

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 14 October 2021

The **SPEAKER (Hon. D.R. Cregan)** 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.

### *Motions*

#### **STATE GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (11:01):** I move my motion in an amended form:

That this house establish a select committee to inquire into, assist and report upon the state government's response to the COVID-19 pandemic, including the management, implementation, policies, procedures, representation, consultation and operations of all agencies of the government engaged in that response, with particular regard to the following:

- (a) the management of COVID-19 outbreaks and clusters, including recent clusters;
- (b) COVID-19 restrictions, border controls and all cross-border issues;
- (c) the effectiveness, consistency and clarity of public communications relating to the government's COVID-19 response;
- (d) the operation and establishment of medi-hotels and other processes for quarantine and self-isolation;
- (e) the operation of the Emergency Management Act 2004, the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020 and related legislation;
- (f) the role and performance of the COVID-19 Transition Committee and the responsibility of ministers and portfolio agencies;
- (g) engagement with, and impacts on, key stakeholders relating to the government's COVID-19 response, including:
  - (i) regional communities;
  - (ii) multicultural communities;
  - (iii) business, agricultural, resources and export sectors;
  - (iv) the broader South Australian community; and
- (h) any other relevant matter relating to the government's response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

We are just adding the one extra word, 'assist', at the very beginning. I thought it was really important to add the extra word because what we are trying to be here is not be a problem to anyone but, rather, an adjunct, an extra pair of hands and eyes, as we move through these new times before us. As South Australians, we can sometimes be very hard on ourselves, particularly when we are the constant target of unfunny quips from the rest of the country and perhaps much wider, more often, and it can be very draining at times.

However, I firmly believe South Australia can be at the forefront of COVID and the COVID response. Particularly as a member of parliament, I would like to be involved and aware of what is going on, rather than waiting for media releases—not that that is necessarily an issue, because I know everyone in South Australia health is doing their very best, as is everybody in government. I think we can be an extra set of helpful people, particularly because parliament does committee work so well, and we can actually do something to assist in the forthcoming period of time.

Most of this year, I think South Australians have come to a new-found respect for and appreciation of this little corner of the country we call home as the effects of the pandemic and recession and instability more widely have rippled around the world in repeated waves. It is fair to say South Australians have been very proud of our public authorities, our health system and the way everyone has worked as hard as possible to get ahead of the curve.

The statistics speak for themselves: only four people have died from COVID-19 in South Australia since the pandemic commenced, and as at 11 October there have only been 913 cases. The government was quick to accept advice and focus on testing, and by mid-2020 we were already talking about the post-pandemic recovery and transition process. At this point, I must mention the extraordinary contribution of SA Pathology and all the testing staff at all the centres, who have worked under enormous pressure. I do not know how they did it, but we are so grateful to them for everything they did.

The Premier set up the Transition Committee, which over time has morphed into a very powerful group. The confidence of the public, though, is being tested by recent events such as the large number of people at the border waiting to come back into South Australia. In November 2020, a number of cases of local transmission of COVID-19 were identified, and a six-day turned three-day statewide lockdown was entered into. That was the Parafield cluster.

This was the genesis of my thinking around this committee. Seeing lines of people for 10 hours in the sun trying to get a COVID test, I just thought there must be some better way of doing things. At that time, some of my colleagues here may recall I tried to get that committee established through a suspension of standing orders, which was lost on a tied vote here in the house.

What started in Parafield as a few cases grew very quickly as contact tracing sprang into action and multiple locations across the metropolitan area were identified. By Sunday 15 November 2020, South Australia was in that six-day lockdown, which was a community pause. The lockdown ended early on 20 November because an individual had been found not to have been totally honest with contact tracers. We now know this was not an isolated case.

People involved in contact tracing are doing their very best to get the evidence and information they need from people who do not always understand or remember everything they have done. In itself, that is a problem, as some individuals, as did this particular person, have English as a second language, accentuating the barriers they have to overcome to make sure the contact tracing works as well as it can.

Then we heard about a student from Flinders University who was accused of breaking quarantine before that was exposed as being incorrect and an apology was duly made. Both this Flinders person and the earlier pizza person of the Parafield cluster were subjected to significant public abuse, creating obvious concerns. I do not want to dwell too much on the rest of all of that, but I think the next important fact in my thinking around all this was in July 2021 when the Modbury cluster was identified, causing a second seven-day statewide lockdown.

An 81-year-old man presented to Modbury Hospital on Sunday 18 July with respiratory systems and tested positive to the virus. The man and his daughter travelled from Buenos Aires. They stayed 14 days in a New South Wales hospital and returned to South Australia, being spared a 14-day quarantine period, which is normal and there is nothing untoward about all of that. But by Wednesday 21 July, South Australia had entered its first day of a lockdown, and a major hotspot, The Greek on Halifax, was identified. By the afternoon, the state had recorded six cases.

The Modbury cluster itself totalled 22 cases, none of them in Modbury, which has to be an absolute miracle because the man had walked around shopping centres, Service SA offices and the local council chambers, where I had actually attended half an hour before he arrived. The entire Modbury Hospital emergency department was locked down and 70 staff were taken out of the frontline. I still do not understand that. However, that is a sideline.

More recently, the major restrictions to the Mount Gambier area were sparked when a mother of four returned home from regional Victoria. I want to also highlight again my profound and deep concern for those who are impacted by this pandemic, but I am also very troubled to learn her car was torched and her house almost lost. That is an issue for me.

It is a truism that this recession has impacted on the poorest members of our society: those who earn a living in precarious casualised work with lower rates of pay, those who are dependent on social security and those who are vulnerable. In my electorate, economic pressures are already running deep and we are seeing elevated demand for emergency relief such as food parcels. I can only again thank those people who have been involved with distributing those throughout the community.

We know vaccination rates are important to what we need to do. We have seen a great response to vaccination after a bit of a tricky start, and we certainly need to do more about all of that. I know we can help with some of the information we have had from our community members, who are ultimately the people at the end of this process. They have come to me, as I am sure they have to all our members, with lots of information about ways we can do things much better and get ahead of the curve.

I will not hold the house any further. There is lots more I am sure all of you want to say to all this. I hope I can count on everyone's assistance to move this forward so that we can be part of the solutions around this and really get ahead and be part of the best practice here in Australia in this very tricky period ahead of us, which I know we all want to see work as well as it can for our people and for the state.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:10):** The member for Florey has brought a motion to establish a select committee to inquire into and report on the state government's response to the COVID-19 pandemic. She subsequently has sought to have the house consider an amendment, which we will consider in due course. That amendment would also suggest that the committee would assist, and I will get to that.

The basis of the select committee is to look at the management, implementation, policies, procedures, representation, consultation, and operations of all agencies in government. It is a broad scope and now the member for Florey has also added to the terms of reference, that the committee is to assist in that response.

To that end, I note the member for Florey concluded her remarks by saying that we can all be part of the solutions, or at least I suppose those who are to be appointed to the proposed select committee. She identifies that she has had community members make suggestions, which of course is welcome, and there is nothing preventing those suggestions from being brought to the attention of the house or to ministers or to agencies at any time. I look forward to the member explaining in her response in due course why a select committee is necessary to do that.

The member thought that a select committee would be useful because it would provide 'an extra set of helpful people', I think were her words, to assist in the response. All of this is, of course, most worthy. My response is that I am looking forward to hearing the discussion about this motion to assist me to form a view clearly as to the merits of the proposed committee and how it would benefit.

There have been a range of parliamentary engagements with agencies looking at the COVID response. There was a celebrated case last year—or I should say whatever is the opposite of celebrated—when the Chief Public Health Officer at the height of the evolving crisis in the first half of last year was brought before a parliamentary committee, I think a Legislative Council committee, and was kept waiting for a period of time to give evidence, having asked to have her evidence brought forward early because, of course, it was at the most urgent time. She was left waiting in the corridor for a period of time and then eventually was not able to present because the committee of the Legislative Council, chaired by the Labor Party I believe, felt they had more urgent business than the Chief Public Health Officer's approach to the pandemic.

Of course, another committee has been established that has provided good information to the people of South Australia and has had a useful accountability measure, which many people have appreciated, into the government's response to COVID. This parliament has many questions that are presented from time to time about the coronavirus response. I do not think there has been a situation in public policy over my lifetime—I stand to be corrected—where the Premier, the health minister, other ministers, chief public health officers and police commissioners have made themselves available to the community on certainly a very regular basis, and at times on a daily basis, to provide information.

However, more information is sought and as Minister for Education, well within the scope of the motion we are looking to find information and report upon information. Whether the committee is established or not, clearly there is a desire for more information. I am happy to provide it about my department's response to COVID and some of the work that we have been doing.

First, in relation to current settings, I bring the house up to date that school and preschool operations are largely business as usual at present, with important ongoing COVID-safe measures in place. That includes at the moment. We of course hope that the advice will enable us to relieve

some of these restrictions sooner rather than later, but the health advice certainly requires us at the moment to have face mask wearing for adults while indoors, except when teaching or engaging with students in our schools. Face mask wearing is also required for students in year 8 and above while indoors. Obviously, there are exemptions to all these categories as appropriate, as there are elsewhere in health settings.

Regretfully, we are still seeking that access to school and preschool grounds be minimised wherever possible to urgent service provision, and adults on site must continue to physically distance wherever and whenever possible, including at pick-up and drop-off times. This is not always easy, but there are also of course site-specific considerations and there is no one size fits all that is relevant for all circumstances.

The circumstances of Scott Creek Primary School and Port Neill Primary School, where there are nine students and three staff, are quite different from Adelaide High School or Glenunga High School or Reynella East College, where they are approaching 2,000 students and hundreds of staff, so we largely allow the principals to make sensible decisions that apply the broad principles in relation that.

We do understand that there are important points of engagement where we want families to be on site and to be able to participate in things. That has been difficult, having been minimised in the last year and a half, but we trust our principals and our leaders to make the good calls and indeed they have access to Department for Education advice and SA Health advice if in doubt. We have provided over the course of the pandemic additional cleaning opportunities and very strong advice. It is advice that exists anyway but certainly applied to the maximum extent that staff and students should stay home if they are unwell, even mildly.

In relation to early childhood settings, where the engagement between adults and children is so important, those mask restrictions do not exist for staff but do exist for parents coming on site. Obviously, while in school settings there is a reduced level of parents coming on site, in early childhood settings that is not feasible. Our focus, of course, is to ensure that the kids get looked after as our absolute priority.

We have dealt with site closure protocols. I think it was the day Professor Spurrier and I undertook a press conference last year to provide advice to the public about what site protocols would be, or within a couple of days, of the first site closure having to happen. In the public system, those protocols have been followed at the Gawler and District College B-12, Elizabeth Vale Primary School, Woodville High School, Roma Mitchell Secondary College, Mawson Lakes Primary School and Preschool, Thebarton, Unley, Kingston, Renmark, Pennington and Henley High School.

Those site closures could have been immensely problematic for communities, yet I am so proud as Minister for Education of the way the department and the school and preschool staff worked so well with their communities, to the point where there was a calm and an understanding. Those communities and those sites and those leaders did an exceptional job and I am very grateful to them. Planning for future outbreaks continues. We of course have had lockdowns, and indeed work has had to be done from home for a period.

We lost some days at the end of term 1 last year for professional development. We lost a couple of days last year during the statewide lockdown and we lost a week this year. The number of days lost in our in-school educational environment were fewer in South Australia than in every other jurisdiction in the country, and our kids have been the beneficiaries of that. They have had the least disruption to their education over the last year and half of pretty much any kids in the world. That is extraordinarily important for their educational development and their wellbeing, for vulnerable children at risk of disengagement from schooling.

There has been disruption, there have been challenges and there are probably some kids we have struggled to get back after the challenges and we would love to get back, but those challenges pale into insignificance compared with some of those faced interstate and overseas.

I take this opportunity to commend all the staff in education and health who have put forward their incredible efforts and resources towards making those educational opportunities available for our kids. It has been a partnership with the government and the people of South Australia: our health

workers and officers and the people of South Australia. Following those instructions have given our kids that opportunity.

While these matters are very front of mind for everyone, they continue to be matters for the parliament. It is a matter for the house whether it wishes to establish, as the member for Florey put it, a further set of extra helpful people able to help the state get ahead. I look forward to further arguments on that matter, but we, of course, stand ready to provide the house with information as required every day that we sit.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, Minister for Education. It may assist members for me to read the first sentence of the amended motion so that that amended motion might be kept close in mind:

That this house establish a select committee to inquire into—

and the new word 'assist'—

assist and report upon the state government's response—

and thereafter follow the words of the existing motion.

**Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (11:21):** I will be relatively brief. I do not intend to repeat various commentary in relation to the COVID-19 pandemic, which has been on the record in terms of the parliament before. Certainly, we thank and support the incredible work done by Commissioner Grant Stevens as the State Coordinator, and the Chief Public Health Officer, Nicola Spurrier. I do think we have had an exceptionally fantastic response in South Australia, led largely by the fact that the community has stuck together. We have had a constructive relationship, with the opposition being constructive about keeping our state safe.

I do think, though, that it is important for the parliament to play a constructive role, and I certainly welcome the amended form of the motion from the member for Florey in the terms that this motion and this committee would be seeking to assist that response. I note that the member for Morialta was talking about how there is a Legislative Council committee; however, I think that this house could do things better. We are in touch with our local constituents in a way that, frankly, the other place is not.

One way I would draw that to the attention of the house is that I know there are members, particularly in those cross-border areas, who have had to face issues that I do not think any member would have expected or any previous member would have dealt with before in terms of those cross-border issues. For the parliament to have a vehicle where we can assist in helping to raise those issues, to ask particular questions that need to be asked, can only be constructive in terms of helping to address those issues. I thank all those members from whatever political persuasion they are who have had to go through that.

Clearly, members are going through a huge number of applications at the moment from returning South Australians as well, and I dare say that local members of parliament are in touch with those people more than perhaps any other member of the Legislative Council would be in terms of their committee.

Having a vehicle for this house, particularly at a critical time, when we are seeking to open the borders and allow COVID-19 into South Australia, would be constructive for the parliament to do to make sure that we can have the best response possible and to make sure those concerns that we are hearing in our electorates have a voice through the parliament to help make that response even better, so I offer our support in terms of the motion.

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (11:23):** I rise to indicate that I will be supporting the amended motion and to put on record a few comments. Firstly, I think the government has done an outstanding job in managing the worldwide pandemic. I do not think you could argue with the numbers as they sit at the moment, particularly when you look at the number of deaths around the world. This government's response has been exemplary and is also leading the world in many respects. That does not mean that there cannot be further improvements and I think that constructive thought and opinion of this house could assist the state government's response, and certainly that is my intent with this.

I will give a couple of examples of that. One is the amendment to the Emergency Management Act that this house passed a couple of weeks ago. It really highlighted that a large

number of people have been waiting for an extraordinary amount of time just to see if they can re-enter South Australia. That was legislated to have a 21-day time line put on it, and I know that has gone a long way to sharpening the focus of SA Health and the communication with people.

In fact, there is now a new portal that is certainly showing progress along the way. In actual fact, it has been opened and it has been looked at by somebody, and it will have a progress bar as to where they are up to. Certainly the biggest complaint that came across my desk was that people were actually applying four, five, 10 times because they did not know whether their first application had been looked at, so I think great improvements have been made in that space.

Another example is briefings for MPs. Certainly the briefing I attended gave a little bit of clarity on SA Health's plans going forward and it answered a number of questions I had. Also, of course, having a regional representative on the Transition Committee, albeit the intent was to have someone who lived in the regions, preferably from the cross-border regions.

As we come to the next phase of the state government managing this pandemic, it is crucial that we get everybody on board, and that is what I am seeking with my support for this committee. We do not need to be playing political games and speaking political banter in here or in the media generally around the handling of this pandemic. One way you get consensus is by working together, sharing information, and by people having the knowledge and not criticising when in fact everything is being done as is. The times for those discussions are in that committee stage.

I will give you an example of that. I am coming to the mind, even though I moved amendments to the Emergency Management Act, that 2 December is a very critical time for this state and the handling of the pandemic going forward and our response as a state to that. I am becoming increasingly firm in my opinion that to take away the emergency management powers at that time may be a mistake because, as our international and state borders open up, we are going to see an influx of COVID cases in South Australia. You can look at Singapore, you can look at the United Kingdom and you can look anywhere else around the world. As soon as borders open up, more COVID comes into the country and, of course, into our state.

That might be exactly the time that you need the emergency management powers to enact arguments or put in place processes that this parliament may be too slow to respond to. We are going to see increased COVID cases, it is going to have an impact on our health system and we need somebody who can manage that in a very rapid way. Again, that is borne out due to more information coming through.

How we handle those cases will have a direct impact on the viability of many businesses and many industries in South Australia. I can give lots of examples, but we had one case in Mount Gambier and we went into pretty tight restrictions for a period of five days, including the Monday to Friday consecutive.

I am very grateful for the state government's business support package of \$3,000; however, numerous businesses are contacting me, and they are not actually critical of the support package at all. As an example, one business was down \$70,000 for the week. They run three separate businesses but under one ABN, so the response is \$3,000 per ABN not per business affected, if that makes sense.

Going forward, we need to know how to manage much higher COVID cases in South Australia without unduly destroying businesses and the economy, and I think that is where this committee could be of assistance to the government. We need a more sophisticated response than just snap lockdowns and very tight restrictions because at the end of this we still need an economy and people to be employed going forward.

It does affect people's mental health. It will have a greater impact, and I think that the member for Florey made a very good point on ABC radio this morning, when she said that it is okay to have an increased number of beds for COVID-related patients, but if those are coming at the expense of mental health beds you are really robbing Peter to pay Paul, and it is an important point to consider.

I know of many, many businesses that had a very stark downturn in their trade, and we need to have systems going forward that can handle higher caseloads and manage it, and I think the committee could assist in that area.

The number of days it takes for people to be informed about whether they can re-enter the state is still a concern, and I have a number of people waiting over 35 days now. There needs to be some clarity around what the 21 days actually means and whether there are any remedies after that 21 days, because it is a legislative requirement now.

SA Health needs more resources to process applications. Could the current system actually be improved? If you have a place where you can self-isolate for the 14 days, be double vaccinated and have a negative COVID test, there could be a more fast-track approach for those who can provide that type of assurance to the state government and ultimately to the people of South Australia. Those options should be looked at.

There are a range of things. I see this as a supportive mechanism, where some of these things can be fleshed out. On radio again, the health minister said that there are 8,000 applications for people desiring to re-enter the state. I wonder what other opportunities there are, apart from greater resources, that we could fast-track, and of course information sharing is vitally important. With those words, I commend the motion to the house.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (11:34):** I also would like to support the member for Florey's request for a select committee to look at COVID-19. First up, can I say straight from the start that if this gets up—and I hope it does—this is no reflection on where we have been or what we have done to date. We have to make that quite clear.

As the member for Mount Gambier indicated, the people of South Australia have done a fantastic job. Our frontline workers have done a fantastic job, and they are under a lot of stress out there. We only have to look at the results so far in South Australia—we have been very, very lucky. I say 'lucky', but I think it is more that the community and the general public have adhered to everything that has been asked of them throughout the course of this pandemic over the last 18 months or two years.

I think that this is an opportunity—like anything, we go along and we do things in our general lives, but it is a time when we need to reflect on how we have been doing it and can we do better. From what I read in the member for Florey's notice of motion, it is to review the opportunities and we can improve it. As the member for Mount Gambier and other members have indicated—and I state this publicly out there—we have not seen the worst at this particular point.

We look at New South Wales, and my thoughts and consideration are for those people. Also, what is happening in Victoria at the moment is absolutely heartbreaking, and you only had to listen to the person on ABC radio this morning who had been across to the ACT to attend the funerals of his sister and the newborn baby who died as a result of that lady's passing. That is traumatic.

We need to look at all the opportunities. Whilst we need to make certain that we have everything in place here in South Australia, my concern is also the regional areas. We have had to abide by all the restrictions that have been done on a statewide basis, and I agree with that. The member for Mount Gambier indicated that a lot of our businesses out there have really suffered financially, not only their own business and the loans they have to pay back but also the workers themselves have had their hours drastically reduced in certain areas. I only have to look at some of my people in accommodation and hospitality: they are down a fair bit, although I do not know the exact amounts.

This notice of motion by the member for Florey asks us to have a look at the opportunity and at how we can better what we have been doing so far. We have had recent briefings for all the MPs. I get phone calls in my electorate, even though it is well and truly away from the borders, and I sympathise with the member for MacKillop and the member for Mount Gambier for the number of people they must be getting requesting to come back into South Australia, specifically workers going from one side of the borders to the other side of the borders.

The member for Mount Gambier put some amendments to the Emergency Management Act just recently regarding the opportunity to have a regional person on the Transition Committee. The government then put what they call a regional person on there, somebody from PIRSA. That person is a fantastic person and a great worker, but I would rather have seen an actual regionally based person on the committee to specifically address some of the issues that are coming in from the close border sections of the South-East of the state.

I know there may be other speakers, and I know the member for Florey wants to close it off, but one of the things going forward is the impact on the health and wellbeing of some of our young kids and also the general public. So far, we have been insulated against some of the financial issues and other stuff because we really have not had it in South Australia at this stage.

Nicola Spurrier has done a fantastic job, as has Grant Stevens, but I have to pay tribute and give credit to the people of South Australia for doing everything possible to ensure that we reduce that opportunity. People say, 'Well, the government has done terrific,' and the government has done terrific, but let's also acknowledge the people and some of the suggestions coming from government, and part of this could be improving and suggesting better ways of doing it.

The impact on the mental health and wellbeing of our communities is my real concern. I see that happening a fair bit already in students. They see their parents being very stressed in various ways, because of their employment or their lack of employment, and that comes back to the young kids. I would hope that, when this select committee gets up, they are some of the things we can look at to ensure not only that we have enough funds in the budget for this but that we also have the bodies on the ground and staff for people to talk to and to make sure we can get through this.

I hope I do not see another pandemic like this in my lifetime—and I want to be here for a long, long time. We have done extremely well. I implore everybody here to vote for this motion for a select committee to look at not only how we have handled it but how we can go forward and better manage all the potential opportunities.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Florey.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Mr Speaker—

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister for Education.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** The member for Hammond was clearly on his feet. It is the tradition of the Speaker in any case to point out that when a member rises who would close the debate that it is drawn to the attention of the house and a member who has not yet contributed is given the opportunity. Notwithstanding that, the member for Hammond was on his feet.

**The SPEAKER:** I sought an indication from the member for Hammond earlier as to whether he wished to speak and I was not clear as to whether there was a response but, nevertheless—

**Mr Pederick:** No, you haven't sought that.

**The SPEAKER:** I tried to signal to the member for Hammond, but perhaps the signal was not seen.

**Mr Pederick:** So are we right, sir?

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hammond.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:40):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I rise to speak on this select committee into the management of COVID-19. In the first instance, I am just so thankful that I live in this state in this great country—in this great state—with respect to this global pandemic. The last global pandemic was over 100 years ago, with the Spanish flu. It was straight after World War I, when tens of millions of people died. I believe at least 60 million people died because of the effects of the outbreak of war across the world. Directly after World War I we had the Spanish flu outbreak, when 500 million people across the world caught it and 10 per cent of those died: 50 million people died from the Spanish flu.

In Sydney, travellers coming back from overseas were quarantined in health facilities on Sydney Harbour, so the management of these things is not completely new, but we have made a lot of advances. Simple things like handwashing, social distancing, covering your mouth and wearing masks were all things employed over 100 years ago after the onset of the Spanish flu, which killed 50 million people.

In the first instance, I would like to thank the people in Health who have done an amazing job not just here in South Australia but also across the world in fast-tracking the development of

vaccines. Multiple vaccines have been developed right across the world. We know there is one in China, and developments have come out of this country, the USA, England and elsewhere in the global fight against COVID-19. I applaud everyone who has been involved in that fight.

While it is right for people to have their position, what does distress me is the anti-vax movement and their religious zealotry, that they follow on Facebook for things that they believe in. I found it fascinating when the first word came out that ivermectin was going to be the drug of choice to beat COVID-19.

When ivermectin first came out in the mid-1980s, I was working in Western Australia on farms for a little while. I had been over there for a rural youth exchange as well around that time. It was a significant milestone in developing a sheep drench for worms and itch mite. It was a great thing to break the cycle and a great rotating sheep drench so that you did not have sheep becoming immune to the effects of drench so that it did not work. It was a great thing, so it was with some bemusement, I should say, that people have peddled this. I do note that ivermectin does come in a human tablet form—in the brief time that I did google the use of it—but it does interest me that people would rather trust that than the science of vaccines.

As we have seen, and as advertised by the great Professor Nicola Spurrier, these vaccines that we have currently were developed just like any other vaccine in the world. It is just that they have been fast-tracked, and rightly so. Of course they have been fast-tracked. A great wealth of time and effort has been put into developing those vaccines. Talking about wealth, the amount of money that governments have been spending, especially here in Australia in our circumstances—the federal government, our state government, the Marshall Liberal government—to make sure that those vaccines can get into arms so that we can get to that 80 per cent double vaccination rate, and a lot higher would be the aim, is considerable.

I must say I held back a bit on getting vaccinated because I thought we should let other community members, those more vulnerable, have more access to vaccines, but as more vaccines rolled in that eased up a bit. The thing that really triggered me was the Delta variant. We have seen that come across the borders. Before I speak about the trucking industry, I just want to applaud truckies, as I have done on the CB radio occasionally as I talk to them going down the road, for the work they are doing in trying times carting freight around this state and this nation. I have heard about truck drivers who have had infected noses from the number of swabs they have had to have to keep their jobs and keep on trucking, basically.

I applaud the staff right around the state and especially those at Tailem Bend, where it is not just a testing station but now a vaccination clinic that people can access, especially now that truck drivers are required to be vaccinated. I really do applaud their work, and long may it keep going to keep this state and this country functioning.

I also want to applaud the work that has been done in contact tracing. We have had exposure points located in my electorate at Pinnaroo and Tailem Bend and across the state. It has been due to the magnificent work of those contact tracers that we have not seen major outbreaks. I have seen people in my electorate—and there have been plenty impacted, I can tell you—who have isolated at home, done the right thing in home quarantine, had all the testing and we have got through it without a major issue.

This is because of the tight controls. Are the tight controls upsetting? Of course they are. I have talked to students across the border in Victoria, and I know of families that have split, with one parent living in Victoria. I know the heartbreaking story of a mother who, early on in the piece, when she wanted to talk to her daughter, had to sit a metre apart from her on the Victorian-South Australian border and talk. They were not allowed to touch, otherwise she would be arrested.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr PEDERICK:** Yes, it is tough, absolutely, but this is a worldwide pandemic and we do have to keep people safe, and I applaud the initiative that people individually have taken to make sure they can support their loved ones. I want to applaud the work that is happening here because, as has already been identified in contributions, when we do open up, and we will open up, we will see Delta here—and it is not a matter of if but when—and our hospitals will need to be ready. They are being prepared with a \$123 million funding boost on top of the other funding, the billions, we are

putting into health, the 1,200 extra nurses and everyone else, because who knows what is going to happen.

As I said, there certainly have been issues with border communities. In Murrayville, where my kids have played footy in the Mallee League since they were six—they are now 17 and 20, so I have a pretty fair idea what happens just across the border at Murrayville, about 30 kilometres from Pinnaroo—they had to be excluded from the football finals because of COVID and it upset them to a great degree. It was very tough. But this is the real thing with COVID management.

Of course we would like it to be easier. I applaud the work that Mehdi Doroudi is doing as the regional representative on the Transition Committee in making sure we can work our way out of how we manage COVID and manage the different levels of closures on the border. I want to applaud border communities. I acknowledge there are mental health strains because of how they have worked with this. Whether they be shearing contractors, health workers, teachers or biosecurity workers, I acknowledge everything they do, and I also want to acknowledge all the work that police, Health and our government are doing to make sure that we get through this and get through it appropriately.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

**STANDING AND SESSIONAL ORDERS SUSPENSION**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (11:51):** I move:

That standing and sessional orders be so far suspended as to enable Private Members Business, Committees and Subordinate Legislation, to have precedence over Government Business until 1pm today.

**The SPEAKER:** An absolute majority is required. An absolute majority not being present, please ring the bells.

*An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:*

**The SPEAKER:** I accept the motion. The question is that standing orders be so far suspended as to enable Private Members Business to have precedence over Government Business.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 22  
Noes ..... 24  
Majority ..... 2

**AYES**

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

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

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

**NOES**

Basham, D.K.B.  
Cowdrey, M.J.  
Harvey, R.M. (teller)  
Marshall, S.S.  
Patterson, S.J.R.  
Power, C.  
Tarzia, V.A.  
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Bell, T.S.  
Ellis, F.J.  
Knoll, S.K.  
McBride, N.  
Pederick, A.S.  
Sanderson, R.  
Teague, J.B.  
Whetstone, T.J.

Chapman, V.A.  
Gardner, J.A.W.  
Luethen, P.  
Murray, S.  
Pisoni, D.G.  
Speirs, D.J.  
Treloar, P.A.  
Wingard, C.L.

Motion thus negatived.

*Motions*

**STATE GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC**

Debate resumed.

**The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment) (11:58):** I rise to speak on this important topic. If I cast my mind back to the early days of the pandemic in March, I remember that my kids were at a football training session for the under 13s at Glenelg Football Club. The under 13s of course draw students from many of the local schools and Sacred Heart was amongst those schools.

Unfortunately, just that very week, as we watched COVID make its way through the world, it finally arrived in Australia and in South Australia. Unfortunately, one of the parents at that school contracted COVID, which of course caused their children and that year level to be immediately quarantined. Some of those students were due to conduct that training session, so the training session was called off. That really brought it home.

I remember talking to parents at the time. There was the realisation that this was going to affect South Australia. At that stage, everyone had very real fears. We had seen what had happened in China, we had seen what had happened in Italy, we had seen what was happening in New York. There was a great deal of fear right from the outset.

As a government, we took the advice of the health experts and have continued to do so the whole way through. All of us here who have spoken to this motion have expressed our genuine thanks not only to all those frontline health professionals here in South Australia but also to all other people on the frontline. In the case of the school I spoke of, the teachers themselves were also uncertain at the time. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Bills*

**SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL BILL**

*Final Stages*

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The ACTING CHAIR (Dr Harvey):** Four amendments have come from the Legislative Council. Deputy Premier, do you wish to speak?

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

I refer to the amendments from the Legislative Council on the South Australian Multicultural Bill 2020. I think everyone would agree that this bill has had a fairly long gestation period, and it has taken a little time to go through both houses of parliament. I thank the members of the Legislative Council, those in the other place, for the work they undertook to accommodate some further issues that have been raised by various stakeholders. I indicate that the government will be accepting the amendments Nos 1 to 4. I will speak briefly in relation to each of those in indicating the government's position.

The first is a provision that a person who is going to sit as a member on the Multicultural Commission must be a person who is either an Australian citizen or a permanent resident of Australia. As members would be aware, as has been made public, there has already been the appointment of a new composition of the South Australian Multicultural Commission and that a new chair and members have been appointed after a process of calling for expressions of interest, I suppose in its formal way, and a selection of those.

Indeed, I have attended a number of functions, as I am sure other members have, where the chair and/or those new members have attended, and so the new commission is already underway

and is following the procedure foreshadowed in this bill. So that has occurred. I do not know whether there is any suggestion that any of those who have been appointed are not either an Australian citizen or a permanent resident of Australia. Nevertheless, I do note that this is something that is not unreasonable, and I am sure that if there had been those who might have been now disqualified, having expressed their indication of interest or appointment, we would certainly have heard from them if this was going to cause them to have to resign from this commission.

The second matter identifies a specification of the gender balance and age diversity and, indeed, geographical residence of members of the commission. We have heard previously of the desire of the former commission to work very hard to have diversity of gender, employment, regional location and youth, and some of the difficulties that have occurred in attempting to encourage the youth in particular.

As members would know, the new chair of the commission is female, so already there has been a consideration of all the diversity elements that have been considered in the appointments. However, one issue remains, and I would encourage all members to give some thought to how they might encourage younger people in their constituencies to put up their hand for this area of responsibility.

It is a really important commission. We want it to have diversity to be reflective of the community. Of course, you cannot have an individual representative for every different cultural organisation in the state. That is not the objective here. The objective here is to recognise that gender, occupation, residence in an urban or regional area and some diversity in the age profile are significant factors in considering all the elements of those who are in our multicultural communities because they also are representative of those aspects.

No. 3, of course, simply deletes No. 4 and moves to No. 6 and I think that is self-evident. No. 4 is one which I think has been a sensible resolution of clarity in the proposed legislation to ensure that there is a recognition of the harm of racism. But, most importantly, and this is certainly a matter which I have been a strong advocate for, and which has now been the case for near 40 years with the establishment of the Equality Opportunity Commission and the role in the Office of the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity—that is, the body that is to deal with areas of discrimination and racial vilification and such matters should be referred to them.

So it is making it very clear that in relation to the negative aspects, if people feel offended or discriminated against or in breach of the obligations, whether it is access to a school or employment or advancement, these are all areas that are commonly areas of discrimination. We need to be alert to that, but we also need to assure that we are not setting up a whole new role for the Multicultural Commission. The Multicultural Commission is: lead by example, provide education, give support and advice, etc, and obviously be able to champion through its charter and objectives the benefits of multiculturalism and interculturalism. With those few words, I commend the amendments to the house.

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON:** We would like to thank all the contributors to this bill. Can I say that the bill that we have before us today reflects much more in terms of where we were heading than in the beginning, because it was quite deficient when it was first laid before this house. There was a lack of recognition of traditional owners, our First Nations people, which was something that was emphasized quite strongly when you saw the consultation and the engagement.

We were very disappointed when we first saw it laid on the table because that did not seem to be detailed at all as was requested. There were many arguments within this bill, some of which the government addressed, including representation. What we have seen is that the other house has gone even further, and that is because they have been lobbied and advocated by people who felt that their voice was not heard.

I am talking in particular about former members of the commission because, of course, during this time a new commission was selected. The irony of it was that those people who spoke to the crossbench and to the opposition were not continued in those roles, and I know they are very disappointed about that.

They were raising with us very important issues. They raised with us issues about the resourcing of the commission. They raised with us the importance of the commission to be connected

not only to the Minister for Multicultural Affairs but also to wider public sector agencies. One of the key aspects of this commission is to provide a voice for our diverse community, and they were very concerned that there was a watering down of their role as a commission.

We were able to remedy that because we raised those issues around resourcing and around the ability of the commission to speak freely with public sector agencies, but of course we did not agree with everything. I have had people ring me and email me with their concerns about some of the areas they felt were wise for us to pursue, given that it has been many decades since we have looked at this area, including reporting of diversity within our public sector.

Many other jurisdictions in Australia do this. The commonwealth does it, as do Queensland and New South Wales. We collect the data, as far as we understand; we just do not report on it. The one thing we know is that if you want something to change you must report, collect and proactively make differences. It was a disappointment for me that that was not included.

I turn to the amendments, and perhaps I can talk to amendments Nos 2, 3 and 4 and then back to amendment No. 1. I thank the Hon. Frank Pangallo in the other house for his activism and his interest, particularly with respect to amendment No. 2, which goes to the fact that we are keen to have representation not only from a gender perspective but also from regional South Australians to make sure their voice is heard. Of course, there is a great tradition of migrants going to our regional areas, and they have been fundamental to the economy. They have invested and created businesses, and we believe it is important that their voice is heard.

Of course, one of the other areas is to make sure that we have young people represented on the commission, and so that has now come into this bill. Amendment No. 3 deals with the number of meetings. Amendment No. 4 is personally incredibly important to me and to the functions of the commission, and that is to raise awareness of the harm that racism and other forms of discriminatory behaviour can do to multiculturalism and interculturalism in South Australia.

The Attorney and I had quite the discussion on this point and she raised, at the time, about the role of the Office of the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity. What we have before us today with this amendment is to combine both of those, as in recognising that there is a function to raise awareness and also to endeavour that the commission is to advise and consult with the Office of the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity, where it is appropriate, on matters relating to discrimination and racial vilification.

I think that this is probably a very significant aspect to this and I think that it is probably the best way forward. We have those with a statutory role within it, combined with the commission which will focus on awareness about the damage and educate our wider community. The amendment that I do not agree with, and the opposition does not agree with, is in regard to amendment No. 1, which is:

A person must not be appointed as a member of the Multicultural Commission unless the person is an Australian citizen or a permanent resident of Australia.

This comes in under the constitution of the Multicultural Commission, and there are many reasons why this amendment does not sit well with the intent or the spirit of this legislation.

Australian citizenship and permanent residency have often become aspirational for many migrants and their families, and people come to Australia in many different ways, often as temporary residents. We have particularly seen the stories, and just recently we have talked quite extensively about our Afghan community. Those who came to Australia in non-traditional ways are often on Bridging visas, which are temporary visas, for many years—sometimes more than a decade.

What we are instituting here is that their voice is unable to be representative on the commission. I do not agree with that. I think that having this in here as part of the constitution is unnecessary, and what should be the focus of the commission is the widest possible representation of our diverse multicultural commission.

Only in recent times have we had our Coalition government try to prevent people achieving Australian citizenship by lifting the bar to do a test of university-standard English, a test that perhaps many Australian-born people would not pass. While that was eventually not pursued by the government, there is a group of people who want to make Australian citizenship harder and more out of reach for people. I completely disagree with that.

We want more people to feel connected to Australia, to feel that they are welcome here regardless of where they were born and how they came to be in Australia. The pathway to citizenship and permanent residency is incredibly important for that to happen.

One of the key aspects of our amendments to this bill was to recognise the contribution that migration, temporary migration and refugee settlement have made to multiculturalism and interculturalism in South Australia. This amendment will exclude new migrants, residents on Temporary Protection visas, students, and a large number of migrants working in a range of fields will be unable to contribute or be a member of the commission.

I raise my concern here today, as the lead speaker for the opposition, to say that we do not support that amendment. I think it is unnecessary and I think the commission should be able to be reflected by the widest possible representation of our migrant community.

**Mr SZAKACS:** I rise to make some short remarks on this, firstly to thank the member for Ramsay for her leadership on this matter, both in her time as a minister and now as the shadow minister for multicultural affairs. It would not be going too far to say that it has been entirely the opposition that has led the agenda on this reform. We have been waiting years—since consultation began on this bill—before a bill, as deficient as it was, was brought before this house.

By the time the bill was brought before the house, the currency of that consultation was already tired and lacking. That was the feedback we got from stakeholders immediately when we met with them and discussed it, something that the Attorney had not done. I do not blame the Attorney for this; it is not her job to be doing the Premier's job for him. The Attorney is not the Minister for Multicultural Affairs: it is in fact the Premier, as strange as that might be, considering his lack of interest in this area. The Premier could not even bring the bill before—

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order, sir.

**The ACTING CHAIR (Dr Harvey):** There is a point of order. The member for Morialta, the Minister for Education.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** There is indeed a reflection on another member, contrary to standing orders—utterly outrageous.

**Mr SZAKACS:** It is for the member who is the subject of a personal reflection, alleged or otherwise, to bring that to the attention of the house.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Point of order: I take offence at the suggestion that as Deputy Premier I do not have a responsibility and role in relation to this matter—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING CHAIR (Dr Harvey):** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —as a member of the cabinet. Secondly, the assistant minister is, of course, in the other place and she does a sterling job in the multicultural community and in this debate in the other place. I think it is a poor reflection by the member against all members here who have taken an interest in it. As Deputy Premier, I take offence and I seek an apology.

**The ACTING CHAIR (Dr Harvey):** The member that the member for Cheltenham was reflecting upon is not here. Nonetheless, I would encourage the member for Cheltenham to address the substance of what is before us here today.

**Mr SZAKACS:** My pleasure. The substance of this is directly to the fact that the Attorney-General is not the Minister for Multicultural Affairs. As great as she may or otherwise be on reflection of that, she is not the Minister for Multicultural Affairs. The Premier is the Minister for Multicultural Affairs, and the Premier, who is the Minister for Multicultural Affairs, did not bring this bill to this chamber. He did not participate in the committee stage. In fact, if the Attorney would perhaps pay attention for a moment, she would actually see that I am giving her a compliment in this in that she is doing—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING CHAIR (Dr Harvey):** Member for Cheltenham, just a moment. It is also disorderly to reflect on the presence of another member in the chamber. I would ask you to return to the substance of what is before us here.

**Mr SZAKACS:** Once again, the Attorney is doing the carrying and the heavy lifting for the Premier. Once again, the Attorney—

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order, sir.

**The ACTING CHAIR (Dr Harvey):** There is a point of order from the member for Morialta.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** The member for Cheltenham is not respecting the ruling that has been given by the Chairman of the committee stage. I think it amounts to obstruction, but I ask you again, sir, to bring him back.

**The ACTING CHAIR (Dr Harvey):** Thank you, minister. Member for Cheltenham, I would urge you to address what is before us here today: the amendments.

**Mr SZAKACS:** Sure. I withdraw any compliments that I have sought to provide to the Attorney-General, who—

**The ACTING CHAIR (Dr Harvey):** Member for Cheltenham, I think this is completely unnecessary. I have asked you to address your comments to—

**Mr SZAKACS:** But, with respect—

**The ACTING CHAIR (Dr Harvey):** No, I am speaking. I have asked you to address your remarks to what is before us, which of these amendments. So could you please do that?

**Mr SZAKACS:** Mr Acting Chair, this is the committee stage, where we have a broader capacity to discuss matters before us. I am specifically discussing—

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Point of order: this is not a broad, free-ranging position. We are in committee on the amendments, and the rules are very clear in relation to addressing the matters before us, which are the four amendments.

**The ACTING CHAIR (Dr Harvey):** Member for Cheltenham, I ask you to address your comments to the amendments that are before us. So could you please do that?

**Mr SZAKACS:** I am happy to, Mr Acting Chairman. Thank you to the Hon. Frank Pangallo in the other place for bringing these to the Legislative Council. We were not able to persuade enough people in this chamber to support these amendments, but they are very clearly supported by the opposition.

I do put on the record my deep opposition to amendment No. 1, which will further limit the franchise of non-citizens in this important area of public policy. We have spent a lot of time over the last six or seven weeks on both sides of this chamber and both sides of the political divide supporting and encouraging the welcome of the newest arriving refugees in the state, that being those from Afghanistan. All of those refugees, not just in this state and in this city but right across this country, are largely on temporary visas of some sort. They are disenfranchised from participating in this representative and advisory body. We do not think that is the right thing to do, albeit that the other amendments that are before us are of merit. They were championed by Labor, and we are very happy to support them.

**The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Cowdrey):** As the amendments were moved en bloc, and in regard to the position that has been put by Labor, we are going to vote on the amendments individually.

Amendment No. 1 carried; amendment No. 2 carried; amendment No. 3 carried; amendment No. 4 carried.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Sir, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**ELECTORAL (FUNDING, EXPENDITURE AND DISCLOSURE) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 June 2021.)

**Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (12:29):** I indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition in relation to the Electoral (Funding, Expenditure and Disclosure) Amendment Bill 2021. I say at the outset how important I believe it is for the integrity of our democracy to have strong laws in terms of how elections are funded, how we determine and disclose those funding arrangements, making sure that the people of South Australia have confidence that there are limits in terms of the role that money plays in our politics.

I think it is very clear that there have been countless examples from all around the world of the toxic role money can play in politics and that in elections there should be a fair contest of ideas, where the bank balance, donations and those sorts of interests should be limited as much as possible.

During the last term of parliament, we put in place a legislative regime and this was introduced by the former Attorney-General, the Hon. John Rau. I think that was a dramatic step forward in terms of our funding, disclosure and expenditure regime that we have for our elections. Do I think it could go further? I think perhaps in the future we could go even further to make sure that we have an even more robust system and to make sure that we limit the role money has in our elections and our politics as much as possible.

These changes took us a very long way from where we were before. I think they were successful in the last election, and there is obviously now an amendment being put forward by the Attorney-General to change that in relation to the forthcoming election. What we had was a system that was subject to a range of amendments in 2016, before the system had gone through an election. This showed the value of introducing and considering electoral legislation well in advance of an election. This is a lesson the Liberals could well learn. The new system was always intended to be reviewed and reformed where it could be improved.

In 2019, two years ago, the Electoral Commission handed down the report into the operation and administration of South Australia's funding, expenditure and disclosure legislation. Then, after that, there was silence and then more silence. Then, on 1 July this year, the capped expenditure period for the 2022 state election commenced, and this is a fundamental element of the entire funding and disclosure system.

As far as this system is concerned, we are already in it for the next election. This has already been running for some months now, yet the Attorney-General only introduced this legislation into the parliament a mere 21 days before that period commenced with no prospect or intention to have it passed before the critical first date of 1 July. In fact, if you look at the government's order of priorities they put forward to the house in government business time, this has been well down the list for many weeks.

Unfortunately, this is part of a pattern of behaviour from the Attorney-General. In almost four years since the 2018 election, there have been four electoral bills introduced by the government. None of them was introduced in 2018 and none in 2019. One was introduced in late 2020, but did not get dealt with until 2021—this year, the last year before the election—in the Legislative Council. Of course, that first bill was voted down in the other place largely on the basis of the lateness of it.

Now suddenly, in the October before an election, the government have three different proposals they have been trying to get through the parliament. One, I understand, has fallen down in the other place and has been rejected; one, I believe, is still on foot; and here we have the third.

As we saw with the other bills, there were concerns raised about making changes to elections so late in the cycle. Labor have raised concerns about this in relation to all these bills. Electoral laws should not be a plaything for the government of the day. They are a foundation of our community's confidence in our democracy. This is making changes to the finance and disclosure scheme in the middle of a capped expenditure period.

When the scheme was originally passed through the parliament in 2013, the Labor government agreed that the scheme would not commence until 2015. The delay was designed to give everyone a chance to get up to speed with the changes and to make sure compliance was as easy as possible. This meant that the 2014 election would not be impacted by the changes that were passed in 2013. The first relevant election would be in 2018.

When the law was amended in 2016, the 2018 election was well over a year away. There was plenty of time for those who were impacted to understand and prepare for the new system before they entered the capped expenditure period. The Attorney mentioned in her second reading speech that the changes largely stem from the Electoral Commission's report into the operation and administration of South Australia's funding expenditure and disclosure legislation.

The problem for the Attorney is that that report was published more than two years ago. The government has had more than two years to act on this report before we entered the capped expenditure period before the 2022 election. In fact, the report itself was published in July 2022, two years before that period started, and the Attorney tabled it in September 2019, more than two years before today's date, yet we heard nothing from the Attorney about this until 9 June this year.

The Attorney is trying to change the legislation a mere 21 days before the funding period began. If that is not bad enough, the opposition did not receive their briefing from the government on the bill until the day before the capped expenditure period started. Unfortunately, this is reflective of how all the electoral bills have been handled by the Attorney since coming to government.

Quite reasonably, the other place have been saying no in relation to laws that have been proposed by the Attorney-General because things have been so late in that period. She clearly has not been getting the hint, and we have now had bill after bill trying to achieve changes to the electoral laws in this state well into the year before the election—now only a few months before the election. This contrasts very significantly with the view that the Attorney-General had when she was in opposition. Of course, she spent 16 years in opposition.

In 2016, in relation to an electoral bill she in fact went on the record to complain about how late it was that those changes were being dealt with before the 2018 election. In 2016, she was complaining that there was not enough time before the 2018 election. She said:

The bill we are currently dealing with, the miscellaneous bill, carries the bulk of the recommendations the government has picked up from the Electoral Commissioner post the 2014 election; in fact, it is only about half of what the then electoral commissioner, Ms Kay Mousley, recommended in her report to the parliament in July 2015. Ms Mousley recommended some 30 reforms to the legislation, primarily to the Electoral Act, that she considered were worthy of the parliament's consideration before we advanced to the next state election.

I am completely at a loss why it has taken the government until November this year to table a bill, especially as it incorporates only half the recommendations of the electoral commissioner.

So, in opposition, the Attorney-General, now the member for Bragg, was critical of the then Attorney-General, the Hon. John Rau, only tabling bills almost two years before the election. Here, we have a very different stance. In this particular bill, we are really into the eleventh hour.

In relation to the scheme we have in place, it has been noted that it provides an annual disclosure period, when parties and associated entities have to comply. As of 1 January in an election year, parties, associated entities, candidates and groups are required to furnish a return at the end of January and then on a weekly basis thereafter. The bill requires immediate disclosure of large gifts received by political parties, which I believe is very important progress in relation to our laws, to make sure that people know and there is disclosure in relation to how money is used in terms of politics. If a party receives a gift that exceeds the value of \$25,000, the party will have seven days to furnish a return to the Electoral Commissioner that includes information such as the name and address of the donor and other prescribed details.

There is also under the law that was introduced a funding cap that restricts the total amount that can be expended by a political party. Those caps are indexed according to CPI. Since the legislation was first introduced, the cap will obviously have increased with CPI. There is a cap if a party runs for all 47 seats, there is a cap of \$3.525 million or 75,000 per district, and then 100,000 per Legislative Council candidate in addition. Very specific caps have been put in place under the laws that were introduced by the previous government and supported by the then opposition Liberal Party that have made the caps on expenditure very clear in our legislation.

In terms of the funding elements, reimbursement happens, but you have to make sure that you account for all those expenditures. That is different from the federal regime, where there have been instances of some parties who have spent very little but have received under electoral funding laws significant amounts of funding for the votes they have received in advance of what has actually been spent. I believe that our scheme that was introduced by the previous government is a significant benefit in relation to that.

However, we do want to see the detail and consider the arguments in relation to this legislation. On the face of it, despite the politics and the complete lack of due process and timeliness by the Attorney-General, we do not believe that at this stage this is an attempt by her to change the rules in favour of the Liberal Party, as opposed to some of the other legislation we have been considering. Most of the changes in this bill are fairly technical and they include:

- reducing areas of double reporting of donations;
- the nuts and bolts mechanics regarding gifts and the state campaign account;
- the termination of an appointed agent; and
- the way expenditure caps interact with candidates losing endorsement.

I understand that there are still discussions happening with stakeholders, led by shadow attorney-general, the Hon. Kyam Maher in the other place, around certain elements of this bill. The opposition, therefore, will be reserving its position on the bill at this time. We will listen carefully to the government's arguments for this bill and will consider it further when it gets to the other place.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Cowdrey):** Are there any other speakers in regard to the bill?

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (12:44):** I appreciate the contribution made by the opposition—not all of the gratuitous comments, but I think you can go too far in relation to my alleged bona fides or not. I would like to acknowledge the directors of the relevant parties: the Liberal Party of Australia (SA Division), I think they still call them the secretary of the Australian Labor Party, all those others who were invited to make a contribution to this debate from other registered political parties, and the stakeholders generally in the contribution on this matter.

I acknowledge the work and discussions with Mr Reggie Martin who, of course, is State Secretary of the Australian Labor Party, to advance a number of these reforms, largely as a result of the assessment and recommendations of the Electoral Commissioner who had prepared his second comprehensive report in relation to matters arising out of the 2018 election. We would have liked here in the parliament to have had some of this information a bit earlier, but it was a lot of work, I understand, for the Electoral Commissioner and so the delay in the publication of his report in relation to funding and disclosure reforms is simply a matter that we have to live with and, as a parliament, we have embraced that with this government bill to progress.

As I understand it, there is no request by members to go into committee on this matter in this house, although there may be some matters traversed in the other place. I would like to place on record again my appreciation to Michelle Coram, who has been made available to discuss matters with other stakeholders and has been diligent in her extensive service in relation to electoral reform and her availability here in the parliament. It seems today she is now not going to be needed but she has been here ever present and ready to provide that advice.

I remind members in relation to these matters that the government is always available to schedule convenient times for the discussion on any matters that are raised, and if there are particular issues for the opposition or crossbenchers—although I have not heard from the latter—then we are happy to discuss those further between the houses.

Bill read a second time.

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4.

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

Amendment No 1 [AG-1]—

Page 3, after line 23—Insert:

(5a) Section 130A(1), definition of third party, (g)—after '\$10,000' insert:  
(indexed)

I indicate that this amendment inserts after '\$10,000' the word '(indexed)'. This is an amendment to ensure that both references to the amount of \$10,000 and the definition of third party will be indexed. The bill already amends the first reference to \$10,000 in this amendment and will amend the second reference. It is really for completeness in relation to the drafting on that. This amendment generally, of course, is to fully implement recommendation 34 of the Election Funding Report.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 5 to 22 passed.

Clause 23.

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

Amendment No 1 [AG-2]—

Page 11, line 27 [clause 23(1)]—Delete '130U(1)(c)(ii)' and substitute '130U(1)(b)(ii)'

I indicate that this is a technical amendment to the drafting to correct a cross-reference to an earlier subsection reference in the bill. Clause 23 is a consequential amendment following the substitution of section 130U in clause 11 of the bill.

**Mr PICTON:** I am just wondering whether the Attorney could outline the cause and effect of this change, and what the differences are between section 130U(1)(c)(ii) and section 130U(1)(b)(ii)?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Let me start by advising that clause 23 provides that parties with six or more members of the Parliament of South Australia that submit a claim for special assistance funding under section 130U will also need to submit an audit certificate under section 130ZV.

The kinds of political expenditure that can be claimed by these parties will be prescribed by regulation and will relate to the costs of complying with part 13A of the act. These prescribed costs may include legal fees, audit fees, accounting and banking services, computing software and the cost of administrative staff performing duties relating to compliance. Parties with none or one to six members of parliament will receive an amount to be prescribed by regulations and will not be required to submit an audit certificate. In general terms, as I understand it, this is for the very minor parties where there is a lower threshold of requirement.

**Mr PICTON:** Was the change from section 130U(1)(c)(ii) to section 130U(1)(b)(ii) a drafting error, or is there a change in effect that is being sought here?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** It is a drafting matter, as I indicated. This is a technical amendment to the drafting to correct a cross-reference to an earlier subsection reference in the bill.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (24 to 27) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (12:54):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**Ms COOK:** Sir, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

*A quorum having been formed:*

### **OPCAT IMPLEMENTATION BILL**

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

(Continued from 21 September 2021.)

Clause 3.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** We were up to clause 3, and I just want to preface all this by saying that we of course support the intent of this bill. We know about its urgency—in fact, we were lucky enough, as was the minister's adviser, to receive a briefing this morning from some experts in the field.

However, we reserve our right to both consider amendments the government might be considering and suggest amendments ourselves in the other place and consider them between the houses. I think I might just squeeze in one question, if I can.

**The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Cowdrey):** Absolutely.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** It concerns the definition of detainee detention and place of detention. I just want some clarification about what detention actually means, because there are obviously instances—and I am sure there will be questions later on in other clauses about this—where police officers, for instance, detain people for any number of reasons, with or without arrest, in their own homes or in hospitals. I am wondering if any of those situations are covered by the current definition of detention.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I think that can be answered by the member having a look at clause 3. You will see that 'detainee' means a person detained at a place of detention, and then it goes on to define detention. It is not a question of somebody who is other than at a place of detention—that is the first thing. The second thing is that we are talking largely about prisons, people who are detained under health legislation, and now police cells.

It is a very broad assessment, but I make the point that we have youth training centres, which are otherwise known as a children's prison—Kurlana Tapa is how we now describe it in modern terms—and we also have people who are subject to detention under the Mental Health Act, and that is particularly significant.

Each of these persons is restricted in movement, and that is generally what has been considered to be included in the discussions and the agreement nationally as to what is compliant with OPCAT; that is, they need to be in a place of detention.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

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

*Petitions*

### **URBAN NEIGHBOURHOOD ZONE**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens):** Presented a petition signed by 179 ratepayers and residents of West Torrens Council and Lockleys District requesting the house to urge the government to reject the proposed code amendment to be applied within the Urban Neighbourhood Zone in relation to the land located at 25 Pierson Street, Lockleys on the basis that it does not conform to the desired outcomes and performance outcomes of PlanSA's Planning and Design Code.

**TAFE SA WHYALLA**

**Mr HUGHES (Giles):** Presented a petition signed by 584 residents of Whyalla and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to reverse the changes to hairdressing at Whyalla TAFE requiring apprentices to travel to Adelaide and replacing a local lecturer with a fly-in-fly-out lecturer.

**HAMPSTEAD HYDROTHERAPY POOL**

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens):** Presented a petition signed by 507 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to commit to re-opening the Hampstead pool to the public and open discussions with the City of Port Adelaide Enfield with the intention of gifting land to the council in the new Oakden and Gilles Plains Structure Plan development for a public swimming facility.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS**

**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)—

CTP Insurance Regulator—Annual Report 2020-21

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

Children and Young People, Office of the Guardian for—Six Month Snapshot of the South Australian Dual Involved Project—Children and young people in South Australia's child protection and youth justice systems September 2021

**EXPOSURE DRAFT BILL**

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:02):** Today, I am pleased to table an exposure draft bill to reform the common law forfeiture law and to open it for public consultation. The draft bill has been prepared to implement the South Australian Law Reform Institute's recommendation that there should be standalone forfeiture legislation in South Australia.

*Ministerial Statement*

**COMPREHENSIVE AUTO-THEFT RESEARCH SYSTEM**

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:02):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I rise today to inform the house of the achievements of the Comprehensive Auto-theft Research System, a unit that sat within the Justice Policy and Analytics division of the Attorney-General's Department in South Australia. There are few organisations whose sole focus is vehicle theft. CARS filled this gap and ensured South Australia would lead the nation in this important area of reform. Although it has now ceased operations, the CARS evidence-based policies developed over the past 22 years remain relevant and will continue contributing to reduce motor vehicle crime not only in South Australia but across the nation.

CARS began as a South Australian-based project back in 1993 before transforming into a national initiative when contracted by the National Motor Vehicle Theft Reduction Council in 1999. The NMVTRC engaged the SA Attorney-General's Department to build on our state-based capabilities, with the aim of creating a national CARS. Combining efforts of government, relevant industry and community stakeholders, its statistical research services and data analytics have formed

the basis of several important theft reduction strategies, including last year's Pop.Lock.Stop community awareness campaign.

Pop.Lock.Stop highlighted the prevalence of motor vehicle theft through at home burglaries, where offenders break in and steal car keys in a form of 'sneak theft'. The simple and direct messaging employed in these campaigns has been an effective means of community education. Approximately 232 million consumers have been exposed to the media coverage relating to the NMVTRC, including the Pop.Lock.Stop campaign.

As I reflect on over 20 years of operation, CARS achievements in combating motor vehicle theft in South Australia have been impressive to say the least. In the 2000-21 financial year, there were 12,306 recorded motor vehicle thefts, compared with just 2,802 in 2020-21. During the same time, nationally we saw a decrease in vehicle thefts, from 145,000 to 47,803. This is a 77 per cent reduction in South Australia and a 66 per cent reduction at a national level.

These results were not achieved overnight, nor by coincidence. Instead, we have seen firsthand the benefits of easily accessible state-of-the-art research and statistical databases originating right here in South Australia. These initiatives have helped to reduce:

- the level of ancillary crimes being committed in stolen vehicles;
- the financial and emotional burden on victims;
- the drain on police resources;
- lost productivity resulting from stolen tools and equipment; and
- the frequency of road accidents involving stolen vehicles.

The positive social and economic impacts of CARS policies have been well recognised. In 2004, CARS won the Australasian Branch's International Association of Auto Theft Investigators award for Outstanding Contribution to the Reduction/Prevention of Motor Vehicle Theft in Australasia. Then in 2009, CARS was awarded a certificate of merit through the Australian Crime and Violence Prevention Awards, recognising reduction in both vehicular and non-vehicular crimes in Australia.

In 2020, CARS data analytics system grew to holding over 715 million records of motor vehicle data from varying sources. CARS has worked collaboratively with police, law enforcement, crime prevention, transport and insurance agencies, as well as local governments, to create a comprehensive national strategy. Effective information sharing networks between state jurisdictions have led to more meaningful data collection and the production of higher level statistical analysis. Working with our state counterparts has been an important strategy in addressing professional motor vehicle theft through the exchange of police reports, vehicle registration and insurance information on stolen or written-off vehicles. CARS achievements show just how important national cohesion and purposeful information sharing networks are in combating crime.

CARS recent closure is not a reflection on their work or results; in fact, it is quite the opposite. While CARS has contributed to the rapid decline in motor vehicle thefts, emerging threats and challenges have called for a close monitoring of expenditure and sadly CARS closure.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge the service of Mr Paul Thomas, who announced his retirement upon the closure of CARS after 31 years in the Public Service. Paul has been a valued member of the Attorney-General's Department and his contribution to shaping policy at a state and federal level not only through CARS but the broader Public Service must be commended.

*Parliamentary Committees*

**NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:07):** I bring up the ninth report of the Natural Resources Committee, entitled South East Drainage Network Fact Finding Visit 30 August to 1 September 2021.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE**

**Mr DULUK (Waite) (14:08):** I bring up the 168<sup>th</sup> report, entitled Kimba Road Level Crossing Removal and Realignment Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Mr DULUK:** I bring up the 169<sup>th</sup> report, entitled Fleurieu Connections Victor Harbor Road Duplication Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Mr DULUK:** I bring up the 170<sup>th</sup> report, entitled Main South Road Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Mr DULUK:** I bring up the 171<sup>st</sup> report, entitled Kurlana Tapa Youth Justice Centre Consolidation Report.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Mr DULUK:** I bring up the 172<sup>nd</sup> report, entitled Trinity Gardens School Redevelopment Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Mr DULUK:** I bring up the 173<sup>rd</sup> report, entitled Springbank Secondary College Redevelopment Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*Question Time***EMPLOYMENT FIGURES**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier explain why job markets in the lockdown states of Victoria and New South Wales outperform South Australia's job market under your divided Liberal Party?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:11):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question—always jumping to the negative—but the reality is that the participation rate in the lockdown states has fallen.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** We can get a briefing for the Leader of the Opposition—he has been in parliament for some time—but the participation rate has fallen in those COVID-affected states, so that makes some sense, and so consequently that has an adjustment on the unemployment factor.

By contrast, in South Australia the participation rate went up. In fact, a further 1,000 people are participating in our economy at the moment, and this is good news. You need to understand how those statistics work before you go out there and talk negatively. I can explain to you exactly how they work.

When the opposition was on the treasury bench they had the opportunity to affect the unemployment rate in this state. I look at those statistics now, and in the last term of their government the unemployment rate was 6.8 per cent. It is now 5.1 per cent, and they want to come in here talking down employers in South Australia that are feeling more confident about our state, and the prospects for our state, and they have gone out and employed more people here in South Australia. But more than employers feeling more confident to go out to employ, so are employees—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Wright!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —and that is why the participation rate in South Australia has surged. Of course, it's natural that it has fallen in some other states because they are in very significant lockdown, and there are other supports that the federal government and their state governments are providing to those people who are unemployed or underemployed, but there has been a diminution in that participation rate. But there is no such situation here.

People are feeling more confident, and that means that more people are entering the job market, and that's good because we still have skill shortages in South Australia. In fact, at the moment, in South Australia there are 18,000 jobs on offer, so there has never been a better time to get a job here in South Australia, and that is because we've got the fundamentals right with regard to the management of the coronavirus. This is giving employers and employees confidence to employ more people or for employees to put themselves forward.

I am very pleased about the fact that we are doing well on those metrics, but I must say that there is much more work to be done. We are significantly lower in our unemployment rate than when those opposite were in charge, which I would point out was not during a coronavirus global pandemic. We know that under the Labor Party—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —unemployment reached a staggering high—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —of more than 8.3 per cent with a lower participation rate. We are working very hard, but there is much, much more work to be done, and that's why every day that we are on the treasury bench we are out talking to people in the business community about the opportunities. That's where we come from. I come from the business community, I don't come as a union boss—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I was never a union boss—never a union boss out there. I have been out talking to employers—and we know what they want—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —and what they want is a government which is going to lower their costs, put businesses forward, focus on developing skills, and these are the things that are inspiring confidence. When I look at those confidence figures, whether it be consumer confidence, business confidence, investor confidence, they are at decade highs. It doesn't happen by accident: it happens by the good work of the people of South Australia, employees and employers, dealing with the difficulties of the pandemic but making sure that we remain optimistic for the future, not always jumping to the negative.

**The SPEAKER:** I warn the member for Lee, and the member for Playford for a second time and the Minister for Industry and Skills.

### EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15):** Supplementary question to the Premier: if the Premier is so connected to the business community, is he willing to debate me at a Business SA event before Christmas?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:16):** It has been a pretty longstanding convention that debates are held in the time of the lead-up to the next election but, rather than have debates—and there are probably a lot of debates going on over there at the moment—we are

focused on the things that matter to the people of South Australia: keeping our state safe and our economy strong, and that is exactly and precisely—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —what we are continuing to do. I haven't been stopped in the street by one person saying, 'Do you know what I want you to do, Premier—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —I want you to have a debate with the Leader of the Opposition—not one person ever. So I am looking forward to that opportunity. I am waiting for that opportunity—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —but in the meantime I'm going to focus on the things that people want here in South Australia, and they want a strong economy—

**Mr Brown:** How about some leadership!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —they want jobs growth, they want jobs for the next generation—

**The SPEAKER:** Premier, please be seated. The member for Playford can leave for 30 minutes under 137A.

*The honourable member for Playford having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** The Leader of the Opposition says he wants to have a debate. We are having a debate in here every single day and what we are doing is putting forward a positive plan for South Australia: more jobs, lower costs, better services, making sure that South Australia can stay safe—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Deputy leader, you are warned.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —and it doesn't matter which metrics you look at. It does not matter which metrics you look at, South Australia is doing extraordinarily well and it doesn't happen by accident. It happens with a partnership and the people of South Australia feeling optimistic about the future. One statistic that I love, and there is no debate about this one, is the net migration of South Australians. Under those opposite, for decades and decades we had an exodus of young people and capital out of this state. Well, now people are lining up—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens is warned.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —to get back into the state at the moment because it is such a waste of opportunity.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Whether we look at our traditional sectors like mining, agriculture, manufacturing, construction, tourism, international students, some of these sectors which have kept our state and our economy and our employment going for decades, these are all great opportunities. But in addition to this—

**The SPEAKER:** Premier, there is what I anticipate, a point of order.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** I rise on a point of order: debate, sir. It was a really simple question. I asked if the—

**The SPEAKER:** Perhaps I will hear out the leader first and then I will come to the Minister for Education.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Debate, sir. The question was very straightforward. I asked the Premier, since he has such profound connections to the business community, is he willing to debate me at a Business SA event before Christmas?

**The SPEAKER:** Leader, that is an argument to what I anticipate is the—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader, order! The Minister for Education.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** The precedents of Speaker Atkinson are that such bogus points of order entail warnings but aren't to be taken by members who have been interjecting—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** —during the course of the answer prior.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hurtle Vale can leave for 30 minutes under 137A.

*The honourable member for Hurtle Vale having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The SPEAKER:** Minister.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Speaker Atkinson's precedents were against bogus points of order as an opportunity to make a speech and, indeed, members who had been interjecting were not permitted to take points of order on standing order 98. I seek your ruling as to whether Speaker Atkinson's precedents will be upheld.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, minister. I will consider that matter, but for the moment I do form the view that there was additional argument put in relation to the point of order which didn't appear to relate to the point of order raised. Nevertheless, I understand the point that you have made, minister. I think we will return to the Premier. The Premier was addressing the substance. I am going to give him some latitude because he is the Premier.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** As I was saying, there is plenty to debate. We've got a very positive plan for South Australia. We are in the parliament. We can have a debate every day. I think it would be prudent, before we get into the debating season in the lead-up to the next election, for the Labor Party to have a policy. Wouldn't it be great if we had a policy debate and the opposition had some policy. We know why the Leader of the Opposition wants to have a debate. He wants to be on the big stage.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Transport is warned.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** He wants people to know who he is. In fact, at every press conference he does he has to have a pull-up banner with his name on it because nobody knows who he is. And the reason why they don't know who he is is that he has no policies, so there is nothing to debate except for a hydrogen plan with a \$500 million black hole in it. Let's debate that.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Premier, there is a point of order. The member for West Torrens.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Standing order 98 applies to rules applying to answers. The Premier is now not answering the substance of the question but debating the topic. I ask you to bring him back to the question.

**The SPEAKER:** I am going to return to the Premier.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** The question was why don't I want a debate. I am outlining a list of reasons why it would be premature. There will be plenty of time for you to get—

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** Are you going to show up to Business SA or not? Why won't you show up?

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Lee!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —your pull-up banner out, tell people who you are and release a policy. I note that the Leader of the Opposition says he's got a policy, the hydrogen policy. It's got a \$500 million black hole in it so far. He says he wants to debate it. Well, when is it going to be released? Because so far what we have had is, what, a 1½ page, two page flimsy release? There are no detailed costings. 'No, no, we got somebody to do it.' Well, maybe let's have a look at it.

Let's have a look because we know what happened the last time this party was in charge of energy policy in South Australia: the biggest hike in terms of energy prices in the history of the state, the most unreliable grid and a statewide blackout that caused absolute misery to businesses, to households and to consumers in South Australia and stuck a great big hole in business confidence, investor confidence and consumer confidence. We have been in for 3½ years and we have been able to fix those three issues—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens is warned.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —and we look forward to the debates in the lead-up to the next election when they are scheduled.

### UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22):** My question is to the Premier. Why does South Australia have a worse unemployment rate than Victoria despite the fact that our participation rate is also worse than Victoria's?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:22):** I know that the Leader of the Opposition has a list of questions that have been prepared from the dream factory for him—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —and he is just working through them, but he might have listened to my first answer, and it is a fact that there has been a decrease in the participation rate. If you look at the way you actually determine what that unemployment rate is, it's a function regarding the number of people—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —relative to the participation rate. What we have seen is a reduction in the participation rate. As I said in answer to the first question, that's pretty normal—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Skills and Industry is warned for a second time.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —and you would expect that at the moment because they have been in a punishing lockdown. When I look at the statistics today, they are pretty damaging and worrying in Victoria with nearly 2,300 new infections today; 18,000—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members on my left, the Premier is making a contribution and I am doing my best to listen carefully.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** It's interesting that the opposition are making mirth when I am discussing a very serious situation in Victoria with—

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** You're the one politicising it.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens can leave for 30 minutes under 137A.

*The honourable member for West Torrens having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The SPEAKER:** Premier.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Thank you, sir.

*The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Today was a very worrying day in—

**The SPEAKER:** Premier, please be seated. The Minister for Innovation and Skills can join him under 137A.

*The honourable member for Unley having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** When you say 'join him', I think they will probably both be leaving the chamber; I doubt they will be joining you in the bar, knowing both their personalities very well.

**The SPEAKER:** You may be right there.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Today is a pretty tough day for our friends over in Victoria—almost 2,300 new infections; it's a record for them. Unfortunately, the Premier of Victoria, the Hon. Dan Andrews, had to report to the people in Victoria today about 18 deaths. They have had to take some very drastic measures in Victoria in terms of locking down that economy. They have had to do that and they have done it in accordance—

**Mr Malinauskas:** Yet they've got more jobs and a higher participation rate.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** They have had to take that action in accordance with the recommendations of the health experts at the moment. Of course it's going to have a damaging effect on the participation rate, and of course there are—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** We know that we are doing everything we can from a commonwealth level as well as a state level to support those people who are in a very difficult situation, either unemployed or underemployed or essentially on the support of the federal and state governments.

What I can say is that these are difficult times in various parts of Australia, most notably at the moment Victoria and the ACT. We do note that there is an improvement in recent days over in New South Wales, and we hope that they are bringing it under control. We know that the way out of this is vaccination. We know that all governments around Australia are doing everything they can to get to that 80 per cent, 16 and over double vaccination status. We know that this is going to significantly reduce that transmission rate and it is going to help from a health perspective, but it's also going to have a massive effect from an economic perspective.

We want to get our economy back to where it was pre COVID. In fact, in South Australia the economic outlook is stronger than it was pre COVID. I think everybody remembers reading the Deloitte Access Economics report earlier this week, where South Australia now has economic growth forecast this year at 3.6, the highest in the nation. That's going to continue because we are continuing to do extraordinarily well in terms of managing the coronavirus with the participation of all South Australians. Our employment is good, but there's still much more work to be done.

### **SPORT INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:26):** My question is for the Minister for Infrastructure and Sport. Can the minister please update the house about how the Marshall Liberal government is delivering for South Australian sporting communities by building what matters?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:26):** I thank the member for her question, and nothing

makes me happier than seeing a hardworking member delivering for their community, because that's what it's about on this side of the chamber: delivering for our communities. We don't put sporting opportunities in the too-hard basket: we deliver them. We deliver these projects because they are important to the people of South Australia.

The biggest ever investment in sport is being delivered by this government, especially at the grassroots level. The Marshall Liberal government has committed more than \$400 million all up into sport since coming into government, and that's an investment right across the state. These grants in sporting and recreation organisations build what matters by developing core infrastructure and community hubs that are key to driving sport participation and getting those rates up right across South Australia.

I know the member for Elder has been very passionate about the Mitchell Park Sports and Community Club. She has been on about this piece of infrastructure for a long period of time, and we are now helping to deliver that. I was also delighted to be in the member for Flinders' local area at a local grassroots club, the Port Neill Districts Community Sports Club, and we inspected their future facility, where they are building a new netball court with a grant of \$82,000 from the Marshall Liberal government. I was very proud to see what they are doing up there in the regions in the member for Flinders' electorate. By giving this community better facilities, we are allowing their young people to get out there, partake in sport and also fulfil their future sporting dreams.

It's not just the member for Flinders' electorate; we are delivering sporting infrastructure for those opposite as well. I know the member for Elizabeth's face lights up when he talks about the project we are delivering there: \$894,436 going into grants for new change rooms at the Elizabeth Oval, Playford Sports Precinct, and new lighting towers at Playford International College. It is a huge investment, again getting more people in his electorate playing sport and active.

Over in the member for West Torrens' electorate, again some wonderful work is happening there at the Peake Gardens Riverside Tennis Club with \$959,750 to develop clubroom facilities, incorporate external access to the canteen and toilets, additional construction of modular unisex change rooms, umpire rooms and improving disability access there as well—a great project. This project will benefit the 278 active members who use the site weekly. I can hear the members over there thanking us because we're doing this great work for both sides of the parliament. Mr Speaker, in your electorate, in Kavel—I was just doing the sums the other day—we have invested \$10 million into the sports community. You heard right—\$10 million:

- \$7.3 million going into the Mount Barker Regional Indoor Aquatic and Leisure Centre, a great project I know you are very keen on;
- \$341,000 sports floodlighting for Mount Barker Regional Sports Hub; and
- \$99,000 for resurfacing netball courts and lighting upgrades at Woodside for the Mid-Hills Netball Association and much, much more.

We are proud to be delivering for the sports communities of Adelaide and in the Adelaide Hills as well.

Back to those opposite, I know the member for Cheltenham's community is buzzing. We have \$85,000 going there to the Woodville oval for floodlighting. The member for Reynell, I know the member will be singing the government's praises because we have delivered nearly \$50,000 for the Southern Districts Cricket Club to install a turf square and surface upgrades to Bice Oval at Christies Beach.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Aren't they excited about this? This will improve their surfaces there and of course improve their cricket facilities as well. This government is proud to be delivering for those opposite and for all South Australians as we build what matters and get more people more active across our state.

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

*Members interjecting:*

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

**ELECTION COMMITMENTS**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:31):** My question is to the Premier. How many more election commitments that you took to the 2018 election do you plan to dump before next year's state election? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Leader, please be seated. There is a point of order.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** As has been ruled in this house many times, it is not within standing orders to offer an argument in violation of standing orders and then try to explain it with leave.

**The SPEAKER:** I will offer the leader an opportunity to rephrase the question.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier got any plans to dump other election commitments that he took to the 2018 election? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** InDaily reports today that the Premier has abandoned or dumped his Adelaide to Melbourne bike trail, which he once described as a world-class tourism cycling trail that would inject millions of dollars into the South Australian economy. The bike trail now joins his other signature policies that he took to the election like GlobeLink, not having a privatisation agenda and the right-hand turn of the tram. How many more election policies are you going to dump?

**The SPEAKER:** I'm going to allow the question.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order, sir: in the explanation that the leader offered, it was very unclear, if it was even mentioned, when the quote finished and when the leader started using his own words again.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, minister. I am sufficiently satisfied that it is clear.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:33):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question and his interest in a policy platform. In fact, in the lead-up to the last election we took hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of fully tested—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —and they are going extraordinarily well. They are going extraordinarily well, and we are monitoring them on a very regular basis. With regard to the Great Southern Bike Trail, sir, as you may be aware, we took a policy to investigate a trail which we thought would be hugely popular with cyclists and also those people wanting to move between Victoria and South Australia. We did that investigation and it wouldn't work in exactly the format that we took to the election but, rather than just—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Premier, you have the call.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Further members will be departing unless there is order.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** But, although the investigation showed that the precise details that we took to the last election would not be rolled out—no pun intended—we are looking at a range of different cycling trails across South Australia, and some of them have been progressively rolled out—

*Ms Michaels interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —and we will continue to do this. This is what people do: they make a commitment to investigate and they do that. That is what we committed to do. We have been very interested in policy, both before coming to government and on a continuous basis. We love the concept of, for example, opening hospital beds. Those opposite didn't share that policy platform: they closed hospital beds. This is one of the great opportunities for comparison.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I'm not sure that the former government took to the last election—or the election before the last, in fact—saying, 'We are going to close the Repat hospital.' Yet what did they do when they got to government? They closed the Repat hospital. This is despite the fact that so many people camped on the steps of Parliament House it was so important to them. It was one of the largest petitions, if not the largest petition, in the history of South Australia. It broke the hearts of the people of South Australia. Thankfully, of course, there was a change of government at the last election and we had the opportunity to implement what was the will of the people of South Australia.

We took a very large policy platform to the last election—in fact, more than 300 fully costed policies that we showed to the people of South Australia. I don't know whether the opposition is into the double figures yet?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Would they be at six, eight? I don't know. Any guesses? No? I know they have—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Transport is warned for a second time.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —the hydrogen policy. I know they want to merge a couple of universities—the universities don't want to have a bar of that. I know they do not want to have any further deregulation of shop trading hours in accordance with the government's plan. I know they don't want to cap council rates in South Australia. I know what they don't want to do, but it's unclear yet, with less than five months until the next election, what they do want to do.

We make no apologies for having a very full policy platform that we took to the last election. Yes, the Great Southern Bike Trail investigation didn't show that this was a good investment for the people of South Australia and there were better alternatives. That's precisely what we are doing. We have done that investigation and we have found that there are better alternatives for the way that we spend taxpayer dollars.

I know that the Minister for Environment and Water has been spending a huge amount of money on bike trails right across the state. You should ask him a question on that. In fact, if they ask a supplementary, you jump up and tell them all about it because what you have been doing there is significantly better than anything that we envisaged before delivering for the people of South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Lee can leave for 15 minutes under 137A.

*The honourable member for Lee having withdrawn from the chamber:*

#### AGTECH

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:37):** 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 supporting our regions through encouraging greater adoption of technology on farm?

**The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:37):** Thank you to the member for Hammond for his great question, and I know his interest in this space is enormous.

This Sunday and Monday, there are going to be 500 people coming to the Convention Centre here in Adelaide to participate in the government's agtech conference, AdvanceAg. This is a great initiative of the government to bring those key people together to talk about the developments that are available in new technologies that the agriculture industry can use.

As a farmer myself, I know the advances that have occurred in my lifetime are enormous, and the importance of uptake by industry to get those into operation is critical. It is very important that we work with industry to make sure they get that uptake. The sooner they use these new technologies, the greater we see the returns to the economy.

It has been a great collaboration, getting this conference up and going. It has been a real challenge, and we have certainly had challenges. We unfortunately had planned to hold this conference at the last lockdown we had in South Australia, so it had to be postponed, but it's looking all good for this weekend. Importantly, we will have the Premier there on Monday morning to open this conference. The Premier certainly very much understands the need for the investment in agtech and supports the development of the wonderful technologies in this space.

We also have a keynote speaker, a New Zealander and founding executive director of Agritech New Zealand. Unfortunately, he is unable to join us personally, but he will be there virtually. He is extremely disappointed that he can't be there. Peter Wren-Hilton is his name, and he was very much key to come across, but unfortunately the COVID restrictions have made it impossible for him to be here.

We also have the chief executive officer and co-founder of a South Australian success story, Myriota, Dr Alex Grant, speaking at the conference. Currently, down at Lot Fourteen, recently signed was an agreement with the Morrison government in the defence satellite space. That's the same technology that can be used for agriculture. It is really important for our farmers that we continue to invest in this space. There will also be 45 businesses there demonstrating their technologies, giving the participants, farmers and others the ability to touch and feel those new technologies.

Also, an exciting part of this year's conference is the introduction of a Pitch to Farmers competition. We have had over 30 nominations and it has been brought down to five finalists who will actually pitch their idea or their recently newly developed technology to the audience and the audience will be able to vote on these ideas. The winner will receive \$10,000 towards developing those ideas. This is a great opportunity for farmers to learn about these new technologies, even before they have been developed. This is a key part of it: to have farmers, to have the ag businesses themselves, agtech startups, technology developers, educators and anyone involved in agtech there. We see a great conference occurring on Monday.

Independent analysis has shown that a full implementation of agtech is important to our South Australian economy. A 20 per cent increase in productivity can lead to a \$2.6 billion increase annually if people take up these new technologies. This is a great initiative by this government to support agtech, to support these initiatives. This leads to jobs. This leads to the importance of keeping South Australia's agriculture as a key part of our economy. We need to continue and we need to encourage our farmers to be involved in this space, to learn, to uptake, and this is a great initiative to link Lot Fourteen right through to our farming. This is a great initiative.

### ELECTION COMMITMENTS

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:41):** My question is to the Premier. Why did the Premier tell the house his policy was to investigate a bike trail? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Only moments ago the Premier told this house that his policy at the 2018 election was to investigate a bike trail, when in fact it says and I quote:

What we'll do

If elected in March 2018, a Marshall Liberal Government will invest in developing a world-class tourism cycling trail from Adelaide to Melbourne, working alongside the Federal and Victorian Governments to have it link with other existing bike trails all the way through to Melbourne.

Is the Premier just making things up again?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:42):** I am more than happy to take this question on behalf of the government. We certainly said we would invest in exploring that trail. We undertook the study, we undertook investment, as we said we would, and it was determined that the sector, those who are passionate and interested and know about bike trails, understood and had reached the conclusion and shared that with the government that those large multiple-day bike trips are really falling out of favour.

So this government decided to look at other opportunities to invest in bike trails and infrastructure right across the state, opening up areas that had been locked up before, locked up by the previous government, because they were strangely ideologically opposed to getting into some of these areas and for other reasons that they just couldn't be bothered, or they didn't have the money because they had cut the National Parks and Wildlife Service and Department for Environment and Water and its predecessor agencies' budgets by some 60 per cent. So when you have cut the budgets that much, you don't actually have the capacity to do these things.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, there is a point of order.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Point of order: debate. The question was: why did the Premier tell the house his policy was to investigate a bike trail? That was the question.

**The SPEAKER:** The minister is making a reasonable attempt to answer the question. I will allow him some latitude but bring him back to the substance of the question.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Really, the investment was around the investigation, and the investigation showed that people wanted investment elsewhere, investment in mountain biking, an incredibly dynamic growing sport, and that's exactly what we are doing.

I was with the Minister for Energy and Mining up in his electorate recently looking at the Southern Flinders Ranges, where we are investing hugely in outdoor adventure and particularly mountain biking. In fact, first off, we opened a new bike trail that goes from Melrose to Booleroo Centre and then turned a sod for the next stage of that bike trail that goes from Booleroo Centre down to Laura, or heading in that direction, with the eventual aim that it will connect up through to the Clare Valley and transform that part of the region.

That goes on top of further investment that we are doing in the Southern Flinders Ranges around an epic loop trail, an international attraction taking people up through areas like the Wirrabara Ranges and Mount Remarkable through to Alligator Gorge and Wilmington, connecting those different landscapes together—Beetaloo Reservoir—and activating them, bringing them to light because we know that when we invest in adventure-based infrastructure, like walking trails, hiking, rock climbing facilities and particularly mountain biking and cycling infrastructure, we draw people in to the regions.

The Minister for Recreation and Sport, along with the member for Davenport and myself, headed down to Glenthorne National Park on Monday to take a look at the new BMX facilities, the Sam Willoughby BMX track, an incredible project being invested in by the Marshall Liberal government in Glenthorne National Park. We saved it from Labor's housing plans and we are bringing it to life as a conservation and recreational precinct. It was so good to go up there onto those pieces of infrastructure—

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, please be seated. Leader.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** I again rise on a point of order: debate. The question was really clear: why did the Premier tell the house his policy was to investigate a bike trail? The minister continues to evade answering the question. It is very straightforward, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, I am going to uphold the point of order and bring you to the question. There is one minute remaining.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** They hate good news. The long and the short of it is we are investing in infrastructure all across the state. The cycling sector didn't want this and so we are moving in another direction.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader, the question is concluded. I anticipate you are moving to the next question.

*Matter of Privilege*

#### **MATTER OF PRIVILEGE**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:46):** I am happy, in that case, to rise on a matter of privilege, sir. Earlier, the Premier made it very clear in his answer to an earlier question that the Premier's policy was to investigate a bike trail when, in an actual fact, on examination of the Premier's policy in the 2018 election, he doesn't mention the word 'investigate' once. We believe the Premier has misled the house.

**The SPEAKER:** Members, a matter of privilege has been made. I invite the leader to furnish me with materials that might make out a prima facie case, and I will return to the chamber once I have considered my decision.

*Question Time*

#### **PRISONS, DRUG USE**

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:47):** My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister please update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is delivering better services through the introduction of buffer zones in South Australian prisons?

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (14:47):** I thank the member for MacKillop for the question. Yes, this government is serious about cracking down on drugs in our prisons. Those of us on this side of the house know that we have a strong history when it comes to this. Not only are we taking a hard-line approach to drugs but we are also taking a hard-line stance against those people who attempt to introduce any kind of contraband into our facilities, whether it be smuggling drugs into prison or even going to more extreme lengths to introduce drugs with technology.

We saw in recent times that we made changes to the Correctional Services Act. Unfortunately, there are some out there who see fit to try to get drugs into our prisons. We saw this in recent times in Port Augusta, where an individual—he wasn't Robin Hood but he had a bow and arrow—tried to propel drugs over into one of our facilities. Lucky for us that, since changes that have come in that this government has made, we have been able to crack down on this sort of behaviour.

When we saw this attempt to introduce contraband into the prison, SAPOL were alerted, I am proud to say, and three people were actually arrested shortly after, and they have since been charged with introducing contraband into a correctional facility. It shows why these important changes that we made are necessary. We no longer need to wait for people to necessarily enter our prisons before they can be charged with contraband or drug offences. Any attempts now to bring drugs into our prisons are obviously completely unacceptable.

Thanks to the new buffer zones that have been created surrounding all South Australian prisons, visitors caught with drugs or prohibited items inside that zone can face hefty gaol time. This means that even if you bring controlled drugs into, say, a prison car park or have drugs around the perimeter fence or outside the visitor entrance or, in fact, onto any government owned land around South Australian prisons, you will risk a maximum penalty of up to 10 years' imprisonment.

Not content with buffer zones on the ground, we have also taken those restrictions right to the sky with buffer zones for the operation of what is otherwise known as a drone or a remotely piloted aircraft. We have seen the emergence of technology such as drones being used by people to attempt to bring in contraband drugs into our prison. That's why we have brought forward these important steps of introducing these offences for people who do the wrong thing. If you do operate

one of these aircraft within 100 metres without the permission of the CE, you will face a maximum fine of \$10,000 or up to two years' gaol.

We have seen a dramatic drop in the introduction of drugs into our prisons over the past months, particularly with the suspension of face-to-face visits in prison due to COVID-19 restrictions. However, I am pleased to inform the house that domestic visits will commence from Saturday 16 October, with bookings able to be made online. Critically, these visits, not only for visitors but also for family members and other people who may need to visit our prisons, are to be for people who have received at least one COVID-19 vaccination. By 13 November, visits will only be able to occur between prisoners and their visitors who are actually fully vaccinated as well. That's to ensure that we keep our prisons, our staff and also the wider community safe.

I do acknowledge that a lot of people have made sacrifices when it comes to the temporary suspension of face-to-face visits. However, we have been able to facilitate Zoom calls right across the prison sites, and this has been fantastic. For some prisoners, they have been able to, through Zoom, look into their living room, see members of their family that they otherwise wouldn't have seen to maintain that important connection. Importantly, the majority of other prison services, including recreation and education and also the prison industry, have been able to continue during the period of the restrictions.

**The SPEAKER:** The minister's time has expired. The member for MacKillop is warned and the member for Wright is warned. I note that the member for Wright is very close to the edge.

#### LIBERAL PARTY CANDIDATES

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:52):** My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier okay with a member facing criminal charges standing as a Liberal candidate at the next state election?

**The SPEAKER:** Those matters are sub judice and the Premier may choose not to answer that question on that basis.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:52):** Again, Mr Speaker, you have made the very valid point that it is a matter that is sub judice and we won't make any further comment on it.

#### LIBERAL PARTY CANDIDATES

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:52):** Does the Premier believe that South Australians are entitled to know whether the Premier is okay with members facing criminal charges being candidates at the next election?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order, sir: exactly the same response as the Attorney-General just made. The question is completely out of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, I have given consideration to the question. It invites a wider answer in relation to all members, and I would be open to receiving submissions as to whether, nevertheless, the matter might traverse sub judice matters, and so I will hear you out on that point. Leader, I will hear out the Leader of Government Business first and then I will turn to you.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** In that case, in response to your comments, it is a hypothetical question.

**The SPEAKER:** Leader, do you wish to address me on that point?

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** I make no reference to any specific matter. I am simply seeking—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The first question was out of order. Members, we are now considering the second question as to why the leader's question ought be put and is not beyond the standing orders.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** My question is simply asking the Premier if he is okay with having people charged with criminal offences being Liberal Party candidates. It goes to whether or not the Premier thinks it is ethical to have people facing criminal charges as members of the Liberal Party standing as candidates at the next election. It's a basic question of standards that the Premier should be held to account on.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members, I will draw the house to order. That was—

*Mr Whetstone interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Chaffey, you are warned. Leader, the initial question appeared to be directed at any member. It didn't specifically mention—or rather the subsequent question is reformulated, which—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Chaffey, you are warned. Please don't respond to interjections. We are going to resolve this matter before the house. The second formulation appeared to be a much wider formulation. I foreshadow that I might be inclined to accept that question if it were put again, but the answer that the Premier or Attorney or any other minister might give may be well informed by the sub judice rule.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Do you want me to re-ask the question?

**The SPEAKER:** I understand that there was a second formulation, which is why it didn't relate to any specific matter and it didn't relate to any specific member and it didn't seek to impugn or—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The leader.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier believe that South Australians are entitled to know whether the Premier is comfortable with having members of his Liberal Party team as candidates for the next state election facing criminal charges?

**The SPEAKER:** The Leader of Government Business.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Again, Mr Speaker, it is a completely hypothetical question for which the Premier is not responsible to the house.

**The SPEAKER:** I am going to allow the question. As I say, refer to the sub judice rule and that may well inform the answer.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:55):** I have nothing to add to my previous answers.

#### LIBERAL PARTY CANDIDATES

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:55):** My question is to the Premier. What is the Premier's policy on candidates facing criminal charges within the Liberal Party? Are they allowed or not allowed?

**The SPEAKER:** He can well answer the question but it might have the same answer. Premier.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:56):** I refer the leader to my previous answers today and yesterday.

#### MEMBER FOR NARUNGA

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:56):** My question is to the Leader of Government Business.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Was the Leader of Government Business laying the groundwork for re-entry to the Liberal Party for the member for Narungga this morning when he told ABC radio that he was a very, very good person?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:56):** No.

#### MEMBER FOR KAVEL

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:56):** My question is to the leader of opposition business in the house. Did the member have any discussions with the member for Kavel about the member for Kavel becoming the Speaker before the member for Kavel announced that he would leave the Liberal Party?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** There might well be a point of order in relation to that.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:56):** Thank you very much. I have had many discussions with Liberal colleagues about their colleagues. Mr Speaker, I have to say that when the select committee was launched and carried into the Deputy Premier the masks went on to conceal the smiles.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It's your question.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order, sir.

*Members interjecting:*

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of Government Business.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Standing order 98: the question was very specifically about one member.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens, please be seated. There is robust debate in the chamber, but I remind members that they are only responsible to the house for government business. This is question time. Questions of this nature inevitably invite questions as to the motives of members, which, of course, would be out of order. I am going to turn to a question that relates to government business. Is there one? The member for King.

#### MEMORIAL DRIVE REDEVELOPMENT

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:58):** My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister update the house on how a world-class tennis venue—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for King, please be seated. I will not permit this discourse in relation to the member for King. The member for King will be heard in absolute silence.

**Ms LUETHEN:** My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister update the house on how a world-class tennis venue is being delivered and how local jobs are being created through the Marshall Liberal government's Memorial Drive upgrade?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:59):** I thank the member for her question and note her passion and advocacy for investing in sport and delivering jobs at the same time. I want to add to that her advocacy for her own community and the great work she has done delivering for the Golden Grove Tennis Club as well, it must be noted—an outstanding precinct. Again, I congratulate her on that.

We have also served up Memorial Drive and the precinct redevelopment there. Anyone who has been across the bridge and over to the Adelaide Oval and seen the development at Memorial Drive would be suitably impressed. Stage 1, the \$10 million roof, was a great outcome. That investment helped us get the Adelaide International and led to us having some of the world's biggest names in tennis here last year: Serena Williams, Novak Djokovic and Rafa Nadal playing here in Adelaide because of that investment we made, and we are very proud of that.

The Premier and I dropped by just a couple of weeks ago to see how the momentum was going for stage 2 of this development. That is coming along amazingly well, and we were both very impressed with what we saw. A \$44 million investment has been injected into stage 2 as part of this massive transformation to make this a state-of-the-art arena.

Let me detail what stage 2 actually includes. The northern and eastern facilities, linked by the concourse level, will enhance patron amenities and food and beverage facilities. The northern facility will include a media and sports technology centre with broadcast facilities, media lounge and space for high-performance sports research and development. The eastern facility will incorporate high-performance training facilities, premium multipurpose event and function spaces and the addition of rigging points for the roof and feature lighting. This is a great expansion and it will be of great benefit to the people of South Australia. Not only that, but it will drive jobs and vibrancy within our city.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The exchange between the leader and the Premier will cease.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** It will also inspire the next iteration of tennis superstars. Talking about jobs, the development will create 85 full-time jobs and, wait for it, 21 new apprentices. The Minister for Innovation and Skills is excited about that. It will employ 350 people through a variety of roles throughout the life of this project. So it's an exciting project coming out of the ground here in Adelaide—of course, not only for sport; it will be used for concerts and other events as well, so the facility will be beneficial to everyone.

We are the government that is building what matters and we talk about that all the time and this is another example of that. We are the government that is creating jobs and that is key to what we are doing. I know that the member for King is very passionate about that. In fact, we are the government that has delivered sports projects for the community of South Australia right across the board. Let's touch on what the Marshall Liberal government has delivered for sporting communities in our great state.

We have mentioned the projects, but sports vouchers can't go unnoticed. When we came to government, we upped the sports vouchers to \$100, so we were putting money back in the pockets of South Australian families, with \$100 for primary school age children who are actually going out and getting involved in sport. We have expanded that out to years 8 and 9 as well, and we have added dance and swimming to that program because we know how important it is to get young people active, and we are helping families with the cost of living in this process.

In fact, in the member for King's electorate more than 1,600 vouchers have been claimed this year, saving families more than \$160,000, which is absolutely outstanding. This government is very proud to be delivering for the sports communities in South Australia. We are very proud of the investment of more than \$50 million into that Memorial Drive precinct so that we can have international events, so that we can keep developing our tennis stars of the future, and that is why we are building what matters for the people of South Australia—to keep prospering South Australia and taking our state forward.

**SPORTS VOUCHERS**

**Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:03):** Supplementary: minister, when will you extend the sports voucher scheme to cover Scouts and Girl Guides in South Australia?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:03):** I thank the member for the question. As I did outline, we have expanded the vouchers and we are always looking at opportunities to expand that further. But we did notice when we came to government that the previous government hadn't actually invested any money in the program going forward, so there was no money from those opposite into our Sports Vouchers program.

We went to the Treasurer and said, 'We need to keep this going because this is a good program.' Labor don't want to continue it; we do on our side of the house. We want to continue it. They had no money for the program.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The leader is called to order.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** No thought to keep rolling it out. We said that we need to keep this going and the Treasurer was obliging. In fact, we said, 'You know what? We need to up the voucher program as well to \$100. We need to make sure we are putting money back into the pockets of the people of South Australia.' Along the way, we looked to expand it even further and we added dance and we added swimming to that program as well. Then we thought we should look to advance it even further because it is such a good program, and we moved it into years 8 and 9 and we will continue to look at how we do it. One of the key focuses we have with this program wrapped around the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Reynell!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —is we want to get more people active. They may not want to do it on that side of the chamber, but that's our focus and why we invested in it on this side. Again, I reiterate: we took it from 50, but the Labor government weren't going to even fund or support it. They had no money in the budget for it. We put the 50 back in and we have made it 100. We actually increased the program.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** They don't like to hear it, but it's a fact.

*Ms Cook interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Then we expanded it, and we expanded it to swimming and we also expanded it to dance.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Families were very appreciative of that—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —and we are very happy about that as well, and now we have expanded it to year 8s and year 9s because we know it helps out families. We will continue to look at ways and means that we can expand it further, but we need to keep making sure that we are delivering for people right across South Australia. That's overlaid not only in helping families with the cost of living when it comes to sport but also making sure we are delivering the infrastructure that sporting organisations need.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, there is a point of order. Please be seated, minister, there is a point of order.

**Mr DULUK:** Standing order 98: as good as the information is from the minister, the question was: when will this government extend the vouchers system to Scouts and Girl Guides? It's not about the values of the Labor Party; it's about wanting to know what this government is doing.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I will reiterate what we are doing.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, just a moment thank you. Standing order 98 provides for rules applying to answers. Those rules, minister, are clear:

- (a) In answering a question, a Minister or other Member replies to the substance of the question and may not debate the matter to which the question refers.

I am going to uphold the point of order. Minister, I bring you to the question or the supplementary question.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** As I outlined to the member, we will continue to look at it as we have with swimming; we advanced it there, as we did with dancing. That's not debate, sir: it's fact. We expanded it in swimming, we expanded it in dance and we expanded it to year 8s and 9s. That is what we have done. We will continue to look at ways we can expand that, but we will also look at a more broader perspective of sport, where we have invested in the infrastructure as well.

We need to take all those factors into consideration, but our government proudly has put more than \$400 million into sport in South Australia, grassroots sport, to get more people more active through our Game On program. We are very proud of that. We have delivered for communities right across the state. We will continue to do that and look for further opportunities as they arise.

**The SPEAKER:** There was concern that the remainder of that question might not address the substance, but the answer has concluded.

#### TRADE AND INVESTMENT

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (15:06):** My question is to the Minister for Trade and Investment. Can the minister please update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is supporting exporters and encouraging investments in jobs in South Australia?

**The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment) (15:07):** I thank the member for Heysen. Of course, I am very sad to have received his question, but also note that he is a fantastic advocate for the Adelaide Hills, which has so many exporting companies there. Wine, especially, is very important to them.

I reported to the house just this week that we have had the highest ever number of merchandise exports in South Australia's history, with \$13.2 billion of money coming into our economy. Of course, it does not come without challenges. The wine industry, which I spoke about, certainly is very challenging, and that is why in the most recent budget we did announce a \$5.4 million Wine Export Recovery and Expansion Program.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON:** That's a program—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister has the call.

**The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON:** The \$5.4 million Wine Export Recovery and Expansion Program concentrates on three key areas, whether that's in existing markets with volumes in the UK, Canada or the US; in the emerging markets, such as Japan, South Korea or Hong Kong; or whether that's in the more emerging markets, the United Arab Emirates, Vietnam, Scandinavia and India.

In terms of those established markets, we have already launched the US Market Entry Program, it's great to inform you, member for Heysen, and the house. We have also launched now an Indian Wine Expansion Program. As I said, that's a developing market for South Australian

wineries to get into, whether they are already existing in the Indian market and looking to expand or whether they are trying to be new entrants to that. Of course, it's got a massive growing middle class—

*Ms Hildyard interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Reynell! Minister, please be seated. Members opposite, these matters are particularly significant for the member for Heysen and to me in my capacity as the member for Kavel, and I wish to hear the answer.

**The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON:** As I said, they have a growing middle and upper class in India with an appetite for wine. COVID has meant that a lot of those middle-class Indian consumers are turning to e-commerce, so there are massive opportunities there and it's just a matter of how can South Australian wineries get access to those.

We are running a 12-month program to help introduce wineries to importers and distributors over there in some key target cities. New Delhi and Mumbai are certainly massive cities, where there are great opportunities. To help us to communicate that message we have a fantastic ambassador, a Master of Wine, so highly distinguished and the only Master of Wine in India, Miss Sonal Holland. The only Master of Wine in India, she is a distinguished writer, a wine commentator and highly respected. She will provide great advocacy for South Australian wineries to get access into that Indian market. As she said, playing the role of a program ambassador, she made the point that India is one of the youngest countries in the world, with 65 per cent of their 1.3 billion population under the age of 35.

It's a great opportunity for South Australian wineries. That will run for the next 12 months, and I encourage all wineries interested in entering that Indian market to really reach out and find out more about this program to help them grow their business and, in turn, employ more South Australians.

#### GRAIN RECEIVAL SITES

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:11):** My question is to the minister for primary production. Can the minister advise what will happen in the event of a COVID outbreak at a grain receival site, whether that site might be shut down, forcing primary producers to travel to more inconvenient locations during middle harvest?

**The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:11):** I thank the member for Narungga for his important question and, as we all know, Yorke Peninsula is such an important part of the grain-growing areas of South Australia, and it certainly has an important part in delivering grain into the South Australian coffers. We have almost 1.5 million tonnes of grain that are going to be coming off Yorke Peninsula this year.

Certainly, we do have the challenges of managing COVID and making sure that we do not have disruptions, particularly during harvest. This is the second year we have seen these disruptions during harvest having some sort of effect on the delivery into those receival points. Talking with Viterra, which is by far the largest receiver of grains in the state, they have been very conscious of the challenges that may be faced not just in managing workforce. We have seen the government invest and commit to making planning opportunities much smoother to allow workforces to be located on site to make sure that we have an opportunity to make sure we have enough workers at site to actually deliver the grain to.

Viterra also continue to develop their strategies to minimise the risks. They have moved to contactless delivery so the drivers will not interact with staff. The drivers will not be getting out of their trucks where staff on the sites are and so there will not be direct contact, limiting the opportunity for infections to occur. If there was an unfortunate detection of an infection that did lead to an issue at a site, Viterra informed me that they have contingency plans in place. They would probably shut the site for about 24 hours while they do a significant clean.

At that point in time, yes, there would be some diversions to nearby sites, but they apparently have mapped out the opportunities and how that could be done. They are also running split shifts, so if there is an outbreak they can limit the number of staff who have to be put into quarantine to manage the risk. This will mean that they are able to continue receiving grains very quickly at those sites. They believe that they will be able to have people back there operational within 24 hours.

They also have alternate workers who will be able to be brought onto those sites if there is a workforce issue in relation to a particular site. I think particularly Viterra has certainly done an enormous amount of work and I thank them and also all the other people involved in the industry to manage through this difficult time. They have made their businesses work and made sure that they will continue to deliver for South Australia and the farmers to make sure they are there at that critical time of bringing grain into our receivable depots.

I wish the farmers and those receiving the grain all the best for harvest as we head into an important part of the year. We wish them the right weather conditions, and that they are able to bring this grain harvest in and deliver \$2.8 billion worth of grain into our economy.

### COVID-19 TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:15):** My question is to the Premier. Has SA Health requested further resources in order to comply with the legislated 21-day requirement to process travel exemptions? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr BELL:** I have a large caseload at the moment of people who are over the 21 legislated days to be informed:

- Rachel, Alex and their two young children relocating from Victoria have purchased a house in Mount Gambier. They have been waiting 36 days;
- Jennifer and Daniel are relocating from country Victoria. Their new employer is holding a job for them—35 days;
- Lisa and daughter relocating from Victoria—43 days;
- Bodie returning to his mother after visiting his father—27 days;
- Tim, a returning SA resident after working in Victoria—22 days;
- Georgia, a student returning from New South Wales—38 days; and
- Richard and Melissa, there is a job waiting for Richard—38 days.

All are getting frustrated that the length of time is beyond the 21 days.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:16):** I thank the member for his question. It is an important question and certainly the situation that exists with regard to the border, particularly the border between Victoria and South Australia, is causing a huge amount of frustration, especially in those border communities but more broadly across South Australia as well. Like the member, I have plenty of people contacting my office on a daily basis making the pleas to let their children back in or for themselves to come back in.

But, as I said earlier today, we currently have in Victoria a very dangerous situation with a record day of new infections—2,300 or 2,297 new infections in the last 24 hours and 18 deaths in that community. The requirement to get back within 21 days I think is an important one so that we can at least give answers to people. Of course, it doesn't mean that they are approved within those 21 days. We are still doing those assessments. If the member or any member has any examples of people who are just not being given an answer within those 21 days, then I would be very keen to hear about them and to make best endeavours to get back to them as quickly as possible.

Obviously, at the moment there are very significant numbers. I haven't had a report today, but we are talking in excess of 5,000 people who are trying to come back in. They are not quite on that number of applications because on one application there might be four or five people, or there could be two or there could just be a single person, but we know there are thousands of people trying to come back in at the moment, especially from Victoria.

I would like to make sure that we can get as many people back across the border as possible but I also want to do it safely. We can see the devastating effects on economies but also on lives and employment if the Delta variant comes in. South Australia is pretty close at the moment.

I want to particularly commend the community down in the South-East for their high-level vaccination rates. We had a scare down there in recent weeks. There was a very significant increase in testing down there. The community takes it really seriously. They do not want the disease to come in. We have also seen a good level of QR code check-ins in the South-East and, of course, good vaccination rates, but we do need to be able to get back to people as quickly as possible.

Sometimes that response, though, is not at this point in time, but I am very hopeful that as the vaccination rate increases in Victoria and they get on top of some of their issues, we may be able to let more people in. In the first instance, though, they will have to do the 14 days of quarantine. Most people are accepting of that. Where it is particularly good for us is where people are double vaccinated and they are not coming directly from an area with high-level infection.

We try as much as possible now to accommodate them doing home-based quarantine. It's particularly important for border communities. They don't want to have to come in from Victoria—from Melbourne, for example. They are living normally in Mount Gambier and they have to go into Adelaide and then pay a fee sometimes to actually do hotel quarantine. We want to be able as much as possible to get them to do that home-based quarantine using that home-based quarantine app.

To the member for Mount Gambier, and in fact to all members in this parliament, if there are things we can be doing when people go beyond the 21 days without a response, then certainly please do not hesitate in letting me know.

#### **DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE**

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:20):** My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Human Services. Minister, why are vulnerable people, including victims of family violence in fear of their safety, being placed in unsuitable, substandard and unsafe emergency accommodation in a caravan park? Also, what is being done to ensure that victims of violence are safe from perpetrators and not being placed at further risk in this sort of accommodation? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain further.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** I have received a very lengthy email, plus I have had several women come into my office in the last three to four months who have found themselves requiring emergency accommodation due to fleeing domestic violence. These people have always outlined a number of concerns around the condition of the caravan park, the breach of confidentiality and antisocial behaviour, as well as violence and drug use.

I have been advised that the toilet doors of the caravan park don't always have working locks and you need to put your foot against the door when using these facilities which is creating uncertainty, risk and fear amongst these people fleeing family violence. I have had three or four who said they will go back to their own homes to live with the perpetrator. Again, I am looking for some guidance from the minister.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:21):** Certainly, the member has raised a most concerning scenario. I am assuming from the question that it's somewhere in Port Pirie, the caravan park. Is that the case? Yes. It's not satisfactory anywhere if people are, of course, in fear for their life and being sent to accommodation—

**The Hon. G.G. Brock:** In close proximity.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —that's not secure. I understand. I am certainly happy to have a look into it, as to how this is occurring. Certainly if there is a facility—and I am aware there are domestic violence facilities within the precinct of Port Pirie—and they are full or unable to be co-located with someone, there may be some COVID restrictions. I don't know the answer to that. I am happy to get the information and make that inquiry.

I certainly haven't been informed of any concern raised about that. I don't know how long ago this occurred, but the Premier and I and others on this side of the house were actually in Port Pirie

only a few weeks ago, and what issue had been raised with us was in relation to future accommodation generally for the population. There hadn't been any issue raised by members of that constituency as to domestic violence facilities. That they are going to facilities that on the face of it are insecure—that is, they can't be protected against an alleged perpetrator or partner or the like—is certainly concerning, so certainly I will be happy to follow that up. If the member is happy to provide me with the details of that, I am more than happy to follow it up.

The member also raised yesterday a question of a female constituent of Greek background who was having concerns with the Public Trustee. I have perused the correspondence that I did send to the member in a letter of 15 September which outlined the proposed offer of the Public Trustee, if she wished to pursue it in relation to translation of her bank statements, that they would provide that advice to her.

Obviously, there is a cost element to that. I think you, member for Frome, have asked to have copies of that material as well. I understand my office has concluded in providing that. If you haven't received it yet, I could follow that up as well. But certainly, that correspondence was being collated. I think there were something like 146 documents you wanted, and that has been offered to be provided.

If somebody wants to have it translated into another language, I confirm what I said yesterday. It is important that services be introduced to the applicant. This particular person has apparently some of her funds with the Public Trustee. She has capacity and she can give instructions, as the member well knows. They are happy to assist in relation to translating services or interpreting services, depending on which service you would like to take, but there will obviously be fees associated with that, as with any other translation costs.

#### **MUSIC TEACHERS**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:24):** My question is to the Minister for Education. What additional funds and other measures will be put in place to employ additional instrumental music teachers in the public education system as year 7s move to high schools?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:24):** I thank the member for the question. There are a range of ways in which we deliver music support for students at school. We have some specialist music schools, and members would be familiar with those. We have an instrumental music service which provides group instruction for students up to year 12 and I believe some one-on-one tuition for some year 12 students. That service has maintained a reasonably consistent number of people over the period that I am aware of. In the time that I have been the minister, I do not think that has changed very much.

In addition, as we have increased resources to schools, we have encouraged schools to look at the work that they do in music. Indeed, some schools, in addition to engaging the music teachers that they may have, offer the opportunity for students to use, through either hourly paid instructors or private music instructors, the opportunity to study music as an individual or in group settings.

I remember the member for Port Adelaide, when she was education minister, was confronted with an industrial dispute brought on by the Australian Education Union, which did not want private music instructors to be allowed to engage with students in public schools. I thought that the member for Port Adelaide, when she was education minister, handled that matter very well. In the end, I think a sensible resolution was achieved. It was a resolution I remember discussing with her ahead of that, and I seriously doubt that it wasn't underway anyway. It was a sensible and logical opportunity for schools that had endeavoured to find individual music instructors who were appropriate and within the school's budget, and so forth, for a student. That not being possible, a private music instructor could be allowed.

That was the situation available to support students studying music when we came to government and all of those resources have continued. Two new things have happened since coming to government. First, we have announced that year 7s are going into high school. This has seen a significant investment over and above what was previously on the books for infrastructure, and many of those infrastructure jobs have gone to supporting performing arts facilities being improved in schools, highlighting the value of music programs for students.

There is also an investment that was originally budgeted at about \$40 million a year. It could be a little bit more than that now, potentially, as we have more students than we had before. There is \$40 million a year extra going into our schools to recognise that in our high schools we have more need for subject specialist teachers and specialist learning environments, reflecting the environment of a high school education rather than primary school, where you mostly have generalist teachers and maybe a specialist music teacher, or the instrumental music service is available, depending on the circumstances.

In that high school environment now, with \$40 million extra going in to support music education and other specialist subjects, many high schools are investing more. That's a matter for the individual school and their circumstances. Some were specialist music schools and some already had music programs and some are expanding those. In addition to that, I am very pleased to advise the house that in I think late 2018 we implemented a new music education strategy which I think had in the order of \$7 million over the forward estimates, but it is ongoing funding that has supported significant amounts of new support for—

**Mr Picton:** Thanks, Susan.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** The Labor government is now claiming credit for a press release they had, which is actually not relevant to the work that I did with Graeme Koehne from the Elder Conservatorium, Vincent Ciccarello from the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra and range of other people. It's an extraordinary body of work and it's been in place since late 2018 and it continues going forward. Labor had 16 years to do these things.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Labor had 16 years; it was a long 16 years. They didn't achieve it. This government has.

#### *Grievance Debate*

#### **HOSPITAL BEDS**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:29):** What a week, what a week! This week we really have seen the Liberal Party outdo themselves. I have to say that if it was not so tragic it would be funny. It would be funny. I have been somewhat struck over the last 48 hours how much this has cut through.

I have had the pleasure of attending a number of business events in recent times, including yesterday evening the launch of the 2022 Downer-Rann Scholarships, an important event for the state and an event the Premier himself was billed to attend and speak at. I was somewhat surprised yesterday to attend the scholarships for this particular award only to find out that the Premier was a late withdrawal. Apparently, it was a late withdrawal. The explanation given by the MC at this particular event was that the Premier was occupied with important parliamentary business.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order, sir: standing order 131.

**Mr Malinauskas:** Is that 'Don't CRACK jokes at the Premier's and the Liberal Party's expense'?

**The SPEAKER:** I will hear the member in relation to any submissions he wishes to put in relation to 131. I anticipate he is drawing my attention to interruptions.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** In addition to the member for Cheltenham interrupting the Speaker just then, many members have been rudely interrupting their leader's speech and I look forward to them being drawn to order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There are a robust number of interjections in the house.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** The Downer-Rann Scholarship launch 2022: Premier Steven Marshall attending the event—had to withdraw because of important parliamentary business. The irony of this,

of course, was that earlier in the day during the course of question time we had the Premier wax lyrical about earlier events where premiers have had to withdraw as a result of stability. The irony is not lost on us.

What all of this is a function of is a government that is imploding, a government that is desperate. What we see at the moment is the Premier fully revealed for the dilettante of a leader that he is. The desperation is so substantial—

**The SPEAKER:** Leader, please be seated. There is a point of order.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order: personal reflections on a member are unparliamentary.

**The SPEAKER:** They have to be raised by the member concerned, but I will ask the leader to keep in mind that standing order.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** I am happy to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** In anticipation of the Premier potentially expressing offence at being characterised as a dilettante—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members will not engage in discussion between themselves.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** —I am happy to recharacterise and to remind South Australians that we do not have a Premier in charge of his own party at the moment, let alone the people of South Australia and its government.

All jokes aside—and we could go on—there are some important matters of state that the Premier should be focused on, and nothing is more important at the moment than getting our health system ready for COVID. That is an exercise that should not be starting now: that is an exercise that should have started 20 months ago.

We cast our minds back to when COVID first started emerging, and in this very place the Premier quite rightly identified that the policy at that point in time for governments—not just in South Australia or Australia but around the world—was to make sure that we flattened the curve and pushed out the peak. The whole underpinning principle behind that policy was getting our health system ready for COVID because we knew eventually it was going to come.

It is tragic that there is almost an inevitability now that COVID is coming to South Australia. The Premier is wholly committed to opening up the borders before Christmas, which is why the health system has to be ready. Yet as we speak, right at this moment, on the verge of COVID coming to this state, as a matter of policy as at 1pm today—a matter of 2½ hours ago—we have 95 people stuck in emergency departments who should be admitted but cannot be admitted. They cannot be admitted because the hospital system cannot cope with demand that is low, let alone if demand is high, and that is a grave concern.

The government today, in a desperate attempt to take away the attention from its own incapacity to govern, rolled out an announcement of 93 new beds. The unfortunate thing about that number is that 93 new beds is less than half the number of beds they have closed this year—188 beds have been closed by the Marshall Liberal government this year that were set up in preparedness and readiness for COVID itself.

Last year, we had the Wakefield Hospital or the College Grove announcement about this government getting ready for COVID: 'We are investing in special beds to be able to accommodate the demand because of COVID,' 188 beds worth. Fast-forward to 2021: 'They are no longer needed,' cut, gone. Yet here we are now, on the verge of COVID coming into our state, and we are down those 118 beds. Instead, we get an announcement of 93 beds coming. In the course of the last hour, in the other place we have learned, 'By the way, not all those 93 beds are going to be ready until potentially January next year,' after the borders are supposed to be open.

The plan for new beds from this government in preparation for COVID looks something like this: close 188 beds, rush out an announcement of 93 beds, open the border and then after that sometime those beds will be ready. What a joke! This is a serious illness. This is something that this government have had bipartisan support to work with us on and they have not done the one job that this Premier is responsible for—and that is getting our health system ready.

Time expired.

### MORPHETT ELECTORATE

#### **The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment) (15:36):**

I take this opportunity to speak about some of the great community football clubs in the seat of Morphett. We have the Sacred Heart Old Collegians Football Club, Morphettville Park Football Club, Plympton Bulldogs Football Club, PHOS Camden Football Club, and please do not forget the Glenelg Football Club in the SANFL. There are some great clubs there. I should mention that the Plympton Bulldogs were recognised most recently as the runner-up for the SANFL Juniors Club of the Year. That is recognition of a fantastic club and the players, officials, coaches, supporters, both on and off the field, as well as the club's overall junior program for both the females and males.

I would also like to take a few moments just to talk about the 2021 season for both PHOS Camden Football Club and Morphettville Park Football Club. PHOS Camden is a great community club located at Camden Oval in Novar Gardens. The Phantoms compete in division 2 of the Adelaide Footy League and have three teams all up. The Phantoms had a really strong season this year, with the A-grade finishing second on the ladder at the end of the minor rounds. Because of COVID, the finals were basically two straight preliminaries and a grand final. Unfortunately, they got beaten in the preliminary final by the eventual premiers, Old Ignatians.

I would like to say well done to the club stalwart Henry 'Hank' Papatolis on winning the division 2 FA Bloch Medal and also the A-grade Best and Fairest medal, which is such a great achievement. I also acknowledge the A-grade coach, Damian Minervini, in his first season. There are some great volunteers down at that club as well, including the president, David Leister; the secretary, Michael Hamilton; the football director, Steve Jacquier; and also the treasurer, Tus Papatolis; among others on the committee.

The other club I would like to take a bit of time to speak about is the Morphettville Park Football Club, another club embedded in the local community right in the heart of Morphettville and based at Kellett Reserve. The Roos compete in division 4 of the Adelaide Footy League, again with three teams competing. The Roos had a fantastic and successful season this year, with the men's A-grade making their grand final after the A-grade finished second on the ladder again at the end of the minor rounds.

The men's A-grade team had an incredible run, breaking a 31-year drought between flags to beat SMOSH West Lakes in the grand final. This has a nice bit of serendipity about it, in terms of their A-grade coach, Steve Nolis, who at the time of the 1990 flag was an assistant coach at the Roos under West Adelaide hall of famer Peter Meuret when they last won that flag. Also, I mention that Nolis was previously the coach at SMOSH.

It is also worth pointing out that they are also a juggernaut in the women's league, with both the A-grade and B-grade women winning their respective grand finals after finishing top of the ladder. Congratulations to all involved, including the president, Paul Farrelly, and the rest of the hardworking committee members. I mention Brenda Farrelly especially, who does a mountain of work there volunteering her time. It was especially great to see the club utilise its fantastic new facility, which the Marshall government committed \$500,000 towards along with the Marion council. The A-grade men's team did not lose a game all season at home.

I would also like to acknowledge today in parliament the sad passing of a wonderful person, Neville Cordes. Neville lived in Glenelg and was a person who would always make everyone feel welcome, going out of his way to speak to anyone who was new or who was standing by themselves, often giving newcomers a bunch of flowers grown in the St Peter's church grounds. Neville came to live in Glenelg after spending much of his life living on Kangaroo Island, where he could appropriately be described as a Kangaroo Island pioneer.

He was a lifelong player coach and supporter of the Kingscote Football Club. He founded the *Islander* newspaper in the 1960s and went on to become Kangaroo Island's mayor, from 1983 to

1987, before leaving for Adelaide to pursue business opportunities in the late 1980s. He is survived by his wife of 55 years, Rosalind, his brother, Dene, sister, Colline, his children, Greg, Maria and Peta and also his six grandchildren. Vale, Neville Cordes.

Time expired.

### WRIGHT ELECTORATE

**Mr BOYER (Wright) (15:41):** I rise this afternoon to put on the record my congratulations to the Modbury (Hawks) Football Club. On Friday of last week, I had the pleasure of attending the annual presentation night at Sfera's. Where else but Sfera's, of course? Many of us in this chamber spend a lot of time there at different events, award nights and school presentation nights, and we were all there again together on Friday night to congratulate the individual award winners from the Modbury (Hawks) Football Club. Also very importantly, I mention—and I will touch upon this in a little more detail in a second—the women's football team, who were the premiers.

**Ms Bedford:** Hear, hear!

**Mr BOYER:** Exactly—hear, hear, indeed! Many people do not know that the Modbury (Hawks) Football Club, which was founded in I think 1862, is actually the oldest football club in South Australia and the sixth oldest in the country, which is pretty remarkable. I am told that the first game that the Modbury Football Club played was on an oval that is very close to where Civic Park is located now. The member for Florey is nodding her head, which makes me think I have that right, which is good.

The club certainly has a very rich history, as you can imagine for a club that has been around for so long. It is immensely respected in the north-east. I think testament to that is the number of elected members of both council and state and federal parliament who attend any event the Hawks put on, and that was the certainly the case on Friday night, and I would just like to make mention of some of the attendees.

The Leader of the Opposition was there; the member for Florey; Tony Zappia, the member Makin; Councillor Damian Wyld from the Tea Tree Gully council; and Councillor Olivia Savvas from the Tea Tree Gully council. The member for Florey has reminded me that Councillor Lyn Petrie was there as well. Of course, Councillor Oliva Saavas is our candidate for the seat of Newland, and I should not forget that the indomitable Rhiannon Pearce, Labor's candidate for King, was there as well.

The night kicked off going through medal counts for the various divisions, and I would like to take the opportunity to congratulate some of the Best and Fairest winners: in D-grade we had Ben Finch; in C-grade, Jack Sutton; in B-grade, Matthew Smith; and in A-grade, Tim Davey, and I would like to speak a little about Tim again in a moment. The winner of the women's Best and Fairest, keeping in mind it was a premiership winning team, was Emily Page.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the sponsors of the club of which there are many. I am not going to name them all, but I think that one in particular deserves very special mention and that is Peter Lempens, who told me he has been involved with the Modbury Football Club basically his whole life. He manages the Mazda and Volkswagen dealership in Mawson Lakes, which is an extremely successful dealership; not only that, he is a very, very generous sponsor of the club.

In fact, the winner of the A-grade Best and Fairest for the last couple of years has had the pleasure of driving a brand-new Volkswagen Amarok thanks to Mawson Lakes Volkswagen. The winner this year, for a record eighth time, was Tim Davey. Given that the Amarok has only been given as a prize for the last two or three years, the only person who has driven it is Tim, but he is indeed a very fortunate person. Tim is a legend of the club. The award he wins for A-grade Best and Fairest is named after the Jolly family who are also stalwarts and pioneers of the club.

Tim gave a very emotional speech, which is worthy of its own acknowledgement. His father passed away during the season. His father never missed a game and was always standing on the hill at the footy ground watching him. Tim spoke really emotionally about how much he loves the club, what a huge part of his childhood it had been and also what an emotional year it was for him playing in A-grade in a year that was not particularly successful for the team but successful for Tim individually. But looking up to the hill and not seeing his dad there, I saw a number of people with

tears in their eyes. I felt very emotional about it, always having had my dad come along and join me for quarter time, half-time and three-quarter time huddles.

One thing I would like to mention in the time remaining to me is the announcement that the opposition made, in particular Peter Malinauskas, who had the honour of getting up and saying if he is elected Premier next year we are going to put \$2.5 million towards the master plan that has been drawn up by the club. It is long overdue. This is a club that has grown and deserves some new facilities. It was wonderful to be there to see the excitement on the faces of those club members, past and present, when we announced it. I dearly hope that this time next year we get the chance to make it a reality.

### COUNTRY EDUCATION STRATEGY

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:46):** I am delighted to update the house today on the Marshall Liberal government's Country Education Strategy. It is how our government is looking to support our regions to be the best they can be, particularly to support the aspirations and ambitions of our young South Australians living in country South Australia.

We want to remove barriers to success and broaden access to support services. If our ambition and purpose is for every child and young person in our state to be supported to fulfil their potential, whatever classroom or kindy they are in, as I have said many times, whatever town or suburb they are in, we have to apply ourselves to meeting the specific and sometimes particular regional challenges that those students may face and some of those challenges applied inconsistently or consistently across country South Australia.

We extensively consulted and developed three particular goals. First, to deliver quality leadership and expert teaching in every preschool and every school; secondly, to ensure that country schools and preschools have access to the systems and support they need to be effective; and thirdly, to provide country children and young people with access to quality learning and pathways opportunities. All of these things we want for all our children and young people. We are developing a 10-year strategy with work plans over three years and then there will be further iterations to particularly address those three goals.

The strategy will deliver better services in country areas. We are ensuring students can reach their full potential by boosting the availability of quality relief teachers, broadening speech pathology and pathology services in country locations, expanding the range of subjects that country students can access, and improving awareness of and access to career pathways that will support the transition to further education and employment.

Our Country Education Strategy has been informed by extensive consultation over a reasonable period of time so we can get it right, with nearly three dozen country schools and preschools; principals; students; parents and stakeholders, including a reference group from a range of country schools; Aboriginal community education team leaders; the Isolated Children's Parents Association—and I have been pleased to increase the support going to students from very remote areas since we have come to government through the ICPA—the Open Access College; and Rural Youth Ambassadors.

I am also pleased that our 2021 Rural Youth Ambassadors are here in Adelaide right now, working directly with our policymakers on things like curriculum delivery. The Rural Youth Ambassadors are Maddy Taylor from Burra, Georgia Hasting and Annabelle Whittaker from Maitland, Emily Sinclair and Brock Lawrie from Cleve, Kayley Kemp from Coomandook, Lilliana Crettenden from Cowell, Hayden Kupke and Jessica McKay from Jamestown, Hanna Biezaite from Kangaroo Inn, Charlotte Deramore from Mannum, Olivia Gill from Moonta, Amber Rice and Caleb Van Zyl from Mount Compass, Marni Black from Mount Gambier, Tailah Galloway from Streaky Bay, William Sampson from Wudinna, and Mitchell Patterson and Nelle Cane from Port Lincoln. I thank all of them for engaging with us.

We are working with South Australian universities also to ensure that student teachers who want to undertake their placement in our regions can do so and have incentives to do so. Our strategy will encourage more teachers to move to regional areas by connecting them with the local community and colleagues so they can feel comfortable and can picture a future in the country before they take a job. Also following from our \$80 million delivery of our investment in SWiFT internet, fibre-optic

cable to every public school and preschool in South Australia, and pretty much all the non-government schools that were not already connected as well.

We are now working very hard to upgrade the ICT infrastructure in country schools, providing better business support to ensure that principals and preschool directors can focus more of their time on improving learning outcomes. We have improved the infrastructure out of sight and now we are making sure that it is fully utilised by all those schools.

I want to thank the team from the Department for Education who have worked so hard to deliver this comprehensive Country Education Strategy, which is going to make such a difference in the lives of tens of thousands of young South Australians in country South Australia right now and indeed tens of thousands more in the years ahead. Thank you to Luke Fraser, Natalie Cullen, Lian Coyles, Claire Moffatt, Sarah Mavrikis, Lauren Aikins, Rachel Crees, Sarah Rooke, Nigel Huxtable and Libby Hill, who have all been engaged in that body of work, along with the very many country teachers, leaders, education staff and families from Ceduna to Mount Gambier who have shared their concerns, experiences and ideas during the consultation period.

This is a government that listens to educators, to families and to young people in the country. I believe our Country Education Strategy will go a long way towards improving outcomes for country education, meeting that ambition for every child and young person in this state to be supported to fulfil their potential.

### **PARK-AND-RIDE FACILITIES**

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:51):** There are two issues that I want to speak about today on behalf of residents in my electorate of Torrens. The first impacts directly on residents in Klemzig, as well as O-Bahn commuters and potential commuters in neighbouring suburbs. Many residents have raised the ongoing issue of the congested streets in Klemzig, made worse by the lack of adequate car parks at the Klemzig O-Bahn park-and-ride. This has been a hot topic with Torrens' residents since the Marshall government's cutting of the project in 2018. This was extremely disappointing for locals, and I have since raised this matter in letters to ministers and in speeches in this place.

The background here is significant. In June 2017, the Labor government announced additional park-and-ride car parks and upgraded facilities along the O-Bahn route, including Klemzig and Tea Tree Plaza. The additional car parks at the park-and-ride at Klemzig were allocated funding, and the contract was awarded to Public Transport Projects Alliance consisting of McConnell Dowell, Mott MacDonald and Arup, with residents being told the project was underway. The Liberal candidate for Torrens at the time would have heard about how important additional car parks were to the residents of Klemzig and neighbouring suburbs.

It was not long after being elected in 2018 that the Marshall Liberal government axed the additional parks and upgrades at both Klemzig and Tea Tree Plaza. There was no mention by the Liberals in the lead-up to the state election that, if elected, they were going to cut the planned new car parks and upgrades at the Klemzig Interchange. From speaking with residents who have spoken to the current Liberal candidate, it is not surprising there has been no mention by the candidate that it was in fact the Marshall government who had cut the Klemzig park-and-ride and upgrade project in 2018.

I know residents of Klemzig have suffered the consequences of these cuts, and they continue to battle parking and safety issues in the local area due to this much needed upgrade not going ahead. Under Labor, the expanded and upgraded Klemzig park-and-ride would already be operational. The surrounding streets would be cleared. There would be more people from neighbouring suburbs using the O-Bahn.

I have continued over the past three years to advocate on behalf of these residents, and I will continue to do so. I have again written to the minister requesting that adequate funding be reallocated to improve these facilities now, and I have a petition circulating that I will table in this parliament. I know how important access to parking facilities near our public transport networks are for work, education, medical appointments, recreational purposes and for connectivity for residents. Public transport users deserve to have adequate and safe access to public transport and car parking, and Klemzig residents—in fact all residents—deserve to have easy and safe access to their homes.

The second issue concerns my constituents who live in the suburb of Manningham. There have been ongoing discussions between the Port Adelaide Enfield council and the department to address the constant complaints from the public who find the junction layout at Hampstead Road, Romilly Avenue, Ian Street and McInnes Avenue, Manningham confusing and unsafe, and where there have been a significant number of accidents and near misses.

In March 2019, residents of Manningham and Broadview received correspondence from the department regarding safety upgrades, and residents were pleased to hear that consultation with the community would commence, and that should a majority of feedback be in agreement with the proposal, the department would finalise the design and notify the community about what the plans would be moving forward. The information provided by the department stated:

...concerns have been raised about this intersection due to its confusing layout, resulting in driver frustrations and unsafe vehicle movements by entering and exiting vehicles from these side roads.

I am sure it would come as no surprise to others in this place what happened next. Consultation was sought until the end of April 2019. Ongoing discussions were had back and forward between the council and the department. Months went by, years went by, and still no action.

At my Manningham street-corner meeting last month, residents said that the issue of this intersection was of serious concern and they were wondering why they had not heard anything for two years ago. After inquiring with the council, it was revealed that the department no longer classifies this intersection as a priority, which is surprising. Knowing the importance of this, the Port Adelaide Enfield council were prepared to contribute to the project. I will be following this up with a letter to the minister—

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Torrens, your time has expired and there is a point of order.

**Ms WORTLEY:** —to seek information on what the department is or is not planning for this dangerous intersection so I can inform residents who have been left wondering since early 2019.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** Point of order, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Torrens has concluded her remarks.

#### INTERNATIONAL DAY OF RURAL WOMEN

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:57):** I would like to rise today to speak about something that is very important to all the regions internationally. Tomorrow is International Day of Rural Women. This year's theme is 'Building rural women's resilience in the wake of COVID-19'. This is an opportunity to celebrate and honour women and girls living in rural areas, particularly in South Australia and more particularly in the electorate of Chaffey.

Today, we recognise the huge role that mothers, daughters and grandmothers play in our rural communities globally. Their valuable contribution to our communities has only become more difficult through the COVID-19 pandemic, and rural women continue to play a critical role in our society. As I said, the great electorate of Chaffey is home to many amazing rural women. I will start off with one of my good friends and colleagues, the federal minister Anne Ruston, Minister for Families and Social Services, and the Hon. Nicola Centofanti, both great role models in the Riverland.

The Murraylands and Riverland Landscape Board is headed up by Di Davidson, with Caroline Phillips and Sandy Iosefellis. The Renmark Irrigation Trust, the oldest large-scale irrigation trust in Australia has two great women on the board, Kate Strachan and Jasvinder Kor, very worthy members.

Regional Development Australia Murraylands and Riverland Board's incoming chair, Jodie Hawkes, is doing an outstanding job. Sandy Iosefellis is also part of that board. We also congratulate Margaret Howie, Petrina Coventry and Bridget Mather on their great work on the RDA board. Destination Riverland, a great tourism body, one of the great growing economies in the Riverland, has the support of Lynda Schenk, the co-deputy chair, as well as artist Liz Frankel, Frances Asher and, of course, Sonya Altschwager. They are doing a great job.

I also want to pay tribute to Sheridan Alm, who was recently made the new Chair of Riverland Winegrape Growers Association. She was also named Viticulturist of the Year at the Australian Women in Wine Awards in 2019. Sheridan has made a great contribution to the industry.

Also, Justine Fogden was the 2019 Secondary Teacher of the Year. I want to acknowledge her for the great work she does in the ag department at Loxton High. Loxton has just seen a new facility built and I thank the Minister for Education for the funding that he has put towards a state-of-the-art ag centre. I also acknowledge the councillors in all of my Riverland councils. They are many and very skilled in putting in a great contribution.

The Riverland also has many female business owners who play key roles in the economy of our local region, but many Riverland women are also involved in many of the service clubs such as Zonta, the voluntary organisation of women in business and the professions advocating to advance the status of women. Voluntary service organisations such as Rotary, Lions and Meals on Wheels are a critical part of the fabric of our regional communities. People benefit every day from the countless hours of those rural women as they continue to volunteer. I salute you and thank you for the great work you do to keep our regional communities where they are today.

In the upcoming South Australian Tourism Awards, Riverland businesses have been named finalists and they are all influenced by women: Berri Riverside Holiday Park, BIG4 Renmark Riverfront Holiday Park, Murray River Trails, River Murray Houseboats, 23<sup>rd</sup> Street Distillery and, of course, the iconic Banrock Station. They are all outstanding tourism businesses with outstanding women who are standing side by side with those businesses to make them as successful as they are today.

I really want to pay tribute to Cassie Bye who is my electorate office manager. She is there early every day, she is there late every day, providing a caring ear and a service second to none, particularly in these trying situations. Every electorate office I know has been impacted by COVID-19 issues, but particularly in my border community Cassie is doing an outstanding job providing an outstanding service. She is getting results for our border communities and those people who are impacted. So I say thank you, Cassie, for the great work that you do at my electorate office.

#### **AUSTRALIA-PHILIPPINES RELATIONSHIP**

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (16:02):** Today, I would like to talk about the upcoming 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the relationship between Australia and the Philippines. I would normally place this on the *Notice Paper*, but there are 198 notices of motion on that *Notice Paper* and we will never ever in the life of this parliament get to them.

As members are aware, the Philippines was originally under the control of Spain, the US and, briefly, Japan. The United States finally ceded control of the Philippines in October 1946, which as we know was 75 years ago. We also know that the Filipino people are very considerate and very dedicated. I have been over there a few times as the president of the Rotary Club of Port Pirie. They are so compassionate and considerate of other people. They would give you the last piece of food in their house and go without themselves.

The first Filipino Consul-General was the formal appointment of Roberto Regala in Sydney before they gained embassy status in 1956. They then permanently relocated to Canberra in 1962. The reason for my bringing this to the house today is because of the connection that Port Pirie has with the Filipino community. Our community of Port Pirie, as I have stated in this house previously, is a multicultural community and we have several hundred people who have migrated from the Philippines to Port Pirie.

All these people have settled in very well to our community, with many people marrying Port Pirie citizens. Many have also established various businesses. I must admit their food is some of the most beautiful you could ever partake of. Also, there are very skilled people out there operating businesses. They are very skilled in various trades, whether they are welders or mechanics, and quite a few are in the IT business in Port Pirie.

It is with these words that I mention the celebration of the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary between Australia and the Philippines. An event will be held at Port Pirie's new sporting precinct, with an excellent range of activities, including various video clips. At the meeting this Saturday night will be the St Mark's College principal, Mr Greg Hay, and Nyrstar, and we heard about Nyrstar yesterday with the question I asked about the TLAP direction and the new agreement and the extra funding.

There is also the St Mark's Parish, with Bishop Karol Kulczycki, SDS, DD, who is the new bishop for the Catholic diocese; he comes from Poland and he is absolutely fantastic. We also have the Honorary Philippine Consul, Mr Darryl Johnson. Mr Johnson is a Port Pirie boy. He lives in Port Pirie and has come down to Adelaide a fair bit and knows the member for Waite quite well. I have been to a couple of shows with the member for Waite at Polish Hill. Mayor Leon Stephens will be there, plus me and the member for Stuart, who will also be there representing the Premier.

It will be a very interesting night, and I think it is going to be fantastic. This weekend is hard, and you would be a bit surprised that in general local members of parliament are sometimes not appreciated for the number of events they go to. I have four events on Saturday night, and as the local member you need to try to get to every one of them. I had the opportunity to actually have one arrangement of going one, two, three, four, and then this organisation's 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary wanted me to speak at eight o'clock that night, so I had to change everything around to be able to accommodate them.

On that night, I have the Filipinos, I have an Italian event, I also have a Muslim event and also my own number one football team, Port. I am the number one ticketholder there; the only thing is, we need to win a few more games. The Adelaide Crows will be the same next year, but we will be fairly close up to the top.

Certainly, the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Filipinos relationship with Australia is very, very important. As I say, the people coming to Port Pirie from the Philippines they have actually married quite a few of our Port Pirie males and vice versa. We have had a lot of the Filipino girls coming over and marrying the boys and vice versa. I certainly believe we will have a nice night on Saturday and I am looking forward to reporting back to the parliament.

#### COVID-19

**Mr DULUK (Waite) (16:07):** You may be interested to know that I have updated my community survey online and going around to letterboxes across my electorate and put a few new issues on there, including what people think about house prices, rental affordability, job creation, protecting our environment, investing in our schools, thoughts on current COVID-19 restrictions and improved public transport.

Responses are coming back in, and the overwhelming majority of people stated that the most important matter to them right now is around sensible COVID-19 restrictions. I, like many others in this place, am extremely proud of the way South Australians have gone about dealing with the directions and dealing with COVID in our community for the last 18 months. It seems that wearing face masks, checking public locations and social distancing is the new norm for so many of us, and for quite a few this is a small price to pay for the freedoms we enjoy. Certainly compared with what is happening in the eastern seaboard, we are very, very lucky.

But, for many, there also seems to be the question being raised about are the restrictions we have in place at the moment meritorious and do they need to be reviewed. It has been about 140 days since the so-called Modbury outbreak—and, as the member for Florey mentioned in her contribution this morning, there was no outbreak of COVID in Modbury at the time, so it was probably unfairly named the Modbury outbreak—but there has not been a case in the community, an active case of community transmission, for 140 days.

Whilst we remain vigilant about Delta coming across the border at some point, people are asking me, and I think probably many other members, some common questions, such as: why are we limited to having a maximum of 20 people at our house, when over 20,000 people are allowed to attend the football? Why are we seeing more than 20 people squeeze into a small cafe shop, when you cannot have 20 people at home? Where is the science or modelling behind this figure of 20 people? Why did it used to be 50? What science changed that?

Why is it okay not to wear a mask when at the gym and exercising and sweating close to other people, but we need to wear a mask when doing other social distancing indoors? Is this consistent? How effective are cloth masks at stopping the spread of the virus? How are we disposing of single-use masks appropriately? This is a very big question across all South Australia and indeed Australia—the environmental degradation associated with single-use masks. Why are sports players allowed to tackle and bump each other during weekend sport, but they cannot shake their hands at the end of a match? Why can we not sensibly dance in public?

Many constituents in my community oppose the current restrictions, which ban dancing in licensed venues, and oppose the wearing of face masks when there is no active COVID-19 or community transmission in the community. These bans are killing our hospitality and live music industry and our important night-time economy. While we have all shown we are extremely compliant with the directions, as we should be, we want the best for our state. When there is no active COVID in the community, are such strict measures really appropriate? This is a common question put to me.

We all need to seriously consider the impact these current restrictions have on our community. In my electorate alone I know three travel agents who have closed their doors in the last 18 months. Tourism operators are hurting at the moment. One of my tourist operators, Dallas Coull, is a constant advocate for his industry. Small business operators across the board are doing it tough. Airlines and airports are obviously hurting. Hotels and regional accommodation and our university sector are on their knees because of the impact of COVID-19. The small business community has borne the brunt of these restrictions. I would hate to be a small business cafe in the CBD. They are doing it really, really tough. The sooner we can get back to business, especially in the CBD, the better it will all be.

How are businesses meant to invest and prepare staffing levels if they cannot anticipate a return to interstate and overseas travellers? Why have businesses had to operate at 75 per cent capacity for almost two years when we have had periods of over 200 days of no community transmission? I do understand that reducing movement is vital when there is active COVID, but we need to have a plan to let business operate at full capacity, to consider the necessity and effectiveness of masks. Allow us to host people in our own homes, let us dance and give us a clear road map for opening.

Businesses and individuals are very quick to respond when there is an active case, and we know they will do it. So, until then, we should have consistent restrictions. With Christmas looming, we still cannot have the Blackwood Christmas pageant. We have thousands of expats stuck overseas, with South Australians wanting to come home. We have an expensive hotel system which, gratefully, is moving to home quarantine. Let's work together, let's get that road map happening and let's reopen our state.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **SITTINGS AND BUSINESS**

**The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (16:12):** I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 26 October 2021 at 11am.

Motion carried.

#### *Bills*

### **OPCAT IMPLEMENTATION BILL**

#### *Committee Stage*

In committee (resumed on motion).

**Ms LUETHEN:** Chair, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

*A quorum having been formed:*

Clause 3.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The member asked about the places of detention and how that was to operate. In reference to clause 3, the interpretation clause, which sets out the definition of 'detainee', it means a person detained in a place of detention. 'Detention' is identified; that can be read, obviously. Furthermore, at about point 4 on page 4 of the bill, 'place of detention' sets out that each of the following is a place of detention: a correctional institution, a training centre, a prescribed mental health facility, a prescribed custodial police station. They have some identification.

Essentially, those places are defined for the purposes that they will be scheduled in regulation. I understand there has been some query about that over a period of time. We have

provided a schedule to the parties who are interested in this bill as to where they are to apply at present—where the police stations are, where the hospitals are, etc. I do not think there is anything groundbreaking about that. There seemed to be some inquiry about whether that ought to be in the act.

For obvious reasons, police stations may open or close, similarly hospital services, etc., so that can change. A ward in a hospital may have a detention ward that then is moved. For example, when the Repatriation General Hospital at Daw Park was open, it had two secure wards. One was Ward 17 and one was Ward 18—one for veterans and one for older persons' mental health. Both had a detainee facility, as I recall. Then the whole of the veterans service, under the previous government, moved to the new Jamie Larcombe Centre, so it was a different place, different address. Service continued but in a different arrangement. So these things do change; we accept that.

If we were to have to come back each time to add to that or change it, it would be obviously some inconvenience to the parliament, but nevertheless that is not something that is insurmountable, it seems to me. We could identify them and then have such other places that may be prescribed or something of that nature, so I am happy to work with that, but it just seems to me that it is pretty clear in the act, or it is now.

I understand, if this is of assistance, that the commonwealth has been describing in its definition of a place of detention that their workable initial definition for primary places of detention is to include any closed facilities where a person has the capacity to be held longer than 24 hours. That does not mean they have to be held for more than 24 hours for the purposes of being considered as part of the data the inspectorates are considering for the purposes of their reports.

What it means is that it is a facility in itself for the purpose of holding for the 24 hours. I suppose what that difference means is that we are distinguishing between an emergency department or an area where there is not a facility for holding them more than 24 hours, that is, they are not in a ward or something of that nature. In any event, as I understand it, we have adopted that across the country as a definition for primary places of detention.

For the purpose of this we have not put a time limit on that. I think that what is going to be clear here is that, wherever people are detained, whether it is for a short or a long period of time in a closed environment like that where their movement is restricted—and these are usually prisons and hospitals—then we need to have this inspectorate established to ensure that there is really a pre-emptive strike here in making sure that these facilities are up to standard.

I make this point again, that largely in South Australia our facilities which have this service have all sorts of inspectors over them, all sorts of means by which they are under scrutiny. One area that was identified as not having that were police cells. It is the one area where there has been a lot of work done and acknowledgement by the police that they needed to incorporate that and to have a process for that supervision.

I have explained in the general debate in this matter that that has been done with the cooperation of the Department for Correctional Services and its visitor inspectorate service and the utilisation of that which is proposed by SAPOL. I hope that answers the question.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I thank the Attorney for her answer. I do thank you; that was very clear. However, my question was not really about prescribing places of detention. I understand what you said. You say that we do not put on a time limit. We are talking about people who are just detained in an enclosed place for any period of time.

I am wondering why we did not consider things like police vehicles or even court facilities—situations where people are detained, whether or not they are arrested, and placed in a vehicle for a period of time. They are restrained. They are to all intents and purposes in custody and detained. Is there no mechanism by which those places and those instances can be assessed by the NPM?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The determination here was to be in relation to places of detention as distinct from police vehicles and ambulances. These are all areas where there is expected to be a transient transport service provided, as distinct from being held in a place of detention. That is the OPCAT approach. I do not know of any other jurisdiction that is going down an area that is outside of a place of detention as distinct from a moving vehicle, and nor, of course, have we gone any way to addressing whether there needed to be some scrutiny over the ambulance service, for example, or police custody or corrections to and from prison to court.

They are expected to be a transient service not a place of detention. That is the objective of the act. Nor to the best of my knowledge has there been any call for that from the OPCAT officials, except in consultation it was raised by one or two of the stakeholders. I think Penny Wright did from memory.

In relation to the official visitors, the Correctional Services (Accountability and Other Measures) Amendment Act already has, for the purposes of a correctional institution, reference to a vehicle, including a police vehicle, on the grounds of a correctional institution and used to transport prisoners to and from correctional institutions—and a cell at a court being used to accommodate the prisoners. They are already under scrutiny. What is not I suppose are the ambulance drivers, but nobody has raised that with me.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** The situations under scrutiny in the provision you just read out are detainees of the Department for Correctional Services? They are not police detainees? That relates to correctional services prisoners?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Yes. As the member probably knows more than most in this house, we have a situation where the police undertake the arrest, there is a transition into the custody of the Correctional Services department, there are bail applications usually in between. Very early in that process, the Correctional Services department takes responsibility for the person who is to be in custody, but they may well be conveyed in a police vehicle.

This definition—it is 19A under the Correctional Services (Accountability and Other Measures) Amendment Act:

...includes a reference to—

- (a) a vehicle (including a police vehicle)—
  - (i) on the grounds of a correctional institution; or
  - (ii) used to transport prisoners to or from correctional institutions; and
- (b) a cell at a court being used to accommodate a prisoner.

So they are already covered.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Sorry, these are supplementaries, sir, you will understand.

**The CHAIR:** So you are looking for clarification here, member for Elizabeth?

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Indeed. What you are saying, then, is what I am saying: criminals who are arrested by the police—to make it simple, on the roadside, who have not had any connection with the Department for Correctional Services yet, but are nevertheless detained in a police vehicle—are not protected by the OPCAT provisions.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** These provisions I have just read out, I will just say it again, are under the Correctional Services (Accountability and Other Measures) Amendment Act and they are under the scrutiny of the official visitors—which is a service that we have in South Australia over prisons—not OPCAT, not the central body in Canberra.

**The CHAIR:** Final question on clause 3, but that is alright. Away you go.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I think we are talking at cross-purposes. I just have one quick question which I think is probably simpler: with the definitions of detainee and the operations of the NPM, is the detainee themselves under any obligation to cooperate with the NPM?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The scrutiny under the OPCAT provisions does not have any mandate over individuals, nor are they the advocates for the individuals. This whole purpose, this whole process, is designed not to go there and say, 'Well, look, I am going to listen to someone'. The Ombudsman can go down there and hear a complaint about not getting their pocket money for the week or whether they were put in their cell too early and all those things.

These people are there to deal with an international measure of attendance to ensure against cruel and inhuman etc., torture and punishment. That is the process. They are there to try to ensure that we have some oversight to make sure that people are appropriately looked after. They are not

there as an individual body of complaint. So if they did interview a detainee of any kind, it would be with their consent.

**Ms COOK:** Mine is in a similar vein but more with respect to a patient within a hospital. We have the definition of a prescribed mental health facility and we talk about that potentially being a ward like the Jamie Larcombe Centre. We then have a range of people who are in hospitals, or in parts of hospitals, with mental health problems as either their primary or secondary issue.

We could have people who are coming to the hospital for a medical illness requiring long-term treatment, greater than 24 hours. Those people, as a consequence, could be diagnosed as having a mental health problem and have a section 32 applied, or those people could have underlying mental health problems and be sent to the hospital for treatment of a medical illness or surgical intervention and be already under an order of detention.

They may be a transfer, like an up-transfer from a mental health facility, so they then go into either a medical ward or a surgical ward in a private or a public hospital. They might be in the emergency department for a prolonged period and go to what the equivalent is of the extended care unit, which does not have all mental health clients or patients in it either. As you described before Attorney, talking about an ambulance. The ambulance, as we know, could be ramped for eight hours with a mental health patient in the ambulance, so they are in a stationary vehicle at a hospital.

If you can bear with me, there are a whole range of permutations that apply to people who come maybe as a medical patient and then have mental health problems uncovered and be detained as a result, or they may be detained and then require transfer and treatment, but they may be within Ward 6A, 5B, S5 or whatever, wherever, or some private ward.

How does this oversight and insurance against mistreatment and torture apply to an individual who is not within a mental health prescribed ward but is a mental health patient for an extended period of time? Having experienced the care and wraparound support needed to give to these clients, it is a very difficult situation when they are not in their home ward, such as a mental health ward, so they are quite challenging. They do need some oversight and support. I just wonder, Attorney, how is it that this applies there?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I think the member is referring to someone who may have, say, a comorbidity. They have a mental health problem—it may not even be diagnosed at that stage—and they are being treated for diabetes at a general hospital. This runs to the argument that surely we should be just declaring the whole of the hospital—babies' wards, everywhere, wherever somebody might be who is potentially at risk who might have to be detained or be under assessment for the purpose of future detention. This is not about individual people. This is a process that relates to places, prescribed places, and they have been defined.

For example, at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the whole of the hospital is not having OPCAT people run all over it. The Cramond Clinic would. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital would also have the older persons ward and at the Royal Adelaide Hospital there is the psychiatric intensive care unit, for example. The lists have been provided to the members who have asked for them; I think the members have had them, so I will not go into all of them.

This is not about individuals. If someone in that scenario that has been raised attends at a hospital having a physical piece of medical treatment done and then is found to have a mental health problem and they are subject to an order of some kind—they may be under a direction in relation to psychiatric detention, which I think can still be up to 24 hours before court orders or guardianship orders have to be obtained, whatever it is; I think you understand the position on it—and they are taken to a facility, it is that psychiatric facility or James Nash House or a prison or a police cell.

It is the place under this process. We have myriad other things, including the Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner and the Ombudsman if there is an issue in relation to care or process in a general hospital.

**Ms COOK:** This is another question. Just to clarify, though, a facility could not be subject to any ramifications of an OPCAT order or inspection as such if they are not that prescribed facility?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Correct.

**Ms COOK:** Asked and answered. Clarified and answered and on to the next. Attorney, when you spoke before you referenced the new bail facility outside Kurlana Tapa that is funded under this

year's budget. Does this fall within the definition of a training centre or any other type of centre for the purpose of this bill?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** There are two facilities that are proposed: one is a bail house and one is a short-term facility. Wherever they are detained and there is a capacity to hold them for more than 24 hours, then, yes, I expect they will be prescribed once they become functional.

**Ms COOK:** The definition of detainee within this bill includes former detainees. Attorney, would you be able to outline what role the NPM will have in regard to former detainees.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** It may well be that in their observations and the reports they have given they have identified an area or practice that is not appropriate, and they ultimately do their report and they are no longer a detainee. That is the first. The second is that there is nothing to prevent someone making a report to the NPM about an area of concern, even if it was not a prescribed place. It enables them to be party to that—a whistleblower, I suppose, for want of a better word.

**Ms COOK:** This will be my last question. Attorney, are you able to outline the role of the NPM Coordinator as listed in the clause? What is the commonwealth's role in that process as well?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Firstly, the NPM Coordinator is regulated and established under commonwealth legislation—it is referenced in here—and they are just that: the coordinator. Two models were offered in considering the sign-up of the states and territories to this: either identify what we had and be able to provide that service individually and top up where appropriate, I suppose, if there were any gaps or have a system of inspectorate all operating from Canberra. I do not know anyone who was taken up that option. Usually that would be about the most inefficient you would ever have. We chose the former.

We have had confidence in the state bodies to be able to undertake this function in the past. They were under the oversight of this parliament, so we have really expanded that for the purposes of being able to comply with the request that we comply under this international treaty.

The functions of the NPM Coordinator include consulting with governments and other bodies on the development of the standards and principles (I am paraphrasing here); collecting the information on the oversight arrangements in relation to persons who are deprived of their liberty and undertaking related research; proposing options and developing resources to facilitate improvements in the oversight arrangements in respect of those persons, including the facility's sharing of data, all those things; and communicating on behalf of the NPM with the UN subcommittee on prevention of torture, which is referred to as the SPT under this legislation. There are a few other facilitating provisions in it, but that is largely it.

Clause passed.

Clause 4.

**Ms COOK:** Attorney, would you be able to outline any expected conflicts between the relevant acts described in the clause and this function of the NPM? For example, would the role of the Training Centre Visitor under the Youth Justice Administration Act have any conflicts in regard to the function of it as an NPM?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I do not think so, in short. I think there is a question of a certain oversight role, and they do it very well. To extend that to be able to complete a report in relation to what they are doing for NPM, there may be some slightly different extra information that is provided. I think they are entirely competent and skilled to do that, and I have every confidence that they will.

**Ms COOK:** I think it is right, but just bear with me. In regard to how this is applied and comes together, previously I asked you for information regarding the funding, and I have asked further questions. The commonwealth is putting in some sort of implementation funding, as I understand it, as a one-off. In relation to these individual NPMs being able to apply this act appropriately, it will require a deal of consultation, education and delivery. Has the Attorney put any thoughts into that costing model and what that will look like?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Just for the benefit of the previous question you asked, it is further down in the bill, but there is a specific conflict of interest clause in case there was a direct

conflict on a matter, and I refer the member to that to identify how any dispute in that regard is dealt with.

In relation to funding, yes, there is process happening at the moment where the commonwealth is sending out certain offers, I think, for two years' funding per jurisdiction; that is being negotiated at present, as it should. They have asked us to sign up to this, we have agreed to do it, we are supplementing it, we require funds to do it—we have always told them we would require that—and undoubtedly there will need to be some preparation and training even to complete the forms so that there is some compliance with this sort of program. They are all still under discussion and negotiation.

Clause passed.

Clause 5.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I preface all this by saying that I do understand conversations are going on regarding possible amendments coming from all sorts of directions in relation to this bill, and I welcome that. It is no secret that we all received a very good briefing this morning from some experts in the field, and it was suggested that under the OPCAT principles, the international principles, the NPM should be considered a team. It is a process and a job that requires a lot of resourcing and requires more than one person to fulfil that role. Each of these subclauses in clause 5 seem to suggest that one person will fulfil the role for each of the acts. I wonder whether any thought has been given to extending that out so there is more than one NPM individual servicing each act.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Let's be very clear: a dedicated NPM or their delegate is one thing. It does not mean they cannot have a team of people assisting them with that job. This concept that the NPM is only a single person, that they are on their own and if they die or they are sick there is nobody who will ever be able to do it—each NPM have staff. There is a delegation clause in the bill to enable the NPM to delegate their NPM functions and powers to any person they consider may be able to assist in the performance of their function. That is all there in the bill. They are not expected to do everything by themselves.

**Ms COOK:** Attorney, I understand there are children detained in adult correctional facilities in a range of circumstances, particularly the watch houses of a whole range of police stations, which is a great shame, as I am sure the Attorney would agree, and not an appropriate place. Would the Attorney confirm whether the Training Centre Visitor, as the prescribed NPM, will be the relevant NPM for all children in detention or just the children within the walls of the training centre? I do not need to explain more, as I am sure you can see where I am going with that.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Youth detention is largely expected to occur within a training facility for children. From time to time, a 17-year-old male, serious offence, may be incarcerated in an adult facility, James Nash House or a psychiatric ward somewhere for forensic detention. If there is any weakness in relation to having access to that by the guardian, for example, there are two. The training visitor is Penny Eldridge, who is the chair of the training centre, basically the children's parole board, and she is the head of the Youth Court. She has access to children if she wishes to have them anyway.

Penny Wright—a different Penny—as the Guardian for Children and Young People, has a visitor role as well. So there are a number of people. Even the Ombudsman can go down there. We have a whole lot of people actually. Probably our youth facility people are the most supervised groups that actually exist but if there is any weakness in that regard, we will have a look at it. It was raised at this morning's meeting for the first time and nobody's raised it before but we will have a look at that. Certainly Penny Wright, I think, has raised this, but Judge Penny Eldridge has not raised it, to the best of my knowledge.

**Ms COOK:** I think maybe we will have another conversation about that one later. In my second reading contribution, I outlined the concerns that have been raised with me regarding the possible detention of children in adult correctional facilities. In terms of the Training Centre Visitor in her capacity as the NPM for training centres, I think you might have started to unpack that, given that you are saying there are all different roles able to visit. What is not clear is that there are children in a range of places who are detained who require a specialist lens on them such as hospitals, and we have talked about the watchhouse.

I am not sure that the response you gave just then shows us that they are going to get that specialist lens over them. We were informed today at the round table that police officers with all good intention made comment that they treated young people the same as adults, and I took that at face value to be that they thought that was a positive thing. I believe Penny Wright—and I do not think I am verballing her—claimed as well that the police officers said, 'We treat them all the same. They get fair treatment. There is no mistreatment.'

I think that was the line that they were trying to take, but they are children and many of the young people who are detained in watch houses for any period of time have experienced a lot of trauma, so they often have an emotional age that is much younger than their biological age. I do not think what you are saying to me is that the youth Training Centre Visitor would go and put a lens over those particular facilities in their role—because we do not know if it will be a her or a he in the long-term future—as the NPM for training centres. Is that what you are saying?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** As I understand it, here is how it works. Whilst there are multiple agencies in South Australia under South Australian laws able to inspect, protect, report to the parliament, etc. there is a Training Centre Visitor and that is to the children's prison basically, and that role is undertaken by Penny Wright. She may have access to someone who is 17, who is under the guardianship of the minister, who might be in any of these other places, and she has the right to be able to visit them anyway because she is the Guardian for Children and Young People.

*Ms Cook interjecting:*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I am just coming to that. Let's assume they are in a psychiatric hospital and there is some question about whether there ought to be some child-specific care of that person or in relation to the treatment that is implemented there. One of the reasons the NPM has the power to delegate is that they can do just that. They can actually delegate for the purposes of inspecting a place of detention of which a 17 year old is at to Ms Wright, for example, or the Guardian for Children and Young People, or anyone else who would be competent to do that.

**Ms COOK:** I will use my last bite at it. In the last line of questioning we were talking about hospitals and we were saying it is not about individuals, it is about the place. In this regard, I am talking about the place. I am talking about children in adult corrections facilities or somewhere else—'the place'. Does the youth Training Centre Visitor, as the relevant NPM for children in detention, get to look at the place, or is that done by one of these other people? If that is the case, what is the point of this?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** There are two things that can occur. One is the Training Centre Visitor is the supervisor for that centre, not for all children under 17 who are in detention, whether in a psychiatric hospital or another facility. There are NPMs that are for facilities. If a 17 year old who has a psychiatric condition is in an adult prison, say, for all sorts of reasons, there may be several people who are delegated to go into that space by the NPM of that facility.

**Ms COOK:** I think I sort of get it. I will do more reading on it. Thank you.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** If I can have a crack at clarifying it, take for instance the City Watch House, as under the administration of the police act—that is the police NPM, for want of a sort of shorthand. If there is a child in there, as there often is, the police NPM can delegate the responsibility of coming in and assessing that place to the child, the youth NPM, is that right? Or can they do the work themselves?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I think you have it completely right. The police would be, within their police cell, the NPM, but they have the capacity to call in, if they think it is a 17 year old, Ms Wright. It may be that they need someone with mental health capacity to assess as well. For the purposes of the numbers of Indigenous children that we have in this situation, I will just make the point that we still have a visitor service that ALRM provides for any person—child or adult—who is taken into custody who is Indigenous, who declares themselves Indigenous.

We have worked this modelling out recently with the Commissioner of Police, for that visitor service to continue. It has been operating for 20 years. It is being upgraded. The commonwealth has put a whole lot more money on the table, and a negotiated arrangement with ALRM to also provide that whole custody notification service as the model. We have had the model of this for 20-odd years,

but they want to upgrade it to add in not just to have a visitor for welfare purposes, to make applications for bail, find them a house, find them suitable relative connections, etc., but also to have the legal adviser in that team.

Questions of legal professional privilege have recently been discussed, etc. They are all in the process, but the commonwealth put a whole lot more money on the table with the negotiations with ALRM to upgrade that service, and that service would still apply. That is something outside of this, but it may be someone in that service that the parties here would actually find useful to be able to provide an assessment in that regard, depending on what the complaint is, I presume.

Clause passed.

Clause 6.

**Ms COOK:** You talked about the conflict of interest earlier and referred us down the track. Did you actually get any feedback regarding conflicts of interest, or has anything been identified that has required any thought or discussion around that?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** To the best of my knowledge and on the advice I had, no-one has raised a problem of conflict of interest, but this is common within the obligations under the usual treaty arrangements, that there be provision for any potential conflict of interest. I think it is in clause 9, in the schedule, in the actual operational part of the bill, which sets out the process, that the NPM must inform the minister in writing, etc. The steps are set out there.

**Ms COOK:** With respect to that, I know Tasmania was in the process. Have you had any discussions or feedback regarding the use of current existing statutory officers in the role of NPM?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** We have not had anything from Tasmania. They are following us, so they are contacting us for advice.

**Ms COOK:** So nowhere?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Nothing has been put to me, no.

Clause passed.

Clause 7.

**Ms COOK:** In respect of the functions of the NPM, are they based on any sort of agreed standard or are they just a specific to our jurisdiction, which we have drafted here ourselves?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** They all have to fit and comply with our standards in South Australia, which you can see under each of the acts.

Clause passed.

Clause 8.

**Ms COOK:** Will NPMs be allocated any specific staff for the role? Will you ensure or oversee some guidance in relation to that happening with individual NPMs so that they have delegated functions? Will they have delegated functions and powers under this clause?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** This is the delegation I was talking about before. They can have their own staff. It is expected they will have staff. They have delegation power to be able to bring in expertise when required. At this stage, I have not received any request for budget, for example, or staff provisions for any of these, but a lot of these already exist. It is a question of what extra resource they may need. As I say, we are negotiating with the commonwealth for them to pay for it for the next two years.

Clause passed.

Clause 9.

**Ms COOK:** Will the Attorney outline what kind of process will be in place for a person transferred from one correctional facility to another? In relation to a child moving from a training centre to an adult facility when they become an adult, is there a handover process that should occur or any kind of scripted documentation?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I will see if there is information I can get for the member on this. It is nothing specifically to do with this. This deals with the legal capacity to be able to disclose information about that patient, resident or prisoner when they transfer from one facility to another. That is obviously to comply with all the other current rules which keep things private. This does not deal with that at all, but there is a process, as best as I understand it. When children, for example, are serving a sentence and they move from a training centre to an adult facility, there is a transfer of their medical records. There is a briefing either way. I am happy to get more information on that for the member. Sometimes they go from hospitals, of course, so James Nash House is included.

Clause passed.

Clause 10.

**Ms COOK:** If during an inspection some sort of abuse or neglect is uncovered in our correctional facility, for example by an NPM, what reporting or referral would be anticipated?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** It would depend on the nature of it. It says here under 10 that the inquiry agency can be South Australia Police or the Ombudsman—it lists them all there. Of course—and this is the same in lots of situations—you have to be able to identify whether it is something that is a weakness that ought to be looked at by, say, the Ombudsman. For example, it could be a prisoner who does not have the right pocket money or they are complaining about being locked in their cell for three minutes longer than they should have been.

If you look through the Ombudsman's report this year, you will see he still had about 780 prisoner complaints. It is still his most outstanding number of complainants in that facility. On the other hand, if there is a suggestion that there is some solitary confinement and breach of the law or some isolation of the prisoner, it may well be something that needs to go the police or other agencies. Again, it depends on the nature of the matter. Otherwise, they would be putting it in their report to go as the NPM person to the national coordinator, which I think they have to do quarterly; is that right? Annually.

**Ms COOK:** I almost feel inclined to ask how many positive feedback reports did you get from prisoners, but—

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

**Ms COOK:** I know: it is about the same as the Housing Trust. In paragraph (h) you talk about 'any other person or body prescribed by the regulations'. Have you put your mind to who, what or where that might be under there? Are there any extras that you might think could be added?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** It is made for provision—in case there is another entity. I discovered I was in charge of about 30 commissioners when I took on this job, so there are a lot of them. There are lots of different jobs and some overlap. For example, we just recently changed the ICAC and Ombudsman's acts significantly and the OPI, but they actually operate as separate entities. We have tried to cover what we know is around. Significantly, if there is a major issue, then clearly police would be called in for most circumstances, I would expect. If it is an allegation of concern in relation to police custody, then it may well be other agencies that are called in.

Clause passed.

Clause 11 passed.

Clause 12.

**Ms COOK:** Is it the government's intention that the minister responsible for each act referred to in the bill is responsible for the annual reporting requirements—for example, the training centre requirements are the responsibility of the Department of Human Services, the Minister for Human Services; Corrections, the minister for corrections, etc?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The annual reporting requirement is from the NPM to the national coordinator, but each NPM will report to their individual minister. The Hon. Michelle Lensink will receive a report from whoever the NPM is for the training centre, as they would normally, but obviously also in this role.

**Ms COOK:** Would it be correct to say that all those individual reports are individually tabled in parliament?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Not necessarily. As you know the departments—I will just refer to it under subclause (3):

The responsible Minister for an NPM must, within 6 sitting days after receiving a report...have copies of the report laid before both Houses of Parliament.

Sometimes that is within a general application. So I receive the Commissioner for Victims' Rights annual report, and it becomes part of the Attorney-General's Department report, which has happened over the consolidation of these annual reports. The fact is that the report itself, whether it is within another report or individually, has to be tabled.

Clause passed.

Clause 13.

**Ms COOK:** In regard to this clause, I notice there are some penalties—\$10,000 maximum penalties, which are reasonably significant, I guess—being introduced for inappropriate disclosure of information. How would those penalties be enforced?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** These are similar to most other provisions around, say, a health act, for example, where in South Australia you have an obligation; you cannot just give patients' information out. You have confidentiality obligations. For example, that is why you have a clause in there that says you are allowed to disclose between NPMs and the NPM Coordinator.

We start with the concept that there is an obligation by the people who work in this field that this confidentiality has to be respected by the law, and you can be punished if you do not, but this would be like the enforcement of any other action as a breach of confidentiality. I am pretty sure these are dealt with in the Magistrates Court, but I can check on that. I think they are similar to the obligations under the health act, but we will just check on that. If it is any different, I will let you know.

Clause passed.

Clause 14.

**Ms COOK:** This clause reflects on the interaction between the bill and the equal opportunity commissioner. I note that the previous commissioner, Dr Niki Vincent, raised significant concerns about the level of resourcing within the commission at times to address complaints. Is there any concern that the implementation of OPCAT might lead to any type of increase in complaints being lodged with the equal opportunity commissioner?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** No specific concerns have been raised about that. For example, today we dealt with the Multicultural Bill, and the question of racism and hatred and so on was raised. It was pointed out that that is a matter which is within the purview of the equal opportunity commissioner to hear applications of discrimination, victimisation, etc., in that field. The change of legislation sometimes can bring a flurry of work. I am not suggesting it will; if it does, obviously we will have to look at it, but it has not been raised as a concern.

Clause passed.

Clause 15.

**Ms COOK:** With respect to this particular clause, Attorney, it is about eight weeks since we had a briefing with your department and officers—thank you. A couple of weeks after that, we spoke here regarding our concerns about the lack of consultation with unions that represent workers and their capacity to appropriately function and be safely protected under these types of acts. Since we discussed and raised concerns about the lack of consultation with the unions, have you actually reached out and consulted with them at all?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** No, and neither have I received it, but I did urge the shadow minister for police to follow up that matter with PASA if he was concerned about that. He also raised it. I do not know whether he has done that or not. Certainly, since the commencement of this debate there has not been any issue raised with me. This is a very standard clause to protect anyone who is in an inspectorate role.

I have to say that of those agencies I am responsible for in relation to their supervision—I read most of the reports from other ministers for work that they do—I have not observed that there has been any sort of attack or obstruction on inspectors in their current state roles. There is one exception to that. I think there was a man who was prosecuted for assaulting or threatening to assault a natural resources inspector of some kind. I cannot remember the full detail of it now, but it was one where he had decided that he was not very happy about the environmental police coming onto his property and carrying out certain inspections. I think there were assault charges laid actually in relation to that matter.

Largely, I have not heard of any complaint, nor can I recall seeing a complaint in annual reports of these agencies that have inspectorate arrangements that that has been a problem for them. I suspect that the most skilled and experienced are within the police force. Obviously, they are dealing with the most difficult circumstances in taking people into custody and arrest and the like and in their role in protecting the public, so that is why they are armed, etc.

There is a little bit of an issue raised, although I have not seen it in the annual report, in relation to bushfires where there was a concern about people being asked to leave property. Occasionally, that comes up where the well-meaning CFS officer gets a mouthful of abuse. These are anecdotal more than anything I have seen has been a problem, but this is a standard clause to protect them.

Clause passed.

Clause 16.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** This clause provides for a penalty for making false or misleading statements. I assume it is aimed primarily at those people who are working in these facilities who may be responsible in some way for the provision of services or the inadequate provision of services and/or some sort of torture or inhuman activity. But does it also provide—and I think from my reading of it that it clearly does—that detainees are similarly penalised for providing false and misleading information to the NPM and does that provision exist, for instance, in the Ombudsman Act or the ICAC? Are you penalised in the same way for providing false or misleading information in a police complaint, for example?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Firstly, in relation to false and misleading statements, this is also in our correctional services law, and those amendments were included in the legislation I referred to earlier, so this is not uncommon. Ultimately, it is still a question for the police and/or DPP as to whether they prosecute these matters or not, but it is not confined just to a prisoner or just to a complainant; it could be anybody. It could be a nurse or somebody who gives false or misleading information about alleged behaviour in hospital.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I assumed that was what he was saying. My question is the reverse and you just answered it, but my secondary question is: do similar penalty provisions apply, for instance, in the case of people making false or misleading complaints against police officers or against nurses or against anyone else in authority?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I recall that they certainly apply in the National Parks and Wildlife Act because we had very long debates on that. They were often called the 'environment police' by the then honourable member for Stuart, Mr Gunn. He had some other rather colourful language about them. In any event, this is not uncommon that there be some process here, and I would think that under environmental law the penalty was actually even higher, but some of that was in relation to obstruction.

It may be in the Police Act that it is higher, where they have a difficulty, of course, in being obstructed and hindered, for example entering a property, gathering evidence, picking up the computer and electronic files and so on. There are certain circumstances where they are obstructed and they have a different penalty regime.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** With your indulgence, sir, I am not referring to obstruction, I am referring to false and misleading statements, that is, perhaps vexatious claims against officers. Do similar provisions exist in other acts to cover those things?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I was just reminded of the Ombudsman Act as well.

Clause passed.

Clause 17 passed.

Clause 18.

**Ms COOK:** Attorney, I am curious about this decision of the four-year review period. Where did that figure come from?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I am advised that this review clause is exactly the same as in the Correctional Services Act.

Clause passed.

Clause 19.

**Ms COOK:** I understand other members, as well as myself, received a submission from Dr Laura Grenfell at the University of Adelaide. She raised a number of concerns about how broad this clause is. I would like to explore a couple of things from that. Clause 19(2)(a) provides:

- (a) the exemption of a person, or class of persons, from the operation of a specified provision or provisions of this Act...

Is it possible that police officers or corrections officers could be entirely excluded from the operations of this bill? Is that an appropriate outcome considering the purposes of OPCAT?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The purpose of subclause (3)(d), which is the issue in question and which was apparently raised at this morning's meeting as well and was this question about whether the minister should have the powers to alter the powers of the NPM via the regs. Here is the situation that may be required.

It is not imperative that this be here, but this is the situation that can occur. The state may be in possession of information which is not appropriate to be transferred. It may be that there are inquiries going on that are subject to the ICAC Act, for example, and so it would be inappropriate for that information to be conveyed to a commonwealth body.

Let me use the reverse. At the moment, we have protected information relating to the redress scheme and, as the Attorney-General, I can make a submission for people who put in an application about whether they are deserved of having a consideration of getting redress if they have committed offences against other people.

They might be a victim, but they might be charged and convicted and in prison for murder or other sexual assault on people which is so heinous that I am asked to give an opinion. I give that information to them and they then process it. From time to time, the information that is provided and checked on might elicit information about whether a person is still working with children and how we deal with that, because it is protected information under the commonwealth act.

It is all well intentioned, but that is the sort of thing where if it can be referred to the police, that is fine, or if the commonwealth can attend to that, or the agency, or the person themselves, the victim. Here is the situation where it becomes very difficult—for example, when the victim themselves, the alleged victim who is making an application under that particular scheme, says, 'Well, I don't want it to be raised,' yet we are left with this concern about how we might protect other potential vulnerable children.

Yes, there are circumstances where for some reason or other it is appropriate that the information is not transferred and that is why that section is there. We are having a look at it because it has been raised. I will just explain to you that just because it is there, giving the minister discretion to deal with this, it is not any kind of concealment because the NPM can raise these matters of concern that they raise. It is there to protect the interests usually of parties within our state who are deserved of protection under other laws.

**Ms COOK:** Thank you, Attorney. I think the section that Dr Grenfell raised as well in her correspondence related to clause 19(3)(d), talking about whether or not there might be—not alleging that you might do so, Attorney, of course not—some unscrupulous attorney or minister that would be able to use their discretion to make some regulatory changes or some amendments that might protect the effective monitoring of their systems and their departments. What does the Attorney say about those concerns and how that kind of conflict of interest could be avoided?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The reverse as well, that is, that as the minister responsible in this area, whoever that is, may consider it appropriate that the NPM actually does report more information to the central coordinator. It is not a question of just saying, 'Look, we need to consider some statutory protections for people in South Australia.' It might be an allegation against a particular officer in a prison, for example, that may be subject to an inquiry with another agency where that information may need to be managed.

It is there as a mechanism to protect that. It may be that the person who was convening the meeting this morning—Laura Grenfell in particular I think was one who may have raised this. She has seen some abuse of this. It has never been raised with me as a concern, other than the fact that it has been raised: why do they need it? I am letting you know why it is there. I do not think there is anything sinister in it.

Another issue that I think was raised—and it may not have been by Dr Grenfell—was whether the minister should have the ability to change the place of detention by regulation. She may not appreciate this, because she has different specialties, but governments can present regulation but they are challengeable by the parliament. For example, let's assume that a facility burnt down—and that sometimes happens in our regional areas, as I think the member would be aware—and another address and facility is set up, then that ought to have the same protection or it may need quick attention to it. I think it is appropriate that that be there.

If Dr Grenfell has any evidence of that being exploited or abused in some way, I am happy to hear from her. But I think in this situation it is important that we—there is a good deal of supervision happening here, and I think the accountability back to this parliament is to the ultimate oversight body. I think at this stage it is appropriate that the regulations stand in the absence of being any actual example of any problem with that.

Clause passed.

Schedule 1.

**The CHAIR:** I am just going to indicate to the committee that there is just one schedule but, to my mind, it seems rather large and it comes in four parts: parts 1, 2, 3 and 4. I am going to provide a little bit of flexibility to the member for Hurtle Vale should she need it in relation to the schedule. I will open it for questioning now and we will see where we go.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I appreciate that, Mr Chairman, and I do not make any comment to dissent. I just point out for the benefit of the committee that these are really just the same procedures being put into each of the other acts.

**The CHAIR:** Yes.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** We have, of course, traversed that in some detail.

**The CHAIR:** Yes, and that is a fair point, Attorney. I note that much of what is covered in the schedule we have already questioned.

**Ms COOK:** Canvassed.

**The CHAIR:** Yes, we have canvassed it, correct. But you still have the opportunity to ask questions, member for Hurtle Vale.

**Ms COOK:** I do not have a lot of questions at all. I have a couple of broad questions. Some of the concerns that were raised with me are about the broader human rights of detainees and, in this case, more so within my portfolio, those of children within the training centre. Do NPMs have oversight over broader human rights issues and standards—for example, the access to health care for a child within a detention environment? I previously canvassed as well that we had reports made about children not being able to attend school because of staffing issues. Is it just specific to safety within the walls regarding specific torture and breaches of those human rights, or are there others that can be canvassed by the NPM?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** It is quite broad because, remember, it is the place not the person that is under scrutiny here, and that includes the circumstances of the detention, size of the cell, right to be able to walk there, access to education services—these are all things that are

important. If you are looking at the international rights of children under treaties and the right to write correspondence, I think, there are all sorts of other treaties that relate to children internationally, but this relates to a place of detention and the circumstances in which they are held in a restricted capacity.

We also have all the state obligations in relation to this, remember, and we have the restrictive practices reviews that are currently being considered—some as a result of the NDIS development but also because mental health has a rather sophisticated and advanced level of restraint rules, as does aged care for that matter. Disability, I would suggest, is in an area of some—I would not say it is adrift; I would say it is simply not sophisticated and formalised in a lot of ways.

Now, of course, because we have the royal commission happening in relation to disability, we have to be alert to the fact of what is a restrictive practice. We can all think historically: arms bandaged in a mental institution, overuse of drugs for sedation, etc. But is a restriction on access to a refrigerator a restrictive practice? In some definitions, yes. Is there a good reason to be able to restrict someone from going to a refrigerator? Yes, if they are a compulsive eater and they are simply not able to control that, and it may be necessary for that management to do that.

Is it reasonable to lock someone in a room when they have dementia? For some, at a level, it may be necessary, and certainly for short periods. These are all the things we have to be looking at at the moment. I just say that there is a lot of oversight in this area and our state obligations under a lot of these acts are already there. We are really just establishing another framework and a reporting mechanism to a national body to comply.

There is the subunit of the United Nations who can visit. Members might not know, but I think about 18 months ago they actually turned up in Australia, ready to have a look at a few places. We did not really have it ready, and we were in the middle of COVID, so it was not terribly convenient. To the best of my knowledge, they did not actually inspect any premises, certainly not in South Australia. In any event, we really need to get all the protections in place with this legislation so that we can actually get operating.

Schedule passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (17:28):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Can I just indicate, for the benefit of those listening to this debate and the recent committee, that apparently the United Nations subcommittee had not actually arrived in Australia before they were told they could not inspect, so they did not actually come—just for those who are listening to this debate.

Thank you very much to all the members who have made a contribution in relation to this. It is new law. The federal Attorney-General of the day, the Hon. George Brandis—now swanning away somewhere, I think, in London—had signed us up to this. We as states around the country have all done the best we can, I suggest, to try to make sure we can honour the commitment to this.

I am not a great one for setting up Taj Mahals in Canberra, especially if it is in relation to the supervision of a service that is actually provided at the local level in a state. I have been very strong in my advocacy for our facilities not to be overburdened with supervision, that we utilise the services of those who do an excellent job already but complement that with ensuring there is coverage for these places of identified detention. I thank members for their contribution, and I thank Emily for being so patient.

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (17:29):** I will keep my comments brief and summarise some of the concerns I still hold regarding the implementation of this very important piece of legislation. I reiterate that we are supporting the bill and will be doing some further consultation between the houses. We expect that not just ourselves but also several other members will look at proposing some

amendments in the other place and look forward to the government's cooperation in respect of a number of those being delivered.

I still have some concerns regarding the lack of clarity around the funding of the implementation of this particular piece of work. It is not reasonable to expect someone like Penny Wright, for example, to undertake this piece of work without a significant investment in resources to get the consultation, education and delivery right. As we know, Penny Wright recently had to resign one of her roles because she simply could not do all the work expected of her. This will be in addition to that in her office.

I know the Attorney has the best interests of the young people at heart, in particular those who are in detention, and we want to get this right with that cohort. With mistreatment and incarceration for any length of time, the earlier it is the higher the chance of recidivism, so we want to get the treatment of those young people right and reduce the impact of any trauma that may occur. I would be keen to hear, perhaps on questioning in the other house, of any sort of surety regarding funding or any proposals that might be put forward.

While we have had a little bit of clarity regarding some of the people versus place functions of this bill, it is still a little difficult to see how that might work for a place where you do not have the regular lens of a person inspecting it having the youth component at their heart, such as an adult watch house, where the usual inspections would be by people who better know the adult model. That is still a concern. There are also still questions to be asked regarding the capacity of the minister and delivery on regulations outside the act that are not being described here. In a nutshell, that sums up where we are at regarding our concerns.

Again, I reiterate that, while we understand it is not the philosophical bent of the Liberal Party to support or engage with unions per se, as we all know the nurses and midwifery union has around 30,000 members here in South Australia. All those members are represented industrially by that union and they will cooperate and support education and awareness programs. With the staff operating under that, including staff under the PSA in the training centre—and I am sure the member for Elizabeth would reiterate members under PASA—those unions will help deliver and reinforce those education programs.

While that has not occurred proactively from the Attorney, it is something we would urge and encourage. We have engaged with the unions to talk about any challenges and how this might roll out, and I expect they would want to participate in those programs. I am really pleased to see that I think we will be the first to get this in place, and I will be keenly watching how that rollout occurs—hopefully as a minister, but we will see how we go.

Bill read a third time and passed.

### **CIVIL LIABILITY (BYO CONTAINERS) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

### **SUICIDE PREVENTION BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

At 17:37 the house adjourned until Tuesday 26 October 2021 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***COMMUNITY WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

**752 Ms BEDFORD (Florey)** (26 August 2021). How will the conversion of CWMS come at 'no costs to residents'—will the ratepayers of the City of Tea Tree Gully need to make up any shortfall beyond the \$65 million commitment funded by state taxpayers?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):**

Following decades of poor management of the CWMS by the Tea Tree Gully council and the compounding of the issue as a result of it being ignored by the previous Labor government, the Marshall Liberal government is getting on with transferring residents in the north eastern suburbs from the CWMS to the SA Water sewer system.

The initial \$65 million set aside to date relates to the current regulatory period. The Marshall Liberal government remains committed to ensuring it will not impose costs to residents as a result of the transition, including during the next regulatory period the cost of which is yet to be determined.

**WESTFIELD TEA TREE PLAZA**

**781 Ms BEDFORD (Florey)** (9 September 2021). How many Datacom employees' car parks will be lost during the construction process of the second O-Bahn park-and-ride at Tea Tree Plaza?

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

Datacom currently has lease agreements with TAFE SA in place for 78 spaces on the proposed site of the new park-and-ride. Temporary car parking arrangements are currently being investigated by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport who will continue to consult with TAFE SA and Datacom.

**KANGAROO ISLAND**

**785 The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson)** (22 September 2021). Is the \$8 million in the 2021-22 State Budget for Kangaroo Island roads in addition to the \$2 million per year which the state government provides to Kangaroo Island Council?

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

Yes.

**MARION ROAD PLANNING STUDY**

**808 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (24 September 2021). With regard to the Marion Road Planning Study Interim Report—

- (a) Will the report be released publicly? If so, when? If not, why not?
- (b) When did the South Australian government receive the report?
- (c) Who received the report? (Which agency or office holder)
- (d) How many pages is the report?
- (e) What recommendations does the report make?
- (f) Does the report make any recommendations with a budget impact?
- (g) Which individuals, organisations or businesses were consulted in the development of the report?
- (h) Is there any reason why the report has not yet been released? What is that reason?
- (i) Is the report before cabinet? Or has it been before cabinet in the past, in its current form?

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

(a) The report is being considered in relation to informing statewide infrastructure funding priorities. In the event that this becomes a priority project the content of the report will form part of the next steps in community consultation.

- (b) June 2019.
- (c) The Department for Planning Transport and Infrastructure.
- (d) 168 pages, plus appendices which amount to a further several hundred pages.
- (e) The report provides recommendations in relation to Marion Road.

(f) In the event that any of the recommendations are to be implemented, appropriate budget allocations will need to be made.

(g) The following individuals, organisations or businesses were consulted:

- City of Marion
- City of West Torrens
- Letterbox drop to local residents
- Highway Hotel/Palmer Group
- Rawson's Electrical
- Freedom Pools and Spas
- Gary J Smith land agent
- BP Anzac Highway/On The Run (OTR)
- Caltex/Caltex Star Mart
- Coles supermarket
- Hertz Truck Rental Plympton
- CR Schultz and Sons Service Centre
- Society of Chinese Medicine and Acupuncture of SA
- Department of Education and Childhood Development

(h) Refer to answer (a).

(i) I will not be making comment on whether matters are or have been considered by Cabinet as they are Cabinet in Confidence.

#### MITCHAM HILLS ROAD UPGRADE

In reply to **Mr DULUK (Waite)** (22 September 2021).

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

The concept design options relating to the upgrade of the Shepherds Hill Road, Brighton Parade and Waite Street intersection are scheduled to be released later this month.

#### CROWN SOLICITOR'S OFFICE

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

1. The CSO made enquiries to determine the availability of a suitably qualified investigator with the requisite experience. The investigator was engaged by the CSO on instructions. This resource is not being funded by the CSO.

2. Yes, that is an accurate statement.

3. No indemnities have been issued to Liberal MPs or former Liberal MPs for any legal proceedings that are currently underway. A total of six MPs have received a reimbursement of legal costs since 1 July 2018.

#### DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS

In reply to **Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

Yes. The DPP report for June 2021 advised me when the Ellis matter was listed for trial.

#### ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

The 2021 AGD Your Voice Survey results indicates that with respect to whether staff feel safe to speak up and challenge the way things are done in the agency (question 11h), 25 per cent of staff disagreed (15 per cent) or strongly disagreed (10 per cent) with this statement (page 11).

This same result is repeated on page 4 where it states, as a negative scoring question, 25 per cent disagreed with the statement that they felt safe to speak up and challenge the way things are done in the agency.

In summary, the 25 per cent figure represents staff who felt it wasn't safe speak out and challenge the way things are done. This represents an improvement compared with the 30 per cent of respondents who didn't feel it was safe to speak out and challenge the way things are done as part of the 2018 survey.

The member for Kurna appears to be interpreting the figure of 25 per cent as representing those staff who do feel it is safe to speak up and challenge the way things are done in the agency. This is incorrect.

#### COURTS ADMINISTRATION AUTHORITY

In reply to **Mr PICTON (Kurna)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

The Agency statements outline a total 76.4 FTE reduction in Budget Operating FTE between the 2021-22 budget and 2020-21 estimated result (revised budget). These FTE figures represent budget cap and do not necessarily reflect the actual FTE and positions in the agency.

This variation predominantly relates to two factors:

- 36.3 FTE—a nominal FTE decrease has been applied against a savings target (CAA efficiency measures) imposed on the CAA for 2021-22. This savings target is nominally applied against salaries and FTE, however, savings may be met via other means.
- 40.0 FTE—reduction in short-term contract staff on the ECMS project. The ECMS project was originally scheduled to go-live prior to 30 June 2021. The 40 FTE budget reduction represents short-term contracted staff working on the project. The project go-live date has been extended to February 2021.

#### COURTS ADMINISTRATION AUTHORITY

In reply to **Mr PICTON (Kurna)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

The \$200,000 is a reduction in the overall juror related expenditure budget. This is not a reduction in the number of juror trials, and if a cost pressure arises from increased activity, this will need to be managed.

#### COURTS ADMINISTRATION AUTHORITY

In reply to **Mr PICTON (Kurna)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

These cost reductions will not result in a reduction of the volume or quality of service provision. It is anticipated that the \$50,000 reduction in the intervention programs goods and services budget will come from unutilised budgets for circuits (\$20,000) and a cost reduction in training materials provided to participants and accredited training services for the service provider (\$30,000).

#### INTERVENTION PROGRAMS

In reply to **Mr PICTON (Kurna)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

The Intervention Programs contracts are as follows:

Supplier	Description	Start Date	End Date	2020-21 Spend
Offenders Aid and Rehabilitation Services (OARS)	Domestic Violence Prevention Program	1/7/2019	30/12/2021	\$417,945
Offenders Aid and Rehabilitation Services (OARS)	Drug Treatment Services	01/10/2020	30/06/2023	\$195,589
Kornar Winmil Yunti (KWY)	Domestic Violence Prevention Program – Aboriginal Men	01/07/2020	30/06/2023	\$121,227

Non-related contract expenditure are as follows:

Intervention Program Area	Description	2020-21 Spend
Domestic Violence Programs	Intervention Programs costs (service provider training and program materials)	28,096
	Interpreting costs	10,446
	General/administrative expenditure	12,556
Drug Treatment Services	Intervention treatment costs (drug testing and participant vouchers)	\$78,010
	General/administrative expenditure	\$21,754

#### COURTS ADMINISTRATION AUTHORITY

In reply to **the Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

The key agency output 'foster an environment in which judicial officers, staff and volunteers can contribute to effective performance of the courts system' (or similar wording) has been included in the Courts Administration Authority statements since 2003-04.

#### FUEL PRICING

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

In the 2020-21 financial year, the government spent \$0.22 million towards the implementation and establishment of the Fuel Pricing Information Scheme (scheme) which commenced in March 2021.

It is expected that approximately \$0.40 million will be dedicated to the ongoing support and management of the scheme in the 2021-22 financial year.

#### CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

There have been no formal complaints of harassment or bullying by staff at CBS in the 2020-21 financial year.

#### CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

The 2021 Your Voice Survey results for CBS indicated that 32 of the 99 respondents were intending to leave the agency at some time over the next five years. Of those:

- 14 expressed an intention to leave within 12 months
- 10 expressed an intention to leave within 1-2 years
- 4 expressed an intention to leave within 2-5 years
- 4 expressed an intention to leave after 5 years.

The total CBS workforce comprised 234 employees as at 30 June 2021.

#### WASTE MANAGEMENT

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

Information regarding costs to councils associated with the solid waste levy is not held by the department.

Information and reports regarding kerbside collected waste and landfill diversion is available on Green Industries SA's website: [www.greenindustries.sa.gov.au](http://www.greenindustries.sa.gov.au).

### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

The South Australian Local Government Grants Commission (the commission) makes recommendations to me on the allocation of untied Commonwealth Financial Assistance Grants to South Australia's local governing bodies in accordance with the commonwealth Local Government (Financial Assistance) Act 1995.

The Marshall government is committed to working with councils to provide much needed stimulus in the community during this time.

The Local Government Infrastructure Partnership Program was established to support councils to accelerate spending on community infrastructure projects that contribute to the future economic growth of their region, support the government's Growth State agenda, or improve local infrastructure facilities for businesses and community organisations to enable them to grow in the future.

Under the program, the state government will provide grants to councils for up to 50 per cent of the cost of approved infrastructure projects.

The successful projects were announced on 23 March 2021, with each of the 58 councils that submitted applications being awarded funding for at least one of their eligible projects.

Through this program, the state government is providing \$106.9 million in stimulus funding, which will unlock a further \$118.5 million in matching council investment and some commonwealth funding.

57 shovel-ready projects, including recreation and aquatic centre developments, new roads and intersection upgrades, playgrounds and community hubs, will be funded via the program. The total stimulus program is estimated to be somewhere in the order of \$270 million to \$290 million.

In addition, the Marshall government has provided support for council-owned childcare service providers through the Community and Jobs Support Fund. The state government matched the commonwealth's support under the Early Childhood Education and Care Relief Package and provided funding in the order of \$860,000 to support these centres in the City of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters, Whyalla City Council, Port Augusta City Council, District Council of Robe, Southern Mallee District Council, Wattle Range Council, District Council of Coober Pedy, and District Council of Karoonda East Murray.

### ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

1. The employee is still employed within Planning and Land Use Services (PLUS).
2. For the period 1 October 2020 to 30 June 2021, there has been one formal complaint made by a PLUS employee.
3. 16 employees left PLUS between 1 October 2020 and 30 June 2021. The total headcount of PLUS as at 30 June 2021 was 191. Reasons for staff leaving included:
  - 7 separating from the public sector
  - 5 transferring to other public sector employment
  - 3 retiring

There were no targeted voluntary separation payments during this period.

### GOODS AND SERVICES

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

For the Attorney-General's Department (controlled), 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	25-26
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Total goods and services	141 765	137 877	138 112	140 367	143 676

For the Public Trustee, 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	25-26
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Total goods and services	5 240	5 445	5 241	5 395	5 531

The top 10 providers of goods and services to the Attorney-General's Department (controlled) for the financial year 2020-21, and the cost for these goods and services were as follows:

Supplier *	Total Value \$m	Description
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	\$18.738	Office accommodation
DXC Enterprise Australia Pty Ltd	\$3.206	ICT support services
NEC Australia Pty Ltd	\$1.837	ICT support services
Hays Specialist Recruitment	\$1.471	Temporary staff
HP PPS Australia Pty Ltd	\$1.375	ICT support services
Data 3 Ltd	\$1.318	ICT support services
Telstra Corporation Ltd	\$1.263	Telephony services
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	\$0.958	Building maintenance
SA Police	\$0.910	Security related services
Talent International (SA) Pty Ltd	\$0.767	Temporary staff

\* Payments made under contracts subject to confidentiality arrangements may be provided separately (subject to legal advice).

The top 10 providers of goods and services to the Public Trustee for the financial year 2020-21, and the cost of these goods and services is as follows:

Supplier	Total Value \$m	Description
SS&C Solutions Pty Ltd	\$0.442	Licence fees and system improvement works for customer asset management system
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	\$0.414	Office accommodation
Crown Solicitor's Office	\$0.389	Outposted lawyers
Randstad Pty Ltd	\$0.383	Temporary staff
SA Government Financing Authority	\$0.356	Corporate Insurance Policy
Oracle Corporation Australia Pty Ltd	\$0.301	Licence fees and support for Customer Relationship Management and Financials systems
Attorney-General's Department	\$0.291	HR and IT network support
DXC Technology Pty Ltd	\$0.287	IT support services
Department of Premier and Cabinet	\$0.265	Telephony and internet services
Auditor-General's Department	\$0.226	Audit services

The Department of Treasury and Finance will provide a response regarding services supplied by South Australian suppliers.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

With regard to executive roles:

(a) Between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021, there were two executive roles abolished within the Attorney-General's Department (including Public Trustee), as listed below:

1. Director, Royal Commission Response Unit
2. Project Director, Restrictive Practices, Royal Commission Response Unit

The total annual employment cost for these appointments is \$357,239 (including superannuation).

(a) Between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021, there were four executive roles created within the Attorney-General's Department (including Public Trustee), as listed below:

1. Senior Prosecutor, Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions
2. Legal Counsel, Crown Solicitor's Office
3. Legal Counsel, Crown Solicitor's Office

## 4. Project Director, Restrictive Practices, Royal Commission Response Unit

The total annual employment cost for these appointments is \$863,367 (including superannuation).

Due to the confidentiality provisions of schedule 2 of SAES contracts, remuneration package values have been aggregated.

**GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING**

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

Table 1 shows the Attorney-General's Department (including the Public Trustee) 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
FTE	8.35	10.05	10.05	10.05	10.05
\$m	1.165	1.433	1.390	1.401	1.413

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 MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

Branch	Allowance Type	Date Range paid for	Actual Amount paid to employee between 1/7/2020 and 30/6/2021
Crown Solicitor's Office	Retention	1 July 2020 – 30 June 2021	\$24,920
Crown Solicitor's Office	Retention	1 July 2020 – 30 June 2021	\$18,179
Crown Solicitor's Office	Retention	28 Aug 2020 – 15 Jan 2021	\$13,706
Public Trustee	Retention	1 July 2020 – 30 June 2021	\$31,481
Facilities and Security	Retention	1 July 2020 – 30 June 2021	\$18,012
Public Safety Solutions	Retention	1 July 2020 – 3 July 2020	\$402
Public Safety Solutions	Retention	1 July 2020 – 30 June 2021	\$19,590
Public Safety Solutions	Retention	6 Nov 2020 – 30 June 2021	\$19,322
Public Safety Solutions	Retention	23 Oct 2020 – 30 June 2021	\$14,115
Public Safety Solutions	Retention	1 July 2020 – 30 June 2021	\$17,400
Public Safety Solutions	Retention	1 July 2020 – 30 June 2021	\$23,918
Public Safety Solutions	Retention	1 July 2020 – 30 June 2021	\$19,936
PLUS Planning & Development	Retention	1 July 2020 – 31 July 2021	\$1,799
PLUS Planning & Development	Retention	20 July 2020 – 31 July 2020	\$4,315

Branch	Allowance Type	Date Range paid for	Actual Amount paid to employee between 1/7/2020 and 30/6/2021
PLUS Planning & Development	Retention	1 July 2020 – 30 June 2021	\$30,020
PLUS Planning & Development	Retention	1 July 2020 – 30 June 2021	\$24,016
PLUS Planning & Development	Retention	29 Jan 2021 – 30 June 2021	\$6,108
PLUS Planning & Development	Retention	26 Feb 2021 – 30 June 2021	\$3,386
Forensic Science SA*	Retention	1 July 2020 – 30 June 2021	\$84,492
Forensic Science SA*	Retention	1 July 2020 – 30 June 2021	\$42,896
Forensic Science SA*	Retention	1 July 2020 – 30 June 2021	\$84,492
Forensic Science SA*	Retention	1 July 2020 – 30 June 2021	\$69,219
Forensic Science SA*	Retention	1 July 2020 – 30 June 2021	\$84,492
Forensic Science SA*	Retention	1 July 2020 – 30 June 2021	\$84,492

\* Note that the Forensic Science SA staff listed above receive an attraction/retention allowance as part of their enterprise bargaining agreement.

#### MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised the following in relation to staff employed within my office:

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	Classification	Non- salary benefits
Ministerial Liaison Officer	LEC5	Nil
Ministerial Liaison Officer	LEC1	Nil
Ministerial Liaison Officer	PO3	Nil
Liaison Officer	ASO4	Nil
Office Manager	ASO8	Nil
Executive Assistant	ASO6	Nil
Ministerial Liaison Officer	ASO5	Nil
Parliamentary and Cabinet Officer	ASO6	Nil
Senior Admin Officer	ASO4	Nil
Admin Support Officer	ASO3	Nil
Admin Support Officer	ASO3	Nil
Admin Support Officer	ASO3	Nil
Admin Support Officer	ASO3	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.

#### TERMINATION PAYOUTS

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

No executive terminations have occurred since 1 July 2020, for the Attorney-General's Department (including Public Trustee).

#### PUBLIC SECTOR EXECUTIVES

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

Since 1 July 2020 the following new executive appointments were made within the Attorney-General's Department (including Public Trustee) (excluding contract renewals):

Role Title
Executive Solicitor, Crown Solicitor's Office
Manager, Commercial Crime & Confiscations, Office of the DPP
Executive Solicitor, Crown Solicitor's Office
Director, Forensic Science SA
Executive Solicitor, Crown Solicitor's Office
Legal Counsel, Crown Solicitor's Office
Legal Counsel, Crown Solicitor's Office
Director, ICT Services
Director, Legislative Services
Director, Justice Technology Services
Senior Prosecutor, Office of the DPP

The total remuneration package value of the above appointments is \$2.406 million.

Due to the confidentiality provisions of Schedule 2 of SAES contracts, remuneration package values have been aggregated.

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** In response to questions 14 and 15 I have been advised the following:

Attorney-General's Department

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2020-21 and across the forward estimates for the Attorney-General's Department—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
National Legal Assistance Partnership—Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Services	Provides both generalist and family law/family violence legal services in South Australia	5,192	5,267	5,350	5,427	5,506
Aboriginal Justice Advocacy Service	To provide advice and advocacy on behalf of Aboriginal South Australians and their interactions with the justice sector.	120	120	226	232	236
Australia New Zealand Policing Advisory Agency (ANZPAA) National Institute of Forensic Science	Contribution to National Institute of Forensic Science	41	41	41	41	41
Australian Government, The Treasury	Contribution to Council for Australian Federation	16	—	—	—	—

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
	(CAF) Secretariat for 2020-21					
Australian Institute of Criminology Research Grants	The Australian Institute of Criminology is Australia's national research and knowledge centre on crime and justice and seeks to promote justice and reduce crime by undertaking and communicating evidence-based research to inform policy and practice	15	16	17	17	17
Australian National Research Organisation for Women's Safety Limited (ANROWS)	Contribution to deliver relevant and translatable research evidence which drives policy and practice leading to a reduction in the levels of violence against women and their children	15	—	—	—	—
Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration	Research into judicial administration and the development and conduct of educational programmes for judicial officers, court administrators and members of the legal profession in relation to court administration and judicial systems	17	—	—	—	—
Australian Pro Bono Centre	Services for promoting and supporting pro bono work	7	7	—	—	—
Australian Sports Commission – 'Play by the Rules'	Deliver education and training that supports environments that are safe, fair and inclusive for sport and recreation	5	5	5	5	5
AustLii Foundation Ltd	To improve access to justice through better access to information	2	—	—	—	—
National Legal Assistance Partnership—Community Legal Centres	Provides both generalist and family law/family violence legal services in South Australia, as well as a Domestic Violence Unit which provides legal assistance and other forms of support, including financial support services such as financial counselling, to women experiencing or at risk of domestic violence in South Australia.	6,241	6,659	6,764	6,868	6,982
Conservation Council SA	To enable the Conservation Council to coordinate a community response to a range of planning, infrastructure and transport initiatives	10	—	—	—	—

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
Bushfire Legal Assistance Services	Provision of Cth funding to the Legal Assistance Sector for the 2019-20 bushfires	875	—	—	—	—
COVID-19 Legal Assistance Services	Provision of Cth funding to the Legal Assistance Sector to help address the impact of COVID-19	4,546	—	—	—	—
Crime Prevention and Community Safety Grants	Encounter Youth— Increase community safety	108	—	—	—	—
Crimestoppers South Australia	Contribution to Crime Stoppers, a program in where the community and media help police solve crime.	200	205	210	215	—
Department of the Premier and Cabinet – iAPPLY Initiative	2020-21 iAPPLY Fee	33	34	34	35	36
Department of the Premier and Cabinet—Better Services Initiative	2020-21 contribution to Better Services Senior Management Council Initiative	12	—	—	—	—
Department of the Premier and Cabinet—JAWUN	2020-21 contribution for JAWUN	12	—	—	—	—
Department of Justice and Community Safety – Bond Products Research project	Contribution to the National Bond Products Research Project	12	—	—	—	—
Drug Court	Provide general legal defence services for defendants referred to and or accepted into the Drug Court Program	159	163	198	203	208
Financial Counselling and Advocacy Service	Financial counselling and advocacy services for tenants with low financial literacy	131	134	138	141	144
Institute of Public Administration SA Division	2020-21 IPAA Agreement	21	—	—	—	—
Municipal Services on Aboriginal Lands	Services funded by the MUNS Program include waste management, dog control and environmental health control, road and airfield maintenance, and water infrastructure maintenance	2,227	3,132	3,210	3,292	3,376
MUNS – Infrastructure Program	Repair and renewal of MUNS related infrastructure that is critical to communities' safety and wellbeing, including roads, waste, landfills, playgrounds and public spaces, wastewater systems and household septic tanks	2,299	4,259	—	—	—
National Coronial Information System contribution	The National Coronial Information System is a data repository	39	40	41	41	42

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
	containing information about deaths reported to a Coroner in Australia and New Zealand					
National Criminal Court Statistics Unit (NCCSU) contribution	State contribution to the NCCSU to compile, analyse, publish and disseminate uniform national criminal courts statistics, subject to the provisions of the <i>Census and Statistics Act 1905</i>	22	23	23	23	23
National Motor Vehicle Theft Reduction Council contribution	Contribution to deliver continuous and sustainable vehicle theft reduction in Australia by advancing reform and cooperation between industry, government and community stakeholders	33	—	—	—	—
Operation Flinders Foundation	Provides a crime prevention program for young offenders and young people at risk of reoffending	477	489	—	—	—
Professor Ross Vining Forensic Research Grant	Provide funding for collaborative research to improve casework	50	50	50	50	50
Road Trauma Support Team of SA	Contribution to Road Trauma Support Team of SA for 2020-21	57	100	—	—	—
Street Crime Initiative (Repay SA)	To provide skills, training and where appropriate qualifications linked to the community work that offenders undertake	296	304	312	320	328
South Australian Law Reform Institute	To provide funding for administrative support	64	48	50	51	52
SA Offender Management Plan	2020-21 contribution to SA Offender Management Plan administrative support	13	—	—	—	—

The following table provides the allocation of grant program/funds for 2020-21 and across the forward estimates for the Attorney-General's Department—Administered:

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
Child Abuse Protection Fund	To fund work which protects children	416	425	434	444	454
Justice Rehabilitation Fund	To fund programs and facilities that will further crime prevention and rehabilitation strategies	298	240	240	240	240
Legal Services Commission	Legal Aid Services (inc. Commonwealth funding)	42,858	43,687	43,715	44,639	45,585
State Expensive Criminal Cases	Reimburse Legal Services Commission for expensive criminal cases	437	400	400	400	400

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
Victims of Crime Fund	To advance the interests of victims of crime or assist in the prevention of crime	5,184	4,174	4,255	4,361	4,469
Harm Minimisation Fund	For programs that support health and safety education and rehabilitation services	31	200	200	200	200

There were no approved carryovers of grants from 2020-21 into 2021-22 for the Attorney-General's Department as at the end of August 2021.

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

The government has provided a list of grant programs administered by the Attorney-General's Department during 2020-21 in omnibus question 14.

#### GOODS AND SERVICES

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

For the Courts Administration Authority, 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	2025-26
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Total goods and services	\$27,352	\$25,733	\$25,946	\$25,883	\$26,510

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	2020-21 Spend
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	\$3,937,203
South Australia Police	\$2,516,944
Academy Services Pty Ltd	\$1,191,066
Zen Energy	\$1,004,191
DXC Enterprise Pty Ltd	\$897,255
Pro AV Solutions	\$756,369
Thomson Reuters (Prof) Aust	\$685,745
OARS SA	\$625,518
Dell Australia Pty Ltd	\$591,171
Southern Cross Cleaning (S.A)	\$585,693

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
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	Maintenance and Minor Works across court sites
South Australia Police	Public Private Partnership (PPP) on behalf of the CAA to Plenary Justice and Police Security Services Branch services.
Academy Services Pty Ltd	Office cleaning
Zen Energy	Electricity
DXC Enterprise Pty Ltd	Whole of Government Mainframe managed by Department of the Premier and Cabinet
Pro AV Solutions	Audiovisual (AV) and Video Conferencing (VC) equipment and installation, predominantly related to the AVL infrastructure refresh project.
Thomson Reuters (Prof) Aust	Library materials, including loose leaf subscriptions, database subscriptions and books
OARS SA	Drug Treatment Services
Dell Australia Pty Ltd	Minor IT hardware, e.g. desktops and laptops

Supplier	Description
Southern Cross Cleaning (S.A)	Office cleaning

### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised the following positions with an estimated cost of \$100,000 or more were abolished between 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021:

Job Title	Estimated Cost
Higher Courts Redevelopment – Executive Consultant	\$198,562
Chief Financial Officer	\$184,699
Manager Workforce Capability Development	\$138,441
Project Manager – AVL	\$136,081
Coordinating Registrar Civil	\$126,535
Manager Management Accounting Services	\$126,535
Manager Magistrates Clerks	\$112,786
Senior Case Manager	\$110,702
Deputy Registrar – Civil	\$103,310
Trainer	\$103,310
Deputy Registrar ERDC	\$103,310
Senior Project Officer	\$103,310

I have been advised the following positions with an estimated cost of \$100,000 or more were created.

Job Title	Estimated Cost
Executive Director Corporate Services/Chief Financial Officer	\$277,741
Director Court Services	\$179,243
Adelaide Registrar	\$136,081
Change Leader	\$136,081
Manager Judicial Support	\$126,535
Deputy Registrar	\$112,786
Deputy Registrar	\$112,786
Youth Justice Coordinator	\$105,750

### GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

Table 1 shows the Courts Administration Authority 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
Total	FTE	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	\$m	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1

The CAA did not incur any advertising or campaign expenditure in 2020-21. No expenditure is budgeted in 2021-22.

### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

Attraction allowances, retention allowances and non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021:

Position Title	Allowance Type	Date range paid for	Actual Amount paid to employee between 1/7/2020 and 30/6/2021
ECMS Project Manager	Retention	1 July 2020 – 30 June 2021	\$24,367
Online Services Lead	Attraction	1 July 2020 – 30 June 2021	\$11,418
Registrar Probates	Retention	1 July 2020 – 30 June 2021	\$15,010
Interim Sheriff	Attraction	15 June 2020-30 June 2021	\$1,287
ECMS Configuration Specialist	Retention	1 July 2020 – 26 February 2021	\$10,483
Senior Project Officer (ECMS Communications specialist)	Retention	1 July 2020 – 26 February 2021	\$3,316
Project Manager, AVL	Attraction	1 July 2020 – 18 June 2021	\$11,304
Manager Program Management Office	Retention	1 July 2020 – 6 November 2020	\$4,064
Judicial Systems Trainer	Retention	1 July 2020 – 1 January 2021	\$4,695

#### MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised the following in relation to staff employed within my office:

The Courts Administration Authority does not have any ministerial staff employed within or seconded to ministerial offices.

#### TERMINATION PAYOUTS

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

There have been nil executive terminations since 1 July 2020.

#### PUBLIC SECTOR EXECUTIVES

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised the following executive appointments have been made since 1 July 2020:

Position	Date	TRPV	Total employment cost
State Courts Administrator	15 Jun 2021	\$331,570	\$347,983
Executive Director, Corporate Services	12 Oct 2020	\$264,641	\$277,741
Principal Registrar Higher Courts	7 Oct 2020	\$208,005	\$218,301
Director Court Services	12 Oct 2020	\$170,789	\$179,243

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised that there has been no budgeted or actual expenditure on grant programs by the Courts Administration Authority for the 2020-21 financial year. No grant expenditure is budgeted by the Courts Administration Authority for the 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24, and 2024-25 financial years.

#### GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised that no grants were paid by the Courts Administration Authority during 2020-21.

**GOODS AND SERVICES**

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

For the Electoral Commission SA, the budgeted expenditure on goods and services for the financial year 2020-21 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	13,976	7,021	2,742	3,535	15,717

The top 10 providers of goods and services for the financial year 2020-21 and the cost and description of these goods and services were as follows:

Supplier	Total Value	Description
Australian Electoral Commission	\$1,063,662	Maintenance and provision of electoral roll
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	\$493,641	Property rent and occupancy
Hays Specialist Recruitment (Australia)	\$183,478	Contract staff
Paxus Australia	\$159,157	Contract staff
GIS People	\$125,000	Funding & Disclosure portal
Australia Post	\$101,075	Postage
Comware	\$94,875	Minor equipment (scanners)
Janison Solutions	\$88,750	Learning management system
Talent International (SA)	\$87,982	Contract staff
Crown Solicitor's Office	\$66,917	Legal advice

For the Administered Items for the Electoral Commission SA, the budgeted expenditure on goods and services for the financial year 2020-21 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	672	515	752	772	554

The top 10 providers of goods and services for the financial year 2020-21 and the cost and description of these goods and services were as follows:

Supplier	Total Value	Description
Liberal Party of Australia (SA Division)	\$130,677	Special Assistance Funding Claims paid
Australian Labour Party (SA Branch)	\$130,677	Special Assistance Funding Claims paid
Department of Treasury and Finance	\$124,622	Remittance of expiation fees received
Australian Greens (SA)	\$78,092	Special Assistance Funding Claims paid
SA Best Inc	\$66,737	Special Assistance Funding Claims paid
Department for Infrastructure and Transport	\$145,000	Mapping services and population projections
Eureka Corporate Group	\$17,346	Printing
Thomas Besanko	\$6,664	Counsel assisting the Boundaries Commission
Wavemaker	\$3,415	Media placement
Auditor-General's Department	\$2,000	Audit services

The Treasurer's office will provide a response to the question regarding the value of the goods and services that was supplied to the agency by South Australian suppliers.

**PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES**

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

Between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021, there were no positions with a total estimated cost of \$100,000 or more which were either abolished or created within the Electoral Commission SA.

**GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING**

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

For the Electoral Commission SA:

- No FTEs were employed to provide communication and promotion activities in 2020-21. There was no employment expense as no FTEs were employed during this period.
- No FTEs are budgeted to provide communication and promotion activities in 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24 and 2024-25. There is no employment expense as no FTEs are budgeted to be employed during these periods.
- There was no government-paid advertising, including campaigns, across all mediums in 2020-21 and none is budgeted for 2021-22.

#### **PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES**

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

No attraction allowances, retention allowances or non-salary benefits were paid to public servants or contractors by the Electoral Commission SA between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021.

#### **MINISTERIAL STAFF**

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** I have been advised the following in relation to staff employed within my office:

Information on ministerial staff employed as at 16 July 2021 was published in the *Government Gazette* on 22 July 2021.

No public sector staff from the Electoral Commission SA were employed within my office or seconded to my office as at 30 June 2021. There were no employment costs as no public sector staff were employed or seconded.

A seconded employee is an employee who is paid for by the department and not the minister's office.

#### **TERMINATION PAYOUTS**

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

No executive level employees have been terminated from the Electoral Commission SA since 1 July 2020.

#### **PUBLIC SECTOR EXECUTIVES**

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

No new executive appointments were made within the Electoral Commission SA since 1 July 2020. There was no employment cost as no new executive appointments were made during the period.

#### **GRANT PROGRAMS**

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** In response to questions 14 and 15 I have been advised the following:

The Electoral Commission SA had no grant programs or funds for the 2020-21 financial year and has no grant programs or funds for the 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24 and 2024-25 financial years.

#### **GRANT PROGRAMS**

In reply to **Ms MICHAELS (Enfield)** (2 August 2021). (Estimates Committee A)

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

No grants were paid by the Electoral Commission SA for the period of 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021. No grant agreements were signed by the Electoral Commission SA during the period.

#### **MINISTERIAL OFFICES**

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 ministerial office resources presented in the 2021-22 budget papers reflect the full cost of each office, including ministerial contract staff, ministerial liaison officers and all administrative staff working in a minister's office.

The 13 FTEs presented in 2017-18 for the then Treasurer's office (former government's 166.9 FTEs across all ministerial offices) did not include all resources engaged in ministerial offices as it did not include ministerial liaison officers and other administrative staff seconded from the department.

The estimated full-year cost of the former Labor government's ministerial offices in 2017-18 was \$40.9 million based on a total of 271 FTEs. This included 18.6 FTEs in the former Treasurer's ministerial office.

The 2021-22 budget of 221 FTEs represents a 50 FTE reduction from the former Labor government 2017-18 staffing levels.

### GOODS AND SERVICES

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:

For the Department of Treasury and Finance, 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	25-26
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Total goods and services	79,330	70,556	74,867	78,359	80,333

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
Frontier Software	\$6,895,795
Infor Global Solutions ANZ Pty Ltd	\$4,131,205
SS&C	\$2,492,670
Hays Specialist Recruitment	\$2,401,423
Fujitsu Australia Ltd	\$2,345,206
Randstad Pty Ltd	\$2,291,126
Datacom Systems (AU) Pty Ltd	\$1,931,797
Data#3 Ltd	\$1,780,419
Basware Pty Ltd	\$1,490,392
KPMG	\$1,317,696

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
Frontier Software	Bureau services for the support and maintenance of the CHRIS 21 human resource management system.
Infor Global Solutions ANZ Pty Ltd	Support and maintenance for the across government financial management system.
SS&C	Software, maintenance and support arrangements for the Super SA superannuation administration system.
Hays Specialist Recruitment	Provision of temporary staff.
Fujitsu Australia Ltd	Application managed services for the RevenueSA information online system.
Randstad Pty Ltd	Provision of temporary staff.
Datacom Systems (AU) Pty Ltd	Bulk purchase of laptop devices to ensure supply to government departments during the COVID-19 emergency.
Data#3 Ltd	Microsoft licensing and desktop security software.
Basware Pty Ltd	Support and maintenance for the across government invoice management system.
KPMG	Audit and financial advisory services.

For HomeStart Finance, 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	25-26
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Total goods and services	14,969	17,860	18,448	15,745	14,609

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
CBRE (V) Pty Limited Trust Account	\$1,100,919
Connective OSN Pty Ltd	\$1,001,559
AFG	\$993,667
Carat Australia Media Services Pty Ltd	\$884,488
Chamonix IT Management Consulting (SA) Pty Ltd	\$631,441
Choice Aggregation Services (Pennley)	\$577,293
Sandstone Technology Pty Ltd	\$550,491
White Clarke Group (IDS)	\$524,179
Showpony Advertising	\$462,548
Data#3 Limited	\$407,696

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
CBRE (V) Pty Limited Trust Account	Office accommodation
Connective OSN Pty Ltd	Mortgage aggregation and broking services
AFG	Mortgage aggregation and broking services
Carat Australia Media Services Pty Ltd	Media placement services
Chamonix IT Management Consulting (SA) Pty Ltd	Specialist technical advice, technology architectural planning and labour hire
Choice Aggregation Services (Pennley)	Mortgage aggregation and broking services
Sandstone Technology Pty Ltd	Loan origination system licencing and support
White Clarke Group (IDS)	Loan administration system project implementation
Showpony Advertising	Creative agency services
Data#3 Limited	Microsoft licencing and desktop security software

For Renewal SA, 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	126,073	115,739	71,975	36,847

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
McMahon Services Australia	\$27,358,307
Hansen Yuncken Pty Ltd	\$21,955,769
Built Pty Ltd	\$7,871,097
LR&M Constructions Pty Ltd	\$6,419,194
SHAPE Australia Pty Ltd	\$4,508,720
T & J Constructions Pty Ltd	\$3,663,014
Civil & Allied Technical Construction	\$2,621,804
Lendlease Building Contractors Pty Ltd	\$2,532,588
KV Equipment Rentals Limited	\$2,259,588
A G O'Connor Pty Ltd	\$1,628,955

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
McMahon Services Australia	Demolition and remediation works
Hansen Yuncken Pty Ltd	Building refurbishment and public realm works
Built Pty Ltd	Heritage restoration works
LR&M Constructions Pty Ltd	Civil and construction works
SHAPE Australia Pty Ltd	Building refurbishment works
T & J Constructions Pty Ltd	Civil and construction works
Civil & Allied Technical Construction	Civil and construction works
Lendlease Building Contractors Pty Ltd	Infrastructure works
KV Equipment Rentals Limited	Car park licence fee
A G O'Connor Pty Ltd	Mechanical and boiler maintenance works

For the Return to Work Corporation of South Australia (RTWSA), the budgeted expenditure on goods and services for the financial year 2021-22 is \$62,401,855. Note, that the RTWSA is not included in the forward estimates period.

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 of Infrastructure and Transport	\$2,920,237
Australia Post	\$1,962,503
Data#3 Limited	\$1,796,221
Hastwell IT	\$1,422,496
IBM Australia Ltd	\$1,262,769
locane Pty Ltd	\$1,003,092
Finity Consulting Pty Limited	\$893,855
Insync Solutions Pty Ltd	\$629,316
Randstad Pty Ltd	\$483,926
Auditor-General's Department	\$414,400

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
Department of Infrastructure and Transport	Office accommodation for tenancy at 400 King William Street Adelaide.
Australia Post	Postal and scanning services.
Data#3 Limited	IT infrastructure equipment and managed services to support RTWSA's information technology network.
Hastwell IT	Managed services to support RTWSA's information technology network.
IBM Australia Ltd	Software licencing and support cost for Cúram insurance system.
locane Pty Ltd	Managed services to support RTWSA's information technology network.
Finity Consulting Pty Limited	Actuarial advice.
Insync Solutions Pty Ltd	Information security management services.
Randstad Pty Ltd	Provision of staff for activities undertaken by the Mining and Quarrying Occupational Health and Safety Committee.
Auditor-General's Department	External audit of the financial statements and significant financial controls.

The following information is provided on behalf of all ministers:

The value of goods and services contracted with South Australian suppliers across all agencies will be collected by Procurement Services SA, by October 2021. Following receipt of the data, Procurement Services SA will review and consolidate the data. The value of goods and services contracted with South Australian suppliers for the financial year 2020-21 will then be published by Procurement Services SA on their website.

#### INVESTING EXPENDITURE PROJECTS

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 following table provides the budgeted expenditure across the 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24 and 2024-25 financial years for each individual investing expenditure project in the general government and public non-financial corporation sector.

2021-22 Budget—Capital Investment Projects and Programs by Minister and Agency (\$000s)				
	2021-22 Budget	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate
Attorney-General				
Attorney-General				
Major Projects				
Consumer and Business Services—improved digital systems	4,100	650	—	—

2021-22 Budget—Capital Investment Projects and Programs by Minister and Agency (\$000s)					
		2021-22 Budget	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate
Annual Programs					
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	2,614	2,854	2,923	2,993
	Outback Communities Authority	1,187	502	507	512
	SA Computer Aided Dispatch System	2,857	—	—	—
	SA Government Radio Network	30,229	—	—	—
	State and Public Safety Communications Infrastructure	256	262	269	276
Courts					
Major Projects					
	Electronic Court Management System	366	—	—	—
	Sir Samuel Way Building facade	5,834	2,485	—	—
Annual Programs					
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	2,323	2,399	2,458	2,518
Electoral Commission					
Major Projects					
	Electoral Amendment Reform Project	2,412	—	—	—
Annual Programs					
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	50	50	50	50
Independent Commissioner Against Corruption and Office for Public Integrity					
Major Projects					
	Independent Commissioner Against Corruption and Office for Public Integrity—systems upgrade	440	51	52	53
Adelaide Cemeteries Authority					
Major Projects					
	Multi-Function Community Precinct—Enfield Memorial Park	13,813	5,050	—	—
	Memorial Gardens—Cheltenham Cemetery	150	150	150	150
	Memorial Gardens—Enfield Memorial Park	450	480	280	180
	Memorial Gardens—Smithfield Memorial Park	20	30	370	200
	Recycled Water/Irrigation Infrastructure	160	70	70	70
	Memorial Gardens—West Terrace Cemetery	170	35	35	185
	Information Technology	110	60	60	100
	Enfield Mausoleum Stage 4	-	2,300	—	—
Annual Programs					
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	434	547	649	313
Public Trustee					

2021-22 Budget—Capital Investment Projects and Programs by Minister and Agency (\$000s)					
		2021-22 Budget	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate
Major Projects					
	Customer Relationship Management Replacement project	1,400	700	—	—
Annual Programs					
	Furniture and Fittings	57	60	62	64
	Software	254	130	133	200
	Machines and Equipment	31	—	—	51
	Hardware	344	80	82	507
West Beach Trust					
Major Projects					
	Roads and Car Parks	800	—	—	—
Annual Programs					
	Caravan Park Accommodation and Facility Upgrades	1,300	854	875	896
	Resort Accommodation and Facility Upgrades	218	747	766	786
	Corporate Services Office and Works Depot	522	428	439	450
	Golf Course	100	160	164	168
	Boat Haven	—	160	164	168
	Reserves	110	320	328	336
Child Protection					
Child Protection					
Major Projects					
	Leasehold, ICT Equipment and Furniture	1,800	—	—	—
	Residential Care Facilities	5,061	—	—	—
Education					
Education					
Major Projects					
	Balharry Kindergarten	300	200	—	—
	Eastern Fleurieu R-12 School – Langhorne Creek Campus	2,200	800	—	—
	Elliston RSL Memorial Children's Centre relocation	600	1,400	—	—
	Escalations	—	—	27	—
	Nailsworth Primary School	700	3,500	800	—
	New Projects	—	—	—	57,731
	New Rostrevor High School	16,570	38,800	29,030	—
	Pimpala Primary School	1,200	8,000	2,800	—
	Planning Studies	300	200	—	—
	Salisbury East High School	1,500	2,500	—	—

2021-22 Budget—Capital Investment Projects and Programs by Minister and Agency (\$000s)					
		2021-22 Budget	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate
	Seaview Downs Primary School	1,500	8,000	5,500	—
	Sust Schl—Aberfoyle Park High School	3,512	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Additional demountable capacity	1,125	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Additional disability capacity	2,690	58	—	—
	Sust Schl—Adelaide High School	8,760	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Adelaide Secondary School of English	760	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Ardtornish Primary School	1,883	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Australian Science & Mathematics Sch	2,201	502	—	—
	Sust Schl—Banksia Park International HS	1,055	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Belair Primary School	4,566	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Black Forest Primary School	3,454	1,315	—	—
	Sust Schl—Blackwood High School	3,100	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Brighton Primary School	40	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Brighton Secondary School	2,735	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Ceduna Area School	1,046	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Charles Campbell College	1,868	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Christies Beach HS & Sth Voc College	2,195	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Clare High School	910	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Craigmore High School	2,231	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Cummins Area School	1,656	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—East Marden Primary School	6,556	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Elizabeth Vale Primary School	6,772	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Findon High School	5,478	4,054	—	—
	Sust Schl—Fregon Anangu School	14,610	295	—	—
	Sust Schl—Gawler and District College B-12	2,615	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Glenelg Primary School	5,642	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Glenunga International High School	18,043	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Glossop High School	6,424	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Golden Grove High School	5,005	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Golden Grove Primary School	5,433	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Goolwa Secondary College	6,264	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Grange Primary School	5,370	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Grant High School	992	—	—	—

2021-22 Budget—Capital Investment Projects and Programs by Minister and Agency (\$000s)					
		2021-22 Budget	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate
	Sust Schl—Hallett Cove School	746	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Hamilton Secondary College	3,141	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Heathfield High School	4,980	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Henley High School	4,494	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Highgate School	1,796	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—John Pirie Secondary School	2,788	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Kadina Memorial School	1,162	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Kapunda High School	4,013	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Loxton High School	315	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Magill School	6,116	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Mannum Community College	1,738	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Mark Oliphant College (B-12)	2,722	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Mawson Lakes School	5,369	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Mitcham Girls High School	1,091	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Mitcham Primary School	4,368	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Modbury High School	1,448	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Moonta Area School	1,279	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Mount Barker High School	879	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Mount Barker Primary School	4,270	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Mount Compass Area School	3,432	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Mount Gambier High School	1,153	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Murray Bridge High School	4,248	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Murray Bridge North School	3,450	1,315	—	—
	Sust Schl—Naracoorte High School	1,821	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Norwood Morialta High School	25,127	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Nuriootpa High School	1,994	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Nuriootpa Primary School	1,570	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Ocean View P-12 College	1,045	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Para Hills High School	1,351	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Parafield Gardens R-7 School	5,419	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Paralowie School	1,276	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Playford International College	5,912	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Plympton International College	186	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Port Augusta Secondary School	3,366	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Port Lincoln High School	4,828	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Project Variations	6,314	—	—	—

2021-22 Budget—Capital Investment Projects and Programs by Minister and Agency (\$000s)					
		2021-22 Budget	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate
	Sust Schl—Reidy Park Primary School	3,453	1,315	—	—
	Sust Schl—Renmark High School	660	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Reynella East College	4,774	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Roma Mitchell Secondary College	13,439	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Roxby Downs Area School	2,469	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Salisbury High School	827	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Seaford Secondary College	1,311	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Seaton High School	5,827	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Seaview High School	3,390	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Settlers Farm Campus R-7	3,454	1,315	—	—
	Sust Schl—Springbank Secondary College	5,487	4,054	—	—
	Sust Schl—Stradbroke School	5,642	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—The Heights School	108	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Trinity Gardens School	4,835	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Underdale High School	5,339	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Unley High School	10,777	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Urrbrae Agricultural High School	3,104	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Valley View Secondary School	5,487	4,054	—	—
	Sust Schl—Victor Harbor R-7 School	558	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Warradale Primary School	6,555	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—West Lakes Shore School R-7	4,565	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Westbourne Park Primary School	3,453	1,315	—	—
	Sust Schl—Wirreanda Secondary School	682	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Woodcroft Primary School	5,478	—	—	—
	Sust Schl—Woodend Primary School	3,453	1,315	—	—
	Sust Schl—Woodville High School	2,588	—	—	—
	Voluntary Amalgamations	968	—	—	—
	Whyalla Secondary College	22,655	—	—	—
Annual Programs					
	Capital Works Assistance Scheme	858	2,137	3,583	3,788
	Major Feasibility Studies	379	532	545	559
	Purchase of Land and Property	1,304	1,337	1,371	1,405
	School Bus Replacement	1,303	1,336	1,369	1,404
PPPs					
	Northern & Southern Adelaide Schools PPP	35,891	—	—	—

2021-22 Budget—Capital Investment Projects and Programs by Minister and Agency (\$000s)					
		2021-22 Budget	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate
SACE Board of SA					
Major Projects					
	SACE Modernisation	78	—	—	—
Annual Programs					
	SACE Board	127	130	133	136
Consolidated Schools					
Annual Programs					
	Consolidated Schools Investing Payments	2,550	—	—	—
Administered Items for Education					
Annual Programs					
	Minor Works—DE AI	616	—	—	—
History Trust of South Australia					
Major Projects					
	National Motor Museum Air Conditioning	530	—	—	—
	History Trust Relocation	1,338	—	—	—
Annual Programs					
	History Trust	100	102	105	108
TAFE SA					
Major Projects					
	Contemporary digital student learning systems and support services	5,628	2,881	—	—
	Revitalising TAFE SA campuses	3,994	—	—	—
Annual Programs					
	Annual Capital Program	9,220	9,275	6,246	6,403
	Purchase of Plant and Equipment	1,757	1,801	1,846	1,892
Energy and Mining					
Energy and Mining					
Major Projects					
	Modern Resources Customer System Transformation	4,339	—	—	—
	Remote Area Energy Supply—Central Power House Solar Upgrade	1,251	—	—	—
	Remote Area Energy Supply – Future Sustainability	832	—	—	—
	Rural Business Support Landowner Information Service	175	175	—	—
Annual Programs					
	Minerals Asset Upgrade and Replacement	255	262	269	276
	RAES scheme power generation and distribution equipment	841	1,542	1,593	2,146

2021-22 Budget—Capital Investment Projects and Programs by Minister and Agency (\$000s)					
	2021-22 Budget	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate	
Environment and Water					
Dog and Cat Management Board					
	Dog and Cat Management Online	50	50	50	
Environment and Water					
Major Projects					
	Adelaide Botanic Gardens and Botanic Park—Infrastructure and Activation Upgrades	8,220	500	—	—
	Ayers House activation	5,662	—	—	—
	East End Kangaroo Island Projects	600	—	—	—
	Flows for the Future	3,842	4,338	2,055	—
	Glenthorne National Park	4,632	—	—	—
	Kangaroo Island Recovery—Asset reinstatement and site clearance	29,420	5,440	—	—
	Opening Up South Australia's Reservoirs	200	—	—	—
	Park renewal investment	1,662	1,000	2,000	2,000
	Parks 2025	21,651	2,975	—	—
	Patawalonga—Replacement of South Gates	3,350	3,350	—	—
	Seal Bay	2,612	—	—	—
	Securing the future of our metropolitan coastline	12,000	12,000	—	—
	State Groundwater and Minerals Data Platform	3,000	1,500	—	—
	Sustaining Riverland Environments Program	30,764	—	—	—
	Torrens Parade Ground—Amenities and Services Upgrades to the Drill Hall	853	—	—	—
	Water Management Solutions	1,800	—	—	—
	Wild South Coast Way	3,646	1,000	—	—
Annual Programs					
	Fire Management on Public Land—Enhanced Capabilities	2,316	2,644	2,173	2,202
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	5,077	5,141	5,270	5,401
	Water Monitoring Equipment	2,143	2,196	2,251	2,307
South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board					
Major Projects					
	South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board	509	522	535	548
Environment Protection Authority					
Major Projects					
	Material Flow and Levy Information System	674	—	—	—

2021-22 Budget—Capital Investment Projects and Programs by Minister and Agency (\$000s)					
		2021-22 Budget	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate
	South Australia's Environmental Incident Reporting System	700	—	—	—
Annual Programs					
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	639	655	671	688
SA Water					
Major Projects					
	Baroota Dam Safety	2,000	140	—	—
	Bolivar Midge Fly Vegetation Screen Project	550	1,300	—	—
	Bolivar Wastewater Treatment Plant Capacity Upgrade	2,366	20,651	—	—
	Eyre Peninsula Desalination Augmentation	29,820	53,331	5,980	—
	Fleurieu Water Quality Improvement	2,606	—	—	—
	Happy Valley Health Compliance Upgrade UV	7,415	744	—	—
	Kangaroo Island Desalination Plant	36,431	5,500	1,157	—
	Leigh Creek Water Main Mine Diversion	9,450	—	—	—
	Mount Bold Dam Safety	4,650	24,022	64,052	80,000
	Mt Barker Development Water Supply Scheme—Stage 1	1,000	1,102	1,347	1,000
	Myponga UV Treatment	52	—	—	—
	Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme	1,338	27,000	—	—
	Opening up our reservoirs	3,659	—	—	—
	Opening up our reservoirs—regulated component	2,099	—	—	—
	Port Lincoln Wastewater Treatment Plant	259	—	—	—
	Purchase water entitlements to the Minister and the River Murray	300	300	300	—
	Tea Tree Gully Wastewater Works	16,200	23,162	22,739	—
	Zero Cost Energy Future	3,822	—	—	—
Annual Programs					
	Asset Renewal	10,251	13,702	10,727	10,993
	Environmental Improvement	27,669	32,111	19,624	22,854
	Information Technology	37,571	36,994	38,011	38,962
	Major and Minor Plant	8,121	6,069	4,231	6,799
	Mechanical and Electrical Renewal	72,054	55,777	59,996	60,615
	Network Extension	42,153	52,899	48,571	47,596
	Networks Growth	31,886	25,675	29,225	27,557
	Pipe Network Renewal	113,744	105,906	93,747	96,577
	Safety	17,428	20,000	27,789	22,040
	Service Reliability Management	6,200	1,954	2,586	2,901

2021-22 Budget—Capital Investment Projects and Programs by Minister and Agency (\$000s)					
		2021-22 Budget	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate
	Structures	63,694	37,741	35,870	42,582
	Treatment Plant Growth	3,301	1,710	3,022	857
	Water Quality Management	10,894	34,438	82,386	43,415
	Water Resource Sustainability	4,540	4,620	6,039	4,673
	SA Water Capital expenditure provision	—	—	—	16,100
Health and Wellbeing					
Health and Wellbeing					
SA Ambulance Service					
Major Projects					
	Port Augusta Ambulance Station	2,250	1,900	—	—
Annual Programs					
	SA Ambulance Service—Medical Equipment Replacement	3,250	3,233	3,314	3,397
	SA Ambulance Service—Vehicle Replacement	8,015	6,723	6,891	7,063
	SA Ambulance Service—Plant and Equipment	1,496	1,021	1,047	1,073
	Volunteer Ambulance Stations	2,690	2,757	2,826	2,897
Health Department					
Major Projects					
	Citi Centre fit out	991	—	—	—
	Electronic Medical Records System	7,229	1,076	—	—
	Enterprise Cancer Prescribing System	7,536	8,770	—	—
	Real Time Monitoring of Prescription Medicine	857	197	170	—
	SA Health Supply Distribution Centre	1,995	—	—	—
Health Regions					
Major Projects					
	Barossa Hospital	—	—	—	5,000
	Country Health SA Sustainment and Compliance	22,899	9,000	9,000	12,246
	Crisis Stabilisation Centre—Northern Suburbs	2,900	11,700	5,800	—
	Flinders Medical Centre Emergency Department Expansion	4,472	—	—	—
	Gawler Emergency Department Expansion	2,400	12,100	500	—
	Leigh Creek Health Clinic	270	1,530	—	—
	Lyell McEwin Hospital Emergency Department Expansion	25,322	7,642	—	—
	Modbury Hospital—Upgrades and Additional Services	25,946	—	—	—

2021-22 Budget—Capital Investment Projects and Programs by Minister and Agency (\$000s)					
		2021-22 Budget	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate
	Mount Barker Hospital Emergency Department	6,800	1,000	—	—
	New Older Persons Mental Health Facility—Modbury	7,800	18,400	18,400	3,400
	New Women's and Children's Hospital <sup>(1)</sup>	37,836	—	—	—
	Psychiatric Intensive Care Beds	12,000	—	—	—
	Repatriation Health Precinct Reactivation	43,707	2,000	—	—
	Residential Aged Care Enterprise System	4,487	359	—	—
	SA Pathology—Frome Road Site Works	2,014	—	—	—
	Strathalbyn Aged Care	9,947	—	—	—
	The Queen Elizabeth Hospital Redevelopment Stage 3	61,729	142,215	74,049	—
	Upgrade to existing Women's and Children's Hospital	4,430	—	—	—
Annual Programs					
	Bio-Medical Equipment	18,153	21,187	21,717	22,260
	Hospitals and Health Units—Minor Works	16,645	20,736	21,254	21,785
	Purchases from Special Purpose Funds—Capital Grants	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
	Purchases from Special Purpose Funds—Other	81	—	—	—
	(1) The government holds a central contingency provision for this project. The total cost of the project will be confirmed in a final business case.				
Human Services					
Human Services					
Major Projects					
	Child and Family Services Information System	700	600	—	—
	Riverside Building—Office fitout	3,161	—	—	—
Annual Programs					
	Kurlana Tapa Youth Justice Centre—Sustainment	548	562	576	590
South Australian Housing Authority					
Major Projects					
	Affordable Housing Initiative	106,122	129,014	71,221	22,685
	Asset & Project Management System	1,422	—	—	—
	Better Neighbourhoods Program	20,218	15,837	16,557	16,971
	Business Systems Transformation	3,216	—	—	—
	Domestic Violence Package—Forty new crisis accommodation rooms	100	—	—	—
	Land Development at Sheffield Crescent, Blair Athol	214	—	—	—

2021-22 Budget—Capital Investment Projects and Programs by Minister and Agency (\$000s)					
		2021-22 Budget	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate
	Minor Projects—SAHT	1,982	3,489	3,576	3,665
	Morphettville Neighbourhood Renewal Project	2,428	9,802	—	—
	Neighbourhood Renewal Project – Blair Athol	7,277	5,282	8,175	1,203
	Neighbourhood Renewal Project – Felixstow	1,983	2,231	1,921	—
	Neighbourhood Renewal Project – Seaton	4,623	2,301	281	214
	Neighbourhood Renewal Project – Woodville Gardens	10,364	11,474	1,587	25
	Playford North Urban Renewal	6,737	7,448	—	—
	Public Housing Capital Maintenance	6,500	5,000	3,000	5,500
	Remote Indigenous Housing	12,431	7,865	12,930	—
Annual Programs					
	Public Housing Capital Maintenance	14,236	14,592	14,957	15,331
	Public Housing Construction and Acquisition	6,304	6,462	6,624	6,790
	SAHT Management Capital	3,469	3,554	3,643	3,734
	Aboriginal Housing Capital Program	3,362	3,446	3,532	3,620
	Community Housing Capital Program	500	—	—	—
Infrastructure and Transport					
Infrastructure and Transport <sup>(1)</sup>					
Major Projects					
	Adelaide Festival Centre Precinct—Plaza and Integration	20,000	37,272	1,000	—
	Adelaide Railway Station	4,000	—	—	—
	Augusta Highway Duplication—Nantawarra to Lochiel	45,000	64,500	39,676	30,824
	Augusta Highway Duplication—Stage 1	44,000	—	—	—
	Augusta Highway Duplication—Stage 3 (Port Pirie to Crystal Brook) Business Case	4,000	1,000	—	—
	Bus Fleet Replacement Program	28,925	21,325	21,996	22,567
	City Tram Extension	1,000	—	—	—
	Critical Road Bridge Maintenance	13,500	5,000	—	—
	Driver Training Reform	1,089	—	—	—
	Dublin Saleyards Access	300	1,990	—	—
	Duplication of Joy Baluch AM Bridge	94,500	33,000	15,168	—
	Ethelton Railway Station	5,000	—	—	—
	Extension of the Tonsley rail line to the Flinders Medical Centre	2,200	—	—	—
	Eyre Highway Widening and Upgrade—Business Case	1,000	1,000	—	—

2021-22 Budget—Capital Investment Projects and Programs by Minister and Agency (\$000s)					
		2021-22 Budget	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate
	Flagstaff Road widening	9,000	2,000	6,370	—
	Fleurieu Connections Improvements Package	141,000	141,000	53,000	25,170
	Fullarton and Cross Roads Intersection Upgrade	20,000	26,090	—	—
	Gawler East Link Road	75	75	—	—
	Gawler Line Electrification	165,001	12,000	1,790	—
	Gawler Line Electrification – Railcars	71,517	—	—	—
	Gawler Railway Line Stations Refresh	15,000	5,000	—	—
	Glen Osmond and Fullarton Road intersection upgrade	12,000	18,206	—	—
	Golden Grove Road- Stage 2	21,500	500	—	—
	Golden Grove Road Upgrade	2,200	—	—	—
	Goodwood and Torrens Rail Junction Upgrade	3,400	1,660	—	—
	Goodwood, Springbank and Daws Road Intersection Upgrade	9,000	8,661	—	—
	Gorges Road, Silkes Road Intersection Upgrade	2,274	—	—	—
	Grand Junction, Hampstead and Briens Roads intersection upgrades	8,876	100	—	—
	Granite Island Causeway Refurbishment	28,000	4,944	—	—
	Greater Adelaide Freight Bypass—Business Case	2,500	7,500	—	—
	Greater State Bypass Route—Truro	—	22,000	55,000	125,000
	Green Public Transport—Retrofit Hybrid Energy Systems to Diesel Trains	2,000	8,000	—	—
	Hahndorf Traffic Improvements	2,500	—	—	—
	Heysen Tunnel Refit and Safety Upgrade	13,670	55,000	5,000	—
	Horrocks Highway	25,400	8,835	700	—
	Increased Detection of Unregistered and Uninsured Vehicles	2,439	655	671	688
	Kangaroo Island Road Upgrades	2,000	15,000	2,000	—
	Kroemers Crossing Roundabout	1,100	—	—	—
	Main North Road, Nottage Terrace intersection upgrade	6,515	200	—	—
	Main North Road, Tulloch Road intersection upgrade	20	—	—	—
	Main North, Kings and McIntyre Roads intersection upgrade	2,073	—	—	—
	Marine Package	13,660	5,000	—	—
	Marion Road and Sir Donald Bradman Drive Intersection Upgrade	5,000	25,000	15,000	—
	Mike Turtur Bikeway	10,000	14,500	—	—

2021-22 Budget—Capital Investment Projects and Programs by Minister and Agency (\$000s)					
		2021-22 Budget	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate
	Mitcham Hills Corridor – Old Belair Road and James Road	16,500	2,883	—	—
	Mitcham Hills Upgrade Program	3,500	9,916	—	—
	Mobile Phone Detection Cameras	14,240	—	—	—
	Murray Bridge to South East Links—Business Case	1,000	4,000	—	—
	Nairne Intersection Upgrade	6,800	200	—	—
	Naracoorte Roundabouts	500	3,810	—	—
	New State School Road Works	12,686	200	—	—
	North East Public Transport Park 'n' Ride	25,215	500	—	—
	North East Road and South Para Left Turn Slip Lane	500	—	—	—
	North-South Corridor—Darlington Upgrade	3,000	48,770	—	—
	North-South Corridor—Northern Connector	3,000	36,313	—	—
	North-South Corridor—Regency Road to Pym Street	24,850	1,000	70,198	—
	North-South Corridor—South Road Superway	500	1,000	2,175	—
	North-South Corridor—Torrens River to Darlington	151,400	—	—	—
	Nottage Terrace and North East Road Intersection	2,000	4,000	—	—
	Oaklands Rail Crossing Grade Separation	614	18,000	—	—
	Old Murray Bridge Refurbishment	10,000	26,000	—	—
	Onkaparinga Valley Road/Tiers Road/Nairne Road intersection upgrade	2,206	—	—	—
	Penneshaw and Cape Jervis Ports	14,000	7,680	—	—
	Port Bonython Jetty Refurbishment	19,000	10,000	—	—
	Port Stanvac Wharf and Foreshore	6,223	—	—	—
	Port Wakefield Overpass and Highway Duplication	40,000	22,000	1,498	—
	Portrush and Magill Roads Intersection Upgrade	13,000	18,377	—	—
	Princes Highway – Augusta Highway duplication	35,000	—	—	—
	Public Transport Ticketing System Enhancements	3,000	—	—	—
	Regional North-South Freight Route	7,168	—	—	—
	Regional Road Network Package	7,593	—	—	—
	Road Maintenance Stimulus	24,000	—	—	—
	Road Safety Package	105,375	105,000	—	—
	Road Safety Package—Regional	37,000	26,094	—	—

2021-22 Budget—Capital Investment Projects and Programs by Minister and Agency (\$000s)					
		2021-22 Budget	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate
	Roads Of Strategic Importance – Cockburn to Burra	22,000	20,000	6,260	—
	Roads of Strategic Importance—Eyre Highway—Port Augusta to Perth	37,500	750	—	—
	Roads Of Strategic Importance—Eyre Peninsula Road Upgrades	19,500	2,685	—	—
	Roads Of Strategic Importance – Renmark to Gawler	21,000	—	—	—
	South East Freeway Pavement Rehabilitation Works	16,200	—	—	—
	State Administration Centre Precinct Properties maintenance	13,350	6,850	—	—
	State Administration Centre Upgrade	4,250	—	—	—
	Station Refresh Program	—	—	—	5,000
	Strzelecki Track	60,000	74,997	40,000	—
	Targeted Road Safety Works	28,311	—	—	—
	Tea Tree Plaza Park n Ride	15,000	33,500	—	—
	Ten New Safety Cameras	289	—	—	—
	Thomas Foods International Facility	—	2,650	—	—
	Torrens Road, Ovingham level crossing upgrade	80,000	70,000	47,944	—
	Transport Demand Model Upgrade	1,890	1,515	—	—
	Urban Growth Fund—Planning and Construction	6,578	535	3,459	1,842
	Small projects	1,551	5,853	—	—
Annual Programs					
	DIT Annual Program	127,977	126,231	137,306	134,086
	Residential Properties	7,366	7,550	7,739	7,932
	(1) A number of DIT projects include expenditure currently budgeted in contingencies. As such, expenditure for some projects is larger than the amounts reflected for some projects above.				
Office of Recreation and Sport					
Major Projects					
	Adelaide Superdrome Upgrade	6,400	—	—	—
	Athletics Stadium Renewal and Upgrade	2,800	3,000	—	—
	Hindmarsh (Coopers) Stadium upgrades	21,000	22,000	1,300	—
	Home of Football at State Sports Park	15,500	—	—	—
	Netball Stadium Upgrade Works	5,850	6,000	—	—
	Sport and Recreation Infrastructure Plan	2,000	26,000	20,000	—
	Womens Memorial Playing Fields	4,750	—	—	—
Annual Programs					
	Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing	1,713	1,743	1,774	1,806
Innovation and Skills					

2021-22 Budget—Capital Investment Projects and Programs by Minister and Agency (\$000s)					
		2021-22 Budget	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate
Innovation and Skills					
Major Projects					
	Digital Transformation—Skills Information System	3,505	3,505	3,627	—
Annual Programs					
	Annual Investing Programs	2,043	3,628	4,407	7,722
Police, Emergency Services, Correctional Services, Road Safety					
Correctional Services					
Major Projects					
	Adelaide Remand Centre – Security Upgrades	1,900	—	—	—
	Adelaide Women’s Prison—40 beds, reception and visits centre	5,900	—	—	—
	DCS Modernisation of Roster Management	700	—	—	—
	iSAFE—An offender and intelligence management system	10,564	2,191	—	—
	Transition of Electronic Security Systems from Analogue to Digital	6,535	9,100	—	—
	Yatala Labour Prison Expansion – 270 beds and infrastructure upgrade	83,915	5,800	—	—
Annual Programs					
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	6,720	7,198	8,678	8,895
Emergency Services—CFS					
Annual Programs					
	Capital Works, Vehicles and Equipment—CFS	25,583	16,693	17,164	20,796
	Replacement of telecommunications equipment—CFS	2,918	2,026	2,077	2,129
Emergency Services—MFS					
Major Projects					
	Aerial Firefighting Appliance	1,300	—	—	—
	General Purpose Pumpers	375	3,152	3,231	3,312
	Noarlunga Command Station	6,448	1,555	—	—
Annual Programs					
	Capital Works, Vehicles and Equipment—MFS	848	6,641	8,400	8,612
	Replacement of telecommunications equipment—MFS	233	238	244	250
Emergency Services—SAFECOM					
Major Projects					
	Alert SA Replacement	151	155	159	163
	Automatic Vehicle Location System	1,400	1,625	—	—

2021-22 Budget—Capital Investment Projects and Programs by Minister and Agency (\$000s)					
		2021-22 Budget	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate
	New Emergency Services Headquarters	13,678	—	—	—
Emergency Services—SES					
Annual Programs					
	Capital Works, Vehicles, Vessels and Rescue Equipment—SES	3,104	4,452	4,565	4,679
	Replacement of telecommunications equipment—SES	449	460	472	484
Police					
Major Projects					
	APY Accommodation projects	4,789	—	—	—
	Expiation Notice Branch System Replacement	3,389	1,898	—	—
	Firearms Control System	2,461	—	—	—
	Mobile Automated Number Plate Recognition cameras	1,500	—	—	—
	Mobile Workforce Transformation Program	8,959	8,053	8,147	8,185
	Police Records Management System—Stages 2 to 4	13,652	10,852	—	—
	SAPOL Communications Centre Upgrade	9,868	6,490	—	—
Annual Programs					
	Minor Capital Works, Vehicles and Equipment	11,318	11,948	12,398	12,708
Premier					
Adelaide Venue Management Corporation					
Major Projects					
	Riverbank Arena	—	10,000	19,561	49,338
	Hindmarsh (Coopers) Stadium Technology Enhancements	2,125	6,375	—	—
Annual Programs					
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	7,354	7,538	7,726	7,920
Art Gallery Board, The					
Annual Programs					
	Capital Investment Program—Art Gallery Board	359	368	377	386
Carrick Hill Trust					
Major Projects					
	Visitor Centre Pavilion – Carrick Hill	1,500	—	—	—
Annual Programs					
	Capital Investment Program—Carrick Hill	42	43	44	45
Libraries Board of South Australia					
Annual Programs					

2021-22 Budget—Capital Investment Projects and Programs by Minister and Agency (\$000s)					
		2021-22 Budget	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate
	Capital Investment Program—Libraries Board	53	55	56	57
Premier and Cabinet					
Major Projects					
	Aboriginal Art and Cultures Centre	56,605	68,000	70,000	—
	Adelaide Festival Centre Precinct—AFC Upgrade	12,044	—	—	—
	Arts Storage	872	—	—	—
	Cultural Storage	9,458	43,826	32,344	—
	Cyber Security	250	—	—	—
	Innovation Hub fit out	5,000	5,000	—	—
	SAGOV Services Portal	6,117	—	—	—
Annual Programs					
	Government Information and Communication Technology Services	6,833	7,003	7,178	7,357
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	2,603	3,805	3,900	3,998
State Governor's Establishment					
Annual Programs					
	State Governor's Establishment	134	137	140	144
Museum Board					
Annual Programs					
	Capital Investment Program—Museum Board	53	54	55	56
Tourism					
Annual Programs					
	Capital Works and Equipment	720	738	756	775
Primary Industries and Regions					
Dog Fence Board					
Major Projects					
	Upgrade of South Australia's Dog Fence	10,793	5,000	2,500	—
Primary Industries and Regions					
Major Projects					
	Upgrade of the South Australian Aquatic Sciences Centre	14,673	—	—	—
Annual Programs					
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	7,734	5,647	5,788	5,933
Forestry					
Annual Programs					
	Plant and Equipment, Roadworks	1,410	200	250	250
	Annual Program Forestry SA	405	—	—	—
Treasurer					

2021-22 Budget—Capital Investment Projects and Programs by Minister and Agency (\$000s)					
		2021-22 Budget	2022-23 Estimate	2023-24 Estimate	2024-25 Estimate
Auditor-General					
Annual Programs					
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	245	251	257	263
Essential Services Commission of SA					
Major Projects					
	ICT Regulatory Intelligence System	663	200	—	—
Annual Programs					
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	152	156	160	164
Support Services to Parliamentarians					
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	200	—	—	—
Treasury and Finance					
Major Projects					
	Shared Services – Masterpiece System	—	1,743	—	1,831
	Taxation Revenue Management System	3,000	—	—	—
Annual Programs					
	Minor Capital Works and Equipment	1,889	1,931	1,974	2,008
	Tax Revenue Management System— ICT Replacement	345	354	362	372
Treasurer's Interest in National Wine Centre					
Major Projects					
	National Wine Centre—Rectification Works	8,225	4,370	569	4
Urban Renewal Authority					
Major Projects					
	Adelaide Station and Environs Redevelopment	2,729	29	—	—
Annual Programs					
	Plant and Equipment	47	81	47	48
Excludes leases and contributed assets					

### SCHOOL INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (29 July 2021). (Estimates Committee B)

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education):** I have been advised of the following:

The building works are in the final stages of documentation completion with final costings being part of that process.

Under the Department for Education's capital works program, contracts are awarded through a competitive tender process following a rigorous evaluation. Savings from any projects that come in under budget are retained by the department to be used as a pool of funding for managing any higher costs that may arise for projects that exceed tender budgets or face particular cost pressures due to unforeseen issues.

This is standard practice for Department for Education capital works programs over many years and is a key component in mitigating risk to the delivery of the overall program of works.