We need to make sure that our law, as has obviously happened over the past 50 years, removes those offences from the statute book, making our society fairer and removing this clear discrimination that existed, and that, for those people who were caught up in them, these offences do not last a single day longer on their public record, on their criminal record, as should be the case.

As was said, these are largely historical offences and it would be well over 50 years since many of them were put in place. However, they do mean a lot to those people to make sure that these records are wiped clean, to make sure that these so-called offences at the time, which upset none of our modern standards of behaviour, should not be there for one minute longer.

We wholeheartedly support this legislation to amend the Spent Convictions Act. It builds on the work Bob Such brought to this parliament. We thank him for his perseverance in terms of pushing this matter and pushing the previous government to introduce the act, and later amend the act, and now the current government to push it even further as well. This has the support of the opposition.

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (12:54):** I just have a brief addition to that and commend the government for bringing this matter before the parliament. I have supported legal and social equality for LGBTIQ South Australians over the course of my parliamentary career and it is fair to say we have come a very long way since I first introduced a modest private member's bill to grant same-sex couples equal access to their superannuation nearly two decades ago.

In this bill, I see another important contribution to the continuing evolution of the law to make equality for LGBTIQ South Australians a practical everyday reality. I have also had a longstanding interest in spent convictions policy and legislation, and I pay tribute to the former Independent member for Fisher, Bob Such—as the member for Kurna just said—who championed these issues. Indeed, the 2009 act, which this bill amends, was a direct result and is directly modelled upon the bill Bob pursued for so many years.

While this bill before us is particularly focused on offences relating to male homosexuality, which were decriminalised in an Australian first by the Dunstan government nearly half a century ago, the importance of spent convictions legislation is wider than these offences alone. I have been made aware by my constituents of a number of cases where a criminal record for a minor offence, perhaps in adolescence or at a time of vulnerability in a person's life, has pursued a person across the course of their lifetime.

With the increasing rise of criminal record screening for a wide variety of jobs, this has come to adversely affect more and more people. Even after the Spent Convictions Act became law, there was a range of continuing problems with police clearances, including publication of cases where no conviction was recorded, seemingly in breach of the spirit of the law. This was among a number of matters I raised with the then Attorney-General upon review of the act in 2012. Surprisingly, not all my suggestions were taken up, and they remain unaddressed to this day.

Suggestions I made which have not been taken up included allowing the most minor offences to be spent over five years rather than 10 and introducing anti-discrimination protections into the Equal Opportunity Act to make discrimination on the ground of an irrelevant criminal record unlawful. I mention these in passing because I hope they will be matters the current Attorney-General might turn her mind to at a later stage.

Turning to the legislation before us, I am pleased this government is acting upon my suggestion the spent convictions scheme ought to be expanded to cover public indecency and like offences which were often used to police homosexual men in past times. A former constituent of mine, sadly now deceased, found himself pursued for a lifetime for a conviction without penalty for indecent behaviour as a result of skinny-dipping when he was 15. The practical effect of this conviction, which stayed on his record in perpetuity, was to prevent him from becoming a volunteer in his son's scout group.

The scheme in this act will be no comfort to him, but I acknowledge it will help address other unjust convictions of a similar nature, and I commend the government for this initiative. I note the government has included a power in this bill for a next of kin to apply to spend a conviction on behalf of a deceased or incapacitated relative. Given the length of time since homosexuality was decriminalised in this state, this is a good initiative and an improvement to the spent convictions regime under the act.

While I am proud South Australia was the first to decriminalise homosexuality and the first to allow for expungement of historical convictions for homosexuality, this bill is a salutary reminder that practical equality in the law, as well as in society, must be an everyday concern for us as parliamentarians and community leaders. We must never tire in continuing to take steps every day to ensure that the promise of equality is a lived reality for all our citizens. I commend the bill to the house.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (12:58):** I thank the member for Kaurna for the indication that the opposition support the bill, and also the member for Florey, who has been an advocate for many years in relation to equality. I note the two matters she raised which she seeks to have included. Firstly, this bill actually abolishes the 10-year rule. The second issue in relation to anti-discrimination law I will have a look at. I suspect that with the abolition that is proposed in this bill it will not be necessary, but I will certainly follow that up to see whether that needs to be considered.

These matters were raised by the Minister for Human Services in her round table with the LGBTQT community. They had identified some of the shortcomings of the previous legislation, important as it was, to try to set the agenda. This identified some areas that needed to be dealt with, including the removal of the 10-year crime-free qualification period. I just make that comment in relation to this for the benefit of the member for Florey.

I also confirm that in relation to the additional offences brought within the designated sex-related offences, as proposed in the bill, these cover homosexual offences that existed in the CLCA before the partial decriminalisation in 1972, which were buggery and attempt to commit buggery; committing or being party to the commission of, procuring or attempting to procure the commission of any act of gross indecency by a male person to another male person; and also (c)(ii) to cover the equivalent offences that existed between 1972 and 1975 when homosexuality was completely decriminalised.

These are buggery and attempt to commit buggery, male person committing an act of gross indecency with another male person, procuring or attempting to procure an act of buggery or gross indecency between two other persons, and soliciting with a view to inducing a person to commit an act of buggery or gross indecency in doing so.

Bill read a second time.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (13:00):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

*Sitting suspended from 13:01 to 14:00.*

**HEALTH CARE (SAFE ACCESS) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**TRAINING AND SKILLS DEVELOPMENT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**DEFAMATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL***Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Petitions***CHILD PROTECTION**

**Ms LUETHEN (King):** Presented a petition signed by one resident of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the government to urgently evaluate the Department for Education's 'Keeping Safe: Child Protection Curriculum', and how it is being delivered within South Australian schools due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

*Parliamentary Procedure***ANSWERS TABLED**

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

**PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Local Government Annual Report—

Franklin Harbour, District Council of Annual Report 2019-20

Kimba, District Council of Annual Report 2019-20

Kingston District Council Annual Report 2019-20

Onkaparinga, City of Annual Report 2019-20

Port Lincoln, City of Annual Report 2019-20

Tatiara District Council Annual Report 2019-20

Tea Tree Gully, City of Annual Report 2019-20

Tumby Bay, District Council of Annual Report 2019-20

Ombudsman SA—Annual Report 2019-20

By the Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Metropolitan Fire Service Superannuation Scheme, SA—Annual Report 2019-20

SafeWork SA—Annual Report 2019-20

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Work Health and Safety—Mine Manager

By the Attorney-General (Hon. V.A. Chapman)—

Coroners Court—Annual Report 2019-20

Courts Administration Authority—Annual Report 2019-20

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Gaming Machines—Fee Notice

Summary Offences—Liquor Offences

Victims of Crime—Fund and Levy

Rules made under the following Acts—

Magistrates Court—Amendment No. 86

By the Minister for Planning and Local Government (Hon. V.A. Chapman)—

Adelaide Cemeteries Authority—Annual Report 2019-20

By the Minister for Energy and Mining (Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Electricity—General—Retailer Energy Productivity Scheme  
Gas—Retailer Energy Productivity Scheme  
Mines and Works Inspection—Mine Manager  
Mining—General  
Opal Mining—Mineral Resources

By the Minister for Education (Hon. J.A.W. Gardner)—

Abortion Reporting Committee, South Australian—Annual Report 2018  
Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee—Annual Report 2019-20  
Child Development Council—Annual Report 2019-20  
Children's Education and Care Quality Authority, Australian—Annual Report 2019-20  
Health Advisory Council—  
Balaklava Riverton Annual Report 2019-20  
Barossa and Districts Annual Report 2019-20  
Berri Barmera Annual Report 2019-20  
Bordertown and District Annual Report 2019-20  
Ceduna District Health Services Annual Report 2019-20  
Coorong Health Service Annual Report 2019-20  
Eastern Eyre Annual Report 2019-20  
Eudunda Kapunda Annual Report 2019-20  
Far North Annual Report 2019-20  
Gawler and District Annual Report 2019-20  
Hawker District Memorial Annual Report 2019-20  
Hills Area Annual Report 2019-20  
Kangaroo Island Annual Report 2019-20  
Kingston Robe Annual Report 2019-20  
Leigh Creek Health Services Annual Report 2019-20  
Lower Eyre Annual Report 2019-20  
Lower North Annual Report 2019-20  
Loxton and Districts Annual Report 2019-20  
Mallee Health Service Annual Report 2019-20  
Mannum District Hospital Annual Report 2019-20  
Mid North Annual Report 2019-20  
Mid West Annual Report 2019-20  
Millicent and Districts Annual Report 2019-20  
Mount Gambier and Districts Annual Report 2019-20  
Murray Bridge Soldiers' Memorial Annual Report 2019-20

By the Minister for Child Protection (Hon. R. Sanderson)—

Guardian for Children and Young People—Annual Report 2019-20  
Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Children and Young People (Safety)—Safety—COVID-19 Exemption

By the Minister for Environment and Water (Hon. D.J. Speirs)—

Coast Protection Board—Annual Report 2019-20  
Government Response to Standing Committees—Inquiry into the Recycling Industry 2020  
Native Vegetation Council—Annual Report 2019-20  
Premier's Climate Change Council—Annual Report 2019-20  
Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Landscape South Australia—Water Register

By the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development (Hon. D.K. Basham)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Fisheries Management—

Demerit Points—Expiated Offences  
General—Expiation Fees

By the Minister for Trade and Investment (Hon. S.J. Patterson)—

Study Adelaide—Annual Report 2019-20  
Trade and Investment, Department for—Annual Report 2019-20

*Parliamentary Committees*

**CRIME AND PUBLIC INTEGRITY POLICY COMMITTEE**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (15:30):** I bring up the fifth report of the committee, entitled Inquiry into Matters of Public Integrity in South Australia.

Report received.

**LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:30):** I bring up the 17<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

**Mr ELLIS:** I bring up the 18<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received and read.

*Question Time*

**ADELAIDE REMAND CENTRE**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:33):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier explain why it has taken 15 months for a dangerous inmate to escape from the Adelaide Remand Centre, since he privatised it, when it appears there has been no other escape from this facility for the rest of this century?

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (15:33):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. I am happy to take this question. I would respectfully say that it's certainly not a time for politics on this subject because—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister has the call. The minister will be heard in silence.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I call the member for West Torrens to order. The Minister for Correctional Services has the call.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** I do think that it's not really a time to play politics on this issue. I can advise the house that shortly after 10.30 this morning my office was advised by the Department for Correctional Services that at approximately 9.55am a prisoner escaped from the Adelaide Remand Centre and fled the area on foot. I can confirm that a male remand prisoner breached the external wall of the Adelaide Remand Centre. SAPOL has been alerted and is on site, and SAPOL has established a forward command at the prison. DCS is also assisting SAPOL with operations. The prison is secure and all prisoners are accounted for. The crime scene has been secured—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** —it's a very serious matter, sir—and a DCS investigator is also on site to coordinate assistance with SAPOL as the lead agency.

The escapee is Jason Burdon, date of birth 16 July 1987. I am informed that he was on remand for breach of bail and also firearm offences. At this time, the priority—and I think that you

would agree, sir—is for SAPOL to apprehend this offender and place him back into custody. That is what the priority is, not playing petty political games. The priority has to be locating—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister for Correctional Services has the call.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** Any escape from a secure facility is certainly a concern; it goes without saying. There is no question that the incident will certainly be subject to a comprehensive investigation, and I certainly await that report. However, what I will say is that anyone who has any information on Jason Burdon's whereabouts or possible sightings is advised not to approach him but to contact the police assistance line on 131 444, or in an emergency 000. As this is an operational police matter, I have to be cautious about any other comment I make on this matter.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the leader, I call to order the leader and I warn the member for West Torrens.

#### **ADELAIDE REMAND CENTRE**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:36):** My question is to the Premier. Given that this is the first escape from the Remand Centre in decades, does the Premier still believe that the privatisation of a maximum security prison is a good idea?

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (15:36):** I thank the honourable member for the question. I would repeat what I said earlier: I think that at the moment this is certainly not the time to be playing petty political games. I want to remind the Leader of the Opposition of what he did in 2017, when he was the Minister for Correctional Services, in regard to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister for Correctional Services has the call.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** Sir, as I did point out, there will be a comprehensive investigation into what has happened, I promise you that. As I pointed out, any escape from any secure facility is certainly a concern, and the priority at the moment is to make sure that we can apprehend this individual and bring him back into custody. That's our priority at the moment. Our priority is not about playing petty politics with this issue at the moment.

#### **ADELAIDE REMAND CENTRE**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:37):** My question is to the Premier. Why did the Premier break his no-privatisation agenda promise prior to the last state election and privatise a maximum security prison?

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (15:37):** Despite the fact that the question did contain an array of argument, I would respectfully refer back to my extensive initial statement on this matter. As I said, I really don't think that now is the time to play politics on this issue. There is a comprehensive investigation—

**Mr Malinauskas:** Now is the time to face up to questions about your own policy.

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the leader!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left! The Minister for Correctional Services has the call. He will be heard in silence.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** I refer to my earlier statement.



**ADELAIDE REMAND CENTRE**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:38):** My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. What were the charges the inmate who escaped from your privatised maximum security facility was being held on and what is his prior offending history?

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (15:38):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. I did mention in my first statement to the house who the escapee is, his date of birth, and I did point out what he was on remand for as well. I did say that. I refer to my earlier statement.

**ADELAIDE REMAND CENTRE**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:38):** My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Is the minister aware of the assailant's previous offending history?

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (15:39):** I thank the honourable member for the question, and I refer the member back to the statement I made earlier in the house.

**Mr Malinauskas:** That doesn't answer the question.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The interjections will cease. Has the minister concluded his answer?

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** Yes.

**ROAD UPGRADES**

**Mrs POWER (Elder) (15:39):** My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government, through the Department for Infrastructure and Transport, is stimulating the economy and helping to build what matters in South Australia?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:39):** I thank the member for her very important question and note that it is 1 December today. Christmas might be just around the corner, and we are dashing all the way when it comes to creating more jobs for South Australians, getting infrastructure projects off the ground and building what matters. There's no 'sleighting' down when it comes to getting contracts out the door and more jobs for South Australians.

In the next two months alone, in November and December, there is almost three-quarters of a billion dollars of tenders that will be released; in fact, the figure is \$680 million, to be precise. This is the Marshall government stimulating our economy and getting on with the job. These projects will create 1,500 jobs during the year during construction. That means we have had more than \$1.35 billion in tenders for construction projects released this year, and I think that is absolutely outstanding.

Compare that with around \$200 million of construction from the Labor government in 2016. Right now, it is like Santa has come early. This is around seven times the investment of what Labor did in 2016, and that is quite a phenomenal figure. I know they don't like it on the other side. They are sitting over there with their resting grinch faces. They don't like Christmas and they don't like that figure. They hate it when we get on with the job. Mr Speaker, with all that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —I am about to tell you that you will have to hold onto your 'reins, dear', because there is a lot more coming down the pipeline. There are around \$16.7 billion of works, and we are building what matters for South Australians: schools, roads, hospitals and sporting infrastructure, and there is a whole lot more to come.

If I could take this opportunity to list a few of the projects for which tenders have been released in November or will be released in December, some of these key projects include the Stuart Highway, where there is over 30 kilometres of work. I know the member for Giles will be very happy

with that. On the Sturt Highway, there is about 25 kilometres of rehabilitation works. Again, there are jobs out in the regions. On the Horrocks Highway, there is pavement rehab between Brinkworth and Gawler, another important project. Also on the Horrocks Highway is about 25 kilometres of sealing and pavement rehabilitation from Wilmington to south Melrose.

In the member for Flinders' electorate—and what a fine member he is; he has done an incredible job over the journey, working for his electorate—on the Eyre Highway between Ceduna and Penong, we are fixing around 65 kilometres near Nundroo and there is about 27 kilometres of shoulder sealing and widening. That is another great job for his community. On the Barrier Highway around Burra, there is more work happening, with road widening, shoulder sealing and pavement rehabilitation. For the Main South Road and Victor Harbor Road duplication, tenders are going out.

There is pavement rehabilitation on the Oodnadatta Track. On the Riddoch Highway, again there is more pavement rehab. On the Strzelecki Track, there is stage 1—the early works—stage 2, a vital project for South Australia. On the Copper Coast Highway, there are two locations in the vicinity of Paskeville and Kulpara. On Maitland Road, there are two locations between Maitland and Ardrossan. On Minlaton Road, it is between Minlaton and Stansbury—the member for Narungga is on fire.

In metropolitan Adelaide, there is Gorge Road and Silkes Road; the intersection of Portrush Road and Magill Road; Cross Road and Fullarton Road, that intersection too; Glen Osmond Road and Fullarton Road, another intersection being upgraded; Grand Junction Road, Wingfield, much to the delight, I am sure, of the members for Enfield, Port Adelaide and Croydon, impacting their community; and I know the member for Lee will be excited about works on the Coast Park, Grange to Semaphore, stage 1, that are happening on the linear trail there.

We are a government that builds what matters to South Australians, and roads are right up there. We are going to be making our roads safer and more productive, and the flow-on effects for commuters and the economy are going to be massive. I am looking forward to next year as more jobs roll out, as more boots hit the ground and as more workers get to work and earn an income to feed their families. With that, merry Christmas to all and enjoy what the Marshall government is doing, which is building what matters.

#### **ADELAIDE REMAND CENTRE**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:43):** My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. What is the financial penalty in the contract with Serco for an escape, and will the minister guarantee that that penalty will cover the full cost to the taxpayers of the ensuing manhunt?

*Mr Knoll interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Schubert is called to order.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (15:44):** I thank the honourable member for the question. Again, what we are doing is traversing other matters besides putting all our attention and our focus on trying to find this individual, rather than playing petty politics about the contract and what the contract says—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The leader will cease interjecting.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** What I am not going to do is run through Labor's record on escapees during their time in government. I am not here to do that. I am not here to talk about when—

*Mr Odenwalder interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Elizabeth is called to order.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** —the Leader of the Opposition was minister for corrections or the member for West Torrens was the minister for corrections or when the member for Light was the minister for corrections. I am not here to talk about that—because if I did that, I could be here all day—because it is not the right thing to do at the moment. At the moment, what we are doing is we are focused on finding this individual and bringing him back in to custody. That is what we are doing.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** That is what we are doing.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister will resume his seat. The Minister for Correctional Services has the call. I am listening to the answer of the Minister for Correctional Services. He will be heard in silence.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** So is there a penalty for some sort of escape like this? Absolutely. Will we go back and will we look at that contract and will we make sure that we execute and we exercise our rights in respect of that contract? Well, that is a discussion to have, and I am sure we will do that down the track, but at the moment the priority is not playing petty politics: it is finding this individual and bringing him back into custody.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Before I call the member for Elizabeth, I warn the member for Elizabeth.

#### **ADELAIDE REMAND CENTRE**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (15:46):** My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Minister, have you visited the Adelaide Remand Centre since the private operators took over the running of the facility?

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (15:46):** In my three or so months being minister, I have taken the opportunity to visit a number of sites in our system. For example, one of them was the Cadell Training Centre—and what a great job they are doing out there. I have also visited Yatala and the Adelaide Women's Prison. I have not been to ARC yet, but I certainly intend to do so.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Before I call the member for Elizabeth, I call to order the member for Playford and I warn the member for West Torrens for a second time.

#### **ADELAIDE REMAND CENTRE**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (15:47):** My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Have the private operators of the Adelaide Remand Centre reduced staffing ratios since taking over the running of the facility?

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (15:47):** I thank the honourable member for the question. I am advised pursuant to the contract that Serco are certainly obligated to maintain an agreed level of staffing, and that through the ARC transition, I believe that all previous staff were certainly given the opportunity to transition to new jobs in the prison system.

#### **ADELAIDE REMAND CENTRE**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (15:47):** My question is again to the Minister for Correctional Services. Again, minister, have the private operators of the Adelaide Remand Centre reduced staffing ratios since taking over the running of the facility?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Playford is warned.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order: I am sure the shadow minister understands that he is not allowed to ask the same question in the same session, let alone one after the other.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. The minister has the question. Does the minister need the question repeated?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** The member opposite is not allowed to ask the same question twice.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I have ruled on the point of order. The member for Elizabeth might repeat the question.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Absolutely. My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Have the private operators of the Adelaide Remand Centre reduced staffing ratios since taking over the running of the facility?

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (15:49):** I thank the honourable member for the question. I refer to my earlier answer.

#### ADELAIDE REMAND CENTRE

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (15:49):** My question is again to the Minister for Correctional Services. How many staff were on duty in the kitchen area from which this inmate made his escape?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order: I suggest that the question contains argument.

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for West Torrens is on two warnings. I call to order the member for Lee.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I uphold the point of order. The question introduced facts. If the member for Elizabeth seeks leave to do so, he might do that. I will give him a chance to repeat or rephrase the question.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Perhaps I will rephrase it. My question is again to the Minister for Correctional Services. Have the staff numbers in the kitchen area from which the inmate escaped been reduced since your government privatised the Adelaide Remand Centre?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister for Correctional Services is seeking the call. I will give the Minister for Correctional Services the opportunity to address the question.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (15:50):** Thank you, sir. I'm not sure why those opposite are laughing. This is certainly not a laughing matter. I am treating this matter—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** I'm trying to answer the question, if you stop interjecting. I am treating this very, very seriously. Obviously, if you were to talk about, in a prison setting, who is where, when, why and how many, that could potentially raise some security aspects. What I will say is that the question related certainly to an operational aspect. As I said, there's an investigation underway. That investigation will be comprehensive. DCS and SAPOL will be making sure that that investigation is comprehensive. I more than anyone will certainly want to see the outcome of that investigation and will look at these matters accordingly.

#### ADELAIDE REMAND CENTRE

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:51):** Supplementary question to the minister: who is leading the investigation to which the minister refers?

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (15:51):** Obviously DCS is assisting SAPOL with this, so I imagine that DCS would conduct the investigation as well as SAPOL.

#### WINE INDUSTRY

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:51):** My question is to the Minister for Trade and Investment. Can the minister please update the house about how the Marshall Liberal government is partnering with industry to support South Australian wine producers? With your leave, sir, and that of the house I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** In 2020, it has been a tumultuous year for the South Australian wine industry, with drought and bushfires, so the Marshall Liberal government is committed to backing these businesses to continue exporting into existing and new markets.

**The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Member of the Executive Council, Minister for Trade and Investment) (15:52):** I thank the member for the question and note that his electorate of Chaffey, based in the Riverland, is a key electorate, and food and wine are very important to your constituents there, member for Chaffey. Of course, it's just one of the world-renowned wine regions we have in South Australia. In fact, we've got 18 various wine regions throughout South Australia: the Barossa Valley, Clare Valley, McLaren Vale, Coonawarra, Adelaide Hills, just to name a few.

**The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan:** The southern Flinders.

**The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON:** The southern Flinders. Many of those are just within an hour's drive of Adelaide. These regions produce premium quality wine that's sold to all corners of the world and enjoyed by millions. Of course, it is also enjoyed by many South Australians. We recognise and are very proud of the wine regions that we have in South Australia and the quality of wine that is introduced.

As the member for Chaffey said, 2020 has really been a very challenging year for our wine producers. They have faced many challenges, each of them large in themselves let alone when they are combined together. As a result, and even since coming to government, the Marshall government has really focused on how we can help our exporters as a whole, how they can grow their business, and specifically also our key wine exporters that are a prime sector in our economy, wanting them to grow.

One of the programs that we have introduced as a government is the wine industry exports recovery program, introduced this year. It is a program that was developed in close consultation with industry, making sure we can support our premium wine producers. It consists of 10 unique projects. All of them have some shared goals. One of them is to help grow wine consumption in our markets and, of course, also to emphasise and really boost the reputation of our South Australian wine in those regions. With that comes growing consumer demand and also increased pricepoints.

As I said, these programs have been delivered as industry partnerships with some of our key industry bodies in South Australia. One of those ten projects is the Emerging Markets Program, which is a partnership with the South Australian Wine Industry Association. It has been developed to help some of our wineries diversify into new markets or grow into existing markets in the Asia region, which includes Malaysia, India, Japan and South Korea. If I could just note that South Korea has in recent years been experiencing year-on-year growth of 18 per cent. So there is an opportunity for our wineries there.

The program aims to do this by creating educational resources for participating wineries, giving them market insights into how to do business in each of those specific countries, as well as providing market intelligence based out of our terrific trade office network. Many of those trade offices are in those keys regions as well.

Another example of the projects undertaken was into the United States market. This is quite a sophisticated market, well established in Australia and South Australia for our exports and trying to grow into that as well. In October and November, in partnership with Wine Australia and also

wine.com, a promotional campaign online was undertaken to drive sales and consumption of South Australian wine into the US.

These are some examples. Others involved working with the Barossa Grape and Wine Association, the Adelaide Hills wine region and the Clare Valley Wine and Grape Association, with them trying to look to grow into the UK. These are some examples of how the government is helping to back business to help them grow exports and support our economy.

There is no doubt that this year has brought about significant challenges and we certainly don't underestimate them as a government, but we are confident in the quality of South Australian wine and also the integrity of the South Australian wine industry.

#### **ADELAIDE REMAND CENTRE**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (15:56):** My question is again to the Minister for Correctional Services. Minister, why was this inmate left unsupervised for such a long period that he was able to fashion a makeshift rope and prise apart a grille to make his escape?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order: standing order 104. The member is meant to address his questions through the Chair, not directly to the minister.

**The SPEAKER:** I will give the member for Elizabeth an opportunity to correct that. I also would give the member for Elizabeth the opportunity to consider the introduction of facts in the question.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Through you, Chair, why was this inmate left unsupervised for such a long period of time that he was able to fashion a makeshift rope and prise apart a grille to make his escape?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order: the member has taken your advice on one of the points of order, the one I raised, but not the one that you raised. Sir, he has still not sought leave.

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order. I will give the member for Elizabeth an opportunity.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Why was this inmate left unsupervised for such a long period of time? With your leave, sir, and that of the house I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** According to media reports and the SAPOL press conference, the prisoner made his escape with a makeshift rope and prised apart a grille to make his escape from the Adelaide Remand Centre.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** Where was Serco, Vince?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for West Torrens is on two warnings. The Minister for Correctional Services has the call.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (15:58):** This is a very serious matter. There is no question that the incident will certainly be subject to a comprehensive investigation. As I said, DCS will investigate it and SAPOL will investigate it. With all respect, I think the member for Elizabeth may be presumptuous in some of the facts there, but, as I said, there will be an investigation—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** —that's underway. We will get to the bottom of it and we won't shy away from it and we will address it.

**ADELAIDE REMAND CENTRE**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (15:59):** My question is again to the Minister for Correctional Services. Why was SAPOL not alerted to this prisoner's escape until 25 minutes after the escape? With your leave, sir, and that of the house I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** According to SAPOL at their press conference, the escape happened at 9.55 and they were not alerted to the fact until 10.20am.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (15:59):** While that is an operational matter, what I will do is reiterate my comments to the house that I made a short time ago. I can advise the house that shortly after 10.30am my office was advised by the Department for Correctional Services that at approximately 9.55am a prisoner escaped from the Adelaide Remand Centre and fled the area on foot. As I said, I reiterate what our priority is at the moment and that is to bring this person back into—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my right!

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** —custody—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the Premier!

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** —but if I do have more details that are relevant and appropriate to bring back to the house at a later—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left!

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is warned.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** If there are more relevant details—

*The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier is called to order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister will resume his seat for a moment. Interjections on both sides of the house will cease. The Minister for Correctional Services has the call. He has been asked a question by the member for Elizabeth who is entitled, as are all members, to hear the answer and to hear the answer in silence.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** I am happy to return to the house with more information at a later date, if it is appropriate.

**SCHOOL INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS, SCHUBERT ELECTORATE**

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (16:01):** My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house on works being undertaken by the Marshall Liberal government to support school infrastructure, particularly in my seat of Schubert?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (16:01):** I am very pleased to have this question from the member for Schubert and it's a terrific opportunity to share with the house and with the people of South Australia—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** —some of the outstanding work that the Marshall Liberal government is doing as we build what matters for our communities, and that includes in education and school infrastructure. Of course, the government—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader will cease interjecting.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** —is undertaking a \$1.3 billion program of infrastructure works around our schools. It is the largest infrastructure program in the state's schools' history and it comes on top of the fact that we also have record spending on our schools, in recurrent terms, because education is critical for the future of our state. The infrastructure we are building will support increased enrolments, will support higher quality facilities and will support the outstanding and excellent teaching and learning that is being undertaken by our educators across our school system.

The member for Schubert obviously has a particular interest in his local electorate and I am really pleased to talk about a number of things that are happening in our schools and our preschools in the Schubert area. At Nuriootpa High School, and indeed at Nuriootpa Primary School, there are projects to the value of \$4.4 million and \$7.5 million to radically upgrade the facilities at those two schools.

Both of those projects are due to be completed in the second half of next year, and I am sure that the member for Schubert can't wait, as indeed I cannot, to go and visit those schools and see that work when it is complete. It was with great pleasure that I remember joining the member for Schubert, I think it was in 2017 or maybe late 2016, to talk to the then principal at Nuriootpa High School about what works needed to take place. That school is very excited. I know that there will be enhancements.

Over the course of the last year, we have undertaken a range of other programs to support not just those schools with major infrastructure upgrades but indeed every school and every preschool in the public system in South Australia. In the member for Schubert's electorate, preschools at Freeling, Lyndoch, Mount Pleasant, Nuriootpa, Tanunda and Williamstown all benefited earlier this year from a stimulus announcement of a \$20,000 grant to ensure that each one of them could do a painting or roofing, tiling or nature play project—upgrades that were necessary—and every single preschool in the government system in the state benefited from the same.

And do you know what? I spoke to a lot of those preschool directors who found that when they were working through what they would do now they had this bounty of \$20,000, there were more projects, indeed, that they had in mind. So in this budget, a \$30,000 grant further on top of that \$20,000 grant is being provided to each and every one of those preschools in the member for Schubert's electorate and around South Australia. That's great work for local tradies, great work for local small businesses and great outcomes for those local preschools.

In the schooling system, we had a significant backlog of maintenance and minor works in the education department system, works that have been approved to be done, works that have been approved to be funded by central office, works that have been identified as being of high need, but works for which no funding source had been allocated. The usual minor works budget of \$12 million to \$15 million in the education department wasn't sufficient, so a \$25 million increase on top of that this year enabled works at Freeling, Greenock, Nuriootpa and Williamstown to be undertaken this year to the value of about \$400,000.

The member for Schubert's schools will be very pleased that in this budget, announced by the Treasurer earlier in the year, works are supported at every public school in South Australia with grants of between \$20,000 and \$100,000, depending on local circumstances and what infrastructure is in place.

For the member for Schubert, schools in Angaston, Freeling, Greenock, Keyneton, Light Pass, Lyndoch, Mount Pleasant, Nuriootpa, Roseworthy, Sandy Creek, Springton, Tanunda, Wasleys and Williamstown will all benefit from that, as will any other schools in any other towns I have missed. I don't think I missed any. So it is great news for schools, great news for local communities and, at a time when stimulus has been necessary for jobs, it's great news for local small businesses and tradespeople in the member for Schubert's electorate.



**ADELAIDE REMAND CENTRE**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (16:05):** My question is again to the Minister for Correctional Services. Is the minister satisfied with the performance of Serco in their running of the Adelaide Remand Centre?

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (16:05):** I thank the honourable member for the question. Obviously, the member for Elizabeth knows the state that the former Labor government after 16 long years—long years—how they—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** That's right.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Elizabeth has asked the question. He will cease interjecting. The minister for Correctional Services has the call.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** Since coming into government, what we have done is we have made a number of sweeping reforms to our prison system, and that includes the biggest capital investment in the system in a generation.

**Mr Brown:** Meanwhile private prisoners are escaping.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Playford is warned for a second time.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** Who said 'rack 'em, pack 'em and stack 'em'? Who said that? Who was that? Our prison officer staff do a fantastic job. We have the lowest rate of recidivism in the nation, and I would have thought there was some bipartisanship on this. I know that there are members opposite who worked hard in this portfolio.

**Mr Picton:** Not on privatisation.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** The member for Kaurua says 'not on privatisation', but what happened in 2017 in regard to the Mount Gambier prison? What happened?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** Do you know who signed the contract? They are clearly not talking.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** They are clearly not talking. We are getting on with the job. We know this is a serious matter. As I said, I don't want to play the politics on this matter. We are going to get to the bottom of it, but our priority at the moment is making sure—

**Mr Malinauskas:** It's not playing politics.

**The SPEAKER:** The leader will cease interjecting.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** —that we locate this individual and bring them back into custody.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the member for Elizabeth, I warn the member for Lee and I call to order the member for Badcoe.

**ADELAIDE REMAND CENTRE**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (16:07):** My question is again to the Minister for Correctional Services. Has the minister sought a briefing from the government's private operator Serco as to the circumstances of the escape and is he satisfied with that response?

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (16:07):** I think I am starting to repeat myself a bit here but, as I said, there is a comprehensive investigation. I will certainly await that report. My office has certainly been in contact—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** —with relevant stakeholders, as you would appreciate, sir, and when I have more to update then of course, if it's appropriate, I will provide an update to the house.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the member for Davenport, I call to order the member for Kaurna and I warn the member for Badcoe.

### **SKILLS TRAINING**

**Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (16:08):** My question is directed to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. I ask the minister whether he could update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is building what matters and providing employers with the skilled workforce required to grow?

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (16:08):** I thank the member for Davenport for his interest in skills here in South Australia. I know he will be particularly interested in the Marshall Liberal government's work in micro-credentials. It is building what matters here in South Australia: more training and employment opportunities for South Australians, delivering skills for industry to provide employers with the skilled workforce they need for their businesses to grow and to employ more South Australians.

Yesterday, I officially announced a new 12-month micro-credential pilot project. We are rolling out business-led micro-credentials that will meet present-day skills needs. While work on micro-credentials is also occurring nationally, South Australia is forging ahead with a pilot as we continue to lead the nation in skills reform with flexible and robust training here in South Australia—a system that is agile. Let me explain: a micro-credential is shorter than a qualification and certifies the assessed learning in a defined set of skills, importantly formally acknowledging the training and learning of the employee.

These bite-size courses provide businesses with the flexibility to rapidly adjust to changes in technology and, of course, in the labour market. Importantly, it provides for staff and jobseekers to upskill. Micro-credentials are particularly important to support high-priority sectors such as digital and human services, including disability and the aged-care sector. They will support people to get into jobs or to reskill and upskill in line with emerging needs.

Businesses and industries can now apply to have shorter bespoke courses formally recognised. This is important, as businesses have been delivering various versions of micro-credentials for their own employees for years but they are not recognised outside of that business. The process we're going through here with this micro-credentialing pilot is to actually formally recognise those credentials. The work that employee has done in expanding their education is recognised beyond the business that they're working for. This makes them more valuable as employees out in the market, and formally recognises the work that they have learnt through the micro-credentialing process.

Expressions of interest are now open and the state government's Training and Skills Commission will lead the industry endorsement and recognition process for micro-credentials on industry request. My Department for Innovation and Skills will provide support to facilitate the development of new courses that address skills gaps in priority sectors or meet, of course, emerging industry needs.

The pilot is just one of the many new initiatives the Marshall government is delivering to support a skilled workforce here in South Australia as we position South Australia to further influence reforms to national training products and prepare South Australia for the new industries that are emerging here in South Australia.

### **CORONAVIRUS, HOTEL QUARANTINE**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (16:12):** My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier release publicly the appendix to the Jane Halton national review of hotel quarantine containing a jurisdictional comparison?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (16:12):** That is something which has gone to national cabinet, so it will be up to national cabinet to release any information that they have, and it is all considered cabinet-in-confidence.

### **CORONAVIRUS, HOTEL QUARANTINE**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (16:12):** My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier now released a copy of the confidential appendix to the Halton national review of hotel quarantine to his health minister, as his health minister said in estimates he was unable to access it?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (16:12):** I refer the member to my previous answer. The author of that report did provide comprehensive feedback to South Australia and to other jurisdictions as part of the debrief to that. So I think that we have a very clear picture, from that Halton review, of how we were tracking against the various elements of that review.

I think, in total, there were six general areas of interest for that review. Under those headings, they had multiple different areas which were evaluated across different jurisdictions, and feedback was provided. I again just repeat to the house what I have said previously: we did extraordinarily well in terms of that evaluation, but that doesn't mean to say there isn't further work to do.

You would note in recent weeks that we have made some changes to the way we go about managing our medi-hotels in South Australia. The first of those of course was the issue that we would move to mandatory seven-day testing. This wasn't previously favoured by the AHPPC for the reasons that I have outlined to this house previously. Nevertheless, due to the particular infection that we had in South Australia and the genomics of that case, which came in on 2 November, we decided to adjust that protocol and move away from mandatory daily declarations of people's wellness to serve on that shift to having that augmented with a mandatory seven-day test.

We have also now released our eight-point plan, in terms of managing our medi-hotels going forward. We note that the Victorian government, in addition to receiving the Halton review, has received the interim Coate investigation report and, before the final report has been accepted, they have already announced that they will be making changes to the way that they run medi-hotels in Victoria.

Dr Chris McGowan, the Chief Executive of the Department for Health and Wellbeing, has now written to the AHPPC asking them to further clarify various issues with regard to managing medi-hotels going forward, particularly in light of some of the changes that we have made in South Australia and the Coate investigation report received in Victoria.

In addition to that, we have placed on the agenda for the next national cabinet meeting the issue of whether there should be pre-flight testing put in place. This is something that has not only been referred to the national cabinet, but it has also been raised at the AHPPC. So we will await any recommendations that the AHPPC makes to the national cabinet with regard to pre-flight testing, and also any changes to the way that we manage medi-hotels in Australia.

We do believe that, whilst we have the right to manage our medi-hotels in any way, shape or form that we choose here in South Australia, there are advantages in sharing information, there are advantages in operating in a national approach, and so we have referred our eight-point plan to the AHPPC, and we await any response from them. What I would say, though, is that we in South Australia remain 100 per cent committed to the national repatriation of Australian citizens, and that means that we do need to have hotel quarantine arrangements in Australia.

### **CORONAVIRUS, HOTEL QUARANTINE**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (16:16):** Supplementary question to the Premier: will the Premier release the detailed feedback on the six areas of interest that the national report gave to South Australia, and are those detailed six areas where the supposed gold star is located?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (16:16):** I don't know what the cynicism is for from the opposition. This is a very serious matter and, quite frankly, it's one of the most important matters that faces our nation at the moment. Currently, there are tens of thousands of Australian citizens who are stranded overseas. Currently, there are a large number of international

students who have already studied in Australia, who are stranded overseas, awaiting the opportunity to return. So this is something we have, I think, a great obligation as a nation to get right.

In South Australia, we have had, I think, somewhere between 8,000 and 9,000 people through our medi-hotels since April. There is clearly an issue associated with the most recent Parafield cluster. That is something that we will learn from, that is something we have already put corrective action in place and we have other aspects of our medi-hotel eight-point plan that we are implementing at the moment. But the reality is that we remain 100 per cent committed to safe medi-hotels so that we can have the repatriation of these Australian citizens to our nation.

**Mr PICTON:** Point of order: debate. The question was very specific in terms of would the detailed feedback on those six areas of interest be released.

**The SPEAKER:** On the point of order, there was reference also to the source of the 'gold star', as I heard the question. I was listening very carefully to the Premier in addressing that matter. The Premier is in the course of answering. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Thank you very much, sir. As I said, Jane Halton provided feedback to national cabinet. It's national cabinet's decision as to what to release. It's not up to individual jurisdictions. Moreover, Jane Halton provided advice directly to the Australian Health Principal Protection Committee (AHPPC).

As most members in this place know, Professor Nicola Spurrier, the Chief Public Health Officer in South Australia, sits on the AHPPC with the chief health officers from around the country, as well as the Acting Chief Medical Officer, Professor Paul Kelly. They have received that information. Our performance has been made extraordinarily clear to us in South Australia, but it really would be a decision for the national cabinet or the AHPPC to release any further details.

What I have said repeatedly in this place is that we take advice from what has happened in Australia, we take advice from what happens in other jurisdictions—interstate and around the world—and we ultimately want to do everything we possibly can to improve our performance with regard to our medi-hotels in South Australia, but it is not up to South Australia to be releasing that information.

#### **WOMEN'S DOMESTIC VIOLENCE COURT ASSISTANCE SERVICE**

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (16:19):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General update the house on the success of the Women's Domestic Violence Court Assistance Service?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (16:20):** I am very pleased to do so, and I thank the member for King not only for this question but also for her advocacy for some of our most vulnerable in the community.

The Women's Domestic Violence Court Assistance Service does what its title says: they assist women navigating the court system, and the three principal areas of support are in relation to the legal advice about intervention orders and also about tenancy disputes. They are also very active to navigate the Magistrates Court processes if they need to vary or amend or revoke provisions in relation to the intervention orders, and they assist specifically in relation to tenancy matters with advice and appearances through SACAT.

It is a really important service, and it really has had outstanding success in the last 12 months. It can refer those in need to other services as well. Since Legal Services commenced its delivering of this service following a competitive procurement process, the commission has, due to its ability to provide a comprehensive service with a high level of expertise, successfully received \$1,867,583 in funding from 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2023, including an optional extension year.

But here is what is really impressive: between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020, the service provided a staggering 1,201 services to 845 clients. The service included 318 provisions of information to clients, 630 provisions of legal advice and/or assistance, 69 duty lawyer attendances and 185 legal representations. Its target for the number of legal services to women in need exceeded that—that is, it had a target of 800 clients per year, which previously had been aimed for and not

achieved, unfortunately, by the former provider in the previous year 2018-19—so 106 per cent of the target is a magnificent effort.

Personally I want to thank and acknowledge Gabrielle Canny, the commission's director. She has been a champion in relation to new initiatives which the commission has taken up and which we have been very proud to support. She has made a great contribution, and this is just another stellar performance of the commission, which is providing a statewide service to mostly women in this area and particularly important, of course, is that they do not have to pay anything. It is a comprehensive service. It is way above its weight in target, and it has delivered an outstanding service comprehensively across the state for free.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the member for Florey, I call to order the member for Reynell.

#### **AGE OF CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (16:23):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General update the house on how long it will take before the government acts to raise the age of criminal responsibility from 10, which is far below that recommended by the United Nations? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Ms BEDFORD:** Every year about 600 children between the ages of 10 and 13 are incarcerated in adult prisons. About 60 per cent of these are Indigenous. Reducing the rate of Aboriginal juvenile incarcerations—a priority of the Closing the Gap agreement—can be swiftly implemented were the government to act as the government has acted in the ACT already. They are raising the age to 14.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (16:23):** I thank the member for her question, and perhaps I will inform the house of a number of things. Firstly, we do have children in custody in South Australia. I commend the Minister for Human Services for, in her time, the massive reduction in the number of children in custody. However, what is clear both here in South Australia and in other regions is that there are far too many Indigenous children—so the member is quite right—relative to the number in the population. There are far too many children in custody, particularly Indigenous children.

What is also the case in South Australia, as distinct from the nationwide data that has been provided by the member, is that very rarely in South Australia do we have a child between the ages of 10 and 14 years in custody. I am advised that it may be one or two at any one time, and they may only be there for a few days; nevertheless, that is still a situation where children do commit crime.

If they are above the age of 10 years and mentally competent, then of course they can be culpable for a criminal offence. That is the situation across the country. At the Council of Attorneys-General, this has been on the agenda for about 18 months. From memory, it was raised by Western Australia. My equivalent in Western Australia established a working committee to look at this question of what do we do in relation to the 10 to 14 year olds. Should they be criminally sanctioned and culpable in relation to criminal conduct? Should it change to 12 or 14?

Should we reverse the *doli incapax*, as it's called? Basically, it is a presumption that, in cases between 10 and 14, not only do you have to prove that they committed the offence and that they had the mental capacity to do so but you also have to establish—essentially, if I abbreviate it down—the child's understanding that they knew what they did was wrong. They have to know the difference between right and wrong. So there is quite a high threshold for children to be prosecuted in South Australia. That is the situation at the moment.

The working committee has been due to report for some time. The expectation is that the next CAG will be in March next year, and we have asked Western Australia to report whatever work it has done in that area. In the meantime, in South Australia we have been looking at this very carefully ourselves. One of the things that occurred before the election in Queensland was the announcement by Premier Palaszczuk that she would not, in her government, change the law; that is, children 10 and above will be legally responsible. She ruled out there being any change.

The ACT have previously indicated that they are interested. A number of other jurisdictions have not made any express position as to what they would consider. So we are yet to see whether there can be any national agreement in relation to where we go with this area of law reform. If they don't come to any resolution, I think it is something that we need to have a formal position on in any event.

I think the key question for South Australia, given that we don't have the same level of incarceration of children in this area, is that, whatever we do in relation to children's incarceration, we have to think about what else we can support children with at that age to ensure that they rehabilitate. Sometimes children kill their parent. Sometimes they do terrible crimes at a young age. Sadly, that is the situation that we have, but we do need to think about what other services might best be employed for them.

#### AGE OF CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (16:28):** Supplementary question: Attorney, what is the correlation between the numbers of children in custody and those who are under care and protection orders?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (16:28):** I think the member is asking me whether there is some connection between some children who have been in care under the guardianship of the minister and/or the chief executive now and whether they are in custody. If she is asking me how many of those currently incarcerated are under the guardianship of the state, I will get that information for her and bring it back to the house.

#### CORONAVIRUS, PARAFIELD CLUSTER

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (16:28):** My question is to the Premier. On whose advice did the Premier rely before he made comments on 20 November regarding the case of the man who worked at the Woodville Pizza Bar?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (16:28):** We have a briefing, and there were many people who were present at that meeting. It was made abundantly clear to me that false and misleading information had been provided to public health officials in South Australia. This is a very serious issue because public health officials rely on information to inform any response they have to a public health emergency.

In this case, that information that was reported to me was very clearly false and misleading. This information that was provided to public health was both false and misleading. I note that the person has now apologised for this, and it is now the subject of police investigation. There has been some scrutiny with regard to this issue and, in particular, whether or not I should have made this comment. I make the point that this is very different from the way it has been characterised by some people.

We don't routinely pass on information provided during an investigation by a public health official to other agencies of government. What we do, though, is expect that all information which is provided to public health officials be truthful and fulsome so that we can frame our response. In this case, it wasn't truthful and it wasn't fulsome. The evidence that had been provided was that this person had casually attended the Woodville Pizza Bar and purchased a pizza, not that they were working as a casual employee.

This was a very material piece of information. I think the police commissioner himself described it as the straw that broke the camel's back, and in fact it was one of the crucial pieces of information that we relied upon in deciding to proceed with that six-day pause or circuit-breaker in South Australia. Ultimately, when we became aware of that piece of information being false and misleading, it caused us to reconsider the magnitude of the cluster in South Australia, and we therefore adjusted that back to a three-day pause or circuit-breaker.

This was still a very important pause or circuit-breaker because, as you would recall, sir, in the early days of this cluster there was a very fast-moving infection in South Australia. We had gone from one infection reported on the Saturday night to three infections on the Sunday afternoon, I think it was. It then escalated to 17 on the Monday morning, so this was moving very quickly and we

needed to get as many people as we could into that 14 days of quarantine in a very short period of time.

It was really important that we didn't have people who weren't in that net, that quarantine arrangement, out continuing to infect people so that that task for our public health administrators in South Australia became larger and larger and larger, so a decision was made to have that pause, have that circuit-breaker. That was shortened because of the great speed of our contact tracing and also that diminished scope.

We were also very fortunate in the work we did that we had the support of the commonwealth, Western Australia, New South Wales and Victoria. We were all working together to do everything we could to put that net across this issue as quickly as possible and put people into quarantine to stop the spread of this very dangerous infection.

### HORTICULTURE INDUSTRY

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (16:33):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on how the state government is supporting the installation of infrastructure to protect horticultural crops?

**The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (16:33):** I thank the member for Kavel for his very important question and for his advocacy for the apple and pear growers in the Adelaide Hills. The Marshall Liberal government is supporting primary producers to protect their horticultural crops from extreme weather and predators through the \$14.6 million Horticultural Netting Infrastructure Program. Additionally, this also supports them in increasing water use efficiency through the provision of funding for netting. We are building what matters for primary producers.

Under the program, we are offering funding for up to 50 per cent of the cost to purchase and install or replace damaged netting over land used for horticultural crops. As of 27 November, 56 applications have been received, seeking a total of \$6.2 million in grants. There have been 44 applications, and a total of \$5.1 million in grants have been approved to date, with the total cost of projects worth \$11.5 million and 359 hectares of crop covered with approved grants.

The benefits of netting also extend beyond risk management of hail and include protection from birds and bats, improved yields, increased marketability of products and labour and water savings. Fruit harvested under netting is more likely to meet the high standards demanded by consumers, providing a market advantage. Up to \$7.3 million in grants is available for primary producers in the Adelaide Hills and Greater Adelaide area. Similarly, \$7.3 million is also available for grants in the Riverland.

The program closes on 30 June 2023 or when funds are fully committed, whichever comes first. The uptake of grants under this program has been very strong to date. Both regions have been hit by several hailstorms in recent years, decimating horticulture crops such as apples, pears, citrus and cherries. In October 2017, the Adelaide Hills were impacted by a hailstone storm that affected 95 per cent of the state's apple and pear orchards. Then again, in 2018, every grower in the Adelaide Hills experienced hail damage to some degree. Of the blocks sampled outside netting, 80 per cent had more than 50 per cent fruit damage.

In November 2019, parts of the Riverland region were impacted by a storm cell that produced a band of hail that impacted 130 growers across 211 properties. This netting program is much-needed relief for horticulturalists. This is another example of the commonwealth and state governments working together to deliver for primary producers in South Australia. We are supporting local jobs through netting businesses, which is important in this challenging economic climate.

### *Grievance Debate*

### ENVIRONMENTAL DECISIONS

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:36):** I would like to turn today to the question of the gentle art of capitulation, the question, as Kenny Rogers put it so well, of knowing when to hold them and when to fold them. We all know that in government sometimes you make decisions that on reflection or with more information you determine need to be

reversed or altered in some way. Of course that happens. Ideally, you do not wait for an outcry of public opinion, the risk of embarrassment in the media, before you come to the sudden realisation that there might be a better way to do it. But, unfortunately, that appears to be largely the way in which the Minister for Environment conducts the acrobatics of the so-called backflip.

Possibly my favourite one of these, because it is my local one, was the sand carting, where the minister wrote a letter to me—he says personally, and I believe him—saying that he absolutely refused to send anyone from the coast protection branch to a public meeting (200 to 300 people attended that meeting) because it was a 'waste of valuable departmental time', to quote him in that letter. That meeting was particularly concerned about our road being put through very precious and very important dunes in Semaphore, a road big enough to take substantial trucks that would cart dozens and dozens of full loads of sand off the beach every day.

That absolute determination that we were wrong and he was right lasted about a week of the locals standing there with placards saying, 'Please don't destroy our dunes!' and the media turning up and the media taking a lot of footage of a woman who bravely had her car locked in by fencing—and, suddenly, there was no need to do that after all. Then there was the permit to cull wombats that was granted, which after a vigorous Facebook campaign was suddenly not required and not necessary.

Then, most recently, on the weekend we had the perplexing situation where an organisation that had a permit from the department, which presumably was a sound permit, because I trust the department manages its permit system well, to care for koalas that required some rehabilitation before being released back into the wild would not have the permit anymore because it was moving to another location. That would cause those koalas to have to be dispersed elsewhere to other carers, if there were some. Some, I understand from that organisation, were in fact already euthanised in the days leading up or would be prematurely, in the minds of the organisation, returned to the wild before they were quite ready for that, although we all agreed that is where they belong.

A letter had been written in early November, I believe, by the organisation saying, 'Minister Speirs, we are moving. You know that we are moving because the Department for Child Protection is kicking us out. Could you please make sure that the permit is updated?' That letter was not replied to. I think we have all had that experience on this side. It was not until the media came, started taking footage and asked for comment that suddenly it was fixed: 'That's alright, perfectly happy to extend a permit to allow the transition.' Again, late, late, late waiting for media attention, but if this is the practice of the minister, excellent, we have some things we would like him to consider.

There is the PFAS dump, which is going to be located in a prime agricultural area. There is the marine parks destruction, where very precious sanctuary zones are going to be torn up without any scientific validity, including from the minister's own review he commissioned that asked, 'What do you think about these sanctuary zones?' The report says, 'They're excellent. They're doing a good job. We can find no evidence of any harm on the socio-economic front and biologically they're doing well.' He's going to tear them up anyway. Ninety-five per cent of people who responded on YourSAy said, 'Please don't do this.' So maybe we are waiting. Maybe there is just a little bit more attention that needs to come and then we can get the right answer.

What I would really like, though, is a rethink of the River Murray. That is where the great capitulation happened, the wrong one, the one that was capitulating to people outside South Australia, as was found by the River Murray royal commission. But, if he wants to change his course, come and have a chat here first. We will advise him and then he can find the right path.

### MORIALTA ELECTORATE

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (16:41):** It is with some disappointment that I report to the house that the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission has decided to shrink the seat of Morialta and take away from the member for Morialta after the 2022 election the opportunity to represent almost all the cherry growers in South Australia.

As we approach Christmas, I can again report to the house, as I do most seasons, that the cherry growers of the Adelaide Hills and Morialta are doing some outstanding work for the people of South Australia in providing a service at the packing shed door. This year, their work has been made much harder than in previous years by a whole range of impacts, whether it be the coronavirus



pandemic, whether in some cases it be impacts from the fires late last year, or whether it be the pestilence of the biosecurity challenges our state has confronted.

I say to all our cherry growers: your work is so commendable. Especially this year, when exports are harder than they have been, when the fruit bats and the lorikeets continue to present challenges, and indeed when the quality of the fruit is so exceptionally high, I say to every member of the house and to every member of the South Australian community: do yourself a favour and do the growers of South Australia a favour and get up Norton Summit Road, get up Gorge Road, get up Montacute Road, get up Lower North East Road into our Hills and support our growers. Get up Greenhill Road and head to Wotton's at Summertown or any of the other growers.

The wine regions in the Adelaide Hills are also suffering this week, of course, because so many of them have been impacted by the decisions of the Chinese government and that is deeply disappointing. We stand with those wine growers. They have been impacted by COVID and they have been impacted by bushfires as well. Their product is amazing. Again, to members of the house and to members of the community: pack an empty esky in the back of your car, head up to the Hills and support our wine growers, particularly those in the seat of Morialta.

I started these comments by identifying that the seat of Morialta is to shrink at the next election, but I reiterate to every one of those electors who supported me in March 2018 that I remain their member, and proudly so, until March 2022 when the boundaries change, and after the boundaries change I am still going to be supporting them every chance I get. It is indeed a disappointment to lose those territories, whether it is those fire-affected communities in Lobethal, Cudlee Creek, Gumeracha or the Lenswood area, some of which I have been representing for four years. Norton Summit, Montacute and Cherryville have been part of my electorate since I was first elected in 2010. People in all these areas at successive elections have welcomed me into their homes and into their communities. I am so grateful for that and my life has been enriched by it. It has been an honour to serve them and I look forward to continuing to serve them passionately until March 2022.

The boundaries commission did indeed give some new areas to the Morialta district, some of which were in Morialta previously. It is with a level of joy that I claim back Newton from the member for Hartley and have the opportunity to once again engage with the constituents of Newton as a candidate and I hope again, after March 2022, as their local MP, as I was from 2010 to 2018. Auldana and a section of the Magill area that have come into Morialta were part of Morialta until 2014. It was an honour to serve that community then and I hope to continue to do so after the election.

Areas for which I have not previously been the member include the section of Magill between Moules Road and Magill Road—indeed, the church I am a member of is in that area—between parts of Morialta, and it is certainly a community I am very familiar with. I look forward to getting to know that area more intimately and doing a great deal of doorknocking there and in the suburb of Vista, where of course so many constituents will benefit from the Marshall Liberal government's enhancements to their infrastructure through the CWMS improvements that SA Water has undertaken.

A number of residents in Highbury, which is already part of Morialta, will benefit from that as well, but I am really looking forward to talking a lot to the residents in Vista about the benefits of this project and learning much more about the range of other matters that are of great interest to them.

I look forward to the election coming in March 2022. I am disappointed to lose certain areas of my seat, but I know, sir, that you as the member for Heysen, the member for Kavel and the member for Schubert, whose seats now come into the Adelaide Hills area, will look to serve those members with passion and I certainly look forward to helping you do so.

**BARNET, MR J.**

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (16:46):** Today, I would like to acknowledge the significant contribution that the late John Barnett and his family have made to the Gawler and surrounding districts community. John Barnett was born on 23 October 1945, at the Hutchinson Hospital in Gawler East and died after a short illness on the morning of 11 November 2020.

I learnt about John's passing at the end of the Remembrance Day service held in Gawler. The news came as a shock. While I knew John had been unwell, I was unaware of the gravity of his illness. A man I had known since my mid 20s was no more—no more political banter, no more talks about the future of Gawler, no more chitchat about the prosperity of the small businesses that line Murray Street.

While John no longer lived in Gawler, his heart never left the town. He still considered himself a local and was still seen as a local, and with some justification. John went to school at Gawler Primary School, followed by a short period at Gawler High School, then to Prince Alfred College, Adelaide. He did a short stint at Adelaide University before deciding to take an apprenticeship at *The News* in Adelaide, where he started with his lifelong friend Julian Swinstead, who also played for Central Districts.

John followed his dad Ken's footsteps into the editorship of *The Bunyip* in 1973 after working for a while in Sydney and doing his national service. This is also where he met his wife, Rosemary. After *The Bunyip* had been in the family for 140 years, the Barnets sold it to the Taylor family in 2003. The Barnet family and *The Bunyip* were and in some ways continue to be synonymous with Gawler. *The Bunyip* has been and continues to be an important journal of record for the people of Gawler and surrounding districts. So intertwined was the Barnet family with Gawler through *The Bunyip* newspaper that their progress was interdependent. *The Bunyip* committed itself to the wellbeing and prosperity of the town, and the townspeople in turn supported *The Bunyip*.

John and Rosemary married on 24 November 1973. The couple had three daughters, Belinda, Meg and Jodie, and now have eight grandchildren, with twins due soon—and just one boy amongst them all. John knew everyone in Gawler, which was his strength and gave him the most satisfaction. He could mingle equally with members of parliament, industry leaders and ordinary members of the community. To uphold the traditions of *The Bunyip* through his editorship was a great achievement in often trying times.

John and I met during the early eighties when I was first elected to public office. It would be fair to say that it was not an instant friendship, but as we gained a better understanding of each other it became apparent that we shared a common interest, which was our love for the Gawler community. This transcended our political differences, so much so that John, a strong Liberal supporter, worked on my campaign for election to parliament in 2006 and that support continued to his death. While his actions at the time upset the local Liberal hierarchy, it did not surprise his friends. John was loyal to the core.

He was a great friend to me personally, and, more importantly, to the people of Gawler. Through his wide range of networks, John became a familiar face at regular lunch gatherings, which he continued after his retirement, and he and Rosemary volunteered at the Adelaide Zoo for well over a decade.

John's funeral will be held this Thursday at the Taylor and Forgie Adelaide Road Chapel, Gawler South. Like *The Bunyip*, Taylor and Forgie are another much-loved institution in Gawler. My sincere condolences go to his wife, Rosemary; children, Belinda, Meg and Jodie; and John's surviving brothers, Anthony and Paul. A life well lived is a gift to the person and their community. Vale, John Barnet.

#### ELDER ELECTORATE CAFES

**Mrs POWER (Elder) (16:50):** I rise to recognise the outstanding efforts and hard work of those in our local cafes in my local community. This year has been a challenging year for businesses, with restrictions impacting when and how they can operate, so it is as important as ever to support our local cafes and in fact all our local businesses.

Within my electorate of Elder, there are countless examples of local businesses that bring people together and are building a legacy for their families and our community. Given the time constraints, I would like to recognise a few of them today that help make up the rich fabric of our local area.

One such family business is The Middle Store on Winston Avenue in Melrose Park, a warm welcoming cafe run by a team of three siblings. Former MasterChef contestant Rose Adam, her sister

Haefer and their brother George opened The Middle Store in May 2015. Together, they serve delicious Middle Eastern-style food, providing a unique twist on many of our favourite breakfast dishes. As someone who has a Lebanese dad, I think I am in a good position to speak about whether or not it is amazing Middle Eastern-style food—and it certainly is.

Just down the road is The Little Fig run by Hayley Ryan. This year, The Little Fig celebrated its fifth birthday. They serve one of the best egg and bacon rolls and the most incredible fruit toast you will find, and very soon Hayley and her partner will welcome the arrival of their baby. Hayley is a little pocket rocket in our community and it is always a delight to visit her. I wish her and her partner well as they grow their family.

Heading into Colonel Light Gardens, you can find Bond and Lane Canteen, which is an inviting, relaxed cafe with a menu showcasing creative twists on brunchtime classics. Cafe owner Lou Rodwell went into the cafe business to do what she loves, and it shows. Welcoming of anyone who pops in for a coffee or a bite to eat or a furry friend wandering past on a walk, the cafe also builds a strong sense of community by hosting art workshops, such as painting with watercolours, which you can enjoy on a Friday night—I think the workshop is called Watercolour and Wine—and clay sculpting, an incredible experience. It is such an innovative way for a cafe to bring people together and support some wonderful local artists. A big congratulations to Lou, Molly and the whole team at Bond and Lane.

Local Crowd is another Colonel Light Gardens gem bringing to life good food, delicious coffee and a strong community vibe. This family-friendly cafe is run by Abdulla, who serves some of the most impressive dishes and seems to know everyone and greets them like an old friend, making you feel instantly at home. Nine 8 on Bank at Clapham Junction, run by Ben and Corrie, is also serving up delicious food. I think their steak pies are some of the best going around and they provide a strong hub for our community by thinking outside the box, having hosted lots of local events in their car park.

Finally, you cannot go past The Pantry on Egmont, Egmont Terrace, in Hawthorn. Silas is a master chef by nature, having worked in kitchens across the world since he was 15. From the doughnuts made in-house to Muffin Mondays and Cindy their little doll that is in there, they use quality ingredients sourced from their own kitchen gardens and from locals who can receive coffee for produce.

All these businesses enrich our local area and contribute to strengthening and growing our economy. As the changes to the boundaries of Elder have just recently been announced, I look forward to getting to know and supporting the hardworking teams at cafes such as Rise and Grind Cafe, Sublime Cafe, Bracegirdle's Cross Road and plenty more. To all the people in our local cafes and to all our local businesses, I sincerely thank each and every one of you for your passion, your commitment and your dedication to your customers, your employees and our local community.

This festive season, let's show them our support. I encourage everyone to think about catching up with friends or family at one of our great local cafes and nominate your favourite cafe for my Love Your Local Cafe Award.

## **SOUTH ROAD**

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (16:55):** I rise to speak about South Road. The South Road upgrade is certainly a source of great excitement in the southern suburbs. For many, it is an eagerly awaited project they are looking forward to seeing come to fruition. People want to see the \$8.9 billion over, I think, 10 years that will be injected into our economy. Hopefully, a lot of that will go to businesses in the southern suburbs. People are certainly looking forward to seeing the creation of up to 4,000 jobs at the peak of the project.

It is of course disappointing that there has been a delay and that it is now going to be 10 years before we see this come to fruition. There has been a great deal of anticipation for some time, with local people expecting to see a decision in relation to tunnels way back in June this year. Nevertheless, this side of parliament certainly commends the government for finally releasing its decision in terms of constructing the hybrid model—a mix of open-cut tunnels and at-grade roadways.

I would like to take this opportunity to also commend the community and the South Road action group in particular, who drew to our attention the risks the Thebarton Theatre—a place I love—and the Queen of Angels Church were facing were it not for the tunnels being built in that area. It is an example of a community group who banded together as a local neighbourhood and campaigned the government, and more widely using the media, to put forward what was a priority for them: the preservation of those heritage and character locations that make up that inner western suburbs area.

Of course, this project is not exciting for everyone. For some people, it is causing a great deal of consternation, a great deal of worry and a great deal of stress. The section from Richmond Road, at the northern boundary of my electorate, down to Cross Road, which will be the southern boundaries of my electorate with the redraw, is most affected. That is where we expect the majority of the 390 homes forecast to be compulsorily acquired will come from. That is the section where we will not see tunnels; instead, we will see the open-cut or sunken roadways and hopefully the upgrade of the existing at-level roadways.

To say that this has sent a ripple through my community is an understatement. The past few weeks have been quite emotional for some people in my community who are anticipating that they may be affected by this. Certainly the future of our schools is a mystery. Parents and families at Black Forest Primary School, Richmond Primary School, Warriappendi School and St Anthony's are wondering what is going to happen to them. The future of Glandore Oval is also a cause for concern.

Today, I want to raise that the lack of information coming from the government to people in my community is really bordering on dangerous. I have spoken with very upset people, including Leticia of Glandore, who was in tears describing to me that for the first time she has found a Housing Trust property where she feels safe and secure. Now she does not know whether that is going to be in the path of the bulldozers and she is going to lose the comfort and security she has at that location.

Certainly, people in my community are doing what they can to help each other in the absence of any information from the government. Although I commend those people who are reaching out to their friends and neighbours and trying to interpret the limited information that is available, many people have been producing maps with their own diagrams, and those have been distributed via social media.

While that comes from a place of trying to help each other, it has actually caused a great deal of grief for many people in the community. This is happening because these people are trying to do the work that the government should be doing. The government should be communicating with local people, the government should be talking with the local member of parliament—who has repeatedly asked for briefings—and the government should be providing more sessions to be able to describe to people what exactly is happening.

The sessions that have been provided are already fully booked. They are not even in the most affected area, which is the Badcoe area, so I would call on the government, firstly, to engage with me as the local MP. My requests for briefings have gone completely unresponded to, which is quite frankly insulting to people in my area, and I would encourage them to communicate with people in our area about what is one of the biggest and most controversial projects that will happen in our area in a generation.

### **MOUNT GAMBIER BUSINESS COMMUNITY**

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (17:00):** I rise to raise the concerns of many in my business community who are, quite frankly, devastated by the actions of the Liberal government. After the statewide lockdown, things did not go back to the previous conditions that were imposed beforehand, and I have businesses on the brink of going broke due to restrictions by stealth that have come in since lockdown.

You have to understand that Mount Gambier is 450 kilometres away from Parafield, where the cluster was, yet my business community has had imposed a one person per four square metre restriction and venue caps. For our hospitality and restaurant sector, this has led to a devastating cascading effect, where bookings have been cancelled, and businesses are electing to have their break-up Christmas shows at different venues—their own work venues, but not in the hospitality sector—because they cannot take the risk that on 14 December things are going to go back to the one person per two square metre ruling.

Even Dan Andrews saw the difference in Victoria between regional Victoria and metro areas of that state, yet this government has imposed the same restrictions for the COVID-19 cluster on the Mount Gambier business community. I fear that we cannot delay in making a decision that, if this one person per four square metres is not immediately overturned, we are going to see businesses particularly in the hospitality and restaurant sector of the Limestone Coast not being able to survive past Christmas. There is no guarantee that 14 December is going to be the date when things return to the one person per two square metres.

I have spoken to the AHA, which is very disappointed that these conditions have been imposed. If we do not do something immediately, and I mean today or tomorrow, we are going to see that 14 December is too late for the hospitality and business sector of my region—places like the Treehouse Adventure Centre, the Blue Lake Golf Links, the South Aussie Hotel, The Barn Steakhouse. I can go on and on naming businesses that have contacted my office very worried that they will not survive this Christmas period.

If the government do not understand this, they need to get out and talk to some of these businesses. They need to understand that they are not on JobKeeper, that they are suffering, that their people are not employed. There is no safety net for them. They are hurting. If they do not make this change, I tell you what—this government is going to have hell to pay come the next election because businesses will go under.

I received a letter from David, who has the treehouse play cafe and who is not on JobKeeper because, when they came back into operation they met the threshold that removed them from JobKeeper. Since the lockdown, they have been unable to open. He was sitting on his computer last night wondering whether on 1 December he is able to open his Treehouse Adventure Centre or his tenpin bowling centre. He employs 20 staff, and at 9.30 last night he finally gets an email from SAPOL saying, 'You cannot open.'

His staff are facing a Christmas without employment, and if the attitude is, 'Oh, they can go on JobSeeker,' that is not a government leading this state. This government has to give very clear advice. It has to pressure this Transition Committee to get to the one per two square metres to give these businesses a chance to survive over the Christmas period because that is when you make your money in hospitality and entertainment.

The rest of the time in Mount Gambier the weather is not as favourable for making money in the hospitality sector. You make money over the three-month period. For the other nine months, you break even, or in some months you make a loss. If this is taken away from them, I am very fearful of what is going to happen to my hospitality and restaurant sector in Mount Gambier. I implore the Transition Committee to take this seriously. Get back to one per two square metres.

#### *Bills*

### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (ABOLITION OF DEFENCE OF PROVOCATION AND RELATED MATTERS) BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (17:06):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce the Statutes Amendment (Abolition of Defence of Provocation and Related Matters) Bill 2020. This bill implements the preferred recommendations in the stage 1 and stage 2 reports of the South Australian Law Reform Institute, entitled The Provoking Operation of Provocation. The SALRI reports recommended that the common law defence of provocation should be abolished.

At common law, if successfully raised, provocation operates as a partial defence, reducing murder to manslaughter. The defence has been criticised for being complex, gender biased and encouraging victim blaming. It is at odds with community expectations that, regardless of the degree of provocation, ordinary people should not resort to lethal violence. Sometimes referred to as the 'gay panic' defence, it has been controversial in its use by accused persons who have perpetrated

violence against members of the gay community. Notwithstanding the defence was rarely successful in this context, this aspect of its operation is offensive and unacceptable.

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

Leave granted.

The defence has had some limited utility in the case of women who, having been the victims of prolonged family violence, finally retaliate against their abuser. Absent the defence, these women may be convicted of murder and face a mandatory sentence of life imprisonment, and a mandatory minimum non-parole period of 20 years.

In line with the recommendations in the SALRI reports, the Bill addresses this issue by ensuring that evidence of family violence and the circumstances surrounding it can be taken into account both at trial—particularly in the context of defences of self-defence and duress, where the dynamics of a domestic relationship may be especially relevant—and in sentencing, including in relation to murder. It seeks to strike a balance between ensuring the changes to the law operate fairly and practically and that they do so without unintended consequences.

To this end, the Bill contains amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 (CLCA), the Evidence Act 1929, the Sentencing Act 2017 and the Bail Act 1985.

Clause 4 of the Bill amends the *Bail Act 1985* to provide that there is a presumption against bail being granted to persons accused of murder. They will have to establish 'exceptional circumstances' in order to justify a grant of bail. This change is being made to ensure consistency with how persons accused of other serious offences are treated in relation to bail.

The common law defences of provocation, duress, necessity and marital coercion are abolished by clause 6 of the Bill, inserting new section 14B into the CLCA.

Duress and necessity are replaced by statutory provisions, the latter called 'sudden or extraordinary emergency' (clause 8). These sit with the provisions regarding self-defence and defence of property in Part 3, Division 2, now re-named 'Defences'.

Clause 7 of the Bill amends section 15B of the CLCA. Currently, that section provides that while defensive action needs to be proportionate to the threat, this requirement does not necessarily mean that the force used by the defendant cannot exceed the force used against them.

Clause 7 adds to this by providing that where the defensive action is taken in circumstances of family violence, the question of proportionality is to be determined having regard to any evidence of family violence before the court. This provision makes it clear that evidence of family violence is relevant to both the subjective and objective aspects of the defences of self-defence and duress. That is, family violence is a relevant consideration in assessing both a defendant's beliefs in the context of self-defence and duress, and in assessing the objective reasonableness of a defendant's conduct.

Further, it clarifies that the CLCA provisions are to be construed by reference to definitions of the terms 'circumstances of family violence' and 'evidence of family violence' inserted in the *Evidence Act* by this Bill.

The new statutory defences of duress and sudden or extraordinary emergency in clause 8 reflect the common law. They do not operate as defences in relation to murder, or related offences such as attempted murder, conspiring or soliciting to commit murder, aiding and abetting murder (and such other offences as may be prescribed by regulation in the future).

New section 15F requires a review of the provisions being inserted in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act by this Bill, 5 years after commencement. The review will consider the effect of the abolition of the common law defences, how amended section 15B has operated, the operation of the statutory defences and whether any further changes are necessary or desirable. This review can be conducted in conjunction with a review of the Evidence Act changes also contained in this Bill.

Clause 9 of the Bill abolishes Part 9, Division 13 of the CLCA and, with it, section 328A. That section contained a defence of marital coercion for (certain) offences committed by a wife in the presence of, and under the coercion of, her husband.

Clause 10 inserts a new division (Part 3, Division 4) in the *Evidence Act*.

Part 3 of the *Evidence Act* currently comprises three divisions dealing with rules of evidence in general cases, sexual cases and the admissibility of evidence showing discreditable conduct or disposition.

New Division 4 provides guidance to the courts in dealing with offences committed in circumstances of family violence.

Key concepts such as 'circumstances of family violence', 'abuse' and 'member of a person's family' are defined to assist courts trying and sentencing for such offences. There is an inclusive definition of what amounts to 'evidence of family violence'.

Expert evidence relating to the nature and effect of family violence (called 'social framework evidence') can be admitted in prescribed proceedings to provide context to the experience of victims of family violence.

Prescribed proceedings are those where a defendant asserts the offence occurred in circumstances of family violence and self-defence, duress or sudden or extraordinary emergency are raised by the defendant.

New section 34Y requires a judge to identify and explain the purposes for which evidence of family violence may or may not be used.

As mentioned previously in relation to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act changes, new section 34Z provides for a review of the operation of the provisions in relation to offences committed in circumstances of family violence after 5 years.

Clause 11 of the Bill contains a further amendment to the *Evidence Act*. It amends s 69A to allow for a court to make a suppression order in relation to evidence given by or relating to a defendant where that evidence relates to family violence suffered by a defendant and is of a humiliating or degrading nature. The operation of this provision will be reviewed after 5 years as part of the review already mentioned.

Clause 12 of the Bill amends section 48 of the *Sentencing Act*.

Section 47(5)(b) of the *Sentencing Act* provides that the mandatory minimum non-parole period for murder is 20 years. Section 47(5)(d) provides that the mandatory minimum non-parole period for 'serious offences against the person' is four fifths of the head sentence. ('Serious offences against the person' are major indictable offences that result in the death or total incapacity of the victim, or conspiracy to commit, or aiding and abetting the commission of such an offence.)

Currently, these mandatory minimum non-parole periods can only be departed from where 'special reasons' exist. Section 48(3) contains an exhaustive list of 'special reasons'.

The amendments to section 48 will allow a sentencing court to depart from the 20 year mandatory minimum non-parole period for murder, or four-fifths of the head sentence for serious offences against the person in 'exceptional circumstances'.

'Exceptional circumstances' may include each of the three factors which currently constitute 'special reasons', as well as an additional factor; namely, that the offence was committed in circumstances of family violence. It is no longer an exhaustive list.

Finally, transitional provisions are needed to deal with criminal liability, sentencing and evidentiary issues that arise with the commencement of this Bill.

The transitional provisions will work in conjunction with a staged commencement of the provisions in order to ensure that appropriate provision is made for legal proceedings that are already on foot before the commencement of the Bill.

In some cases, it is appropriate for the law that is applied in those proceedings to remain (and be applied) as it was prior to the proceedings commencing.

In other cases, the new laws can be applied to proceedings that are underway but have not been completed when these provisions commence.

There are separate transitional provisions for each of the amendments to the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935* (CLCA), the *Evidence Act 1929* and the *Sentencing Act 2017*.

Clause 1 disapplies section 15B(2) and (3) of the CLCA (inserted by clause 7) to trials that commenced before these new provisions become operative. This is to ensure that the law in relation to tests of 'reasonable proportionality', or 'reasonableness' does not change part way through a trial in cases where defences of self-defence, defence of property or duress are raised.

Clause 2 ensures that the new *Evidence Act* provisions (Part 3, Division 4, inserted by clause 10 of the Bill) apply to proceedings that have commenced but not been completed when the new provisions commence and to proceedings that are commenced after the provisions become operative.

The only exception to this is new section 34Y which requires a judge to identify and explain the purpose for which evidence of family violence can be used. Like clause 15B, it is not feasible for this new provision to apply to trials that are already underway. Rather, this provision will apply prospectively to trials that commence after the new provisions become operative.

Clause 3 relates to the changes made to section 48 of the *Sentencing Act*. It ensures that the amendments to the *Sentencing Act* apply in relation to any sentence imposed after the commencement of the amending Act, regardless of whether the proceedings for the offence had commenced prior to or after the commencement of the amending Act. In so doing, it clarifies that the amended sentencing scheme applies to proceedings already on foot at the date of commencement, as well as proceedings that commence after the commencement.

Taken as a whole, the Bill will impact positively on the community by removing defences that are out of step with community expectations—in particular by abolishing the defences of provocation and marital coercion—and by

giving the courts greater flexibility to consider defensive actions taken in the context of family violence as mitigating circumstances in sentencing.

It ensures that issues of domestic violence can be properly ventilated in courts by creating special evidentiary provisions relating to evidence of family violence. These provisions put the impact upon victims of domestic violence front and centre of criminal trials and ensure that both the trier of fact and the sentencing court must have regard to such evidence.

The Bill will also ensure that defendants who have themselves been the victim of domestic violence may be afforded the protection of a suppression order in respect of evidence relating to that domestic violence that is humiliating or degrading in its nature, whether that evidence is given by the defendant or another witness.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

###### 1—Short title

###### 2—Commencement

###### 3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Bail Act 1985*

###### 4—Amendment of section 10A—Presumption against bail in certain cases

This clause amends section 10A of the principal Act to include murder in the list of offences where there is a presumption against bail.

##### Part 3—Amendment of *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*

###### 5—Amendment of heading to Part 3 Division 2

This clause makes a consequential amendment to the heading to Part 3 Division 2 of the principal Act.

###### 6—Insertion of section 14B

This clause inserts new section 14B into the principal Act, abolishing the specified common law defences.

###### 7—Amendment of section 15B—Reasonableness etc where offence committed in circumstances of family violence

This clause amends section 15B of the principal Act to require a court, in determining certain questions relating to the reasonableness etc of certain conduct where a defendant asserts that an offence occurred in circumstances of family violence, to have regard to any evidence of family violence admitted in the course of the trial for the offence.

###### 8—Insertion of sections 15D, 15E and 15F

This clause inserts new sections 15D, 15E and 15F into the principal Act, codifying the common law defences of duress and necessity abolished by clause 6 as well as requiring a review of the operation of the provisions of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935* amended or enacted by this measure.

###### 9—Repeal of Part 9 Division 13

This clause repeals Part 9 Division 13 of the principal Act, made redundant by the provisions of this measure.

##### Part 4—Amendment of *Evidence Act 1929*

###### 10—Insertion of Part 3 Division 4

This clause inserts a new Division 4 into Part 3 of the *Evidence Act 1929* as follows:

###### Division 4—Evidence in proceedings where circumstances of family violence

###### 34U—Interpretation

This proposed section defines terms used in the Division.

###### 34V—Circumstances of family violence

This proposed section sets out the meaning of an offence being committed, or other event occurring, in circumstances of family violence. This meaning applies to all Acts in the absence of a contrary intention.

###### 34W—Evidence of family violence

This proposed section sets out what is evidence of family violence. This meaning applies to all Acts in the absence of a contrary intention.



34X—Certain expert evidence relating to nature and effect of family violence to be admissible

This proposed section allows expert evidence of the nature and effect of family violence to be admissible in certain legal proceedings.

34Y—Trial directions relating to evidence of family violence

This proposed section requires a judge to identify and explain the purpose for which evidence of family violence may, and may not, be used if admitted in the trial of an offence committed in circumstances of family violence.

34Z—Review of Division and section 69A

This proposed section requires the Minister to cause a review of the operation of this Division, and of section 69A, to be conducted.

11—Amendment of section 69A—Suppression orders

This clause amends section 69A of the principal Act to allow a court to make suppression orders in relation to certain evidence relating to family violence.

Part 5—Amendment of *Sentencing Act 2017*

12—Amendment of section 48—Mandatory minimum non-parole periods and proportionality

This clause amends section 48 of the principal Act to allow a sentencing court to set a lower non-parole period than that required under section 47 of that Act in prescribed or exceptional circumstances. Exceptional circumstances may include the commission of an offence in specified circumstances of family violence.

Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

This Schedule makes transitional provisions in respect of how this measure affects matters that are on foot at the time the measure comes into operation.

**Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (17:09):** Can I start by passing on my congratulations to you, Deputy Speaker, on your announcement of your retirement and thank you for your service. Not many people leave this house with tremendous respect from both sides, so congratulations to you. I rise to speak on this bill and indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition. I also indicate the Labor Party's support for this important piece of legislation.

Whilst this bill extends well beyond the issue of provocation, that element is certainly the one that gives rise to today's debate. In simple terms, provocation has operated as a partial defence at common law for much of our legal history. If the defence was made out, a defendant could have a conviction for murder reduced to the lesser crime of manslaughter. Over the centuries, provocation has been used in other places and times to deal with a range of circumstances. These included, for instance, a man killing his wife's lover if he discovered them being unfaithful. It may also have covered a response to a person's child being killed.

Sadly, it has also been used around the world, and here in South Australia from time to time, where a defendant claims that a homosexual advance provoked them to kill the other person. That defence is wrong for many reasons, including its gender bias and its victim blaming. It does not meet the standards we have as a community that should be in our law today. The defence has also had the effect of excusing the use of lethal violence when it is not necessary and when other reasonable responses were available.

There is wide agreement in the community now that the so-called gay panic defence element of provocation is offensive, discriminatory and excuses homophobic conduct. Certainly, the time for it to end is well past. Despite the outdated gay panic defence, though, the idea of provocation defence still has some utility in domestic and family violence cases. When provocation is talked about, it is often mentioned primarily in relation to gay panic, but there are a number of other areas of provocation used in the law.

I think one of the elements where it has been used particularly in South Australia is because we have a mandatory life sentence for murder and a mandatory non-parole sentence, which means that these sorts of other defences come to the fore as well. For example, some utility could be someone who is subjected to a long, prolonged violence, perhaps domestic violence, who may retaliate against their abuser but cannot establish that their actions were self-defence.

Labor did not pass legislation to abolish provocation under statute while in government. Primarily, this was due to the belief—including as was said by the Chief Justice at the time, I believe, Chief Justice Kourakis—that it no longer operated under South Australian common law. There was a view that because it was no longer the community standard it no longer existed in the common law. However, that idea was extinguished, unfortunately, when we had a High Court judgement in the Lindsay case that confirmed that the gay panic aspect had not been extinguished.

Following the High Court case, the previous Labor government asked the South Australian Law Reform Institute to inquire into the rights of and discrimination against LGBTQ people. SALRI's work on this matter gave rise to an audit report and two formal research reports totalling almost 550 pages. The executive summary of the initial audit report describes at the very beginning:

In January 2015 the Attorney-General of South Australia, the Honourable John Rau MP, invited the South Australian Law Reform Institute (SALRI) to accept a reference to inquire and report on those South Australian laws that discriminated against particular members of the community.

The reference was announced as part of the speech of the Governor, His Excellency the Honourable Hieu Van Le AO, at the opening of Parliament on Tuesday 10 February 2015. In particular, the Governor stated that:

'My Government will invite the South Australian Law Reform Institute to review legislative or regulatory discrimination against individuals and families on the grounds of sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, or intersex status.

Their recommendations will then be considered in the South Australian Parliament.'

The report goes on to state:

The desktop audit has determined that there are over 140 pieces of legislation that, on their face, discriminate against individuals on the basis of sex or gender diversity.

The report further states:

SALRI provides examples of this type of legislation and suggestions for how legislation in this category can be quickly amended or removed.

While SALRI was able to isolate legislation that, on paper, had a discriminatory effect, by far the most compelling evidence came from the consultations and submissions of individuals regarding the impact of current legislation upon their lives. The lived experience of individuals places, in stark relief, the operation of law on matters that are fundamental to all South Australians. The individuals consulted asked searching questions of the law and the values it enshrines. How does the law assist me to be the person I am? How does it support me to engage, free from discrimination, in the community in which I live? How can I have the relationship with the person I love recognised and start to raise a family in South Australia? These and other questions only served to highlight the discriminatory barriers that members of the LGBTIQ communities face in their daily lives.

Through the targeted consultations, submissions and use of YourSAY—the state government online consultation website—SALRI was able to determine legislation that was of particular concern for the LGBTIQ communities.

This audit report made recommendations about matters that required further review and reporting by SALRI. Recommendation 2.8 said, and I quote:

The existing common law partial defence of provocation that permits homosexual advances to constitute circumstances of provocation, having regard to the full range of complex issues arising from this defence. SALRI will also consider any relevant recommendations of the South Australian Legislative Review Committee, as well as relevant interstate reforms including the Crimes Amendment (Provocation) Act 2014 (NSW).

This recommendation was accepted by the Labor government at the time and SALRI was asked to undertake further work. The first stage SALRI report was delivered in April 2017 and ran to 150 pages. The executive summary provided some context for the work that was undertaken and the work that remained unfinished at the time, and I quote:

South Australia has historically been at the forefront of developing and implementing laws designed to prohibit unlawful discrimination and to promote equality. The state was the first Australian jurisdiction to introduce sex discrimination legislation and the Sex Discrimination Act 1975 (SA) took full effect from August 1976. It was the first jurisdiction to legalise consensual homosexual acts in 1975 in the aftermath of the tragic death of Dr George Duncan in 1972.

It continues:

This Report contains the first stage of findings of SALRI's further consideration of the operation of the law of provocation and related issues. SALRI was clear in the Audit Report that the current law needed reform to remove its

discriminatory gay panic aspect. However, this aspect of provocation is only part of a wider picture. The role, scope, and even the existence, of provocation as a partial defence to murder, is controversial and has been the subject of extensive study and criticism. The whole issue of provocation is complex (including its interaction in South Australia with the mandatory sentence for murder). The problems of provocation extend [well] beyond its impact on LGBTIQ communities and encompasses gender implications, especially in its application to victims of family violence.

The second stage of SALRI's work on provocation was delivered in April 2018 just after the election and ran to 238 pages. The executive summary of the second stage reflected the complexity of the issues that needed to be addressed, particularly seeking to avoid any unintended but well intentioned reforms. I quote again:

...the Stage 1 Report described that reform to the law of provocation was necessary beyond simply discarding the gay panic aspect and that more radical reform of the present law is necessary. In particular, a strong criticism of the present law expressed in the Stage 1 Report was that the defence of provocation is gender biased and unjust, namely that it unfairly favours male defendants (especially those who have killed a female partner) while applying unfairly to women accused of murder (especially those who have been subjected to prolonged family violence). SALRI noted that the current law in this area in South Australia needs reform to remove any aspect of the law that discriminates on the basis of sexual orientation and/or gender.

The Stage 1 Report outlines the many criticisms of the present law. It is widely asserted that 'the operation of the [partial] defence [of provocation] is gender biased, anachronistic and archaic and promotes a culture of "victim blaming"; that the legal test is conceptually confusing, inappropriately privileges a loss of self-control and is difficult for juries to understand and apply; and that provocation can be adequately dealt with at the sentencing stage, as it is in all other criminal offences'. The New Zealand Law Commission concluded that 'both conceptually and in practice we consider the partial defence of provocation to be irretrievably flawed'. SALRI accepts these criticisms of the present law are well-founded. The criticisms of provocation are such that all Australian jurisdictions bar South Australia have now either abolished it entirely or at least narrowed the scope.

SALRI emphasises that any effort at meaningful reform must include the wider issues in this area beyond the gay panic aspect.

Those two SALRI reports, the second of which was delivered over 2½ years ago now, have led us to the bill that we are finally debating today. The Liberals of course promised to act on this, but it was not until it was actioned in the upper house to move on this that we now have this bill 2½ years after the second SALRI report.

Whilst the delay may be criticised, the content of the bill delivers on the substance of what was recommended 2½ years ago. Importantly, it takes away the ability for a person to claim that a sexual advance was an excuse to kill, while providing a range of protections and supports for victims of family violence.

Looking at the technical issues of the bill, noting that this bill has been debated already in the other place, I will not go into every aspect of the bill but will provide a summary of some of the key provisions. Most people may think that this already exists under law, but the bill amends the Bail Act so that a charge of murder has the presumption against bail. The bill abolishes the common law defences of provocation, duress, necessity and marital coercion. As a transitional measure, these defences will be available for offences that are allegedly committed before the bill's commencement.

In abolishing these defences, it introduces various statutory provisions that provide greater clarity for defendants, lawyers and courts in dealing with these issues. For example, the Criminal Law Consolidation Act will have new sections that deal with duress and sudden or extraordinary emergency, but these will not be available for a prescribed offence, including murder, attempted murder, conspiring or aiding and abetting to murder.

As noted earlier, the bill makes a number of changes to protect and support victims of family violence. For example, the bill amends provisions regarding self defence, so that where a defendant asserts their offence occurred in a situation of family violence the court must have regard to the circumstances of family violence when determining reasonable proportionality.

The new provisions exist in addition to the current provisions regarding self defence and reasonable proportionality that require a defendant to, firstly, genuinely believe their conduct was necessary and reasonable for a defensive purpose (a subjective test) and, secondly, prove their conduct was reasonably proportionate to the threat they genuinely believed to exist (an objective test). It should be noted that the defendant's conduct in self defence may exceed the force used against them if it is reasonable to do so.

After debate in the other place, the bill now includes a five-year review mechanism. It requires the minister to conduct a review with a report that must address the effects of the new sections, the abolition of the common law defences, its effects on family violence and other considerations. Without going into specific detail, the bill amends the Evidence Act to introduce a range of new definitions regarding family violence and new provisions with regard to taking and considering evidence where family violence is asserted. The definition includes that a single act can amount to abuse, as can multiple acts that form a pattern of behaviour, even though some acts may appear trivial in isolation.

The bill defines 'family violence' and 'members of the person's family' in a broad way to account for various, diverse family structures and allows a wide variety of materials to be used as evidence of family violence. As a final comment on the technical aspects of the bill, it also amends the Criminal Law Consolidation Act regarding suppression orders. The bill states that a court can make suppression orders in relation to a defendant or their evidence if the offence occurred in family violence circumstances or if the evidence is humiliating or degrading. This protection is already available for victims of family violence who are not defendants. However, this amendment will protect defendants who were victims of family violence prior to being charged with the offence.

The time has come for these changes to occur. They have the full support of the opposition to remove this very outdated, very damaging defence from our common law. We support this bill. We encourage the government to enact it without delay so that hopefully we can make sure that nobody else in this state uses these very outdated, very offensive defences in the future.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (17:24):** I want to make some remarks in regard to the bill and my support for the bill. I have been an advocate for these changes for a very long time. We should note that this has been driven by the Attorney-General, the member for Bragg, who I know as Vickie Chapman. I know I should not be using her name in this place, but she does deserve to be recognised.

It should also be noted that this has happened within the first term of a new government. The previous government was here for 16 years and did not bring a bill like this to the parliament. I am very pleased that the first woman Attorney-General in South Australia has seen how important it is to remove this provocation defence that enables somebody who might be approached for a date by someone of the same sex to use that as an excuse to murder that person, as though that is some sort of provocation.

The best answer to any question that somebody asks you about something you may not want to participate in is to say no. That is the best and easiest answer. It is certainly not an appropriate response to then take that person's life because of whatever reason. The member for Kaurna is right: this has taken far too long to come to this place. I am very pleased that the Labor Party, after not acting on this for 16 years, are now supporting this change.

I think what is also important about this is that it still enables women who are victims of domestic violence to have a defence based on their treatment. Those who have experienced it personally or experienced it professionally would know that domestic violence comes across in many different forms, whether it be the financial control of someone, whether it be physical violence or whether it be the isolation of a partner by the dominant partner, predominantly the man. I am not speaking out of turn when I say that the perpetrator in relationships is almost exclusively the male.

I congratulate the Attorney-General on bringing the bill to the parliament. I am very pleased that it will have a quick passage through this place and that we will be able to not only put a new protection in place for LGBTIQ people but also take another step towards removing discrimination and the stigma that these members of our community have been forced to deal with their entire lives.

I have a dream that the only time one's sexual orientation is of interest is when somebody wants to ask you out, otherwise what does it matter? If you are asked out and it is not of interest to you, you can simply say, 'No, thank you for the offer. I am flattered but, no, it's not for me.' It is a very simple way of dealing with the situation and I congratulate the Attorney-General on bringing the bill to the parliament.

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (17:29):** I rise to support the Statutes Amendment (Abolition of Defence of Provocation and Related Matters) Bill, introduced by the Attorney-General, on behalf of

people living in King. This Marshall Liberal government and the Attorney-General have made a clear and unequivocal commitment that we would reform the law of provocation to remove the possibility of unwanted same-sex sexual advances being raised as a partial defence to murder. It is offensive and unacceptable, and our government appreciates what the removal of this defence will mean to so many LGBT Australians.

South Australia is the only jurisdiction in Australia to allow the gay panic defence as an option under the umbrella of the broader provocation defence to murder. By way of background to the house, the provocation defence has been used to reduce convictions of murder to manslaughter in circumstances where a heterosexual man has killed another man for making a pass at him. It was raised in a case in South Australia as recently as 2015, the last state to allow the defence.

It was reported that more than 25,000 people, including 2,500 based in Adelaide, signed a petition asking for the removal of this defence and for stronger laws to protect victims of hate crime. The so-called gay panic provocation defence for murder is deeply rooted in homophobia and discrimination. At its core, it holds that a same-sex advance is so abhorrent and menacing or shameful as to provide some partial justification for murder. That is an offensive notion. It is a relic of a time long gone, when such discrimination was not considered unusual, but thankfully it is no longer the case in our great state in 2020. It is time for this defence to be removed.

Issues with the provocation defence reach further than the gay panic defence. The operation of provocation is heavily rooted in gender bias and promotes a culture of victim blaming. Our government has also carefully considered how the current South Australian law fails to adequately reflect the situation of women who experience family violence and who may be driven to kill their abusive domestic partner or who may be at risk of being killed by their abusive partner.

This year, a university student, Evangeline Polymeaneas, investigated and prepared a report for me as part of her studies, called 'Rape myths and their implications: a report on law reform in South Australia', and I see some similarities. In this report, Evangeline states:

Criminology literature suggests that social perception of a crime and the likelihood of escaping accountability are some of the significant reasons that individuals commit crime... Those who would otherwise refrain from committing a crime, when they see an opportunity to, feel as though they would not be held accountable, can justify to themselves that it is not a crime, are much more likely to commit a crime.

We are making changes to South Australian law to make it very clear to community members that there will be strong consequences for serious violence against our South Australian community members. Clearly, in this bill we are talking about non-threatening or nonviolent sexual advances.

In preparation for this bill, the South Australian Law Reform Institute has released two reports examining the operation of the common law defence of provocation, which provides a partial defence to murder by reducing what would be a conviction for murder down to manslaughter. The SALRI reports recommend that the common law partial defence of provocation should be abolished. It is complex and difficult to understand, gender biased, encourages victim blaming, offensive in its application against victims who are gay, and at odds with community expectations that, regardless of the provocation, ordinary people should not be driven to lethal violence.

However, there are circumstances where the defence has some limited usefulness. For example, as we said, in the case of a woman who, having been a victim of prolonged family violence, finally retaliates against her abuser. In such circumstances, the partial defence of provocation can mitigate the crime of murder to manslaughter. The abolition of provocation without further amendment to the criminal law, may mean women in this state who kill their abuser are charged with murder in circumstances where that would be inappropriate or unjust. A murder conviction carries a mandatory sentence of life imprisonment, with a mandatory minimum non-parole period of 20 years.

The drafting of this bill has been a complex process requiring careful consideration and consultation with criminal law experts. It has been necessary for the Attorney to seek expert advice, including from South Australia Police and the Director of Public Prosecutions, regarding the abolition of the defence in murder cases, as well as to consider further reforms to sentencing and defences relating to family violence. The potential implications of the removal of the defence are significant, and there are aspects of provocation laws that should remain in our sentencing regime, including, for example, where domestic abuse victims kill an abuser in self-defence.

In essence, the bill removes defences that are out of step with community expectations and gives the courts greater flexibility to consider all the mitigating circumstances in sentencing. Laws that legitimise and excuse violent and lethal behaviour against any member of the community have no place anywhere in South Australia and no place anywhere in Australia.

On behalf of people living in King, I support the introduction of this legislation and hope that the South Australian parliament will support the bill to protect all victims of hate crimes in sentencing decisions. I commend the bill to the house.

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (17:36):** Sir, congratulations on your announcement. You will be very much missed, but I look forward to one more year with you. As the spokesperson for Labor, the inclusion of our LGBTIQ-plus community gives me great pleasure. It is pretty appalling that someone's gender or sexuality can be used as any form of excuse in the eyes of the law and, sadly, we are the last remaining state to allow such a thing as gay panic.

This defence is appalling not only in its discriminatory nature but also in the way it perpetuates the very appalling attitude over time of people in a small section of the community against people and their choice around sexuality. The marriage equality debate that has happened over many years in Australia ultimately has resulted in an absolutely outstanding show of support for the LGB community, and this is a natural progression. I know that we had many discussions prior to the last election and came to a point of commitment around doing positive work in this space, and I am really pleased to see that this bill has come forward.

This perpetuation of homophobia, and the approach of a same-sex person to another being so abhorrent and so appalling that it would justify murder, that we have for so long considered to be acceptable is something that completely mystifies me. Many public statements have been made to the contrary. I know that former equal opportunity commissioner Nikki Vincent made public calls for the repeal of this and talked about the common law gay panic defence no longer being reflective of community attitudes in our society today—something we completely support.

I know that concern has been raised regarding the removal of this defence and the implications in regard to domestic violence cases. I am confident we are dealing with that and that this is not relevant to what we are talking about. I feel very comfortable that we will move forward to a point where we are able to discriminate between the two quite clearly.

I know we have had quite a number of inquiries into this. The gay panic defence is a product of very old attitudes that we need to squash and get rid of. I think if we refuse to take action on this, we are sending all the wrong signals to our one community, which is inclusive and accepting of people and their choices around gender and sexuality.

People from the community have contacted me in support of what is happening in this space, along with conversations we have been having around other things that mystify me, such as gay conversion therapy. For me, it is an obvious next step in our community: to grow and become a modern community where everybody has equal standing and respect.

There is no legitimate excuse for murder under any circumstances and there should be no defence such as gay panic. I am pleased that this has come to the parliament. I am pleased that we are now part of what is happening in every other state, and I support and commend this bill.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (17:41):** I thank the members who have made a contribution to this debate and for their indication of support. There are certainly very important reasons as to why we are promoting this law reform. I feel very proud that our government and the party room have endorsed, with the support of the parliament, the conclusion of this legislation in order to produce much-needed reforms.

There is the gay panic aspect of this, which has been of concern. The member was quite right in referring to the Lindsay case. I am not sure that the Chief Justice suggested it was not ever to be available and that the common law was dead, but maybe they relied on comments he had made to suggest that it was not necessary to progress the legislation.

I certainly had conversations with the former Attorney-General about those matters, but let's be very clear on making an approach for a sexual invitation: although Minister Pisoni suggested that

you can just say no, the reality is that women who have received sexual advances from men have not been able to avail themselves of this absurd scenario of being able to kill somebody as a result. If they had, frankly there would be a lot of dead men around.

This is an important part of reform to, firstly, make sure that we remove the outdated aspects of that and, secondly, that we recognise, in circumstances where somebody has been killed and there has existed a level of abuse and domestic violence that is able to be proportionally recognised, that factor should be taken into account.

There has been a lot of work done by the Commissioner for Victims' Rights, the DPP, SAPOL and a number of other stakeholders. I particularly recognise them because they were very instrumental in ensuring we did not throw out the baby with the bathwater. I also want to recognise the Hon. Mark Parnell, who raised an issue with us arising out of some academic research. A lot of people have made a significant contribution to the development of this law. I am very proud of it. I am deeply appreciative to the parliament for supporting this and I will certainly exercise every endeavour to ensure this law reform comes in as promptly as possible after the passage of the same.

Bill read a second time.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (17:44):** I am advised there is no request to go into committee. Accordingly, I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

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

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 November 2020.)

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (17:45):** I rise to speak as the lead speaker on behalf of the opposition on the Statutes Amendment (Fund Selection and Other Superannuation Matters) Bill. This is a government bill that basically seeks to pick up the initiative that has been twice moved in the other place by the Hon. Connie Bonaros to introduce what is commonly known as choice of fund for South Australian government employees, and other members of public sector superannuation schemes, to give those members the ability to have their superannuation funds in their accounts invested with someone other than, in most cases, the state's Southern State Superannuation Scheme, or Triple S scheme, as it is commonly known.

This initiative has a very long history, even before the initiative of the Hon. Connie Bonaros. There have been repeated requests spanning back at least 20 years, as far as I am aware, particularly by members of the Triple S scheme wanting to have the ability to choose another superannuation fund, not exclusively—and I would not even wager that this falls into the category of the majority of these calls—but is not too hard to imagine that members of the Triple S scheme may want the opportunity, for example, to invest if not in an industry or a retail fund then perhaps in a self-managed super fund.

You might be thinking: why has it taken so long for this initiative to come to this place? Well, basically speaking, there are a couple of reasons. One is that there was, as far as I am aware, a predominant view within the agency responsible for managing these superannuation funds, now called Super SA. There was a long-held view that providing the ability for members to choose a different fund would necessarily diminish the pool of funds available for investment from the superannuation scheme and with that make it more expensive to invest those funds in the various categories of investment. That is to say, with a diminishing pool of funds and a similar cost of administration and investment of those funds, investment costs for each member would necessarily increase, and so on.

There was also at times the argument put that, having fewer funds under management may also affect investment returns but, in my view anyway, that is perhaps not as persuasive an argument as the previous one. More to the point, the overarching concern—in the face of what we have seen pretty much now for the last 25 years from the commonwealth—is the ongoing push from federal treasurers for South Australia to reach an agreement with the commonwealth to remove what is referred to as its constitutionally protected status with regard to the superannuation scheme.

If you consider that a public sector fund like the Triple S scheme enjoys constitutional protection, it basically means that it maintains a tax-exempt status or a tax exemption, at the least, for the moneys paid as contributions into that scheme, both the superannuation guarantee contributions—the mandatory employer contributions—and any additional contributions a member may elect to make themselves. That is a very generous concession, make no bones about it.

The superannuation contributions tax, I think I am right in saying, is currently 15 per cent. If we think about how much the state government spends on employing people and what 9.5 per cent of those employment expenses are, using that as a proxy for the amount of money the state government spends on those superannuation guarantee mandatory contribution payments, it does not take too many calculations to work out that we are talking something in the order of \$100 million in taxation that the commonwealth could be collecting from the South Australian government that it is currently not.

That is a lot of money spread across those members of the schemes. The concern that a move by South Australia towards fund choice might put that at risk has really been at the heart of concerns about whether to move towards a choice of fund arrangement. Of course, that raises the issue of whether that is a reasonable concern, or is that jumping at shadows or fearmongering or similar?

It is certainly my recollection as someone who used to work for a former Treasurer, and also the recollection (to put the words in his mouth) of the member for West Torrens, who was a former state Treasurer, that there was a constant formal communication from federal Treasurers urging the state to give up this constitutional protection and reach an agreement with the commonwealth about the arrangements under which that tax-exempt status would be forfeited.

It is worth bearing in mind that South Australia is the last public sector regime, as far as I am aware, that enjoys this status. It is also the last that does not have choice of fund. The concern is that if South Australia were to change its very unique arrangement here and move towards a choice of fund, that might enliven the interest of the commonwealth, and that would re-enliven those calls from the commonwealth for South Australia to finally submit to the taxation regimes that other public sector funds around the country have done.

It is a bit like that argument about what it takes to change the GST arrangements in Australia. It is not accurately understood by many people what confers this tax exemption or this constitutional protection on the South Australian superannuation schemes. It is not a state instrument that does that: it is a federal instrument. I think it is a schedule to the federal taxation administration Income Tax Assessment Regulations.

Perhaps in that regard it does not even require formal legislative change but merely an amendment to those regulations—that is to say, it is reasonably easily done. As recently as when the current Prime Minister, Scott Morrison, was the federal Treasurer, I am told it was their communication with the state government, urging there to be a change in this regard. That is really the other main concern about why this move has not occurred.

What does this bill propose to do? It proposes to introduce a regime to provide members of the Triple S scheme with a choice of fund. It allows a Triple S scheme member to nominate an eligible fund—one that meets the appropriate standards and is registered and appropriately regulated and so on—and to have those state government employer contributions made to that fund rather than to the public sector Triple S scheme.

It also allows what you could refer to as a partial nomination or what the bill and the explanatory clauses refer to as portability of a portion of your superannuation account balance to another fund, that is, not moving all your arrangements to a fund other than Triple S but maintaining



some of those arrangements but taking some balance out and applying it outside of the Triple S scheme.

It also enables Super SA to try to attract members into the Triple S scheme. If choice of fund is to be allowed, I have been advised in the briefing I received on this bill that Super SA expects to lose some members who will make the choice to go to a different superannuation fund. I am told their best available modelling estimates that 5 to 10 per cent of members of the Triple S scheme may go and presumably a corresponding amount of funds available for investment in the scheme may also leave.

To try to offset that potential reduction of the superannuation fund, Super SA proposes to engage in a strategy of trying to move people back into the Triple S scheme—perhaps we could call them dormant Triple S accounts; perhaps at one point they were a member of the Public Service and they moved on to a different employer—and encouraging them to move their current superannuation arrangements outside of Triple S and consolidate them within Triple S. I am told by Super SA that it is hoped that this choice of fund manoeuvre will have some offsetting benefit to the loss of members and fund balances.

Perhaps with that move of becoming almost a partially open scheme, if we could call it that, where Super SA is able to compete in a very limited way for accounts to be moved or accounts to be re-enlivened within Triple S, moving funds from outside the scheme into the scheme might also enliven the interest of the commonwealth. Perhaps for the commonwealth that has for so long, particularly under conservative federal governments, sought to have these tax-exempt constitutional protection arrangements removed for South Australia, this might also prove enough of an incentive for them to look at doing this.

This bill also proposes—perhaps not a central idea necessary to implement a choice of fund regime—to allow the Super SA Board to be responsible for the employment of staff within Super SA, including the chief executive, rather than the current regime which effectively sees those people employed by virtue of the Treasurer and the Department of Treasury and Finance. They are the three main elements of this bill. Given the hour, perhaps I might suggest to the house that I have leave to continue to my remarks at the next appropriate opportunity.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

At 17:59 the house adjourned until Wednesday 2 December 2020 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE**

**306 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth)** (14 October 2020). On how many occasions, since January 2019, have SAPOL sniffer dogs been invited onto school grounds by school principals to look for drugs under protocols agreed between SAPOL and the education department?

- (a) Which schools invited them?
- (b) On what dates?
- (c) Were any illicit drugs found on any occasion and what action was taken by either the school or SAPOL?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education):**

I refer the member for Elizabeth to the *Hansard* of estimates hearings where these matters were discussed.

**TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT**

**316 The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (14 October 2020). What was the daily traffic count as recorded by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport along Park Terrace, Ovingham, prior to the Park Terrace, Fitzroy Terrace and Torrens Road upgrade in 2015?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised:

Park Terrace, Ovingham, carried an average of approximately 49,400 vehicles per day prior to the upgrade of the Park Terrace/Fitzroy Terrace/Torrens Road/Jeffcott Road intersection in 2015.

**TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT**

**317 The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (14 October 2020). What is the most recent daily traffic count recorded by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport along Park Terrace, Ovingham? Please provide the date of that count?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised:

A traffic count survey conducted on 27 August 2020 indicated that Park Terrace, Ovingham, currently carries an average of approximately 56,200 vehicles per day.

**PORT PIRIE, EMERGENCY SERVICES**

**318 The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome)** (14 October 2020). What was the cost of providing accident and emergency services at the Port Pirie Hospital for 2019-20 and 2018-19, and what is the projected cost for 2020-21?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education):** The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The cost for providing accident and emergency services at Port Pirie Hospital for 2018-19 was \$2.7 million.

The cost for providing accident and emergency services at Port Pirie Hospital for 2019-20 was \$3.5 million.

The projected cost for providing accident and emergency services at Port Pirie Hospital for 2020-21 is \$3.6 million.

**PORT PIRIE, EMERGENCY SERVICES**

**319 The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome)** (14 October 2020). What is the cost of contracting general practitioners to provide accident and emergency services at the Port Pirie Hospital for 2019-20 and 2018-19, and what is the projected cost for 2020-21?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education):** The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

In 2018-19 the cost of contracting general practitioners to provide accident and emergency services at the Port Pirie Hospital was \$1.1 million.

In 2019-20 the cost of contracting general practitioners to provide accident and emergency services at the Port Pirie Hospital was nil, as a locum model was used.

The projected cost for general practitioners to provide accident and emergency services at the Port Pirie Hospital in 2020-21 is nil, as a locum model is being used.

**PORT PIRIE, EMERGENCY SERVICES**

**320 The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome)** (14 October 2020). How many general practitioners (and how many FTE in total) were contracted to provide accident and emergency services at Port Pirie hospital for 2019-20 and 2018-19, and how many are budgeted for 2020-21?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education):** The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

In 2018-19, 13 general practitioners were contracted to provide accident and emergency services at the Port Pirie hospital. The contracted general practitioners were paid on a sessional roster basis.

In 2019-20, nil general practitioners were contracted, as a locum model was used to provide accident and emergency services at Port Pirie hospital.

In 2020-21, nil general practitioners are budgeted to be contracted, as a locum model is being used to provide accident and emergency services at Port Pirie hospital.

**PORT PIRIE, OVERSEAS GENERAL PRACTITIONERS**

**321 The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome)** (14 October 2020). How many overseas general practitioners applied for registration in 2018-19 and 2019-20 to work in Port Pirie?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education):** The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

This information is not held by the state government. Practices and candidates apply to the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency for registration directly in an individual capacity.

**PORT PIRIE, OVERSEAS GENERAL PRACTITIONERS**

**322 The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome)** (14 October 2020). How many overseas general practitioners have in 2018-19 and 2019-20 applied to work in South Australia?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education):** The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

This information is not held by the state government. Practices and candidates apply to the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency for registration directly in an individual capacity.

**PORT PIRIE, OVERSEAS GENERAL PRACTITIONERS**

**323 The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome)** (14 October 2020). How many overseas general practitioners have been approved to work in Port Pirie? How many of those applications were not approved and why?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education):** The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The Yorke and Northern Local Health Network has no direct involvement in general practitioner recruitment for the practices in the town.

The process is undertaken by the practice and the GPs who are applying to Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency directly for consideration of appropriateness of practice in the country.

**FRUIT FLY**

In reply to **Ms BEDFORD (Florey)** (17 November 2020).

**The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):**

Following the detection of maggots in fruit bought at a local retail outlet by a member of the public, an immediate withdrawal from shelf of all mangoes from a Northern Territory producer was undertaken. The member of the public rang the fruit—fly hotline to report the incident on Friday 30 October 2020 and a response commenced immediately on the suspicion the maggots were fruit fly. Molecular testing of those maggots confirmed they are Jarvis' fruit fly—a relative of Queensland fruit fly which is native to the northern parts of Australia.

Jarvis' fruit fly does not occur in South Australia and this detection does not represent an outbreak of fruit fly. Due to the actions of the member of the public in reporting this incident, a product recall has been successful in preventing an incursion of this pest. The fruit entered the state as part of a commercial consignment with documentation indicating compliance with entry protocols.

As part of normal response procedures, a formal incident was raised with the Northern Territory government (where the mangoes originated) to investigate this matter. The producer has been suspended from supplying mangoes to South Australia under the treatment protocol involved until that investigation is completed. Further actions or sanctions will depend on the outcomes of that investigation. Jarvis' fruit fly and Queensland fruit fly are from the same genus of fruit flies (*Bactrocera*). Both are native to the northern parts of Australia and favour tropical to subtropical environments. However, Queensland fruit fly has a wider range along the east coast of Australia. Queensland fruit fly

also has a wider host range compared to Jarvis' fruit fly, but they share several common host fruits. Queensland fruit fly has a higher tolerance towards colder temperatures compared to Jarvis' fruit fly. Mediterranean fruit fly is a different genus of fruit fly altogether and is established in a number of Mediterranean climates across the world. The Mediterranean fruit fly is smaller and develops faster than the other two species.

### *Estimates Replies*

#### **RAIL SERVICES**

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (18 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

The Auditor-General has advised the Passenger Transport Act 1994 prescribes the reporting date so there is no mechanism for an extension of time if the Auditor-General sees fit under that act. The Auditor-General has also advised if additional work is required on the probity processes, he has existing powers under the Public finance and Audit Act 1987 to conduct further work and put in a separate report under that act.

#### **RAIL SERVICES, EY REPORT**

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (18 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

The Auditor-General has advised he has a copy of an Ernst and Young report about rail services.

#### **ACCENTURE**

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (18 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

Details about any financial assistance provided to Accenture is commercial in confidence.

#### **COVID-19 INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS**

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (18 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

The pilot programme covers nine markets: Singapore, Hong Kong, Japan, the Republic of Korea, China, Vietnam, Thailand, Malaysia and Indonesia.

#### **GOVERNMENT CAMPAIGNS**

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (18 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

Yes, various government departments utilise this legitimate and contemporary communications method as a part of their campaign activities. For example, the state regularly utilises influencers and key opinion leaders to entice consumers to visit our state. Influencers are used through social and other media to engage with the intended target audience.

#### **MCGREGOR TAN**

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (18 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

The contract is with the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and is valued at up to \$499,090 excluding GST, over the term of the contract, which commenced on 5 February 2020 and will conclude on 30 June 2021. There is no minimum spend attached to the contract, and no penalty applied if the total amount is not spent.

#### **MCGREGOR TAN**

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (18 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

The contract is for market research services. This may include, if required for the specific project, focus groups.

**MCGREGOR TAN**

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (18 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

Focus groups were conducted ahead of the COVID-19 public information campaign being implemented.

**MCGREGOR TAN**

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (18 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

The research did not ask questions about the Premier's performance during the pandemic. The research did ask questions about trust and confidence in the South Australian government's management of the pandemic.

**PREMIER AND CABINET DEPARTMENT**

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (18 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

Nick Reade will receive a total remuneration package of \$625,000 per annum.

**LOT FOURTEEN**

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (18 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

Five tenants are currently receiving some form of market lease incentive being either rent free periods or capital towards fit-out.

**MEMBER FOR WAITE**

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (18 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

The cost of the investigation was \$5,885.22 including GST.

**ACCOMMODATION ALLOWANCES**

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (18 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

Prior to the operation of Determination No. 9 of 2020 Country Members' Accommodation Allowance claim forms required members to certify the details contained on the claim form by signing and dating the form.

**GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING**

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (18 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

My department is not responsible for allocating the advertising budgets for other state government departments. agencies are responsible for their expenditure allocated for government advertising. This information will be provided from each agency in response to omnibus question 5.

**CYBERSECURITY**

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (18 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

The South Australian government takes cyber security very seriously.

All government agencies must have procedures in place for management and reporting of cyber security events and incidents, including reporting to the Office for Cyber Security within my department and to the Privacy

Committee of South Australia. Due to the sensitive nature of these issues, we do not provide details about specific risks, breaches or issues.

#### PROACTIVE DISCLOSURE MONITORING

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (18 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

Proactive disclosure is governed by Premier and Cabinet Circular 035 Proactive Disclosure of Regularly Requested Information which was developed by State Records and approved by cabinet. Once a circular has been approved by cabinet, it must be followed by ministerial offices (where relevant) and all government departments.

#### VICTIMS OF CRIME FUND

In reply to **Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

Due to the uncertainty regarding future changes to the forward estimates, projections of the balance of the Victims of Crime Fund are not regularly maintained. However, it is projected the balance of the Victims of Crime Fund will be \$174 million as at 30 June 2021.

#### VICTIMS OF CRIME FUND

In reply to **Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

The balance of the Victims of Crime Fund as at 30 June 2019 was \$153.2 million.

#### VICTIMS OF CRIME FUND

In reply to **Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

The balance of the Victims of Crime Fund as at 30 June 2020 was \$158.7 million.

#### VICTIMS OF CRIME LEVY

In reply to **Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

In 2019-20, \$11.9 million of victims of crime levy was collected by way of expiations by SA Police and the Fines Enforcement and Recovery Unit.

#### VICTIMS OF CRIME FUND

In reply to **Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

Due to the uncertainty regarding future changes to the forward estimates, projections regarding the 'surplus' or 'deficit' of the Victims of Crime Fund are not regularly maintained. However, it is projected the 'surplus' of the Victims of Crime Fund will be \$8.8 million in 2020-21.

#### VICTIM SUPPORT SERVICE

In reply to **Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

The Victim Support Service (VSS) previously had eight office locations in Adelaide, Berri, Mount Gambier, Murray Bridge, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, Port Pirie and Whyalla. Relationships Australia South Australia (RASA) currently has 10 office locations where it provides in-person services, located in Adelaide, Hindmarsh, Port Adelaide, Marion, Salisbury, Elizabeth, St Agnes, Berri, Mount Gambier and Port Augusta. Other in-person services are provided via outreach in Gawler, Noarlunga, Clare, Loxton, Barmera, Murray Bridge, Mount Barker, and Ceduna. These locations can be expanded if it is identified there is a need.

**SHERIFF'S OFFICERS**

In reply to **Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

The average budgeted FTEs for the Sheriff's Office is 122 FTE for the 2019-20 financial year.

Forty-three Sheriff's Officers have been subject to disciplinary proceedings in the past five years.

Ten instances of leave have been taken by Sheriff's Officers in the past five years due to stress or mental health issues.

**RESIDENTIAL TENANCY BONDS**

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

As at 30 June 2020, Consumer and Business Services held \$219.2 million in residential tenancy bonds.

**RESIDENTIAL TENANCY BONDS**

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

As at 30 June 2020, Consumer and Business Services held \$13.1 million in unclaimed residential tenancy bonds.

**RESIDENTIAL TENANCY BONDS**

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

In relation to the unclaimed bonds that are held by Consumer and Business Services, 96 per cent relate to tenants and 4 per cent relate to landlords.

**RESIDENTIAL TENANCY BONDS**

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

Based on unclaimed bonds as a proportion of the total assets available for investment at 30 June 2020, unclaimed bonds earned an estimated \$0.2 million in interest and investment distributions in the 2019-20 year.

**LIQUOR LICENSING APPLICATIONS**

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

In relation to the 5,634 liquor licensing applications referred to in the 2019-20 year:

- 1,060 were applications for a new liquor licence (excluding short-term licences);
- 620 were applications to transfer a liquor licence; and
- the remaining 3,954 were applications to vary a licence, whether it be to the licence conditions or changing the licensed area, etc.

**LIQUOR LICENSING APPLICATIONS**

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

In the last quarter of 2019-20, Consumer and Business Services received 162 applications for new liquor licences.

**LIQUOR LICENSING APPLICATIONS**

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

As at 30 November 2020, Consumer and Business Services had received 2,848 liquor licensing applications for the 2020-21 year.

**LIQUOR LICENSING APPLICATIONS**

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

The 2019-20 projection was originally estimated to be significantly lower than 2018-19. This was made on the presumption that 'low-risk' events would not need to lodge an application with Consumer and Business Services (CBS) to obtain a liquor licence and would instead only notify CBS of their event. However, further amendments to the Liquor Licensing Act 1997 removed the proposed notification process, meaning 'low-risk' events were required to lodge an application, albeit with no fee attached. This resulted in more applications being received in 2019-20 than anticipated.

The 2019-20 actual also included an additional 900 short term licences which CBS issued free of charge to permanent licensees to allow them to alter their trading rights when COVID-19 restrictions were put in place. Approximately 800 licences were granted to restaurants to allow them to sell takeaway during this period, and another 100 were granted to allow various licensees to extend their licensed area outdoors to allow more patrons into their premises.

**LIQUOR LICENSING FEES**

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

The following presents a breakdown of the revenue received in 2019-20 by Consumer and Business Services (CBS), as well as the forecast for 2020-21, for each industry or sector regulated by CBS:

Industry	2019-20 Actual \$'000	2020-21 Forecast \$'000
Liquor	4,167	7,273
Builders	11,699	10,927
Plumbers, Gas Fitters and Electricians	5,643	5,170
Real Estate	2,972	2,614
Conveyancers	287	267
Security	4,155	4,299
Second-Hand Vehicle Dealers	746	673
Labour Hire	1,313	212
Associations	88	150
Co-operatives	2	-
Births, Deaths and Marriages	6,326	7,297
Business Names	96	53
Other	3	18
Total	37,497	38,953

**SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSIONER**

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

The table on page 23 of the annual report refers to enquires made under the Small Business Commissioner Act 2011 which includes general enquires about small business issues or small business startups. The Small Business Commissioner advises that the drop in 'small business issues' enquires between April and June 2020 could be accounted to the COVID-19 pandemic where small businesses were experiencing hardship. These enquires have been recorded under the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020.

The below table shows the total number of enquiries received under each relevant Act. It is evident that the number of inquiries under the Small Business Commissioner Act 2011 has decreased from the previous year, however enquiries under the Retail and Commercial Leases Act 1995 have significantly increased and there were 241 inquiries under the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020.



Inquiries by Act	2019-20	2018-19
Small Business Commissioner Act 2011	1,632 (42.08 per cent)	1,659 (49 per cent)
Retail and Commercial Leases Act 1995	1,583 (40.82 per cent)	1,187 (35 per cent)
Building and Construction Industry Security of Payment Act 2009	116 (2.99 per cent)	132 (4 per cent)
COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020	241 (6.21 per cent)	-
Farm Debt Mediation 2018	63 (1.62 per cent)	42 (1.3 per cent)
Local Government Act 1999	2 (0.05 per cent)	15 (0.4 per cent)
Late Payment of Government Debts (Interest) Act 2013	2 (0.05 per cent)	-
Other jurisdictions	239 (6.16 per cent)	348 (10.3 per cent)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,878</b>	<b>3,383</b>

#### SECURITY OF PAYMENT ACT CLAIMS

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

Page 32 of the Small Business Commissioner's annual report outlines the number and monetary amount of claims versus the number and monetary amount of awards under the Building and Construction Security of Payment Act 2009 adjudication process. This adjudication process is conducted by an independent adjudicator appointed by an authorised nominated authority who are required to report their process outcomes to the Small Business Commissioner. The Small Business Commissioner advises that the adjudication process is an independent one and the adjudicator makes a determination after considering all of the relevant documents presented. The Commissioner advises that some claims may not be due and payable or not within the contractual terms.

Total Amount Claimed vs Awarded:

		2019-20 Adjudications	2019-20 Amount	2018-19 Adjudications	2018-19 Amount
ABC Dispute	Claimed	0	\$0	2	\$212,869.10
Resolution Services	Awarded	0	\$0	2	\$151,164.00
Adjudicate Today	Claimed	55	\$15,893,798.13	64	\$32,598,646.51
	Awarded	35	\$3,051,025.32	59	\$10,183,194.38
Australian Solutions	Claimed	3	\$3,095,611.07	1	\$166,792.00
Centre	Awarded	2	\$0	1	\$155,822.70
Master Builders	Claimed	2	\$60,847.80	0	\$0
Association of SA	Awarded	1	\$10,144.20	0	\$0
Nominator	Claimed	2	\$93,528.60	0	\$0
	Awarded	1	\$37,190.22	0	\$0
Resolution Institute	Claimed	1	\$25,043,823.50	13	\$90,851,012.22
	Awarded	2	\$15,754,761.98	11	\$6,466,779.58
RICS Dispute	Claimed	0	\$0	2	\$7,168,272.01
Resolution Services	Awarded	0	\$0	1	\$91,524.14
<b>TOTAL</b>	Claimed	63	\$47,187,609.10	82	\$130,997,591.84
	Awarded	41	\$18,853,121.72	74	\$17,048,484.80

#### INDIGENOUS COMMUNITY MUNICIPAL SERVICES

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

All municipal services infrastructure prioritised for repair and renewal through the municipal services program audit and condition assessment have been included within the \$9.1 million allocated for such purpose by the Government. During recent discussions, however, communities have raised additional needs that were not previously identified. These include more identified areas containing illegally dumped waste (Yalata), the desire to have fresh water, toilet and shower facilities for itinerant Aboriginal people visiting or camping on the outskirts of communities (Davenport, Point Pearce), replacing a water pump and renewing a sewage system following a failed septic soakage pit (Kalparrin). These issues were not identified during the 2019 consultations, where communities did not fully identify their community's facilities and infrastructure needs. Where possible such issues will be addressed within the available funding. If they are considered to be high priority, they may be completed in preference to lower priority projects.

#### INDIGENOUS COMMUNITY MUNICIPAL SERVICES

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

There are 17 municipal services agreements for the provision of municipal services to Aboriginal communities and homelands.

Direct funding is provided to eight communities and homelands—Kalparrin, Raukkan, Koonibba, Oak Valley, Scotdesco, Tia Tuckia, Yalata, Nipapanha, and two Aboriginal Organisations—Ceduna Aboriginal Corp. and Yartawarli Aboriginal Corporation Resource Agency.

The Ceduna Aboriginal Corporation services eight homelands in the Ceduna region, and the Yartawarli Aboriginal Corporation Resource Agency services eight homelands in the northern Flinders region.

Funding is also provided to local councils or a similar authority to provide services on behalf of four communities—Yorke Peninsula Council (Point Pearce), Berri-Barmera (Gerard), Coober Pedy (Umoona), and the Outback Communities Authority (Dunjiba).

Two private providers are engaged for waste collection services—EP Recycling (West Coast Homelands), and Veolia Environmental Solutions (Davenport).

Negotiations regarding revised agreements for the 2021-22 financial year are currently underway. It is anticipated that these will be completed by 31 May 2021, for signing by all parties on 1 July 2021.

#### PLANNING AND DESIGN CODE

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

The total spend from 1 July to 30 November 2020 was \$1.55 million.

This amount does not include any technology related costs or business readiness costs.

#### COUNCIL LEVY

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

The estimated revenue from the council levy in 2020-21 is \$1.3 million.

#### LAND VALUATION

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

The annual general valuation is undertaken as at 1 January each year, in accordance with the Valuation of Land Act 1971 (VL Act) and Valuation of Land Regulations 2020 which inform the parameters by which the valuations are undertaken. Valuations are undertaken on the basis of highest and best use of the unencumbered estate in fee simple—except where the valuation needs to have regard to the notional value provisions of s 22A of the VL Act. Both site and capital values are the capital amount for which the land should exchange as at the Date of valuation between a willing buyer and willing seller in an arm's length transaction, after proper marketing and where the parties had each acted knowledgeably, prudently and without compulsion—in accordance with *Spencer v Commonwealth* 1907. The highest and best use is what would result in the highest value for an asset and is determined by what is physically possible, financially feasible and legally allowed. In accordance with best valuation practice, there are a number of high-level assumptions in the determination of value. They include, but are not limited to, the following:

- The land is capable of being separately sold.
- The estate in fee simple in the land to be valued is unencumbered and the valuation is not of the taxpayer's interest in the land.
- The willing buyer and willing seller are hypothetical.

As mentioned, there are parameters within the VL Act and Regulations, such as the assumption for site value that improvements on the land, which are not exhausted are assumed to have not been made, except where those improvements are in the nature of site works such as clearing of timber, scrub or other vegetation. However, it has been supposed that the subject question tends to assumptions specific to the coming 1 January 2021 general valuation. Notwithstanding these comments, there are no specific assumptions pertinent to the coming year. As research is still ongoing up to and beyond the date of valuation until gazettal in May 2021 and noting the potentially disruptive forces of COVID-19 on the property market, there is not currently a clear forecast as to the value changes expected (for residential or commercial).

**LAND VALUATION**

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

In anticipation of the 1 January 2021 general valuation, the Valuer-General has instructed her service provider, Land Services SA to undertake a research report as to the impacts of COVID-19 on the property market. This report includes both qualitative and quantitative research and analysis to inform her position. In order to understand the impacts closest to the date of valuation 1 January 2021, industry engagement and research is at its peak at this time and therefore, the results are not yet clear. There is also a significant amount of market commentary relating to this topic which is, at times, conflicting in nature. As such, it would currently be premature to elaborate on the current investigations.

**SHERIFF'S OFFICERS**

In reply to **the Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

For the period 1 January 2016 to 30 June 2020 the total number of claims of bullying made by Sheriff's Officers to the CAA was 12. 11 were investigated and 2 came back in favour of the Sheriff's Officer who made the bullying claim (that being the allegations were substantiated/proven):

Year	No. of CAA complaints of Bullying & Harassment	No. Investigated	No. in favour (i.e. allegations proven/substantiated)	Not substantiated or insufficient evidence to support claim
2016	5	5	2	3
2017	4	3	-	4
2018	3	3	-	3
2019	-	-	-	-
to 30/6/2020	-	-	-	-

**GOODS AND SERVICES**

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

(a) Attorney-General's Department (Controlled)

	2020-21 \$'000	2021-22 \$'000	2022-23 \$'000	2023-24 \$'000	2024-25 \$'000
General supplies & services	146 868	145 670	140 968	141 449	144 066

Public Trustee

	2020-21 \$'000	2021-22 \$'000	2022-23 \$'000	2023-24 \$'000	2024-25 \$'000
General supplies & services	5 547	5 486	5 799	5 593	5 756

(c) Attorney-General's Department

	Goods and Services Provider	Cost \$m	Description
1	Department for Infrastructure and Transport	16.634	Office accommodation
2	DXC Enterprise Australia Pty Ltd	3.868	ICT support services
3	Department of Premier and Cabinet	2.964	Telephony and internet services
4	NEC Australia Pty Ltd	1.983	ICT support services
5	Telstra Corporation Ltd	1.581	Telephony services
6	DPTI—Building Management	1.386	Building maintenance
7	Data 3 Ltd	1.263	ICT support services
8	SRA Information Technology Pty Ltd	1.233	ICT support services
9	Siemens Healthcare Pty Ltd	1.082	Medical equipment
10	Hays Specialist Recruitment	0.952	Temporary staff

Public Trustee

	Goods and Services Provider	Cost \$m	Description
1	Department for Infrastructure and Transport	2.154	Office accommodation
2	Crown Solicitor's Office	0.425	Outposted lawyers
3	SAICORP	0.324	Corporate Insurance Policy
4	DXC Technology	0.283	IT support services
5	Department of Premier and Cabinet	0.282	Telephony and Internet Services
6	Auditor General's Department	0.228	Audit Services
7	Toll Transport Pty Ltd	0.206	Mail and Courier Services
8	Attorney General's Department	0.192	HR and IT Network support
9	Randstad Pty Ltd	0.150	Temporary Staff
10	PricewaterhouseCoopers	0.112	Internal Audit and Risk

- (c) Refer above.
- (d) Treasurer's office to provide response.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

Between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020, there were four executive roles abolished and three executive roles created within the Attorney-General's Department (including Public Trustee). Details of these roles are outlined below:

Executive roles abolished:

- Managing Solicitor, Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions
- Senior Solicitor, Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions
- Executive Solicitor, Crown Solicitor's Office
- Director, Internal Consulting, Fines Enforcement and Recovery Unit

The total employment cost for these four roles was \$927,000 (including superannuation).

Executive roles created:

- Director, Financial Services
- Executive Solicitor, Environment and Planning Group, Crown Solicitor's Office
- Director, Business Services, Crown Solicitor's Office

The total employment cost for these three roles was \$586,000 (including superannuation).

#### GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised that for the Attorney-General's Department (including the Public Trustee):

- 8.65 FTEs were allocated to communication and promotion functions during 2019-20, costing \$0.937 million.
- The table below outlines the budgeted FTEs and estimated employment costs across the forward estimates.

Year	No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities	Estimated Employment Expense (\$m)
2020-21	9.25	1.051
2021-22	9.25	1.045
2022-23	9.25	1.061
2023-24	9.25	1.072

- As an open and transparent Government, Marketing Communications Activity Reports and Annual Media Expenditure details are proactively disclosed. The reports list all marketing campaigns over the cost of \$50,000 and are disclosed on the DPC website:

<https://www.dpc.sa.gov.au/about-the-department/accountability/government-marketing-advertising-expenditure>.

**PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES**

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

Attraction allowances, retention allowances and non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 are outlined in the table below:

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
Senior Solicitor	LEC5	Retention	\$25,000
Senior Solicitor	LEC5	Retention	\$18,333
Manager Service Delivery	MAS3	Retention	\$20,000
Manager Facilities & Security	MAS3	Retention	\$18,070
2020 Upgrade Network Manager—SACAD	MAS3	Retention	\$15,000
Team Leader Application Specialist—SACAD	ASO7	Retention	\$17,000
Manager Commercial	ASO8	Retention	\$12,267
Senior Legal Officer—State Redress Scheme	LEC5	Retention	\$19,000
Manager SACAD Services	MAS3	Retention	\$24,093
Manager Service Delivery	MAS3	Retention	\$20,000
Manager Investment Services, Public Trustee	ASO8	Retention	\$25,000
Senior Specialist Forensic Science*	Senior Consultant	Retention	\$84,764
Senior Specialist Forensic Science*	Senior Consultant	Retention	\$50,858
Senior Specialist Forensic Science*	Senior Consultant	Retention	\$84,764
Senior Specialist Forensic Science*	Senior Consultant	Retention	\$84,764
Senior Specialist Forensic Science*	Senior Consultant	Retention	\$84,764
Senior Specialist Forensic Science*	Senior Consultant	Retention	\$84,764

\*Note that the Forensic Science SA staff listed above receive an attraction/retention allowance as part of their enterprise bargaining agreement.

**MINISTERIAL STAFF**

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised the following in relation to staff employed within my office:

Ministerial staff employed as at 17 July was published in the *Government Gazette* on 23 July 2020.

Due to changes in ministerial portfolios, the following table lists public sector staff employed as at 23 November 2020.

Title	Classification	Non-salary benefits
Chief of Staff	MINCOS	Car park
Senior Ministerial Adviser	MIN000	Car park
Ministerial Adviser	MIN000	Car park
Ministerial Adviser	MIN000	Car park
Ministerial Adviser	MIN000	Car park
Ministerial Adviser	MIN000	Nil
Ministerial Liaison Officer	PO3	Nil
Ministerial Liaison Officer	LEC5	Nil
Ministerial Liaison Officer	LEC2	Nil
Ministerial Liaison Officer	ASO5	Nil
Manager, Office of Deputy Premier	ASO8	Nil
Personal Assistant to Deputy Premier	ASO6	Nil
Parliament and Cabinet Officer	ASO5	Nil
Liaison Officer	ASO4	Nil
Senior Admin Officer	ASO4	Nil
Admin Support Officer	ASO3	Nil
Admin Support Officer	ASO3	Nil
Admin Support Officer	ASO3	Nil

There are no staff seconded to my office in addition to the funded positions listed in the above table.

**TERMINATIONS PAYOUTS**

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

There were no executive termination payments made by the Attorney-General's Department or the Public Trustee during 2019-20.

#### EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

The following new executive appointments have been made by the Attorney-General's Department and the Public Trustee since July 2019 (excluding contract renewals):

Position	Total employment cost (TEC)
Assistant Crown Advocate	\$230,048
Director, Regulation and Advice, Consumer and Business Services	\$219,000
Director, Public Safety Solutions	\$210,000
Special Counsel	\$184,307
Executive Solicitor, Environment & Planning Group (job shared role)	\$115,024
Executive Solicitor, Environment & Planning Group (job shared role)	\$115,024
Director, Financial Services	\$183,600
Director, Business Services, Crown Solicitor's Office	\$172,000

In most cases, existing positions were abolished or reconfigured to create these roles.

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** In response to questions 14 and 15 I have been advised the following:

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2019-20 and across the forward estimates for the Attorney-General's Department—Controlled:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2019-20 Actual \$000	2020-21 Budget \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000
Australia New Zealand Policing Advisory Agency (ANZPAA) National Institute of Forensic Science	Contribution to National Institute of Forensic Science	41	41	41	41	41
Australian Institute of Conveyancers (SA) Professional Development Program and Public Advisory Service	Provide an advice service and educate conveyancers or members of the public about conveyancing matters or issues	159	209	209	209	209
Australian Institute of Criminology Research Grants	The Australian Institute of Criminology is Australia's national research and knowledge centre on crime and justice and seeks to promote justice and reduce crime by undertaking and communicating evidence-based research to inform policy and practice	15	16	17	17	17
Australian National Research Organisation for Women's Safety Limited (ANROWS)	Contribution to deliver relevant and translatable research evidence which drives policy and practice leading to a reduction in the levels of violence against women and their children	20	—	—	—	—
Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration	Research into judicial administration and the development and conduct of educational programmes for judicial officers, court administrators and members of the	15	15	—	—	—

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2019-20 Actual \$000	2020-21 Budget \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000
	legal profession in relation to court administration and judicial systems					
Australian Pro Bono Centre	Services for promoting and supporting pro bono work	7	7	—	7	—
Australian Sports Commission—'Play by the Rules'	Deliver education and training that supports environments that are safe, fair and inclusive for sport and recreation	5	5	5	5	5
AustLii Foundation Ltd	To improve access to justice through better access to information	2	2	—	—	—
CCTV grants	To increase community safety	15	—	—	—	—
Communication Partner Program	To support people with complex communication needs who come into contact with the criminal justice system	255	—	—	—	—
Community Legal Services	Provides both generalist and family law/family violence legal services in South Australia	5,403	12,175	12,392	12,587	12,776
Bushfire Legal Assistance Services	Provision of Cth funding to the Legal Assistance Sector for the 2019-20 bushfires	292	583	—	—	—
COVID-19 Legal Assistance Services	Provision of Cth funding to the Legal Assistance Sector to help address the impact of COVID-19	2,641	2,289	—	—	—
Crime Prevention and Community Safety Grants	Increase community safety	105	108	—	—	—
Drug Court	Provide general legal defence services for defendants referred to and or accepted into the Drug Court Program	165	188	193	198	203
Financial Counselling and Advocacy Service	Financial counselling and advocacy services for tenants with low financial literacy	128	131	134	138	141
Indigenous Justice Clearinghouse	To reduce Indigenous over-representation in the criminal justice system and improve safety in Indigenous communities	14	14	—	—	—
Land tenure data and mapping services	Land tenure data and mapping services for Native Title claims	330	330	330	330	330
National Coronial Information System contribution	The National Coronial Information System is a data repository containing information about deaths reported to a Coroner in Australia and New Zealand	39	40	41	41	42
National Criminal Court Statistics Unit (NCCSU) contribution	State contribution to the NCCSU to compile, analyse, publish and disseminate uniform national criminal courts statistics, subject to the provisions of the <i>Census and Statistics Act 1905</i>	22	23	23	23	23
National Motor Vehicle Theft Reduction Council contribution	Contribution to deliver continuous and sustainable vehicle theft reduction in Australia by advancing reform and cooperation between industry, government and community stakeholders	33	33	33	33	33
Operation Flinders Foundation	Provides a crime prevention program for young offenders and young people at risk of reoffending	477	477	489	—	—
Professor Ross Vining Forensic Research Grant	Provide funding for collaborative research to improve casework	50	50	50	50	50
Real Estate Institute of SA Professional	Provide an educational program and advisory service for the benefit	257	257	257	257	257

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2019-20 Actual \$000	2020-21 Budget \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000
Development Program and Public Advisory Service	of agents, sales representatives and members of the public					
Safe City CCTV	To support the maintenance of the CCTV network owned by the Adelaide City Council	112	—	—	—	—
Street Crime Initiative (Repay SA)	To provide skills, training and where appropriate qualifications linked to the community work that offenders undertake	290	298	306	314	322
South Australian Law Reform Institute	To provide funding for administrative support	39	40	41	42	43

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2019-20 and across the forward estimates for the Attorney-General's Department—Administered:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2019-20 Actual \$000	2020-21 Budget \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000
Child Abuse Protection Fund	To fund work which protects children	407	416	425	434	444
Justice Rehabilitation Fund	To fund programs and facilities that will further crime prevention and rehabilitation strategies	33	—	—	—	—
Legal Services Commission	Legal Aid Services (including Commonwealth funding)	17,411	42,804	43,687	43,715	44,639
State Expensive Criminal Cases	Reimburse Legal Services Commission for expensive criminal cases	469	995	400	400	400
Victims of Crime grants	Grants to advance the interests of victims of crime or assist in the prevention of crime	4,856	2,784	2,881	2,935	3,011

The following table details the new commitment of grants in 2019-20 for the Attorney-General's Department—Controlled:

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Australia New Zealand Policing Advisory Agency (ANZPAA) National Institute of Forensic Science	Victoria Police	Contribution to National Institute of Forensic Science	41
Australian Institute of Conveyancers (SA) Professional Development Program and Public Advisory Service	Australian Institute of Conveyancers SA Division	Provide an advice service and educate conveyancers or members of the public about conveyancing matters or issues	159
Australian Institute of Criminology Research Grants	Australian Institute of Criminology	The Australian Institute of Criminology is Australia's national research and knowledge centre on crime and justice and seeks to promote justice and reduce crime by undertaking and communicating evidence-based research to inform policy and practice	15
Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration grant	Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration	Research into judicial administration and the development and conduct of educational programmes for judicial officers, court administrators and members of the legal profession in relation to court administration and judicial systems	15
Australian National Research Organisation for Women's Safety Limited (ANROWS)	Department of Human Services	Contribution to deliver relevant and translatable research evidence which drives policy and practice leading to a reduction in the levels of violence against women and their children	20



Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Australian Pro Bono Centre	Australian Pro Bono Centre—University of NSW	Supporting pro bono work throughout the legal profession	7
Australian Sports Commission—'Play by the Rules'	Australian Sports Commission	Deliver education and training that supports environments that are safe, fair and inclusive for sport and recreation	5
AustLii Foundation Ltd	AustLii Foundation Ltd	To improve access to justice through better access to information	2
CCTV Grants	The District Council of the Copper Coast	CCTV cameras for the Kadina CBD to increase community safety	15
Communication Partner Program	Uniting Communities	To support people with complex communication needs who come into contact with the criminal justice system	255
Community Legal Services	Legal Services Commission	Provides both generalist and family law/family violence legal services in South Australia	320
Community Legal Services	Northern Community Legal Service	As above	823
Community Legal Services	SA Council for Community Legal Services	As above	85
Community Legal Services	Southern Community Justice Centre	As above	1,351
Community Legal Services	Uniting Communities	As above	988
Community Legal Services	Westside Community Lawyers	As above	867
Community Legal Services	Women's Legal Service	As above	969
Crime Prevention and Community Safety	Encounter Youth Hindley Street Program	Increase community safety	105
Drug Court	Legal Services Commission	Provide general legal defence services for defendants referred to and or accepted into the Drug Court Program	155
Drug Court	Aboriginal Legal Rights	As above	10
Financial Counselling and Advocacy Service	Anglicare SA Inc.	Financial counselling and advocacy services for tenants with low financial literacy	128
Indigenous Justice Clearinghouse	Department of Justice (NSW)	To reduce Indigenous over-representation in the criminal justice system and improve safety in Indigenous communities	14
Land tenure data and mapping services	Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Land tenure data and mapping services for Native Title claims	330
Legal Assistance Funding for Bushfire support	Legal Services Commission, Community Legal Centres SA	Provision of Commonwealth funding to the Legal Assistance sector for the 2019-20 bushfires	292
Legal Assistance Funding for COVID-19	Legal Services Commission, Community Legal Centres SA, Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement (ALRM), Family Violence Legal Service Aboriginal Corporation (FVLSAC)	Provision of Commonwealth funding to the Legal Assistance sector to help address the impact of COVID-19	2,641
National Coronial Information System contribution	Department of Justice and Regulation	The National Coronial Information System is a data repository containing information about deaths reported to a Coroner in Australia and New Zealand	39
National Criminal Court Statistics Unit (NCCSU) contribution	Australian Bureau of Statistics	State contribution to the NCCSU to compile, analyse, publish and disseminate uniform national criminal courts statistics, subject to the provisions of the Census and Statistics Act 1905	22

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
National Motor Vehicle Theft Reduction Council contribution	South Australia Police	Contribution to deliver continuous and sustainable vehicle theft reduction in Australia by advancing reform and cooperation between industry, government and community stakeholders	33
Operation Flinders Foundation Exercise	Operation Flinders Foundation	Provides a crime prevention program for young offenders and young people at risk of reoffending.	477
Professor Ross Vining Forensic Research Grant	Flinders University of South Australia	Provide funding for collaborative research to improve casework	50
Real Estate Institute of SA Professional Development Program and Public Advisory Service	Real Estate Institute of SA	Provide an educational program and advisory service for the benefit of agents, sales representatives and members of the public	257
Safe City CCTV	Adelaide City Council	To support the maintenance of the CCTV network owned by the Adelaide City Council	112
Street Crime Initiative (Repay SA)	Department for Correctional Services	To provide skills, training and where appropriate qualifications linked to the community work that offenders undertake	290
South Australian Law Reform Institute	South Australian Law Reform Institute	To provide funding for administrative support	39

The following table details the new commitment of grants in 2019-20 for the Attorney-General's Department—Administered:

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Child Abuse Protection Fund	Southern Adelaide Local Health Network	To fund work which protects children	44
Child Abuse Protection Fund	Women's and Children's Health Network	As above	44
Child Abuse Protection Fund	Northern Adelaide Local Health Network	As above	44
Child Abuse Protection Fund	Crown Solicitor's Office	As above	138
Child Abuse Protection Fund	Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions	As above	37
Child Abuse Protection Fund	Power Community Limited	Aboriginal Power Cup sponsorship	100
Justice Rehabilitation Fund	Hutt Street Traders Association	Purchase and installation of safety equipment on Hutt Street	33
Legal Aid Services	Legal Services Commission (LSC)—includes Commonwealth funding	Payment to LSC to provide legal aid services to the community	17,411
State Expensive Criminal Cases	Legal Services Commission (LSC)	Reimburse LSC for expensive criminal cases	469
Victims of Crime grants	Family Safety Framework grant (DHS)	To advance the interests of victims of crime or assist in the prevention of crime	143
Victims of Crime grants	Victim Support Service	As above	2,303
Victims of Crime grants	Women's Domestic Violence Court Assistance Service	As above	484

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Victims of Crime grants	Women's and Children's Hospital—Yarrow Place Rape and Sexual Assault Service	As above	119
Victims of Crime grants	Women's and Children's Hospital—Yarrow Place Country Response grant	As above	302
Victims of Crime grants	Northern Adelaide Local Health—Victim's register: Forensic mentally ill offenders	As above	110
Victims of Crime grants	Northern Adelaide Local Health—Court Diversion Service	As above	147
Victims of Crime grants	State Redress Response Unit	As above	546
Victims of Crime grants	Department for Child Protection	As above	197
Victims of Crime grants	Homicide Victims Support group	As above	7
Victims of Crime grants	Road Trauma Support Team SA	As above	96
Victims of Crime grants	Women's Safety Service Crisis Hotline (DHS)	As above	410

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

The government has provided a complete list of grants paid during 2019-20 in question 14.

#### GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

The annual reports published for each of the agencies I am responsible for will contain this information.

#### GOODS AND SERVICES

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised of the following for the Courts Administration Authority:

Goods and services budget for 2020-21 and the forward estimates:

Year	Goods & Services Budget (\$'000)
2020-21	\$30,353
2021-22	\$26,614
2022-23	\$25,883
2023-24	\$25,887
2024-25	\$26,080

Top 10 providers of goods and services:

Provider	2019-20 Spend	Description
Department for Infrastructure and Transport.	3,373,749	Maintenance and minor works across court sites
South Australia Police	2,785,392	Public Private Partnership (PPP) and Police Security Services Branch service
Academy Services Pty Ltd	1,565,761	Office cleaning
Simec Zen Energy	1,305,586	Electricity
DXC Enterprise Australia Pty	1,226,718	Whole of Government Mainframe managed by Department of the Premier and Cabinet
Access Testing Pty Ltd	723,765	Developer testing service. Outsource testing for ECMS project
Thomson Reuters (Prof) Aust	675,418	Library materials, including loose leaf subscriptions, database subscriptions and books
NEC IT Services Australia Pty	643,005	Whole of Government for Major IT Contracts—Server and Network Support
OARS SA	606,147	Drug Treatment Services
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	584,570	Telephone charges

The value of goods and services supplied by South Australian suppliers will be provided by the Treasurer's office.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised of the following positions with an estimated cost of \$100,000 or more were abolished:

Job Title	Estimated Employment Cost
Magistrate	\$ 335,760
Exec. Dir. Strategy & Court Operations	\$ 272,391
Director—Executive Projects	\$ 138,441
Manager Accounting Services	\$ 126,535
Manager Probates Service	\$ 112,786
Court Reporter Level 4	\$ 112,786
Court Reporter Level 4	\$ 112,786
Court Reporter Level 4	\$ 112,786
Youth Justice Co-ordinator	\$ 110,702
Youth Justice Co-ordinator	\$ 105,750
Senior Case Manager	\$ 105,750
Senior Case Manager	\$ 103,310
Senior AJO Northern	\$ 103,310

I have been advised that the following positions with an estimated cost of \$100,000 or more were created:

Job Title	Estimated Employment Cost
Judicial Registrar	\$ 170,731
Project Manager—AVL	\$ 136,081
Team Leader—TIC	\$ 112,802
Senior Facilities Officer	\$ 112,786
Deputy Registrar of Probates	\$ 111,003
Deputy Registrar of Probates	\$ 111,003
Team Leader—Abuse Prevention Program	\$ 109,667

#### GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised that for the Courts Administration Authority:

As at 30 June 2020, 1.0 FTE was allocated to communication and promotion functions, costing \$110,560.

- The table below outlines the budgeted FTEs and estimated employment costs:

Year	No of FTEs budgeted to provide communication and promotion activities	Estimated employment expense
2020-21	1.0	110,560
2021-22	1.0	112,218
2022-23	1.0	113,902
2023-24	1.0	115,610

- The CAA did not incur any advertising or campaign expenditure in 2019-20. No expenditure is budgeted in 2020-21.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised of the following for the Courts Administration Authority:

Attraction allowances, retention allowances and non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020:

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Annual Allowance
ECMS Project Manager	MAS-3	Retention	\$23,733
On-line Services Lead, ECMS	ASO-8	Attraction	\$11,411
Manager, Program Management Office	MAS-3	Retention	\$10,000
Project Manager, AVL	ASO-8	Attraction	\$11,841
ECMS Configuration Specialist	ASO-5	Retention	\$15,806
Senior Project Officer (ECMS, Communications specialist)	ASO-5	Retention	\$5,000
Judicial Systems Trainer	ASO-6	Retention	\$9,278
Registrar Probates	LE-2	Retention	\$15,000

#### MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised the following in relation to staff employed within my office:

The Courts Administration Authority does not have any ministerial staff employed within ministerial offices.

#### TERMINATIONS PAYOUTS

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised that for the Courts Administration Authority:

There has been NIL executive terminations since 1 July 2019.

#### EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised that the following executive appointments have been made since 1 July 2019:

Position	Date	Annual Salary	Total employment cost
Principal Registrar Higher Courts	7 October 2020	\$204,000	\$214,098
Executive Director, Corporate Services	12 October 2020	\$259,544	\$272,391
Director Court Services	12 October 2020	\$167,500	\$175,791

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised that there has been no budgeted or actual expenditure on grant programs by the Courts Administration Authority for the 2019-20 financial year. No grant expenditure is budgeted by the Courts Administration Authority for the 2020-21, 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24 financial years.

**GRANT PROGRAMS**

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised that no grants were paid by the Courts Administration Authority during 2019-20.

**GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS**

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised that no new sections have been established by the Courts Administration Authority since 1 July 2019.

**GOODS AND SERVICES**

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

For the Electoral Commission SA:

- \$2,936,000 is budgeted to be spent on goods and services for 2020-21, \$13,375,000 for 2021-22, \$7,230,000 for 2022-23, and \$2,717,000 for 2023-24.
- The top 10 providers of goods and services by value to the agency for 2019-20 and a description and the cost to the agency of those goods and/or services is as follows:

Providers	\$	Description
Australian Electoral Commission	1,317,498.18	Maintenance and provision of electoral roll
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	556,946.82	Property rent and occupancy
Hays Specialist Recruitment	150,539.76	Contract staff
GIS People	125,000.00	Funding & Disclosure portal
Australia Post	110,195.10	Postage
Abacus Cash Systems	99,000.00	Counting machines
Crown Solicitor's Office	93,540.59	Legal advice
Department of Premier & Cabinet	54,789.82	ICT operating infrastructure
Wavemaker	45,915.09	Statutory media placement for elections
TCB Transport	45,279.00	Transport, storage and warehouse

For Administered Items for the Electoral Commission SA:

- \$899,000 is budgeted to be spent on goods and services for 2020-21, \$503,000 for 2021-22, \$515,000 for 2022-23, and \$753,000 for 2023-24.
- The top 10 providers of goods and services by value to the agency for 2019-20 and a description and the cost to the agency of those goods and/or services is as follows:

Providers	\$	Description
Department of Treasury and Finance	389,543.65	Remittance of expiation fees received
Liberal Party (SA Division)	128,279.00	Special Assistance Funding Claims paid
Australian Labour Party (SA Branch)	128,279.00	Special Assistance Funding Claims paid
Australian Greens (SA)	74,830.00	Special Assistance Funding Claims paid
SA Best Inc	74,830.00	Special Assistance Funding Claims paid
Wavemaker	52,855.70	Media placement (Boundaries Commission)
Thomas Besanko	24,016.00	Counsel assisting the Boundaries Commission
Department of Premier & Cabinet	3,757.06	Internet hosting (Boundaries Commission)
Eureka Printing	1,557.28	Printing reports (Boundaries Commission)

Providers	\$	Description
Advance SA	1,171.28	Special Assistance Funding Claims paid

The Treasurer's office will provide a response to the question regarding the value of the goods and services that was supplied to the agency by South Australian suppliers.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

Between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020, there were no executive roles abolished within the Electoral Commission SA. During this period there were no executive roles created.

There were no employment costs as no executive roles were abolished or created during the period.

#### GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

For the Electoral Commission SA:

- No FTEs were employed to provide communication and promotion activities in 2019-20. There was no employment expense as no FTEs were employed during this period.
- No FTEs are budgeted to provide communication and promotion activities in 2020-21, 2021-22, 2022-23 and 2023-24. There is no employment expense as no FTEs are budgeted to be employed during these periods.
- There was no government-paid advertising, including campaigns, across all mediums in 2019-20 and none is budgeted 2020-21.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

No attraction allowances, retention allowances or non-salary benefits were paid to public servants or contractors by the Electoral Commission SA between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020.

#### MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised the following in relation to staff employed within my office:

- Ministerial staff employed as at 17 July was published in the *Government Gazette* on 23 July 2020.
- No public sector staff from the Electoral Commission SA were employed within my office or seconded to my office as at 30 June 2020. There were no employment costs as no public sector staff were employed or seconded.

#### TERMINATIONS PAYOUTS

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

No executive level employees have been terminated from the Electoral Commission SA since 1 July 2019.

#### EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

No new executive appointments were made within the Electoral Commission SA since 1 July 2019. There was no employment cost as no new executive appointments were made during the period.

**GRANT PROGRAMS**

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

The Electoral Commission SA had no grant programs or funds for the 2019-20 financial year and has no grant programs or funds for the 2020-21, 2022-23 and 2023-24 financial years.

**GRANT PROGRAMS**

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

No grants were paid by the Electoral Commission SA for the period of 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020. No grant agreements were signed by the Electoral Commission SA during the period.

**GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS**

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (23 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised:

No new sections were established within the Electoral Commission SA since 1 July 2019.

**TARGETED LEAD ABATEMENT PROGRAM**

In reply to **the Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining):** I have been advised:

Yes. In calendar year 2020, the Targeted Lead Abatement Program budgeted \$520,000 of funding for the Port Pirie Environmental Health Centre. Of this amount, \$420,000 is to employ three additional caseworkers to enable the centre to engage with and provide its services to more children's families in Port Pirie. The remaining \$100,000 is to enable the centre to deliver lead exposure reduction services to high risk families for children with elevated blood lead levels. The government also contributes to TLAP through the Department for Health and Wellbeing's annual operational funding for the Port Pirie Environmental Health Centre.

**TARGETED LEAD ABATEMENT PROGRAM**

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining):** I have been advised:

Nyrstar and the Department for Energy and Mining developed the Targeted Lead Abatement Program (TLAP) review terms of reference as required by the TLAP Agreement, to which Nyrstar and the state are both parties, which was made in 2014. The review commenced on 26 May 2020 and extensive consultation was undertaken. The Mayor of Port Pirie, local state and federal members of parliament, and Port Pirie community members were all consulted during the review. The final report was received on 24 August 2020.

**TARGETED LEAD ABATEMENT PROGRAM**

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining):** I have been advised:

The TLAP Committee comprises an independent chairperson and three members from both Nyrstar and the State Government.

The current members are:

1. Ms Julie Mitchell, Independent Chairperson
2. Ms Gail Bartel, Communication Manager, Nyrstar Port Pirie
3. Mr Adrian Beerworth, Regional Counsel, Nyrstar Australia
4. Mr Jim Tyler, Environment Manager, Nyrstar Port Pirie—until November 2020
5. Dr Roger Kirchner, Chief Executive Officer, Yorke and Northern Local Health Network
6. Associate Professor Rob Thomas, Chief Scientific Advisor, Department for Energy and Mining



7. Ms Julieann Riedstra, Chief Operating Officer, Department for Education

#### **NYRSTAR**

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining):** I have been advised:

Nyrstar has committed up to \$3 million per year to the Targeted Lead Abatement Program (TLAP) since it commenced in 2014. From this, Nyrstar has been able to use \$660,000 for on-site lead emission reduction and dust suppression and cleaning initiatives that contribute to a key TLAP objective of reducing lead exposure to the community. This may include for capital expenditure items.

#### **ELECTRANET**

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining):** I have been advised:

The government has underwritten early works activities from ElectraNet and TransGrid as part of the \$200 million commitment to expedite the delivery of an interconnector to New South Wales.

#### **SOLAR ENERGY**

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining):** I have been advised:

Relevant agents are appointed by solar customers and have the ability to manage a customer's solar generation in an electricity supply emergency in response to a lawful direction to do so. We have observed a competitive market for relevant agent services, with numerous fee free services available. Many fee-based offerings include an external hardware device to monitor and control the solar generation and provide other services to help a consumer reduce their energy costs. Services may include monitoring as well as managing controlled loads and household appliances. Therefore, free and paid offers cannot be compared.

#### **HOME BATTERY SCHEME**

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining):** I have been advised:

The regulations preserve the ability of a battery system to be charged by the customer's solar generation and discharge to supply the household when the grid is unavailable. Battery backup arrangements were first discussed at the July stakeholder forum between officials and stakeholders. The stakeholder view expressed at the forum was that the wiring guideline could ensure battery backup was not impacted.

Accordingly, the Office of the Technical Regulator worked collaboratively with stakeholders to ensure the wiring guideline included smart meter wiring options which enable a battery to be charged by the customer's solar generation and discharged to supply the household when the grid is unavailable, whilst still meeting the standards implemented on 28 September 2020. It is up to the installer as to how they configure the battery backup arrangements. I am advised that there are numerous options or arrangements that are possible, depending on the equipment used and the customer's needs.

#### **HOME BATTERY SCHEME**

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining):** I have been advised:

The Office of the Industry Advocate undertakes periodic audits and maintains a SA Products and Services register which includes an assessment of the production facilities of the home battery manufacturers participating in the Home Battery Scheme. The SA Products and Services register currently lists Eguana Pty Ltd as Manufacturing in addition to Assembly/Supply/Install operations, and lists Alpha-ESS as undertaking Assembly/Supply/Install operations.

#### **GAS PRICES**

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining):** I have been advised:

The Australian Energy Market Operator is of the view that the long-term gas price could range from between \$8 to around \$12 per gigajoule. The draft 2021 Inputs, Assumptions and Scenarios Report will commence formal consultation on the scenarios, inputs and assumptions proposed for use in the Australian Energy Market Operator's 2021-22 forecasting and planning activities. The gas price projections in the draft report, which will be a key input into the 2021 Gas Statement of Opportunities, indicate that from 2030 the forecast long-term delivered gas price for industrial customers in South Australia will be around \$8.50 to \$11 per gigajoule.

#### SAVINGS TARGETS

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining):** I have been advised:

No.

In the period 2018-19 through 2023-24, the department will have implemented savings totalling \$51.6 million, of which \$18 million has been met through the implementation of revenue and cost recovery measures.

#### ROAD FUNDING

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised:

Of the \$6.9 billion in road funding, \$3 billion is the commonwealth funded component.

#### GAMMIE, MR F.

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised:

In the 2019-20 financial year, Mr Fergus Gammie was paid \$657,140.00 (GST inclusive) by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

#### TRAIN SERVICES

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised:

The contract has been uploaded onto Tenders SA, based on an eight-year term. The total contract is 12 years, which includes an optional four-year extension. The total contract value is \$2.14 billion including GST. Note that the total contract sum includes operational costs as well as major periodic maintenance. The major periodic maintenance fluctuates year on year based on the asset life cycle. The impact of compounding indexation on the contract sum is significant and represents \$274.7 million of the \$1.94 billion (excluding GST) over the 12-year term. Accordingly, it is weighted greatest to the latter years of the contract. The escalation over the last four years can be explained by indexation as the comparison that was undertaken was based on nominal amounts as opposed to real values (GST inclusive).

#### TRAIN DRIVERS

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised:

In consultation with employees and their representatives, including unions, Keolis Downer commenced an 'Expression of Interest' (EOI) process on 20 October 2020 to enable employees to register their interest up until 27 November 2020. Formal offers of employment are to commence after this process has been completed. As at 24 November 2020, 139 current train drivers and senior drivers had lodged an EOI with Keolis Downer. Following the completion of the EOI period, Keolis Downer advised that they had received an additional four EOIs from current train drivers.

#### FERRY BERTHING

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised:

The following estimated time lines are provided for the design and construction of new ferry berthing structures at Cape Jervis and Penneshaw:

Registration of interest	Q4 2020
Request for quotes	Q1 2021
Contract award	Q2 2021
Start on-site works	Q3 2021
Completion of all works	Q2 2023

#### ROAD MAINTENANCE

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised:

The Hon C L Wingard: I have been advised that:

The new road maintenance reform delivery model has structured the coordination and delivery of road maintenance services by private sector providers across the following four zones:

- Zone 1—Metropolitan Adelaide
- Zone 2—Regional South
- Zone 3—Regional North
- Zone 4—Outback

The distribution of zones are different to the previous arrangements in which services were partly outsourced to industry and partly performed by departmental personnel in different areas of the state.

As a result of the implementation of the new contact arrangements:

- 13 employees chose to accept offers of employment from the new service providers and are no longer working within the Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT).
- 15 ongoing employees have decided to separate from DIT and a further 14 have sought to voluntarily separate in January 2021.

All remaining ongoing employees continue to work in DIT or have taken up other opportunities across the public sector.

#### ROAD MAINTENANCE

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised:

The commentary in the Agency Statements for the variance between the 2020-21 budget and 2019-20 actual states that the \$18.3 million increase in expenditure is partially offset by 'reform costs associated with road maintenance and Service SA in 2019-20 of \$3.4 million'. This commentary reflects that in 2019-20 reform costs of \$3.4 million were incurred, that are not budgeted to also be incurred in 2020-21. The \$3.4 million relates to reform costs in 2019-20 rather than savings in 2020-21 related to the regional road maintenance contract.

#### BRIDGE MAINTENANCE FUNDING

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised:

The state government receives \$1.7 million annually from the commonwealth government for bridge maintenance. The funding is part of the 2020-21 Australian government contribution for road network maintenance under the National Partnership Agreement on Land Transport Infrastructure. The state government has also been successful in securing other commonwealth funding for bridge upgrades and projects, including a \$160 million contribution from the Australian government for the Joy Baluch AM Bridge duplication project and a \$9.6 million contribution to deliver a higher capacity north-south freight route between Murray Bridge and Annadale, which will include bridge upgrades along the route.

#### BRIDGE HEALTH INDEX

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised:

The health index is a numerical rating of 0 to 100 that reflects element inspection data in relation to the asset value of a structure or group of structures. The premise of the health index is that each structural element has an initial asset value when new. An element may deteriorate to a lower condition state, reducing its asset value. With

maintenance or rehabilitation, the condition of the element is likely to improve and the corresponding asset value to increase.

Each road structure is typically inspected at a routine interval which may be four years or eight years depending on the type of structure. During the field inspection the element condition at that time is determined. Once the condition distribution is known, the current element value can be determined for all elements on the structure. The health index for the structure is the ratio (from 1 to 100) of the current element value to the replacement element value of all elements on the structure. To apply the health index concept to a group of structures, the entire group is treated as one large structure containing the summation of all element quantities and condition distributions within the group.

#### PUBLIC SECTOR ENTERPRISE AGREEMENTS

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised:

For the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing the total increase in employee benefits expenses from 2018-19 to 2019-20 was \$0.383 million (4.4 per cent).

Of this, \$0.180 million related to severance or redundancy payments. The remaining increase is primarily due to standard wage increases under the South Australian Modern Public Sector Enterprise Agreement.

#### CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised:

For the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing in the 2019-20 financial year, a total of \$2.099 million was spent on external contractors, and \$0.306 million was spent on consultants. This includes those engaged for capital works.

#### GRASSROOTS FOOTBALL, CRICKET, AND NETBALL FACILITY PROGRAM

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised:

The following is a breakdown of all projects funded through the Grassroots Football, Cricket, and Netball Facility Program.

Round	Applicant	Total Funded	Total Project Cost
Round 1	Berri Football Club Incorporated	\$149,200	\$298,455
Round 1	City of Onkaparinga	\$500,000	\$1,002,000
Round 1	City of Port Adelaide Enfield	\$500,000	\$1,475,347
Round 1	City of Tea Tree Gully	\$264,800	\$529,760
Round 1	Corporation of the City of Port Augusta	\$486,500	\$973,055
Round 1	District Council of Mount Barker	\$341,450	\$682,986
Round 1	Eudunda Sporting Club Incorporated	\$200,000	\$950,000
Round 1	Flinders Park Football Club Incorporated	\$224,900	\$544,900
Round 1	Kalangadoo War Memorial Park and Community Sports Club Incorporated	\$153,000	\$458,000
Round 1	Karoonda Districts Football Club Incorporated	\$258,200	\$554,125
Round 1	Long Plains Netball Club Incorporated	\$142,250	\$284,560
Round 1	Mallala Netball Club Incorporated	\$76,000	\$153,769
Round 1	McLaughlin Park Sports Incorporated	\$108,000	\$216,119
Round 1	Port Broughton Combined Sporting Clubs Incorporated	\$350,000	\$711,381
Round 1	South Gambier Football Club Incorporated	\$206,800	\$413,709
Round 1	The Barossa Council	\$206,250	\$412,500
Round 1	The Barossa Council	\$350,000	\$890,000
Round 1	The Corporation of the City of Whyalla	\$890,850	\$3,360,727
Round 1	West Lakes Sports Club Incorporated	\$303,500	\$607,120
Round 1	Woodville West Torrens Football Club Incorporated	\$288,300	\$595,889
Round 2	Adelaide Hills Council	\$490,000	\$1,404,851
Round 2	Adelaide University Sports Association Incorporated	\$675,000	\$2,240,025
Round 2	Alexandrina Council	\$800,000	\$3,387,062
Round 2	Cherry Gardens Ironbank Recreation Ground Incorporated	\$255,000	\$545,194
Round 2	City of Tea Tree Gully	\$335,000	\$1,002,751
Round 2	Corporation of The City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters	\$490,000	\$1,130,820
Round 2	Henley Football Club Incorporated	\$450,000	\$931,200

Round	Applicant	Total Funded	Total Project Cost
Round 2	Mid Hills Netball Association Incorporated	\$99,000	\$198,649
Round 2	The Barossa Council	\$881,000	\$2,907,770
Round 2	The Clare Sports Club Incorporated	\$880,000	\$3,355,900
Round 2	The Corporation of the City of Campbelltown	\$245,000	\$10,244,000
Round 2	Victoria Park Jamestown Management Committee Incorporated	\$400,000	\$802,254
Round 3	City of Holdfast Bay	\$487,000	\$1,000,000
Round 3	City of Mitcham	\$700,000	\$2,150,000
Round 3	City of Playford	\$590,000	\$6,292,833
Round 3	City of Tea Tree Gully	\$92,500	\$243,953
Round 3	Coromandel Valley Ramblers Cricket Club Incorporated	\$326,000	\$673,674
Round 3	District Council of Loxton Waikerie	\$380,000	\$775,220
Round 3	Encounter Bay Football Club Incorporated	\$400,000	\$975,000
Round 3	Houghton Inglewood & Hermitage Soldiers' Memorial Park Incorporated	\$435,000	\$879,775
Round 3	The Barossa Council	\$197,000	\$525,400
Round 3	The Barossa Council	\$265,000	\$661,020
Round 3	The Corporation of the City of Campbelltown	\$400,000	\$824,000
Round 3	The Crystal Brook Football Club Incorporated	\$216,500	\$624,840
Round 3	The Kadina Football Club Incorporated	\$172,000	\$348,939
Round 3	The Streaky Bay and District Community Complex Incorporated	\$64,000	\$129,421
Round 3	Tintinara Oval and Rec Association Incorporated	\$275,000	\$553,370
		\$17,000,000	\$59,922,324

It should be noted the Total Funded column, totalling \$17 million, includes \$2 million contributed to the program by the SANFL and SACA. The state contribution to the program was \$15 million. Through the Grassroots Football, Cricket, and Netball Facility Program \$881,399 was contributed across two projects from the Federal Government's Move It Aus—Community Sport Infrastructure Program.

Organisation	Grant amount	State/Territory	Round
Adelaide Hills Council	\$499,199	SA	3
Henley Football Club Incorporated	\$382,200	SA	3
	\$881,399		

### GOODS AND SERVICES

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining):** I have been advised the following in relation to spend on goods and services:

The Department for Energy and Mining has budgeted to spend the following amounts on goods and services from 2020-21 across the forward estimates:

2020-21 (\$000)	2021-22 (\$000)	2022-23 (\$000)	2023-24 (\$000)	2024-25 (\$000)
48,676	39,737	31,435	30,855	28,687

The top 10 providers of goods and services to the department in 2019-20 were:

SA Power Networks	Operation costs for the state's temporary generators.	\$12.5 m
Mogas Regional Pty Ltd	Fuel for the Remote Area Energy Supply scheme.	\$6.1 m
Cowell Electric Supply	Electricity generation, distribution and retail services for the Remote Area Energy Supply scheme.	\$5.1 m
Horsdale Power Reserve P/L	Operation of the Horsdale Power Reserve.	\$4.1 m
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	Office accommodation expenses.	\$3.3 m
Department of Primary Industries and Regions	Information Communication Technology services provided under service level agreement.	\$2.0 m
Department for Innovation and Skills	Corporate services support provided under service level agreement.	\$1.7 m
Crown Solicitors' Office	Out-posted lawyers and other legal services.	\$1.0 m
Hogan Lovells	Port Pirie Transformation legal services.	\$0.7 m
SRA Information Technology P/L	System and application development and support.	\$0.6 m

**PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES**

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining):**

I have been advised the following in relation to positions created or abolished between 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020:

The following eight positions, with a total employment cost of more than \$100,000, have been abolished (noting that ASO5 with on-costs including superannuation exceeds \$100,000):

Position title	Classification	Cost
Senior Executive Officer	ASO5	\$106,963
Senior Project Officer Advisory	ASO7	\$130,902
Senior Geologist	PO3	\$119,981
Principal Environmental Adviser	PO4	\$134,927
Deputy Director	PO5	\$145,840
Director, Strategic Coordination	SAES1	\$197,875
Project Manager	SAES1	\$198,767
Director, Resource Information	SAES1	\$196,124

The following 18 positions, of which eight were transferred from the Department for Innovation and Skills at the cessation of the SLA, with a total employment cost of more than \$100,000, have been created (noting that ASO5 with on-costs including superannuation exceeds \$100,000):

Position title	Classification	Cost
HR Business Partner	ASO5*	\$106,963
Data Analyst—SA Geology	ASO5	\$106,963
Senior Project Officer	ASO6	\$116,731
Senior Media Officer	ASO6*	\$116,731
Senior HR Business Partner	ASO6*	\$116,731
Senior OD Consultant	ASO6*	\$116,731
Principal HR Consultant	ASO7*	\$130,902
Principal Industry Development	ASO7	\$130,902
Principal Accountant x 3	ASO7*	\$130,902
Principal Policy Officer x2	ASO8	\$140,740
Program Manager ADI	ASO8	\$140,740
Project and Compliance Engineer	PO2	\$109,478
Senior Geophysicist	PO3	\$119,981
Senior Electrical and Technical Standards Officer	OPS6	\$106,693
Director Information Strategy & Delivery	SAES1	\$240,163

\* Note these eight positions transferred as part of cessation of SLA with the Department for Innovation and Skills.

**GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING**

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining):** I have been advised the following:

At 30 June 2020, 6.8 FTEs were allocated to communication and promotion functions in 2019-20, costing \$0.80 million.

The table below outlines the budgeted FTEs and estimated employment costs:

Year	No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities	Estimated Employment Expense
2020-21	9.0	\$1.01 million
2021-22	7.0	\$0.86 million
2022-23	7.0	\$0.87 million
2023-24	7.0	\$0.88 million

As an open and transparent government, Marketing Communications Activity Reports and Annual Media Expenditure details are proactively disclosed. The reports list all marketing campaigns over the cost of \$50,000 and are disclosed on the DPC website:

<https://www.dpc.sa.gov.au/about-the-department/accountability/government-marketing-advertising-expenditure>.

**PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES**

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining):**

I have been advised the following in relation to attraction and retention allowances paid to departmental staff between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020:

Job Title	Allowance Type	Attraction/Retention Allowance— Monetary Component
Chief Geoscientist	Retention Allowance	\$24,182
General Manager Policy & Communications	Retention Allowance	\$23,682
Manager Exploration Regulation	Retention Allowance	\$21,744
GM Licensing & Legislation	Retention Allowance	\$18,070
Community Lead Engagement	Attraction Allowance	20 per cent
Deputy Director	Retention Allowance	\$24,544
General Manager Oil and Gas	Attraction Allowance	\$34,343
Principal Drilling Engineer	Retention Allowance	\$41,837
Principal Mining Regulator— Olympic Dam & Uranium	Retention Allowance	\$18,984
Principal Drilling Engineer	Retention Allowance	\$41,837
Manager Exploration Assessment	Retention Allowance	\$21,744
Principal Environmental Regulator— Assessment & Compliance	Retention Allowance	\$20,122
Manager Gas Systems Regulation	Retention Allowance	\$10,500
Principal Mining Regulator	Retention Allowance	\$14,755
Director Engineering Operations	Retention Allowance	\$4,751
Principal Technical Officer	Retention Allowance	\$6,500
Lead Engineer Pipeline & Security	Retention Allowance	\$34,643
Manager, Infrastructure	Retention Allowance	20 per cent

The following employees have a non-salary benefit of a car park between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020:

Job Title	Classification
Chief Executive	EXF
Executive Director, Energy Resources	SAES2
Executive Director, Mineral Resources	SAES2
Director Geological Survey SA	SAES1
Deputy Exec Director Mineral Resources	SAES1
General Manager Mineral Tenements/Mining Registrar	Non-executive
Project Director, GFG	SAES1
Director Resource Infrastructure and Investment Taskforce	SAES1

**MINISTERIAL STAFF**

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining):**

I have been advised the following in relation to staff employed within my office:

Ministerial staff employed as at 17 July 2020, was published in the Government Gazette on 23 July 2020.

The following table lists public sector staff employed as at 30 June 2020:

Title	ASO Classification	Non-salary benefits
Business Support Officer	ASO3	Nil
Senior Business Support Officer	ASO4	Nil
Ministerial Liaison Support Officer	ASO4	Nil
Cabinet Parliamentary Officer	ASO5	Nil
Executive Assistant	ASO5	Nil
Liaison Officer	ASO6	Nil
Liaison Officer	ASO7	Nil
Office Manager	ASO7	Nil

There are no staff seconded from the department to my office as at 30 June 2020.

**TERMINATIONS PAYOUTS**

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining):**

I have been advised the following in relation to executive terminations since 1 July 2019:

- A total of two executive terminations have occurred since 1 July 2019.
- The total value of these terminations was \$274,663.

**EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS**

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining):**

I have been advised the following in relation to new executive appointments in the department since 1 July 2019:

Position Title	Classification	Cost
Director, Geological Survey of SA	SAES1	\$223,814
Director, Information Strategy and Delivery	SAES1	\$240,163
Director, Strategy and Government Relations	SAES1	\$202,800
Director, Strategy and Government Relations (temporary backfill)	SAES1	\$196,318

**GRANT PROGRAMS**

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining):** I have been advised the following:

The table below provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2019-20 and across the forward estimates for the Department for Energy and Mining.

Grant Program / Fund Name	Purpose of grant program / fund	2019-20 Actual \$000	2020-21 Budget \$000	2021-22 Budget \$000	2022-23 Budget \$000	2023-24 Budget \$000
Bird Lake	To assist the Port Augusta Council undertake rehabilitation works	809	2,135			
Future Fuels	To address future fuel technologies, systems and markets, social acceptance, public safety and security of supply	115	100			
Renewable Technology Fund	To support further integration of the next generation renewable technologies.	5,620	13,648	3,122	4,888	211
Home Battery Scheme	Subsidies to reduce the cost of home battery installations for consumers	38,210	28,138	12,675	5,200	5,400
Demand Management Trials	To advance the use of energy demand response, demand aggregation and integrating distributed generation assets into the grid	649	11,200	651		
Energy Productivity Program	To assist large energy using businesses manage their electricity costs and contribute energy supply benefits to the state	1,779	2,443			
Project Energy Connect	Early works in relation to the planning and design of a new transmission interconnector between NSW and SA.	13,247	57,150			
National Energy Efficient Buildings	Cross-industry collaboration to deliver the National Energy Efficient Buildings Project	45				
Multiscale Physics for Enhanced Oil Recovery	To support long-term strategic research alliances between higher education and other organisations, including industry to apply advanced knowledge to oil recovery problems	30	20	10		
Oil and Gas Strategy	To facilitate the establishment of the Gas Industry Social and Environmental Research Alliance (GISERA) Program in the South East	333				



Grant Program / Fund Name	Purpose of grant program / fund	2019-20 Actual \$000	2020-21 Budget \$000	2021-22 Budget \$000	2022-23 Budget \$000	2023-24 Budget \$000
SA State Chair of Petroleum Geology	Contribution to the costs of the University of Adelaide in employing a Chair of Petroleum Geology	205	207	209		
Carbon Capture	Contribution to research outcomes for carbon capture and storage and unconventional resources	50				
Mining and Petroleum Engineering Scholarships	To support the Scholarship Program with the long-term objective of helping to arrest a forecast skill shortage in the resources sector.	110	220	220	220	220
Core Innovation Hub	To establish an innovation hub where key stakeholders can develop strategic partnerships to address industry challenges and create economic development opportunities.	349	600	420	180	
Global Maintenance Upper Spencer Gulf (GMUSG)	Support for GMUSG in providing a platform for local business to network and work collaboratively on mining and resource projects	60	60			
Mine engineering and skill development	Developing and facilitating projects to increase the availability and productivity of the resources industry workforce	408	233	239		
MinEx CRC Exploration	To provide new technologies for improving the productivity of mineral exploration drilling and for the acquisition and incorporation of data into 3D models	350	350	300	300	300
Landowner Information Service	The operation of a free, independent information service for landowners seeking information on mineral resource regulatory requirements, including exploration and mining production activities	267				
Explore SA—Gawler Challenge	To run and promote crowd geoscience competitions to obtain multiple research and mineral target models to be provided to SA and made available to explorers	600	1,400	1,200	950	
Grid Scale Storage Fund	To support development of grid scale energy storage projects to firm renewables, help reduce energy costs and enhance reliability of SA's electricity system	-	6,150	5,300	6,330	9,600
Critical Minerals Global Supply Chain	To undertake an open platform international competition to identify technical innovation opportunities across the state's critical minerals value chain		550			
Electric Vehicle Charging Network	To establish a statewide electric vehicle charging network to increase the uptake of electric vehicles, accelerate smart charging and vehicle-to-grid charging trials.			750	1,250	

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining):** I have been advised the following:

The government has provided a complete list of grants paid during 2019-20 in question 14.

#### GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining):**

I have been advised the following in relation to the structure of the department:

- There have been no new sections created in the department since 1 July 2019.
- For transparency, existing sections of the department have been merged effective from October 2020.

#### GOODS AND SERVICES

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020).  
(Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):**

I have been advised that for the Environment Protection Authority, the goods and services budgets are as follows:

Financial Year	Goods & Service Budget (\$,000m)
2020-21	7,618
2021-22	7,619
2022-23	7,681
2023-24	7,891
2024-25	8,151

The top 10 providers of goods and services by value to each agency reporting to the minister for 2019-20; and a description of the goods and/or services provided by each of these top 10 providers, and the cost to the agency for these goods and/or services are as follows:

Provider	Purpose	Actual payment (\$)
Department for Infrastructure & Transport	Rent and Accommodation Services	1,867,650
Crown Solicitors Office—AGD	Legal fees and payments	1,021,545
Land and Water Consulting	Environmental assessment work	324,357
McMahon Services Australia Pty Ltd	Spraying of adhesive at Sedan site and removal of asbestos	320,391
Mid Murray Council	Asbestos disposal service from Sedan site	240,328
Open Office Pty Ltd	Capital enhancements & software maintenance	217,675
Department for Environment & Water	MoU for various ICT Services	159,974
Bluesphere Environmental Pty Ltd	Soil vapour mitigation work	133,802
Kerr Environmental Pty Ltd	Soil vapour mitigation work—various locations	126,965
Auditor-General's Department	Interim & Financial Statement Audit	126,100

The value of the goods and services that was supplied to the agency by South Australian suppliers will be provided by the Treasurer's office.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020).  
(Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised:

Between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020, there were six roles abolished within the Environment Protection Authority, which were:

- Senior Environmental Advisor
- Manager Air Science
- Project Engineer (Noise)
- Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Water Quality)
- Environmental Protection Officer (Water Quality)

The total employment cost for these roles was \$645,541.

During this period, there were two roles created, which were:

- Senior Advisor Reform Projects
- Principal Policy Adviser

The total employment costs for these roles was \$231,038.

**CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS**

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020).  
(Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):**

I have been advised that for the Environment Protection Authority, the below list of consultants and contractors were used and totalled over \$10,000 during the specified time period:

Contractors	Method of appointment	Purpose / Reason	Actual payment (\$)
AECOM Australia Pty Ltd	Request for Quote/ Direct Negotiation	Environmental assessment work for purposes of site contamination remediation	36,368
Land and Water Consulting	Request for Quote	Environmental assessment work for purposes of site contamination remediation	324,357
Kerr Environmental Pty Ltd	Direct Negotiation	Soil vapour mitigation work—various locations	126,965
JBS&G Australia Pty Ltd	Request for Quote	Environmental assessment work for purposes of site contamination remediation	24,013
Arris Pty Ltd	Request for Quote	Review & re-draft an EPA guideline on wastewater irrigation	28,525
Equifax	N/A	Company database searches	10,286
Shape	Request for Quote	EPA fitout works—GHD Building, Level 2, 211 Victoria Square	65,710
Transport Energy Emission Research	Direct Negotiation	Input software file for vehicle emissions data	24,100
Kleinfelder Australia Pty Ltd	Request for Quote	Environmental assessment work for purposes of site contamination remediation	120,308
Fyfe Pty Ltd	Request for Quote/ Direct Negotiation	Environmental assessment work for purposes of site contamination remediation	41,491
Bluesphere Environmental Pty Ltd	Direct Negotiation	Soil vapour mitigation work—various locations	133,802
Blue Tongue Outdoor Pty Ltd	N/A	Print, fold, insert into envelopes, distribute and mail out the community updates for the EPA	18,651
GHD Pty Ltd	Direct Negotiation	Monarto Waste Project—for purposes of site contamination remediation	27,707
Greencap	N/A	Sample analysis and reports—various locations	28,920
Chris Madden	Direct Negotiation	Streams and drains work in south east region	18,155
University of South Australia	N/A	Measuring, modelling & managing legacies of marine pollution as new resources	25,000
Golder Associates Pty Ltd	Request for Quote	Environmental assessment work for purposes of site contamination remediation	58,610
Mid Murray Council	Direct Negotiation	Asbestos disposal services from Sedan site	240,328
McMahon Services Australia Pty Ltd	Request for Quote	Spraying of adhesive at Sedan asbestos site to enable removal	320,391
Tonkin Consulting	Direct Negotiation	Landfill gas screening assessment—various residential properties	25,067
Rawtec Pty Ltd	Request for Quote	Container deposit scheme review	83,850

Consultancies	Method of appointment	Purpose	Actual payment (\$)
Allan Holmes Consulting	N/A	Radiation review proposal	10,500
Philip Hudson Consulting Pty Ltd	Direct Negotiation	Container deposit scheme review	56,250

**GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING**

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised that for the Environment Protection Authority:

- For 2019-20, four FTEs were allocated to communication and promotion functions, costing \$476,304.
- The table below outlines the budgeted FTEs and estimated employment costs:

Year	No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities	Estimated Employment Expense (\$)
2020-21	4.0	495,912
2021-22	4.0	503,351
2022-23	4.0	510,901
2023-24	4.0	518,564

- As an open and transparent Government, Marketing Communications Activity Reports and Annual Media Expenditure details are proactively disclosed. The reports list all marketing campaigns over the cost of \$50,000 and are disclosed on the DPC website:

<https://www.dpc.sa.gov.au/about-the-department/accountability/government-marketing-advertising-expenditure>

**PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES**

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised of the following for the Environment Protection Authority:

Attraction allowances, retention allowances and non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020:

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
Manager, Site Contamination	PO5	Retention	\$24,544.40
Chief Executive	CEO099	Non-salary benefit	\$3,480.00
Director, Science and Information	SAES1	Non-salary benefit	\$3,480.00

**TERMINATIONS PAYOUTS**

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised of the following:

No executive level employees have been terminated from the Environment Protection Authority since 1 July 2019.

**GRANT PROGRAMS**

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** In response to question 14 and 15, I have been advised:

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2019-20 and across the forward estimates for the Environment Protection Authority-Controlled:

Grant program / fund name	Purpose of grant program / fund	2019-20 Actual \$000	2020-21 Budget \$000	21-2022 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000
National Environment Protection Council (NEPC)	SA's contribution towards the secretariat operational budget for the NEPC Service Corporation	17,325.00	17,325.00	17,325.00	17,325.00

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2019-20 and across the forward estimates for the Environment Protection Authority—Administered:

Grant program / fund name	Purpose of grant program / fund	2018-19 Estimated result \$000	2019-20 Budget \$000	2020-21 Estimate \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000
Nil					

The following table details the *new* commitment of grants in 2019-20 for the Environment Protection Authority—Controlled:

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value\$
Nil			

For the period of 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020, below is a breakdown of all grants paid by the Environment Protection Authority, including when the payment was made to the recipient, and when the grant agreement was signed by both parties:

Date	Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$	Agreement Signed
May 2020	National Environment Protection Council (NEPC)	Department of Agriculture, Water & Environment	NEPC Operational Contribution—2019-20	17,324.99	11 October 2019

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised that for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet:

The government has provided a complete list of grants paid during 2019-20 in question 14's response.

#### GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised:

The annual reports published for each of the agencies I am responsible for will contain this information.

#### GOODS AND SERVICES

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised that for SA Water:

1. Operational expenses and capital expenses over SA Water's current regulatory period is outlined in the table below.

\$'000	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Expenses	576,228	585,418	600,762	602,223
Capital (excluding Contributed Assets)	586,612	589,033	550,695	495,706

2. The top 10 providers for 2019-20 by value and a description of their services are as follows:

Supplier	Description of Services
Enerven	Delivery of Zero Cost Energy Future project.
Allwater Joint Venture	Metropolitan Adelaide Service Delivery
Fulton Hogan	Capital Works and Services
Trility Pty Ltd	Operate and maintain Build, Own Operate and Transfer (BOOT) schemes on Murray and Victor Harbour Wastewater Treatment Plants
AGL	Renewable Energy Supply Agreement—Adelaide Desalination Plant
Leed & Valoriza Water	Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme Design and Construct

Supplier	Description of Services
Adelaide Aqua Pty Ltd	Operational and maintenance services—Adelaide Desalination Plant
SEM Group of Companies Pty Ltd	Metropolitan extensions and connections
John Holland Pty Ltd	Murray Bridge WWTP Relocation Project
SA Power Networks	Electricity network charges

3. Due to the commercial nature of these agreements, SA Water considers the value of these agreements to be commercial-in-confidence.

4. The value of the goods and services that was supplied to SA Water by South Australian suppliers for 2019-20 was approximately \$799 million, exclusive of GST.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised of the following:

Between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020, there were no executive roles abolished within SA Water. During this period there were no executive roles created.

#### CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised that for SA Water consultancy expenditure from 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020 was \$769,257.

There were seven consultants engaged during this period. The consultants were engaged by SA Water to provide independent expert advice not available within SA Water. Details of the consultants, a summary of the work undertaken and the cost of that work are published in SA Water's 2019-2020 annual report. This information is listed below:

- AMCL Pty Ltd—\$219,146.65  
Water Main Independent review. The contractor provided management systems auditing expertise to conduct the water main breaks review for the SA Water board
- Due Diligence Consultants Pty Ltd—\$36,393.81  
Financial Integrity and due diligence reporting.
- Ernst & Young—\$12,000.00  
Ernst and Young provided financial statement disclosure support.
- Frontier—\$85,937.50  
Advice on an appropriate regulatory rate of return for Our Plan 2020-24
- KPMG—\$181,839.80  
KPMG developed a discounted cashflow model and provided advice on key assumptions. It developed a technical accounting paper relating to seasonal water allocation allowable revenue adjustments. It conducted a review of the Zero Cost Energy framework as a non-regulated service.
- PricewaterhouseCoopers—\$146,251.45  
PwC provided advice on updating methodology for measuring long term viability.
- Tony Mac Consulting Pty Ltd—\$87,688.00  
Provided advice on the preparation of analysis and framework for the Enterprise Agreement negotiation.

#### GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised that for SA Water:

- At 30 June 2020, 14.2 FTEs were allocated to communication and promotion functions, costing \$1,934,640 in the 2019-20 year.
- The table below outlines the budgeted FTEs and estimated employment costs:

Year	No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities	Estimated Employment Expense
2020-21	14.0	\$1,855,856*
2021-22	14.0	\$1,838,694*
2022-23	14.0	\$1,838,694*
2023-24	14.0	\$1,838,694*

\*2020-21 real terms

- As an open and transparent Government, Marketing Communications Activity Reports and Annual Media Expenditure details are proactively disclosed. The reports list all marketing campaigns over the cost of \$50,000 and are disclosed on the DPC website:

<https://www.dpc.sa.gov.au/about-the-department/accountability/government-marketing-advertising-expenditure>

#### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised of the following for SA Water:

Attraction allowances, retention allowances and non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020:

Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
SAW4	Market Allowance	\$6225.07
SAW5	Market Allowance	\$9083.08
SAW5	Market Allowance	\$10213.33
SAW6	Retention Allowance	\$2300.39

#### TERMINATIONS PAYOUTS

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised:

SA Water's executive structure consists of its senior leadership team, which comprises its chief executive, a chief financial officer and five general managers. SA Water's former chief executive and former General Manager Business Services resigned from SA Water in the 2019-20 financial year.

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** In response to questions 14 and 15 I have been advised the following:

SA Water does not manage a grant program or fund for which the minister is responsible.

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised that for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet:

The government has provided a complete list of grants paid during 2019-20 in question 14.

#### GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised:

The annual reports published for each of the agencies I am responsible for will contain this information.

### GOODS AND SERVICES

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020).  
(Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):**

I have been advised that for Green Industries SA the budget for good and services over the forward estimates and the top 10 providers of these goods and services are as follows:

The budget for GISA's goods and services is \$13.59 million in 2020-21, \$3.747 million in 2021-22, \$3.803 million in 2022-23, \$2.323 million in 2023-24 and \$2.349 million in 2024-25. The top 10 providers of goods and services by value for 2019-20 is listed as follows:

Providers	Description of goods and services provided	\$ Value of goods and services provided (GST exclusive) in 2019-20
McMahon Services Australia P/L	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$2,046,062
Royal Park Salvage (Asbestos)	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$1,608,893
Southern Ocean Construction	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$1,528,950
Fleurieu Regional Waste Authority	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$1,095,758
Delta Group Pty Ltd	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$796,808
Horizon Construction Services Pty Ltd	Construction of four household chemical and paint drop-off facilities	\$687,878
D&V Services Pty Ltd	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$655,800
Southern Ocean Lodge	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$674,750
Island Earthworks	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$595,850
Department of Human Services	Provision of funding for reimbursements to people who organised their own clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$475,953
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$10,166,703</b>

All of these suppliers are based in South Australia.

### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020).  
(Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised:

Between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020, there were no roles with an employment cost of \$100,000 or more that were abolished within Green Industries SA. During this period one role with an employment cost of \$100,000 or more was created. This was:

POSITION TITLE	SAES LEVEL
Deputy Chief Executive	SAES Level 1

Individual executive total remuneration package values as detailed in Schedule 2 of an executive employee's contract will not be disclosed as it is deemed to be unreasonable disclosure of personal affairs.



## CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020).  
(Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised that no consultants were engaged by Green Industries SA in 2019-20. There were 37 contractors engaged across 12 projects in 2019-20. Contractors with a contract value above \$10,000 each are listed as below:

Contractors	Work undertaken	\$ Actual payment (GST inclusive)	Reason for engaging the contractor	Method of appointment
McMahon Services Australia P/L	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$2,250,668.76	To provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	The combination of Selective Tender and Direct Negotiation
Royal Park Salvage (Asbestos)	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$1,769,782.30	To provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	The combination of Selective Tender and Direct Negotiation
Southern Ocean Construction	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$1,681,845.55	To provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	The combination of Selective Tender and Direct Negotiation
Delta Group Pty Ltd	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$876,488.39	To provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	The combination of Selective Tender and Direct Negotiation
D&V Services Pty Ltd	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$721,380.00	To provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	The combination of Selective Tender and Direct Negotiation
Horizon Construction Services Pty Ltd	Construction of four household chemical and paint drop-off facilities	\$756,666.33	To provide the South Australian community with disposal facilities for household chemicals and paint.	Open Market
Island Earthworks	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$655,435.00	To provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	The combination of Selective Tender and Direct Negotiation
Cleanaway Operations Pty Ltd	Collection of materials at various Hazardous Waste Depots and mobile waste collection events	\$389,804.58	To collect, treat and dispose of materials dropped off at the household chemical and paint facilities.	Open Market
De-Construct Pty Ltd	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$373,902.47	To provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	Selective Tender
Mud Environmental Pty Ltd	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from	\$327,291.25	To provide services for the bushfire	Direct Negotiation

Contractors	Work undertaken	\$ Actual payment (GST inclusive)	Reason for engaging the contractor	Method of appointment
	the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia		waste and debris clean-up project.	
GP & Sons Demolition Pty Ltd	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$275,079.00	To provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	Selective Tender
A & V Contractors Pty Ltd	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$258,060.00	To provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	Selective Tender
Mike Haywood's Sustainable	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia.	\$226,778.40	To provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	Direct Negotiation
Circular Economy Alliance Australia	Services for the development, marketing and delivery of the Global Leadership Program on the Circular Economy	\$205,225.00	To support the capacity of the agency.	Open Market
Richmond Civil Works Pty Ltd	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$201,504.13	To provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	Selective Tender
Project Leadership Pty Ltd	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$178,756.08	To support the capacity of the agency regarding the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	Direct Negotiation
Harradine Contracting PTY LTD	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$167,773.80	To provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	Direct Negotiation
Kym Schubert Holdings Pty Ltd	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$160,600.00	To provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	Direct Negotiation
Safe House Asbestos	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$157,761.30	To provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	The combination of Selective Tender and Direct Negotiation
MBG Constructions Pty Ltd	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$154,832.15	To provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	The combination of Selective Tender and Direct Negotiation
Boomerang Alliance Incorporated	Provision of services to develop, implement and manage the plastic free pilot precinct program	\$148,500.00	To support the capacity of the agency and deliver the program.	Selective Tender
Rawtec Pty Ltd	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$144,819.84	To support the capacity of the agency and provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	Direct Negotiation

Contractors	Work undertaken	\$ Actual payment (GST inclusive)	Reason for engaging the contractor	Method of appointment
Dynamic 3E	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$141,818.32	To support the capacity of the agency and provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	Direct Negotiation
Agresolve Pty Ltd	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$129,156.50	To provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	The combination of Selective Tender and Direct Negotiation
Greencap	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$66,302.50	To provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	Direct Negotiation
University of Adelaide	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$63,690	To support the capacity of the agency and provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	Direct Negotiation
Sustainable Solutions—Marina Wagner	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$63,243.92	To support the capacity of the agency and provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	Direct Negotiation
Balhannah Salvage Trust	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$62,645.00	To provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	Direct Negotiation
Rawtec Pty Ltd	Provision of services to prepare the recycling activity survey for 2018-19	\$54,156.30	To support the capacity of the agency in preparing the survey/report.	Selective Tender
Cleanaway Operations Pty Ltd	Collection of materials for the Backlight Program	\$54,103.50	To manage the collection and disposal of materials collected through the program.	Selective Tender
Tuff Torq Tool Truck	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$50,646.00	To provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	Direct Negotiation
University of South Australia	Provision of services for the Which Bin campaign evaluation.	\$49,720.00	To support the capacity of the agency in undertaking the market evaluation.	Selective Tender
Asbestos Removal Services SA	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$47,025.00	To provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	Selective Tender
United Earthworks Pty Ltd	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from	\$44,847.13	To provide services for the bushfire	Direct Negotiation

Contractors	Work undertaken	\$ Actual payment (GST inclusive)	Reason for engaging the contractor	Method of appointment
	the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia		waste and debris clean-up project.	
Rawtec Pty Ltd	Provision of services to analyse and quantify material and value flows of the organics recovery and processing sector in SA and identify current environmental and economic benefits and future opportunities	\$43,901.00	To support the capacity of the agency.	Open Market
AC Demolition & Serv Pty Ltd	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$40,227.00	To provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	Selective Tender
Rawtec Pty Ltd	Provision of services regarding the State Government waste survey.	\$31,912.00	To support the capacity of the agency in developing the strategy.	Selective Tender
Rawtec Pty Ltd	Provision of an analytical study regarding COAG Export Ban Infrastructure Planning.	\$31,630.50	To support the capacity of the agency in undertaking an analytical study.	Selective Tender
Morton Philips Pty Ltd	Provision of services regarding recruitment of the Deputy Chief Executive, GISA	\$24,640.00	To manage the recruitment process.	Selective Tender
SA Specialized Services	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$23,170.40	To provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	Selective Tender
South East Asbestos Pty Ltd	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$14,080.00	To provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	Selective Tender
Tyne Environmental	Provision of services for clean-up, management and resource recovery of waste and debris, resulting from the 2019-20 bushfires in South Australia	\$12,826.00	To provide services for the bushfire waste and debris clean-up project.	Selective Tender
	Total	\$13,132,695.40		

#### GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised that for Green Industries SA:

- At 30 June 2020, 0.7 FTEs were allocated to communication and promotion functions, costing \$107,490.32 (including on-cost).
- The table below outlines the budgeted FTEs and estimated employment costs:

Year	No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities	Estimated Employment Expense
2020-21	1.5	\$198,936
2021-22	1.7	\$223,631
2022-23	1.7	\$227,292
2023-24	1.7	\$230,701

- As an open and transparent Government, Marketing Communications Activity Reports and Annual Media Expenditure details are proactively disclosed. The reports list all marketing campaigns over the cost of \$50,000 and are disclosed on the DPC website:

<https://www.dpc.sa.gov.au/about-the-department/accountability/government-marketing-advertising-expenditure>.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised of the following for Green Industries SA:

Attraction allowances, retention allowances and non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020:

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
Manager Policy and Projects	ASO8	Retention Allowance	\$3,309.17

#### TERMINATIONS PAYOUTS

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised:

No executive level employees have been terminated from Green Industries SA since 1 July 2019.

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** In response to questions 14 and 15 I have been advised the following:

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2019-20 and across the forward estimates for Green Industries SA—Controlled:

Grant program / fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2019-20 Actual Expenditure \$000	2020-21 Estimate \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000
Recycling Infrastructure Grants	Funding towards the construction of new and upgraded materials recovery and processing facilities, including to assist the resource recovery sector respond to challenges and opportunities presented by international market conditions.	4,900	7,092	3,202	3,277	2,969
Kerbside Performance (Food Organics) Incentives	Funding towards the implementation and maintenance of food waste recycling systems via kerbside organics bins for Local Government.	2,300	2,189	1,972	1,858	1,469
Regional Transport Subsidies	Funding to provide regional councils with temporary relief to subsidise the transport of kerbside collected recyclables to recovery facilities.	783	1,089	0	0	0
Council Modernisation Grants	Funding to support modernisation and innovation in the local government sector through smart bins, technology upgrades, auditing support and other measures that can assist further development of the three-bin system.	450	1,117	850	950	0
Circular Economy Market Development Grants	Funding to support South Australian businesses to further their market development efforts for recycled and recyclable materials.	240	475	300	300	300

Grant program / fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2019-20 Actual Expenditure \$000	2020-21 Estimate \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000
Circular Economy Business Support Program projects (CEBSP)	Funding for businesses and industry associations to engage third party technical advisers to identify, prioritise and implement improvements in resource/material efficiency, and other circular economy practices.	244	366	335	335	335
Fight Food Waste Cooperative Research Centre	Funding for reducing food waste throughout the supply chain, transform unavoidable waste into innovative high-value co-products and engage with industry and consumers to deliver behavioural change.	34	26	0	0	0
Innovation in School Education	Funding for investigating and trialling teaching models which offer contemporary approaches towards action learning about waste reduction and recycling education.	41	0	0	0	0
National battery stewardship project	Funding to support the Battery Stewardship Project to National Environment Protection Goals.	8	0	0	0	0
Trade Waste Initiative	Funding towards reducing trade waste load and volume for South Australian food and beverage businesses.	761	978	0	0	0
Innovation Commercialisation Grant Program	Funding provided for a commercialisation program for waste, recycling and the circular economy.	150	0	0	500	500
Circular Economy Policy and Implementation projects	Funding for identifying alternative, higher-value users for waste such as on-site bioenergy production and /or secondary product development.	18	0	0	0	0
Minor other grant payments (under \$5,000 each)		20	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>9,949</b>	<b>13,332</b>	<b>6,659</b>	<b>7,220</b>	<b>5,573</b>

The following table details the new commitment of grants in 2019-20 for Green Industries SA—Controlled:

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$ (GST exclusive)	Date agreement signed	Date payment(s) made*
Recycling Infrastructure Grants	Downer	Glass fines replacement	\$500,000	24/08/2020	-
	Foodbank SA	Mount Gambier Cool room	\$94,800	22/01/2020	17/18/2020 28/09/2020
	NAWMA	Pooraka Transfer Station upgrade	\$175,000	09/01/2020	-
	Peats Group Ltd	Picking station	\$250,000	03/05/2020	01/04/2020
	Foodbank SA	Food Rescue vehicle	\$51,695	22/01/2020	-
	Recycling Plastics Aust	New markets for mixed plastics	\$500,000	22/01/2020	24/03/2020 08/09/2020 08/09/2020
	Adelaide Hills Council	Polystyrene Recycling	\$26,966	16/01/2020	18/05/2020
	Recycling Plastics Aust	Paper recovery from plastic	\$500,000	22/01/2020	24/03/2020 08/09/2020 10/12/2020
	Clare Valley Waste	Telehandler, walking floor	\$230,331	09/01/2020	10/03/2020 18/05/2020

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$ (GST exclusive)	Date agreement signed	Date payment(s) made*
	Just Skips	Telehandler	\$145,650	20/01/2020	20/07/2020 20/07/2020
	AAA Recycling	CDL Depot expansion	\$36,450	15/01/2020	-
	Ceduna Recyclers	Shredder	\$37,900	15/01/2020	13/03/2020
	NAWMA	Polystyrene recycling	\$33,400	09/01/2020	30/03/2020
	Transmutation Pty Ltd	Plastic recycling expansion—Robe	\$27,540	09/01/2020	03/02/2020 13/03/2020 25/08/2020
	ANZ Recycling Platform	Mobile e-waste processing facility	\$160,800	03/05/2020	-
	City of Mount Gambier	Piercing baler	\$30,000	30/06/2020	-
	VISY Recycling	Paper Quality Improvement	\$43,140	15/01/2020	03/07/2020
	Ceduna Recyclers	Containers for e-waste storage and transport	\$9,200	15/01/2020	13/03/2020
	U Pull It	Plastic bumper Recycling	\$110,000	30/06/2020	14/07/2020
	Adelaide Hills Recycling	Screens, air vac separators	\$477,000	31/12/2019	29/01/2020 27/05/2020 02/07/2020
Circular Economy Market Development Grants	The McKell Institute	A Second-Life Solution for SA Jobs: Embracing a Lithium-ion Waste Management industry in SA	\$50,000	17/03/2020	06/04/2020 16/06/2020
	Downer Group	Reconophalt EPD	\$22,500	09/04/2020	30/04/2020 01/07/2020 16/10/2020
	Northern Adelaide Waste Management Authority	Feasibility, Justification, and Market Analysis for the Establishment of a Centralised Fibre Secondary (re)Processing Plant in South Australia Project	\$87,388	21/04/2020	30/04/2020 11/08/2020 30/11/2020
	Waste Management and Resource Recovery Association of Australia (WMRR)	Buy Recycled Expo	\$75,982	25/06/2020	08/07/2020 13/10/2020 30/10/2020
Kerbside Performance (Food Waste) Incentives	Rural City of Murray Bridge	New opt-in food waste system for 400 households	\$2,043	17/04/2020	-
	City of Tea Tree Gully	Reinvigorated opt-in food waste service for 8,000 households	\$73,588	15/06/2020	06/07/2020
	Wattle Range Council	Reinvigorated area-wide food waste system for 4,400 households	\$18,900	20/04/2020	16/07/2020
	City of Port Adelaide Enfield	Reinvigorated area-wide food waste system for 20,900 households	\$106,765.50	30/04/2020	12/5/2020
	City of Mount Gambier	Reinvigorated opt-in food waste system for 5,500 households	\$32,954	07/05/2020	19/08/2020

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$ (GST exclusive)	Date agreement signed	Date payment(s) made*
	Port Augusta City Council	New area-wide food waste system for 6,000 households	\$28,291	30/04/2020	18/05/2020
	The Barossa Council	New area-wide food waste system for 5,200 households	\$24,472.16	01/06/2020	02/07/2020
	City of Campbelltown	New area-wide food waste system for 22,300 households	\$256,952	30/06/2020	06/07/2020
	City of Unley	Area-wide food waste system for 17,000 households	\$202,835.50	30/06/2020	06/07/2020
	City of West Torrens	New opt-in food waste system	\$17,669.50	26/06/2020	02/07/2020
	City of Tea Tree Gully	Reimbursement for opt-in food waste service for 6160 households	\$78,130	29/06/2020	06/07/2020
	Fleurieu Regional Waste Authority (FRWA)	Opt-in food waste system for 1,000 residents	\$13,382.84	03/07/2020	-
	City of Charles Sturt	Opt-in food waste system for 10,000 new and 5,432 existing residents	\$157,002	01/07/2020	02/07/2020
	Adelaide City Council	Opt-in food waste system for 1,000 existing and 1,000 new dwellings	\$21,200	30/06/2020	14/07/2020
	NAWMA	Opt-in food waste system for 64,427 residents (retrospective)	\$194,649	26/06/2020	02/07/2020
	Local Government Association of SA (LGA)	Opt-in food waste system for 71,058 households across Adelaide in conjunction with Woolworths supermarkets	\$243,176.25	29/06/2020	02/07/2020
	City of Port Adelaide Enfield	Reinvigoration of existing food waste systems	\$94,366.40	25/06/2020	02/07/2020
	City of Holdfast Bay	Reinvigoration of existing food waste systems	\$25,531	30/06/2020	02/07/2020
	City of Burnside	Reinvigoration of existing food waste systems	\$38,213.70	29/06/2020	02/07/2020
Council Modernisation Grants	Fight Food Waste Limited	East Waste project	\$90,000	17/10/2019	4/05/2020
	Holdfast Bay	Weekly FOGO	\$97,900	01/06/2020	09/06/2020
	City of Port Adelaide Enfield	Market research—FOGO stage 1	\$24,376	12/06/2020	02/07/2020
	Yorke Peninsula Council	Food waste feasibility and market research	\$20,000	12/06/2020	03/07/2020
	City of West Torrens	Weekly FOGO	\$31,500	29/04/2020	14/08/2020
	Murraylands River LGA	Regional Waste Management Plan update	\$35,000	18/05/2020	15/10/2020
	City of Unley	Weekly Organics pilot	\$25,885	12/06/2020	17/06/2020



Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$ (GST exclusive)	Date agreement signed	Date payment(s) made*
	Legatus Group (Central Local Govt Region)	Regional Waste strategy	\$30,000	18/05/2020	06/07/2020
	AHRWMA	Regional Waste Management Plan	\$20,000	16/06/2020	09/06/2020
	Fleurieu Regional Waste Authority	3 Logix waste track	\$80,000	12/06/2020	09/06/2020
	City of Tea Tree Gully	Public place recycling trial	\$33,306	06/07/2020	-
	City of Mitcham	Business Case	\$10,500	25/06/2020	08/07/2020
Regional Transport Subsidies	Adelaide Plains Council	Regional Transport Subsidies Program 2019-20	\$7431.72	07/04/2020	20/04/2020 21/08/2020
	Berri Barmera Council	Regional Transport Subsidies Program 2019-20	\$27,934.92	30/03/2020	07/04/2020 13/08/2020
	City of Mount Gambier	Regional Transport Subsidies Program 2019-20	\$104,400.00	01/04/2020	22/04/2020 21/08/2020
	City of Port Lincoln	Regional Transport Subsidies Program 2019-20	\$67,298.03	26/03/2020	07/04/2020 21/08/2020
	Copper Coast Council	Regional Transport Subsidies Program 2019-20	\$27,898.08	07/04/2020	20/04/2020 13/08/2020
	District Council of Grant	Regional Transport Subsidies Program 2019-20	\$21,717.00	26/03/2020	07/04/2020 26/08/2020
	District Council of Robe	Regional Transport Subsidies Program 2019-20	\$7,181.76	09/04/2020	30/04/2020 08/09/2020
	Light Regional Council	Regional Transport Subsidies Program 2019-20	12,412.32	25/03/2020	07/04/2020 13/08/2020
	Mid Murray Council	Regional Transport Subsidies Program 2019-20	\$3,705.48	31/03/2020	06/04/2020 12/08/2020
	Mount Barker District Council	Regional Transport Subsidies Program 2019-20	\$35,338.20	31/03/2020	07/04/2020 11/09/2020
	Naracoorte Lucindale Council	Regional Transport Subsidies Program 2019-20	\$23,964.00	27/03/2020	22/04/2020 26/08/2020
	Port Augusta City Council	Regional Transport Subsidies Program 2019-20	\$34,684.56	30/03/2020	07/04/2020 26/08/2020
	Port Pirie Regional Council	Regional Transport Subsidies Program 2019-20	\$38,586.96	06/04/2020	05/05/2020 13/08/2020
	Renmark Paringa Council	Regional Transport Subsidies Program 2019-20	\$21,741.12	15/04/2020	22/04/2020 21/08/2020
	Rural City of Murray Bridge	Regional Transport Subsidies Program 2019-20	\$18,015.84	26/03/2020	07/04/2020 31/08/2020
	The Barossa Council	Regional Transport Subsidies Program 2019-20	\$23,929.80	25/03/2020	07/04/2020 09/09/2020
	Wattle Range Council	Regional Transport Subsidies Program 2019-20	\$38,767.20	30/03/2020	07/04/2020 21/08/2020
	Yorke Peninsula Council	Regional Transport Subsidies Program 2019-20	\$23,431.92	27/03/2020	20/04/2020 21/08/2020

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$ (GST exclusive)	Date agreement signed	Date payment(s) made*
	Fleurieu Regional Waste Authority	Regional Transport Subsidies Program 2019-20	\$131,276.64	21/4/2020	14/05/2020 21/08/2020
CEBSP—LEAP Grants	Christian Schools Australia	Sustainability program	\$45,200.00	16/07/2019	06/08/2019 17/10/2019 13/03/2020 25/09/2020
	Barossa Wine Industry Recycling Initiative	Waste management in the wine industry	\$38,960.00	5/05/2020	16/06/2020 02/07/2020
	Independent Brewers Assoc	Sustainability Program for Independent Brewers	\$49,400.00	3/06/2020	23/06/2020 02/07/2020
CEBSP—REAP Grants	Beston Pure Dairies	Jervois Site Water Monitoring Project	\$20,000.00	22/05/2020	16/06/2020
	Southern Barn Pty Ltd	Resource Efficiency Assessment	\$11,900.00	22/07/2020	18/09/2019 06/01/2020 01/06/2020
	Southern Free Range Pty Ltd	Resource Efficiency Assessment	\$17,600.00	22/07/2020	18/09/2019 07/01/2020 01/06/2020
	Chateau Yaldara	Energy Efficiency Assessment	\$16,000.00	6/09/2019	02/10/2019 07/01/2020 07/01/2020
	Murray Bridge Farms (AAMIG)	Energy Efficiency Review	\$20,000.00	23/06/2020	03/07/2020
CEBSP—VBW	Bedford Phoenix Incorporated	Waste and Recycling Opportunities study	\$14,480.00	18/02/2020	19/05/2020 25/06/2020
	Beyond Bank	Waste Management Review and Improvement	\$15,000.00	19/09/2019	29/11/2019 16/04/2020 10/07/2020
	Regis Aged Care	Waste and Recycling Management Processes and Contracts	\$11,200.00	15/07/2019	23/07/2019 7/11/2019
	Kangaroo Island Sealink Pty Ltd	Sealink—Reducing Waste to Landfill	\$14,990.00	25/02/2020	23/06/2020
Innovation in schools	Ground Swell	Innovation in schools	\$45,000.00	2/12/2019	13/12/2019 05/03/2020
Waste Strategy and Policy	Fight Food Waste Limited	Fight Food Waste Cooperative Research Centre	\$60,000	17/10/2019	29/08/2019 29/10/2019 28/01/2020 14/05/2020
National Battery Stewardship Program	Department of Environment and Science—Queensland Government	Battery Stewardship Scheme	\$8,339.50	1/11/2019	21/04/2020
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$6,862,116</b>		

\* The sum of payments made on these dates may not amount to the total grant value where grant commitments extend beyond 30 June 2021.

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020).  
(Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised that for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet:

The government has provided a complete list of grants paid during 2019-20 in question 14.

#### GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020).  
(Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised that:

The annual reports published for each of the agencies I am responsible for will contain this information.

#### GOODS AND SERVICES

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020).  
(Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised that for the Department for Environment and Water:

The amounts budgeted for goods and services (including consultancies) for 2020-21, and for each of the years of the forward estimates period, are detailed below:

	2020-21 \$'000	2021-22 \$'000	2022-23 \$'000	2023-24 \$'000	2024-25 \$'000
Goods & Services	111,603	73,978	49,126	47,365	46,924

The top 10 providers of goods and services, in 2019-20, by value and the description of the goods/services provided are detailed below:

Goods/Services Provider	Description	Total Value
Department for Infrastructure & Transport	Accommodation, cleaning services and property repairs & maintenance	\$10,996,934
SA Water Corporation	Service provision relating to South Australian Riverland Floodplains Integrated Infrastructure Program (SARFIIP); Opening of Reservoirs election commitment and water & sewerage charges across the Department	\$3,839,969
A Haros & Sons Earthmoving P/L	Adelaide Living Beaches—sand replenishment services	\$2,647,900
Silver City Drilling	Interim Great Artesian Basin Infrastructure Investment Program—bore drilling services	\$2,365,463
MC Dredging & Port Development	Adelaide Living Beaches—dredging services	\$1,900,494
McConnell Dowell Construction Aus P/L	Adelaide Living Beaches—sand replenishment services	\$1,857,123
Department of Premier & Cabinet	Managed network services, telephony & data line charges	\$1,628,479
Crown Solicitor's Office	Legal Services, land settlements and advice	\$1,446,341
Leaseplan Australia Ltd	Fleet Management costs	\$1,378,319
Primary Industries & Resources SA	Monitoring & scientific services—South Australian Research & Development Institute (SARDI)	\$1,307,560
Total		\$29,368,581

Of the total goods and services listed above, \$23.768M were provided by South Australian suppliers.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020).  
(Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised of the following:

Between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020, the following executive roles were abolished within the Department for Environment and Water:

- Director, Cleland Wildlife Park
- Director, Organisational Reform
- Director, River Murray Operations
- Group Executive Director, Climate Change

The total employment cost for these roles was \$818,097 (excluding on-costs).

During this period the following executive roles created:

- Director, Conservation and Wildlife
- Director, Green Adelaide

- Director, Regional Operations
- Director, Strategy
- Executive Director, Environment, Heritage and Sustainability

The total employment cost for these roles was \$1,015,473 (excluding on-costs).

#### CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020).  
(Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised that for the Department for Environment and Water:

A consultant is an individual or organisation who is engaged for a limited period of time to carry out a defined task and to provide expert specialist or management advice that is not readily or usually available within the public sector. This includes developing specialised plans, strategies and recommendations for the agency to consider. The engagement of consultancies is undertaken in accordance with State Procurement Board and across-government procurement policies. In addition, consultancy procurement processes must be approved by a minimum director-level officer in accordance with Premier and Cabinet Circular 043.

Details of consultancies above \$10,000 between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 are as follows:

Consultant	Description	Amount
Ernst & Young	Emissions Reduction Approaches for South Australia	\$175,544
Price Waterhouse Coopers	Review of the DEW Corporate Services model	\$94,990
Megan F Dyson	Policy review of Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act for DEW on behalf of DEW, DEM, EPA & DPTI	\$41,250
MABEKI Consulting	Provision of community engagement and advice in the creation of Glenthorne National Park	\$12,620
Total		\$324,404

A contractor (or temporary agency staff) performs 'routine' tasks that are supervised by agency employees. These tasks generally would not differ materially from those of employees working in the same area. The engagement of temporary agency staff is undertaken in accordance with the Government's Preferred supplier contracts for clerical, information technology and financial services staff. In accordance with government policy, DEW also reviews the availability of suitable surplus staff prior to engaging temporary agency staff. Details of contractors (temporary agency staff) above \$10,000 between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020 are as follows:

Contractors	Purpose	\$ Actual payment
Hays Specialist Recruitment Pty Ltd	Temporary Staff for Regional Programs, Environmental Science, Native Vegetation Management, Corporate Services	\$559,724
Modis Staffing Pty Ltd	Temporary staff for Information Technology & Water Licensing	\$479,929
Randstad Pty Limited	Temporary Staff for Environmental Science, Water Science & Monitoring, Coastal Protection, River Murray Operations, Water Licensing, Regional Programs	\$418,787
Paxus Australia Pty Ltd	Temporary staff for Information and Technology	\$268,538
Maxima Tempskill/Recruitment	Temporary Staff for Coastal Protection, the Botanic Gardens & State Herbarium and Regional Programs	\$254,419
Hudson Global Resources	Temporary staff for Information Technology, Regional Programs, Environmental Science, and Corporate Services	\$168,740
CKM Management Solutions	Temporary Staff for the Adelaide Living Beaches programme	\$89,371
Complete Personnel Recruitment	Temporary Staff for South Australian Arid Lands Region—Regional Programs	\$84,842
Urban & Regional Planning	Temporary Staff for Climate Change	\$56,621
Gramac Solutions	Temporary Staff for Naracoorte Caves	\$34,735
McArthur (SA) Pty Ltd	Temporary Staff for Flows for the Future	\$15,580
Manpower Services Pty Ltd	Temporary staff for Information Technology	\$12,760
Total		\$2,444,046

### GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020).  
(Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised that for the Department for Environment and Water:

- At 30 June 2020, 16.03 FTEs were allocated to communication and promotion functions, costing \$1,872,333.
- The table below outlines the budgeted FTEs and estimated employment costs.
  - At 1 July 2020, former NRM board staff moved out of the department (to join new Landscape Board teams). This will result in an overall reduction in DEW communication and promotion FTE and expenses compared with previous years.
  - There are no other plans in place to either increase or decrease FTEs employed to provide 'communication and promotion activities' in the years 2020-2024 so it has been assumed the figures will be constant across these years.

Year	No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities	Estimated Employment Expense*
2020-21	11.09	1,335,237
2021-22	11.09	1,355,265
2022-23	11.09	1,375,594
2023-24	11.09	1,396,228

\* Salary calculations include on-costs for payroll tax (4.95 per cent), long service leave (3 per cent), Workcover (1 per cent) and superannuation (based on the individual employee's chosen rate). The EB has been incorporated into the 2019-20 and 2020-21 costs. From 2021-22 onwards an estimated 1.5 per cent (DTF rate) has been applied to each of the out years as the EB increase is unknown for these years.

- As an open and transparent Government, Marketing Communications Activity Reports and Annual Media Expenditure details are proactively disclosed. The reports list all marketing campaigns over the cost of \$50,000 and are disclosed on the DPC website:

<https://www.dpc.sa.gov.au/about-the-department/accountability/government-marketing-advertising-expenditure>

- In 2019-20 the Department for Environment and Water spent \$29,156 (excluding GST) through the government's Master Media Scheme on media advertising campaigns.

Summary Table of 2019-20 total campaign expenditure:

Campaign	Total Cost (ex GST)
You can...in parks	\$20,429
Glenthorne National Park	\$5,001
State Flora	\$3,726
Total (ex GST)	\$29,156

### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020).  
(Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised of the following for the Department for Environment and Water:

Attraction allowances, retention allowances and non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020:

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
Regional NRM Manager (EP)	MAS3	Retention	24,093
Regional NRM Manager (KI)	MAS3	Retention	24,093
Manager Crown Land Programs	MAS3	Retention	5,000
General Manager, Human Resources	MAS3	Retention	5,000
Principal Hydrologist	PO4	Retention	11,262
General Manager, Water Licencing	MAS3	Retention	5,000
Program Manager, Dog and Cat unit	MAS3	Attraction	6,151
Team Leader, Animal Welfare and Wildlife	ASO7	Attraction	2,000

**MINISTERIAL STAFF**

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020).  
(Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised the following in relation to staff employed within my office:

Ministerial staff employed as at 17 July was published in the *Government Gazette* on 23 July 2020.

**TERMINATIONS PAYOUTS**

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020).  
(Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised of the following:

There were no executive level employees terminated from the Department for Environment and Water for the financial year 2019-20.

**GRANT PROGRAMS**

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020).  
(Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** In response to Questions 14 and 15 I have been advised the following:

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2019-20 and across the forward estimates for the Department for Environment and Water—Controlled:

Grant program / fund name	Purpose of grant program / fund	2019-20 Actual \$000	2020-21 Budget \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$'000
National Parks and Wildlife	The sustainable management of South Australia's nature, parks, places, wildlife and cultural assets ensures the social, environmental and economic prosperity of the state.	2,661	3,492	2,246	2,451	2,661
Water and the River Murray	Water is managed sustainably for the benefit of the environment, community and economy.	26,662	28,340	28,944	29,862	30,816
Environment, Heritage and Sustainability	Develop and deliver policies that support sustainable development and protect and conserve the state's environment and heritage, in partnership with key bodies in the face of a changing climate.	2,865	2,885	2,750	-	-

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2019-20 and across the forward estimates for the Department for Environment and Water—Administered:

Grant program / fund name	Purpose of grant program / fund	2019-20 Actual \$000	2020-21 Budget \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$'000
Administered Items	Financial support grant for the Zoo, the Stormwater Management Authority, Adelaide City Council Parklands, and Qualco-Sunlands Ground Water Control Trust.	13,797	14,190	14,695	14,642	14,982

The following table details the commitment of grants in 2019-20 for the Department for Environment and Water—Controlled:

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$'000
Water and the River Murray	Murray-Darling Basin Authority	Annual contribution to the Murray-Darling Basin Authority and return of SARFIIP interest.	22,931
Water and the River Murray	University of Adelaide	Grant for the Healthy Coorong Healthy Basin Phase 1 trial and Investigations.	1,232
National Parks and Wildlife	RSPCA	Grant for the administration of the Animal Welfare Act 1985.	1,160
Water and the River Murray	Gurra Downs Date Company Pty Ltd	Grant for Gurra Water Supply Scheme, and water supply infrastructure (Loxton irrigation).	1,146
National Parks and Wildlife	The Nature Conservancy	Funding for the Metropolitan Coast Shellfish Reef project.	900
Environment, Heritage and Sustainability	National Trust of South Australia	Grant for various heritage activation projects that will contribute to heritage tourism, regional economic development, heritage conservation and creation and support of heritage trades and skills.	400
Water and the River Murray	SA Water Corp	Reimbursement for investigation costs into the use of Adelaide Desalination Plant to Support the Commonwealth River Murray Water Efficiency Program.	340
National Parks and Wildlife	District Council of Coober Pedy	Grant for the Kanku-Breakaway Conservation Park and Co-management Board.	329
Environment, Heritage and Sustainability	City of West Torrens	Tree planting to combat tree loss through urban infill.	205
National Parks and Wildlife	Conservation Council of South Australia Inc.	The grant will partially fund delivery of three broad program areas: Operation of a community conservation centre; Community consultation and engagement; and Development of the 'Nature of SA' project.	201
Environment, Heritage and Sustainability	City of Onkaparinga	Greening our urban areas—reducing the urban heat island affect through urban tree planting and water sensitive urban design.	200
Environment, Heritage and Sustainability	University of Adelaide	Grant funding to continue the appointment of Professor in Systematic Botany at the University in the broad field of Plant Systematics and Conservation with the Minister agreeing to partially fund this for an initial period of five years, with the intention that the appointment will be ongoing if the Professor meets key performance indicators set by the parties.	193
Water and the River Murray	River Murray and Mallee Aboriginal Corporation	Grant for the provision of Cultural Heritage Co-ordinators and Monitors across SARFIIP program.	172
Water and the River Murray	Cowarie Pastoral Co	Repair/Rehabilitation Works	150
Water and the River Murray	University of Adelaide	Grant for the establishment of a South Australian Water Ambassador to deliver specific water related functions and outcomes for the State government and water sector.	100
Water and the River Murray	Bureau of Meteorology	Grant for assisting local government in flash flood management.	94
Environment, Heritage and Sustainability	City of Marion	Grant for the Edwardstown Green Infrastructure Project.	85

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$'000
Water and the River Murray	Ngarrindjeri Aboriginal Corporation	Grant for the Ngarrindjeri partnerships regarding Healthy Coorong Healthy Basin Program—Phase 1.	74
Environment, Heritage and Sustainability	Wattle Range Council	Grant for the Rivoli Bay Study	71
Environment, Heritage and Sustainability	City of Playford	Grant for the Smith Creek Trail	59
Environment, Heritage and Sustainability	City of Unley	Grant for the Living Streets Pilot Program	59
Environment, Heritage and Sustainability	Primary Producers SA	Grant supporting engagement and policy advice as it relates to the business of DEW and South Australia's primary producers.	50
Various programs	Other grants	Various other smaller grants	2,037

The following table details the commitment of grants in 2019-20 for the Department for Environment and Water—Administered:

Grant program / fund name	Beneficiary / Recipient	Purpose	Value \$'000
Administered-Support grants	Royal Zoological Society	Financial support grant for the Zoo	6,646
Administered-Support grants	Stormwater Management Authority	Annual grant paid to support the authority	5,513
Administered-Support grants	Adelaide City Council	Grant provided for parklands related activities such as watering the parklands, ongoing management and enhancement of the parklands and operation of the Adelaide Park Lands Authority	1,598
Administered-Support grants	Qualco-Sunlands Ground Water Control Trust	Temporary grant to the Trust in accordance with Part 7 of the <i>Ground Water (Qualco-Sunlands) Control Act 2000</i>	40

The following table details the new\* commitment of grants across the forward estimates for the Department for Environment and Water—Controlled:

Grant program / fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2020-21 Budget \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000
Environment, Heritage and Sustainability	Climate change resilience	1,000	2,000	—	—
Environment, Heritage and Sustainability	Grants to support State Heritage Place owner	250	250	—	—

\*new grants defined as those committed from or after the 2020-21 State Budget.

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised that for the Department for Environment and Water:

The government has provided a complete list of grants paid during 2019-20 in the response to question 14.

#### GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (24 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised:

The annual reports published for each of the agencies I am responsible for will contain this information.

#### VETERAN WELBEING CENTRE

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (25 November 2020). (Estimates Committee A)



**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

The investment supports refurbishment and fit-out of the former Sleep Studies building at the Repat Health Precinct to create the Veteran Wellbeing Centre. The Centre will provide consult rooms, digital hub and office spaces. Part of the funding is going towards refurbishment of the Schools Patriotic Funds (SPF) Hall which will incorporate a cafe, spiritual care space, activity hub, a large meeting space and a veteran's commemorative linkage canopy. The SPF Hall refurbishment is directly adjacent to the Veterans' Wellbeing Centre and is a crucial supportive element to the goals of the Veteran Wellbeing Centre.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to various members. (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised:

Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT)

Budgeted spend on goods and services for 2020-21, and for the each year of the forward estimates is currently estimated to be:

	2020-21(\$'m)	2021-22(\$'m)	2022-23(\$'m)	2023-24(\$'m)	2024-25(\$'m)
Supplies & Services	762.822	764.197	733.085	731.744	732.917

Top ten providers of goods and services by value to DIT for 2019-20:

Vendor	Description of Goods/Services	Total Spend Incl GST (\$'m)
Spotless Facility Services Pty Ltd	Across Government Facilities Management Arrangement Services Provision	169.051
Torrens Transit Pty Ltd	Provision of Regular Passenger Services	153.146
Australian Transit	Provision of Passenger Transport Services	79.800
Bombardier Transportation Aust.	Goods and Services relating to Rail Maintenance	52.230
CBRE (v) Pty Ltd	Office Accommodation Leasing	29.286
Knight Frank Australia Pty Ltd	Property Acquisition Services	25.845
Simec Zen Energy Retail Pty Ltd	South Australian Government Electricity Provision	21.980
Collier International (SA) Pty Ltd	Property Management Services	16.191
MRS Property Pty Ltd	Property Acquisition and Advisory Services	11.563
Top Coat Asphalt Contractors	Asphalt Supply and Application Services	10.846

Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing (ORSR)

Budget for goods and services for 2020-21, and for each year of the forward estimates:

	2020-21 \$'000	2021-22 \$'000	2022-23 \$'000	2023-24 \$'000	2024-25 \$'000
Supplies and Services	6,213	6,244	6,552	6,321	6,073
Payments for Property, Plant & Equipment	38,237	31,713	51,743	36,774	1,806

Top ten providers of goods and services by value to ORSR or 2019-20.

Vendor	Description of goods/services	Total Spend (inc. GST)
DIT—Building Management	Major capital projects, and facilities management under the Across Government Facilities Management Arrangements.	\$3,625,440
DPC	Business support services under Service Level Agreement.	\$827,380
YMCA Aquatic & Event Services	Capital works, facility and equipment hire, outgoings and plant and equipment repair and maintenance at the SA Aquatic and Leisure Centre.	\$701,775
Aurecon Australasia Pty Ltd	Professional services relating to the agency's Commonwealth Games Feasibility Assessment Project and Strategic Asset Management Plan.	\$368,153

Vendor	Description of goods/services	Total Spend (inc. GST)
Zen Energy Retail Pty Ltd	Electricity provider at various Agency facilities.	\$312,414
Deloitte Financial Advisory	Professional services for the Commonwealth Games Feasibility Assessment Project.	\$223,731
Qbt Pty Ltd	Business travel provider for the Agency (airfares, accommodation).	\$209,433
YMCA South Australia Inc	Equipment and maintenance at the Parks Recreation and Sports Centre.	\$188,530
SA Water Corporation	Water at various Agency facilities.	\$139,674
Pricewaterhousecoopers	Professional services relating to the State Sport and Recreation Infrastructure Plan Project.	\$132,506

The Department of Treasury and Finance will be providing a whole of government response in relation to the value of goods and services supplied by South Australian suppliers.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to various members. (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised:

Department for Infrastructure and Transport

Abolished:

Agency	Title	Total Employment Cost
Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT)	Enterprise Architect	\$110,107.00
	Project Officer	\$110,107.00
	Strategy Security Leader and Advisory	\$110,107.00
	Information Strategist	\$110,107.00
	Principal Strategy Officer	\$110,107.00
	Principal Accountant	\$110,107.00
	Project Manager	\$110,107.00
	Unit Manager General Administration	\$110,107.00
	Principal Consultant Human Resources	\$110,107.00
	Senior Planner Aviation	\$110,107.00
	Principal Advisor Road Network	\$118,413.00
	Senior Business Partner	\$118,413.00
	Unit Manager Learning and Development	\$118,413.00
	Unit Manager MetroCard	\$118,413.00
	Manager Property and Building Management	\$120,467.00
	Project Team Leader	\$120,467.00
	Manager Performance Support Services	\$120,467.00
	Manager Government and Strategy Performance	\$120,467.00
	Library Manager	\$100,887.00
	Network Strategy Road	\$100,887.00
	Principal Pavements Engineer	\$113,505.00
Team Leader Traffic Access	\$113,505.00	
Project Manager	\$113,505.00	
Manager Modelling	\$122,722.00	
Senior Project Manager	\$122,722.00	
Associate Government Architect	\$122,722.00	

Created:

Agency	Title	Total Employment Cost
Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT)	Principal Project Officer Commercial Marine and State Waters	\$110,107.00
	Principal Policy Officer	\$110,107.00
	Manager Digital and Customer Experience	\$110,107.00
	Program Management Officer	\$110,107.00
	Workforce Transition Lead	\$110,107.00
	Project Lead Data and Analytics	\$110,107.00
	Principal Auditor	\$110,107.00
	Principal Auditor	\$110,107.00
	Manager Systems Development	\$110,107.00
	Content Development Lead	\$110,107.00
	Team Leader Rail Procurement	\$118,413.00
	Team Leader IT and Public Transport Procurement	\$118,413.00

Agency	Title	Total Employment Cost
	Project Manager Across Government Facilities Management Authority Safety Improvements and Initiatives	\$118,413.00
	Project Manager Across Government Facilities Management Authority Safety Improvement	\$118,413.00
	Program Management Lead	\$118,413.00
	Business Improvement and Systems Lead	\$118,413.00
	Business Planning and Performance Manager	\$118,413.00
	Project Manager	\$118,413.00
	Project Manager South Australian Public Transport Authority	\$118,413.00
	Manager Commercial Marine and State Waters	\$120,467.00
	Manager Road Safety Information and Analysis	\$120,467.00
	Manager Road Safety Policy and Projects	\$120,467.00
	Manager Registration Licensing and Heavy Vehicle Policy	\$120,467.00
	Manager Procurement Governance and Policy	\$120,467.00
	Manager Goods and Services Commercial and Contracts	\$120,467.00
	Manager Budgeting and Reporting	\$120,467.00
	Manager Ticketing	\$120,467.00
	Manager Network Planning	\$120,467.00
	Manager Business Solutions	\$120,467.00
	Cost Manager	\$100,887.00
	Investment Program Manager	\$100,887.00
	Project Manager	\$100,887.00
	Project Manager	\$100,887.00
	Project Manager	\$100,887.00
	Project Manager	\$100,887.00
	Project Proving Lead	\$113,505.00
	Project Manager (Congestion Busting)	\$113,505.00
	Infrastructure and Asset Manager	\$122,722.00
	Zone Transition Manager	\$122,722.00
	Manager Engineering Services	\$122,722.00
	Manager Network Assessment	\$122,722.00

Office for Recreation Sport and Racing

Abolished:

Agency	Title	Total Employment Cost
Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing	Strategic Projects (created September 2019)	\$120,467

Created:

Agency	Title	Total Employment Cost
Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing (ORSR)	Manager Funding Services (Grants Review)	\$110,107
ORSR	Strategic Projects (abolished June 2020)	\$120,467

#### GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to various members. (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised:

Department for Infrastructure and Transport

At 30 June 2020, 11 FTEs were allocated to communication functions at a cost of \$1.058 million for the 2019-20 financial year. In 2020-21 the Communications Directorate will have 20 FTEs as a result of the realignment into the directorate of three current FTEs and addition of six new FTEs. The realignment includes the integration of existing road safety partnerships roles, internal communications and market research.

The new roles will focus on improved engagement and digital communications and will support the expanded investing program for the Department. It is estimated that the cost for the 20 FTEs will be circa \$2.188 million. The number of FTE's for the financial periods 2022-23 and 2023-24 will be determined as part of the budget setting process in those years.

For 2019-20 the cost of advertising across all mediums was circa \$0.683 million. Similar level of expenditure and corresponding budget allocation is estimated for 2020-21. Consistent with the Government's Marketing

Communication Guidelines, all marketing initiatives over the cost of \$50,000 and considered appropriate for public release are disclosed on the DPC's website.

#### Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing

1.0 FTE was employed to provide communication and promotion activities in 2019-20. The annual salary and total employment cost will not be released as it is considered an unreasonable disclosure of personal affairs.

The table below outlines the budgeted FTEs and estimated employment costs for staff engaged to provide communication and promotion activities:

Year	No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities	Estimated Expense	Employment
2020-21	1.6	\$158,100	
2021-22	1.6	\$160,472	
2022-23	1.6	\$162,879	
2023-24	1.6	\$165,322	

The total cost of government-paid advertising, including campaigns, across all mediums in 2019-20 was \$9k. The budgeted cost for 2020-21 is \$13k.

### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to various members. (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):**

Department for Infrastructure and Transport

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Amount
Senior Safety Engineer	PO503	Attraction / Retention	\$42,296.54
Manager Across Government Accommodation	MAS301	Attraction / Retention	\$35,858.96
Manager Real Estate	MAS301	Attraction / Retention	\$30,912.95
Project Manager Heavy Vehicle Projects	MAS301	Attraction / Retention	\$28,792.79
Manager Marine Operations	MAS301	Attraction / Retention	\$23,906.04
Rail Infrastructure Manager	ASO803	Attraction / Retention	\$23,496.61
Unit Manager Communication and Electrical Systems	ASO803	Attraction / Retention	\$23,496.56
Manager Contract Management Advisory	MAS301	Attraction / Retention	\$23,496.56
Zone Transition Manager	PO503	Attraction / Retention	\$21,089.79
Principal Across Government Facilities Management Authority Contracts Manager	ASO803	Attraction / Retention	\$19,972.06
Delivery Manager Projects	PO503	Attraction / Retention	\$19,936.02
Manager Across Government Services Reform	MAS301	Attraction / Retention	\$19,776.92
Project Manager**	ASO603	Attraction / Retention	\$19,530.90
Unit Manager Train Operations	MAS301	Attraction / Retention	\$19,222.70
Manager Facilities Services	MAS301	Attraction / Retention	\$18,825.65
Manager Assessment and Policy Reform	MAS301	Attraction / Retention	\$16,793.49
Manager Traffic Management Centre	ASO803	Attraction / Retention	\$14,952.08
Senior Contract Manager	ASO803	Attraction / Retention	\$14,952.08

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Amount
Manager Governance Projects And Business Services	MAS301	Attraction / Retention	\$14,952.08
Delivery Manager Projects	PO503	Attraction / Retention	\$14,952.08
Delivery Manager Projects	PO503	Attraction / Retention	\$14,952.08
IT Program Manager	MAS301	Attraction / Retention	\$14,668.95
Unit Manager Technical and Operation Assurance **	PO503	Attraction / Retention	\$13,455.00
Manager Regional Planning and Growth Management	MAS301	Attraction / Retention	\$13,375.67
Digital Solutions Manager	MAS301	Attraction / Retention	\$12,931.94
Unit Manager Network Control	ASO803	Attraction / Retention	\$12,361.16
Across Government Facilities Management Authority Service Manager	ASO803	Attraction / Retention	\$11,748.31
Manager Property and Building Management	MAS301	Attraction / Retention	\$11,514.80
Unit Manager Tram Operations	ASO803	Attraction / Retention	\$11,271.47
Manager Future Mobility and Passenger Transport	MAS301	Attraction / Retention	\$11,209.50
Manager Construction Commercial Advisory	MAS301	Attraction / Retention	\$9,968.14
Program Manager	MAS301	Attraction / Retention	\$8,313.39
Manager Business Partnerships	MAS301	Attraction / Retention	\$8,313.36
Technical Architect	ASO704	Attraction / Retention	\$8,303.09
Urban Manager Construction And Specialist Maintenance	ASO803	Attraction / Retention	\$8,047.44
Unit Manager Road Maintenance Delivery	PO503	Attraction / Retention	\$7,881.22
Manager Technical Services	PO503	Attraction / Retention	\$6,591.78
Manager Property Acquisition	MAS301	Attraction / Retention	\$5,447.76
Unit Manager Electrical Engineer	PO404	Attraction / Retention	\$5,221.92
Unit Manager Track Civil Engineer	ASO803	Attraction / Retention	\$4,539.80
Unit Manager Operational Development	MAS301	Attraction / Retention	\$3,900.20
Manager Procurement Operations	MAS301	Attraction / Retention	\$3,450.51
Principal Field Testing Officer	TGO503	Attraction / Retention	\$3,010.12
Planning Lead	PO601	Attraction / Retention	\$2,867.73
Principal Project Manager	ASO803	Attraction / Retention	\$2,723.88
Unit Manager Signal And Control System Engineer	PO503	Attraction / Retention	\$1,854.18
Project Manager Target Operating Model Delivery	ASO803	Attraction / Retention	\$1,815.92
Senior Commercial Advisor	ASO704	Attraction / Retention	\$620.08

\*\*Public Servants in receipt of Maintenance Allowance

Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Amount
Head Hockey Coach	OPS5	Retention	\$9,922.08
Head Rowing Coach	OPS6	Retention	\$10,787.64
Head Swimming Coach	OPS7	Retention	\$30,031.76
Rowing Talent Pathways Coordinator	OPS4	Retention	\$7,225.15
High Performance Lead	ASO5	Retention	\$5,392.82
Assistant Swimming Coach	OPS3	Retention	\$13,573.60

#### MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to various members. (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):**

I have been advised the following in relation to staff employed within my office:

Ministerial staff employed as at 17 July 2020 was published in the *Government Gazette* on 23 July 2020.

Due to changes in ministerial portfolios, the following table lists public sector staff employed as at 24 November 2020:

Title	ASO Classification	Non-salary benefits
Office Manager	ASO7	Nil
Executive Coordinator	ASO6	Nil
Government Liaison Officer	ASO6	Nil
Ministerial Liaison Officer	ASO6	Nil
Ministerial Liaison Officer	ASO6	Nil
Team Leader Business Support	ASO6 (0.8)	Nil
Digital Communications Officer	ASO4	Nil
Senior Business Support Officer	ASO4	Nil
Business Support Officer	ASO3	Nil
Business Support Officer	ASO3	Nil

[Note – non-salary benefit could be a description or value (i.e. car park)]

As at 24 November 2020 there were no staff seconded from a department to my office.

#### TERMINATIONS PAYOUTS

In reply to various members. (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised:

Department for Infrastructure and Transport

One South Australian Executive Service termination payment has occurred since 1 July 2019. The total value of the executive termination payment was \$88,263.00.

Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing

The Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing has not reported any executive terminations since 1 July 2019.

#### EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS

In reply to various members. (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised:

Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT)

In February 2019 DIT implemented a new organisational structure centred on its customers, communities and the products and services it delivers. As at 30 June 2019, there were 28 South Australian Executive Services employees employed within DIT and 33 employed as at 30 June 2020.

Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing

The Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing has made the following executive appointments since 1 July 2019:

- Director, Corporate Strategy and Investment

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to various members. (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised:

Department for Infrastructure and Transport

The below table details for each grant program and fund the 2019-20 actual expenditure and budgeted expenditure in the forward estimates:

Grant/Fund	Purpose	2019-20 Actual \$'000	2020-21 Budget \$'000	2021-22 Budget \$'000	2022-23 Budget \$'000	2023-24 Budget \$'000
Black Spot Program (Operating)	State and Federal	2,009	5,463	1,646	1,716	1,934
Boating Safety—SABFAC	To establish and improve recreational boating facilities in South Australia's coastal and inland waters.	2,930	2,152	2,181	1,217	1,247
Future Mobility Fund	Driverless vehicles	1,780	2,029	—	—	—
Kangaroo Island Maintenance Project	Upgrade of Local Unsealed Roads on Kangaroo Island	1,722	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,050
Centre for Automotive Research (CASR)	Funding provided by DIT and the Motor Accident Commission for continuing operation of CASR within the University of Adelaide.	1,522	932	955	979	1,003
National Transport Commission (NTC)	To contribute to the national road, rail and intermodal transport reform agenda	509	643	627	631	647
Mount Gambier Airport Upgrade	Redevelopment of Mount Gambier Regional Airport	3,632	404	-	-	—
The Parade/George Street, Norwood	Scramble crossing		300	—	—	—
Austral Asia Railway Corporation (AARC)	Grant for the operation of the Corporation	150	185	190	195	200
Way2Go	Way2Go is an innovative program to get more students safely walking, riding and using public transport for school travel. Way2Go provides schools and councils with resources, strategies and ideas to make school travel safer, greener and more active	324	145	148	151	154
MAC Local Government Initiatives	MAC Road Safety Fund—The Corporation of the City of Whyalla	307	119	—	—	—
KESAB	Road Watch Program	85	85	87	89	91
Remote Airstrip Upgrade Program (RAUP)	State Government co-funding – round 7	539	61	-	-	—

Grant/Fund	Purpose	2019-20 Actual \$'000	2020-21 Budget \$'000	2021-22 Budget \$'000	2022-23 Budget \$'000	2023-24 Budget \$'000
Local Government Association Aviation Payment	Contribution to the LGALMS Aerodrome Risk Management Programme	40	41	42	43	44
Bridges Renewal Program	Bridges Renewal program	1,143	-	-	-	-
Greenways and Bicycle Boulevard Program	Bicycle Boulevard improvements	148	202	-	-	-
Heavy Vehicle Safety and Productivity Programme	Australian Government initiative to fund infrastructure projects that improve the productivity and safety outcomes of heavy vehicle operations across Australia.	1,229	-	-	-	-
State Bicycle Fund	To assist with the building and maintenance of bicycle and Active Transport Infrastructure – bike paths, ramps, 'cut throughs', road crossings, bike parking, signs etc.	250	779	-	-	-
Sealing a portion of Lyndoch Road	Funding agreement with Light Regional Council	500	-	-	-	-
Supporting Regional Aviation Initiative	Supports priority infrastructure upgrades at regional airports.	10	-	-	-	-
Building Better Regions Fund	Supports the commitment to create jobs, drive economic growth and build stronger regional communities into the future.	66	-	-	-	-
Circular Economy Market development grant	Grants for councils, not-for-profit organisations, research institutes and businesses that produce, manufacture, sell or promote South Australian recycled materials and recycled-content products.	11	-	-	-	-
SA Freight Council	Promote the welfare and development of the freight industry in South Australia	167	180	170	160	-
Land Use Planning	Coordinate a community response to a range of planning, infrastructure and transport initiatives.	10	-	-	-	-
Administrative Grant to active Community Road Safety Groups (CRSG)	All active Community Road Safety Groups are insured by DIT for Public Liability and Accident and Health Insurance. These active Community Road Safety Groups are eligible to invoice for a \$500 Administration Grant.	6	-	-	-	-
Rural City of Murray Bridge	Financial Grant Agreement—Land Purchase	270	-	-	-	-



Grant/Fund	Purpose	2019-20 Actual \$'000	2020-21 Budget \$'000	2021-22 Budget \$'000	2022-23 Budget \$'000	2023-24 Budget \$'000
Pichi Richi Railway Station	Upgrade level crossing at Quorn from passive to active	652	-	-	-	-
Watervale Community Association	Building a new community multipurpose facility at the Watervale Soldiers Memorial Recreation Ground	122	-	-	-	-
Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources	Contribution to Heavy Vehicles Emission Reduction Analysis	27	-	-	-	-
TAFE SA	Debra Summers Scholarship Award—Commercial Cookery	10	-	-	-	-
Greek Orthodox Community	An extension to an existing building to accommodate ethnic school and community use	200	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>		<b>19,000</b>	<b>15,820</b>	<b>8,108</b>	<b>7,244</b>	<b>7,435</b>

\*Note that these budgets are subject to change during normal budget processes throughout the year and represent operating related expenditure only.

Contractual commitments as at 30 June 2020 are as below:

Contractual commitments made at 30 June 2020:	2020/21 \$000
Boating Safety Unit – SABFAC:	
City of Salisbury	630
Yorke Peninsula Council	330
Renmark Paringa Council	125
District Council of Loxton Waikerie	195
Future Mobility Fund:	
Ezymile Pty Ltd	335
Australian Transit Enterprises Pty Ltd	925
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,540</b>

Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing

(a), (b) and (d) Table 1 provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2019-20 and across the forward estimates for the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing (ORSR). ORSR controlled grant programs are funded year-on-year by appropriation, the program/fund does not have a running balance. ORSR administered funds have the following balances as at 30 June 2020:

Recreation and Sport Fund, \$1.5 million

Sport and Recreation Fund, \$3.3 million

Grants paid are funded either via an appropriation or revenue received specifically for the purpose of providing the grant. These revenues form part of the approved annual budget. Carryovers comprised \$0.85m from the Sports Vouchers program in 2019-20 to the Active Club Program in 2020-21.

Refer to Table 2.

TABLE 1: Grant Programs and Funds:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2019-20 Actual \$000	2020-21 Budget \$000	2021-22 Budget \$000	2022-23 Budget \$000	2023-24 Budget \$000
<b>Controlled</b>						
Racing Industry Fund	Provides assistance for a variety of purposes to the racing industry in South Australia. Grants are approved by the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, Treasurer, Premier,	3,523	3,900	4,100	4,200	-

	Cabinet or State Budget, where there is no public call for applications.					
Grassroots Football, Cricket, and Netball Facility Program / Grassroots Sporting Facilities Program *Note expanded to other sports	To assist eligible organisations to develop core infrastructure that directly impacts participation through the development of good quality, well designed and utilised facilities.	11,000	15,000	10,000*	-	-
Regional and Districts Facilities Program	Provides assistance to eligible applicants to create regionally significant sport and active recreation precincts by developing sporting infrastructure.	-	5,000	5,000	-	-
Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program	Provides assistance to eligible organisations to plan, establish or improve sport and active recreation facilities.	3,628	4,328	4,344	4,435	4,491
Active Club Program	Provides assistance to active recreation and sport clubs with minor facilities, and programs and equipment.	3,150	2,495	1,670	1,696	1,722
Sport and Recreation Sustainability Program	Provides assistance for the leadership, policies and services provided by South Australian state sport and active recreation organisations and industry representative bodies.	2,752	3,100	3,100	3,257	3,338
Sport and Recreation Development and Inclusion Program	Provides assistance to eligible organisations to develop and implement projects that will grow the sport or activity, improve services or address barriers to inclusion.	2,941	3,018	3,030	3,181	3,247
SASI Individual Athlete Program	Provides assistance to eligible elite and country athletes who are engaged in an Olympic, Paralympic or Commonwealth Games sport and event.	148	135	135	135	135
State Facility Fund	Provides assistance to eligible organisations to plan, establish or improve State sport facilities.	500	-	-	-	-
VACSWIM	Provides assistance to eligible organisations to provide children aged 5 to 13 years old with opportunities to develop a range of water skills and positive experiences.	455	470	482	494	506
Other Grants	Provides assistance for a variety of purposes to a variety of individuals or not for profit organisations that are approved by the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, Treasurer, Premier, Cabinet or State Budget,	4,360	62,845	54	56	56

	where there is no public call for applications. 2020-21 includes grants related to the State Infrastructure Package.					
Sports Vouchers Subsidies	The program provides an opportunity for primary school aged children from Reception to Year 7 to receive up to a \$100 discount on sports or dance membership or registration fees. The purpose is to increase the number of children playing organised sport or participating in dance activities by reducing cost as a barrier.	5,805	8,000	8,200	8,405	8,615
Subsidies—Parks Community Centre	Operator Subsidy to YMCA for the operation and management of the Parks Community Centre.	777	850	948	1,074	1,074
Subsidies—SA Aquatic and Leisure Centre	Operator Subsidy to YMCA for the operation and management of the SA Aquatic and Leisure Centre	970	1,155	1,184	1,214	1,271
SANFL Payroll Tax Grant	Payroll Tax Relief Grant	240	240	240	240	240
Administered						
Sport & Recreation Fund	The Office has responsibility for two Administered funds; both of which are created and governed by legislation. Monies in the funds are transferred to Controlled and applied to sport and recreation activities as prescribed in the relevant legislation and approved by the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing.	4,300	4,500	4,525	4,551	4,578
Recreation and Sport Fund		-	-	-	-	-

TABLE 2: GRANT COMMITMENTS

Grant	Beneficiary/Recipient and Purpose	2020-21 \$000	2021-22 \$000	2022-23 \$000	2023-24 \$000
Subsidies—Parks Community Centre	Operator Subsidy to YMCA for the operation and management of the Parks Community Centre	850	948	1,074	-
Subsidies—SA Aquatic and Leisure Centre	Operator Subsidy to YMCA for the operation and management of the SA Aquatic and Leisure Centre	1,155	-	-	-
SANFL Payroll Tax Relief	Payroll Tax Relief Grant	240	240	240	240
VACSWIM	To Enventive Incorporated for VACSWIM Management Office	108	-	-	-
Sport and Recreation Sustainability Program	Grants to 64 various grantees, with multi-year grant agreements. Provides assistance for the leadership, policies and services provided by South Australian state sport and active recreation	2,557	-	-	-

Grant	Beneficiary/Recipient and Purpose	2020-21 \$000	2021-22 \$000	2022-23 \$000	2023-24 \$000
	organisations and industry representative bodies.				
Sport and Recreation Development and Inclusion Program	Grants to 41 various grantees, with multi-year grant agreements.  Provides assistance to eligible organisations to develop and implement projects that will grow the sport or activity, improve services or address barriers to inclusion.	1,532	-	-	-

## Note:

1. Not all grant funding is allocated to a specific grant program. Allocations are made during the financial year as a result of the finalisation of agreements between ORSR and relevant stakeholders.

2. Budgets for the forward estimates are not allocated to individual grant recipients as the majority of grants are provided / allocated to recipients during the financial year in which the grant is applied for. Budgets are subject to the annual budget process and final cabinet endorsement.