

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

### Thursday, 23 September 2021

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 this parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.

#### *Parliamentary Committees*

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: STATE CENTRE OF FOOTBALL**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:04):** I move:

That the 128<sup>th</sup> report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled State Centre of Football Project, be noted.

The State Centre of Football was established in the State Sports Park Master Plan structure plan in February 2020. The state centre is located on the vacant parcel of land between Roma Mitchell Secondary College and the Croatian Sports Centre with road access off Briens Road. It is open grassland, flattish at its western end and rising to the east.

The centre project was allocated \$19 million in the 2018-19 state budget with the anticipation that a further \$7 million would be obtained from the federal government, but this did not subsequently eventuate. An additional \$5 million has been allocated to the project to ensure a sufficiently comprehensive scope and for the venue to be able to deliver on its Women's World Cup 2023 training site nomination.

The Centre of Football is an integral part of the State Sports Park and its football precinct, which includes the adjacent Roma Mitchell Secondary College and the Croatian sports hub centre, which is the home, as members will know, of the Adelaide Croatia Raiders Soccer Club.

The state centre will be the headquarters for Football SA and is a nominated training venue, as I earlier mentioned, for the forthcoming FIFA Women's World Cup 2023. The state centre will also provide significant new playing opportunities for community and clubs in the northern Adelaide region, both in its traditional form and its popular five-a-side futsal form. The state centre will include the following scope of works:

- construction of a new stadium with 5,000 spectator capacity, including a 1,000-seat grandstand with lighted hybrid grass/artificial turf;
- two training pitches and 10 five-a-side futsal pitches, also lighted and with artificial turf;
- player, media, officials and referee facilities;
- new road and intersection upgrades with Briens Road;
- plaza and car/bus parking;
- gym and cafe facilities; and
- Football SA's administration and corporate facilities.

Construction is scheduled to commence, with substantial completion expected by December this year.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to this project and received assurances that the appropriate consultation had been undertaken. The committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to appropriate agency consultation and does meet the criteria for the examination of projects as described in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, section 12C. The Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the scope of the proposed public works that I have described.

Motion carried.

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: ANGLE VALE WASTEWATER AUGMENTATION CHARGE WORKS**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:07):** I move:

That the 129<sup>th</sup> report of the Public Works Committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled 'Angle Vale wastewater network augmentation charge works' be noted.

SA Water is proposing to install the new wastewater network to service the growth in allotments in the Angle Vale area. Residential development at Angle Vale is currently expanding rapidly, with a potential increase in connections to SA Water's network forecast to rise from the current 478 to 5,063 allotments over the next 30 years. Development in the area has already exceeded expected growth rates and, in addition, there is a new 1,600-student school under construction, planned for completion in early 2022.

In response to the increased pace of development, SA Water seeks to accelerate the delivery of the wastewater network to service the area. The key aim of the works is to provide a reliable, safe and maintainable connection of the Angle Vale wastewater network to the Bolivar Wastewater Treatment Plant. The preferred option for the new wastewater network includes two pumping stations, 1.2 kilometres of gravity main and 3.1 kilometres of rising mains.

The project will deliver new infrastructure—pipework and pumps—to ensure reliable and safe disposal of wastewater from the Angle Vale area through the Bolivar Wastewater Treatment Plant by the end of this year. This will replace the existing tankering system which is utilised in the early stages of developments when there is insufficient wastewater produced to effectively utilise a sewer system connected to a wastewater treatment plant.

The South Australian Water Corporation Board approved the release of capital expenditure of \$12.7 million to be funded through SA Water's Regulatory Determination 2020-24, Our Plan 2020-24, to compete this project. Project works are expected to have commenced with practical completion expected in October of this year.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to this project and received assurances that the appropriate consultation had been undertaken. The committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to the appropriate agency consultation and does meet the criteria for the examination of projects, as described in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Based on the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it supports the proposed scope of public works that I have outlined.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:10):** I rise to speak to the 129<sup>th</sup> report of the Public Works Committee, entitled 'Angle Vale wastewater network augmentation charge works'. I wish to note the historic association that my family had with Angle Vale after they left Plympton, where my original forebears William and Mary Pederick had a farm in 1840. You could have farms then, obviously, in Plympton. They went out to Gawler River, where their son Robert Adams had land. The land on which the Gawler River church sits was land donated by the Pederick family. Some people say it was the stoniest piece of the property, and that is why it was donated, but it was put to good use and God's work.

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

**Mr PEDERICK:** Yes. There are some very historic names buried there. My original forebears lie in the cemetery next to a lot of the Dawkins family, the Reddens and a whole range of other pioneers of this state. From Gawler River my family moved to Angle Vale. Certainly, back in the day the properties were only about 180-acre lots. You obviously had two together, or something like that, and you might have 368-acre lots. So between my grandfather Leonard and my father, Robert, they farmed several properties around the Angle Vale area. Some of that land was next to the Northern Expressway, where the munitions dumps were compulsorily acquired in 1939, off our land. In 1950, 11 years later, some of that land was compulsorily acquired as part of the Edinburgh airbase.

The reason I am giving that brief overview of my family history in the area is that my father, who was born in 1920, could remember the land between Gepps Cross and Gawler as having only farms and farmhouses on it. He could remember land opening up at Salisbury and Elizabeth over

that time. In later years, we have seen the expansion around Angle Vale, Virginia, Two Wells and associated towns around there and, obviously, Gawler as well, which has become a major centre and was the business centre for them back in the day.

Angle Vale is growing exponentially. You can see developments going ahead all the time, so expansion of any works is necessary where you see urban infill from what was, well back in the day, very much an agricultural area. This project, with regard to augmenting the wastewater network, is absolutely vital. It is a beautiful part of the world, but a very much changed landscape from when my forebears first lived there. My father grew up on Heaslip Road, two miles from the Angle Vale school. The school is still on the same site.

He and his family would ride into school on one horse, get off the horse, tap it on the butt, the horse would find its way home, and they would walk home in the afternoon. As I indicated, things have moved on since the late twenties or early thirties of the last century, so these works are vital. I commend any of these works that help make communities function, and they are absolutely necessary in light of giving development the opportunity to increase.

Some people would say that it is a sad fact of life, but it is a fact of life with a burgeoning population that people have to have somewhere to live, and a spot like Angle Vale is where people can do that with the expanded urban area. I certainly support this project, and I wanted to note the historic association my family have had with this area. It has sharply changed since my father was a lad growing up through the Depression and further on. I commend these works and wish this motion speedy passage through the house.

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:16):** I appreciate very much the member for Hammond's contribution. I also take this opportunity to thank members of the committee, who have worked diligently not just in relation to this report but also in relation to many matters concerning public works right across the state since the commencement of this parliament.

Motion carried.

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:16):** I move:

That the 130<sup>th</sup> report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled The Queen Elizabeth Hospital Redevelopment—Stage 3, be noted.

The Queen Elizabeth Hospital is a 303-bed acute care teaching hospital that provides inpatient, outpatient, emergency and mental health services to a population of more than 250,000 people living primarily in Adelaide's western suburbs. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital is a centre for research, with the world-class Basil Hetzel Institute and, through a partnership with UniSA, it is a training ground for the next generation of healthcare professionals.

This proposal is for the construction of the new clinical services building at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which is the final component of The Queen Elizabeth Hospital—stage 3 redevelopment. This component will provide a new clinical services building, inclusive of:

- emergency department comprising 46 treatment spaces, including 22 acute cubicles, two resus rooms, 10 fast-track cubicles, four behavioural assessment bays and eight extended emergency care cubicles. Seven external ambulance bays will also be provided;
- medical imaging department comprising two CT scanners, one MRI suite, four X-ray suites, four ultrasound procedure suites, one fluoroscopy suite and also an additional angiography suite;
- front of house unit functions;
- intensive care unit comprising 14 beds;
- central sterile services department;
- pathology core lab on site;

- procedure area, including interventional cardiac catheter laboratories, comprising a cardiac catheter suite, one cardiac procedure suite, three surgical procedure rooms and associated support pre-operative holding bays and post-operative recovery bays;
- operating theatres and recovery facilities comprising 12 operating theatres and associated support, pre-operative holding bays and post-operative recovery bays; and
- rehabilitation inpatient accommodation and therapy areas, including 52 single inpatient rooms.

Additional project works will include:

- site engineering infrastructure systems and support structures;
- works associated with relocating services from Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre into the existing main Tower Block and the existing facility services workshop building;
- site works including new roadways, pedestrian movement and landscaping in the vicinity of the new clinical services building;
- refurbishment of the existing Queen Elizabeth Hospital morgue; and
- other related infrastructure and site consolidation works to achieve functional efficiencies, where available.

The total investing capital budget for the new clinical services building is \$290.9 million, which is the majority of the approved Queen Elizabeth Hospital stage 3 redevelopment budget. The remaining funds previously funded the now multideck car park and the upgrade to the cardiac catheter laboratory facilities. Construction is expected to commence in May 2021, with practical completion expected in January 2024.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to this project and received assurances that the appropriate consultation had been undertaken. The committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to the appropriate agency consultation and does meet the criteria for the examination of projects as described in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991.

Based on the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the scope of the proposed public works that I have outlined to the house.

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (11:20):** Yet again, here we have another project that was committed and planned under the previous Labor government that has faced delay after delay under this government since the last election. This construction should have been well underway by now and should have been almost finished, but we are still on early works because this government have delayed and delayed this project over the past couple of years. You only have to look at the minister's own press releases over the past couple of years to see changing time lines for when construction was going to start slipping after slipping after slipping.

Very clearly, the plan that was articulated, planned and budgeted under the previous Labor government back in 2017 was to construct the new car park, then establish this new clinical services building on the old car park and then decommission the Tower Block building at The QEH. What we saw was a delay in establishing a new car park, but even once the new car park was established there was no action at all on the old car park site for building the new building. It was well over a year while nothing happened, and we are only seeing some early works now. Proper construction has not started. So we have basically seen two years of delay on this project under this government.

Then what is actually going to be delivered? Not what was promised is going to be delivered—let's be very frank. The whole range of services that are currently provided in the Tower Block building are to remain in the Tower Block building under this proposal. Outpatient services, education officers and various other speciality types of services that are provided are staying inside the 1960s Tower Block, which is not fit for service, because they are not fitting in this new building.

What the government is now basically saying, which they are not saying publicly but they are saying privately, is they are now going to need a stage 4 redevelopment at some stage in the future

to come back and fix up what they have not fixed up this time. We do not know how much that is going to cost, we do not know when that is going to be, but eventually there will need to be a proper decommissioning of that Tower Block and those services will need to go into a new building. As I said, we do not know when that will be or how much that will cost at some stage down the track.

But outpatient services are not going to be in this new building. We also know that there are very clearly significant doubts about cardiac services. We have heard from the clinicians themselves their concerns about what the plans are for cardiac services in this new building, essentially downgrading those services in the new building, which goes exactly against what the government promised at the last election.

We are also hearing concerns from clinicians about gynaecology services at The QEH, that they may well be pulled out and sent to the Women's and Children's Hospital, depriving the western suburbs women of local gynaecology services and surgery in their local area, when we know that that is a significant area of demand in that area. These issues are still yet to be answered and there are significant doubts about what services will be going into that new hospital. Clearly, there is a lot of concern in the western suburbs about what the government has planned in terms of some of those important services and whether we will be seeing downgrades in these services.

Very clearly, when it comes to the capital works, the Liberals have delayed this project. It should have been very close to being constructed now, but we are likely not to see any significant construction before the next election. I think that shows the contempt the people of the western suburbs are held in by this government, particularly when you see there is no vaccination clinic in the western suburbs and no testing clinic run by the state government in the western suburbs. We are seeing services downgraded and significant delays to the upgrade of their hospital that should have been well underway by now.

**Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham) (11:25):** I also rise on this important matter. Firstly, I would like to thank the member for Kavel for his stewardship of this committee. If it were not for his fairness as the chairman, I do not think we would have actually had some of the evidence we have been able to elicit from SA Health, which actually does expose that the Marshall Liberal government have been telling a whole series of porky pies for a number of years now about their intentions for The QEH. I will come to that evidence in a moment, including a number of matters that were provided on notice by SA Health that do expose that what you hear from the Marshall government is very different than what you get.

If you drive down Woodville Road like I do every single day—and I know that the member for Lee does and the member for Port Adelaide does a little less regularly but certainly spends a lot of time there—you would certainly see a few things happening. The first thing that you would have noticed happening in the last couple of years at The QEH was the massive and dramatic increases to car parking fees both for staff and patients.

It is perhaps to be forgiven for some of those members on the government benches not taking much notice of The QEH. They do not tend to drive past the city too much. To be frank, we would probably check their passports if they tried to as well. But it was pretty funny for me to see a couple of months ago the health minister blow in with a brand-new shiny hard hat and his high-vis vest to toss a bit of dirt down at The QEH. He was joined by a couple of other really awkward looking Liberal candidates. I do not think they would have spent too much time in a public hospital, certainly not in the western suburbs anyway, but they were looking pretty awkward.

It is understandable and quite forgivable that they looked awkward, because they would have to have known some of the furrphies the government have been telling about The QEH. If they have been doorknocking in the western suburbs, then they will have been getting the very loud and clear message from residents that the absence, the complete jettisoning, of public policy from this government towards the western suburbs is stark and clear.

The lack of advocacy from the member for Colton for The QEH is quite stark as well. Again, forgivably, the member for Colton does not have those links to the western suburbs that the people like the member for Port Adelaide, the member for Lee and I do. I do not have the keys to the City of Salisbury like the member for Colton does, but if he were serious about standing up for the western suburbs and not just the couple of little niche areas that he cares about, then he would be standing up with the member for Lee, the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Port Adelaide and myself to demand action on The QEH. He would have been standing up with us, shoulder to shoulder, when

his government closed without warning, without notice, The QEH western suburbs COVID testing clinic.

You would no doubt know, Mr Speaker, because it was widely publicised in the media, that the first we knew about that, the first the public knew about the closure of the COVID testing clinic at The QEH, was a sad face emoji down at The QEH. I do not even know how our friends in Hansard will publish that, but it was one of those things, a sad face emoji. It was quite telling actually. I feel so sorry for the staff down there who have been doing an exceptional job, a stunningly good job looking after our community for decades. They have had to resort to a sign on a wall, without notice from somewhere higher up the chain in SA Health and from the minister's office perhaps, to close the western suburbs vaccination clinic.

Maybe 50 metres towards the front entrance and up six flights of stairs rests a dead, empty, fully kitted-out COVID vaccination clinic. Again, if the member for Colton were serious about standing up for his community, he would be there with us demanding the opening of the western suburbs vaccination clinic. He would be demanding the opening up of a pop-up western suburbs vaccination clinic as well, because we know that communities that are in the western suburbs and suburbs that I represent are amongst the lowest vaccinated in this state.

It is not because they are cynical, it is not because they are anti-vaxers, it is not because they are somehow joining the fruitloops in Victoria talking about conspiracies: it is because they are from lower socio-economic areas, it is because they do not have their own autonomous transport, it is because English is a second language to them—all of which are factors that our public health officials know and tell us are factors that contribute to lower vaccination rates.

If we are going to be rushing towards this national plan, as the Premier seems to want to do, in terms of opening up our state later this year, then I am deeply concerned that that will be at the expense of leaving our western suburbs behind because there is no action, there is no plan and there is no consideration of opening up an effort down in our western suburbs.

In respect of this upgrade, I was very proud—not in this place at the time—to represent many hundreds and thousands of workers who work at The QEH. I was incredibly proud to see the strong, loud commitment from the then Labor government to invest directly in our QEH, to provide a space, to update and upgrade facilities that were the right thing to do for our western suburbs and also the right thing to do for those staff, for those workers who work at our public hospitals and public health facilities.

For many months—in fact, for more than a year since coming into power—the Marshall government kept telling us a number of things. They told us, 'We will back this in. We will follow through with the Labor government commitment to upgrade The QEH.' You could not fault that. But it became very clear very quickly that that was on their terms. As the member for Kaurana has already spoken about, it is only through the inquiry led by the member for Kavel that we have identified that SA Health and this government plan to cut cardiac services at The QEH. That is clear, that is unequivocal and it is provided on evidence.

We also know that we will have an unprecedented vacancy and empty space at The QEH in the old Tower Block. We know that it is empty for a very good reason, because the evidence of SA Health, the evidence of this government is that this is the poorest, the oldest and the least compliant facility anywhere in our public health system. It is a disgrace that this Tower Block will be sitting there dead, empty and vacant in the same way that the vaccination clinic currently is sitting vacant—because it is just a bridge too far.

We have seen little top-ups of capital funding into this over the last 12 months too. Frankly, that is the taxation that you pay, that is the levy that we have to pay, that the community has to pay because of the inaction of this government in getting the wheels going on this redevelopment. One thing that really grates me—and, again, I can probably forgive some of the members on the government benches—is where is the outcry from those opposite that the outpatients facility will no longer be upgraded?

For years, the government, in press releases, in media opportunities, were saying, 'Yes, the outpatients facility will be upgraded. Everything is fine, nothing to see here.' We know that was

rubbish, and it was only through the evidence provided to this committee that we saw that the government had been telling porky pies to the community of the western suburbs.

I have used the outpatient facilities. Members of my family have used the outpatient facilities. Doctors and specialists and nurses are doing what they can in extraordinary circumstances there in a bottleneck. If this government were serious about health care, serious about looking after the western suburbs, they would not back away from the outpatients upgrade, they would not back away from cardiac facilities. They would do more than simply hike more out of the pockets of working western suburbs residents through car parking fees.

Motion carried.

#### **JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE SOCIAL WORKERS REGISTRATION BILL**

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (11:35):** I move:

That the final report of the committee be noted.

The Social Workers Registration Bill 2018 was referred to the joint committee on 29 November 2018, and it began hearing evidence on 30 January 2019. On 3 December 2020 I tabled the final report of the Joint Committee on Social Workers Registration Bill 2018. Twenty recommendations were made relating to the provision for the registration of social workers and the establishment of a social workers registration board with powers to investigate complaints and enforce penalties for practitioners who breach competency and ethical standards.

As part of its inquiry, the committee heard from a range of interested parties, including the Australian Association of Social Workers, social welfare agencies and education providers. Nine written submissions were also received. The committee also wrote to the federal government, as well as all state and territory jurisdictions, seeking feedback regarding the registration of the social work profession. Oral evidence was heard from 11 separate stakeholders, some of whom had also provided written submissions. The committee also heard, by teleconference, from the peak body representing social workers in New Zealand.

The submissions received informed the 20 recommendations made in the report. The committee produced a revised bill as part of its deliberations which, in line with the original intent of the bill, seeks to enhance the professional standards of the social work profession and better protect the safety of the community.

Much of the evidence expressed general support for registration rather than drawing attention to specific sections of the bill. The report reflects those aspects of the bill that were emphasised in the submissions received. I acknowledge the efforts of the members of the committee and the secretary for all the work that was undertaken. The state government supports, in principle, both the bill and the joint committee's findings. The AASW has publicly welcomed support for a registration scheme, and maintains the need for a national scheme with oversight from the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency (AHPRA).

Registration of social workers would have a range of benefits, including improved public safety, higher standards of conduct and accountability through the provision of accessible mechanisms for complaints and review, and improved professional development opportunities for people within the profession. The government will continue to advocate for a national scheme under the registration and accreditation scheme with oversight from AHPRA.

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (11:38):** I am speaking on the Social Workers Registration Bill committee, and thank my fellow committee members for the hard work and commitment they have displayed—including your fine self, sir—in a process whereby we would see the registration of social workers rolled out under legislation in South Australia.

We as a Labor parliamentary party support the registration of social workers and applaud the work in the previous parliament by then health minister, Jack Snelling. He tried to bring the federal health ministers and other ministers together to have a conversation and roll out a federal scheme which, as stated before by the Minister for Child Protection, the member for Adelaide, is the preferred scheme under AHPRA, where the professional practice and standards of social workers would be truly acknowledged and transportable from state to state and a mechanism acknowledged as the most appropriate for other health practitioners and professionals, such as nurses, doctors, etc.

I think it is a big shame that the federal government is not showing leadership on this and ensuring that social workers get that support and recognition: it is high time. Social workers are not only some of the most compassionate and committed workers in the multidisciplinary team but they are pragmatic and careful problem-solvers. They need a mechanism whereby standards are observed and supported and a professional practice and professional development regime as well acknowledged.

While that is the most preferred or the number one preference, of course we support the presentation of legislation formed here under our committee in South Australia and would like to see the commitment that was given prior to the last election by the Liberal Party to get this bill drafted, which is now so. I question what work has been done under the current state government as to delivery on that commitment to get registration of social workers in practice, but it was not clear from the member for Adelaide whether or not there has been any work behind the scenes in preparation now for the ratification of this report.

I am questioning whether or not we will see any action now in respect of this very important issue, and it is more important now, given we have enormous crises in health care, child protection and housing all coming to a peak at the moment on the background of COVID and other contributing factors in our state. I think it would be great to see that registration happen and that acknowledgement of social workers so they can just get on with their business and support people in our community in the way they do.

I again thank all contributors to the committee. We had great contributions from social workers' associations from South Australia and federal members as well as that committee, SACOSS and many other fantastic contributors, such as the university. I think we have good evidence, we have a good bill and we would like to support its passage as quickly as possible. I hope to see it presented very soon into the house so that we can just vote on it and let social workers get on with doing what social workers do best—that is, supporting people who live on the margins in our society. I commend the report.

Motion carried.

#### **LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE: WORKLOAD OF THE LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:44):** On behalf of the member for Narungga, I move:

That the report of the committee, entitled *Workload of the Legislative Review Committee*, be noted.

I move that this report be noted as a member of the Legislative Review Committee. I note that Mr Ellis as a previous member was determined in the *Notice Paper* to speak to this, so my contribution will be relatively brief other than to say—

**The SPEAKER:** I presume on behalf of the member for Narungga, the member for Flinders?

**Mr TRELOAR:** Yes, on behalf of the member for Narungga, although he no longer sits on that committee. That is the situation. But, certainly as a member of the committee for this calendar year thus far, what I have come to know, as other members have known in the past, is that the committee has an onerous workload. Obviously, we need to review not just regulations made within this parliament but also those regulations from local government. The committee has two wonderful and hardworking staff, Mr Matt Balfour and Ms Maureen Affleck, but we certainly feel as a committee that to a degree we are being overwhelmed by the amount of regulation we are asked to deal with, particularly given that we have scrutiny principles that we need to apply to ensure that our job is done properly.

I will acknowledge the other members of the committee: the member for Ramsay, the member for MacKillop, the Hon. Nicola Centofanti of the other place, who ably chairs the committee, the Hon. Connie Bonaros, and the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos. It is a big committee. It works exceptionally well under the leadership of our capable Chair. In essence we are highlighting the workload and the necessity we feel for more support in managing this situation. We certainly have been speaking with the Clerk of the Legislative Council about staff support, and I think we as committee members would all be supportive of that, as would our existing staff members.

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (11:46):** I also rise to speak on the report on the workload of the Legislative Review Committee. I joined the committee a short while ago, and shortly thereafter there was an added role given to the committee, which is to consider petitions. In general, and for a very long period of time, it has been about the scrutiny function of that committee. I have to say that technically we are looking at what consultation has taken place for the regulations. Have we got enough information here?

It is a bit of a dry process from time to time, but it is, actually, where I would say the rubber hits the road. It is often where fees that have increased for a certain amount in a certain industry are looked at, and the question is: what consultation has taken place, and, if it was to be tested in a court, are we clear about what the intention of this legislation was and then how it is represented in the regulation?

Because of that—the key legal and constitutional safeguarding that we do within that committee—we do have a staff member who has that experience: someone who is legally trained and a research officer. They draft inquiry reports, and they compile briefings as well. It is critical for us to hold the government to account. We have raised from time to time the poor quality of the supporting reports.

It seems to me that not everyone either has the experience or is given the detail of what is necessary for us to make sure that we are making regulations that have actually gone out there easy to read and easy to understand. So quite often we would have to go back to the minister and say, 'We need more detail here,' and that takes quite a bit of time—to get to that point. Recently there was another aspect added—to look at the eligible petitions. The member for Florey brought that to this house. Petitions that are over 10,000 signatures are now referred to the Legislative Review Committee.

I have to say the expectation was that there would be only a few of those petitions, but even in the short time that I have been on the committee we have had a petition about the government's retention of the motor vehicle registry and Service SA. That was signed by quite a few people and was brought to the committee as well. In fact, let me remind you that it was signed by 12,705 residents of South Australia who expressed their concern about this government's intention to close three Service SA offices.

We know there is already a line-up to go to Modbury, Prospect and Mitcham as well. The question is: what was the intention? Was it to reduce access for the public, for South Australians to register their motor vehicles and do other different substantial transactions? South Australians spoke very clearly with their voice and, of course, 12,000 residents came in.

The second petition was regarding planning reform, with 13,928 residents of South Australia signing their name about concerns to the changes to the planning act. Let me just tell you that that required a lot of time and a lot of focus. We asked for submissions and for people to come in, we talked to experts in the field from different areas, whether it be heritage or architects, and that took quite some time. Of course, that is something that the committee then has to put together in a report. The third petition, petition No. 13 of 2020, was the maintenance of the current composition of the Teachers Registration Board. That was signed by 11,606 residents of South Australia. Recently, we were referred the climate change petition, and that has recently arrived with committee.

The committee inquires into, considers and reports under section 16B of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. The question is: do we have enough staff? That is really why the report was written today. When we look at other jurisdictions, both WA and Queensland have three staff members in a committee who look at petitions and scrutinises subordinate legislation.

What the report focuses on is that, yes, we have been asked to do this additional work, but the intention was that we thought that we would only have a few petitions, but people are far more active than we expected, or maybe one might say that this government is making decisions that make people unhappy and therefore more than 10,000 have added their names. Whatever the case may be, this requires more attention and more support.

An additional proposal, as well as having additional staff, is to also allow the committee to refer petitions to another standing committee, and that needs to be considered. It has been suggested within the report, for example, that the Environment Resources and Development Committee might be better able and well experienced to deal with the climate change petition. At the

moment that is something that is not able to occur, and it is a proposal that is talked about within this report.

I rise today to note the report and consider that it is important that we do our job well on these committees and that we are adequately supported with experienced and skilled staff. I want to say thank you to Matt Balfour and Maureen Affleck, who do a great deal of work on what is very technical information and provide us with great assistance, but they have been put under great pressure. I support this report that we should consider getting additional people and additional staff members for the committee.

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:53):** I would like to thank the member for Ramsay for her comprehensive summary of the report, an excellent contribution, and also her valued work on the committee. It goes without saying that when committees of this parliament come together they are sometimes led down partisan lines, but I would like to think that our committee particularly tries to avoid that and does its very best to apply the scrutiny principles, the research necessary to give proper consideration to legislation and regulations, not just from this parliament but also more and more from local government as well.

I am pleased to report also that we are just about done for this year, at least with cat by-laws, which is certainly something we are very pleased to tick off. I wholeheartedly support the report and move that it be noted.

Motion carried.

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: ADELAIDE WOMEN'S PRISON REDEVELOPMENT**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:56):** I move:

That the 131<sup>st</sup> report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Adelaide Women's Prison Redevelopment Project, be noted.

The Adelaide Women's Prison is the state's only dedicated women's prison and has the capacity to accommodate 256 female offenders with high, medium and low security ratings. The Adelaide Women's Prison provides a range of services and supports designed and tailored specifically for women in custody.

As part of the 2018-19 state budget, cabinet approved capital works funding of \$20 million for the construction of a 40-bed accommodation unit, along with a new reception building and visits centre at the prison. The 40-bed residential-style accommodation was completed as part of the previously approved 40-bed high-security accommodation, health centre and admissions project. The new reception building and visits centre will provide security at point of entry for staff and visitors. The visits centre will offer a normalised family and visitor space that supports the interactive connection between mothers in custody and their children and increased continuity of access with family.

The total construction cost for the delivery of the project is \$12.958 million. This includes construction costs, builders' preliminaries, construction escalation, locality loading, and construction and design contingency. The scope of works for the Women's Prison redevelopment project includes:

- construction of two new buildings, the new reception building and a visits centre;
- an upgrade of the northern sally port as it transitions to the main prison entrance;
- an upgrade to the northern perimeter to support the northern sally port;
- an upgrade of internal access and egress paths, with the construction of a new roadway from the northern sally port to the admissions and health centre; and
- electronic security to meet the site digital security requirements.

Construction is expected to commence in January 2021, with completion anticipated during January 2022. The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to this project and received assurances that the appropriate consultation in relation to this project had been undertaken. I recommend the scope of the proposed works I have outlined to the house.

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (11:58):** Thank you for the opportunity to speak on this report unexpectedly this morning. I support any infrastructure build in the prison system, and particularly in the Women's Prison. This project, of course, is a culmination of work begun in 2014. As the report noted, the Department for Correctional Services under the Labor government launched its first Women Offender Framework and Action Plan, Strong Foundations and Clear Pathways. It is something I believe in very strongly. As I have noted in this place before, I am extremely lucky that I have as a leader someone who is a former corrections minister and who takes these issues very seriously.

Whatever else we talk about in here, I know that, should we be lucky enough to win government and should I be lucky enough to become the Minister for Correctional Services, the leader will be on at me every day to improve the prison system in order to rehabilitate prisoners and to reduce recidivism for its own sake—because, after all, these are human beings we are talking about—and also for the sake of the safety of the community in South Australia. This is something the leader believes in very passionately. It is something I will be taking to the election and I will take it very seriously, should I be lucky enough to become the minister.

The Women's Prison, of course, is a very important facility. We know that women come to prison often for very different reasons to men. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

### *Bills*

## **ELECTORAL (ELECTRONIC DOCUMENTS AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Committee Stage*

In committee.

(Continued from 9 September 2021.)

New clause 36A.

**The CHAIR:** Member for Kaurana, so we are clear, we are on amendment No. 1, schedule (4), standing in your name. We have the insertion of new clauses 36A and 36B. We have had a brief discussion before going into committee and certainly the suggestion from the Clerk is that we break this up a bit, so I am of the understanding that you will now move new clause 36A as part of amendment No. 1 on schedule (4).

**Mr PICTON:** My understanding from discussion with the table is that the desire is to separate my amendments set No. 4, amendment No. 1 into 36A and the 36B as separate amendments, as that would ease the progress of this through the parliamentary process. We will come back to 36B later. I move:

Amendment No 1 [Picton-4]—

Page 12, after line 9—Insert:

36A—Amendment of section 115—Limitations on display of electoral advertisements

Section 115(1)—delete '1 square metre' and substitute '2 square metres'

Essentially, we have had a discussion in this chamber already in relation to the size of electoral advertisements, and in particular the one square metre rule, which is a prohibition that nobody seems to understand why there is such a prohibition in place in South Australia. The best we can determine, and the Attorney has used her department's know-how to scour *Hansard*, is that it is linked with the fact that we have had corflutes, is my best reading of the situation.

There is another bill that we will not talk about that we have recently considered in relation to that matter. Clearly, it is the government's desire that that no longer be the case, which then leaves the question of, if that is going to happen—and we will see what happens in the other place—what should happen in relation to other sized posters. The question is: should there be a restriction in terms of one square metre for posters that could be displayed at your home, on a private residence or on polling booths in such requirements as may well be allowed in other acts to be considered?

I do not think there has been any justification at all that one square metre should be sufficient. I think clearly it has been noted by the Electoral Commissioner previously that this is difficult to

enforce, hence now recommending a change to go from one square metre to two square metres, which I do not think could be suggested would blight the landscape.

It would allow additional flexibility for candidates to be able to put their message forth in terms of whatever their political messaging may be, to have that freedom of expression and, particularly in the context of what has been proposed elsewhere by the Attorney-General, I think it does allow a greater benefit in terms of people's expression of their political beliefs, whether as a candidate or as a third-party participant in the electoral process, hence recommending that we move to two square metres from one square metre.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I will address my remarks to amendment No. 1, part A, which is for the introduction of a 36A to increase the one square metre rule to two square metres. I indicate the government opposes any increase to the current one square metre rule for electoral advertisements as set out in section 115 of the Electoral Act.

Of course, we canvassed this considerably in our previous debate, when the mover of this amendment sought to abolish size restrictions altogether and set out, over I think about 16 hours of debate, all the people who had long names and could not fit them on a one metre square. I am not sure that poor old member for Stuart would be able to fit his name onto a two metre square, but anyway, that was his argument at that stage. The government opposes this amendment.

**Mr PICTON:** It is disappointing that this is not going to get support from the government. While there has been a good amount of discussion, I think we could discuss it some more, but I will leave it at the discussion that we have already had, except to say that when you have the Attorney moving other regulations or legislation to try to limit people displaying advertising and the ability that they would have, then surely we should be able to make sure that that could be a size of which could actually be noticed. There is still no reason that has been put forward as to why that should not be the case for why these restrictions should be there. It is a pretty bad state when we have parliament having laws that have very little rationale behind them, so I hope the parliament will support this amendment.

New clause negatived.

**Mr PICTON:** I move:

Amendment No 1 [Picton-4]—

Page 12, after line 9—Insert:

36A—Amendment of section 115—Limitations on display of electoral advertisements

- (1) Section 115(2)(b)—delete '1 metre' and substitute '0.5 metres'
- (2) Section 115(3)—after paragraph (b) insert:
  - (ba) without limiting paragraph (b), the exhibition of an advertisement on a vehicle used for the purposes of a mobile office of a candidate; or
  - (bb) the exhibition of an advertisement on polling day within 50 metres of a polling booth open for polling (but nothing in this paragraph limits the operation of section 125); or

The amendment in relation to schedule (5), in a similar vein to the previous amendments, would be to relax restrictions on electoral advertisements. We have a restriction in place for another unknown reason; that is, if you do have posters they have to be one metre apart.

If the government is not going to support having an expansion of the size of posters that should be allowed, or advertisements of any kind, then we are at least asking for consideration that we should reduce the distance they have to be apart from one metre to half a metre. Especially if the other bill that the parliament is considering in relation to corflutes progressed, and that is banning from public roads, then the need for the one metre separation rule is drastically reduced. So there will not be a situation where volunteers try to monopolise Stobie poles or the like, or take up an entire polling booth.

It really questions why that one metre restriction needs to be in place in the future. It also means that in the large part, electoral advertisements would be occurring on private property, and it

is unlikely that materials would be competing for positions on private properties. Certainly, if it were my house, I would not be having multiple sets of parties being able to advertise. There would be no issue in terms of allowing my Liberal opponent to have a poster out the front of my house because I would not allow them to do that. So there is the question of why there is such a restriction in place in regard to that.

The second part of it is in relation to people being able to use a campaign vehicle. This has been raised a number of times. I believe the member for Florey has had issues with this in relation to the Florey mobile campaign office that she operates. Other candidates from time to time have had issues raised in terms of whether having a vehicle that you use as your office is falling foul of section 115 of the act. I do not see there is any reason why we should not allow candidates to display their name prominently, etc., on their campaign vehicle. You probably would not want a fleet of them, but certainly allowing a vehicle to be used for the purpose of a mobile office of a candidate seems appropriate.

The last section would be to allow the exhibition of an advertisement on polling day within 50 metres of a polling booth, but nothing in this paragraph limits the operation of section 125. So, likewise, I think that these are sensible amendments that allow further expression of free speech and further ability for candidates, particularly those who do not have significant funds to invest in very expensive television or other electronic advertising to be able to partake in the political process, and I ask the house to endorse it.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I refer to amendment No. 1 on schedule (5), and indicate that it is hardly surprising that we would see this amendment as late as it might be produced, given the embarrassing situation that the Australian Labor Party had for the Jay bus, which did offend this rule. There was to be a hugely painted bus with all the promotional material about why they would support Mr Weatherill in his attempt to seek re-election. It was a rather embarrassing situation where that piece of advertising had to be withdrawn.

It is clearly there to ensure that the limitation as to the size of advertisements, which is the one metre rule, is not offended, therefore the obligation has always been that each display be a metre apart. The effect of this amendment is to reduce it and obviously create more of a billboard effect which completely attempts to undermine the requirement of having the restriction. The parliament has endorsed that we have the restriction and that we maintain that, therefore this would offend that, and it would allow for cars and buses to be completely covered in advertising.

Whilst I note that the member for Kaurana seems to be sympathetic to the plight of the member for Florey, I would remind him that it is his party that actually caused one of their endorsed Labor members, the Hon. Jack Snelling, to stand against her for pre-selection. They did not seem to show much sympathy to her at that stage. It is opposed.

**The CHAIR:** Do you wish to make any closing remarks?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Sorry, I should indicate that in relation to paragraph (bb), which is the removal of the restriction of the size of posters within 50 metres of a polling booth on polling day, I am advised that this would cause very considerable congestion for electors trying to cast a vote. It is not something that I have approached the Electoral Commissioner about, and I certainly want to inquire whether the mover of the motion has sought the advice of the Electoral Commissioner and, if so, what his response was.

**Mr PICTON:** Yet again, we have from the government a rejection of positive suggestions to try to increase the ability for people to display their democratic rights in relation to an election without really any reasoning why that should be the case. Why should the member for Florey not be able to have a campaign car that is a campaign office with advertising on that vehicle saying that she is Frances Bedford, 'Contact me for your concerns' and whatever particular issues she may well be campaigning on?

There does not seem to be any reason why that should not be the case, and basically whatever particular views the Attorney had about the Jay bus, my recollection is that it did comply with this restriction in that there was a panel on health, there was a panel on climate change, there was a panel on infrastructure, and they were all a metre apart. So it did comply, but the question is: what is the moral value that we are trying to seek by saying that if you have a bus you have to have a metre here, then a metre there and then a metre there?

It does not seem to be for any particular public policy reason why that restriction should be in place whatsoever. There is no benefit that the community would have by having that restriction in place, and there is really no argument that has been put up whatsoever against that. I hope that the house will see the importance of making sure that candidates should be able to communicate with their electorates. Again, I note this is another way in which candidates who are not well funded would be able to participate in the electoral process to the best of their ability, and I ask the endorsement of the house.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** A further question, then: has the mover of the amendment at any time sought the advice of the Electoral Commissioner on this matter and, if so, what was the response?

**Mr PICTON:** I again refer to the 2014 report, and that is what we have relied upon in drafting this. The 2014 report talked about removing these restrictions entirely in relation to advertising that would be in place. We have the Attorney picking and choosing the bits of reports that she likes to implement and the ones that she does not like to implement. But very clearly we were told by the Electoral Commissioner in 2014 that if you have these restrictions in place on size, on distance—all of these sorts of things about posters—then it creates this huge headache for the Electoral Commissioner in going about his job in terms of implementing that, and it was her on that occasion, in terms of working out: have people breached these laws?

The Attorney has already said that she is a regular complainant (I hope not a vexatious complainant) under the electoral laws in terms of submitting batches of complaints against her political opponents and that is why the Electoral Commissioner raised those concerns in 2014. We have read them, we have understood them and that is why we are trying to seek various different ways to address those concerns that were raised in 2014.

New clause negatived.

New clause 36B.

**Mr PICTON:** I move:

Amendment No 1 [Picton-3]—

Page 12, after line 9—Insert:

36B—Amendment of section 115A—Automated political calls

Section 115A(1) and (2)—delete subsections (1) and (2) and substitute:

A person must not make, or cause or permit the making of, a telephone call consisting of a pre-recorded electoral advertisement.

Maximum penalty:

- (a) if the offender is a natural person—\$5,000;
- (b) if the offender is a body corporate—\$10,000.

Essentially, this is about robocalls. South Australians have become sick and tired of political robocalls. This was shown in huge displays of anger from the public when a couple of years ago the Liberal Party and their current leadership decided to bombard South Australians with robocalls at all hours of the day, waking up people—waking up shiftworkers who might have just finished their shift at a hospital, waking up people and their kids who needed to have a good sleep—early in the morning with robo messages from the Liberal Party.

We saw a huge outpouring of anger in the community about this. We saw talkback radio light up with concerns about these robocalls, with a huge call from people saying, 'When will this stop? When will we no longer be subject to these robocall messages?' That is why we, on this side, have adopted a policy that we are taking to the election to say that, if we are elected, we will ban these robocalls from happening. But it is up to the government. We have the opportunity right now to put that change into place before the next election, to make sure there is an even playing field. Everybody will have the same rules and we can stop those robocalls being operated for political purposes which, no doubt, annoy and harass South Australians.

This section would delete the current section which allows these calls to take place and would ban somebody from being able to permit a telephone call consisting of a prerecorded electoral advertisement. If the person was a natural person, there would be a fine of \$5,000. If the person was a body corporate, there would be a fine of \$10,000.

South Australians would no longer be burdened with what they saw a couple of years ago when the Liberal Party authorised messages and was bombarding South Australians. If my recollection serves me correctly, we had the absolutely ridiculous situation where on one day South Australians were being bombarded with phone calls from these robocall message banks and then the next day exactly the same thing happened again. There were all sorts of apologies flying: 'Oh, the system didn't work properly,' etc.

Clearly, the Liberal Party wanted to send these messages out. They did not have volunteers making the calls, engaging with people, asking them their views. You would just pick up the phone and hear this ridiculous message from the Liberal Party. South Australians have had enough. They do not want to see this happening again. That is why we are bringing this amendment and that is why we have a policy to end this and make sure that this becomes a banned piece of conduct within our Electoral Act.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The opposition's position on this—which is not to completely discount whether there may be some merit in this approach—is that it is in fact the Do Not Call Register Act 2006, which is an act of the commonwealth parliament, which explicitly permits robocalls relating to an election. The Australian Communications and Media Authority explains on its website:

As part of a healthy democracy, political parties, independent members of parliament, candidates for election, or interest groups (including trade unions) will use a variety of ways to communicate with you. During an election or other period, even if your phone number is on the Do Not Call Register, you may receive calls relating to the election, including calls providing information, polling calls, research calls and calls from parties seeking campaign donations.

I am advised that federal MP Rebekha Sharkie has said that she will introduce a bill to allow recipients to unsubscribe from political texts. I suggest, therefore, it is appropriate for any amendments to limit automatic texts or phone calls to be progressed in the commonwealth legislation.

If any change is to be made to the laws about these robocalls, changes should be made at the commonwealth level in order to avoid any argument of potential inconsistency between state and commonwealth legislation. Whilst it is a new and novel approach proposed by the mover, it is a matter we will have a look at, but we are in the wrong forum, I suggest, for it to be dealt with, and therefore I indicate we will be opposing this amendment.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** I rise to make it perfectly clear that the South Australian parliamentary Labor Party is committed to banning robocalls from political parties—full stop. We announced our policy some time ago that we will seek to ban robocalls, given the opportunity to do so. Everybody understands that the electoral law that we are discussing today governs the rules that political parties have to abide by. It is entirely within the purview of the state parliament to determine that robocalls from political parties cannot and should not happen, and that is what I and my party are advocating for today.

As I said, we announced our policy some months ago. If this law is not changed now, then it is Labor's intention in government, if we are successful at the next election, to ban robocalls for evermore. But, here, we have an opportunity right now. The government has decided to move a whole bunch of electoral changes in recent times, and that gives us the opportunity to ban robocalls in the lead-up to the next state election due in March next year. In the lead-up to March next year, we are going to have a state election.

As in any healthy democracy, both major political parties—indeed, minor parties and Independents—will be advocating their cause and using any forms of communication available to them to promote their policies and their ideas and their vision for the future of this state. That is healthy. But doing it through the imposition of unsolicited robocalls into people's private homes or, indeed, potentially on their mobile phones, is something that does not accord with the interests of the South Australian people. They are sick of it.

As any family would know, particularly if you have young kids and it is dinnertime, the last thing you want to do is pick up the phone and receive a call from a political party pushing down the phone a message that is unsolicited and certainly not desirable. This is an unnecessary intervention

into people's homes and their mobile phones from political parties that should not happen. That is why we should pass this law today that bans robocalls being used by political parties.

I must say that I am incredibly disappointed that the Liberal Party has just formally advised the people of South Australia that it believes that robocalls should continue, including at the next state election. We could change the rules for everybody now and they are saying that is not going to happen. That is incredibly disappointing.

We will be making it clear to all South Australians in the lead-up to the election that the Labor Party's policy is to ban robocalls, and we will do so if we win the election. We will also be making it clear that any Liberal Party member of this parliament who votes against this amendment today believes in robocalls. Whether that be the member for Bragg or the member for King, we will be out there on the door, saying, 'Did you get a robocall?' and we will say, 'The member for King wanted that to happen. They didn't take the opportunity to ban those robocalls.'

We will be assertively making that point clear to every South Australian, because I think they would be alarmed to know that the Liberal Party is determined to continue to impose themselves on people's lives and send them a robocall message at a time that is least convenient to them. I would implore those opposite to change their position on this.

Let's ban robocalls. It will be a law that applies to everybody. It will apply to Labor, it will apply to the Liberal Party, it will apply to the Greens, the Independents and everybody. We can take the moment now and save South Australians that inconvenience, that intervention and that imposition on their everyday lives. There are more than enough ways to communicate political messages outside of robocalls, so let's ban the practice and let's do it today.

The final point I make is that the hypocrisy and inconsistency from those opposite are nothing short of mind-blowing. The government as recently as yesterday used its majority—the tyranny of the majority—to pass a bill banning corflutes.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Point of order, Mr Chairman. Not only is the leader reflecting on a vote of the house but it is irrelevant.

**The CHAIR:** Yes, I uphold that point of order. It was just yesterday, leader.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** The government has a policy of banning corflutes. I would submit that to most South Australians a corflute they drive past on a Stobie pole is far less offensive than a robocall received on a private landline or private mobile in the middle of the night. I would have thought that was a pretty elementary proposition. We have those opposite saying, 'We're going to ban posters, but robocalls, away we go.'

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Point of order: I think to have a compare and contrast is one thing, but to now go again into making assertions in relation to how members voted in relation to this matter is a reflection on the vote, and it is a matter still before the other house.

**The CHAIR:** I upheld your earlier point of order, Attorney. I do not believe that the leader has a case to answer this time. I do not believe that he has reflected on the vote as he did in the first instance. Leader.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Let me be clear, the Liberal Party's policy on electoral communication is as follows: posters? Cannot have posters. Robocalls in the middle of the night? That is perfectly legitimate. The members for Hammond, Morphett, Chaffey, King, Newland and Adelaide think that the Liberal Party should be able to call people at 3 o'clock in the morning unsolicited, but you cannot have an election poster up on a Stobie pole. That is the Liberal Party's position. How patently absurd.

No-one can logically arrive at the view that that is somehow a consistent position to have. It is absurd. We will continue to rail against these changes. We know the Liberal Party's track record on robocalls. The member for Kaurana went through that in a bit of detail, and I think it is worthy of people's contemplation.

However, let me be clear: right now in this house we have the opportunity to ban robocalls. I want to do it, the Labor Party wants to do it and the Liberal Party is stopping that ban because it is going to continue robocalls into the homes of South Australian people unsolicited, unwarranted and extraordinarily inconvenient. We think that is wrong, and we are going to continue to fight against.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I have a question to the mover of the motion, and that is whether any request has been presented to the leadership of the Australian Labor Party nationally to amend the commonwealth legislation, which currently permits robocalls and, if so, what was the answer?

**Mr PICTON:** Can I welcome the opportunity to rebut the ridiculous notion that was put forward by the Attorney-General that somehow we cannot alter the law in relation to robocalls here in this state. Firstly, let's look at the act as it is, because we already have legislation in South Australia that regulates robocalls. This is amending a section of the act that already regulates what robocalls can be used in South Australia.

**Mr Malinauskas:** Now I know what Dan Cregan was talking about.

**Mr PICTON:** That's right. Section 115A—Automated phone calls:

- (1) A person must not make, or cause or permit the making of, a telephone call consisting of a pre-recorded electoral advertisement unless, immediately after the part of the call consisting of the advertisement, the following statements are made...

So we already have a law in this state that says that you cannot make this phone call unless you meet the requirements that we in this parliament have set. You now come to this parliament and say, 'Oh, you can't move this because, poor little South Australia, we don't have the power to implement laws here; it all has to be the commonwealth. You should ring Anthony Albanese and ask him to put something in place in Canberra because we can't do this here.' We can do this here because we already have a law that covers this field; we already have a law that prohibits robocalls unless particular requirements are met.

What we are proposing is to remove those requirements and say that nobody can make a robocall and not say, 'Here are the hoops you can jump through and do it,' but to remove those hoops and make a clear declaration that those robocalls cannot happen in South Australia. The other galling thing about what the Attorney is putting forward is that she is saying that here is this type of political activity that the parliament may well want to restrict, but that we cannot do this because of potential laws that may conflict with the commonwealth.

It is the exact opposite argument she had in relation to corflutes. Her policy in relation to corflutes is that in South Australia we can do what we like; they are our elections, we can restrict them in any way we want and the commonwealth can look after itself. When it comes to robocalls, which she wants to keep, she is saying that we cannot regulate this area of our election debate here in South Australia because you have to ring Anthony Albanese and have a chat to him, Rebekha Sharkie or Scott Morrison, that we can no longer regulate this.

It is a ridiculous argument, an argument that has been concocted to hide the fact that they want to continue to have this activity allowed in our South Australian elections. It is regulated already in this state. We want to make sure it is outlawed in relation to our political campaigns in this state, and I think that if the Attorney wants to oppose this she should articulate the policy reasons why robocalls should be allowed, what are the actual reasons that this is a good thing for South Australians and should be allowed in our elections, because no such argument has been put forward so far.

**Ms LUETHEN:** I have a question for the mover of the amendment, seeking clarification on whether the amendment will also lend itself to stopping the text surveys that the Labor Party put in to constituents in my electorate. I received several complaints from people receiving texts from the Labor Party, where they are forced to fill out a survey. They are not able to unsubscribe and have to go through the entire survey to be able to unsubscribe. Will your amendment relate to this sort of campaign activity?

**Mr PICTON:** It would be exactly the same for the texts the Liberal Party sends out to people. If the member for King wants to put forward an amendment that expands this in relation to texts, certainly we would be willing to consider it. At the moment we have a section 115A, which covers phone calls and robocalls, and I am seeking to amend that to make sure they are banned. If she is putting forward a proposal to expand that to cover other forms, I would be happy to look at that.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I will take it as a no, that no request has been made to the federal leadership of the Australian Labor Party. Let's be absolutely clear, at no time have I asserted that this is not a sovereign parliament able to make determinations on this matter.

Secondly, although it might have been inconvenient for the Leader of the Opposition to mention this, if he had been listening he would have heard me say it may well be that this is a proposal that has merit and that we will have a look at it. But in the meantime we have identified where it probably should be dealt with and to deal with such issues as the member for King has raised as to how comprehensive this should be. To simply throw something in at the dying paragraphs of the clauses of a bill—

**Mr PICTON:** We have had this policy for two years.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** He has had this policy for two years. In 16 years of government did we see a little twinkle of that? No, of course not. But, nevertheless, they may have merit and I repeat that. I know it is inconvenient to the Leader of the Opposition's speech, because he wants to come in and say, 'This is Labor policy. We are going to take this to the next election.' So be it, but do not misrepresent the position of what our position is, and that is that we will obviously consider these matters, but at this point we have not done that and we, therefore, will not be supporting the motion to amend at this point.

**Ms COOK:** I rise to support the member for Kaurna's amendment that would stop now the rubbish that my constituents experienced when the Liberal Party sent out random robocalls at a time when they were trying to sleep. Basically, in the middle of their sleep they were receiving phone calls, asking them their opinions, leading them to vote Liberal and doing all the political rubbish that they get on the phone that means nothing to them.

I doorknock thousands of people per year in my electorate and I can tell you there are a lot of them who say, 'If you send those rubbish phone calls out before an election telling me who to vote for, I won't be voting for you. I am sick of them. I can't stand them.' People want to be spoken to one on one and reached out to. I do my best to do that in my electorate. Having sat in a marginal seat that was on nine votes for so long, I put out a word of warning to those people in marginal seats where a handful of votes can make the difference.

I urge people like the member for King, the member for Adelaide, the member for Elder and the member for Newland, who are all in seats where a handful of votes could mean their political future, if you are going to allow your party to go into an election still having robocalls as part of their platform and not vote for this change right now that knocks those robocalls out, I say do it with some degree of fear that you might have a handful of people turn around and say to you, 'You could have got rid of these calls that wake me up from my sleep and annoy the heck out of me and you didn't, so I won't vote for you.'

I support this amendment not just because of that but because really people are sick of robocalls. They mean nothing and they do nothing but annoy people.

**Ms LUETHEN:** I am clarifying that I will not be supporting the amendment because I take it from the member for Kaurna's answer that the amendment does not stop unsolicited texts from the Labor Party to constituents that force them into a survey with no ability to unsubscribe.

**Mr PICTON:** Thank you to the member for King. This amendment bans robocalls. If you want to ban robocalls, then people can support this amendment. If you do not want to ban robocalls, then vote against this amendment. The member for King is talking about text messages. Let's be very clear, the Liberal Party uses text messages as well. I think the member for King should be very careful to check if her party, in fact maybe even campaigners in her own area, has used text messages before. I ask her to check that with her local people.

This is not what this amendment is about. As I said, that is an issue that I am happy to consider, but this is about section 115A of the act that covers automated phone calls. This section already covers automated phone calls and already sets a regulation and regulatory scheme around how those automated phone calls should happen. Rather than having hoops that people should jump through to be able to do those automated phone calls, this amendment proposes to flatly say they are banned. The member for King and all members in this house will have a choice when we vote on this amendment. Do you support banning robocalls? If yes, then you can support this amendment. If you do not, then you can oppose this amendment, and they will continue into the next election.

The committee divided on the new clause.

Ayes ..... 23  
 Noes ..... 23  
 Majority ..... 0

AYES

Bedford, F.E.  
 Bignell, L.W.K.  
 Brown, M.E.  
 Duluk, S.  
 Hughes, E.J.  
 Michaels, A.  
 Piccolo, A.  
 Szakacs, J.K.

Bell, T.S.  
 Boyer, B.I.  
 Close, S.E.  
 Gee, J.P.  
 Koutsantonis, A.  
 Mullighan, S.C.  
 Picton, C.J. (teller)  
 Wortley, D.

Bettison, Z.L.  
 Brock, G.G.  
 Cook, N.F.  
 Hildyard, K.A.  
 Malinauskas, P.  
 Odenwalder, L.K.  
 Stinson, J.M.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.  
 Cregan, D.  
 Harvey, R.M. (teller)  
 Marshall, S.S.  
 Patterson, S.J.R.  
 Power, C.  
 Tarzia, V.A.  
 Whetstone, T.J.

Chapman, V.A.  
 Ellis, F.J.  
 Knoll, S.K.  
 McBride, N.  
 Pederick, A.S.  
 Sanderson, R.  
 Teague, J.B.  
 Wingard, C.L.

Cowdrey, M.J.  
 Gardner, J.A.W.  
 Luethen, P.  
 Murray, S.  
 Pisoni, D.G.  
 Speirs, D.J.  
 van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

**The CHAIR:** The result of the division is that there are 23 ayes and 23 noes.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order! Given that the vote is tied, as Chair I have the casting vote, and I give that vote with the noes.

New clause thus negated.

Clause 37.

**Mr PICTON:** A question to the Attorney: why is an apparently genuine certificate of the Electoral Commissioner's withdrawal request no longer proof of evidence for an offence?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I am referring to section 116A, which relates to evidence under the Electoral Act 1985. Clause 37 purports to delete paragraph (d). It is an evidentiary provision. It is consequential upon the amendment following section 113, which is a misleading advertising amendment, which has already been passed.

Clause passed.

New clause 37A.

**Mr PICTON:** I move:

Amendment No 2 [Picton-4]—

Page 12, after line 11—Insert:

37A—Amendment of section 121—Conduct of officers, scrutineers etc

(1) Section 121(3)—after 'booth' insert 'that is open for polling'

(2) Section 121—after subsection (4) insert:

(4a) A person who is or has been in a restricted area in relation to the scrutiny of votes under section 89(4) must not, before the close of poll, disclose to any person outside the restricted area any information about the results of a count of votes undertaken before the close of poll.

Maximum penalty: \$5,000.

- (3) Section 121—after subsection (6) insert:
- (7) The Electoral Commissioner may declare an area to be a restricted area for the purposes of the scrutiny of votes under section 89(4).
- (8) The Electoral Commissioner may vary or revoke a declaration under subsection (7).
- (9) In this section—  
*restricted area* means an area declared to be a restricted area under subsection (7).

This is in relation to the amendment of section 121 in relation to the conduct of officers, scrutineers, etc. This amendment seeks to do two things. The first is fairly simple and the second is a little bit more complex. The first amendment simply allows scrutineers to wear party branding in a polling booth once the booth is closed.

I am sure we all have stories of volunteers who are scrutineering and have left at 5.55pm, looking around for a jumper or a jacket or anything they can use to cover up their campaign shirt, their 'Vickie Chapman for Bragg' shirt or the like, so that they are not falling foul of section 121 of the act. Of course, it is very important that any kind of branding that encourages anyone to vote for a particular candidate or party should not be displayed in a polling booth while voting is happening. There is certainly no disagreement there.

However, this change would only make it an offence to display the branding while the booth is open. While name badges are usually used, it may in fact be beneficial for polling officials to be able to easily identify which party or candidate a particular scrutineer is representing. I do not wish to bring the actions of any electoral officials into disrepute; however, I would suggest that in many cases this is how this offence tends to work in practice anyway, and believe this is common sense.

Very clearly, no-one is allowed to take branding in when you are voting, but when the voting is over there is no-one left to convince and so probably, in any sense, it helps people to understand who the relevant party people are if you can see the particular merchandise they are wearing.

The second part of this amendment seeks to address some concerns members of this place raised earlier in the debate in relation to the secrecy of early counting of pre-poll votes. I note that on 20 December the Attorney's office provided draft regulations to the opposition to outline the approach the Attorney wishes to take on this issue.

The Attorney previously said that these regulations would likely be based on the New Zealand scheme. The problem is that the New Zealand scheme outlined penalties for breaching the secrecy of the early vote counting in its legislation. The government bill did not provide this safeguard. This amendment is seeking to at least partially fix that. What this amendment does is insert an equivalent section to 174G(2) of the New Zealand Electoral Act 1993, which has existed in its current form since 2002.

So when it came to this issue in terms of the way the scrutiny process is going to work, where votes are going to be counted now before polling has finished, we are being told, 'Let's just wait for the regulations. The regulations will have it all there. By the way, we are seeking to replicate what New Zealand has in its electoral processes to make sure they are consistent in the way that operates.' The big difference is that New Zealand has it all in the statute. Its parliament has legislated all these things. They are protected as part of the New Zealand electoral law. They are not part of the regulations in New Zealand.

What we believe should be the case is that we should, as much as possible, be putting those prohibitions, restrictions, protections, in place in the Electoral Act so that they cannot be changed at the last minute by a government in regulation and that everyone would have certainty about what those provisions should be. I absolutely agree, in terms of the New Zealand model, and the New Zealand model does have penalties in place for people who would breach the secrecy of the early voting counting in its legislation.

That is important to note because that could potentially have an impact on the results of an election. We are in a very rapidly evolving news environment, and if we have leaks coming out of the counts of early votes that may well have an impact upon people who have not yet voted, who would

still be to vote. None of us wants to see that, so let's make sure we are using those same provisions that New Zealand has in place to protect the scrutiny of that count, to make sure it is an offence for somebody to go out and give the public information in regard to the scrutiny that had happened before the end of the polling booth being open.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

*Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.*

*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 Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Distribution Lessor Corporation—Annual Report 2020-21  
Generation Lessor Corporation—Annual Report 2020-21  
Transmission Lessor Corporation—Annual Report 2020-21

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

Criminal Investigation (Covert Operations) Act 2009—Annual Reports 2020-21 pursuant to section 47—  
Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission  
Independent Commissioner Against Corruption  
SA Police

By the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)—

Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission, Board of the—Annual Report 2019-20  
Witness Protection Act 1996—Annual Report 2020-21

*Parliamentary Committees*

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:02):** I bring up the 162<sup>nd</sup> report of the committee, entitled Glenthorne National Park Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Mr CREGAN:** I bring up the 164<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Thomas Foods International Water and Wastewater Services Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Mr CREGAN:** I bring up the 165<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Aboriginal Art and Cultures Centre Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Mr CREGAN:** I bring up the 166<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Virginia Wastewater Network Augmentation Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Mr CREGAN:** I bring up the 167<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled State Basketball Centre Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*Question Time***FACEBOOK POSTS**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:03):** My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier give consent to the Liberal Party of South Australia to sponsor ads on the Premier's Facebook page that offered access to COVID-19 updates and the vaccine rollout and include government branding?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:04):** Not that I'm aware of, sir.

**FACEBOOK POSTS**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04):** My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier give consent—or anyone from his office give consent—to the Liberal Party to sponsor posts on the Premier's Facebook page encouraging people to sign up to, 'Be the first to know what's happening in SA, including the latest COVID-19 updates'?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:04):** I don't have any knowledge of that matter. I am happy to make an inquiry.

**FACEBOOK POSTS**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04):** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier understand that my line of questioning goes to his Facebook page?

*Members interjecting:*

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left! I will allow the question. Does the Premier seek the call?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:05):** Sir, I am quite aware that the Leader of the Opposition was using taxpayers' dollars to actually promote his Labor Party policies. He was very embarrassed when it was pointed out exactly and precisely what he was doing. I hope that he has actually stopped promoting the Labor Party using taxpayer dollars.

What the Liberal Party has done with regard to my personal Facebook page, I am happy to make an inquiry, but that's got nothing to do with taxpayer dollars. We know exactly and precisely what the Leader of the Opposition was authorising—taxpayer dollars. Just remember this everybody: taxpayer dollars to actually promote Labor Party advertisements.

Where on earth would that actually occur? Oh, I know exactly and precisely: on the second floor of this building in the Leader of the Opposition's office—taxpayer dollars. Of course, he was caught red-handed—caught red-handed! What we have been asking is whether or not that money is going to be repaid by the Labor Party—

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier will resume his seat.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —to the taxpayers of South Australia.

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier will resume his seat for a moment. The member for West Torrens is called to order and warned. It is particularly disorderly to interject from outside of one's seat.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order, sir: standing orders have been suspended on that matter.

**The SPEAKER:** The member will resume his seat. There is no point of order. The member for Lee rises on a point of order. The member for Lee has the call.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Thank you, sir. My point of order is about standing order 98, and that is debate. The question was succinct and specific about the Premier's Facebook page.

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order. The Premier will confine his answer to the substance of the question. It was quite specific. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Premier rises on a point of order.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The question was whether the Premier understood the Leader of the Opposition's line of questioning. That was his actual question.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Mr Speaker—

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee will resume his seat. I have ruled on the point of order. The Premier has the call. The Premier has concluded his answer.

#### FACEBOOK POSTS

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07):** My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier give consent to the Liberal Party of South Australia to spend tens of thousands of dollars to sponsor ads on the Premier's Facebook page to encourage people to 'Sign up for official government information regarding COVID-19 recovery' and, specifically, 'the vaccine rollout'?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:07):** We are very proud of the information that we have provided to the people of South Australia, in particular with regard to the vaccine rollout in South Australia.

What I can say is that the Liberal Party, of course, is working with the government to send those very important messages to the people of South Australia. It's a pity that the Labor Party wasn't doing the same thing. What we know about the money that the Labor Party has spent—taxpayer dollars—is that they actually had radio advertisements signed off by Reggie Martin using taxpayer dollars with Labor Party advertisements.

That's what the Leader of the Opposition was spending the taxpayer dollars on out of his Leader of the Opposition's budget. It was absolutely disgraceful. Of course, we know that the Leader of the Opposition—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Playford!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —has been very embarrassed recently having to withdraw comments that he made—the misleading information he provided to the people of South Australia.

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier will resume his seat. The member for Lee rises on a point of order.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** It's the same point of order as the previous one I raised: standing order 98, debate.

**The SPEAKER:** Well, debate and relevance. The question in this case was specific. The Premier in his answer has been providing what I interpret to be some comparative observations. The Premier will direct his answer to the substance of the question. The Premier has the call. The Premier has concluded his answer.

#### SPORTS FUNDING

**Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:09):** My question is to the Minister for—

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens is warned for a second time. The member for Newland might commence his question again.

**Dr HARVEY:** My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is building what matters for sports clubs across South Australia and keeping communities active?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:09):** I thank the member for Newland for his question. He is a hardworking member in his area and he is getting the job done. He's all about building what matters for South Australians.

South Australia is seeing the biggest ever investment in grassroots sports and it is being delivered by this government. In June this year, we announced that 115 sporting clubs and organisations across the state will receive significant upgrades to their facilities thanks to a \$24 million grant program from the Marshall Liberal government. We recently closed our most recent round of grants, with just over \$20 million on the table, and we will have more to say about that in the coming weeks and months.

These grants assist sport and recreation organisations to build what matters by developing core infrastructure and community hubs that are driving up sport participation rates and keeping South Australians active—and we know how important that is. That's why I was delighted to join the member for Newland to open the completed resurfacing of the long jump area for the Tea Tree Gully athletics club, thanks to a \$25,000 grant from the Marshall Liberal government. That goes with the investment, of course, in the football and cricket club there, and that precinct is going ahead in leaps and bounds. A big thank you to the member for Newland for that.

By giving these athletes the facilities they need to train, we are giving them the best chance to fulfil their sporting potential. On this side of the house, we are ensuring we create pathways for athletes to reach great heights while we are investing \$49 million in our new SASI headquarters, which will be a place where we can identify, develop and support high-performance athletes and programs.

It's not just the member for Newland's electorate that we are supporting. We are also investing in the Adelaide Hills. A fine example would be Heathfield Oval in your electorate, Mr Speaker. Again, I was delighted to be there with your good self turning the sod the other day—a \$490,000 grant from the Marshall government helping upgrade change rooms for better access to the venue at Heathfield Oval, which will allow a playing experience for the ages, which is great news to the thousand-plus users each week.

Over to Athelstone, the member for Morialta's electorate has delivered a \$400,000 Foxfield Precinct recently. He joined me to open these newly completed and constructed modular unisex change rooms and umpire rooms and improving disability access as well. This project will benefit football, cricket, soccer, and more than 250 active members who use that site, as well as provide access to public toilets for people who walk along there. But the list goes on.

The member for Kavel, who I hear is a former cricketer of note, has delivered \$45,000 to the Hahndorf Cricket Club for new cricket nets and a synthetic pitch—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Elizabeth!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —and weren't they happy about that? I was there back in June with the member for Kavel when we got that project underway.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Hurtle Vale! The member for Hurtle Vale is called to order.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Another true warrior is the member for Adelaide.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** They don't like these projects we're rolling out—hundreds and hundreds of projects building what matters for the people of South Australia. The member of Adelaide, isn't she delivering for her community, with a \$216,000 upgrade to the North Adelaide Golf Club, improving the irrigation system there? We know through COVID more people are out playing golf, getting active, and that is great for all of South Australia.

These grants, these sport and recreation grants—and they are all outlined on the website, hundreds right across the state—are building what matters for the people of South Australia, driving up participation rates and keeping people active. We know how important that is.

*Ms Hildyard interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Reynell!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** We are so excited to be delivering these projects for the people of South Australia. Can I finish by saying a great project in the member for Unley's electorate: the Sturt Bowling Club. We turned the lights on the other day and he rolled the bowl down, did it like a professional. No bias here—we are delivering a crackerjack program and we are building what matters for the people of South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Elizabeth is called to order. The leader is seeking the call. Before I call the leader, I warn the member for Hurtle Vale and I call to order the member for Wright and the member for Reynell.

#### FACEBOOK POSTS

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14):** My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier give consent to the Liberal Party of South Australia to use the Premier's official Facebook page to promote access to COVID-19 updates and collect, recruit and gather people's personal information?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:14):** I refer the leader to my previous answer.

**The SPEAKER:** The leader has the call.

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

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

#### FACEBOOK POSTS

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14):** My question is again to the Premier. When people signed up to the Premier's Facebook page to get the latest news on SA's COVID-19 recovery, including and specifically the vaccine rollout, where did this personal information go? Was it to the Liberal Party or to the government of South Australia?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:15):** As the Leader of the Opposition would be aware, Facebook is open to every single person in this state, and we do put important information on that Facebook site—important information regarding the vaccine rollout which, by the way, is doing extraordinarily well here in South Australia at the moment. We are opening up more and more sites, and people are very interested in the vaccination pathway because they know that this is our pathway out of the situation that we currently find ourselves in.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** There is a lot of useful information which is on the Facebook site.

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier will resume his seat.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** The question was quite specific about where the information went—either to the Liberal Party or to the government of South Australia—not about people's interest in the vaccine rollout.

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

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

*Mr Brown interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Playford is called to order and will cease interjecting. I am listening carefully to the Premier's answer. In my view, the Premier is entitled to

provide some context in the circumstances of the question, particularly in relation to information that is posted on a particular platform, how it is used and so forth. I am listening carefully to the Premier's answer. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Thank you very much, sir, and I know you are interested and I know that those on this side of the chamber are also interested in how we can make ourselves as safe as possible here in South Australia.

Certainly, the vaccination rollout in South Australia, which is going extremely well, is our pathway to a normal Christmas or as normal as we can possibly make it, where we can end statewide lockdowns and of course state lockouts as we reduce the risk of transmission as we increase that vaccination rate. We make no apology for using all and every single methodology for telling the people about this situation. It is a very good message, and I would encourage those opposite to join with the government, join with SA Health, join with all South Australians in charting a course and promoting a course out of the current situation.

As for the leader's question—his slightly cryptic question—saying, 'What happens with the data?' I am not sure which data he is referring to. In his previous question it was more about the vibe when he said, 'I think the Premier knows where I'm going.' I don't think anybody knows where he is going, and I just make the observation that we now have less than six months to the election—less than six months to the election. We have had a lot of negativity, a lot of whingeing, whining, carping and complaining from those opposite, but we haven't seen any policy. I think there was something about a university merger. I don't know whether he has spoken to the universities about that. I know that he doesn't want to deregulate—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order, sir.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —shop trading hours in South Australia. He defines himself by what he doesn't want—

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier will resume his seat.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Sorry, the Leader of the Opposition—

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier will resume his seat.

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Chaffey is called to order. The member for West Torrens rises on a point of order.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Standing order 98, sir: the Premier is not answering the substance of the question; he is debating the answer.

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold that point of order. The Premier will address the substance of the question. As I have indicated in ruling on a previous point of order, I am listening carefully. The Premier, in my view, is entitled to provide some context in answering the question. The Premier will direct his answer to the substance of the question. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** The social media that I operate isn't something which is an official government website—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —but I think it's only fair that all members of parliament share government messages, especially government messages which are aimed at protecting the lives of South Australians. What we have done in South Australia, working with the people of South Australia, is to keep our state safe and our economy strong, and that's only happened with the partnership of all South Australians.

I implore those opposite to also share those messages about how we can chart a course out of the situation that many other parts of the country find themselves in with the Delta variant, with

extensive restrictions. We don't want those in South Australia, so I think it's only fair that we do everything we can, everything within our power, in a bipartisan way.

The Leader of the Opposition, sir, as you would be more than aware, is out there on a pretty regular basis telling everybody how bipartisan he is about our response to COVID. What we really want him to be doing is promoting those core messages: get vaccinated, use the QR code check-in, make sure that when you are unwell, go and have yourself tested.

The Delta variant kills people. I was looking at some of the statistics today out of New South Wales. There were more new infections and more deaths today in New South Wales than we have had in South Australia for the last 18 months. What we are doing here in South Australia is working with the people of South Australia. Using all platforms to inform people about our situation here in South Australia is working and I hope it continues into the future.

### **BUSINESS ENTREPRENEURIAL PROGRAMS**

**Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:20):** My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is backing business through entrepreneurial programs?

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (14:20):** I thank the member for Elder not just for her question but for her very strong interest in entrepreneurship, particularly social entrepreneurship, in her role in supporting women against domestic violence.

The Marshall Liberal government understands the crucial role that innovation plays to create a vibrant and robust economy. It drives productivity, it solves problems and it creates jobs. The thriving startup hub at Lot Fourteen is now home to 58 companies occupying 194 workstations. The hub residents have collectively raised \$25 million, an increase of more than \$13 million over the past year.

Our Future Industries eXchange for Entrepreneurship (FIXE) program inspires, equips, enables and celebrates entrepreneurship. It is one of those areas where sometimes we get a little bit embarrassed about our success as businesspeople and entrepreneurs, but our FIXE program celebrates the success of South Australians. By building our entrepreneurial ecosystem, we support the creation of new business and new jobs in South Australia.

The Marshall government also works with the business community to ensure that young entrepreneurs can access valuable coaching and professional development. Last night, I attended the 2021 graduation of SAYES, Business SA's entrepreneurial mentoring program. This 12-month program assists young South Australians to turn their business ideas into reality by creating a sustainable model for their newly established businesses. A key initiative since 1998, the SAYES program has an annual intake of 35 participants with a mix of regional and metropolitan entrepreneurs.

A survey of the 2020 cohort found that, collectively, revenue among participants grew by 38 per cent to over \$12.4 million, and net profits have grown by 177 per cent. Participants are not only growing their bottom lines but they are also collectively employing more South Australians by increasing staff by 42 per cent.

Last night, I was pleased to announce the new two-year Marshall government funding grant program. This supports another 70 entrepreneurs to take part in this valuable opportunity and help create more businesses and more jobs here in South Australia and a much stronger private sector economy.

Last night, we heard from last year's Young Entrepreneur of the Year, Sam Ackland, the director of Build Clean. Build Clean, based in the member for Elder's electorate, is a business-to-business cleaning service that builders utilise before handing over newly completed homes and commercial premises. In just three years, Build Clean has grown to employ 40 staff.

This year's Young Entrepreneur of the Year is Luke Timmins. He is the owner and director of the Adelaide and Hills Lawns and Gardens company, which is in the seat of Kavel. The Marshall government's support for the Business SA SAYES program is one of the many ways this government supports young South Australians to turn their ideas into business realities and to create more jobs now and into the future. It is a very exciting time in South Australia for the private sector, for businesses to grow. For young people who want to make a difference, people who want to go out

and start their own businesses, the government is there supporting them. We are making sure that young people have the skills for those roles.

And, of course, we have the lowest youth unemployment in the nation at 9.2 per cent. The national level is 10.2 per cent. That's because of the opportunities we are offering young people and young people are choosing to stay in South Australia. We have stopped the brain drain. They are not going interstate—8,000 a year we lost under those opposite. Now they are staying in South Australia because we have brought the opportunities here to South Australia. We have made sure young South Australians have the skills they need to exploit those opportunities delivered by the Marshall government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I am playing catch-up here. I call to order the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Before I call the leader, I just remind members on my left and on my right that there is no general invitation to a cacophony of interjections, so I will indicate a general warning: those interjections will cease.

It is the practice to provide warnings to individual members for interjections and the Speaker endeavours to be even handed in that regard, but there is no general invitation to a chorus of interjections. That will cease. The leader is seeking the call.

#### FACEBOOK POSTS

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:26):** My question is to the Premier. When a South Australian signs up to the Premier's Facebook page, where does the information go? Does it go to the government of South Australia or does it go to the Liberal Party of South Australia?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:26):** This is a very interesting set of questions that are being asked today. Let me get this straight. The Leader of the Opposition is currently in here asking a line of questions complaining about—are you ready for this—the Liberal Party using Liberal Party money to promote key COVID messages to South Australians. What he is fine with—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —is the Leader of the Opposition's office using taxpayer dollars to promote Labor Party advertisements.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order, sir.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** That's what it's at.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** At its very simplest form, that's what they are for, because that's what they are always like—

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier will resume his seat.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —using taxpayer dollars to advance their own case.

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier will resume his seat for a moment. The member for West Torrens rises on a point of order.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Standing order 98: rules applying to answers. The Premier is now debating the answer rather than answering the substance of the question. The question was very specific and pointed and the Premier refuses to answer.

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. The Premier has, over the course of the last 12 seconds or so, in commencing an answer to a question—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** —well, the last many seconds—been providing context in response to a question that invited two alternatives to a general question. I am endeavouring to listen carefully to the Premier's answer. The Premier is in order and has the call.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I have finished my answer, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier has concluded his answer.

#### FACEBOOK POSTS

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:28):** I will ask the Premier another question.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader has the call.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** My question is to the Premier. When a South Australian goes onto your Facebook page—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** —on the Premier's Facebook—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members on my right!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members on my left!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier is called to order. The leader has the call. The leader is entitled to be heard in silence. Members on my left!

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** My question is to the Premier. When a South Australian goes on the Premier's official Facebook page and signs up to the Premier's official Facebook page, where does the information regarding that South Australian go, to the South Australian Liberal Party or the South Australian government?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:29):** The Leader of the Opposition is getting confused. I have had a Facebook account for it must be more than a decade. It's a Steven Marshall account. Yes, it does say 'Premier of South Australia'. It is not an official government Facebook site, an official government website. I happen to be the Premier of South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** It's a position of great privilege. It's an honour to serve in this role. I will use every single method possible to promote our key COVID messages to the people of South Australia. The Leader of the Opposition is complaining about this today. He is coming in here saying, 'How dare the Liberal Party use Liberal Party dollars to promote the COVID message?' But he sits idly by—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier will resume his seat. The leader rises on a point of order.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Standing order 98: this is clearly debate. The Premier is seeking to—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** The Premier is seeking to characterise the line of questioning and making references to the Labor Party. We are simply asking: where does the information go? Is it going to the Liberal Party, or is it going to the government?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for King is called to order. The Premier, in answering the question—and I have noted the question—is addressing the substance of the question. The Premier is in order and the Premier has the call. I don't uphold the point of order. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** It seems an extraordinary line of questioning, but nothing is extraordinary in this place anymore. The question right back to the Leader of the Opposition is: when people like his page—and, let's face it, he's been using taxpayer dollars to promote all sorts of political Labor Party advertisements in recent times, including radio advertisements—where does that data go? Where does that data go?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** When somebody likes the member from West Torrens's Facebook site, where does that data go? What sinister means is the member for West Torrens using with the data that he has collected because people like his page?

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** As I have said right from day one, this is very clearly Liberal Party dollars being used to promote the simple messages that we want to convey to the people of South Australia. I think it's great that the Liberal Party want to do this. I think it is outstanding that the Liberal Party want to join in. Clearly, those opposite are used to what was going on—which was rife when they were in government—which is using taxpayer dollars to advance their cause. This by contrast—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Yes, absolutely! And that's why when we came to government we had to completely rewrite—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —the way that we actually spent taxpayers dollars when it came to taxpayer-funded advertising campaigns because, quite frankly—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Ramsay!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —people were a bit sick of seeing Labor Party politicians' faces on their television set—paid for by the taxpayers of South Australia—immediately up to an election. That's what they were sick of and that's what we unwound on coming to government. But we still do have some significant expenditure in terms of our advertising, and I think most people appreciate we've got a very important message to get across to the people of South Australia.

With regard to the line of questioning that the Leader of the Opposition has gone down today, I cannot be any clearer: the Liberal Party have been using their own money, the Liberal Party's money, to promote to the people of South Australia their desire for all South Australians to know about COVID, the state's response to COVID, the things that we can do to protect our state and, in particular, having a successful vaccination rollout in this state. It's going well, and I thank the Liberal Party for participating in informing the people of South Australia about that.

This does contrast—and it's important for people to understand the contrast—between how the Liberal Party is spending money on a positive campaign to promote health and keep our state safe in our economy strong versus the Labor Party, which have taken taxpayer dollars through the Leader of the Opposition's office, put ads on radio, and they have done so for what reason? To promote Labor Party policies, not public health messages—Labor Party policies. That's the same old Labor. Shame on them!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Before I call the leader, the member for Playford is warned for a second time, the member for Ramsay is called to order, the member for Lee is called to order and the Minister for Innovation and Skills is warned. I call to order the Minister for Energy and Mining and I call to order the deputy leader and the leader.

#### FACEBOOK POSTS

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:34):** My question is to the Premier. Given the information the Premier has shared with the house in question time today, can the Premier please confirm to the house that the Premier's Facebook page is not an official government Facebook page but, rather, his own private Facebook page operated in conjunction with the South Australian Liberal Party?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:34):** I refer the leader to my previous answers.

#### RECREATIONAL FISHING AND CAMPING FACILITIES PROGRAM

**Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:34):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister please update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is backing business through investment in recreational fishing infrastructure?

**The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:35):** I thank the member for his great question. As the member knows, South Australia has an incredibly proud—

*Ms Hildyard interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Reynell is warned.

**The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM:** —fishing sector—

*Mr Odenwalder interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Elizabeth is warned.

**The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM:** —which plays a role in the social and economic fabric of our state—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM:** —contributing more than \$160 million. We know that when—

*Ms Hildyard interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM:** We know when people fish, there are significant economic benefits: people enjoy staying in the regions, they enjoy visiting their local tackle shop, eating at local restaurants and spending in the communities. This all supports jobs.

More than \$1.7 million is being made available for South Australian projects to improve and develop new fishing, boating and camping facilities in the recreational fishing sector. The Recreational Fishing and Camping Facilities program is being funded by the Australian government in partnership with the Liberal Marshall government. It will improve marine and freshwater fishing opportunities for both locals and visitors.

We will see the exciting funding of programs when councils apply to maintain and build new facilities in their areas, whether it be marine rescue, fishing or camping facilities. We will see it in areas like down at Robe in the member for MacKillop's electorate, where people go out crayfishing—there is an opportunity there—and in the beautiful seat of Finnis there is an opportunity to go out fishing on the Pages.

In the city, whether you go out from West Beach in the member for Colton's electorate, go out fishing in those wonderful areas out in the bays, or whether it be over in the Narungga electorate on Yorke Peninsula going out from Moonta, or whether it be on the West Coast, where the member for Flinders has about half that state's coast in his electorate—Tumby Bay, Port Lincoln and Streaky Bay—these are wonderful areas to go out and enjoy the community and invest in our fishing sector.

Applications are now open for project funding ranging between \$3,500 and \$200,000. It will be up to local councils to go out and improve the facilities in their regions. It will deliver tangible benefits across the state, particularly boosting tourism and delivering practical value for an estimated 277,000 South Australian men, women and children who love recreational fishing.

The Marshall Liberal government is supportive of ensuring more South Australians can enjoy boating, camping and fishing. But this isn't just fishing in the coastal areas, it is also fishing in our rivers. Whether it be in the member for Hammond's electorate fishing at Murray Bridge or in the member for Chaffey's electorate in the Riverland, there are many opportunities. It even includes fishing in the reservoirs that have proudly been opened by the Minister for Environment and Water.

There are great opportunities for money to be invested in the regions, and this will see much-needed funds go to local councils to improve the jetties, the camping facilities and the boat ramps, creating jobs in our local and regional communities and providing an opportunity for people to get out there and enjoy the natural environment we have in South Australia.

This is a fantastic opportunity for councils to invest in their areas, invest in what people want in their local areas, improve those facilities, and get people out there fishing, get people out enjoying the environment. This is a great opportunity for South Australians.

*Members interjecting:*

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

#### FACEBOOK POSTS

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:39):** My question is to the Premier. Given the Premier has conveyed to the house this afternoon that the Premier's Facebook page is a personal Facebook page, why are the emails and websites on the Premier's Facebook page at premier.sa.gov.au official government websites?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:39):** I am the Premier of South Australia. I think it's reasonable—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —I think it's pretty logical—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Colton is called to order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —that you might promote that. I have just had a look at the Facebook that the Leader of the Opposition seems to be complaining about at the moment. I don't know what he is complaining about. There seems to be a lot of very good news for South Australia on there at the moment, used to promote the fact that South Australia is the most livable city in Australia and the third most livable in the world. There are posts there fantastically advocating for the full cycle docking to come to South Australia, and guess what? It did! And the life-of-type extension and the Hobart-class upgrade—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —are to come here to South Australia. There is some fantastic news on there about the opening up of the Happy Valley Reservoir, which will happen in December. Those opposite hate that policy. They are probably going to close it. They hate good news. There's a lot of very good news on there, particularly with regard to the redevelopment, the revitalisation of the Repat precinct.

We know the Leader of the Opposition closed the Repat. He broke the hearts of South Australians who absolutely believed in that precinct. He closed it. We are spending a huge amount of money. I was down there on the weekend and it's promoted on my Facebook. I was down there on the weekend as we were making more beds available so that people can have that transition from hospital back to home in a more conducive environment. It will also take the pressure off our hospital system in South Australia. And, yes, there is some excellent information with regard to vaccination—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Hurtle Vale!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —here in South Australia. I love the post that says that we have now had more than 1.5 million doses administered here in South Australia. At the moment, we are around 100,000 doses every single week in South Australia as we get towards—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Hurtle Vale!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —the 80 per cent vaccination rate for those 16 and over. We know that when we do that we will be able to end statewide lockdowns and also make sure that we end those state lockdowns in South Australia. It's a really important policy and we want to—

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier will resume his seat. The member West Torrens rises on a point of order.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Standing order 98: while this information might be useful generally, the question was not about the COVID-19 vaccine rates. It was about whether or not the Premier's private Facebook page had government contact information on it.

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order. A certain amount of context in response to the question and the nature of the use of the Facebook page and the range of purposes to which it's used is, in my view, appropriate. The Premier, however, should confine his answer to the substance of the question. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Back to the substance of the question, which is whether or not we did direct people or, if you like, provide people information to official government websites and information. There is nothing wrong with that. By contrast, those opposite just put out dodgy information. The Leader of the Opposition recently has had to retract some of the dodgy information he has put out there, incorrect information, misleading information—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —which he was forced to retract and apologise for.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Playford!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** By contrast, what we are doing with my personal Facebook site—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Wright!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —is directing people to real information, official information that's going to give people the information they need to keep our state safe and our economy strong, rather than fearmongering, rather than spreading false information around—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Wright!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —which undermines the great work that SA Health are doing in South Australia. It must be humiliating for the Leader of the Opposition to have to do withdraw that information—

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier will resume his seat. The leader rises on a point order.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** The exact same point of order that was raised by the member for West Torrens and upheld by you: debate. The question was very specific. The opposition would be very grateful if the Premier could just answer one question today.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I will rule on the point of order. I have upheld the point of order raised by the member for Torrens and, as the leader indicates, there is nothing terribly novel about the point of order that the leader raises. The Premier will confine his answer to responding to the substance of the question. The alternative is that we can move on. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Yes, of course, we do highlight where there is official government information and I personally would hope that the Leader of the Opposition would be doing the same thing. If he is not pointing to the official information, what information is he pointing to? I have given the chamber one example of the false and misleading information that he has provided to the people of South Australia, which he had to withdraw and apologise because it was false and misleading and it undermined the confidence the people of South Australia had.

By contrast, what we are doing is providing people with access to that official information. It's accurate, it's timely and it's going to help us get out of the situation that we currently find ourselves in with the Delta variant.

### FACEBOOK POSTS

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:45):** My question is to the Premier. Given the Premier has conveyed to the house this afternoon that the Premier's Facebook page is a private Facebook page, can the Premier please assure the people of South Australia that no taxpayer-funded staff ever work on the Premier's Facebook page for either the production of content or the posting on it?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:45):** I think that the Leader of the Opposition might like to look in his own office—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, Minister for Innovation and Skills!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —which currently has quite a number of candidates who are working, paid for by the taxpayers. Apparently they are just in their lunchbreaks going to 15 functions a day. We are doing whatever we can, absolutely whatever we can, to promote that message. I am personally very happy to make my personal Facebook available and my personal Instagram and Twitter account available to get to the key messages out to keep South Australia safe.

By contrast, the Labor Party clearly is against this. I don't know what information they do want to be providing to the people of South Australia during this pandemic. We know one example recently—it was humiliating for the Leader of the Opposition. He was forced to apologise and withdraw information—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier will resume his seat for a moment. The member for West Torrens rises on a point of order.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes, sir. Again, a minute into the Premier's answer, standing order 98. We asked the Premier whether or not public officers employed by the taxpayer are working on his private Facebook page. The Premier is now debating the answer, talking about something completely irrelevant.

**The SPEAKER:** The question related to the use of staff and certain particular staff. The Premier in answering the question will address the substance of the question. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Of course, sir, people in my office do post things on my private Facebook, and so they should. This is important information. It's exactly what would happen in the Leader of the Opposition's office, exactly what happened in Premier Weatherill's office before, and we make no apology for that. It's important information to be provided to the people of South Australia.

I can't think of a higher cause at the moment than making sure that the people of South Australia have access to accurate information, information that is going to keep our state safe and our economy strong. Also, as I have alluded to before, very briefly before the member for West Torrens gets up to protect his leader but, as I pointed out very briefly before, we have to do this to counter the misinformation which is being put out by the Australian Labor Party and in particular we know that the Leader of the Opposition has recently suffered a humiliating request—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order, sir.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Here we go again.

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier will resume his seat.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for West Torrens rises on a point of order. He is entitled to be heard in silence.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Sir, you won't be surprised that it's standing order 98, rules applying to answers. The Premier is now again not answering the substance of the question but attempting to debate the question. The question we asked him was very specific and you have ruled on it previously. I ask you to ask the Premier to come back to the substance of the question.

**The SPEAKER:** And at this point I uphold the point of order. The Premier has provided an example, perhaps to illustrate the purpose for which the communication of certain messages is undertaken and its importance and so forth. The question was quite specific, directed to certain staff and the Premier will address the substance of the question.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I have just taken an opportunity to take a look at the Leader of the Opposition's Facebook page—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —which, lo and behold, has references to official government websites and information. Only a few moments ago, this was apparently a crime. I said that I hoped the Leader of the Opposition was directing people to official government lines and it turns out he is, so I offer my congratulations, and I think that it is important to get those official messages out.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Point of order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Congratulations or otherwise, the Premier will resume his seat. The leader rises on a point of order.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** It is standing order 98. Sir, you have repeatedly upheld other points of order in this regard. The Premier persists in wanting to talk about the opposition or the Australian Labor Party, but the question is really specific and goes to who is working on his personal Facebook page—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** —and whether or not this is government staff.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my right! The leader, in fact, raises a point of order in respect of quite distinct subject matter. The subject matter to which the member for West Torrens drew attention and the point of order I ruled on a moment ago was quite distinct. I detect the Premier, in providing this further example, is drawing a comparison in respect of the use of certain material and how it is circulated not only by himself and his staff but others—there is a distinction. I'm listening carefully to the Premier's answer. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I have finished my answer, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier has concluded his answer.

### **PRISONER REHABILITATION**

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:51):** My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister inform the house about the therapeutic and rehabilitative activities the Department for Correctional Services supports offenders with to participate in?

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (14:51):** I thank the member for King for her keen interest in this area. We all know that we have a duty—we have a duty that, once prisoners do come into our custody, we have to do everything we can, wherever it's possible, to try to rehabilitate them and turn their lives around. That is why our government is committed to working hard and providing offenders with the rehabilitative support these offenders need to give them the best possible chance of living a healthy, productive life on their release.

We know that many former prisoners face difficulties. They face difficulties before they come into prison but also when seeking employment, including many who suffer from low literacy and numeracy skills, homelessness, addictions and of course potential discrimination from employers as well, particularly where they have had criminal history checks that are required for certain professions. That is why the programs that the Department for Correctional Services runs and offers to offenders are so important, so that we can help these people build the skills, confidence and knowledge that they need to try to succeed in the community, which is very important.

Recently, I was pleased to attend what is called the Road to Redemption program graduation. This course had 11 participants in it. There was a mix of offenders who had served their sentence and some who participated as part of what is called their discharge planning process.

Road to Redemption is a 10-week program and it provides former Aboriginal offenders with the skills and knowledge required to try to find a job—to help find employment in the construction and civil construction industry. Participants were provided with hands-on experience working on a Housing SA property. I am pleased to inform the house that in fact the majority of graduates have secured jobs or job interviews. How good is that? Some of these people, for the first time in a long time, have been able to be provided with the dignity of work with that opportunity. If we can empower these people, if we can get them on the straight and narrow, that is a good thing.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank Kathy McKenna from Drug and Alcohol Services SA. Recently, I attended what was I think one of the most fulfilling visits that I have done in my time as a minister whereby I visited The Woolshed in the Adelaide Hills. The Woolshed is a Drug and Alcohol Services therapeutic community facility. It is not the one that the member for Hammond visits for a pami in Hindley Street. It's a different facility. This Woolshed is a very special facility.

I visited The Woolshed and I do want to thank Kathy McKenna and the team and Director, Craig Minervini. I was able to visit a whole range of people with certain addictions, be they drug addictions, gambling addictions or alcohol addictions. The staff at The Woolshed do a tremendous job in helping to turn these people's lives around. It was a really touching visit. I want to thank not only those people for having the courage to book themselves into that facility but also the staff for the wonderful work they are doing.

It is why our government is assisting where we can at the Adelaide Women's Prison, to help people gain employment skills and experience through things like the award-winning U-Turn Construction Pathways program. As a result of an upgrade of an existing accommodation block at the Adelaide Women's Prison, female prisoners have also had the opportunity to take part in this program, gaining skills and experience on a real construction site.

Of course, there are also the various art programs within the Department for Correctional Services. This year, we had a feature piece in the SALA Festival. This year actually over 80 entries were on display, which represents the largest collection of works from the prison system. I look forward to working with the Department for Correctional Services and Mr Brown and his team as we continue to deliver the next big project, which is actually the full business case for a dedicated rehabilitation prison as we promised in the state budget.

#### FACEBOOK POSTS

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:55):** My question is to the Premier. What will the data that has been captured via the Liberal Party's sponsored posts on the Premier's Facebook page be used for?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:55):** My understanding is that when people like a Facebook page they get information that is on that Facebook page, which is readily available to anybody who does sign up, and what they will get is a constant stream of positivity about the direction of this state.

This is going to be very difficult for those opposite to swallow because they hate good news. Anything good news seems to be a complete and utter disaster for them. What they will get, for those people who do like my Facebook site, or like my Twitter site, or like my Instagram site, is information about South Australia—you know, the positive reform that is occurring in South Australia. That is the information that will be provided to them.

#### FACEBOOK POSTS

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:56):** Let me ask a new question. My question is the Premier. For greater clarity, when a South Australian signs up to the Premier's Facebook page their information is passed on to the Liberal Party. What does the Liberal Party use that information for?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:56):** The alternative Premier in South Australia doesn't really know how Facebook works. Maybe in the Labor Party—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —to become a new comrade—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —you've got to fill out, sign in blood, give your first child—I've got no idea what goes on over there. Here on this side, on my Facebook site, you've just got to press a button and it is Like, and let me tell you that plenty of people are liking my site—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —and I think that is positive. People are making sure that they get that quality information.

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier will resume his seat. The leader rises on a point of order.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Standing order 98, sir: the Premier is seeking to make commentary about our understanding of Facebook. The question was about signing up to the Premier's Facebook page as distinct from liking it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I heard the question.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my right! I will rule on the point of order. I heard the question. I listened carefully to the Premier's answer. There was some reflection about a level of understanding. Now, whether or not the minister has come to grips with the question as the questioner might have had it in mind is a question for the minister to deal with. The question was asked. The Premier has had the opportunity to answer. He has concluded his answer.

### HYDROGEN

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:58):** My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister please update the house on hydrogen projects in South Australia?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:58):** Thank you to the member for Hammond.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I really appreciate the member for Hammond's strong support for the people of his electorate and our state more broadly and his keen interest in these hydrogen projects. He has asked me about some hydrogen project proposals, and it is a pleasure to share some information with him, and of course with you and with this house. There are some fantastic projects working at the moment.

H2U is developing a terrific program on Eyre Peninsula. AGIG has a fantastic project up and running at Tonsley, which I had the great pleasure of attending the opening with the Premier, Professor Alan Finkel—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —and many other distinguished people who actually on that day said to us—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** This was a project that we had been working on for a long time but, goodness gracious, once the Marshall Liberal government came into power this project expanded, this project grew and this project is much better than it ever would have been under other circumstances. It's fantastic to be able to talk about that and, as members opposite know, the Treasurer is going through an expressions of interest process with regard to government-owned, taxpayer-owned land—I think about 2,200 hectares of land—at Port Bonython, with the express purpose of using that land for the benefit of South Australians—

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —to develop a hydrogen hub there.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** That fits in with the federal government's plans for hydrogen hubs around the country. In fact, only a few days ago the federal government announced an additional \$150 million, bringing it to \$450 million for hydrogen hubs around Australia. In their list, they explicitly mention Eyre Peninsula, South Australia, as a great place to develop a hydrogen hub. So we are doing an enormous amount of work here. There is another project that members might be aware of, and that's the opposition's hydrogen project proposal.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** For shame!

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Energy and Mining will resume his seat. Members on my right!

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hammond is called to order.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Ashamed of his own project.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Energy and Mining is warned.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for West Torrens—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left! The leader will cease interjecting. The member for West Torrens rises on a point of order. The member for West Torrens has the call.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Thank you, sir: standing order 96:

2. questions may be put to other Members but only if such questions relate to any Bill, motion or other public business for which those Members, in the opinion of the Speaker, are responsible to the House.

**The SPEAKER:** I am familiar with the standing order.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The Minister for Energy and Mining has no responsibility to the house for any policy of the Australian Labor Party.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my right! I am well aware of the terms of the standing order to which the member for West Torrens adverts, and I am also very conscious of the bounds within which the minister may answer the question in accord with that standing order. I am listening carefully to the Minister for Energy and Mining's answer. The minister has the call.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** The member for Hammond asked me about hydrogen projects. I have talked about one from H2U, I have talked about one from AGIG, I have talked about the state government's work, I have talked about the federal government's work and I am perfectly entitled to talk about another hydrogen project as well, one which was announced six months ago to the day.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order, sir.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister will resume his seat. The member for West Torrens rises on a point of order.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Standing order 96 again, sir: the Minister for Energy and Mining has no responsibility to the house for the policies of the South Australian opposition.

**The SPEAKER:** I don't—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Sir, there are precedents on this.

**The SPEAKER:** I don't uphold the point of order, for the time being at least. The minister is entitled to address the question and, in so doing, to address the substance of the question by reference to a range of projects. I listened carefully to the question and I am listening carefully to the minister in answering the question. The minister has the call.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** This project, which those opposite say they want to build on behalf of the people of South Australia with approximately \$600 million, is nowhere near the amount of money required. Public expert information provided by the CSIRO and other international experts says that they are approximately \$500 million short of their target. All I do, very simply, is call on the opposition: release your costings, release your modelling and provide all the information for all South Australia to see.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I will save the member for West Torrens from needing to, as I anticipate, rise on a point of order. There are bounds within which the minister is entitled to address a range of projects/initiatives within the subject matter of the question. They don't extend squarely to addressing beyond a certain extent the particular terms of individual parties' policies or programs. The minister, as I anticipate, has concluded his answer.

### COUNTRY HEALTH SERVICES

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:04):** My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health. Can the minister confirm that there will be no doctors in the entire Central Yorke Peninsula—none at Maitland, none at Ardrossan and none at Minlaton—from this afternoon through Monday and what is being done to address this obvious gap in services?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:05):** I thank the member for the question. We are well aware, obviously, of the member's passion for health in his community, and I previously have advised the house about the experience I had when visiting his area as the Minister for Education, the discussions we had about some of the matters in Kadina in particular.

The member has particularly asked about Ardrossan, and so I have some information that is relevant. Obviously, SA Health and the Yorke and Northern Local Health Network don't have direct involvement in general practitioner recruitment for GP practices within their local health network, and that includes at the Ardrossan hospital.

General practice training and funding are primarily a responsibility of the commonwealth government; however, the Yorke and Northern Local Health Network does provide support where it can. For example—and this goes directly, I think, to the second part of the member's question—I am advised the Yorke and Northern Local Health Network is working with Adelaide Unicare to assist in providing equipment to the Minlaton Medical Centre to enable accident and emergency services to continue.

Further, the Marshall Liberal government has committed \$20 million over four years to develop and implement a South Australian Rural Medical Workforce Plan. This plan was released in December 2019. It outlines the government's commitment to recruit, train and develop the health professionals needed to deliver country health services. The plan includes doubling rural medical intern positions, offering more training opportunities and identifying ways to grow, incentivise and strengthen our rural medical workforce.

As I have outlined, there are certain aspects the member raises, the concerns that he represents on behalf of his constituents, that are indeed commonwealth responsibility, but SA Health will provide support where it is possible to do so. This government is committed to providing that support where we can, and I have outlined some of the measures that have already taken place.

### PINKY FLAT

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:07):** My question is to the Premier in his role as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. When will control of the area known as Pinky Flat be returned to the Kaurna people and what protections exist to prevent this culturally significant area being turned into a sort of

Melbourne Southbank, regardless of its importance to the Kurna people? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Ms BEDFORD:** According to Kurna elders, Pinky Flat has been identified as an important site of continuing cultural heritage significance and is part of Kurna engagement with country.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:07):** As the Minister for Planning, I just indicate that there is currently under consideration a code amendment in relation to the southern part of the riverbank area. That's south of the River Torrens and that is currently under consideration.

There has been some recent media about that. I think *The Advertiser* ran a public survey, an online survey, as to the question of whether people coming back into the city should be encouraged. In particular, I note that they were referring to Pinky Flat, which is on the northern boundary; nevertheless, it is an important part of the precinct completely. For those interested, I notice as of this morning there was a 70-30 position on that positively that there be events on the Pinky Flat area.

As the member would know, there have been a lot of events that are on that site and they from time to time come across to the area of responsibility I have, in relation to mainly whether they have a liquor licence or not, and the security around those events. There's an urban beach program, which was initiated by the previous government and which I think still continues from time to time. It seems to be reasonably popular. I don't know.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** No? Perhaps it wasn't that popular. It was the previous government. Anyway, there are lots of events that occur there. I haven't been provided with any information as to any current claim by the group that the member refers to, but I am happy if she wants to provide that detail to ensure that that followed up.

**The Hon. S.S. Marshall:** It's a planning issue.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** It's a planning matter. If there has been any matter or concern raised with her, I am happy to follow that up. I am aware that the Adelaide City Council have looked at a number of projects on the northern boundary. I can make an inquiry with the Adelaide City Council. As the Minister for Local Government, I am happy to do that. But, again, if the member would like to provide that information, I will be happy to follow it up.

**Ms BEDFORD:** Supplementary—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Before I call the member for Florey, I call to order the member for Kurna.

#### PINKY FLAT

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:10):** Supplementary to the Premier: does the Premier acknowledge Pinky Flat is an area of cultural significance to Kurna people and that they have some say in what might be going on at Pinky Flat?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:10):** I thank the member for Florey for her question. She's quite right: this is a very important area of South Australia. Karrowirra Parri is very important to the Kurna people, in fact to all South Australians, but in particular the Kurna people, and Pinky Flat—

*Ms Bedford interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I'm not sure why the member for Florey thinks that that's sad. I think it's a very important of our state. Under the previous government, we know that they were working with the then Adelaide City Council and had all sorts of developments at Pinky Flat, all sorts of parties at Pinky Flat. I remember an urban beach. I think the member for Lee was in charge of the area at the time, and he thought it was a good idea. Nobody in South Australia thought it was a good idea. Nobody actually grabbed their towel and went down to Pinky Flat for a dip in the Torrens. It didn't work out very well apparently. But we are very cognisant of the importance of that area, and we haven't put an event like that, that provided—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier will resume his seat. The member for Lee rises on a point of order.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Mr Speaker, I take exception to that. I have never swum off any landing at Pinky Flat and I ask the Premier to withdraw.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It's a bogus point of order. The member for Lee is warned. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** What I was referring to, of course, was that there was an urban beach put in place, funded by the previous government at Pinky Flat. We didn't think that was a particularly appropriate use of Pinky flat—those opposite thought that it was—and so I just raise that point. We know that it is extraordinarily important. As the Deputy Premier has pointed out, she is the Minister for Planning within our government. There is some work being done with regard to the planning arrangements on the southern side of the river. Last time I looked on a map, Pinky Flat happened to be on the northern side, but in this topsy-turvy world maybe people are getting a little bit confused.

I make the point that the work that is being done in planning at the moment is for the southern side, and we do think that it is very important to make sure that that Pinky Flat area is appropriately utilised. There have been various uses for that area in the past. I have highlighted one. There have been others when the previous government was in power, when I think that they had some Fringe activities on the site. In fact, I think the Royal Croquet Club at one stage was at Pinky Flat.

These were all things that were presided over by the previous government. I am not aware of any such activation that we have presided over, but I just assure the member that we recognise how important that area is, as is the entire river, Karrawirra Parri, not only to Aboriginal people but to all South Australians. It is a very important part of our state, a very precious part of our state, and we take our responsibilities in that regard very seriously.

As I have pointed out, the work that the Deputy Premier is doing at the moment out for consultation is with regard to the Riverbank Precinct on that southern side of the river.

#### **STATUTORY AUTHORITIES REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:13):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney advise the house if the Attorney has received any correspondence of any sort from a Mr Colin Schwartz or any other persons requesting a meeting with the Attorney to discuss the outcomes of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee, which happened in the other house, regarding the outcomes of this committee from the sheriffs who were involved in the committee's investigation? With your leave, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** Several ex-Sheriff's Officers believe that they unfairly and unjustly lost their positions in the Courts Administration Authority and are looking for further direction to try to re-enter the workforce in some form or other. I understand they are trying to organise a meeting with the Attorney-General.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:14):** I confirm for the member for Frome that I have received correspondence. My recollection is that they were seeking some compensation. I have referred those matters to the Chief Justice at the Courts Administration Council, as he is the head of the council that employs the 165-odd Sheriff's Officers in the Sheriff's Office.

In addition to that, as the member is aware, several recommendations were proposed as a result of that inquiry. Several related to recognition of employees in the Sheriff's Office with all the same entitlements as other public sector employees. As was pointed out in the responses from me and the Chief Justice in respect of that inquiry, they have that entitlement already.

There was a recommendation, for example, that consideration be given to the transfer of employment of the Sheriff's Officers to the Department for Correctional Services. That wasn't taken up, but other recommendations were, including that a human resources person of expertise be appointed to the council. That requires legislative reform. I am aware that a draft bill has been

prepared and the best I can recall is that it has actually been forwarded to the Chief Justice for his consideration so that all the matters that are committed to be implemented are.

In respect of individual witnesses, I have received some correspondence and I have referred that matter to the new chief administrator of the Courts Administration Authority, and the council, chaired by the Chief Justice, to look into.

#### **STATUTORY AUTHORITIES REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:16):** Supplementary to the Attorney-General: can the Attorney advise when she forwarded that to the relevant people and departments?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:16):** I would have to check that. I have received several pieces of correspondence. I would have to make that inquiry and check the date.

#### **NATIVE BIRD PROTECTION**

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:16):** My question is to the Minister for the Environment. What is the government doing to protect native birds and habitats from off-road vehicles travelling along beaches and over dunes, such as in the area of Carpenter Rocks and Canunda National Park in my electorate?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:17):** I thank the member for Mount Gambier for that question. It's a good question and it is a question that highlights something which has been a problem for probably many years but which has become an increasing problem in the last year or so with an increased visitation to regional South Australia, which in many ways from a tourism and economic development point of view is a good thing but, of course, there can be tension between conservation and environmental resilience and outcomes and people using the natural environment for enjoyment.

One of those areas where that tension emerges, there is no doubt, is where four-wheel driving occurs on beaches, in parks and in sand dunes. The coastal environment does tend to be particularly fragile and vulnerable to this sort of interference.

A couple of years ago, because of the concern that I noted in this area, particularly from advocacy from friends groups, like Friends of Little Dip and other friends groups down in the South-East, I referred this matter to the Natural Resources Committee, a standing committee of the state parliament, and they undertook an inquiry that came up with a range of recommendations. I have been working with my department, with our landscape boards and with the Department for Infrastructure and Transport on possible responses to those.

We continue to work through those, but things we are looking at include the potential for having a permit scheme, ensuring that permits are connected with appropriate online education and perhaps watching videos that provide advice and support to four-wheel drivers and beach users as to how to undertake this activity in a more structured and safer way that gets that balance between enjoying the great outdoors and protecting the fragile environment.

Other things we are looking at are a greater level of structure along our coastline, better access points, better signage and better local education. A significant increase in the number of rangers has certainly made a difference in this. When we came to office, there were only 93 rangers in South Australia. We are up to nearly 140 now. Every regional community, particularly the coastal areas, has more rangers now, providing that support, that insight, that direction and expiation, if necessary. I know that the number of rangers down in Little Dip and service in Cunanda and through the South-East has increased markedly, and that capacity is better than it was before.

But we can do better on this front. I continue to work with landscape boards, with local councils, that often have care and control of these beach environments, and with organisations such as friends groups and Birds SA to do better on this front. There are those great benefits from increased regional visitation, but we do have to get the balance right.

*Grievance Debate***FACEBOOK POSTS**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:20):** Each and every one of us in this house has been bestowed with a particularly unique privilege to be parliamentarians of our state. The privilege of course does not rest in the power that has been bestowed upon us. It does not rest in the responsibility that has been bestowed upon us. The real privilege is the confidence that South Australians have expressed in each of us to represent their best interests.

The consciousness of that privilege should be particularly profound during the course of a crisis. When we experience a crisis or an emergency, whether it be a bushfire or a flood, South Australians are looking to their leaders, their elected leaders they have entrusted to do absolutely everything they can that is right by them in those extraordinary circumstances. That has never been truer in our lifetime more than it is now, with an unprecedented global pandemic. Now more than ever South Australians are putting their trust in us not to act politically but act responsibly during an extraordinary emergency.

That is why, from the start of the pandemic right up until now, the opposition has never sought to prioritise a political objective during the course of the pandemic. We have always prioritised, in response to the health response, what is the right thing to do by those South Australians who have confidence in us. They do not want to see politicians playing politics during the pandemic. They want to see issues raised that are legitimate and appropriate. They want to see decisions made, which are difficult ones during the course of the pandemic, but what they do not want is politics.

You can imagine in that context how confronting it is to learn that during the course of the pandemic the Premier of South Australia was having paid Facebook posts on the Premier's Facebook page. South Australians were going onto the Premier's Facebook page, with the Premier omnipresent giving an official press conference in front of the Premier's logo and the state insignia, referencing the Premier's website—[premier.sa.gov.au](http://premier.sa.gov.au)—and having posts paid for by the Liberal Party saying, 'Sign up here for information regarding the state government's COVID response, including the vaccine rollout,' only to find out that when they clicked on signing up, their information on Facebook was not going to an official state government source but, rather, to the South Australian Liberal Party.

That is playing politics during the pandemic. That is the Premier of South Australia using the pandemic to seek to procure a political advantage for his interests, not acting in the state's interests. So South Australians understand exactly what has occurred here, when South Australians signed up to the Premier's Facebook page, ostensibly to get COVID information, including about the vaccine rollout, they were, unknowingly presumably, handing information over the South Australian Liberal Party, information like their IP address, their contact details, including their mobile phone number, even information regarding where they reside. It was all being handed over to the South Australian Liberal Party for the Premier's political benefit.

If that is not playing politics during the pandemic, I am not sure what is. It goes to the question of trust. It goes to the question of: can South Australians really put their confidence in the Premier who during the middle of the pandemic is thinking about how he can solicit their private information rather than worrying about the issue at hand?

We know that during the course of the pandemic the Premier was not the one making the decisions; he has handed over all the government's authority and responsibility to the police commissioner. That has proven to be a wise decision, because the police commissioner has been making all the critical judgements at all the critical times for the better part of the last 18 months approaching two years.

South Australians know that Grant Stevens will most likely have been in charge of the state longer than the Premier has by the time the election comes around. However, what South Australians probably do not know is that the Premier of South Australia, the member for Dunstan, was actually seeking to procure their private information during the pandemic.

We are going to continue to offer bipartisan support to the government in the health response, but we are not going to provide bipartisan support for this Premier collecting South

Australians' private information during the pandemic for the Liberal Party's political benefit. That is not okay, and that is certainly not in accordance with the confidence that South Australians have placed in this government, confidence that is fast evaporating and should not last beyond the election.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

Time expired.

### **FOSTER AND KINSHIP CARER WEEK**

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (15:25):** I rise today to speak about Foster and Kinship Carer Week, which was celebrated last week, and to put on the record the wonderful work that our foster carers and kinship carers do every day caring for some of the most vulnerable children in our state.

It was a great opportunity last week, with activities and events all around the state. Unfortunately, I was only able to get to several of those because of regional areas and time limits. However, I did attend one in the north with the Department for Child Protection where I met many, many carers and was able to thank them firsthand and hear any of their concerns as well as the good experiences they are having with our department.

I also attended an Anglicare event at Grange, where I was again able to meet with carers and discuss issues with them. In fact, several of them raised the possibility of adopting children who had been in their care for many years, and about how excited they were with our government's policy to introduce adoption.

Finally, I also attended the Aboriginal Family Support Services carers' function at Regency Park, which was a wonderful day. We had beautiful weather in a garden setting, and it was wonderful to be able to speak firsthand to carers and hear about their experiences. In the great majority of cases it is great experiences they are having, working with these gorgeous children. I greatly appreciated any feedback they gave for improvement as well, because I truly believe we can always continue to improve what we do as a government and as a minister.

Whilst our government has been putting a lot of effort and resources into early intervention and prevention through our Intensive Family Support Services, family group conferencing and reunification services such as the recently announced Newpin, where it is safe to do so we reunify children, keep them with their family. However, there are still many, many children who are unable to remain at home, despite all the work we are doing, and it is then that we search for family, wherever possible, who can stand up and provide stability and love for that child.

If that is not possible, we look to foster carers, and we have over 1,000 foster carers who have opened their homes and hearts to children. They do an amazing job and we are very fortunate. For the first three full years of our government we have had net positive increases in the number of carers, largely due to the work our non-government organisations have been doing in recruiting foster carers. However, it is also due to the work we are doing as a government to improve things for foster carers.

Some of the things we have done for foster carers and kinship carers since coming into government include increasing the payments up to age 21. Statistically, 30 per cent of children were homeless within a year of leaving care, and that is why our government extended the care repayments to age 21. We have also worked on a statement of commitment with Connecting Foster and Kinship Carers, which is also the first professionally funded peak body. We are very fortunate to have them working on behalf of our carers and advocating for them.

We also doubled the funding for exceptional needs and set up a recruitment and retention task force with DCP and all the foster care agencies to improve our information sharing and our education sharing, and improve our systems to make it better for all carers. We consulted our adoption from care policy, which was greatly received by the majority of foster carers, many of whom already consider the children in their care as part of their family.

We continually look for better ways to support our carers, both across government and across community, in line with our whole-of-government and whole-of-community approach. Things

such as the joint action plan with the Department for Education, where we have education champions and specialised teams, as well as our priority services in health and therapies, as well as housing options for children and young people leaving care. We also worked with the community, such as Catholic Education South Australia, for their 200 to scholarships and, more recently, SEDA College SA, which has offered 10 scholarships in sport streams to children in care.

We have expanded ambulance cover to 21 years of age, dental services to 25 years of age and we continue to look for better ways and further ways that we can support our carers. We sponsor the national Foster and Kinship Care Week held in June and recently hosted our fourth cohort of graduates who have participated in a Diploma of Community Services, again through partnerships with the Bradford Institute and subsidised by the Department for Innovation and Skills.

Time expired.

### GLANDORE CHARACTER ZONE

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (15:30):** Today is a very sad, a very disappointing and a very disheartening day for my electorate, particularly those at Glandore. Many are even expressing anger and fury. That is because they have just learned that a development reaching eight storeys into the sky has been approved for Glandore. It is a development that has been the subject of more than four years of community debate and lobbying and petitions and legal advice and council motions and parliamentary speeches and community meetings and much letter writing.

It is a development at the centre of a broader issue for the Glandore community: the protection of the Glandore character zone. This eight-storey development at 192 Anzac Highway was first proposed more than four years ago. As a mere candidate, I was part of that passionate community that fought against the original application and, at that time, we won.

Why were we fighting it? Because this development overshadows the Glandore character zone, because it does not fit in with the character surrounds, because building this sets a precedent for the stretch of land along the length of the Glandore character zone and because the planning outcomes in terms of traffic, parking and other concerns are an issue for the Glandore community.

We do not do enough in Adelaide to preserve the architectural character of residential areas, our built history. Glandore is a gem of the inner southern suburbs—an absolute gem—and every character home is a winner or a hidden diamond waiting for its chance to shine again. The market is certainly recognising this with some very competitive prices of late.

Because of the beauty and completeness of the architectural landscape in Glandore, about seven years ago the community fought hard to establish Glandore character zone. They wanted to do that to protect the incredible wealth and concentration of Art Deco and period homes in the wide tree-lined streets. They wanted to make sure that future generations can enjoy this slice of history. It is something worthy of admiration and protection.

As part of that special character zoning, it was a commitment that the adjoining properties along Anzac Highway, just a few hundred metres in length, would not be more than three storeys in height. This would prevent overshadowing and infringing on the character zone and help preserve the area. That is a commitment that has been tested and fought and won by the Glandore community repeatedly, and residents should be commended for their efforts.

So you might ask: how have we arrived at this point? How is it that an eight-storey building can go up, this time very suddenly and with no community consultation? The answer is simple. The answer is this Liberal government. The answer is this planning minister. The answer is that in July the minister used a power afforded her to correct minor errors to make wholesale changes

The minister claimed that by allowing eight storeys on this block and seven others, she was correcting an error, but everyone in Glandore knows that is not the case. It is not a mistake that our community wants to protect its character zone. With the stroke of a pen, that three-storey limit that locals have fought so diligently for was shattered, and it took seconds for this developer to resubmit their bid for eight storeys, as is their right under this legal change that has been done by the Liberal government.

I am under no illusion, there will soon be more of these applications and within the year probably we will see the landscape change. Single storeys will be replaced by not just one but many high-rise apartments, previously foreign to this area, each one overshadowing the character zone in Glandore. With each one, we will remember this day when the Liberal government failed our community, the day they said, 'A character zone does not really mean much and it is fine for this strip of land to look like every other on Anzac Highway, which is rapidly being transformed.'

I am not against new developments, neither are the people in my electorate. Yes, people need places to live and, yes, we need to have more density in the city to avoid spread in the country. But can't this community have one little slice of heritage, one little slice of history? Can't we just protect that? According to this government, the answer to that is no.

I really feel that this minister and the Liberal government have radically underestimated the mood in Glandore and made a political miscalculation here. Then again, maybe they have calculated perfectly. Maybe to them the votes of developers are more important than the votes of people in Glandore. Despite the pleas of the local council and our community for the minister to suspend this change until at least the community could have a say, that was denied. I will continue to fight alongside Glandore people for the protection of their character zone. But today there is no doubt that this Liberal government has made that so much harder.

### CHAFFEY ELECTORATE

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:36):** Today I rise to talk about the most recent sporting and school events in Chaffey. Firstly, I would like to congratulate everyone involved in the Riverland Primary Schools' Music Festival, this year celebrating its 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary. The concert was held at the Chaffey Theatre over three days. The performances were absolutely outstanding and I was pleased to be able to attend. It was wonderful to see so many of my Riverland schools involved. I would like to mention those involved as follows:

- Berri Primary School;
- Moorook Primary School;
- Cobdogla Primary School;
- Monash Primary and Preschool;
- Renmark West Primary School;
- Riverland Special School;
- Barmera Primary School;
- Kingston-on-Murray Primary School;
- Ramco Primary School;
- Waikerie Lutheran Primary School;
- Waikerie Primary School;
- Rivergum Christian College;
- Loxton Primary School;
- Loxton Lutheran School;
- Our Lady of the River School;
- Renmark North Primary School;
- St Albert's Catholic School; and
- Loxton North School.

Following the Riverland concert series, a small group participated with 1,500 other students from across South Australia at the Entertainment Centre representing the Riverland choir. I would like to mention and thank the dedicated teachers and volunteers who put so much work, so much extra

effort and so many extra hours into ensuring the concerts were a success. It is an absolute credit to them.

I would also like to give a big shout-out to the Riverland regional coordinator, Joanna Whitehead, who does an outstanding job in leading the concerts and making sure each year is a special event. So much work goes into the concerts, especially given the circumstances at the moment dealing with COVID-19 compliance. The students all enjoyed performing, but without the commitment of Joanna the concerts probably would not go ahead. I know that at the Chaffey Theatre after the concert had finished, many of the children came running out, as they now have to wait for their parents outside, and their faces of joy and fulfilment really did speak volumes in those young primary school students, accomplishing what is a great event.

Of course, I want to talk about finals time in the Riverland with winter sports. This year's finals were made even more special because many of the sporting codes have had to adhere to COVID rules with COVID plans and the situation that we saw last year with the cancellation of many of our sporting codes and final series in 2020 has been overcome this year.

It was great to get out to the independent football final at Paruna. We saw Ramco get up and win—a great outcome by the Ramco Roosters. It was also the RFLW, the women's league, which saw Berri get up and win. It was just a great outcome for women's football and women's football sport in general. I was also lucky enough to attend the RFL finals down at Tigerland in Loxton. It was great to see a raft players, not only the juniors, playing a really good standard of football. Renmark was successful in the under 13s and Barmera won the under 15s.

In the under 18s, the Senior Colts, Berri was successful. What I was really astounded by was the quality and skill level of football, particularly in the B and A-grades. Renmark was good enough to win both those grades. Loxton put on a great spectacle with their new facility, the mezzanine level in their new facility at Loxton Oval. It was also great to witness Renmark becoming back-to-back premiers and to witness a large crowd that was COVID compliant. Everyone was sitting around the outside the oval to watch their beloved teams get up.

I would also like to congratulate the girls in the netball finals, also held in Loxton, when Renmark took out the A-grade finals, which was great. Renmark really did have quite a finals series. Renmark Olympic Soccer Club remained undefeated against Loxton. Clearly, it was a good year for Renmark; however, the Barmera Pelicans women's team was successful in beating Renmark 3-0. In hockey, Loxton won another premiership after beating Waikerie 3-2. It was a great night. In the A-grade women's, Renmark was able to get up over Berri 1-0.

I would like to congratulate everyone who was involved in winter sports in the Riverland and Mallee in all sporting codes. Most of those involved were volunteers and donated hundreds of hours to these clubs to make sure these final series were a success. The local sporting clubs and associations all rely on volunteers. They all rely on the support of their local communities and it was a great display of community friendship.

Time expired.

#### **LAWSON, MR P.**

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:41):** Today, I would like to speak about a resident of Torrens, a much admired and respected South Australian, Paul Lawson, who last week left this world at the age of 103. Little did I know when I was invited to meet Paul on his 100<sup>th</sup> birthday that a friendship would develop. Paul was intelligent and inspirational and the enthusiasm and gleam in his eyes when he spoke with passion about his working life were truly amazing.

From creating the bust of the Somerton Man, to palaeontology and taxidermy at the South Australian Museum, Paul lived a full life. To understand his contribution, I draw from an article by my son, completed as part of his university degree and published on the City of Adelaide website. Dedicating his time to the interview was a demonstration of Paul's enthusiasm for encouraging young people to pursue their passion and be the best they can be, while at the same time talking about some of his own passions.

In the 1930s, as a young taxidermist employed in a junior role at the South Australian Museum, to undertaking top-secret work on the unidentified body found on Somerton Beach, to being

part of an international expedition that uncovered fossils thousands of years old, Paul gave true dedication. Paul also had the sole responsibility for the safekeeping of the touring Apollo mission NASA moon rocks while they were in South Australia at the Museum. It is a journey Paul enjoyed reliving in minute detail.

In September 1936, as a 19 year old Paul won the South Australian clay target shooting championship. His passion for clay target shooting resulted in him becoming partially deaf and led him to pursue taxidermy as a lone pastime. During the Great Depression, Paul's father enrolled him in an expensive correspondence course at the Northwestern School of Taxidermy in Nebraska, USA, at what Paul describes as a great cost during the Depression. He reflected fondly on his memories of his father contacting the director of the South Australian Museum and the events that followed leading to his employment there.

In 1948, in his role at the South Australian Museum, Paul was called into the director's office to meet a senior police sergeant, along with four other policemen. The senior sergeant asked Paul if he could cast a bust for the unidentified corpse found on Somerton Beach. This infamous case became widely known as the Somerton Man. Paul recalled how secretive the whole situation was, being led down to the morgue to create the bust. He spoke about the eeriness of the situation as he sat in a darkened room, which has since been widely pictured and is now on display at the South Australian Police Museum.

In 1953, still in his role as a taxidermist at the South Australian Museum, Paul was asked to accompany American professor, Ruben Stirton, on an expedition to Lake Callabonna in search of the fossil remains of a prehistoric beast named the diprotodon. Sir Douglas Mawson had given Professor Stirton advice as to where to look. 'When we located the fossils it was very exciting. It took us weeks to dig them up', he told me. The fossils remain on display today at the museum in a glass cabinet on the first floor.

Paul accompanied Professor Stirton on five expeditions searching for fossils in Australia. He was invited to join Professor Stirton for more than a year at the University of Berkeley in California to assist in research. Wanting to give back to the South Australian Museum for the life it had given him, Paul contributed to the Museum's drone technology to assist future paleontology research.

Associate Professor Diego Garcia-Bellido is a senior researcher in paleontology at the South Australian Museum. He said:

Paul epitomises the adventurer we all have inside when growing up, but in his case he has been able to keep it up all along. He brought that energy, thirst for knowledge and eagerness to the South Australian Museum.

Paul led the Discovery Centre at the museum for a number of decades in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. His vision and generosity have allowed the Museum to develop new areas of reconnaissance with 21<sup>st</sup> century technology: drones and underwater ROVs.

Up until recently, Paul had regular visits from people he had met throughout his fascinating life, from retired federal police, retired police detectives and some still in service through to university professors and museum researchers. His friend, Verna, was a constant joy.

In recent times, during COVID restrictions visiting became more difficult, but I am glad I was able to visit with him last month on his 103<sup>rd</sup> birthday. His interests in solving the identity of the Somerton Man and paleontology research continued to his final days. Vale, Paul Lawson, one of life's true gentlemen.

Time expired.

## REPAT HEALTH PRECINCT

**Mrs POWER (Elder) (15:46):** We have reached another historic milestone in the reactivation of the Repat with the Marshall Liberal government announcing the return of surgical services to the site.

As a Liberal team, both in opposition and now in government, we listened to our community. We made a promise that if elected we would stop the sale of the Repat and reactivate it into a thriving healthcare precinct, and that is exactly what we did and what we are continuing to do.

The return of surgery to the Repat is big news for my local community, and in fact big news for all South Australians. It was really special to be able to host my 10<sup>th</sup> Repat forum. At the time I

thought it was my eighth or ninth. I have had so many of them I have lost count, but when I looked back it was my 10<sup>th</sup> Repat forum and held this time at the SPF Hall on site. It was incredibly special to be able to share this exciting news with my local residents; and, of course, as always, provide them with the opportunity to ask questions of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing and others I had on the panel.

It was yet another incredible Repat forum with approximately 100 people attending, and I thank every one of those who made it to this recent forum or any one of my Repat forums. Most importantly, I thank everyone, every South Australian, who joined the fight against Labor's sale of the Repat. Together, we won that fight when the Marshall Liberal government was elected in 2018, and together we have continued to work to breathe life back into the Repat.

Whilst there is already much occurring at the site, I think that since we took office in 2018 I know that Minister Wade quickly tore up the contract of sale and got on with the job of working with the community to build the master plan and to do so much at the site. The recent news of the return of surgery is just incredible news. Many people know that previously there were four operating theatres at the Repat. The team of staff there were just incredible and were often recognised as providing a gold standard of service.

The recent plans that have been revealed for the return of surgical procedures for the Repat show that we will build up to six operating theatres, which is absolutely incredible news. The operating theatres will be supported by a 30-bed overnight capacity, a GP clinic, a community pharmacy and other specialist, medical and allied health services. This means that public patients will be able to access surgical procedures once again at the Repat. Planned services for public patients will include ophthalmology, orthopaedics, general surgery, urology and colonoscopy procedures.

The Marshall Liberal government will invest more than \$413 million over 10 years for Nexus to deliver services from this new purpose-built facility. We expect that this will significantly help reduce waiting lists right across our health system and ensure that we can meet demand for health care now and into the future. We know that the demand for renal dialysis is increasing significantly. With this in mind, we have also ensured that this new facility will include a 20-chair renal dialysis unit, which will be a really important service for those in my local community, the southern suburbs and more.

Demolition works have already started on site and are expected to be completed by April next year. Construction of the new facility is then expected to start in the second half of 2022. I am so proud to be a part of a government that promised to save the Repat and reactivate it into a thriving healthcare precinct and to be delivering on that promise. We truly are building what matters: creating local jobs and better lives for people right across the state. In the inner south, in my local electorate, we are significantly improving our health system.

Whilst I stand in this house, I stand here just one of the many individuals of an incredible group of people who together fundamentally change the fate and the future of the Repat. In doing so, we have improved health care in our community and our state.

### **CROSS ROAD**

**Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:51):** Sir, I ask: what is the future of Cross Road? This is the question on the mind of many in my community and, indeed, your community on the South Eastern Freeway as well who live along this popular road corridor. Will Cross Road continue to have increased levels of heavy freight hurtling down through the suburbs? Will there be large cement bridges that tower high into the skies, huge cut-outs and burrows below the streetscape? Will there be tunnels connecting the South Eastern Freeway and the north-south corridor? Overpasses, underpasses, bridges and tunnels—no-one knows what the future of Cross Road looks like, but some are starting to speculate.

The Civil Contractors Federation (SACCF) recently released their Digging Deep for South Australia report, which outlines their civil infrastructure priorities beyond 2020. As suggested by the CCF in their SA Possible Future Projects report, there are two options for connecting the Cross Road network between the South Eastern Freeway and the north-south corridor: tunnels or major grade separations at all key intersections. So that is grade separation at Cross Road and Fullarton Road; at Duthy Street, Harrow Road and Cross Road; and at the Goodwood Road intersection, which is a

huge intersection. Of course, there is the rail freight that will need grade separation at Hawthorn, and, of course, Emerson Crossing.

Following these comments, Business SA put out their 2022 election wish list, Charter 22. On page 15, they say:

Business SA supports a combination of other viable options to reduce the impact of heavy vehicles entering and traversing key arterial routes in Adelaide, including both a substantive Cross Road upgrade.

In their report, they declare that once the north-south corridor is complete, feedback from the freight industry suggests that the significant volumes of heavy vehicle traffic using Portrush Road to access Port Adelaide will seek to cut across to South Road via Cross Road, anticipating the potential increase in traffic volumes along Cross Road. This follows previous comments from the then Labor government back in 2013 when they put out their Integrated Transport and Land Use Plan, which stated: 'The construction of the north-south corridor will encourage greater use of Cross Road by freight traffic.'

The Integrated Transport and Land Use Plan concentrates on ensuring that freight routes through Adelaide are efficient, and that freight vehicles are concentrated on the freight routes identified, in and of itself meritorious. Of course, that includes Cross Road. The minister at the time, the member for Lee, went on radio in January 2017 in relation to B-doubles rumbling down Cross Road, down heavily populated areas through my community and past lots of schools traversing that road. The member for Lee, the minister at the time, said on ABC radio, 'This is what's in the state's best economic interest.' The real question is: is that still the Labor Party's position?

More importantly, is that the government's position, to continue with the Labor Party destruction of my community? I can say today that increased heavy freight on Cross Road and building a Mad Mouse look-alike freeway is not in the best interests of our community. We have seen what cut-out and cover projects look like and members of my community have expressed to me that such developments will destroy our suburbs and make half of Adelaide look like a cement-ridden major city.

These intentions have the potential to ruin the character of my community and the residents who live along it. They are tired of the noise and air pollution that semitrailers create when travelling down their streets and they are ready to protest. Of course, we protested to save the Waite Gatehouse. The community came together and the department and the government saw sense at the time not to mess with the people of Waite and those looking to save the Waite Gatehouse.

The communities are very proactive in their love for their heritage, for their suburbs. There is another public forum being held to discuss public transport throughout the Adelaide Hills. This will be on 11 October at 7pm in Mount Barker. The subjects to be discussed will be the future of the South Eastern Freeway, the Hills rail bypass, passenger rail throughout the Adelaide Hills and, of course, Cross Road and many other important public transport issues that impact my communities.

I extend an invitation to all members of parliament to come up to the forum, to participate and to put on the record to the people of South Australia, to the people of our communities, what their intention is for Cross Road and what their intention is for heavy freight through our communities. I look forward to working with my community to represent their needs and to maintain what makes our community so special.

### **SOUTH AUSTRALIAN JUNIOR SOCCER CHAMPIONSHIPS**

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:56):** Today, I would like to talk about the forthcoming South Australian Junior Soccer Championships which will be held at Port Pirie over this weekend coming. Due to the COVID pandemic, the state championships were not held last year and the original venue for the state championships this year was originally to be held in Mildura. However, due to the uncertainty of the COVID issue, the association decided it would be unwise to travel to Mildura. They, to my information, then had to do a tremendous lot of work to get an alternative location.

As we all appreciate in this house, to arrange an event as large as this takes a lot of hard work. The association is to be congratulated on their dedication and their commitment to getting it going again this year. Whilst Port Pirie may not have been the first location to be considered this year due to Port Pirie holding the event in 2019—which I will mention was a great success and everybody

walked away very impressed with the organisation and the playing fields there—Whyalla, Strathalbyn, Adelaide Shores and another location were eliminated this year for many reasons.

However, Port Pirie, when asked, was able to facilitate the event at very short notice, which will be greatly appreciated by all the young players as they will have the opportunity to be able to participate in these championships and actually fare themselves against other associations. Unfortunately, Broken Hill and Sunraysia had to withdraw due to the COVID restrictions. There are still, to my information, 31 teams nominated from nine associations.

The games will be played over five pitches, which will include the new Memorial Oval in Port Pirie, which is part of the redevelopment of the sports complex there. There will be two pitches there. The adjacent Port Pirie West Primary School, which has also been upgraded as part of the sports complex, has two pitches and there is one pitch at the John Pirie Secondary School, which just got a \$12 million redevelopment. There is a bit of construction there, but nothing will interfere with the oval itself.

The great thing about this is that all the games will be played within a 330-metre walk from any of the games being played. This will allow parents, who may have children playing in different divisions, to be able to watch all their children at the one time. We have in our city the finest playing surface—a synthetic field—at the Virtus playing fields at Byrne Park. Whilst these chosen pitches are really great, I would have liked the tremendous pitch located at Byrne Park to be showcased; however, these other five pitches will suffice.

Whilst there has been a lot of work undertaken by the state junior association, the local association in Port Pirie, the Port Pirie Regional Council and the Spencer Gulf Football League over many weeks, I am disappointed that, when looking at the Port Pirie Regional Council website today promoting events such as these, there appears to be no mention of this event even happening.

The Spencer Gulf Football League have to be congratulated because this weekend we have the grand final for the Spencer Gulf and, because the football league had to vacate the oval—which they agreed to—both our Port Pirie teams will be playing in the grand final in Port Augusta. I know the local junior soccer association has been extensively promoting this event and needs to be congratulated.

My appreciation also goes to the two local soccer clubs in Port Pirie—Savoy and Virtus—who have worked tirelessly with the Port Pirie Junior Soccer Association to make this event happen. I would like to pay my great appreciation to the junior soccer association in Port Pirie, especially Phil Amato, the chairperson of the local association, and also Kylie Crouch, who whilst not on the association committee, put her hand up to ensure that this event could be undertaken. Well done, Kylie.

Port Pirie, as I have mentioned in this house previously, is ideally positioned because of our location to facilitate events such as those being held this weekend. Looking forward, I believe that our community, our council and everybody need to far more aggressively seek more sporting events that will not only showcase the excellent playing facilities that we have in our region, and be of great economic benefit to our community, but also allow those visiting to see the great work that has been undertaken and the very attractive Southern Flinders Ranges.

I also want to promote the fact that interest in junior soccer in Port Pirie is increasing tremendously and the sport is getting far more popular. I want to congratulate both the soccer clubs there on their participation. In closing, again my very sincere thanks to everyone who has been involved in bringing this event to our community. I look forward to seeing it and visiting all the games over the two days.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **SITTINGS AND BUSINESS**

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining)**  
**(16:01):** I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 12 October 2021 at 11am.

*Bills***CIVIL LIABILITY (INSTITUTIONAL CHILD ABUSE LIABILITY) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining)**  
**(16:02):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Mr Speaker, the Government is pleased to introduce the Civil Liability (Institutional Child Abuse Liability) Amendment Bill 2021.

The bill introduces four important reforms for institutional child abuse victim survivors.

The bill will:

- reverse the onus of proof in negligence cases,
- codify and expand the definition of vicarious liability,
- assist in identifying a proper defendant, and
- enable the setting aside of previous settlements.

These reforms are based on, and consequential to, recommendations from the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse

In September 2015, the Royal Commission released its Redress and Civil Litigation Report which included 99 recommendations to alleviate the impact of past institutional child sexual abuse on victims, and to prevent future abuse.

The bulk of those recommendations related to the establishment, funding and operation of a national redress scheme and have been implemented.

The National Redress Scheme came into operation on 1 July 2018, and on 1 February 2019 people who were abused in South Australian Government institutions became eligible for redress under the scheme.

The remaining recommendations in the Redress and Civil Litigation Report are aimed at improving civil litigation systems for those victim/survivors who wish to seek compensation through a civil claim.

The amendments contained in this bill implement these remaining recommendations.

These reforms have been developed through broad consultation with stakeholders, including various government agencies, the courts and legal organisations, children's advocates, community service providers, religious organisations and peak bodies for schools, childcare centres and foster care agencies.

It is worth highlighting that while the recommendations made by the royal commission were limited to sexual abuse, following consultation, the government has determined to extend provisions in the bill to include serious physical abuse and related psychological abuse committed in an institutional context.

The Bill amends the Civil Liability Act 1936 by inserting new part 7A and part 7B.

The first reform will reverse the onus of proof.

One option for survivors seeking compensation against an institution is to commence an action in negligence. However, uncertainty can arise around the existence of a duty of care outside of well established categories.

The burden of establishing that an institution failed to exercise reasonable care can be particularly difficult for victims of abuse to prove, especially in respect of historical abuse.

The royal commission was satisfied that institutions are in a better position to prove the steps it took to prevent abuse. They generally have better access to records and witnesses capable of giving evidence about its behaviour at the time the abuse occurred.

Division 2 of part 7A introduces a legislative duty on institutions to take all reasonable steps to prevent the abuse of a child by a person associated with the institution while the child is under its care, supervision, control or authority. This makes clear that, in an action in negligence, a duty of care is owed by the institution and is one that cannot be circumvented through delegation.

In addition, division 2 of part 7A introduces a reverse onus of proof in relation to breaches of the legislative duty. Generally, a plaintiff must establish all elements of a claim in negligence, including that the defendant failed to take reasonable care to prevent the harm. The bill reverses this onus, providing that the institution is taken to have

breached its duty of care unless the institution proves it took all reasonable steps to prevent the abuse. The bill prescribes a non-exhaustive list of matters that are relevant in deciding whether the institution took all reasonable steps to prevent the abuse.

In line with the royal commission recommendations, division 2 of part 7A applies only to abuse that occurs after its commencement.

Reform two will codify and expand vicarious liability

Division 3 of part 7A addresses the vicarious liability of institutions. Vicarious liability is a common law doctrine that imposes no-fault liability on employers for the wrongdoing of employees committed in the course of employment.

The royal commission recommended imposing a non-delegable duty—another kind of no-fault liability—on certain institutions for institutional child sexual abuse.

The intent of the royal commission recommendation was to override the common law position that non-delegable duties do not extend to liability for intentional criminal conduct.

However, the High Court case of *Prince Alfred College Incorporated and ADC* [2016] HCA 37, has since made clear that the correct approach to consider the no-fault liability of an organisation for the intentional wrongdoing of its employees is through vicarious liability.

The court also articulated a clear test for determining an organisation's vicarious liability for child abuse perpetrated by an employee. Division 3 of part 7A implements the intent of the royal commission's recommendations, but does so in a manner that is consistent with what has now been identified as the preferable legal approach to no-fault liability in these cases.

Section 50G of the bill codifies the High Court's approach in relation to vicarious liability.

In short, an institution will be vicariously liable for abuse committed by an employee if:

- the apparent performance by the employee of a role in which the institution placed the employee supplied the occasion for the abuse to occur, and
- the employee took advantage of that occasion to abuse the child.

In determining whether the institution supplied the occasion for the abuse, the court is to take into account:

- whether the institution placed the employee in a position in which the employee had authority, power or control over the child,
- the trust of the child, or
- the ability to achieve intimacy with the child.

The common law in Australia has limited vicarious liability to acts of employees. This has presented a major obstacle for survivors who suffered abuse at the hands of other persons placed in a position of trust or authority but who were not technically employees of an organisation.

The bill addresses this unfairness by extending the vicarious liability of institutions to abuse committed by persons who are akin to an employee of the institution.

Again, in line with the recommendations of the royal commission, division 3 of part 7A will only apply to abuse committed after its commencement.

The third reform will assist in identifying a proper defendant

One of the major obstacles faced by survivors in attempting to seek compensation is identifying a proper defendant against whom to commence litigation.

This is particularly an issue with unincorporated associations as they lack legal personality, and consequently cannot sue or be sued.

This was the difficulty encountered by the plaintiff in the New South Wales case of *Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church for the Archdiocese of Sydney and Ellis* (2007) 70 NSWLR 565.

Mr Ellis alleged abuse at the hands of a priest in the archdiocese and commenced legal action against several defendants including the Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church, which was incorporated under NSW legislation.

However the trustees, who held and controlled the church property, were found to be not vicariously liable given their lack of oversight of the alleged offending priest.

As a result, unincorporated associations have been able to avoid liability for abuse committed against children in their care despite, in some cases, holding significant assets in an associated trust.

Divisions 4, 5 and 6 of part 7A address the liability of unincorporated associations and their office holders. These provisions enable an abuse claim to be commenced against the unincorporated institution through the

nomination of an appropriate defendant, such as an associated trust, with sufficient assets to satisfy the potential liability.

It also enables a claim to be commenced against a current office holder where a cause of action existed against the former office holder. The current office holder will not be held personally liable but may satisfy liability out of the assets of the institution or of an associated trust.

Another limitation that was highlighted in the Ellis case, but was not addressed in the royal commission's recommendations, was the difficulties arising from the lack of perpetual succession in unincorporated institutions and its offices.

Division 6 of part 2 provides for the continuity of institutions and offices, including by enabling action to be taken against successor institutions following a change in structure such as a merger.

These changes will apply to abuse committed before or after commencement of the bill, enabling victims to take action against unincorporated institutions for historical abuse.

Section 50T declares sections 50K and 50Q as corporations legislation displacement provisions. South Australia, along with all other states, has referred powers to the commonwealth in respect of corporations law.

The Corporations Agreement 2002, which sets out the rights and obligations of parties in relation to the administration of the corporations scheme, requires state legislation to expressly indicate where it is inconsistent with the national law and to declare the inconsistent provisions as being excluded from the national law. It is necessary to make such a declaration in relation to 50K and 50Q, as they affect the rights, duties and liabilities of trustees with respect to their dealings with trust property and have the potential to be inconsistent with aspects of the Corporations Act 2001.

#### Reform four allows for the setting aside of previous settlements

The Limitation of Actions (Child Abuse) Amendment Act 2018, which came into operation on 1 February 2019, retrospectively removed any time limitation for commencing child abuse actions.

The government has heard concerns that victims who settled their claims prior to 1 February 2019 may have done so on unfair terms on the understanding that the limitation period would preclude them from being able to commence or maintain proceedings.

Similarly, victims who, prior to commencement of this bill, have been precluded from taking legal action against an unincorporated institution may have entered into settlements on unfair terms given these institutions have been shielded from liability. Should the bill pass the parliament, those victims who reached unfair settlements on the understanding that they had no legal right to sue may wish to seek to have those agreements set aside.

Part 7B of the bill enables these categories of victims to commence proceedings in respect of their child abuse claim and to apply to the court to set aside the settlement agreement.

The court may set aside the agreement if it is just and reasonable to do so. Section 50W(3) sets out the factors that may be considered by the court.

These factors focus on the extent to which the limitation period or barriers to identifying a proper defendant materially contributed to the applicant's decision to enter into the agreement, as well as the circumstances in which the agreement was negotiated and entered into.

The court may also consider any other matter it considers relevant.

The intent of part 7B is to address unfairness that has resulted from the application of legal barriers that have, or will be, removed retrospectively.

It is not intended to provide a broader mechanism for victims to re-litigate matters that have been settled on terms that they now consider to be disadvantageous. The bill attempts to strike the appropriate balance between the interest of finality and giving recourse to victims who historically have been prevented from seeking justice due to unfairness in the operation of the law.

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

#### EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

##### Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Civil Liability Act 1936*

4—Insertion of Parts 7A and 7B

This clause inserts new Parts 7A and 7B into the principal Act as follows:

Part 7A—Child abuse—liability of institutions

Division 1—Preliminary

50A—Interpretation

This section defines terms and phrases used in Part 7A.

50B—Meaning of associated trust

This section sets out what an associated trust is in Part 7A.

50C—When persons are associated with institution

This section sets out when a person is, and is not, associated with an institution for the purposes of Part 7A.

50D—Application of Part

This section explains that Divisions 1, 4, 5 and 6 of Part 7A apply to a cause of action regardless of whether it arose before or after the commencement of the Part and that the Part binds the Crown in all capacities (as far as permitted).

Division 2—Duty of institutions to prevent child abuse

50E—Duty to prevent child abuse

This section imposes a duty on institutions to take reasonable steps to prevent child abuse by a person associated with the institution in certain circumstances.

50F—Proof of whether duty was breached

This section provides that an institution is taken to have breached its duty to take reasonable steps to prevent child abuse by a person associated with the institution unless the institution proves it took reasonable steps to prevent it. It also sets out the matters that are relevant to whether an institution took reasonable steps to prevent the abuse.

Division 3—Vicarious liability of institutions

50G—Institutions vicariously liable for abuse of child by employee

This section sets out the circumstances in which an institution is vicariously liable for child abuse perpetrated by an employee.

Division 4—Liability of particular institutions and office holders

50H—Liability of incorporated institution that was unincorporated at time of abuse

This section provides that a proceeding for a cause of action in respect of child abuse may be commenced or continued against an institution that was unincorporated at the time of abuse in certain circumstances.

50I—Liability of current office holder of unincorporated institution

This section provides that a proceeding for a cause of action in respect of child abuse may be commenced or continued against a current officer holder in an institution in certain circumstances.

50J—Claim against unincorporated institution and nomination of appropriate defendant

This section allows a proceeding for an abuse claim to be commenced against an institution that is an unincorporated body and allows the institution to nominate a person as an appropriate defendant for the purposes of an abuse claim against it and also allows a court to order that the trustee of a trust is the institution's nominee in certain circumstances.

50K—Proceeding against nominee of unincorporated institution

This section sets out what applies to a proceeding against a nominee of an unincorporated institution (for example, anything done by the institution is taken to have been done by the nominee).

Division 5—Satisfaction of liability

50L—Assets available to satisfy liability of institution

This section allows an institution to satisfy liability under a judgment in, or settlement of, an abuse claim out of assets of the institution and assets of an associated trust.

50M—Assets available to satisfy liability of nominee

This section allows an institution's nominee who is the trustee of an associated trust of the institution to satisfy the liability under a judgment in, or settlement of, an abuse claim out of the assets of the trust and assets of the institution.

It also allows an institution's nominee who is not the trustee of an associated trust of the institution to satisfy the liability under a judgment in, or settlement of, an abuse claim out of its assets and assets of the institution.

#### 50N—Assets available to satisfy liability of current office holder

This section provides that a current office holder is not personally liable under a judgment in, or settlement of, an abuse claim but may satisfy the liability out of the assets of the institution and the assets of an associated trust.

#### 50O—Satisfaction of liability by trustee of associated trust

This section enables the trustee of an associated trust to pay an amount in satisfaction of the liability of an institution, nominee or current office holder and to realise assets of the trust for that purpose.

It also provides that:

- the trustee may be indemnified out of the trust property for the satisfaction of the liability despite any limitation on a right of indemnity of the trustee;
- the liability of the trustee as the institution's nominee is limited to the value of the trust property;
- the trustee is not liable for a breach of trust for doing anything authorised by the section.

#### 50P—References to liability

This section provides that a reference to liability in Part 7A Division 5 includes costs associated with proceedings for the relevant abuse claim.

#### Division 6—Miscellaneous

#### 50Q—Entities may act despite other laws and duties

This section enables certain entities to act under Part 7A Division 5 and to consent to being an institution's nominee despite another law, term of a trust or duty.

#### 50R—Continuity of institutions

This section provides that an institution may be liable under Part 7A Division 4 if it is substantially the same as it was at the time when the cause of action accrued and sets out when an institution may be considered substantially the same.

It also provides that, if there is no institution that is the same, or substantially the same, as the institution, a relevant successor of the institution may be taken to be the same institution and sets out when an institution is a relevant successor and what happens if more than 1 institution is a relevant successor.

#### 50S—Continuity of offices

This section provides that an office holder may be liable in accordance with section 50I if the office is substantially the same as it was when the relevant cause of action accrued and if there is no current office that is the same, or substantially the same, then the current head of the institution is taken to be the current office holder.

#### 50T—Corporations Act displacement

This section declares that sections 50K to 50Q are Corporations legislation displacement provisions in relation to the Corporations legislation generally.

#### 50U—Proceedings despite previous judgment

This section enables proceedings in accordance with Part 7A to be commenced against a person or institution, if leave of the court is granted on the basis that it is just and reasonable to do so, even if a judgment was given that the person or institution was not an appropriate defendant in relation to the cause of action before the Part commenced.

#### Part 7B—Child abuse—setting aside settlements

#### 50V—Meaning of affected agreement

This section sets out the meaning of an affected agreement for the purposes of Part 7B.

#### 50W—Court may set aside affected agreement

This section enables a person to apply to a court to set aside an affected agreement and commence proceedings on a cause of action to which section 3A of the *Limitation of Actions Act 1936* applies, or in respect of an abuse claim, in a court with sufficient jurisdiction.

The section allows a court to set aside an affected agreement if it is just and reasonable to do so and sets out matters the court may consider. It also allows a court to set aside certain other instruments, orders, judgments etc that give effect to the affected agreement but not certain other instruments, contracts etc.

The section further provides that evidence of matters in connection with an attempt to negotiate settlement of the dispute to which the affected agreement relates may be adduced as evidence in proceedings under this section despite section 67C(1) of the *Evidence Act 1929*.

50X—Effect of setting aside affected agreement

This section provides that an affected agreement and anything else set aside under Part 7B is void and sets out other effects of the setting aside of an affected agreement.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Picton.

## ELECTORAL (ELECTRONIC DOCUMENTS AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

### *Committee Stage*

In committee (resumed on motion).

New clause 37A.

**The CHAIR:** My understanding is that new clause 37A has been moved, as amendment No. 2 on schedule (5).

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Yes, the member for Kaurua has moved amendment No. 2 on schedule 137(5), which sets out the provision for the creation of an offence, essentially, for a \$5,000 fine in the event that there is a disclosure to any person during the period under question. This is to provide some integrity and robustness around the integrity of allowing for the counting of votes to be undertaken before the close of poll.

I make no criticism of the need to do this. It had been proposed by the government that we follow the terms and conditions around this in the regulations, and reference had been made during our contribution, and I think referred to by the opposition, to the New Zealand electoral act, which has been facilitating this opportunity and done just that. They have, however, as was pointed out by the member for Kaurua, incorporated that in their act. It has a \$2,000 fine if there is a breach. I am not quite sure what the dollar value of the New Zealand dollar is at the moment relative to ours, but it is usually fairly comparable.

I do not take issue with the fact that we need to have some rigour around a process. Whether it is in the act or in the regulations or what the penalty should be of any breach is still a matter to be considered. I would need to confer with the Electoral Commissioner as to both the adequacy of something that is being proposed here and/or the level of fine.

There is also provision further in foreshadowed amendments relating to the regulation powers. I indicate at this point that I am not in a position to indicate the government's acceptance of this amendment, but we will work on it between the houses and work out whether that needs to go in the act and, if so, what the relevant penalty should be. I am happy to work with the member for Kaurua on that exercise.

**Mr PICTON:** I welcome that the Attorney is willing to look at it. I express my disappointment that we cannot support it in this house, given that what the Attorney had previously told the house was that we were basing this on the New Zealand model. This is the New Zealand section replicated. As she has noted, it is a slightly increased penalty, but it is a penalty in keeping with all the other penalties of a similar nature, as I understand it, throughout the act.

As I remember from yesterday, when we were looking at the corflute legislation, the same penalty provision would be in place for putting up a poster under the bill the Attorney is looking at there. I do not see that there is any particular issue with the penalty, but then again she is not proposing that it should be smaller or any other amount. I welcome that at least she is willing to look at it between the houses, but I do not see any reason why it could not be supported and incorporated now.

New clause negatived.

Clause 38.

**Mr PICTON:** I move:

Amendment No 3 [Picton-4]—

Page 12, after line 12—Insert:

(1) Section 125(1)—delete '6 metres' and substitute '8 metres'

This amendment seeks to extend the exclusion zone for campaigning outside of polling booths from six metres to eight metres from the door, especially as we will be trying to run a COVID-safe election in 2022. As we have discussed in this house a number of times during this debate, it is reasonable to extend the campaign exclusion zone. As it stands, we often have queues that extend beyond the six-metre zone that currently exists within the act, and that was before the need for social distancing.

While many voters relish the opportunity to take a how-to-vote card from every single party, candidate or interest group, there are others who know how they will vote and do not wish to be approached while in the line. This change will give an additional limit to aid people in achieving that goal. The presiding officer will retain the ability to designate a lesser distance as they see fit. This can be required for a range of reasons, including looking after the health and safety of volunteers by allowing them to stand under a shelter during rain or extreme heat if less than six metres or, if this amendment passes, less than eight metres from the entrance to the polling booth.

It might be impractical at a polling booth to have an eight-metre campaign zone at the entrance, therefore the need for that flexibility. Therefore, the need for this amendment is the practical effect that it will be a maximum distance that can be applied at eight metres, particularly reflecting the additional needs for social distancing that will be in place for this election.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** On this matter, I am advised by the Electoral Commission that they do not have any position on this. Again, we will have a look at it. I think there is clearly a six-metre rule; everyone is used to that. I have not heard any persuasive argument by the member for Kaurua as to whether that be eight metres, to be frank, but he might come up with something else that is a bit more persuasive.

This has never been asked for by the Electoral Commission, to say we need to have a greater space for people to be cushioned from any kind of—I think you described it as more unpleasant. I am not quite sure what your word was, but it was certainly not something that everyone enjoys, having to run through the gauntlet of people who want to promote certain candidates or policies. I have not had any group come to me to say that this would be necessary.

It would simply introduce something without really any other justification. We are clearly going to have people at pre-polls and on polling day having access to information and those who wish to promote their particular candidate with how-to-vote cards, and this is part of the democratic process. Again, I am happy to have a look at that between the houses.

Amendment negated; clause passed.

Clause 39.

**Mr PICTON:** In relation to clause 39, can the Attorney point to any instances where concerns about false or misleading information being provided under the act have been raised?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** To whom or—

**Mr PICTON:** Publicly or to the Electoral Commissioner or to the department.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I will take that on notice, and if there is something that I can assist the house with between the houses I will provide that information.

**Mr PICTON:** Have any issues been raised about candidates' residential addresses on nomination forms, as to whether they might fall under an offence currently or under this bill?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Not that I am aware of, but again I will make that inquiry.

**Mr PICTON:** Can the Attorney advise what the Electoral Commission does to verify the information provided to them under the act as to whether it is false or misleading and whether there is likely to be any change under this clause?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** As to what is false or misleading? As to what is—to be false or misleading or which is to be reported on?

**The CHAIR:** The information provided.

**Mr PICTON:** What work is done by the Electoral Commission to verify the information that is provided by candidates, for instance, in the nominations?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Is that in relation to addresses or generally?

**Mr Picton:** Addresses.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Again, I will make that inquiry and provide that information.

Clause passed.

New clause 39A.

**Mr PICTON:** I move:

Amendment No 4 [Picton-4]—

Page 12, after line 21—Insert:

39A—Amendment of section 130—Employers to allow employees leave of absence to vote

Section 130(1)—delete '2 hours' and substitute '3 hours'

Obviously, we know that the right to vote is a cornerstone of our democracy, and it is very important that South Australians have the ability to get to the polling booth, particularly on election day when they need to vote.

Section 130 of the Electoral Act makes it an offence for an employer to prevent a worker from leaving work, or levy a disproportionate deduction of pay or penalty in order to have an appropriate amount of time to be able to vote in an election. The current act has a maximum limit of two hours, but this amendment seeks to make it three hours. This, of course, does not mean that anyone can just get out of work for an extra hour on election day. I note that it is also an offence for a worker to take this leave of absence under the pretence that they will be going to vote without any genuine intention of doing so.

What this means is that if this is needed because lines or queues are extra long, then the maximum time someone has to vote would be three hours without suffering a penalty rather than two hours. It has already been acknowledged that there are a range of different processes that the Electoral Commission need to go through to run a COVID-safe election, and there are polling booths that do have significant queues. This would be an additional safety measure to ensure that if there were long queues on election day, people would not suffer a significant penalty to vote.

This section does not apply to an elector whose absence may cause danger or substantial loss in respect of the employment in which the employee is engaged. I suspect that if an employee were to use this provision, most reasonable employers would not impose a penalty if the employee were gone for 2½ hours to vote; unfortunately, as many of us on this side of the house can attest from our work with working people, unreasonable employers do exist, and this change is designed to protect the worker in such an instance.

It is a commonsense change that is designed to allow workers to deal with what may be the reality of the longer time it will take to vote at the next election and possibly other elections in the future.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Can I just say that the Electoral Commissioner has not raised this, the unions have not raised it, Business SA has not raised it. Obviously we would like to consult with employers and employees about this extra time that might be required, but I just remind the member that under the bill before us we are already promoting and have passed an extra pre-poll allowance for 12 days to deal with the fact that we have a big rush on election day and we need to be able to expand that. So we are expecting that there will be a reduction in the lines.

We have also had a commitment from the Electoral Commissioner during estimates that it is not his intention at all to close any polling booths; there is no rationalisation happening here.

Obviously we are also providing telephone-assisted voting in certain circumstances. We would certainly be hoping there would be a reduction in the line-up, for people to be able to have work off.

Again, I am happy to look at this between the houses, and I am happy to speak with Business SA. Employers might be more accommodating for someone who is in a COVID situation who might need extra time—they might have to catch three buses to get to the polling booth or whatever—but at this stage it has not been raised by anybody. However, I am happy to look at it between the houses.

New clause negated.

Clause 40 passed.

New clauses 41 and 42.

**Mr PICTON:** I move:

Amendment No 5 [Picton-4]—

Page 12, after line 23—Insert:

41—Amendment of section 133—Disqualification for bribery and undue influence

Section 133—delete '2 years' and substitute '4 years'

42—Amendment of section 139—Regulations

Section 139—after subsection (2) insert:

- (3) Subject to subsections (4) and (5), a regulation made for the purposes of this Act cannot come into operation during a prescribed period.
- (4) A regulation made for the purposes of this Act may come into operation during a prescribed period if the Minister certifies that the registered officer of the major party that is not in government on the date falling 14 days before the making of the regulation has agreed in writing to the regulation coming into operation during the prescribed period.
- (5) Subsections (3) and (4) do not apply to the substitution of a regulation by another regulation made for the purposes of Part 3A of the *Subordinate Legislation Act 1978* that is substantially the same as the regulation being substituted.
- (6) A reference in this section to the *major party that is not in government* is a reference to the registered political party with the greatest number of members of Parliament, not including—
  - (a) the registered political party whose members of Parliament form government; or
  - (b) if the government is formed by the members of more than 1 party, or 1 or more parties and other members of Parliament, whether acting in coalition or otherwise—any registered political party or parties so forming government.
- (7) In this section—
 

*prescribed period*—each of the following is a prescribed period:

  - (a) the period of 6 months immediately preceding the day after the day on which a general election must be held under section 28(1) of the *Constitution Act 1934*;
  - (b) the period from the issue of a writ for a by-election for a House of Assembly electoral district until the return of the writ.

The current Electoral Act disqualifies anyone who is convicted of bribery or undue influence, or an attempt to commit bribery or undue influence, for a period of two years from the date of conviction from sitting or being elected. It makes sense that a person engaged in bribery or undue influence will not be allowed to be elected to parliament or sit in parliament; however, the time limit of two years does not appear to make any particular sense.

A person who is convicted of one of these offences may not be prevented from running at the subsequent election. We have four-year electoral cycles, not two-year electoral cycles, and so there does not seem to be a particular limit that would be in place for somebody who committed that offence at the previous election. Especially if this offence relates to an election, it seems extraordinary that a person would not be necessarily prevented from running four years later. This amendment enforces a full term of parliament before the person convicted of bribery or undue influence can run for election or hold a seat in parliament again. That is the first part of amendment No. 5.

The second part of amendment No. 5 is in relation regulations. Many of us who have spoken in this house, in this rather short debate that we have had on this bill so far, have raised concerns about the sheer number of decisions that have been left to regulation in this bill. In South Australia, our elections are not run by the party of government; they are run on rules that are agreed to by the parliament and arbitrated by the independent Electoral Commission.

It is an important part of our democracy that the rules are well known and agreed to in advance of the election. Because of the timing of our parliamentary sittings and the fixed election cycle, there is the risk that the government can make regulations that impact the running of an upcoming election after parliament has risen but before the issuing of writs and caretaker provisions begin. It is important for the government of the day to be able to make changes on the run to deal with new circumstances that arise and there will not always be time for legislation to make it through the parliament.

This amendment seeks to provide a bipartisan approach to electoral regulations within the last six months before an election. This essentially mirrors caretaker provisions that occur after the issuing of writs before an election. The registered officer of the party that held the most seats in parliament—that is, does not form government—would have to provide written agreement to the regulations. Parliamentary counsel advises that this would happen 14 days before the making of the regulation to allow various cabinet processes to occur prior to regulations being made by the Governor.

In considering this amendment, the opposition contemplated a number of options to make sure that every candidate knew the rules they would be abiding by in the lead-up to the election. Ultimately, we reach this compromise position where, if the government did find it important enough to enact regulations within the last six months before an election, they could do so, but it would have to make the case to the opposition of the day and ensure that the rules are not being changed in such a way that would disproportionately benefit the government of the day.

The opposition feels, that because there is so much reliance on regulations for the operation of this bill, it is the right time to put forward such a change to the act to ensure the integrity of our electoral system, to make sure that the government of the day could not erode democratic rights. If the government is serious about maintaining electoral process independently then they would have no issue in supporting this amendment.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** On the first matter of amendment No. 5 on schedule 137(5), I think it is, of the member for Kurna, it relates to the disqualification of a candidate for bribery or undue influence and a proposal to delete two years and substitute four years. This is the disqualification period for which the party could not be a candidate if they were convicted of these offences.

Can I just say that there is already provision in our constitution which provides for a member's seat becoming vacant if the member fails to turn up to parliament for 12 consecutive days; is not or ceases to be an Australian citizen; takes an oath or makes any declaration or acknowledgement of allegiance, obedience, adherence to any foreign prince or power; does, concurs in, or adopts any act whereby the member may become a subject or citizen of any foreign state or power; becomes bankrupt or an insolvent debtor within the laws; becomes a public defaulter; is attainted of treason; is convicted of an indictable offence; or becomes of unsound mind. It would be hard to prove the latter in lots of cases. But in any event, we have a fairly comprehensive list of when you can no longer be a candidate.

I do not know what the origin is of the bribery and undue influence provision in the act or as to what the reason is for the two years. Again, I am happy to have a look at that but it just seems to me at this point that there has been no disclosure as to why that should change. It may relate to cycles. I do not know. I have not seen any of the debate or any argument put on that.

In relation to the second aspect, which is the incorporation of regulations, I do not think in the entire time I have been here that we have seen anything quite like this. It sets out a fairly unusual process to provide the opposition with the power to delay the commencement of regulations in the six months leading up to an election when this period has already commenced.

So there are the caretaker conventions—we understand that; they are well established. The proposed amendment unnecessarily complicates both these established processes. There is also the Subordinate Legislation Act which sets out the ordinary process for making regulations and generally that regulations come into force four months after the day on which they are made or at such later date as is specified in the regulation.

I will not go through all of that, but I am advised that, although the member seems to be foreshadowing some kind of abuse of process here, there are two things I will bring to the attention of the house. One is that we have drafted some regulations. We have provided a copy of that—I think it has gone to the Hon. Kyam Maher. We are happy to still keep talking about those in anticipation that there will be some reforms if this legislation passes the parliament. Even that is a bit back to front. We understand the reasons why that is, and we would hope that there are some bona fides accepted in relation to that.

But even if the opposition takes the view that this is some devious plot by the government to have some abuse of the process and therefore to exploit the circumstance that there may not be any parliament sitting after December this year, I hear that. Can I just say that I want to reassure the parliament that at any time a party can make an application for a judicial review of a matter and that is a position that is available to them if they are unhappy with a decision that is made in relation to this.

So there are remedies here in relation to how this is dealt with if there is some suggestion of some sinister intent or plot on behalf of the government to deal with this. We have provided draft regulations, we have invited the conversation about any amendments that are sought in that regard and we are happy to continue to do that during the course of the passage of this bill. If it is to pass this house, then it would be between the houses that we would be happy to continue to confer.

I have not had any requests from the Hon. Kyam Maher, who has the general management of this on behalf of the opposition, but again he is aware that we are happy to meet with him and provide any other information and/or listen to his proposals in relation to the development of the regulations.

**Mr PICTON:** I think the Attorney hit the nail on the head in terms of our concerns in terms of what the government's motives might be in relation to the various things that, throughout the course of this short debate, we have had on this bill. They have said that they are going to leave it up to regulation, and that is why this amendment is seen to be introduced. While you can circulate all the drafts of regulations you like, the government can change its mind and the government could introduce new regulations right up until caretaker period with no ability for the parliament to have oversight of that. That is what this amendment seeks to fix, which of course would apply to future governments as well and to future times when the parties might be in different positions as well.

I think in the lead-up to the election there should be certainties as to the rules, which is one of the reasons why we have raised concerns in relation to the entirety of this legislation. This is being brought to the parliament at one minute to midnight before we have the election campaign and these sorts of rules should have been established long ago if the government was so serious to do so.

The Attorney said, 'You can apply for a judicial review.' Sure, but that has a very limited scope in what the judiciary would seek to throw out the regulation issued by the Governor. They are not going to do it because of the merits of the case. They are not going to throw it out because it is unfair, only if it had somehow fallen foul from an administrative law perspective in terms of the regulations and the scope of them that are being introduced.

There may be a whole range of things that would be totally okay from an administrative law perspective but very unfair in terms of favouring the government's chances at the next election, so that is not really a remedy in terms of addressing the concerns that we have. That would be very limited in scope and not address the fact that the government could issue things that could ultimately benefit their own electoral chances. We remain completely unconvinced that leaving so much of this to chance in the regulations is the way to go.

New clauses negated.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (16:31):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

I appreciate the indication of support for those aspects the opposition were prepared to accede to and I would hope that we can have some fruitful negotiations in relation to some of the proposals that have been presented for further consideration between the houses.

I especially wish to thank the Electoral Commissioner, Mr Mick Sherry, and Mr David Gully—I am sure there are many other officers who provided support and information for the development of the bill—for the work they do for the purpose of elections and democracy generally in our state.

I understand that it is Mr Gully's last state election coming up. He has provided a powerful level of service in this area to this state, and I will doubtless have more to say about him down the track. I make the point that they have a pretty significant year coming: they will have to deal with federal election issues for the Australian Electoral Commission, we have a state election coming up and we have local government elections in the latter part of next year. There is a lot of work that is described in his annual report and referred to in estimates that he and his office have to do, so I thank them for that.

I also wish to acknowledge Michelle Coram, from Legislative Services in our Attorney-General's Department, who has been the adviser to me. She has done a stellar job; she always does. She has had to sit and listen to the informative contributions of many of the members of the parliament over 19½ hours of deliberations on this bill, never with any complaint. She sat here and listened, interested in all those who made a contribution. I was tempted to go to sleep from time to time. Nevertheless, she has been absolutely incredible, so I do thank her especially for the work she has done in relation to this.

I also wish to acknowledge Antony Green. I read somewhere that he is proposing to retire soon from his world of commentary. I want to especially thank him. He came to South Australia and acknowledged and publicly supported the idea that we pick up the opportunity for the counting of voting and have a process where we are able to reduce the declaration of votes and be able to start counting and put them in the piles, so to speak, so that we can know shortly after election day who is going to form government and who is not.

The idea these days of having to wait weeks for a determination about who has won their seat, who is going to be forming government, has really been difficult. I recall an occasion when I left the state immediately after a federal election. It was expected that Ms Gillard was going to become the Prime Minister. I came back within two weeks, and I asked the person at the entry of Sydney Airport whether we had a Prime Minister yet and he said, 'No, still nobody in charge'. I felt at the time that that was just really unsatisfactory, and so I think it is important.

We have the technology to do it. We have the security arrangements to provide it. I thank Mr Green for supporting our initiative in this regard for Australia so that we can make this an improved position for the next election. With those few words, I commend the bill to the house.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before I call the member for Kaurana, Attorney, how long did you say the debate lasted?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** It was 19½ hours. It started about 10 o'clock on the Tuesday through to midnight on the Tuesday night. We spent all the Wednesday on it and then to 10 o'clock on the Thursday. I think that my office counted up that it was about 19½ hours—so we have comprehensively considered this bill.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I can honestly say, Attorney, that as Chair of Committees it did not seem that long.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Didn't it?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** That is gracious. Thank you, sir.

**Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (16:36):** I think that on behalf of everybody on this side of the house we would all say that the debate flew by. I thank everybody for their contributions. I think that the concerns that have been raised consistently on this side of the house still remain. We are concerned about people's ability to exercise their democratic right to vote.

The Attorney was faced with two options. The Electoral Commissioner gave her a recommendation to allow enrolment right up until election day. That would have expanded the number of people who would have had their say and voted in our state election. That was choice 1. She has opted to go for choice 2, which is not to do that but to limit the amount of time that people have to enrol before the election.

We are disfranchising people from being able to have their say at the election. There has been no clearly articulated reason why that should be the case. Ultimately, that will mean that there are many thousands, if not tens of thousands, of South Australians who under option (a) would have been able to have their say in the state election compared with option (b) who would not be able to have their say.

That is the central reason why we are opposed to this legislation. The second reason is that this has been brought to the parliament at one minute to midnight before the state election. We are right in the last six months now before election day, and the Attorney has on multiple fronts tried to change the rules right at the last minute.

We had various other pieces of legislation that were the top priorities. We talked about bringing back the QC title. That was a top priority compared to this legislation, which has been left to the last minute. Changing the rules this late in the game we do not believe is the right approach that should be taken by this parliament, and we will be raising that consistently if we are not successful in stopping this now in the other place.

We believe that every South Australian should have the right to vote and to enrol up until election day. We believe that the government of the day should not be changing the rules for the forthcoming election with such little time to go until that election. We will continue to raise concerns about this bill and to raise concerns about what will be limiting the chance of South Australians to have their say on what will be a very important election for South Australians.

Do you want to continue with a government which is cutting the health system, privatising essential services and which is mired in corruption and scandal, or do you want to adopt a new vision for this state? We believe that South Australians will opt for the latter, but clearly the government believe that trying to stop people—particularly young people—from enrolling to vote is their best way of staying in government.

The facts are very clear that the vast majority of people who are enrolling late are younger people, and clearly the government is afraid of those younger people expressing their views. We have heard as much from the commissioner herself. She has written to all members of parliament expressing her concerns with this legislation, that it would deprive young people from having a say. Let's not let the Attorney-General's agenda of stopping young people from having a say proceed, and let's make sure that as many young people as possible have the chance to have their say in the next election.

The house divided on the third reading:

Ayes ..... 25

Noes ..... 21

Majority ..... 4

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.  
Cowdrey, M.J.  
Ellis, F.J.  
Knoll, S.K.  
McBride, N.  
Pederick, A.S.  
Sanderson, R.  
Treloar, P.A.

Bell, T.S.  
Cregan, D.  
Gardner, J.A.W.  
Luethen, P.  
Murray, S.  
Pisoni, D.G.  
Speirs, D.J.  
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Chapman, V.A.  
Duluk, S.  
Harvey, R.M. (teller)  
Marshall, S.S.  
Patterson, S.J.R.  
Power, C.  
Tarzia, V.A.  
Whetstone, T.J.

## AYES

Wingard, C.L.

## NOES

Bedford, F.E.  
Boyer, B.I.  
Close, S.E.  
Hildyard, K.A.  
Malinauskas, P.  
Odenwalder, L.K.  
Stinson, J.M.

Bettison, Z.L.  
Brock, G.G.  
Cook, N.F.  
Hughes, E.J.  
Michaels, A.  
Piccolo, A.  
Szakacs, J.K.

Bignell, L.W.K.  
Brown, M.E.  
Gee, J.P.  
Koutsantonis, A.  
Mullighan, S.C.  
Picton, C.J. (teller)  
Wortley, D.

Third reading thus carried; bill passed.

### STATUTES AMENDMENT (CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE) BILL

#### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (16:46):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The government is pleased to introduce the Statutes Amendment (Child Sexual Abuse) Bill. I seek leave to have the second reading explanation and explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

Mr Speaker, the government is pleased to introduce the Statutes Amendment (Child Sexual Abuse) Bill 2021.

The bill introduces many important reforms as a result of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. The royal commission was established in 2013 and undertook five years of inquiry into responses by institutions into instances and allegations of child sexual abuse.

The royal commission delivered four sets of recommendations, one of which was contained in the Criminal Justice Report tabled in federal parliament on 14 August 2017.

Many of the report's recommendations are already in place in South Australia, however a number still require legislative reform to be implemented. The bill amends various acts to implement the required legislative reform recommended by the report.

In addition to implementing the recommendations, this bill also makes various amendments that are aimed at assisting domestic abuse victims in the criminal justice system.

Turning now to the provisions of the bill.

Part 2 of the bill contains amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 (CLCA).

Clauses 4, 5 and 6 of the bill amend the CLCA in line with recommendation 29 to provide a similar age or reasonable belief defence for the offences of unlawful sexual intercourse, indecent assault where the victim is under 17 and consents, and procuring a child to commit indecent assault.

The similar age defence applies where the victim was 17 or over and the defendant was under the age of 18 at the time of the offence or believed on reasonable grounds that the victim was of or above the age of 18. The defence is limited to defendants who are in a position of authority by virtue of providing religious, sporting, musical or other instructions to the victim.

The wide definition of position of authority under the CLCA means that there may be young people who provide this kind of instruction who should have a similar-age consent defence available to them.

Clause 7 of the bill creates new offences of failing to report child sexual abuse and failing to protect a child from child sexual abuse in line with recommendations 35 and 36.

New section 64A provides it is an offence if a prescribed person knows, suspects or should have suspected that another person has previously engaged in the sexual abuse of a child and:

- The child is under 18;

- The other employee is still employed by the institution or another institution, or
- The sexual abuse occurred in the preceding 10 years, and refuses or fails to report that abuse to the police.

The offence also applies where the prescribed person is engaging or is likely to engage in the sexual abuse of a child.

A prescribed person is defined to be an employee of an institution. In these circumstances, the employee is required to report child sexual abuse by another employee of the institution.

An institution is defined in new section 64 to mean an entity (whether private or public) that operates facilities or provides services to children who are in their care, supervision or control. This includes medical and religious institutions.

A prescribed person also includes providers of out of home care, commonly known as foster carers, who are caring for the child in premises other than the child's home. The foster carer receives or may receive payment or financial or other assistance in relation to the care provided.

In these circumstances an out of home carer is required to report child sexual abuse by another out of home carer. This is in recognition of the position of trust that foster carers are placed in when they take on the care of children who are in the guardianship or custody of the chief executive.

The provisions of new section 64 operate retrospectively in certain circumstances.

Under new section 64A(5) it is a reasonable excuse not to make a report where a report has already been made under section 31 of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017. No criminal or civil liability lies for reporting a matter in good faith under new section 64A and the prescribed person cannot be liable for professional misconduct. The identity of the reporter is protected as if he or she made the report under the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017 and he or she has the same protection from victimisation.

Clause 7 of the bill inserts new section 65 to create a criminal offence of failing to protect a child from sexual abuse in line with recommendation 36. New section 65 provides that it is an offence if a prescribed person knows that there is a substantial risk that another person will engage in sexual abuse of a child who is under the age of 17, or in relation to whom the abuser is in a position of authority, and the employee has the power or responsibility to reduce or remove that risk but negligently fails to do so.

In the case of a prescribed person who is an employee of an institution, the employee is required to protect a child from sexual abuse by another employee of the institution. Where the prescribed person is a foster carer, then the obligation is to protect a child from sexual abuse by another foster carer.

In line with recommendation 83, clause 8 of the bill makes retrospective section 73 of the CLCA which abolishes the presumption that a boy under the age of 14 is incapable of having sexual intercourse. South Australia was the first jurisdiction to abolish the presumption which originated in the English common law in the 1700's. This provision did not operate retrospectively and has been recognised as having the potential to protect an alleged perpetrator from being charged and convicted of historical sex offences.

Turning now to the amendments to the Criminal Procedure Act 1921 contained in part 3 of the bill.

There are a number of recommendations aimed at alleviating the need for child sexual abuse victims to attend court, where they are again confronted by their abuser and often experience significant distress during cross-examination. Consistent with these recommendations, clause 9 of the bill amends section 111 of the Criminal Procedure Act to allow for the admission of audio or audio visual recordings of interviews with victims of sexual abuse and domestic abuse at committal, as opposed to a written statement.

Clause 10 of the bill amends section 114(3) of the Criminal Procedure Act. Under the current law, if a witness is a victim of an alleged sexual offence, has a cognitive impairment that adversely affects the person's capacity to give a coherent account of experiences or respond rationally to questions, or is under 14, the court must not grant permission to call a witness for oral examination in committal proceedings, unless satisfied that the interests of justice cannot be adequately served except by doing so.

Clause 10 expands this provision to also include victims of an alleged offence involving domestic abuse.

In line with recommendation 79, clause 11 of the bill amends section 157 of the Criminal Procedure Act to give the DPP the right to bring an interlocutory appeal against a pre-trial ruling that has the effect of terminating or substantially weakening the prosecution's case. This clause can apply to other situations in the interest of justice. The DPP's current right of appeal is very limited, and the absence of such a right has led to unfavourable outcomes in the courts. The defendant already has a right to appeal interlocutory decisions at the completion of the trial under the Criminal Procedure Act.

Turning now to amendments to the Evidence Act 1929 contained in part 4 of the bill.

In line with recommendations 52 and 53, clause 13(2) of the bill amends section 12AB of the Evidence Act to expand the categories of witnesses who may give evidence at a pre-trial special hearing before without the defendant present to include:

- All child sexual abuse victims (no matter what their age at the time of the trial);
- Any other witness in a child sexual offence trial who is a child, is vulnerable or any other witness if the court is satisfied that they should be allowed to give evidence in a manner contemplated by this section; and
- Domestic abuse victims.

Such hearings alleviate the need for victims to be confronted by their abuser when they give evidence in court.

In line with recommendations 54 and 60, clauses 13(1) and 14 of the bill allow the court to make orders about the manner, duration and type of questions that may be asked of witnesses at pre-trial special hearings and of vulnerable witnesses giving evidence in a trial of child sexual offences. Directions can also be made that certain evidence that contradicts, challenges or discredits a witness's evidence, need not be put to the witness. The court may also make directions about the use of aids such as plans and maps that help communicate a question or answer.

In line with recommendation 56, clause 15 of the bill amends section 13C of the Evidence Act to require audio visual recordings of evidence for all child sexual abuse victims given in court. Currently under the Evidence Act, recordings are only required for vulnerable witnesses, which is limited to a child of or under the age of 16 years who is the victim of a sexual offence. Such recordings may be relied upon in any subsequent trial or retrial.

Clause 16 of the bill inserts new section 29B into the Evidence Act to abolish Markuleski directions as recommended in the Criminal Justice Report. New section 29B provides that in a trial in which more than one offence is charged, a trial judge must not direct the jury that its doubt regarding the truthfulness or reliability of the victim's evidence in relation to one charge, should be considered when assessing the truthfulness or reliability of the victim's evidence generally or in relation to other charges.

In line with recommendation 69, clause 16 of the bill inserts new section 29C into the Evidence Act, allowing for the admission of expert evidence on the development and behaviour of children generally, and the development and behaviour of children who have been victims of sexual offences or offences similar to sexual offences, in proceedings related to child sexual abuse. Such evidence could assist the jury in better understanding the evidence given by child sexual abuse victims.

Clause 17 of the bill amends section 34P of the Evidence Act to increase the admissibility of discreditable conduct evidence. This amendment is consistent with the royal commission's recommendation, encouraging greater admissibility of this evidence. Discreditable conduct comprises of propensity and similarity of account evidence.

In order to admit this kind of evidence, section 34P(2) of the Evidence Act requires that its probative value substantially outweighs the prejudicial effect that it may have on the accused. Clause 17 of the bill removes the word 'substantially'.

Clause 18 inserts new section 67K into the Evidence Act to provide that the fact that information was gained during or in connection with a religious confession does not prevent or otherwise affect the giving of evidence as to, or the disclosure of, the information for the purpose of any civil or criminal proceedings for child sexual abuse. This is consistent with recommendations 33 and 36. A working group was established by the Council of Attorneys-General to consider these recommendations which proposed principles for reform in this area. The amendments contained in clause 18 of the bill are consistent with these principles for reform which were subsequently endorsed by the council on 29 November 2019.

Part 5 of the Bill amends the Sentencing Act 2017.

In line with recommendation 75, clause 19 of the bill amends section 26 of the Sentencing Act to require the court, when setting a single sentence for an offence involving different victims or one committed on different occasions, to indicate the sentence that would have been imposed in respect of each offence.

Clause 21 of the bill enacts recommendation 76 by amending section 68 of the Sentencing Act. Clause 21 requires the court, when sentencing for child sexual abuse offences, to set sentences in accordance with the sentencing standards at the time of sentencing, instead of at the time of the offending. However, the sentence must be limited to the maximum sentence available at the date when the offence was committed. This clause clarifies and replaces section 68 of the Sentencing Act.

Part 6 of the Bill amends the Summary Offences Act 1953. In line with recommendation 52, clause 22 amends section 74EA of the Summary Offences Act to require pre-recorded investigative interviews with Police for all child sexual abuse victims, no matter what their age is at trial. There is currently only an obligation to record interviews with children under the age of 14 or a person with a disability that adversely affects their capacity to give a coherent account of their experiences or to respond rationally to questions. Applications can be made under the Evidence Act for these recorded interviews to be admitted at trial instead of the witness having to give evidence.

Finally, in line with recommendation 84, part 7 of the bill amends the Young Offenders Act 1993 by inserting new section 19A. This section provides that for committal proceedings in the Youth Court, an audio visual record of evidence of the victim of a child sexual offence may be admitted if the recording is of evidence given in earlier criminal proceedings or during an investigative interview under Part 17 Division 3 of the Summary Offences Act. In order to admit

the recording, the court must be satisfied as to the victim's capacity to give evidence and that the defendant was given a reasonable opportunity to view the recording.

New section 19A also provides that the victim of a child sexual offence cannot be required to give oral evidence at committal except in the form of an audio visual record. These provisions are aimed at ensuring that child sexual abuse victims do not have to give evidence on any additional occasion in circumstances where the accused is a juvenile.

Mr Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to promote the identification of individuals who sexually abuse children and to ensure their appropriate conviction in the courts. It also seeks to protect and assist child sexual abuse victims through the court process to reduce the trauma that they often suffer. The impact of child sexual abuse can be lifelong, and the impact on their families and the broader community can continue into subsequent generations.

Assisting domestic abuse victims through the court process is also of particular concern and has been included in this Bill as part of the Government's commitment to wider reform addressing domestic and family violence.

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

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

###### 1—Short title

###### 2—Commencement

###### 3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*

###### 4—Amendment of section 49—Unlawful sexual intercourse

This clause creates a new defence for a person accused of a 'position of authority' unlawful sexual intercourse offence by virtue of the person providing religious, sporting, musical or other instruction to the victim. The defence will only apply where the victim was 17 at the time of the offence and either the accused was under the age of 18 at the time of the alleged offence or the accused believed the victim was 18 or over.

###### 5—Amendment of section 57—Consent no defence in certain cases

This clause creates a new defence for a person accused of a 'position of authority' indecent assault offence by virtue of the person providing religious, sporting, musical or other instruction to the victim. The defence will only apply where the victim was 17 at the time of the offence and either the accused was under the age of 18 at the time of the alleged offence or the accused believed the victim was 18 or over.

###### 6—Amendment of section 63B—Procuring child to commit indecent act etc

This clause creates a new defence for a person accused of a 'position of authority' offence against section 63B (1)(a), (1)(b)(i) or (3) by virtue of the person providing religious, sporting, musical or other instruction to the victim. The defence will only apply where the victim was 17 at the time of the offence and either the accused was under the age of 18 at the time of the alleged offence or the accused believed the victim was 18 or over.

###### 7—Insertion of Part 3 Division 11B

This clause inserts new offences relating to institutional child sexual abuse as follows:

###### Division 11B—Institutional and out of home care child sexual abuse

###### 64—Interpretation

This provision defines certain terms used in the Division.

###### 64A—Failure to report suspected child sexual abuse

This provision creates a new offence in certain circumstances where an employee of an institution or provider of out of home care knows, suspects or should have suspected that another person has previously engaged in the sexual abuse of a child or is engaging, or is likely to engage, in the sexual abuse of a child, and refuses or fails to report that to police. The maximum penalty is 3 years imprisonment. It is a defence to a charge of the offence if the defendant had a reasonable excuse for the refusal or failure to report.

###### 65—Failure to protect child from sexual abuse

This provision creates a new offence in certain circumstances where an employee of an institution or provider of out of home care knows that there is a substantial risk that another person will engage in the sexual abuse of a child and has the power or responsibility to reduce or remove that risk but negligently fails to do so. The maximum penalty for the offence is 15 years imprisonment

#### 8—Amendment of section 73—Proof of certain matters

This clause makes the rule that no person will, by reason of their age, be presumed incapable of sexual intercourse retrospective.

#### Part 3—Amendment of *Criminal Procedure Act 1921*

#### 9—Amendment of section 111—Committal brief etc

Section 111(5) allows a police record of interview or an audiovisual record to be used as a witness statement for certain categories of vulnerable witnesses. This clause amends section 111(6) to include victims of alleged sexual abuse as well as victims of alleged offences involving domestic abuse as witnesses to whom subsection (5) applies.

#### 10—Amendment of section 114—Taking evidence at committal proceedings

This clause amends section 114(3) for consistency to include victims of alleged offences involving domestic abuse as witnesses who cannot be called for oral examination at committal proceedings unless the court is satisfied that the interests of justice cannot be adequately served except by doing so.

#### 11—Amendment of section 157—Right of appeal in criminal cases

This clause allows the Director of Public Prosecutions, with the permission of the Full Court, to appeal against an interlocutory judgement where the interlocutory judgement destroys or substantially weakens any charge and, if correct, is likely to lead to abandonment of that charge or where it is in the interests of justice for the appeal to be permitted.

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

#### 12—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause inserts a definition of *child sexual offence*.

#### 13—Amendment of section 12AB—Pre-trial special hearings

This clause lists a number of kinds of directions that a court may make when making an order for a pre-trial special hearing in relation to a witness in a trial of a charge of a child sexual offence. The clause also provides that, in the case of a trial of a charge of a child sexual offence, the section will apply to an alleged victim of the offence (regardless of their age at the time of the trial), a child, a vulnerable witness or any other witness if the court is satisfied that they should be allowed to give evidence in a manner contemplated by the section.

#### 14—Amendment of section 13A—Special arrangements for protecting vulnerable witnesses when giving evidence in criminal proceedings

This clause provides an equivalent direction making power for courts making an order under section 13A.

#### 15—Amendment of section 13C—Court's power to make audio visual record of evidence of vulnerable witnesses in criminal proceedings

This clause requires that, if a witness is the alleged victim of a child sexual offence, the court must order that an audio visual record be made of a witness's evidence before the court (unless such an order has already been made).

#### 16—Insertion of sections 29B and 29C

This clause inserts new sections as follows:

#### 29B—Prohibited direction in relation to doubts regarding truthfulness or reliability of victim's evidence

This provision prohibits a trial judge from directing a jury that if the jury doubts the truthfulness or reliability of the victim's evidence in relation to a charge, that doubt must be taken into account in assessing the truthfulness or reliability of the victim's evidence generally or in relation to other charges.

#### 29C—Evidence of opinions based on specialised knowledge of child behaviour etc

This provision provides that if a person has specialised knowledge of child development and child behaviour then evidence of that person's opinion that is wholly or substantially based on that specialised knowledge is admissible in proceedings relating to sexual abuse of a child.

#### 17—Amendment of section 34P—Evidence of discreditable conduct

This clause alters the test for admitting discreditable conduct evidence for a permissible use to require that the judge be satisfied that the probative value of the evidence admitted for that use outweighs any prejudicial effect (rather than the current requirement that it 'substantially outweighs' any prejudicial effect).

#### 18—Insertion of Part 7 Division 11

This clause inserts a new Division specifying that no confessional privilege applies in civil or criminal child sexual abuse matters in the State.

Part 5—Amendment of *Sentencing Act 2017*

## 19—Amendment of section 26—Sentencing for multiple offences

If a court is imposing a single sentence for multiple offences involving different victims or committed on different occasions, this provision will require the court to indicate the sentence that would have been imposed in respect of each offence had the court not imposed a single sentence.

## 20—Amendment of heading to Part 3 Division 6

This clause deletes a reference to paedophilia and replaces it with a reference to child sexual abuse.

## 21—Substitution of section 68

This clause inserts a new provision requiring a court that is sentencing an offender in relation to a child sexual offence to have regard to the sentencing practices, principles and guidelines applicable when the sentence is imposed rather than when the offence was committed.

Part 6—Amendment of *Summary Offences Act 1953*

## 22—Amendment of section 74EA—Application and interpretation

This clause applies the Division on recording interviews with vulnerable witnesses to any person being interviewed as the victim of an alleged child sexual offence.

Part 7—Amendment of *Young Offenders Act 1993*

## 23—Insertion of section 19A

This clause inserts a new provision allowing the alleged victim of a child sexual offence to give pre-recorded evidence in committal proceedings in the Youth Court and ensuring that the alleged victim cannot be required to give oral evidence for the purposes of the committal proceedings except evidence in the form of such a recording.

**Mr PICTON:** Can I seek clarity? Is this the same bill that was previously introduced about an hour ago?

**The SPEAKER:** No. Order of the Day No. 27 was dealt with earlier this afternoon. I did not hear the Attorney first of all, but I clarified it: it is Order of the Day No. 26 that has just been dealt with.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

**MOTOR VEHICLES (ELECTRIC VEHICLE LEVY) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 August 2021.)

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:48):** I rise to indicate that I am the lead speaker on this side of the chamber on this bill and that we will be opposing this legislation. I was thinking about how do I succinctly say why we would oppose this, and I feel like saying: read the room. Read the room on what is going with climate change. Work out that what we need to do is put every effort we have, every instrument, every tool towards decarbonising, and this bill drags us in the other direction.

Why? Why would you do this? It is not even that it is a piece of legislation that will come into force in the near future. What it is, though, is a very clear message to people considering having a zero carbon emitting vehicle that there is a tax coming, that there are costs coming. Will that be enough to dissuade people? I do not know, but it might. What I do know is what we are facing. We are facing runaway climate change.

In this state, we do an exceptional job when it comes to stationary energy, that is, the energy system is very low carbon not least because of the efforts made under the Rann and then Weatherill governments to introduce low energy and renewable energy forms of technology: solar panels, wind and, of course, we use gas to firm, not coal.

That is terrific. Do we rest on our laurels? We cannot and we cannot for two reasons. One is that climate change is real and everyone has to do their bit. There is no good asking developing nations struggling with their standards of living to drop their carbon emissions if we are not doing every single thing we can in the developed world to do the same.

The other reason is just as pressing. We need a low-carbon economy because decarbonising the world is coming and if we are not ready for that economically, technologically and in lifestyle we will be left behind. A perfect example of that is, in fact, electric vehicles. We do not have the full range. We do not have the cheaper ones. They do not bother to sell them here because we are not buying them.

I will absolutely pay respect to the government for investing in more charging stations. That is a disincentive, particularly in a country like Australia, where we like to go for long trips and where we have a lot of space between places. I get that that can put people off and the government has done something about that.

At the same time, we do not have the range, particularly at the cheaper end of vehicles, to encourage people when they are weighing up between the options, when they are looking at the family budget, wondering which way to go. Every effort needs to be to tip them towards electric and saying that you are going to tax them tips it the other way.

Our emissions that come from transport are higher—nearly 30 per cent of our emissions come from transport—than our stationary energy because, as I mentioned, we did such a good job previously and this government, to its credit, at least has not turned its back on renewables. Despite some pretty fierce words, particularly on Sky News, *The Bolt Report*, something dreadful like that, the Premier loved to leap on blaming renewables for the statewide blackout.

But, since the election, they have chosen to wrap themselves in our legacy and I appreciate that because climate change is bipartisan—should be, it is not in Canberra, but should be. Here we face a question of what to do about transport energy. Where we are at the moment is only 0.7 per cent of new car sales in South Australia are electric vehicles. I think we can all agree we are not where we need to be if we take climate change seriously and if we want to rejig our economy to be decarbonised.

What does it look like in other nations? In Europe and in the UK—it breaks my heart a little to have to talk about those separately—around 10 per cent of new car sales are electric vehicles. But in Norway it is 75 per cent. They have made the jump. They made the jump early in low-carbon stationary energy and they are making the jump early in transport energy. That is where we need to be because when you are in a place where you are having great uptake of technology you are also likely to be in a place where you will be innovating technology, where you will be having people enthused enough and mentally prepared enough to think about low-carbon technology that they will start to be investing and considering new forms of technology.

Who knows? We could even get a car industry back sometime in this state. Heaven forbid that a federal Liberal government would chase it away again. Who knows? In the distant future we might have such innovation here should we embrace this technology.

What we are hearing from the other side is that instead of looking at this they are looking at this. They are saying, 'Well, when you have a petrol vehicle you pay fuel excise and some of that fuel excise is used for roads.' Not all, not by a longshot, but some—and certainly not hypothecated, not required to be spent on roads—but some of it is spent on roads. They are saying, 'We are a bit worried that we are going to lose access to the federal money collected by the federal government spent back on our roads.'

I understand that and, if we were not in a deep, difficult crisis with climate change and desperately needing to change our emissions profile and our technology uptake, I could understand that we would interrogate that question of whether there needs to be another form of raising tax. But there are some problems with that.

First of all, it is actually a national tax and this does need to be solved nationally. If there is going to be a replacement for fuel excise, let's have a national conversation about that. Secondly, it is not hypothecated, so we are replacing a hypothecated tax with one that is not. Thirdly, the real problem for the falling revenue in fuel excise are the cars that are more efficient, the four-cylinder cars, the ones that use less petrol. Is the government going to be consistent and say, 'We need to make them pay more than they are otherwise paying in order to compensate for their relative efficiency'? No, they do not. In fact, it is cheaper—as it should be—to register your car here if it is a four-cylinder; \$138 to register your car. Six cylinders go up to \$281 and V8s to V12s are \$407.

The EV tax, as estimated—once on, in the future—will be something like \$443. You are giving a whack to EVs that you are not giving to four-cylinder cars and yet four-cylinder cars are actually undermining the fuel excise far more than electric vehicles. It does not take into account the significant savings to the community, and therefore to the government, of having a low-emission vehicle—savings in air quality, savings in amenity and in our emissions—which we all want to do, right? We all want to lower emissions. We are all on board with this and yet we are going to charge a zero-emission car more.

The government have come back and forth a few times on this idea. The first time they announced it they said that they were, I think in the last budget, going to bring it in soon after the budget measures. That went away and it was going to be maybe after the election. Then it reared its head again; it came back in this budget speech—not in the budget papers, not in the budget measures—and it has been reworked in what I suspect those opposite thought was a really clever way to get this through.

They recognised that if they came out only with a tax they would be the only jurisdiction in Australia that simply taxed electric vehicles and did not have any kind of incentive. The other two states that have this tax or are in the process of going to have this tax—in the case of New South Wales who has pushed it out to the future as well—they have substantial incentives.

The government thought, 'What we will say is that we will do a \$3000 incentive for vehicles that are essentially under the luxury car tax level and we will make that contingent on getting this tax that will tick away like a time bomb to leap into reality further down the track.' There is no reason to link those. To say that you must have one to have the other is a choice. It is a furphy to say, 'You can only have an incentive if you have a tax.' It is not in the legislation, so opposing this legislation does not stop the incentive.

It is not that it is out of the budget—because presumably they have budgeted the \$3,000 car incentive—so there is nothing stopping them should they be unsuccessful with this bill from doing the right thing and incentivising the purchase of electric vehicles, nothing. Will they? In some ways, politically it would be great if they decided not to because then we get to look even purer on electric vehicles than we already do by simply opposing this tax. I would be surprised if they turned away from people in the end.

There is no necessity to vote for this bill in order to get the incentive. There is a necessity to vote against this bill if you want to use every instrument at your disposal to deal with climate change—and on this side we do. On this side, we are prepared to say that we will move as swiftly as we can to decarbonise this economy and, if there is a tax issue or a funding of roads issue, we will participate in a national discussion about how that works, but we will not be imposing an additional road-user charge on people who choose to go early in the right direction to have an electric vehicle.

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (17:00):** I rise to support this very important piece of legislation, one that during my time as a minister was very keenly debated at the Transport and Infrastructure Council, which I think has since been replaced under the new national cabinet arrangements. It is something that has been very much on the agenda of both TIC, as it was then known, and also the Board of Treasurers discussions at a federal level to come to an early landing on what is an important and vexing issue in Australia.

Electric vehicles are coming. Every single major manufacturer in the world is in the process of developing electric vehicles. In fact, many have scaled back their innovation and design in internal combustion engines and are solely focusing on electric vehicles. In fact, companies like General Motors, out of the US, have some very firm commitments around their switch to electric vehicles. They are coming.

Putting to the side for one moment the positive environmental impacts of electric vehicles, the reason electric vehicles are coming is that the cost of manufacturing those vehicles will move down the cost curve, and it is largely about the improvement in battery technology. We are continuing to see that improve all the time, not just in relation to cars but also in relation to household batteries, and everywhere we see battery improvements happen. In fact, the iPhone 13 came out just this week, and we again saw improvements to battery technology. This is continuing to evolve.

Electric vehicles are coming. The reason they are coming is that, once the cost of the vehicle moves down the cost curve, and given there is a lower cost to maintaining an electric vehicle because

it has fewer bits to maintain, they will become cheaper to own over the life cycle of that vehicle. It will not be so much about environmental benefits as it will be about pure economics that will see electric vehicles take over the globe because they are cheaper once we move down the cost curve.

It is inevitable that electric vehicles are coming to Australia. It is inevitable that electric vehicles are coming to South Australia. It is fairly sure that, in a market like South Australia, notwithstanding some of the positive comments from the member for Port Adelaide, we are simply going to be purchasers of electric vehicles because all of the OEMs around the globe are the existing internal combustion engine vehicle manufacturers who are the ones who are switching. It could be that in the future the assembly of these vehicles is best done on a regional basis, but I have not seen any evidence that that is the case, so the countries that are manufacturing cars now are the ones that will manufacture them into the future.

What I desperately reject is the idea that, by putting in place a user-charge regime, we are going to stop electric vehicles from coming. That nexus, that causation, is one that has not been proven. It has not been proven because the fundamental driver to move to electric vehicles will be overall cost. User charge or no user charge, those costs are coming down. These vehicles will become more efficient and they will become cheaper.

Another inconsistency with the argument the opposition is proffering is the fact that at the moment these cars are more expensive. An electric vehicle user charge is inevitable. In the short run, it is actually those who can afford it who will get this subsidy, this benefit, and it is those who continue to have to use cheaper internal combustion engines who will be subsidising the wealthy people, who are able to afford electric vehicles, the higher they are at the moment at the cost curve. The reason we know this is the case is that most of these vehicles are more expensive and hit the threshold to be subject to the luxury car tax.

What putting a regime in place does now helps ensure that electric vehicles do come to this country, to this state, by delivering regulatory certainty. When it comes to energy provision in this country, regulatory certainty is something the industry has been craving. When somebody is deciding whether or not they are going to buy new a vehicle, one of the key considerations is going to be, 'Once I buy this vehicle, what possibility is there for some sort of change in the taxation regime that is going to change the maths around the ownership of this vehicle?' Uncertainty in this space is going to lead people not to want to purchase electric vehicles.

The regime we put in place seeks not to put this in place today, for charges to start today, but to give ourselves time for this market to mature. There are some who would suggest that cost parity for electric vehicles is coming in about the middle of this decade, and there are some who suggest it might take a few years forward of that, but what we know with similar technologies is that there are often step changes. As more and more advancements and developments are undertaken, these things tend to come down, sometimes exponentially.

I think in this case, somewhere in the middle of this decade, or potentially a year or two after that, purchase parity is going to be achieved between internal combustion engines and electric vehicles. From that point on, the market is going to do what the market does, and that is choose the vehicle that makes the best sense for individuals. Delivering certainty right now guarantees that people are going to have certainty when the time comes for them to decide whether or not they want to purchase an electric vehicle.

However, there is a more fundamental reason an electric vehicle user charge is important, and it is something that Mr Harris, from the Productivity Commission, has talked about for a long time. We actually have user charging on our train network, we have user charging at our ports, we have user charging on our public trains. We basically have user charging now on basically every single level of transport infrastructure and transport provision in the country, save and except for road infrastructure and private vehicles. It is the last area in which we have this clumsy, indirect taxation regime.

To offer a counterpoint to the member for Port Adelaide's comment around hypothecation of the fuel excise, somewhere in the last two to three years—depending on the maths you look at—we actually flipped. From the amount of fuel excise we collect being about twice what we spent on roads nationally about 20 years ago, it has flipped so that the increase in the cost of provision of road

transport infrastructure now exceeds the amount collected via fuel excise and motor registration. We are now in a situation where we are spending more on our roads than we collect in tax.

So hypothecation or no hypothecation, the maths is fairly simple: we are spending more than we get, and therefore all the money collected goes towards this. The opportunity for us to use electric vehicle road user charging to create a cents per kilometre charge, rather than an indirect per litre charge, is a great innovation that is going to help drive innovation across our country. For instance, a group of people with electric vehicles and road user tokens in their vehicles will have the opportunity to say, 'I'm willing to spend more money to fix this road here.'

We have been trying hypothecated road user charging for heavy vehicles for a long time, and it is something that has only slowly happened at a federal level with a number of trials, including here in South Australia. From an industry perspective, they are more than happy to pay for the roads to get upgraded; it allows for greater productivity benefits for them.

Imagine being able to do that for all private vehicles, knowing that when you drive on the road the money you are paying in user charges actually goes towards the roads you use. That is a fantastic development and one that will drive innovation and better spending when it comes to where our very scarce road infrastructure dollars need to go. It would complete what has happened in every other transport sector in our country, and that is a more directly correlated relationship between who is paying the tax and where that money goes. For that reason, if for none other, this is a very important innovation here in Australia and certainly in South Australia.

To wrap up, can I say that this is inevitable. We already see a number of jurisdictions in this country moving down this path. What we are seeking to do, by coordinating the introduction of these charges across the country, is give a higher degree of regulatory certainty. Mark my words: if we do not deal with this issue now, it is only going to become more difficult to deal with later on. If we do not deal with this issue now, it will come back to haunt us in five or 10 years' time because what will happen is federal taxation revenue will plummet.

The push then will be to give less money for road infrastructure to state governments. State governments will then have to try to find the shortfall to make sure that their road infrastructure gets built and maintained properly, and we will then have to do something much like what we are talking about doing here right now. But, if we do it now, we do it in a way that delivers certainty and also takes away the pain of this issue politically.

There is an opportunity to put something in place now, whilst there are only a few electric vehicles on the road, so that there is mass take-up and there is a common understanding. What I would hate is a situation in five, six or seven years' time where the haves are able to get a tax discount because they do not have a user charge but the have-nots, who are still driving internal combustion engine vehicles, are cross-subsidising the very people who should be paying their fair share.

That is what I thought the Labor Party stood for; it is clear that they do not. It is clear that they have missed the fundamental economics of this situation. Again, the nexus here that somehow, by not having a road user charge, we are going to get around this issue is nonsense—absolute nonsense. I would say: deal with it now, deliver certainty now, deliver innovation in road user charging and more direct taxation in this space now and allow the industry to get on and help to bring electric vehicles here to South Australia.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr van Holst Pellekaan.

**INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION (CPIPC RECOMMENDATIONS)  
AMENDMENT BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

*Standing Orders Suspension*

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining)**  
**(17:13):** I move without notice:

That standing and sessional orders be so far suspended as to enable the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption (CPIPC Recommendations) Amendment Bill, being a private member's bill, to take precedence forthwith over government business.

**The SPEAKER:** An absolute majority not being present, ring the bells.

*An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:*

Motion carried.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I move:

That standing and sessional orders be so far suspended as to enable the bill to be taken through all stages without delay.

Motion carried.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (17:16):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This is a bill that has progressed through the Legislative Council, sponsored by the Hon. Frank Pangallo. It amends the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Act 2012. The origins of that legislation are well known to members and it has been the subject of amendment in its lifetime. The bill that is currently before us, commencing in the other place, has had its origins from a report prepared by what is often known as the CPIP Committee, that is the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee, most specifically in its fifth report tabled in the House of Assembly on 1 December 2020.

There had been a comprehensive review in relation to a number of matters. It was initially chaired by the Hon. David Ridgway but in more recent years had changed to the Hon. Dennis Hood and had been populated by members of this house on both sides, together with those from the Legislative Council. I thank all those who participated in the CPIP consideration of the review and for their report.

Can I also acknowledge that, although this bill does purport to implement recommendations contained in that report, it is not to say that it actually includes all the recommendations or indeed that there have not been other aspects added to it. But in general terms it replicates recommendations that are from that report.

I wish to also acknowledge the reviewers; firstly the former reviewer under the act, Kevin Duggan QC, and the current reviewer, John Sulan QC, both of whom have provided support to the operation of the commissioner and in particular their role as reviewers in reporting to this parliament over a number of years and the provision of their evidence.

Retired commissioner Bruce Lander QC has also provided evidence and, of course, his work as the former commissioner. Current commissioner, Ann Vanstone QC, has provided both evidence to the committee and indeed has undertaken this role in more recent years. The Ombudsman, Mr Wayne Lines; the Commissioner of Police, Mr Grant Stevens; and the President of the Police Association of South Australia, Mr Mark Carroll; just to name a few have provided, sometimes on multiple occasions, a contribution to the development of these reforms.

Not everything in this bill is what everyone wants, in relation to the cross contributions from various parties involved in the development of this reform, but it is fair to say that the Legislative Council have very carefully looked at a number of matters. For example, they have excluded from consideration a new concept of adding a power of compensation to be paid under this act. That seems to have been abandoned along the way.

For the sake of the record, these are the things that have been incorporated. Number 1 is the provision under the recommendation that the commissioner is to be responsible for corruption and to establish a commission. Number 2 is that the Ombudsman, who is to be responsible for misconduct and maladministration, is to be set out in the Ombudsman Act. Number 3 is that the Office for Public Integrity is to be established as a separate entity. Number 4 is the repeal of the classification of misconduct and maladministration as serious or systemic, and number 5 is amending the confidentiality provisions.

Number 9, if I jump to that, is to rename the ICAC review of the inspector of ICAC and confer further functions. Number 10 is the reviewer of the Ombudsman and number 11 is the reviewer of

OPI, which is the Office for Public Integrity. Number 13 is to confer further functions on CPIPC, which is the committee I referred to. Number 16 is to provide that members of the public can attend Office for Public Integrity agencies in person. Number 17 is in relation to the Judicial Conduct Commissioner not being an administrative decision-maker during the course of his or her employment or six months prior to the appointment—that is, overlapping with the commissioner.

There was a recommendation, which I have identified as number 6, which is the amendment to the definition of 'corruption' and the review of persons defined as 'a public officer'. In part, that recommendation has been accepted.

Areas that have not been accepted were setting out when a person may be named in any report of the Ombudsman and allowing them to make representations to be named. Number 12 is that the adoption of the recommendations of the CPIPC review into the ICAC bill 2018 is relevant to public hearings. That has not been picked up. Recommendation 14, establishing an integrity standards adviser, has not been picked up in this bill.

Largely, the areas of reform are covered. I thank those on the committee for the work they undertook to not only receive the evidence but to consider the matter and prepare from their deliberations the recommendations that we now have.

I also indicate that the question of the direct referral from the current ICAC, soon to be a commission if this bill passes, is also the subject of some questions that are in matters before the High Court and that includes the direct referral of matters from the commission to the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions. We, of course, are always in the hands of what superior courts might make provision for and we will wait and see what happens in relation to those matters. Upon there being any conclusion of those legal points, as Attorney-General I would expect that I may need to come and report to the parliament as to any legislative reform that may or may not be required arising out of that.

As I am aware, a number of members wish to speak on this matter, at least from the opposition. There are two amendments that are foreshadowed and these really relate exclusively to transitional provisions which, on the face of it—this is absolutely no disrespect to the other place—appear to have been overlooked in relation to allowing for transitional provisions.

One is to ensure that, under the Surveillance Devices Act, the material that is issued for the purpose of investigation of a matter by the commission does not lapse and it enables the transition provision to be made. The second is to ensure that the role of the Judicial Conduct Commissioner, which will die with this bill as an office position, will have a transitional provision, so we can ensure that any conduct of that commission is not interfered with to ensure its transfer. That, members might recall, was a recommendation of the former commissioner, Bruce Lander, shortly before he retired, which has also been endorsed and recommended by the current commissioner who at this stage is still the judicial conduct commissioner and undertakes that work.

Can I say that the matter has had some considerable gestation in the development, but I acknowledge the Hon. Frank Pangallo's introduction of the bill in the other place, ultimately setting out a number of these recommendations and incorporating them. They have received the support of the Legislative Council, and I commend the bill to the house.

**Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (17:25):** I rise to speak on this bill and indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition. We acknowledge that this bill was introduced into the other place by the Hon. Frank Pangallo and acknowledge that the Attorney-General is bringing it through and supporting it in this house.

I understand that the bill was developed after recommendations by a parliamentary committee in consultations with the government and others. The Attorney, in particular, has supported the legislation. I refer to the extensive commentary made in the other place, of course, through the course of the debate. Of course, my colleague, the shadow attorney-general, the Hon. Kyam Maher, spoke on it there, and as his representative in this house I will summarise some of the key aspects of this legislation.

The bill proposes to separate corruption from maladministration and misconduct matters in regard to which body investigates which element. Under the proposed model, the Independent Commission Against Corruption will be the inquiry agency with the responsibility for corruption, just

as the name says. The Ombudsman will be the inquiry agency in most circumstances for misconduct and maladministration matters.

Importantly, I have been advised by the shadow attorney-general that the Ombudsman has advised support for being responsible for the investigation of misconduct and maladministration matters. The bill also proposes changes to both the front end and to the back end of the complaints investigation system.

At the front end the Office of Public Integrity, which receives, assesses and refers complaints about corruption, misconduct and maladministration, will be made newly independent. The new back end of the system will have a new inspector to replace the current reviewer. The inspector will provide oversight of both ICAC and the Ombudsman with expanded powers.

This reflects stronger oversight bodies that are in place in other states and territories, and addresses issues that have been considered for some time by the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee for a number of years. I recall when I was on that committee that it was an issue that was raised back then.

These new powers will include the ability to recommend compensation where a person has suffered undue reputational damage as a result of inquiries. As I noted earlier, this is a private member's bill but is progressing with strong government support. As the Treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas MLC, said in the other place last night:

Almost five years ago to the day—in fact, it was 20 September 2016—I put on the public record in this chamber my very strong views in relation to the need for the reform of ICAC.

Clearly, this is something that the current government, or at least the Treasurer, has been contemplating since before they were elected. Obviously, the Attorney-General has indicated her support by bringing and adding her weight to this legislation in the parliament and moving it through this chamber.

Moving significant and complex legislation from the crossbench without the benefit of the bureaucracy to support you is no easy task. To get this far, and indeed for the bill to pass this chamber, it has required government support. The government, and in particular the Attorney-General, is in a unique position in South Australia to offer that support. In fact, section 49 of the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Act 2012, states:

Provision of information to Attorney-General.

- (1) The Commissioner must keep the Attorney-General informed of the general conduct of the functions of the Commissioner and the office and, if the Attorney-General so requests, provide information to the Attorney-General relevant to the performance of the functions of the Commissioner or the office (but not information identifying or about a particular matter subject to assessment, investigation or referral under the act).
- (2) However, if the Commissioner is of the opinion that to provide information as requested by the Attorney-General would compromise the proper performance of the Commissioner's functions, the Commissioner may instead provide to the Governor a detailed written explanation of the reasons for the Commissioner's opinion.

The law does not just encourage the provision of information to the Attorney-General that no-one else can access; in fact, it mandates it. Obviously, our state's highest law officer has the expertise, the departmental support and unique access to ICAC information to have the most detailed understanding of any person in this chamber or the parliament in regard to the operations of ICAC and the implications of this bill. My colleague the Hon. Kyam Maher said it well in his speech in the other house, and I quote:

There is no-one better placed in this parliament than the Attorney-General to make those decisions about this sort of reform, and it should provide some comfort that the Attorney has turned her mind to it as the first law officer of the state, with the extra information the Attorney has available to her by virtue of section 49 of the act, and decided that these ought to be supported,

With that knowledge and capacity, clearly she has lent her weight now in this chamber to the legislation. While we do not always agree or support the Attorney, we need to place a degree of trust in her views on this matter, given the unique position and knowledge that she holds. So I indicate that the opposition is supporting the second reading in this chamber and is likely to support the

amendments that are being proposed in this chamber, as well as the amendments that have come from the other place.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (17:30):** It is very clear—as my good friend the member for Kaurna has just said—that we would not be at this point in time had it not been for the dedicated support of this change by not only the Attorney-General of South Australia but by the Hon. Frank Pangallo, who is Chair of the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee, and my colleagues on that committee, who have been diligent, hardworking members of that committee. They have heard the stories and seen the calls for change.

As the member for Kaurna has said, we are not in the same unique position that the Attorney-General is in to have a closer understanding of the operation of the ICAC Act. She is in a unique position, not only by statute but by commission in this state. Quite frankly, we have to rely on her guidance on this, and she is the one who has guided this legislation through this house. I understand she is proposing two amendments, which the opposition will support. Again, the unanimous support is based largely on the support for change here by the Attorney-General of South Australia.

I also want to point out that the Leader of the Opposition today made a statement issuing an instruction to every member of the parliamentary Labor Party that, if any member of the parliamentary Labor Party was (1) subject to an investigation by ICAC, (2) facing charges by ICAC, or (3) the subject of a referral to the Office for Public Integrity by an independent statutory officer, they were to recuse themselves from voting on these matters. Standing order 170 says, 'No Member to vote if personally interested.' The standing order states:

A Member may not vote in any division on a question in which the Member has a direct pecuniary interest, and the vote of the Member who has such an interest is disallowed.

The Statement of Principles that this parliament has endorsed has the strong support of the Attorney-General, our guiding light during this debate. Point IV of the principles provides:

- IV. Members of Parliament should declare any conflict of interest between their private financial interests and decisions in which they participate in the execution of their duties. Members must declare their interests as required by the Members of Parliament (Register of Interests) Act 1983 and declare their interests when speaking on a matter in the House or a Committee in accordance with the Standing Orders.

Point V and point VI of the principles state:

- V. A conflict of interest does not exist where the Member is only affected as a member of the public or a member of a broad class.
- VI. Members of Parliament should not promote any matter, vote on any bill or resolution, or ask any question in the Parliament or its Committees, in return for any financial or pecuniary benefit.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens, I might just pull you up there. The relevant question arises only after a vote in the house. In the meantime, it is incumbent upon the Chair to remind honourable members that this is in the course of the second reading debate on the bill.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I understand that, sir, yes.

**The SPEAKER:** Should there be any question in relation to a vote, it is appropriate that might be considered after.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I was not moving point of order, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** In that sense, the course of the second reading is concerned with the substance of the bill itself and the member will direct remarks in the course of the debate to that relevant subject matter.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Thank you, sir. This bill is making some fundamental changes to the way ICAC conducts its investigations. Currently, the ICAC commissioner has jurisdiction over the Office for Public Integrity and can initiate investigations on her own motion and conduct investigations and cooperate with the DPP, South Australia Police, agencies as the commissioner sees fit to make public statements as they see fit, and it is our very strong view that any member who is subject currently to an investigation should not vote on this matter.

The three members who come to mind are the member for Mount Gambier, the member for Narungga and the member for Dunstan. They should not participate in this debate. The member for Dunstan, in particular, the head of the government, has been mentioned by office by an independent statutory officer, the Ombudsman, who has—

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens will resume his seat for a moment. The Minister for Energy and Mining rises on a point of order.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** You directed the member for West Torrens to direct his remarks to the substance of the bill. It seems to me that he has not done that. Regardless of the merits of what he is talking about, whether they be strong or weak or otherwise, voting and people's eligibility to vote is very clear. It exists, there are rules about it and it has nothing to do with this bill.

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order. This is not the occasion to address the question of members' eligibility or not to vote. As I have indicated to the member, the question may be raised following any vote that might occur subsequently. The member for Lee rises on the point of order.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Standing order 119: reflections on votes of the house. You have ruled on a point of order made with reference to no standing order. The member for West Torrens has not offended a standing order, let alone standing order 119. I do not believe there is a basis for your ruling to require the member for West Torrens to move on from his comments. The purpose of the second reading debate—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —is to convince members to vote or not vote in a particular manner, which is exactly what he is doing.

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. The direction in relation to the member for West Torrens' contribution in the course of the second reading debate is as to relevance. The member for West Torrens, in addressing the second reading, will address the bill. In relation to any question of a vote and members' eligibility or otherwise, that is a matter that is appropriately raised following any vote. The member for West Torrens will address the substance of the bill. The member for West Torrens has the call.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The ICAC commissioner has made public statements about the changes to this bill, and she has stated quite clearly and unequivocally that parliamentarians should not be voting on this legislation if they are conflicted. She has said it publicly on radio—she thinks there is a clear conflict. I am not a judicial officer like she is. I do not have her judicial or legal experience.

She is one of the most respected Queen's Counsels in South Australia, she is one of the most respected Supreme Court justices ever to have served on the bench and she was the government's pick for ICAC commissioner, and unanimously supported by the Statutory Officers Committee, and is someone who has carried herself with great dignity in the role. When someone with those credentials says that there are clear conflicts about who votes on this bill, and I am being told I cannot even talk about it in the parliament, I think that is inhibiting—

**The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan:** That's not what the Speaker said.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Thank you for your contribution. I look forward to your speech.

**The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan:** It's not.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Thank you, but I look forward to your speech. My point on this legislation, which is meritorious and I am supporting, is that there are some members for the

good order and passing of this legislation, as to remove any doubt to its intent which is for the good order and operation of an Independent Commission Against Corruption—

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens will just resume his seat for a moment. The Minister for Energy and Mining rises on a point of order.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Again, the member for West Torrens is defying your very clear instructions, which are to contain his contribution to the substance of the bill, not a totally different topic, which is about whether people should vote or not vote or when they might vote. As you have said, that is a totally different issue and nothing to do with this bill.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Kaurua rises on the point of order.

**Mr PICTON:** On the point order: this is the ICAC legislation and the member was referring to comments by the ICAC commissioner. It is hard to imagine that that is not relevant to the debate that we have at hand.

**The SPEAKER:** It is not that hard for me to imagine, member for Kaurua. Just to be very clear, the matter is a standing order 127(1) matter. This is the second reading debate on the bill. If any member wishes to address my attention to any aspect of the bill that deals with the eligibility or otherwise for individual members to vote in circumstances of conflict, then I will hear it; otherwise, I have directed the member for West Torrens to address the subject matter of the bill and otherwise not to offend against standing order 127(1). The member for West Torrens has the call.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Just to explain myself, I am advocating on behalf of this bill. I think it is a good piece of legislation. My concern is that there is public debate about the integrity of this legislation, not because of what is contained in it but because some people are questioning the intent. To remove that discrepancy about what the intent is, what you should do is make sure that anyone who is under any suspicion does not vote on the bill.

That way, everyone's hands are clean and that way the public cannot accuse parliamentarians of attempting to do something for their own benefit but rather the good order and operation of an ICAC anticorruption system that will ensure the state has a system in place that protects it from public officers abusing their office with corruption, maladministration or misconduct.

If the public does not have faith in the manner in which this legislation is passed, that weakens the intent of the bill. In advocating for that bill, in advocating for the passage of this legislation, I say that three members should recuse themselves: the member for Dunstan, the member for Narungga and the member for Mount Gambier.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens will resume his seat. The Attorney-General rises on a point of order.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Again, the member is straying into what he may or may not pursue in relation to a conflict of interest position. Secondly, he has made a scandalous allegation—he has made this allegation outside the parliament—that the Ombudsman has referred the Premier for investigation. He has not done that at all. He has not said that. It is scandalous to think that the member here is trying to use this debate as a means to upgrade this.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Point of order, Mr Speaker: is there a point of order here or a complaint?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** It is just disgraceful.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I will deal with the matter, member for Lee. I am not sure ultimately what, if any, further point of order is raised. Perhaps it might suffice to indicate there is no point of order. Again, I direct the member for West Torrens to address his contribution to the house to the substance of the bill to avoid offending against standing order 127(1).

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** In conclusion, the author of this legislation, the Hon. Frank Pangallo, I think his intentions are honourable. I think he is a man of great substance and a caring and compassionate man. He cares for the people who have been adversely impacted by the exercise of extraordinary powers that waive common law rights by compulsion. The public, I think, want certainty.

I have not accused the Premier of being referred to anything. I said the office of the Premier has been referred to the Office for Public Integrity, and that is a fact. The office of the Premier of South Australia has been referred to the Office for Public Integrity by an independent statutory officer—not by me. My argument is that anyone occupying the office of the Premier, whether they are public officers or parliamentarians, should not be involved in this debate, should not be involved in here. Why? For the good order of the passage of this legislation, for the good order of the operation of the bill. If the Premier wishes to soil this legislation with his presence, then I think what you will find—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for West Torrens will resume his seat.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Again asserting that there is no proper stand of the Premier to either contribute to or vote on this debate. That is completely out of order. It is disgraceful.

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** What standing order was that?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Lee will cease interjecting. I have addressed the matter now a number of times—several times—in a short period of time. The member for West Torrens, in contributing to the second reading debate, will do just that: he will contribute to the debate by addressing the substance of the bill and will avoid transgressing against standing order 127(1). The member for West Torrens has the call.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I think the greatest thing in the previous ICAC legislation that has offended me is the way the coercive powers were used after a referral. That concerned me the most, using those coercive powers to gain further information after an investigation had ceased and charges had been laid. I think that needed to be remedied and remedied quickly. I am glad the Hon. Frank Pangallo has done so in his legislation.

When you ask for equal justice before the law, and to be tried by your peers in an open and fair case, the idea that coercive powers could be used while that case is underway is unfair and against the interests and the standing of a free and open democratic society. We should know who our accuser is, we should all play by the same rules, and the state should not have an advantage. When I say 'the state', I mean the Crown. I think the way some of that power was exercised was unfortunate.

I hope this legislation passes without anyone questioning the intent of the legislation. I hope members who should not vote do not vote. I hope they do the right thing. If they do vote, people will question the intent of this legislation. I know that the member in the other place, who is the author of this legislation in coordination with the Attorney-General in the lower house, is attempting to create a system that will still deliver oversight of public officers, with an independent Office for Public Integrity, with a reviewer with real teeth.

I just point out to the house that both reviewers, Mr Duggan and Mr Sulan, have told our committee that they personally paid out of their own pocket for executive assistants in terms of drafting letters, rather than having those resources provided to them. That is unacceptable. That is why we need a reviewer who is properly resourced to do their job and have oversight of these extraordinary powers we have gifted to a commissioner.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (17:48):** I will not speak for very long on this bill. I want to echo some of the sentiments that have already been expressed in the course of the debate so far. It is no mean feat for a crossbench MP in the other place to try to undertake a significant series of amendments to such a crucial piece of legislation, to try to strike an improved balance between the capacity of the ICAC to undertake investigations and for successful prosecutions, perhaps potentially, to follow some of those investigations and also for the parliament to ensure that the rights of South Australians, who may find themselves the subject of investigations, are protected throughout the process.

Not at the time it was broadcast but later via the ABC iview app, I watched the television news on Tuesday night. I think anyone who saw the media report of the proposed changes to this bill, that was telecast by the ABC, would have been absolutely mortified by the impact on a number of people who have been subjected to investigations.

I do not think it is fair or reasonable to characterise the efforts of the ICAC and its two highly esteemed commissioners to date through the prism of those experiences that were represented in that TV report. Like pretty much everyone in this parliament in either chamber, I think both Mr Lander QC and also Ms Vanstone QC are held in the highest regard, not just within here but also elsewhere throughout the legal fraternity and generally throughout the South Australian community. That is certainly my view. Although I am not as familiar with Ms Vanstone as I am with Mr Lander, certainly I think for both of them their records in the legal profession speak for themselves. In many instances their records as commissioners, in this regard as ICAC commissioners, speak for themselves.

The ICAC, and the legislation which establishes it and governs it, is not without fault, which is why it is being amended. I congratulate the Attorney-General on her stewardship of the bill in this place indicating that, other than a couple of minor infelicities which need to be tidied up in what was passed by the other place, she strongly supports the reforms to this bill. I think when you have the state's Attorney-General standing lockstep with the remainder of the parliament about the need to reform the ICAC Act, it is an indication that the concerns are genuine and that the proposed reforms are not only widely supported but supported by the first law officer of the state. That is an important thing to note.

In another debate, as the Deputy Premier has made it clear, I have been required to participate in one of these inquiries, including giving evidence as a witness in one matter. While I do not think it is appropriate that anyone, including me, let alone the Attorney, reflects on that or provides any running commentary on that, I was very cognisant of the gravity of the situation—not only the responsibility that I had as somebody providing evidence but certainly what it meant for the people who were facing charges—as well as the impact and the resources dedicated to either prosecuting those charges or defending those charges by the DPP or by defence counsel.

This is a very large and very resource-intensive exercise on any measure when it comes to the investigation, let alone the investigation and prosecution of a matter of alleged corruption or indeed maladministration or misconduct. We all take, I know, all of us together, our obligations as members of parliament very seriously.

*Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan.*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I know we all take our responsibilities as members of parliament extremely seriously and assertions have been made from some quarters, not all but some quarters publicly, that this is a bill that is designed to protect the interests of members of parliament by making it more difficult, more impossible, to investigate members of parliament. I reject that.

Certainly it increases the complexity of the structures involved in that, and it increases the accountability and transparency, but I do not believe it is fair that any of us are subject to an allegation that we are considering this legislation to provide ourselves with some sort of cloak or shroud from scrutiny or investigation by any of these integrity agencies. I reject that.

I hope we are able to conduct ourselves, for the remainder of the consideration of this bill, in a way that demonstrates to the community that we are not acting in self-interest but instead are acting in the interests of all South Australians, who may or may not find themselves the subject of investigation, that the processes are fair and that those who are conducting them are accountable and their operations transparent. That is my understanding of what the basis of this bill is.

As to the undoubted harm that has occurred to some people who have found themselves the subject of investigation, only for those investigations and even prosecutions not to go any further, I know they have suffered irreparable damage, including the most grievous outcome of one person taking their own life. If that does not underline how important this debate is, the consideration of this bill is, I do not know what will. It is clear that the status quo cannot continue and that change needs to be made in this regard.

I will finish by saying that I think it is appropriate that the member for West Torrens raised the points he did. I know you do not share that view, sir, but it was the ICAC commissioner himself who said on the radio this morning, 'It is extraordinary. It is a classic conflict of interest.' If we cannot believe somebody with more than 40 years of extraordinary legal experience, who is held in the highest esteem within the legal fraternity as a former District and Supreme Court judge and the current ICAC commissioner, then who can we believe on that point?

**The SPEAKER:** I think the member for Lee has concluded his remarks. I just indicate that it does not much matter what I or anyone else thinks about the expression of an opinion by someone outside the chamber. The relevant matter I draw to the attention of all members is that in the course of the second reading debate the relevant standing order is standing order 127(1).

I remind all members that insofar as the second reading debate is concerned, and as it continues, all members are on notice that that is the relevant standing order for consideration. Again, I indicate that if the Attorney-General speaks she closes debate.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (17:58):** First, I acknowledge and thank all those who have made a contribution to the expression of support in relation to the bill before us. At the outset, I have to say that I do not get praise from the member for West Torrens very often, but when he suggested that I was in some way the architect of this or influential in it, I remind members that due regard has to be given to the fact that this is the Hon. Frank Pangallo's bill and it was presented from the Legislative Council.

I have already outlined that it started in a manner that I suggest was outside the report that has been referred to; nevertheless, those barnacles seem to have disappeared as the debate has continued in the other place. As the Attorney-General, on behalf of the government I again indicate our support for the bill.

Two things were raised during the course of the contribution that I also need to be clear about. There was an assertion that at least one of the reviewers incurred personal costs in relation to the administrative duties they undertook whilst they were a reviewer—I think it was described as secretarial duties or expenses—and that they had personally met those. Can I say that I am aware that one of the reviewers had retained his own secretarial services, and that was a matter that he had certainly conveyed to me during the course of his duties.

At no time has either of the reviewers who have served in the time I have been Attorney-General asked me for any other personal reimbursement of expenses. They have been provided with support staff and other expenses to cover for the purpose of undertaking their duty, which is not only to operate as a reviewer on matters that are raised but also to undertake an assessment for the purpose of reporting to this parliament every year.

In fact, several times reports have to be prepared in that year to identify that they have undertaken largely their work in ensuring that the process—such as issuing warrants, authority to take possession of documents or subpoena people, undertake surveillance, all those sorts of things—has actually properly complied with the law. That is a very important check that this parliament insisted be in respect of the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption from its inception.

It may be that one or other of them may have indicated that they had their own personal assistants in undertaking their duties, but I just want to reassure the house that if expenses are required to be met for the purpose of providing that, it is a little bit unusual. I also want to assure the house that from time to time we get other reviewers for specific purposes to undertake work. Sometimes it is to review legislation.

We pay them a fee. We provide them with usually a contractual hourly rate, and appropriate researchers and support staff are provided, often from the Crown Solicitor's Office, to facilitate that and provide that information to me as Attorney-General, or to the government generally, or to this parliament. That is the process. I certainly invite the member to provide any particulars, if there was something else that he is aware of that raises some concern.

The second matter was an issue raised by the member for Lee in his contribution, and again I thank him for his endorsement and indication of support. He outlined an experience that he has had. I think anyone who has in any way been involved with the processes of any integrity body can be reassured or bruised or have a view as a result of some experience they may have had.

I do not in any way reflect on the member for Lee. I have not in relation to his experience. I note that he has disclosed it for the purpose of this debate—I think that is entirely appropriate—but

if in fact he is in some way weighed by his experience and it blurs his judgement or anything of that nature, then of course that is a matter for him to disclose to the parliament.

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** No, your judgement is blurred: you quoted my testimony in parliament—

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the member for Lee!

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** But I do not—

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** —while an appeal was still being considered.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Lee is called to order.

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** The first law officer of the state, do you think that's appropriate?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I don't accept that assertion; in fact, I utterly reject it.

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** Well, you did it! It's on the *Hansard*.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Lee!

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Can I just conclude by indicating that whilst there has been some indication of our commissioner, Ann Vanstone QC—

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** How did you get access to my evidence?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —I appreciate her contribution to the general debate and the development of the reforms in this area. So I do place on the record my thanks for that and commend the bill to the house.

Time expired.

Bill read a second time.

#### *Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 60 passed.

Schedule 1.

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

Amendment No 1 [AG-1]—

Page 74, lines 32 to 34 [Schedule 1 clause 59(1)]—Delete 'as if it had been issued for the purposes of the investigation of a matter by the Commission'

It is proposed, because this is a transitional position, to ensure that those currently extant are able to continue to operate and provide a transition, so the deletion of those words has that effect, as I am advised. I am getting a nod from Ms Travers, who is an all-seeing expert on parliamentary drafting.

Amendment carried.

New clause 65A.

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

Amendment No 2 [AG-1]—

Page 76 after line 13—Insert:

65A—Judicial Conduct Commissioner continues in office

Despite section 12(3) and clause 16 of this Schedule, the Judicial Conduct Commissioner holding office under the *Judicial Conduct Commissioner Act 2015* as in force before the commencement of this Act continues to hold that office on the commencement of this Act.

Similarly, this is to make provision for the Judicial Conduct Commissioner, which, as members are aware, effectively is abolished in the processes we have under this legislation. To ensure that there

is a transition to enable that, so there is no lapse or period during which we do not have somebody in this office, it is necessary to introduce this amendment so that we can ensure the continuity. As members would know, the Hon. Ann Vanstone QC is not only our Independent Commissioner Against Corruption but also our Judicial Conduct Commissioner, just another role she undertakes on behalf of the people of South Australia.

Consistent with her recommendation, and that of her predecessor, that position will continue but will be populated by a person independent of the commissioner against corruption. This is purely a transitional clause to ensure that we do not have a period during which there is no commissioner at all.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** When did the Attorney-General first tell the ICAC commissioner she was supporting this legislation, these amendments?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I am referring to amendment No. 2 in my name, which relates to ensuring that the Judicial Conduct Commissioner, as a populated position, does not lapse as a result of this progressing. I do not have anything further to add on it.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Attorney, have you consulted with the ICAC commissioner at all on any of the amendments moved in the other place that you are asking this house to accept or these current amendments you have moved?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** For the sake of completion on this, let me say that since we have had the report, as the member ought to be aware because he has had the ICAC commissioner before the CPIP Committee to consider all those recommendations several times, that has been a matter we have canvassed with her and myself as a member of the government.

This is Mr Pangallo's bill; this is not my bill. We have accepted it from the Legislative Council in its amended form. However, there are two items that have been brought to my attention during the course of today, which, if this bill passed without these amendments, would leave us without a Judicial Conduct Commissioner and, furthermore, without a capacity to ensure that the surveillance devices requirements are able to be maintained for the current investigation. That is the purpose of these amendments.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** My point that I am trying to make to the committee is that the Attorney-General has formulated a view, either on advice, that these amendments are necessary for the operation of the ICAC. My question is: what role has the ICAC commissioner had in developing these amendments? What is her view on the amendments that the house is accepting from the other place?

The other place had a private member's bill presented to it. There were numerous amendments to it, and it has come down to us as amended. The Attorney-General has carriage of the bill in the house. The ICAC commissioner on radio today and in the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee said she was stunned that the government was supporting this legislation.

My question to the Attorney-General, which she is so far refusing to answer, is: did the Attorney-General, as the conduit between the executive and an independent statutory officer—that is, the member of the executive who is responsible for this act—speak to the ICAC commissioner about this legislation? Did you go through it with the ICAC commissioner, clause by clause, to form a view? Or have you outsourced all your thinking to other members of the parliament? If you have, why are you still Attorney-General?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I will largely take that as a comment. I think all members would be aware of the view of Ms Vanstone in relation to her statements both publicly and to the CPIP Committee, and so I will take that as a comment.

New clause inserted.

**The CHAIR:** We now come to the schedule as amended.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I still do not have an answer from the Attorney-General about this. I do not want to labour the point much longer. This is a private member's bill that is now in government time in the House of Assembly. The Attorney-General is responsible for the ICAC Act. The Attorney-General has assured us and given us confidence to support to this bill and her two

amendments on the basis of the work she has done. I have asked a very, very pertinent question, which I would like an answer to: have you discussed this bill that we are about pass in its current form with the ICAC commissioner in person?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Again, I do not think there is anything further usefully I can add. The member for West Torrens frequently comes in to call for my resignation and various other things, but I take that as a comment. I utterly reject his assertions.

**The CHAIR:** Can I come in here, member for West Torrens. I do not know that the member for West Torrens did make any assertions; he asked a question.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I have never asked for the Attorney-General to resign. I do not—

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I am sure it is coming.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order, please!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** My point is that the Attorney-General tells us this is a good bill, that this bill will give us a good ICAC system. What I am asking is: has the Attorney-General given the courtesy to the ICAC commissioner to sit down with the ICAC commissioner and the employees at the OPI and the reviewer to inform them of the changes that are coming?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I have nothing further to add.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** You are just not going to answer?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** This is Pete's big moment.

Schedule as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (18:15):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (18:15):** I rise to make a brief contribution to the third reading of this bill and congratulate everyone who has worked to get this better outcome in regard to the operations of ICAC. What these amendments do today is confirm what was the original intent when we passed the ICAC legislation of referral to the police for the prosecution process. I commend that that is where we have landed with this current legislation and I want to note that that was the intent of the original legislation. The work by the Hon. Frank Pangallo in the other place and people in this place and others has finally got us there. I commend the legislation.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (USE OF FACIAL RECOGNITION SYSTEM) BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (SPIT HOOD PROHIBITION) BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (INTERVENTION ORDERS AND PENALTIES) BILL**

*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

**LEGISLATION INTERPRETATION BILL**

*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the amendment made by the House of Assembly without any amendment.

At 18:21 the house adjourned until Tuesday 12 October 2021 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***FRUIT FLY**

**757 Ms BEDFORD (Florey)** (26 August 2021). Why has South Australia not seen a decrease in fruit fly infestation in metropolitan and Riverland affected areas, following the release of sterile fruit flies, baiting and advertising costing South Australian's \$27.4 million in 2020-21 and an additional \$16 million in 2021-22?

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

With increasing occurrences of fruit fly interstate, the pressure on South Australia's borders is as high as it's ever been. The Marshall Liberal government's efforts have seen a decrease in fruit fly with 50 less active centres in metropolitan Adelaide for example.

**FRUIT FLY**

**758 Ms BEDFORD (Florey)** (26 August 2021). How much revenue has been made from fruit fly fines?

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

\$4,008,136 from expiations and \$26,751 resulting from court challenges.

**FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES**

**759 Ms BEDFORD (Florey)** (26 August 2021). What funding has been allocated to PIRSA's Family and Business Support (FaBS) mentors to support producers affected by fruit fly?

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

The government extended its existing Family and Business (FaB) Mentor service to include primary producers affected by the fruit fly outbreaks on 24 March 2021.

The program is allocated \$500,000 per year for three years.

**CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT**

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (25 August 2021).

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

While all of the Department for Child Protection efficiency targets were met in the 2018-19, 2019-20 and 2020-21 financial years, it should be noted that the department's total budget has *increased* over that period from \$534 million to \$606 million, a 13 per cent increase.

**EMPLOYMENT FIGURES**

In reply to **Ms BEDFORD (Florey)** (8 September 2021).

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

Job number calculations are based on full time equivalent basis. If an individual works on both sites only the proportion of time spent on each site is included in the job numbers for the individual project.

**FORESTRY INDUSTRY ADVISORY COUNCIL**

In reply to **Mr BELL (Mount Gambier)** (8 September 2021).

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

The terms of reference for the Forest Industry Advisory Council of South Australia (FIACSA) call for two meetings a year.

FIACSA met in February 2021 and the council is likely to call another meeting by the end of 2021.

There have been many meetings and discussions with forestry industry stakeholders, including the FIACSA chair, with the Department of Primary Industries and Regions throughout the past year.

*Estimates Replies***GOODS AND SERVICES**

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):** I have been advised the following:

For the Department of Primary Industries and Regions, the budgeted expenditure on goods and services for the financial year 2021-22 and each of the years of the forward estimates period is as follows:

	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Total goods and services	64,346	34,937	32,264	31,059

The increase in 2021-22 relates to time limited programs.

The top 10 providers of goods and services for the financial year 2020-21 and the cost for these goods and services were as follows:

Supplier	Total Value
Randstad Pty Ltd	\$17,436,936
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	\$10,358,077
Humanihut Pty Ltd	\$4,340,471
Rntt Pty Ltd	\$4,220,999
Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development (WA)	\$2,930,562
Leaseplan Australia Ltd	\$2,254,820
Budget Rent A Car Aust Pty Ltd	\$2,037,149
Dow Agrosiences Australia Ltd	\$1,804,993
Zen Energy Retail Pty Ltd	\$1,708,041
Data 3 Ltd	\$1,300,879

The top 10 providers of goods and services for the financial year 2020-21 and the description of these goods and services is as follows:

Supplier	Description
Randstad Pty Ltd	Mainly for provision of field teams and staffing for Fruit Fly response and monitoring.
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	Rent and facilities management.
Humanihut Pty Ltd	Management of the seasonal workers quarantine facility.
Rntt Pty Ltd	Mainly for staffing for Fruit Fly response and monitoring.
Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development (WA)	Production and supply of sterile fruit flies for the Fruit Fly outbreaks.
Leaseplan Australia Ltd	Leasing and vehicle fleet management services.
Budget Rent A Car Aust Pty Ltd	Vehicle hire for the Fruit Fly staff.
Dow Agrosiences Australia Ltd	Supply of fruit fly bait.
Zen Energy Retail Pty Ltd	Electricity.
Data 3 Ltd	Information Technology.

The value of goods and services supplied to the Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA – Controlled operations by South Australian suppliers—\$44.7 million.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):** I have been advised the following:

(a) Between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021, roles abolished within the Department of Primary Industries and Regions:

Title	Total Employment Cost (\$)
Principal Research Scientist	\$154,849.04
Senior Assets & Procurement Consultant	\$106,078.46

(b) Between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021, roles created within the Department of Primary Industries and Regions:

Title	Total Employment Cost (\$)
National Feral Deer Coordinator	\$109,485.12
Kangaroo Island Feral Pig Control Coordinator	\$109,485.12
Emergency Management Officer	\$109,485.12
Fishery Reform officer	\$109,485.12
Senior Communications Adviser	\$109,485.12

Title	Total Employment Cost (\$)
Recovery Projects Coordinator	\$109,485.12
Manager Operations	\$109,485.12
Manager Operations	\$109,485.12
Manager Operations	\$109,485.12
Research Scientist	\$112,606.22
Family and Business Support Mentor	\$120,193.62
Incident Controller	\$120,193.62
Facilities and Assets Manager	\$120,193.62
Data Entry Quality Assurance Manager	\$120,193.62
Director, Operations	\$161,416.92

#### GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):** I have been advised the following:

Table 1 shows the Department of Primary Industries and Regions' total FTE, actual and budgeted, to provide communication and promotion activities for the period 2020-21 to 2024-25:

Table 1: FTE employed in communication and promotion activities

		2017-18 Actual	2018-19 Actual	2019-20 Actual	2020-21 Actual	2021-22 Budget	2022-23 Budget	2023-24 Budget	2024-25 Budget
Total	FTE	15.1	7.8	6.6	9.3	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8
	\$m	1.671	848,000	746,400	1.038	1.557	1.557	1.557	1.557

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. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):** I have been advised the following:

Employee Title	Branch	Allowance Type	Date Range paid for	Actual Amount paid to employee between 1/7/2020 and 30/6/2021
Principal Research Scientist	SARDI	Retention Allowance \$	20/06/2020—19/06/2022	\$32,680.00
Principal Scientist Marine Ecosystems	SARDI	Retention Allowance \$	01/05/2021—27/08/2021	\$30,000.00
Program Leader Soil Biology & Molecular Diagnostics	SARDI	Retention Allowance \$	01/07/2020—30/06/2022	\$29,251.00
Program Leader (Environmental Assessment Mitigation & Rehabilitation)	SARDI	Retention Allowance \$	01/05/2021—05/11/2021	\$26,855.00
Exec Director Biosecurity SA	Biosecurity SA	Retention Allowance \$	14/03/2020—13/03/2021	\$23,084.00
General Manager Food & Plant Standards	Biosecurity SA	Retention Allowance \$	22/10/2020—30/04/2021	\$21,694.00
Manager Of Market Access	Biosecurity SA	Retention Allowance \$	01/07/2020—01/07/2021	\$20,283.00
Principal Scientist	SARDI	Retention Allowance \$	24/11/2020—30/04/2021	\$20,000.00
Tech Manager Poultry Food Production Systems	Biosecurity SA	Retention Allowance \$	06/03/2021—05/11/2021	\$18,968.00

Employee Title	Branch	Allowance Type	Date Range paid for	Actual Amount paid to employee between 1/7/2020 and 30/6/2021
Principal Scientist Crop Ecophysiology	SARDI	Retention Allowance \$	03/10/2020—30/04/2021	\$16,000.00
Principal Research Scientist	SARDI	Retention Allowance \$	20/06/2020—18/06/2022	\$15,126.00
Sub Program Leader, Crustacean	SARDI	Retention Allowance \$	01/07/2020—30/04/2021	\$15,126.00
Principal Scientist Climate Variability	SARDI	Retention Allowance \$	01/05/2021—05/11/2021	\$13,806.00
ICT Architect Data & Infrastructure	Corporate Services	Retention Allowance \$	01/08/2020—31/07/2021	\$13,715.00
Principal Scientist Viticulture	SARDI	Attraction Allowance \$	01/05/2021—05/11/2021	\$12,000.00
Research Scientist (Abalone)	SARDI	Retention Allowance \$	28/06/2020—27/06/2022	\$8,800.00
Research Scientist	SARDI	Retention Allowance \$	01/07/2020—30/04/2021	\$7,500.00

Further, between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021, no non-salary benefits were paid to public servants. This figure relates exclusively to the part payment of individual membership fees for a professional body or association, up to the value of \$300 per person, consistent with departmental policy.

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Amount
NIL			

#### MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):** I have been advised the following in relation to staff employed within my office:

Information on ministerial staff employed as at 16 July 2021 was published in the *Government Gazette* on 22 July 2021.

The following table lists public sector staff employed as at 30 June 2021:

Title	ASO Classification	Non- salary benefits
Office Manager	ASO704	Car Park
Executive Assistant to the Minister	ASO501	
Senior Business Support Officer	ASO504	Car Park
Ministerial Liaison Officer	ASO502	Car Park
Ministerial Liaison Officer	ASO502	
Business Support Officer	ASO303	
Business Support Officer	ASO301	

[Note – non-salary benefit could be a description or value (ie car park)]

#### TERMINATION PAYOUTS

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):** I have been advised the following:

No executive termination has occurred since 1 July 2020, for all agencies reporting to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development.

#### PUBLIC SECTOR EXECUTIVES

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):** I have been advised the following:

Since 1 July 2020 the following new executive appointments were made within the Department of Primary Industries and Regions. Some appointments were made to existing vacated roles.

Agency	Role Title	Total Remuneration Package Value (TRPV)
Corporate Services	CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER	\$240,000.00
Corporate Services	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER	\$225,500.00

The total annual employment cost for these appointments is \$465,500.00 (excluding on costs).

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):** In response to Questions 14 and 15 I have been advised the following:

Department of Primary Industries and Regions

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2020-21 and across the forward estimates for the Department of Primary Industries and Regions—Controlled:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2020-21 Estimated result \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000
Northern Adelaide Food Park	The Northern Adelaide Food Park initiative was established to create opportunities for businesses to co-locate and enable both new and existing food and beverage processors, manufacturers, food packaging specialists, cold-chain suppliers and logistic and transport companies to expand and grow.	-	-	1,450	50	-
Advanced Food Manufacturing	The program focused on translating new or existing research and technical expertise into practical outcomes for food and beverage producers, to help them create new high value or value added products or processes. Connecting the producers to the technical experts that can help them develop new products and processes and understand the value that can be added through technical innovation, and the associated productivity, and export development potential.	20	-	-	-	-
Marine Scalefish Fishery Reform	Provide commercial marine scalefish licence holders with an opportunity to voluntarily exit the fishery. Is part of the State Government's Marine Scalefish Fishery Reform process.	21,860	-	-	-	-
SA Wine Industry Development Scheme (SAWIDS)	The program focussed on the development and support of projects that add economic value to the wine industry.	1,300	-	-	-	-
South Australian River Murray Sustainability Program (SARMS) – Commonwealth funded program	Commonwealth funded competitive grant program to enable the SA River Murray irrigation industry to meet the new policy directions of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan	920	-	-	-	-

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2020-21 Estimated result \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000
	and potential challenges faced by future climate change scenarios, and to support the vibrant communities across the Region.					
On-Farm Emergency Water Infrastructure Rebate Scheme – Commonwealth funded program	Commonwealth funded grant program to provide a one-off 25 per cent rebate up to \$25,000 (GST exclusive) to primary producers in drought affected areas for the costs associated with the purchase and installation of On-Farm water infrastructure.	990	-	-	-	-
Horticulture Netting Infrastructure Program	Commonwealth funded grant program for South Australian horticulture producers to install new or replace damaged netting, following damaging hailstorms that impacted fruit industries in the Adelaide Hills in 2017 and 2018, and in the Riverland in 2016 and 2019.	2,366	7,367	4,867	-	-
South Australian Drought Support Package	South Australian Government's drought support package aims to support farm families, local businesses and rural communities dealing with drought conditions.	11,157	-	-	-	-
Bushfire Response – primary producer grants – joint Commonwealth funded program	Bushfire recovery grants up to \$75,000 jointly funded with the Commonwealth to primary producers affected by the Kangaroo island and Cudlee Creek Fires.	7,389	-	-	-	-
Recovery grants for apple growers	Commonwealth funded bushfire recovery grants for apple producers affected by bushfire damage to assist with clean-up, repair or replacement of trees, infrastructure and equipment.	483	4,343	965	-	-
Local Economic Recovery (LER) support	LER aims to boost local economies by providing funding to South Australia's communities and industries most affected by 2019-20 bushfires. Vineyard and horticulture rebuilding and resilience, including cherries and olives, across Adelaide Hills, Cudlee Creek and Kangaroo Island. The program is co-funded by the Federal and South Australian governments under the National Bushfire Recovery Fund.	-	4,920	-	-	-
Regional Growth Fund *	Support projects that unlock new economic activity in our regions, creating jobs, growing export opportunities	4,625	43,487	14,728	19,618	19,062

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2020-21 Estimated result \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000
	and strengthening regional communities.					
Regional Development Fund	The program focussed on driving economic growth and productivity by investing in regional infrastructure, creating jobs and new opportunities for regional South Australia.	2,287	2,222	145	-	-
Upper Spencer Gulf & Outback Futures Program	Supporting the region to achieve economic recovery by offering assistance to projects that will contribute to the economic diversification, resilience and capacity building of these communities.	5	276	-	-	-
Regional Development Australia	The Regional Development Australia Boards (RDA) have been provided with funding certainty through over \$12 million allocated over four years. This funding commitment will allow RDA Boards to continue to provide vital advice and support to drive economic development in each region.	3,591	3,307	-	-	-
Economic Sustainability Program	The Economic Sustainability Program is targeted towards key regional economic development projects that facilitate strong, vibrant and sustainable regional industries and communities.	145	-	-	-	-
Mobile Black Spot Program	This initiative provides \$10 million over three years to address mobile phone black spots across South Australia. Improving mobile phone coverage within the state will contribute to improved productivity, improved safety and enhancing the reputation of the state's key tourist destinations.	5,573	3,200	-	-	-
South East Forestry Partnership Program	The South East Forestry Partnerships Program is a merit-based grant program to assist the forest and wood products industry by encouraging further investment in new and existing businesses. Funding was allocated over three phases.	2,464	-	-	-	-

The following table details the carryover of grants from 2020-21 into 2021-22 for the Department of Primary Industries and Regions approved as part of the 2021-22 State budget process and included in the above table:

Grant/program name	2020-21 \$000	2021-22 \$000
Regional Growth Fund	(48,525)	48,525

Regional Development Fund	(1,283)	1,283
South Australian River Murray Sustainability (SARMS) Program	(170)	170
Horticulture Netting Program	(2,500)	2,500

\*Negative indicates reduction in expenditure

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):** I have been advised the following:

The government has provided a list of grant programs administered by the Department of Primary Industries and Regions during 2020-21 in omnibus question 14.

#### MACHINERY OF GOVERNMENT CHANGES

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):** I have been advised the following:

There were no machinery of government changes affecting the Department of Primary Industries and Regions since 1 July 2020.

#### GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):** I have been advised the following:

Section 4 of DPC Circular 13 – annual reporting details the use of the annual report template. The template includes sections for an organisational structure and changes to the Agency to be included by each agency.

I refer the member to the annual reports which have been published for each of the agencies for which I am responsible.

#### MOUNT GAMBIER RECREATION HUB

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

For the Regional Growth Fund, grant payments are made on a reimbursement basis on achievement of milestones agreed in the grant deed upon proof of approved project expenditure.

To date, nil funding has been paid to the grantee, as a variation of the commonwealth government grant deed (and subsequently the Regional Growth Fund grant deed) is being negotiated due to COVID-19 delays.

The grantee is to provide a copy of the executed commonwealth government grant deed to inform the Regional Growth Fund grant deed variation and associated milestones.

#### FRUIT FLY

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

On 8 September 2021 I provided further information to the House of Assembly on the answer provided during estimates.

The Department of Primary Industries and Regions had advised me in writing there was a confidentiality clause in the contract with Ms Poh Ling Yeow. This advice provided to me was incorrect.

I am now advised there is no confidentiality clause in the final contract signed by Ms Poh Ling Yeow. The contract was for a 12 month period from 12 February 2021 for an amount of \$10,000.

#### FRUIT FLY

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

On 8 September 2021 I provided further information to the House of Assembly on the answer provided during estimates.

The Department of Primary Industries and Regions had advised me in writing there was a confidentiality clause in the contract with Ms Poh Ling Yeow. This advice provided to me was incorrect.

I am now advised there is no confidentiality clause in the final contract signed by Ms Poh Ling Yeow. The contract was for a 12 month period from 12 February 2021 for an amount of \$10,000.

#### **MOUNT GAMBIER RECREATION HUB**

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

- (a) This information is provided in the June 2021 report to the Public Works Committee.
- (b) Total project expenditure at 5 July 2021 was \$14,931,100. All costs incurred by the Council to date.

#### **PASTORAL LANDS BILL**

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):** I am advised that 2 December 2020.

#### **PRIMARY INDUSTRIES AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

The \$1.2 million in additional cost recovery was received from a combination of commonwealth government and several different industry funded research and extension activities. For the most part the activities are cost recovered by SARDI as the delivery agent.

#### **TREASURY AND FINANCE DEPARTMENT**

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

The budget is \$5.500 million.

There are currently 26.6 FTE'S in the branch with the following classifications:

- 1.0 SAES 2
- 3.0 SAES 1
- 5.2 AS08
- 2.8 AS07
- 4.8 AS06
- 5.0 AS05
- 4.8 AS04

The Commercial and Economics Branch is comprised of the following Teams:

- Economics Team: 5.0 FTE
- Schools PPP Project: 2.8 FTE
- Commercial Projects and Business Services: 18.8 FTE.

#### **TREASURY AND FINANCE DEPARTMENT**

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

The main projects managed by the Commercial and Economics Branch in 2020-21 include:

- Social impact bonds and pay-by-results contracts—working with service delivery agencies the Department of human Services and Department of Child Protection, providing oversight of the ASPIRE homelessness social impact bond, establishing the Newpin Family Reunification Program, and establishing the Resilient Families Program;

- Australian Bragg Centre—managing the state's position in respect of the construction of the Australian Bragg Centre (previously known as 'SAHMRI 2'), planning to establish proton therapy services, and managing the State's obligations under the National Partnership Agreement with the commonwealth government;
- Schools Public Private Partnership—working with the Department for Education, providing contract management and oversight of the construction and delivery of two new birth to year 12 schools at Aldinga (Payinthe College), Aldinga (Riverbanks College);
- Port Bonython—working with Department for Infrastructure and Transport and Renewal SA, undertaking site due diligence and management of expression of interest process to enable future industrial, energy and mining development on State-owned land in the Port Bonython precinct;
- Barossa New Water—working with the Department of Primary Industries and Regions, undertaking assessment of options and development of high-level business case for delivery of recycled water to the Barossa; and
- Unsolicited proposals—secretariat support and analysis of various proposals put to the state's Unsolicited Proposals Committee.

In addition, the branch has managed various tasks related to the State's obligations under historical transactions. It has also worked with various agencies in support of their commercial projects.

#### GOVERNMENT BANKING CONTRACT

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

The government banking contract rebate in *Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 171*, refers to the total rebates received by the South Australian Government in 2019-20 from both the Commonwealth Bank of Australia and Australian and New Zealand (ANZ) Bank under the respective government wide banking contracts.

The rebate from the Commonwealth Bank of Australia is based on account balances and the rebate paid by the ANZ Bank is based on total card spend.

#### PUBLIC NON-FINANCIAL SECTOR

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

A 1.0 percentage point move in the average interest rate applying to the public non-financial corporations (PNFC) sector net debt would change PNFC sector net interest expense by approximately \$88 million in 2024-25.

#### SA HEALTH

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

The below table sets SA Health's reprofiled savings requirement reflected in the 2021-22 Budget across the forward estimates.

\$ millions	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
2021-22 Budget savings targets	-	80	160	240	320
Savings Targets (year on year growth)		80	80	80	80

For comparison purposes, the savings included in the 2017-18 Mid-Year Budget Review under the former government were:

\$ millions	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Former Government Savings Targets (2017-18 Mid-Year Budget Review)	70	212	325	425	516

#### GOVERNMENT SAVINGS TARGETS

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

The table below reflects the breakdown of savings by agency across the four years which reconciles to the total shown on page 24 of Budget Paper 3. The table reflects the cumulative value of savings measures over the forward estimates.

Agency	2021-22 Budget (\$m)	2022-23 Estimate (\$m)	2023-24 Estimate (\$m)	2024-25 Estimate (\$m)
Across Government	1.8	7.1	7.1	7.1
Attorney-General	2.7	5.0	7.3	9.7
Child Protection	—	—	3.2	6.7
Correctional Services	5.4	8.3	11.7	14.8
Courts	4.2	4.8	5.5	5.5
Defence SA	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.3
Education <sup>(1)</sup>	7.9	16.2	20.6	24.6
Electoral Commission	—	0.1	0.1	0.1
Emergency Services—CFS	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.8
Emergency Services—MFS	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.5
Emergency Services—SAFECOM	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3
Emergency Services—SES	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3
Energy and Mining	0.4	1.3	2.0	2.8
Environment and Water	2.6	4.8	7.1	9.4
Environment Protection Authority	0.3	0.5	0.7	1.0
Green Industries SA	—	0.1	0.1	0.1
Health and Wellbeing	80.0	160.0	240.0	320.0
Human Services	1.9	3.6	6.7	9.9
Infrastructure and Transport	7.4	13.9	21.3	27.7
Innovation and Skills	3.2	5.3	7.1	8.9
Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing	—	0.5	1.0	1.5
Police	1.2	2.2	3.0	3.8
Premier and Cabinet	8.7	10.1	12.8	15.6
Primary Industries and Regions	2.0	3.9	5.7	7.6
South Australian Housing Authority	0.7	1.3	1.3	1.3
TAFE SA	1.4	6.3	10.8	23.8
Tourism	0.8	1.8	2.6	3.4
Trade and Investment	1.0	1.5	2.2	2.8
Treasury and Finance	1.1	3.5	5.9	8.5
West Beach Trust	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Total existing operating savings	135.5	263.6	387.6	518.9
(1) Includes SACE Board and Education and Early Childhood Services Registration and Standards Board				

**GOVERNMENT SAVINGS TARGETS**

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

The 1 per cent expenditure growth applied for 2021-22 and 2022-23 has resulted in a reduction in budgeted expenditure of around \$15 million in 2021-22 and around \$30 million in 2022-23 compared with the 2.5 per cent indexation estimates previously provided.

Over the three-year period 2020-21 to 2022-23, agencies' budgets were set to provide average indexation of 1.5 per cent per annum. The retention of 2.5 per cent indexation in 2020-21 is estimated to have provided agencies with additional budget capacity of \$10 million in 2020-21 compared to a scenario where agencies' 2020-21 budgets were adjusted to reflect 1.5 per cent indexation.

**COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE**

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

Mr Mark Jones was appointed Chief Officer of the Country Fire Service on 1 October 2019.

**COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE**

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

No recruitment firm was engaged for the recruitment process that resulted in the appointment of Mr Dominic Lane as the Chief Executive of SAFECOM on 3 June 2019.

VUCA was engaged through a standard tender process in 2019 to support the recruitment for the role of Chief Officer of Country Fire Service, which Mr Mark Jones was appointed to on 1 October 2019.

Another recruitment process was undertaken for the SAFECOM role after Mr Lane resigned on 1 April 2021. Rosemary Hardham and Associates was engaged to support this recruitment. The cost of services provided by Rosemary Hardham and Associates was \$32,500 plus GST.

**COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE**

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

VUCA was engaged through a standard tender process in 2019 to support recruitment for the role of Chief Officer of Country Fire Service (CFS).

Following the resignation of Mr Dominic Lane from the role of Chief Executive of the South Australian Fire and Emergency Services Commission (SAFECOM) on 1 April 2021, the Commissioner determined a new approach to market was required given the role was different to the role of Chief Officer of CFS.

Rosemary Hardham and Associates was invited to submit a quotation due to their significant prior experience in recruiting to interstate and national senior emergency management roles. After evaluating the tenders, Rosemary Hardham and Associates was selected.

**CEDAR APARTMENTS, WEST LAKES**

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

SafeWork SA has no knowledge as to whether the solar PV system remains disconnected from the lifts in the Cedar Apartment block.

It is the responsibility of the Office of the Technical Regulator (OTR) to monitor and check work undertaken on the power supply to the lift system.

I confirm that I have not had any contact with Mary Jo Fisher in the last six months.

SafeWork SA inspectors have not had any contact with Mary Jo Fisher since 24 June 2020.

**FLEET SA**

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

The budgeted dividend from SAFA for 2021-22 is based on an estimated 2021-22 profit after tax of \$33.6 million, with profits of \$14 million from Treasury, \$9.8 million from Fleet SA, and \$9.8 million from insurance. The

Treasury estimate is based on an increase in the Treasurer's loan and deposit balances. The Insurance and Fleet SA profit estimates are based on standard operating conditions, including an insurance investment return of approximately 5.75 per cent and nil profit from vehicle sales in the Fleet SA portfolio.

Treasury's \$14 million and Fleet SA's \$9.8 million profits have been included in the dividend estimate, in full. The Insurance portion of the dividend is \$9 million, which is based on maintaining the portfolio's solvency.

This is per the SAFA dividend policy to pay 100 per cent of the net profit after tax for its Treasury and Fleet SA operations and 100 per cent of the average net profit after tax (over a rolling five years) for its Insurance operations. In the event of a zero dividend in the rolling five-year average, the amount paid will be any amount over solvency requirements as determined by management, up to a maximum of current year actual or estimated profit. As the insurance operations incurred a loss in 2019-20, the latter provision has been applied.

#### **SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY**

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

As at 30 June 2020, net assets in fund 1 were 116.0 per cent.

#### **SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY**

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

Fund 2's total assets at 30 June 2021 were \$20.7 million, fully offset by total liabilities of \$20.7 million.

Fund 3's total assets at 30 June 2021 were \$53.4 million, fully offset by total liabilities of \$53.4 million.

#### **SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY**

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

1. For the period 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021, 111 claims were reported against Fund 3.
2. For the period 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021, a total of \$11.3 million in premium revenue (gross written premium) has been received.
3. During the period 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021, \$5.68 million was paid out in claim settlements. This value comprises actual payments made on claims reported within the financial year, as well as payments on claims reported in previous periods.

#### **SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY**

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

This item reflects actual and budgeted indemnity payments made by the Administered Items of the Department of Treasury and Finance to SAFA for building indemnity insurance (SAFA Insurance Fund 3). The Treasurer indemnifies SAFA for the financial outcomes of the fund and the payments represent the extent to which insurance payouts exceed premium revenue in a year.

The 2021-22 budget of \$0.618 million is an accounting estimate based on actuarial advice. The final amount paid in 2021-22 will be based on actual activity in 2021-22.

#### **SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY**

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

The South Australian Government Financing Authority (SAFA) continues to receive periodic updates of applications made under the National Redress Scheme for Institutional Child Sexual Abuse'.

#### **SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY**

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

As at 31 May 2021, seven claims were fully finalised claims and the paid amounts for those claims are as follows:

Aboriginal Lands Trust	\$61,000
Carrick Hill Estate	\$33,763
State Library of SA	\$72,705
State Opera of SA	\$40,370
Tourism SA	nil
Windmill Theatre	\$116,842
Zoos SA	\$3,000,000

The amounts paid to 31 May 2021 (totalling approximately \$35 million) includes the above fully finalised claims, together with interim payments made to agencies during the ongoing assessment of their claims.

The additional payments made and received by agencies as at 31 May 2021 is as follows:

Adelaide Festival Centre Trust	\$4,780,000
Adelaide Venue Management Corporation	\$23,078,000
Country Arts SA	\$937,234
Department of Environment and Water	\$1,037,294
History Trust of SA	\$380,000
SA Museum	\$146,700
West Beach Trust	\$2,000,000

At 31 May 2021, the two remaining claims for State Theatre Company and Art Gallery of SA have had not had any interim payments made and were subject to ongoing assessment.

#### **SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY**

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

The premiums paid by Zoos SA for insurance coverage provided by SAFA for the last 3 financial years are:

2019-20	\$126,379
2020-21	\$143,417
2021-22	\$170,057

The premiums attributable to the business interruption cover (which are included in the above) are:

2019-20	\$4,540
2020-21	\$10,071
2021-22	\$23,625

The premiums charged to Zoos SA are calculated using the same methodology as all other insurance premiums charged by SAFA.

#### **SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY**

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

There were 104 reported sales of new battery electric vehicles in the 2020 calendar year.

For the 2021 calendar year, as at 31 July 2021 there have been 149 reported sales of battery electric vehicles in South Australia.

The official mechanism for reporting new vehicle sales is the Federal Chamber of Automotive Industries (FCAI). Tesla as a manufacturer choose not to report its sales to FCAI, so the vehicle sale numbers exclude Tesla vehicles.

#### **SUPER SA**

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

Since the COVID-19 Financial Hardship Early Release of Benefits scheme since it commenced in April 2020, 9,107 Super SA members have made 12,803 withdrawals from their superannuation accounts totalling \$106,999,158.76.

2,538 members withdrew amounts of less than \$10,000.

3,201 members withdrew \$10,000.

714 members withdrew an amount between \$10,000 and \$20,000.

2,654 members withdrew the maximum allowable amount of \$20,000.

Super SA's records indicate that 827 accounts were rendered with a nil balance as a result of the above withdrawals.

#### SUPER SA

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

Super SA actual expenditure on consultants for the 2020-21 financial year was \$745,746.

The forecasted spend on consultants for the 2021-22 financial year is budgeted to be \$1,152,000.

#### SUPER SA

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

1. The \$30 million return of deposit account balances – superannuation referred to in Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 171 is a budgeted receipt to the Consolidated Account in 2021-22. There has not been any actual return of deposit account balances – superannuation to the Consolidated Account in either 2020-21 or 2021-22 to date.

This budget line, along with a corresponding payment line in Budget Paper 4, Volume 4, page 175 payments to the South Australian superannuation funds, is used to facilitate the transfer of funds between superannuation schemes via the Consolidated Account. This occurs, when the need arises in a financial year, to ensure that the Parliamentary Superannuation Scheme, Judges' Pensions Scheme and the Governors' Pensions Scheme are maintained in a balanced position (a surplus equivalent to at least 10 per cent of liabilities). When any of these superannuation schemes are in either an excess or deficit position, these transfers occur to return them to a balanced position.

2. This budget line is the same line that was used in 2018-19 to transfer excess funds from the Parliamentary Superannuation Scheme and the Judges' Pensions Scheme into the Consolidated Account. These funds were then paid back from the budget line Payments to the South Australian Superannuation Fund to the Governors' Pension Scheme and the South Australian Superannuation Scheme – Employer Account.

This practice is consistent with the Parliamentary Superannuation Act 1974 which requires the parliamentary defined benefit schemes to be fully funded. There is no similar requirement in the other two schemes, however, they are kept in balance by adopting the same statutory requirement as the parliamentary scheme. Where the financial results and actuarial assessments for any of the three schemes shows them to be in either an excess or deficit position, any excess funds will be transferred via the Consolidated Account to the schemes in deficit.

#### REVENUESA

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

The Commissioner of State Taxation advises me that section 78(d) and (e) of the Taxation Administration Act 1996 and Regulation 4(1) of the *Taxation Administration Regulations 2017* prevent me from disclosing such confidential information obtained under or in relation to the administration or enforcement of the Authorised Betting Operations Tax Act 2000.

#### REVENUESA

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

As at 9 August 2021, 1,535 HomeBuilder grants have been paid in regional South Australia. Of these, 1,411 were new builds (including off-the-plan transactions) and 124 were substantial renovations.

#### RENEWAL SA

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

An amount of \$4.8 million was transferred from Renewal SA to the Department for Innovation and Skills (DIS) during 2018—19 and applied as a subsidy to the sublease agreement with Stone and Chalk to establish the startup at Lot Fourteen.

The balance of funds was reallocated to heritage refurbishment capital works by way of market incentives, and was all committed prior to the 2020-21 financial year, with most of the expenditure committed in financial year 2019-20.

DIS is responsible for the agreement with Stone and Chalk. Renewal SA is not responsible for administering this funding.

#### RENEWAL SA

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

1,260 people are undertaking business, working, researching and studying at Lot Fourteen.

This includes 48 established businesses on site.

Stone and Chalk has 58 businesses working in the start-up hub with a total of 194 workspaces occupied across approximately 1,300 square metres.

A total of approximately 13,500 sqm of lettable area is leased or committed as at July 2021.

#### RENEWAL SA

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

1. The total cost of the project is \$8.179 million.
2. Payment to Renewal SA will be on a cost recovery basis for staff who have capability in urban renewal planning and delivery. Renewal SA is engaged by the SA Housing Authority as its development manager. The exact value of the fee is yet to be determined. It will form part of the project costs.
3. SA Housing Authority has advised that the surplus will be used to support a range of social housing initiatives to support the delivery of the Our Housing Future Strategy 2020-2030.
4. There will be 35 social housing properties demolished and 16 new social housing outcomes delivered. A further 43 housing outcomes will be created for sale to eligible affordable housing purchasers, plus 42 housing outcomes for the open market.

This equates to more than half of the housing outcomes dedicated to public housing tenants and eligible affordable housing purchasers.

#### HOMESTART

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

The tables below show the number of loans applications submitted and settled for the last two financial years:

FY 2019-2020 (No.)		
Loan type	Applications submitted	Approved/ Settled
Advantage	396	253
Low Deposit	12	3
Seniors Equity	113	107
Shared Equity Option	44	34

FY 2020-2021 (No.)		
Loan type	Applications submitted	Approved/ Settled
Advantage	551	341
Low Deposit	3	2
Seniors Equity	60	54
Shared Equity Option	58	40

**SUPER SA**

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

The total staff in the Call Centre was as follows:

- At 30 June 2019: 26
- At 30 June 2020: 29
- At 30 June 2021: 30
- At 11 August 2021: 36 (noting that the Super SA Board has approved a maximum number of 41 Call Centre staff, comprised of mainly AS03 and AS04 roles, for the year ending June 2022).

**PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES**

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer):** The following information is provided on behalf of all Ministers:

The FTE count for each agency at 30 June 2021 will be published in the Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment's Workforce Information Report for 2020-21 towards the end of 2021.

As previously advised, because the numbers are notional, forward estimates are not included by agency in budget statements. However each agency statement provides an estimate for the budget year's FTEs for the agency.

The total employment cost and FTE levels for each year of the forward estimates can be located within Tables 2.7 and 2.8 respectively of the 2021-22 Budget Statement.

While each agency has a savings task over the forward estimates, any FTE reductions associated with this task are notional and based on estimates of how the savings across the forward estimates may be delivered. Chief executives have the flexibility to deliver the savings in the manner that best suits the needs of the agency.

The government does not have a TVSP target for FTEs.

**CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS**

In reply to **the Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** The following information is provided on behalf of all ministers:

As required by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet Circular PC013 -Annual Reporting Requirements for 2020-21 information relating to expenditure on consultants and contractors including the vendor, total cost and nature of work undertaken, will be detailed in annual reports published by agencies.

**PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES**

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

Employee Title	Branch	Allowance Type	Date Range paid for	Actual Amount paid to employee between 1/7/2020 and 30/6/2021
Manager, Return to Work Services	Government Services	Retention Allowance	22/6/2020 to 2/7/2021	\$12,046
Lead Inspector of Mines	SafeWork SA	Retention Allowance	22/6/2020 to 2/7/2021	\$34,052
Lead Inspector of Mines	SafeWork SA	Retention Allowance	22/6/2020 to 2/7/2021	\$34,052
Director, Treasury Services	South Australian Financing Authority	Retention Allowance	22/6/2020 to 2/7/2021	\$16,173
Principal Advisor, Accounting & Finance	Financial Management, Reporting and Policy	Retention Allowance	22/6/2020 to 2/7/2021	\$15,000

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Amount
Chief Executive, CTPIR	SAES 2	Car Park	\$4,248

Further, between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021, \$11,560 of non-salary benefits were paid to public servants. This figure relates to the part payment of individual membership fees for a professional body or association, up to the value of \$300 per person, consistent with departmental policy.

#### MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer):** I have been advised the following in relation to staff employed within my office:

- Information on ministerial staff employed as at 16 July 2021 was published in the Government Gazette on 22 July 2021.
- The following table lists public sector staff employed as at 30 June 2021

Title	ASO Classification	Non- salary benefits
Office Manager	AS08	Car park
Executive Assistant to the Treasurer	AS06	Nil
Ministerial Liaison Officer	AS06	Nil
Ministerial Liaison Officer	AS06	Nil
Ministerial Liaison Officer including Cabinet	AS06	Nil
Senior Business Support Officer including FOI and MLO Housing and Urban Development	AS05	Nil
Parliamentary Officer	AS04	Nil
Senior Correspondence Officer	AS03	Nil
Correspondence Officer	AS02	Nil

- No staff were seconded from the department to my office as at 30 June 2021.

A seconded employee is an employee who is paid for by the department and not the minister's office.

#### TARGETED VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PACKAGES

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer):** The following information is provided on behalf of all ministers:

Agencies have advised that a total of 429 TVSPs and executive separations (405.4 FTEs) were accepted during 2020-21, and that the following expenses were incurred (excluding payments associated with accrued leave):

- TVSP and executive separation payments \$40.0 million
- Payroll tax and shared services fees \$0.5 million

Expenses associated with 292 acceptances were centrally reimbursed—\$25.7 million for TVSP and executive separation payments and \$0.3 million for payroll tax and shared services fees.

Agencies met costs associated with the other 137 acceptances—\$14.3 million for TVSP and executive separation payments and \$0.2 million for payroll tax and shared services fees.

Other than in specific circumstances approved by the government where significant reform activity is underway, agencies are responsible for managing costs associated with TVSPs and separation payments.

The TVSP budget for reform activities is not set at the agency level. A central budget allocation of \$30 million has been included in 2021-22 for central reimbursement where agencies are undertaking significant reform activity.'

2020-21 TVSP expenses

	Centrally Reimbursed		Cost met by agency	
	No.	\$	No.	\$
General Government Sector				
Child Protection	–	–	2	258,724.73
Correctional Services	21	1,907,674.86	–	–
Courts Administration Authority	4	413,928.12	–	–
Defence SA	–	–	1	37,499.63
Education	–	–	20	1,895,575.79
Environment and Water	–	–	4	357,214.00
Health and Wellbeing	78	7,559,925.43	21	1,898,287.52

	Centrally Reimbursed		Cost met by agency	
Human Services	27	2,167,889.66	3	210,553.00
Infrastructure and Planning	120	10,164,063.31	9	1,036,159.29
Innovation and Skills	–	–	2	179,948.41
Libraries Board of South Australia	–	–	1	124,111.77
Premier and Cabinet	–	–	5	585,333.73
Primary Industries and Regions	–	–	5	463,979.00
South Australia Police	–	–	2	153,241.64
TAFE SA	42	3,462,252.75	5	379,235.42
Treasury and Finance	–	–	6	546,627.37
Public Non-Financial Corporations				
Forestry SA	–	–	1	85,261.57
Public Trustee	–	–	2	203,054.08
South Australian Housing Authority	–	–	42	3,856,673.91
SA Water	–	–	5	1,768,192.67
Urban Renewal Authority	–	–	1	238,034.99
Total Payments to Employees (exc Accrued Leave)	292	25,675,734.13	137	14,277,708.52
Payroll Tax on TVSP Payments		186,309.58		133,740.94
Shared Services SA Fees		115,606.40		53,410.00
Total Employee Separation Expenditure		25,977,650.11		14,464,859.46
Grand Total			429	40,442,509.57

#### TERMINATION PAYOUTS

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

One (1) executive termination has occurred since 1 July 2020, for all agencies reporting to the Treasurer. The value of termination payments made to this executive was a gross amount of \$147,707 plus the value of accrued leave entitlements.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer):** The following information is provided on behalf of all Ministers:

The Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment maintains the excess employee database for the SA public sector.

The following table has been prepared based on the information as at 30 June 2021 and represented in tabular format that ensures privacy principles apply.

A number of employees do not work full time and the enterprise agreement that applies to the individual employees specifies the rates of pay as either hourly, weekly or annual rates of pay. The rates shown are as they appear in the enterprise agreement.

The enterprise agreements also specify increments for the rates of pay and this information is provided in the table as the salary/wage range payable for a full-time employee.

Agency	As at 30 June 2021: Months Excess	Minimum Salary/Wage Payable (for a full time employee) (\$)	Maximum Salary/Wage Payable (for a full time employee) (\$)
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	<1	80,830	89,897

Agency	As at 30 June 2021: Months Excess	Minimum Salary/Wage Payable (for a full time employee) (\$)	Maximum Salary/Wage Payable (for a full time employee) (\$)
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	1	72,135	75,616
Human Services	1	55,315	59,503
Human Services	1	101,859	110,107
Human Services	1	55,315	59,503
Human Services	1	92,784	98,143
Human Services	1	92,784	98,143
Human Services	1	92,784	98,143
Human Services	1	92,784	98,143
Human Services	1	92,784	98,143
Human Services	1	92,784	98,143
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	2	63,681	67,868
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	2	72,135	75,616
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	2	63,681	67,868
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	2	63,681	67,868
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	2	1,189.40 per week	1,213.12 per week
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	2	1,189.40 per week	1,213.12 per week
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	2	1,189.40 per week	1,213.12 per week
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	2	1,189.40 per week	1,213.12 per week
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	2	1,189.40 per week	1,213.12 per week
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	2	1,189.40 per week	1,213.12 per week
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	2	1,189.40 per week	1,213.12 per week
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	2	1,189.40 per week	1,213.12 per week
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	2	1,189.40 per week	1,213.12 per week
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	2	1,189.40 per week	1,213.12 per week
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	2	1,189.40 per week	1,213.12 per week
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	2	1,189.40 per week	1,213.12 per week
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	2	80,830	89,897
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	2	63,681	67,868
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	2	72,135	75,262

Agency	As at 30 June 2021: Months Excess	Minimum Salary/Wage Payable (for a full time employee) (\$)	Maximum Salary/Wage Payable (for a full time employee) (\$)
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	3	80,830	89,897
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	3	83,152	92,020
TAFE SA	4	114,105	118,413
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	4	92,784	98,143
TAFE SA	5	92,784	98,143
Treasury and Finance	5	101,859	110,107
TAFE SA	5	92,784	98,143
Treasury and Finance	6	104,296	113,505
Human Services	6	40.72 per hour	41.57 per hour
Human Services	6	40.72 per hour	41.57 per hour
Human Services	6	1019.10 per week	1030.60 per week
Human Services	6	1041.60 per week	1053.30 per week
Human Services	6	40.72 per hour	41.57 per hour
Human Services	6	83,152	96,329
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	6	92,784	98,143
Education	7	114,105	118,413
Treasury and Finance	8	114,105	118,413
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	9	1,243.52 per week	1,249.74 per week
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	9	1,561.83 per week	1,594.88 per week
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	9	1,561.83 per week	1,594.88 per week
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	9	1,654.21 per week	1,687.75 per week
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	10	1,489.12 per week	1,557.92 per week
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	10	1,243.52 per week	1,249.74 per week
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	10	1,243.52 per week	1,249.74 per week
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	10	1,243.52 per week	1,249.74 per week
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	10	1,243.52 per week	1,249.74 per week
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	10	1,243.52 per week	1,249.74 per week
Human Services	11	997.00 per week	1,008.10 per week
Human Services	11	997.00 per week	1,008.10 per week
Human Services	11	1,019.10 per week	1,030.60 per week

Agency	As at 30 June 2021: Months Excess	Minimum Salary/Wage Payable (for a full time employee) (\$)	Maximum Salary/Wage Payable (for a full time employee) (\$)
Human Services	11	1,019.10 per week	1,030.60 per week
Human Services	11	1,019.10 per week	1,030.60 per week
Human Services	11	997.00 per week	1,008.10 per week
Human Services	12	1019.10 per week	1,030.60 per week
Health and Wellbeing	12	83,152	96,329
Human Services	13	40.72 per hour	41.57 per hour
Human Services	13	40.72 per hour	41.57 per hour
TAFE SA	14	96,259	98,665
TAFE SA	14	96,359	98,665
Human Services	14	40.72 per hour	41.57 per hour
TAFE SA	14	92,618	94,933
Innovation and Skills	17	92,784	98,143
Human Services	19	55,315	59,503
Primary Industries and Regions SA	23	95,429	100,887
Premier and Cabinet	25	114,105	118,413

#### GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer):** The following information is provided on behalf of all Ministers:

Table 1 details (for all agencies) operating carryover expenditure amounts approved by cabinet into 2021-22, and amounts not approved by cabinet as part of the 2021-22 budget.

Agency	Approved into 2021-22	Approved into Future Years	Not approved
Attorney-General	1,012	—	—
Child Protection	717	—	—
Courts	157	—	—
Defence SA	265	94	—
Education	700	780	80
Emergency Services—SAFECOM	2,300	—	—
Energy and Mining	19,725	5,220	—
Environment and Water	12,304	2,625	—
Health and Wellbeing	7,466	4,223	3,240
Human Services	3,800	—	—
Innovation and Skills	1,121	540	—
Infrastructure and Transport	14,170	1,022	—
Police	1,872	—	—
Premier and Cabinet	2,584	429	—

Primary Industries and Regions	53,319	—	—
Tourism	1,045	1,415	—
Trade and Investment	46	—	—
Treasury and Finance	2,514	250	—
Treasury and Finance Administered Items	88,410	—	—
<b>Total</b>	<b>213,527</b>	<b>16,598</b>	<b>3,320</b>

#### GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer):** The following information is provided on behalf of all ministers:

Table 1 details (for all agencies) investing carryover expenditure amounts approved by cabinet into 2021-22, and amounts not approved by cabinet as part of the 2021-22 budget.

Agency	Approved into 2021-22	Approved into Future Years	Not approved
Attorney-General	32,685	—	—
Child Protection	3,523	—	—
Correctional Services	45,700	—	—
Education	18,227	—	—
Energy and Mining	1,139	—	—
Environment and Water	27,900	1,250	—
Environment Protection Authority	674	—	—
Health and Wellbeing	38,265	8,528	—
Innovation and Skills	—	2,000	—
Infrastructure and Transport	95,930	31,649	—
Police	11,516	—	—
Premier and Cabinet	250	—	—
Primary Industries and Regions	8,533	—	—
TAFE SA	914	—	—
Treasury and Finance	3,000	—	—
<b>Total</b>	<b>288,256</b>	<b>43,427</b>	<b>—</b>

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer):** In response to questions 14 and 15 I have been advised the following:

Department of Treasury and Finance

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2020-21 and across the forward estimates for the Department of Treasury and Finance—Controlled:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2020-21 Actual \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000
Augusta Zadow Award	This funding is used to meet the costs of a work health and safety initiative benefitting young workers or working women, which may involve practical solutions, research or further education.	25	25	25	25	25

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2020-21 Actual \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000
Health and Safety Representative (HSR) Training Subsidy	This subsidy is available to Health and Safety Representatives (HSR) and the approved training providers that deliver training to those HSR. Certain criteria needs to be met to be eligible for the subsidy.	-	20	20	20	20
SafeWork Australia Funding	South Australia's contribution to the administration of Safe Work Australia pursuant to the Intergovernmental Agreement for Regulatory and Operational Reform in Occupational Health and Safety	744	741	760	779	798
Sponsorships Program	Contribution for various work health and safety awards, expos and conferences.	7	10	10	10	10

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2020-21 and across the forward estimates for the Department of Treasury and Finance—Administered:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2020-21 Actual \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000
Community Support Grants and Donations	Provides grants and donations to the South Australian community.	-	150	154	158	162
Contribution to Racing SA	Grants to assist the racing industry in South Australia	15,082	16,014	16,254	16,557	16,792
COVID-19 Support Fund	Provides grants targeted towards recovery in sectors and across the economy in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and additional community services required to respond to demands directly resulting from COVID-19.	146,911*	259,887	15,786	-	-
First Home Owner Grants	Provides grants to eligible first home owners.	63,291	86,169	38,615	21,048	47,886
Future Jobs Fund	Provides targeted industry financial assistance.	3,889	5,069	991	450	150
HomeBuilder	Provides grants to assist the residential construction market by encouraging the commencement of new home builds and renovations. This is a Commonwealth funded initiative	99,925	163,367	23,303	-	-

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2020-21 Actual \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000
	administered by states and territories.					
Industry Financial Assistance Fund (IFADA)	Provides targeted industry financial assistance to South Australian businesses.	8,470	23,249	-	-	-
Job Accelerator Grant	Provides grants to employers for employing additional employees in South Australia.	1,508	-	-	-	-
Jobs and Economic Growth Fund	Provides targeted industry financial assistance.	73,583	134,208	93,888	60,709	40,203
Local Government Infrastructure Partnership Program	Provides support to councils to accelerate spending on community infrastructure projects to enable growth in the future.	-	81,715	-	-	-
Pre-Construction Grant	Provides grants to eligible off-the-plan apartment purchases.	710	-	-	-	-
Small Business Payroll Tax Rebate	Rebate provided to eligible employers with taxable Australian payrolls under a threshold.	61	-	-	-	-

\*Covid-19 Support Fund 2020-21 actual not yet finalised.

The following table details the carryover of grants from 2020-21 into 2021-22 for the Department of Treasury and Finance:

Grant/program name	2020-21	2021-22
	\$000	\$000
Economic and Business Growth Fund	-25,410	25,410
IFADA	-12,094	12,094

The above table does not include carryovers which will be finalised as part of the 2020-21 end of financial year carryover process.

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

The government has provided a list of grant programs administered by the Department of Treasury and Finance during 2020-21 in omnibus question 14.

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer):** The following information is provided on behalf of all Ministers:

The Agency Statements present agency financial information allocated by major areas of activity or 'programs'.

The preparation of this information is an extensive process and involves the allocation of a range of agency overhead costs. This process is undertaken annually at budget time in order to clearly define and allocate the budget for the coming year over the various programs that the agency undertakes. Therefore, program financial estimates across each year of the forward estimates are not available.

#### GOVERNMENT SAVINGS TARGETS

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer):** The following information is provided on behalf of all ministers:

No new savings were introduced in the 2021-22 Budget.

The table below reflects the breakdown of savings by agency across the four years which reconciles to the total shown on page 24 of Budget Paper 3. The table reflects the cumulative value of savings measures over the forward estimates.

Agency	2021-22 Budget (\$m)	2022-23 Estimate (\$m)	2023-24 Estimate (\$m)	2024-25 Estimate (\$m)
Across Government	1.8	7.1	7.1	7.1
Attorney-General	2.7	5.0	7.3	9.7
Child Protection	—	—	3.2	6.7
Correctional Services	5.4	8.3	11.7	14.8
Courts	4.2	4.8	5.5	5.5
Defence SA	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.3
Education <sup>(1)</sup>	7.9	16.2	20.6	24.6
Electoral Commission	—	0.1	0.1	0.1
Emergency Services—CFS	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.8
Emergency Services—MFS	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.5
Emergency Services—SAFECOM	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3
Emergency Services—SES	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3
Energy and Mining	0.4	1.3	2.0	2.8
Environment and Water	2.6	4.8	7.1	9.4
Environment Protection Authority	0.3	0.5	0.7	1.0
Green Industries SA	—	0.1	0.1	0.1
Health and Wellbeing	80.0	160.0	240.0	320.0
Human Services	1.9	3.6	6.7	9.9
Infrastructure and Transport	7.4	13.9	21.3	27.7
Innovation and Skills	3.2	5.3	7.1	8.9
Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing	—	0.5	1.0	1.5
Police	1.2	2.2	3.0	3.8
Premier and Cabinet	8.7	10.1	12.8	15.6
Primary Industries and Regions	2.0	3.9	5.7	7.6
South Australian Housing Authority	0.7	1.3	1.3	1.3
TAFE SA	1.4	6.3	10.8	23.8
Tourism	0.8	1.8	2.6	3.4

Agency	2021-22 Budget (\$m)	2022-23 Estimate (\$m)	2023-24 Estimate (\$m)	2024-25 Estimate (\$m)
Trade and Investment	1.0	1.5	2.2	2.8
Treasury and Finance	1.1	3.5	5.9	8.5
West Beach Trust	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Total existing operating savings	135.5	263.6	387.6	518.9
(1) Includes SACE Board and Education and Early Childhood Services Registration and Standards Board				

Previous savings and the detail of the specific measures have been presented in earlier budget papers.

#### GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer):** The following information is provided on behalf of all Ministers:

Any measures approved and funded subsequent to the 2021-22 budget will be announced at a time decided by the government and published in the 2021-22 Mid-Year Budget Review.

#### HOMESTART

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

Previous analysis estimated that of more than 32,000 SA Housing Trust tenancies, around 100 might be able to buy a home. The analysis naturally incorporated a variety of assumptions and limitations which were formed based on HomeStart's experience and judgement.

No campaigns or marketing initiatives targeting SA Housing Trust tenancies has been undertaken on this specific issue, although HomeStart and SA Housing Authority continue to collaborate in other areas.

#### HOMESTART

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

1. In recent years, approximately 20 – 25 per cent of total loans have been for homes in regional areas. Based on current forecasts for total loans, HomeStart estimates between 320 and 400 homes will be financed in regional areas for 2021-22.

2. The following table, based on data provided by SAHA and HomeStart's lending statistics, shows the number and proportion of SAHA's one thousand affordable project homes that were financed by HomeStart during 2020-21.

SAHA initiative	Total affordable sales 2020-21	Number financed by HomeStart	% of sales with HomeStart as Lender
Affordable Housing Initiative—1000 Homes	31	3	10%

#### IMPAIRMENT ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

I intend to make all submissions received in the initial consultation conducted by ReturnToWorkSA publicly available, subject to the consent of the authors of the submissions. I also intend to make the submission from the Minister's Advisory Committee publicly available.

ReturnToWorkSA is in the process of contacting consultees to obtain their consent or otherwise to this intention.

I am also advised that ReturnToWorkSA is contacting the external medical experts that informed the original set of proposed changes to seek their permission to publish their advice on the ReturnToWorkSA website. At the time of preparing this advice, the majority had given their consent.

With respect to recommendations made by ReturnToWorkSA to me, I advise that ReturnToWorkSA provided recommendations for proposed changes to be consulted on. The original consultation documents provided to consultees identify the substantive changes ReturnToWorkSA were interested in pursuing, subject to consultee feedback and, ultimately, my approval.

Not all changes recommended by ReturnToWorkSA were ultimately approved and my ministerial statement on 24 August 2021 in the Legislative Council identified the key recommendations which I did not approve as well as the substantive clauses that were incorporated in the new guidelines.

#### IMPAIRMENT ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (28 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

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

Firstly I would like to clarify that ReturnToWorkSA did not provide me with 'preliminary recommendations'.

ReturnToWorkSA collects data and feedback on an ongoing basis with respect to the operation of the Impairment Assessment Guidelines (the Guidelines). This data, over time, indicated a need to update the guidelines to deliver greater clarity, consistency, and transparency, and to reflect relevant medical and clinical advancements and refinements.

ReturnToWorkSA, in addition to appropriately trained in-house staff, sought external expert medical advice to inform them in drafting a set of proposed changes that could be put out for consultation in accordance with the requirements of the Return to Work Act 2014.

Those proposed changes were provided to me with a request for approval to consult on my behalf. I approved a broader consultation than that required by the act and the proposed changes were distributed for feedback on 28 May 2021. No consultants were retained by ReturnToWorkSA as part of this process.

As you would be aware, on 24 August 2021 the state government published the updated impairment assessment guidelines, which incorporated extensive consultation and community feedback, resulting in amendments to more than 30 of the over 70 proposed substantive changes, removal of any set deduction in benefits for pre-existing injury and protection of worker choice of assessor.

With respect to the medical experts who informed the original proposed changes, I am advised that ReturnToWorkSA is seeking their permission to publish their names on the ReturnToWorkSA website and that at the time of preparing this advice the majority had provided their permission.

I also understand your office has made a freedom of information request to my office and ReturnToWorkSA, and that a response will be provided in due course.

#### TRADE AND INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT

In reply to **the Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment):** I have been advised the following:

In 2020-21, around 2400 individual companies had direct client engagement with the Department for Trade and Investment (DTI).

This includes companies where direct interaction has been reported in the DTI CRM over the year, companies involved in DTI exporter development programs and company clients of the TradeStart program who have engaged with TradeStart officers this year and participants in online B2B matching programs.

#### GOODS AND SERVICES

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment):** I have been advised the following:

1. For the Department for Trade and Investment, the budgeted expenditure on goods and services for the financial year 2021-22 and each of the years of the forward estimates period is as follows:

	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
	Budget	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Total goods and services	15 358	15 500	15 900	15 700

2. and 3. The top 10 providers of goods and services for the financial year 2020-21 and the cost, description for these goods and services were as follows:

Supplier	Total Value	Description
HAYS SPECIALIST RECRUITMENT	\$702 474	Temporary Staff Services
KATALYST	\$396 180	Digital Interface Development
RANDSTAD P/L	\$368 406	Temporary Staff Services
CARAT AUSTRALIA MEDIA	\$317 679	Advertising and Associated Services
HUDSON GLOBAL RESOURCES (AUST)	\$281 967	Temporary Staff Services
CAREY TRAINING PTY LTD	\$174 864	IT Services and Support
DELOITTES	\$156 449	Professional Advice
ESCIENT PTY LTD	\$154 920	Business Development and Analysis Services
HAKT PTY LTD	\$137 321	Portal Development and Delivery

4. The value of the goods and services that was supplied to DTI by South Australian suppliers – response to be provided by Treasurer.'

#### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment):** I have been advised the following:

1. The following two lists relate to the Department for Trade and Investment for the period 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021.

(a) Between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021, 11 positions with a total estimated cost of \$100 000 or more were abolished:

- Business Coordinator, Space, Creative Industries and Hi-Tech – \$108 694
- ICT Transition Manager – \$142 850
- Manager, Trade and Regions – \$142 850
- Market Develop Officer UK/Europe – \$108 694
- Principal Project Officer – \$132 902
- Project Manager, Strategic Operations – \$145 310
- Regional Manager (3) – \$132 902
- Senior Software Developer – \$118 571
- Supply Chain Manager – \$142 850

(b) Between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021, 14 new positions with a total estimated cost \$100 000 or more were created:

- Business Analyst – \$142 850
- Business Development Officer, Creative Industries – \$118 571
- Digital Projects and Engagement Officer – \$108 694
- Economic Analyst – \$108 694
- Export Development Manager – \$142 850
- Export Development Officer (2) – \$118 571
- International Business Development Manager – \$142 850
- International Project Coordinator – \$108 694
- Manager, Trade – \$142 850
- Manager, Trade Programs and Business Improvement – \$142 850
- Principal HR Business Partner – \$132 902
- Principal Project Officer – \$132 902
- Program Manager, Online Services – \$132 902
- Senior Grant Development Officer – \$132 902.'

**GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING**

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment):** I have been advised the following:

1. Table 1 shows the Department for Trade and Investment FTEs to provide communication and promotion activities for the period 2020-21 to 2024-25:

Table 1: FTE employed in communication and promotion activities

2020-21 Actual	2021-22 Budget	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate
17.6 FTE	16 FTE	16 FTE	16 FTE	16 FTE
\$2.078 million	\$2.064 million	\$2.079 million	\$2.110 million	\$2.141 million

The Department for Trade and Investment's total cost of government-paid advertising, including campaigns, across all mediums in 2020-21 was \$760 636. Budgeted cost for advertising in 2021-22 is \$778 229.

**PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES**

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment):** I have been advised the following:

1. During the 2020-21 financial year, the Department for Trade and Investment had two employees in receipt of an attraction and retention allowance. The total cost of the allowances was \$13 029.'

Employee Title	Allowance Type	Actual Amount paid to employee between 1/7/2020 and 30/6/2021
Manager, Trade	Attraction	\$12 047
Manager, Market Development	Retention	\$982

**MINISTERIAL STAFF**

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment):** I have been advised the following in relation to staff employed within my office:

1. Under section 71 of the Public Sector Act 2009, information on ministerial staff employed as at 16 July 2021 was published in the *Government Gazette*.

The following table lists public sector staff employed as at 30 June 2021. As at 30 June 2021 the ASO2 administrative officer position was vacant.

Title	ASO Classification	Non- salary benefits
Office Manager	ASO8	Car park
Principal Communications and Engagement Officer	ASO7	Car park
Ministerial Liaison, Cabinet and Parliamentary Officer	ASO6	
Executive Officer to the Minister	ASO5	
Senior Business Support Officer	ASO4	
Business Support Officer	ASO3	
Administration Officer	ASO2	

**TERMINATION PAYOUTS**

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment):** I have been advised the following:

1. Since 1 July 2020, the Department for Trade and Investment had no executive terminations or redundancies pursuant to section 44(1) of the Public Sector Act 2009 ('PS Act').

**PUBLIC SECTOR EXECUTIVES**

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment):** I have been advised the following:

1. Since 1 July 2020, the following new executive appointments were made within the Department for Trade and Investment.

Agency	Role Title	TRPV
DTI	Director, Defence	SAES1
DTI	Director, Health and Medical Industries	SAES1
DTI	Director, International Markets	SAES1

The total annual employment cost for these appointments is \$577 260 (excluding on costs).'

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.

**GRANT PROGRAMS**

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment):** In response to questions 14 and 15 I have been advised the following:

1. The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2020-21 and across the forward estimates for the Department for Trade and Investment:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2020-21 Budget \$000	2021-22 Budget \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000
Economic Investment Fund *	Was available for investment projects to deliver significant strategic and economic benefits for the state, where there was a case for public support of private project, and when competing with other jurisdictions (national and international) to attract investment.	6 466	3 800	910	450	150
SA Landing Pad *	Attract international and interstate early-stage and established companies with transformational and high-growth potential and job creation across priority industries.	1 660	1 160	1 180	-	-
Global Expansion Program *	Support high-growth, export-ready South Australian businesses to build their export capability and capacity.	900	650	500	-	-
SA Export Accelerator Program – eCommerce Accelerator Program *	Support eligible South Australian companies to pursue international market development opportunities through eCommerce platforms.	823	120	-	-	-
SA Export Accelerator Program *	Support eligible South Australian companies to pursue international market development opportunities.	802	823	843	864	886

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2020-21 Budget \$000	2021-22 Budget \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000
Wine Strategy *	Promote SA wine producers through online retail promotion	502	-	-	-	-
SA Export Accelerator Program – Bushfire Relief *	Assist South Australian exporters affected by the bushfires maintain their export markets.	200	-	-	-	-
Health Industries Fund *	Was available to attract international and interstate companies in the life sciences sector to commence or expand operations in South Australia.	100	-	-	-	-
International Research Co-op Shandong	Support the establishment and operation of China-Australia Joint International Laboratories which support the parties' participation in a series of independent research and cooperation projects to develop world leading technology innovations.	100	-	-	-	-
StudyAdelaide	Supports StudyAdelaide to promote Adelaide as a destination for international students and implement events and activities to enhance international students' experience during their study time in South Australia.	2 644	2 500	2 500	2 500	2 500
Food SA	Support development of the food and beverage industry through Food South Australia (Food SA).	1 000	960	1 000	1 025	1 051
Discretionary Grants	Assist various organisations in South Australia.	5 242	8 583	1 159	1 164	1 049
<b>Total</b>		<b>20 439</b>	<b>18 596</b>	<b>8 092</b>	<b>6 003</b>	<b>5 636</b>

\* Classified as major grant program open for applications which are assessed against established grant program criteria and eligibility requirements and not specific, targeted grant agreements with one organisation or minor grants and sponsorships.

The following table details the new commitments of grants in 2020-21 for the Department for Trade and Investment:

Grant program / fund name	Recipient	Purpose	Value \$'000
SA Export Accelerator Program – eCommerce Accelerator Program	Various	Provides funding to eligible South Australian companies to pursue international market development opportunities through eCommerce platforms.	1 462
SA Landing Pad	Various	To attract international and interstate early-stage and established companies with transformational and high-growth potential and job creation across priority industries.	1 160
Global Expansion Program	Various	Provides funding to support high-growth, export-ready South Australian businesses to build their export capability and capacity.	1 000
SA Export Accelerator Program	Various	Provides funding to eligible South Australian companies to pursue international market development opportunities.	497
SA Export Accelerator Program – Bushfire Relief	Various	To assist South Australian exporters affected by the bushfires maintain their export markets	90
<b>Total</b>			<b>4 209</b>

The following table details the carryover of grants from 2020-21 into 2021-22 as part of the state budget for the Department for Trade and Investment:

Grant/program name	2020-21 \$000	2021-22 \$000
Destination Adelaide – ICEF ANZA Conference	-46	46

The following table details the 2020-21 actual payments made from the Department for Trade and Investment.

Grant program / fund name	Recipient	2020-21 Actual Payment \$'000
<b>Grants Paid to Non-SA Government Entities</b>		
SA Export Accelerator Program – eCommerce Accelerator Program	Various	1 371
Food SA	Food South Australia Inc	1 000
Global Expansion Program	Various	630
Wine Strategy	Various	498
SA Export Accelerator Program	Various	481
SA Landing Pad	Various	266
SA Export Accelerator Program – Bushfire Relief	Various	127
National Trade Program	Export Council of Australia	48
Discretionary Grants	Various	33
Sub-Total		4 454
<b>Grants Paid to SA Government Entities</b>		
StudyAdelaide	StudyAdelaide	2 644
Economic Investment Fund	South Australian Financing Authority	2 093
Discretionary Grants (SA Government)	Various	1 103
Sub-Total		5 840
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>10 294</b>

The following table details the actual and budgeted payments into the grant fund for the Department for Trade and Investment. The department has not included appropriation funding direct from the Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF), funding passed on from DTF through the Jobs and Economic Growth Fund, Community and Job Support Fund, or recovery of grants that did not proceed in the response to part d.

Grant program/fund name	2020-21 Actual result \$000	2021-22 Budget \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000
Economic Investment Fund	50	-	-	-	-

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment):** I have been advised the following:

The government has provided a list of grant programs administered by the Department for Trade and Investment during 2020-21 in the response to omnibus question 14.

#### MACHINERY OF GOVERNMENT CHANGES

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment):** I have been advised the following:

The Department for Trade and Investment has not had any machinery of government changes since 1 July 2020.

**GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS**

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment):** I have been advised the following:

There have been no new sections to the Department for Trade and Investment established since 1 July 2020.

**AGENT GENERAL**

In reply to **the Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment):** I have been advised the following:

The 2020-21 financial statements will not be fully finalised until 30 September 2021. They will be publicly available in the 2020-21 annual report, once laid before parliament.

**COVID-19 QUARANTINE FACILITIES**

In reply to **the Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment):** I have been advised the following:

The Department for Trade and Investment, SA Health, South Australia Police and Flight Training Adelaide (FTA) have worked together to develop an operational plan for the site to ensure it satisfies SA Health and SA Police quarantine compliance standards.

This plan has been approved by the Chief Public Health Officer for South Australia.

Flight Training Adelaide will operate the Parafield quarantine facility as a commercial service provider and will be totally responsible for operation of the site. The site will be governed by a Quarantine Compliance Agreement with SA Health.

Security and health services will be provided by service contractors approved by SA Health and SA Police, the quantity and capability of the services will be governed by the Quarantine Compliance Agreement.

SA Health and SA Police will have a constant presence at the Parafield quarantine facility, their role will be to oversee adherence to the compliance agreement.

**TRADE AND INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT**

In reply to **the Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment):** I have been advised the following:

The increase in budgeted investing expenditure for the office relocation and refurbishment project of \$311 000 in 2020-21 relates to the capitalisation of approved ICT project expenditure (\$19 000) and a revision to the scope of the project (\$292 000), including the replacement of workstations which were found to be at the end of their useful life and did not provide the most efficient layout or footprint.

The additional investing cost of \$292 000 was funded from the operating savings made on the new lease (annual operating expenditure savings of around \$500 000) and included:

- \$5715 – professional fees
- \$5600 – automated access door to assist mobility impaired staff
- \$252 500 – replacement of workstations and partitions; and
- \$28 185 – other minor adjustments to the scope of works.

**GOODS AND SERVICES**

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised the following:

The Department for Child Protection's supplies and services budget for 2021-22 and estimated budgets across the forward estimates are provided below:

	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
	Budget	Budget	Budget	Budget	Budget
		Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate
	\$000	\$000	\$000	\$000	\$000

	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Supplies and services	400,125	417,676	432,563	444,654	455,768

The top 10 providers of supplies and services for the financial year 2020-21 and the cost for these supplies and services were as follows:

Supplier	Total Value GST Exclusive	Service Description
HenderCare Foundation	\$48,582,058	\$35,909,748 relates to agency staffing and remaining to OOHC placement services
Baptist Care SA Inc	\$32,436,458	\$11,592,664 relates to agency staffing and remaining to OOHC placement services
Aboriginal Family Support Services	\$24,436,256	OOHC placement services, OOHC placement support services, Advocacy and Support services, family reunification services, carer assessment services, family group conferencing
Supplier	Total Value GST Exclusive	Service Description
Junction Australia Ltd	\$15,111,810	OOHC placement services, OOHC placement support services
Life Without Barriers	\$14,022,685	OOHC placement services
Minda Incorporated	\$13,444,038	OOHC placement services
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	\$13,206,681	Office accommodation rental, AGFMA fees, cleaning, car park rental, electricity and alarm monitoring
Anglican Community Care Inc	\$11,434,084	OOHC placement support services, OOHC placement services, reunification services
Anglicare SA Inc	\$10,932,438	OOHC placement support services, Family reunification services
Key Assets Australia	\$10,215,864	OOHC placement support services

The value of the goods and services supplied to the department by South Australian suppliers is approximately \$322 million in 2020-21.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised the following:

Between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021, the following roles with a total estimated cost (inclusive of base salary and employer superannuation) of \$100,000 or more were abolished within the Department for Child Protection.

Position No	Position Title	Classification	Estimated Cost
P14445	Principal Project Manager, Financial Recovery	MAS300	\$131,911
P18430	Senior Investigator	ASO700	\$120,567
P04354	Facilitator of Learning	ASO600	\$101,598
P18423	WHS Policy Officer	ASO600	\$107,467
P27149	Data Warehouse Developer	ASO600	\$104,532
P14195	Information Analyst	ASO600	\$107,467
P14196	Information Analyst	ASO600	\$107,467
P30691	Senior Project Officer	ASO600	\$101,598
P29449	Principal Project Officer OOHC	ASO800	\$129,662
P04645	Facilitator of Learning	ASO600	\$101,598
P27739	Lead Project Officer—Incident Management	ASO700	\$117,534
P31667	Manager, Operations	MAS300	\$113,119
P06919	Information Analyst	ASO600	\$107,467

Position No	Position Title	Classification	Estimated Cost
P32450	Senior Project Officer	ASO600	\$107,467
P30278	Principal Project Officer	ASO800	\$129,662
P12584	Manager, Practice Strategy	MAS300	\$131,911
P05350	Principal Business Manager	ASO800	\$129,662
P27747	Information Systems Lead	ASO600	\$107,467
P05617	Team Leader, Subpoena	ASO600	\$107,467
P05329	Principal Business Manager	ASO800	\$129,662
P04595	Principal Clinical Psychologist	AHP400	\$117,937
P30076	Senior Project Officer	ASO600	\$107,467

Between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021, the following roles with a total estimated cost (inclusive of base salary and employer superannuation) of \$100,000 or more were created within the Department for Child Protection.

Position No	Position Title	Classification	Estimated Cost
P34388	Business Analyst	ASO600	\$107,467
P34389	Business Analyst	ASO600	\$107,467
P32620	Supervisor	AHP300	\$107,482
P12544	Clinical Lead	AHP400	\$117,937
P12546	Clinical Lead	AHP400	\$117,937
P36148	Contract Manager	ASO600	\$101,598
P34200	Data And Business Analyst	ASO600	\$101,598
P34614	Data Governance Lead	ASO700	\$111,536
P34153	Lead Clinician	AHP300	\$115,287
P34847	Lead Project Officer	ASO700	\$120,567
P34539	Manager Residential Care	MAS300	\$131,911
P34148	Manager, Therapeutic Carer Support Team	AHP400	\$120,924
P32628	Practice Lead(Practice Approach & Alcohol & Other Drugs)	AHP400	\$124,288
P32619	Principal Project Officer	ASO800	\$124,945
P35154	Principal Social Worker	AHP400	\$124,288
P34201	Project Manager	ASO800	\$124,945
P33349	Residential Property Procurement & Commission Lead	ASO700	\$114,615
P33623	Rostering System Administrator	ASO600	\$107,467
P33625	Rostering System Administrator	ASO600	\$101,598
P34815	Senior Briefing Officer	ASO600	\$104,532
P34202	Senior Business Analyst	ASO700	\$111,536
P37042	Lead Clinician	AHP300	\$114,204
P37100	Lead Clinician	AHP300	\$115,287
P36237	Senior Project Officer	ASO600	\$101,598
P33272	Lead Project Officer	ASO700	\$111,536
P36101	Senior Policy Officer	ASO600	\$107,467
P36559	SILS Coordinator	AHP300	\$107,482
P32633	Strategic Contracts Officer	ASO700	\$114,615
P33733	Supervisor	AHP300	\$107,482
P36372	Supervisor	AHP300	\$115,287
P33717	Supervisor—Protective Intervention	AHP300	\$107,482

Position No	Position Title	Classification	Estimated Cost
P33611	Supervisor Practice Development	ASO700	\$111,536
P35222	Transition from Residential Care, Disability Coordinator	AHP300	\$115,287

#### GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised the following:

The average actual FTE for 2020-2021 in relation to the Communications and Engagement Unit was 5.7 FTE with total employee benefits expenditure of \$667,567. The unit's employees cover the discrete functions of internal communications, external communications, media enquiries (including social media), online communications (website and other digital platforms), as well as a manager.

5.0 FTE is budgeted to provide communication and promotion activities for 2021-22 with an expenditure budget of \$610,491.

The total expenditure on government-paid advertising, including carer recruitment and information campaigns, across all mediums in 2020-21 was \$35,539 with associated budget for 2021-22 of \$34,000.

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 **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised the following:

Position Type	Award Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
Lands Based Worker	OPS5	Attraction Allowance	\$1,902
Lands Based Worker	OPS5	Retention Allowance	\$1,779
Lead Clinician	AHP3	Retention Allowance	\$299
Lead Practitioner	AHP5	Retention Allowance	\$8,069
Lead Practitioner	AHP5	Retention Allowance	\$3,082
Manager	MAS3	Attraction Allowance	\$2,078
Manager	AHP5	Retention Allowance	\$323
Manager	MAS3	Retention Allowance	\$924
Manager	MAS3	Retention Allowance	\$5,488
Manager	MAS3	Attraction Allowance	\$15,934
Manager	MAS3	Retention Allowance	\$9,201
Manager	ASO7	Attraction Allowance	\$4,248
Manager	MAS3	Retention Allowance	\$647
Manager	MAS3	Retention Allowance	\$19,259
Manager	MAS3	Attraction Allowance	\$1,457
Manager	MAS3	Retention Allowance	\$575
Manager	MAS3	Attraction Allowance	\$2,291
Manager	MAS3	Retention Allowance	\$12,008
Manager	MAS3	Retention Allowance	\$554
Manager	ASO8	Retention Allowance	\$4,540
Manager	MAS3	Retention Allowance	\$19,475
Manager	MAS3	Attraction Allowance	\$24,016

Position Type	Award Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
Manager	ASO8	Attraction Allowance	\$10,442
Manager	MAS3	Retention Allowance	\$24,016
Manager	MAS3	Attraction Allowance	\$739
Manager	MAS3	Retention Allowance	\$647
Manager	MAS3	Attraction Allowance	\$12,008
Manager	MAS3	Retention Allowance	\$23,093
Position Type	Award Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
Principal Psychologist	AHP4	Retention Allowance	\$991
Principal Psychologist	AHP4	Retention Allowance	\$2,967
Principal Psychologist	AHP4	Retention Allowance	\$12,851
Psychologist	AHP2	Retention Allowance	\$4,399
Psychologist	AHP2	Retention Allowance	\$8,799
Psychologist	AHP2	Retention Allowance	\$10,116
Psychologist	AHP2	Retention Allowance	\$4,925
Senior Practitioner	AHP2	Retention Allowance	\$171
Senior Practitioner	AHP2	Retention Allowance	\$1,976
Senior Psychologist	AHP3	Retention Allowance	\$7,263
Senior Psychologist	AHP3	Retention Allowance	\$3,613
Senior Psychologist	AHP3	Retention Allowance	\$3,136
Senior Psychologist	AHP3	Retention Allowance	\$28
Senior Social Worker	AHP2	Attraction Allowance	\$159
Senior Solicitor	LE04	Attraction Allowance	\$861
Social Worker	AHP1	Attraction Allowance	\$86
Social Worker	AHP2	Attraction Allowance	\$1,411
Social Worker	AHP2	Retention Allowance	\$988
Solicitor	LE03	Retention Allowance	\$4,831
Supervisor	AHP3	Retention Allowance	\$231
Supervisor	AHP3	Retention Allowance	\$4,238
Supervisor	AHP3	Retention Allowance	\$9,902
Supervisor	AHP3	Retention Allowance	\$4,037
Supervisor	OPS5	Retention Allowance	\$4,792
			\$301,864

Further, between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021, \$340,114 of non-salary benefits was paid to public servants.

Benefit Type	Amount
Motor vehicle	\$181,654
Housing benefits	\$32,285
Car parking	\$26,900
Expense payments	\$89,126
Other non-cash benefits	\$10,149
Total	\$340,114

**MINISTERIAL STAFF**

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised the following in relation to staff employed within my office:

- Information on ministerial staff employed as at 16 July 2021 was published in the *Government Gazette* on 22 July 2021.
- The following table lists public sector staff employed as at 30 June 2021.

Title	ASO Classification	Base Salary at 30 June 2021
Manager, OMCP	ASO7	\$107,337
Ministerial Liaison Officer	ASO6	\$92,784
Ministerial Liaison Officer	ASO6	\$92,784
Executive Assistant to MCP	ASO5	\$80,830
Senior Administration Officer	ASO3	\$63,681

**TERMINATION PAYOUTS**

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised the following:

No executive terminations occurred between 1 July 2020 and 6 August 2021 within the Department for Child Protection.

**PUBLIC SECTOR EXECUTIVES**

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised the following:

There were no changes in the number of established executive positions in the Department for Child Protection during the 20-21 financial year.

Between 1 July 2020 and 6 August 2021, two executive appointments were made to vacant roles within the Department for Child Protection, with an annual salary and total employment cost (at 6 August 2021) as follows:

Role Title	Annual Salary	Total Remuneration Package Value
Director, Legal Services	\$174,958	\$192,454
Regional Director, South	\$177,794	\$195,573

**GRANT PROGRAMS**

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** In response to Question 14, I have been advised the following:

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2020-21 and across the forward estimates for the Department for Child Protection:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2020-21 Actual result \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000
Research into Harmful Sexual Behaviours	To enable the Australian Centre for Child Protection (ACCP) to undertake a program of work comprising research and research translation activities that improve South Australian responses to harmful sexual behaviours (HSB) in children and young people.	500				
Family Matters (SA) Campaign	Further the aims of the Family Matters Campaign in South Australia and support collaboration with the SA Government on implementation of Family Matters related activity.	190	182			

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2020-21 Actual result \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000
Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2020-21 Actual result \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000
CAFFSA (Child and Family Focus SA) Policy Officer	Engage a Policy Officer to undertake policy activity that will support the child and family services sector (child protection).	100	100			
Create Foundation Engaging Children and Young People	For CREATE to develop a pathway for engagement with children and young people and a strategy to promote the views of young people through appropriate communications channels.	65				
NAIDOC SA - Community Events	To fund NAIDOC SA community events that celebrate and recognise the achievements, culture and language of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. The event also provides an opportunity for Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal participants to engage from across the state.	25	25			
Care Leavers Australia Network	Provision of services to South Australian Care Leavers including helping members access counselling, access files and records, contact other services including support with Centrelink and housing.	15	15			
Healthy Development Adelaide funding partnership	Healthy Development Adelaide (HDA) was established in 2004 as an initiative of the University of Adelaide and seeks to link research, service delivery and policy development in the physical, psychological and social health of infants, children and adolescents. The organisation is supported by a partnership of South Australian (SA) organisations including DCP in recognition of the role of HDA in leading emerging child and youth research and connecting research, policy and practice.	8	3			
The Karen Fitzgerald Fund promotional video	The Karen Fitzgerald Fund is a community-based volunteer group established in honour of South Australia pioneer of child protection services, Karen Fitzgerald, to continue her legacy as a champion of children's safety and rights. The grant was to fund the production of a new promotional video to depict who Karen Fitzgerald was and the relationships between Flinders Foundation and The Karen Fitzgerald Fund.	3				

The following table details the carryover of grants from 2020-21 into 2021-22 for the Department for Child Protection:

Grant/program name	2020-21 \$000	2021-22 \$000
N/A	-	-

### Grant Programs

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

The following table provides a breakdown of all grants paid by the Department for Child Protection for the period of 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021.

Grant program/fund name	Recipient	Total grant paid in 2020-2021 (GST exclusive) \$000	Payment Date	Execution Date
Research into Harmful Sexual Behaviours	University of South Australia	500	16/06/2021	Jun-21
Family Matters (SA) Campaign	Child and Family Welfare Association of SA	186	23/10/2020 & 05/02/2021	Oct-20 & Jan-21
NAIDOC SA—Community Events	NAIDOC SA INC	25	17/02/2021	Nov-20
Care Leavers Australia Network	Care Leavers Australia Network	15	27/01/2021	Jan-21
Healthy Development Adelaide funding partnership	University of Adelaide	8	14/10/2020 & 10/02/2021	Sep-20
The Karen Fitzgerald Fund promotional video	Flinders Foundation	3	21/04/2021	Mar-21

### MACHINERY OF GOVERNMENT CHANGES

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised the following:

There were no machinery of government changes that impacted the Department for Child Protection in 2020-21.

### GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised the following:

There have been no new sections established within the Department for Child Protection during 2020-21.

### CHILD PROTECTION

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

Officers within the Department for Child Protection (DCP) work closely with SA Police on any police investigations that may involve children or young people in care or with whom the department is otherwise engaged. As part of these investigations, DCP staff may, from time to time, be shown relevant CCTV footage.

### CHILD PROTECTION

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

As the number of Aboriginal babies involved is small, the Department for Child Protection (DCP) is not in a position to provide a figure for 2020-21, as this would risk identifying vulnerable Aboriginal families.

**CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT, PORT LINCOLN**

In reply to **Ms HILDYARD (Reynell)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

The Department for Child Protection (DCP) monitors and reports on missing persons report data for children and young people in care at a state level. A proportion of each year's reports relate to children and young people living in Port Lincoln.

**INNOVATION AND SKILLS DEPARTMENT**

In reply to **the Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay)** (4 August 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** I have been advised:

Eight (8) staff are presently engaged in the administration of employer-sponsored and skilled migration programs.

This number represents an increase of one (1) person when compared to 30 June 2019 and 30 June 2020.

There has been no decrease.

**DESIGNATED AREA MIGRATION AGREEMENTS**

In reply to **the Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay)** (4 August 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** I have been advised:

In 2020-21 my department received endorsement applications from 27 South Australian employers under the state's Designated Area Migration Agreements (DAMAs).

**DESIGNATED AREA MIGRATION AGREEMENTS**

In reply to **the Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay)** (4 August 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** I have been advised:

As at Friday 13 August 2021, no state or commonwealth government departments have applied for South Australia's Designated Area Migration Agreements.

**DESIGNATED AREA MIGRATION AGREEMENTS**

In reply to **Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham)** (4 August 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** I have been advised:

The reference to the increase in age limit to 35 applies to the youth mobility schemes of each country (i.e. Working Holiday Maker program in Australia) not employer-sponsored visas under an SA DAMA.

The South Australian government is aware that commitments in the mobility chapter of the Australia-United Kingdom Free Trade Agreement (FTA) negotiations: agreement in principle document will allow for companies to sponsor visas committed in the FTA without first having to prove that a national of the country in question could not be hired to do the job, through the reciprocal removal of economic needs tests.

The state government is not aware of which visas will be committed in the FTA and whether or not it will apply to the DAMAs, as this is a commonwealth government arrangement.

**TAUONDI**

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (4 August 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** I have been advised:

Through the three-year Workforce Development Support Grant (2017-2020), Tauondi Aboriginal College was asked to deliver a range of skills and employment targets. I have been advised that Tauondi did not meet all of those targets.

**TAUONDI**

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (4 August 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** I have been advised:

Latest NCVET data shows that South Australia has had the largest increase, in percentage terms, in Australia for Aboriginal apprentices and trainees in training, with an increase of 19.9 per cent as at 31 December 2020. The number of Aboriginal apprentices and trainees who commenced in South Australia, has also increased, by 12.6 per cent, again, the largest increase in the nation.

In 2020-21, the Department for Innovation and Skills provided funding support to Tauondi through peppercorn lease arrangements valued at approximately \$830,000 per annum and asset maintenance support of \$150,000 per annum. Funding support of around \$420,000 was also provided to Tauondi through:

1. Building capability projects to support Tauondi to develop course products for delivery in the training market.
2. Training priority projects to work with employers in identifying workforce needs and opportunities for Aboriginal people as a basis for further project activity by Tauondi.
3. Funding for the delivery of learner support services by Tauondi for Aboriginal VET students.
4. Funding to engage business and commercial development expertise to support Tauondi's future development.

The commonwealth government has provided Tauondi with funding support for foundation skills delivery in the order of \$800,000.

Tauondi was able to access funding through the Subsidised Training List, the \$200 million Skilling South Australia program and the \$138 million JobTrainer program.

Very strong progress has been made by the Marshall government to lift participation of Aboriginal people in paid apprenticeships and traineeships, leading to rewarding careers.

Through the Marshall government's public sector Skilling South Australia project, we are providing more opportunities for young Aboriginal students to work in paid traineeships across the public service.

Rikiesha Miller was recently awarded 2021 Skilling SA Public Sector Outstanding Aboriginal Trainee. She undertook a paid traineeship in the Attorney-General's Department and was supported with her studies at Tauondi College.

The department is continuing to explore opportunities with Tauondi to increase its delivery of training and related services.

#### SKILLS TRAINING

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (4 August 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** I have been advised:

Tauondi is one of nearly 70 training providers, including TAFE SA, delivering vocational education and training (VET) courses to Aboriginal students in South Australia.

The South Australian government supports three training providers to deliver government subsidised training which are Aboriginal-owned and operated.

These training providers are:

1. Aboriginal Health Council of South Australia
2. Carey Training
3. Tauondi Aboriginal College.

#### GOODS AND SERVICES

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (4 August 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** I have been advised the following:

For the Department for Innovation and Skills, the budgeted expenditure on goods and services for the financial year 2021-20 and each of the years of the forward estimates period is as follows:

	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25	25-26
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Total goods and services	15,877	12,267	11,564	12,715	12,969

No goods and services expenditure has been budgeted for the Department for Innovation and Skills – Administered Items.

The top 10 providers of goods and services for the financial year 2020-21 and the cost for these goods and services were as follows:

Supplier	Total Value
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	\$4,838,317
Wavemaker	\$1,505,010
Data 3 Ltd	\$670,971
Rural Business Support Service	\$350,000

Supplier	Total Value
NEC IT Services Australia Pty Ltd	\$340,315
PricewaterhouseCoopers	\$307,243
Sideways Theory	\$292,504
Hays Specialist Recruitment	\$282,950
Frame Creative Pty Ltd	\$275,880
Taptu Pty Ltd	\$268,724

The top ten providers of goods and services for the financial year 2020-21 and the description of these goods and services is as follows:

Supplier	Description
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	Office accommodation provided under Memoranda of Administrative Arrangement.
Wavemaker	Marketing costs for various government initiatives including Skilling South Australia.
Data 3 Ltd	Software licencing and IT devices.
Rural Business Support Service	Provision of services to support small businesses impacted by 2019-20 bushfires.
NEC IT Services Australia Pty Ltd	Network support and server.
PricewaterhouseCoopers	To provide analysis and advice on VET Strategic Market Development planning and review of the 'Upfront Assessment of Need' process to support future delivery.
Sideways Theory	Marketing costs for various government initiatives including Skilling South Australia.
Hays Specialist Recruitment	Temporary labour hire.
Frame Creative Pty Ltd	Redevelopment of the Skills and Business digital ecosystem.
Taptu Pty Ltd	Provision of enterprise and solution architecture services to support DIS systems.

No goods and services expenditure was incurred for the Department for Innovation and Skills – Administered Items in 2020-21.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (4 August 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** I have been advised the following:

Between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021, there were two executive roles abolished within the Department for Innovation and Skills. They were:

- Director, Client Services (SAES1)
- Chief Digital and Data Officer (SAES1)

The total employment cost for these two roles during this period was \$311,059 (including payroll tax).

During this period there were eight executive roles created. They were:

- Project Director, Enterprise Change (SAES1)
- Director, Cyber Security and Hi Tech (SAES1)
- Director, Corporate and Commercial (SAES 1)
- Director, Information, Technology and Asset Services (SAES 1)
- Lead Architect (SAES 1)
- Director, Skills Policy Reform (SAES 1)
- Director, Skills and Workforce Projects (SAES 1)
- Director, Client Services and Migration (SAES 1)

The Project Director, Enterprise Change and Lead Architect have been created as short-term roles (one and two years respectively) to address specific Departmental priorities in respect to critical projects.

The total employment cost for these eight roles during this period was \$1,193,047 (including payroll tax).

**GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING**

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (4 August 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** I have been advised the following:

Table 1 shows the Department for Innovation and Skills' total FTE, actual and budgeted, to provide communication and promotion activities for the period 2020-21 to 2024-25:

Table 1: FTE employed in communication and promotion activities

		2020-21 Actual	2021-22 Budget	2022-23 Budget	2023-24 Budget	2024-25 Budget
Strategic Communications	FTE	7.4	7.3	6.3	6.3	6.3
	\$m	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9
<b>Total</b>	FTE	7.4	7.3	6.3	6.3	6.3
	\$m	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9

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 BOYER (Wright)** (4 August 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** I have been advised the following, as per policy changes implemented under Labor in 2009:

Employee Title	Branch	Allowance Type	Date Range paid for	Actual Amount paid to employee between 1/7/2020 and 30/6/2021
Business Development Manager	Innovation and Science	Retention	1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021	\$16,605
Deputy Director, Strategic Policy	Strategy, Policy and People	Retention	1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021	\$19,367
Manager, Risk and Performance	Performance and Business Operations	Retention	1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021	\$11,841
Manager, Analytics and Systems	Skills and Workforce Capability	Attraction	6 July 2020 to 30 June 2021	\$7,534
Senior Case Manager	Strategy, Policy and People	Attraction	1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021	\$5,000
Manager, Client Engagement	Strategy, Policy and People	Retention	1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021	\$22,000

Non-salary benefits provided to public servants include those provided for vehicles, car parks and educational expenses for HECS supported courses. The total taxable value of non-salary benefits provided to public servants was \$20,905 (total grossed up taxable value of \$42,674) for the period 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021 which is in line with the fringe benefits tax (FBT) reporting year.

This excludes the taxable value of non-salary benefits provided as part of the total remuneration package value (TRPV) for executives. The amounts disclosed for car parks below are provided for vehicles hired by the department from LeasePlan.

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Amount
Chief Executive	EXECOF	Car Park	\$1,973
Chief Executive, Office of the Training and Skills Commission	SAES 2	Vehicle and Car Park	\$1,973
Director, Skills and Workforce Projects	SAES 1	Vehicle	\$4,657

Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Amount
Director, Strategic Policy and Projects	SAES 1	Car Park and Vehicle	\$1,973
Director, Traineeship and Apprenticeship Services	SAES 1	Car Park and Vehicle	\$1,973
Executive Assistant	ASO6	Car Park	\$1,110
Executive Director, Strategy Policy and Migration	SAES 2	Car Park and Vehicle	\$1,973
Principal Consultant Governance and Advice	ASO8	Educational Expense	\$3,225
Principal Stakeholder Engagement Policy Officer	ASO8	Educational Expense	\$959
Senior Skills Adviser	ASO7	Vehicle	\$1,089

#### MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (4 August 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** I have been advised the following in relation to staff employed within my office:

- Information on ministerial staff employed as at 16 July 2021 was published in the *Government Gazette* on 22 July 2021.
- The following table lists public sector staff employed as at 30 June 2021.

Title	ASO Classification	Non- salary benefits
Office Manager	AS07	
Executive Officer to the Minister	AS06	
Ministerial Liaison Officer	AS06	
Cabinet and Parliamentary Liaison Officer	AS05	
Digital Communications Officer	AS05	
Business Support Officer	AS03	
Trainee (Business Support Officer)	AS02	

#### MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (4 August 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** I have been advised the following in relation to staff employed within my office:

- Information on ministerial staff employed as at 16 July 2021 was published in the *Government Gazette* on 22 July 2021.
- The following table lists public sector staff employed as at 30 June 2021.

Title	ASO Classification	Non- salary benefits
Office Manager	AS07	
Executive Officer to the Minister	AS06	
Ministerial Liaison Officer	AS06	
Cabinet and Parliamentary Liaison Officer	AS05	
Digital Communications Officer	AS05	
Business Support Officer	AS03	
Trainee (Business Support Officer)	AS02	

#### TERMINATION PAYOUTS

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (4 August 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** I have been advised the following:

Nil executive terminations have occurred since 1 July 2020, for all agencies reporting to the Minister for Innovation and Skills.

#### PUBLIC SECTOR EXECUTIVES

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (4 August 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** I have been advised the following:

Since 1 July 2020 the following new executive appointments were made within the Department for Innovation and Skills. Some appointments were made to existing vacated roles.

Role Title	SAES Level
Project Director, Enterprise Change	SAES 1
Director, Cyber Security and High Tech	SAES 1
Director, Corporate and Commercial	SAES 1
Director, Information, Technology and Asset Services	SAES 1
Lead Architect	SAES 1
Executive Director, Innovation and Science	SAES 1
Director, Skills Policy Reform	SAES 1
Chief Operating Officer, Office of the South Australia Chief Entrepreneur	SAES 1
Director, Skills and Workforce Projects	SAES 1
Director, Client Services and Migration	SAES 1
Chief Executive, Department for Innovation and Skills	CE
Director, Small Business	SAES1

The total remuneration package value (TRPV) for these executive appointments is \$2,715,439 (excluding payroll tax). This is including the chief executive's TRPV of \$360,000.

I have been advised that the Department of Premier and Cabinet Policy PC027 – Disclosure of Government Contracts Clause 21 prohibits the disclosure of the TRPV of executive employees (excluding the chief executives).

For this reason, the details of TRPV for other positions will not be disclosed as it is considered an unreasonable disclosure of personal affairs. I have been advised that this has been the case since December 2005.

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (4 August 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** In response to questions 14 and 15 I have been advised the following:

Department for Innovation and Skills

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2020-21 and across the forward estimates for the Department for Innovation and Skills—Controlled:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2020-21 Actual result \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000
Adelaide Film Festival	Operational funding for Adelaide Film Festival.	1,084	1,110	1,126	1,133	1,140
Adult Community Education (ACE)	Grants paid to ACE providers to deliver foundation skills training (literacy, numeracy, digital literacy and employability skills) in accessible community settings.	739 (COVID impacts)	1,984	1,984	1,984	1,996
Australian Cyber Collaboration Centre (A3C)	To establish and support the A3C which support cyber start-ups, scale-ups and existing enterprises to launch new products and services to global markets.	1,390	1,780	430	—	—
Australian Institute of Machine Learning	Build on research strengths in machine learning. It is the first machine learning institute in Australia.	1,000	1,300	—	—	—

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2020-21 Actual result \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000
Boosting Business Investment Migration	To assist with achieving 1,000 business migrant nominations.	—	375	425	428	431
Bushfire Response—Small Business and Not for Profit grants	Provide up to \$50,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the 2019-20 South Australian bushfires. (short-term program responding to bushfires)	2,605	—	—	—	—
Bushfire Response—Small Business Loss of Income Grant	Provide up to \$10,000 for eligible small businesses impacted by the significant 2019-20 bushfires. (short-term program responding to bushfires)	2,140	—	—	—	—
Centre for Business Growth	Support the creation of a new position, the Playford Professor of Business Growth, and provide continued support for outreach activities included in the centre's Growing South Australian Companies program.	—	680	506	320	275
Defence Industry Workforce & Skills Action Plan	To partially fund the salary and other expenses associated with the Director Defence Industry Workforce and Skills.	375	—	—	—	—
EXCITE Strategy	To establish Innovation and Translation Intermediaries within South Australia's Innovation Districts and Neighbourhoods.	—	1,880	1,878	1,876	—
Gig City	Connect businesses within key innovation precincts with extremely fast broadband speeds of 1 gigabit per second and up to 10 gigabits per second available on request.	807	1,105	349	356	—
Government as First Customer (Go2Gov)	To support early-stage business to pitch their innovation product or service to state government agencies.	286	813	—	—	—
Jamfactory	Operational Funding for the Jamfactory.	950	1,075	1,087	1,093	1,100
JobTrainer National Partnership Agreement	To ensure job seekers can reskill and upskill for in-demand jobs, school leavers are provided a pathway into their careers, and businesses are able to get the skilled workers they need. (short-term program in response to COVID-19 impacts)	9,551	82,478	27,572	—	—
Live Music Venue Support	Live music venue grants to support the hosting of live music. Provided as a reimbursement of costs from 1 January 2021 to 30 June 2021 as part of the Arts Recovery Fund to fast track recovery in the South Australia's arts and Culture Sector. (short-term program in response to COVID-19 impacts)	458	—	—	—	—

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2020-21 Actual result \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000
Local Finance Management Scholarships	Scholarship program to provide post-graduate research opportunities in finance and related sectors by investing in research projects exploring new innovations, products or problems in the finance and fintech sectors.	—	250	—	—	—
Longitudinal Study	Funding for undertaking a Longitudinal Study over 5 years to assess the impact on former automotive workers as a result of the closure of GMH and Toyota.	200	200	200	—	—
Lot Fourteen/FIXE	Rental subsidies for the Innovation, Incubation, Start-Up and Growth Hub to be domiciled at Lot Fourteen.	1,630	1,669	—	—	—
Music Development Office	Facilitate the development of South Australia's music industry by supporting both creative and business development.	1,711	1,609	1,616	1,626	1,636
National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy	To support South Australian based NCRIS facilities through the purchase of new equipment and the upgrade of existing equipment.	4,159	3,784	3,675	462	462
National Infection Control Training Fund	To support the accelerated uptake of the new nationally accredited Infection Prevention and Control Training skills set (or equivalent nationally accredited training), for customer-facing employees in any industry. (short-term program in response to COVID-19 impacts)	329	—	—	—	—
Regional Jobs Support and Incentive program	To assist the urgent mobilisation of a seasonal and regional workforce to fill vacancies and boost employment access across South Australia in key industries and supply chains, over the next 6-12 months. (short-term program in response to COVID-19 impacts)	1,585	490	—	—	—
Research and Innovation Fund (formerly Research Commercialisation and Start-up Fund)	To support South Australian businesses to collaborate with researchers and universities to solve industrial problems, commercialise new products and services and attract research infrastructure investment into the state, as well as to encourage the establishment and growth of start-ups.	7,618	7,253	8,824	8,874	8,922
SA Film Corporation	Operational Funding for the SA Film Corporation.	4,839	6,506	6,604	6,702	6,848
SA Film Corporation – Video Games Development Rebate	Rebate Scheme to support the game development industry.	307	3,010	-	-	-

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2020-21 Actual result \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000
SA Film Corporation – Post-production, Digital and Visual Effects (PDV) Rebate Scheme	PDV Rebate Scheme to support the screen industry.	917	7,598	6,000	6,000	6,000
Science and Research Fund	Dedicated Research and Development funding to support the State's research community to compete successfully on a national and global scale.	1,650	100	—	—	—
Skilling South Australia	Fund to support a range of initiatives to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia through subsidised training and support services. (NP Agreement ends June 2022)	42,257	43,787	19,333	16,794	5,238
Small to Medium Enterprise (SME) Business Advisory Services Scheme	To assist small to medium enterprises in South Australia to access business advice to support the development of sustainable business strategies. (short-term program in response to COVID-19 impacts)	2,708	—	—	—	—
Tauondi	Review of business and commercial development capability to support program design towards delivering services that meet current and future training needs. (funding through peppercorn lease, maintenance programs and training continued)	190	-	-	-	-
TechInSA	Contribute to the development of South Australia's high-tech industry. (	211	—	—	—	—
Training Fund & other VET Support	Subsidies for TAFE SA and non-government training providers for the provision of VET and associated services.	264,536	261,407	264,680	260,209	247,010
Workforce Mobility and Micro Credential	To support the development and pilot of micro-credential training in priority sectors and also includes funding for the development of suitable online platforms. (pilot project)	2,737	—	—	—	—
TAFE SA Capital	Support provided to the TAFE SA Capital program.	19,176	24,080	20,109	12,179	12,484
Other minor grant payments	Various	499	154	-102	104	106

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2020-21 and across the forward estimates for the Department for Innovation and Skills – Administered Items:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2020-21 Actual result \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000	2022-23 Estimate \$000	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000
Student Transport Concessions	To support Student Transport Concessions. Payable to the Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT).	15,590	13,096	13,424	13,759	14,103

The following table details the carryover of grants from 2020-21 into 2021-22 for the Department for Innovation and Skills—Controlled:

Grant/Program Name	2020-21 \$000	2021-22 \$000
GigCity	-921	921

There were no carryovers of grants from 2020-21 into 2021-22 for the Department for Innovation and Skills – administered Items.

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (4 August 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** I have been advised the following:

The government has provided a list of grant programs paid by the Department for Innovation and Skills during 2020-21 in omnibus question 14.

#### SKILLS TRAINING

In reply to **Mr BELL (Mount Gambier)** (4 August 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** I have been advised:

This strategy led to an increase in apprentices and trainees over 2020.

The \$16 million VET Continuity package, which concluded June 2021, supported 92 RTOs contracted by the Department of Innovation and Skills to continue the delivery of training through COVID-19.

This investment enabled RTOs to develop new delivery models, retrain and upskill staff and access new technologies.

#### INNOVATION AND SKILLS DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (4 August 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** I have been advised:

The reduction of 10 FTE from the 2019-20 actual of 337 FTE to the 2021-22 budget of 327 FTE is primarily due to rightsizing the departments graduate program, from 11 FTE to 4 FTE, making it more sustainable in line with the department's size.

The projected FTE for the Department for Innovation and Skills over the forward estimates is provided below:

- 2022-23 estimate – 287 FTE
- 2023-24 estimate – 276 FTE
- 2024-25 estimate – 274 FTE

The FTE estimates are subject to change.